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CHAIR KENNEDY: Good morning, everyone. It is Wednesday, the 2nd of December. Thank you for joining us for our meeting today. First order of business.

If I could ask staff to call the roll, please.

MS. MARSHALL: Good morning, Commissioners.

Commissioner Le mons?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Here.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Present.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Here.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Vazquez.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Akutagawa.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Here.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner, Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Kennedy.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Here. Did you record Commissioner Vazquez as present?

MS. MARSHALL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Vazquez is here.

Thank you.

MS. MARSHALL: Got it. Thank you. We have a quorum.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

Director Claypool, do you have any announcements?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: I do not, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Members, any announcements or items of general interest? Okay.

I did not review the agenda yesterday morning, but I did put that on my list of things to do first thing today.

So the first order of business is, as always, public
comment. That will be followed by a presentation of some draft policies with discussion and possible adoption of those.

If there are votes, there will be further public comment periods before those votes.

I anticipate that after our 11:00 break, we will go into subcommittee reports. And then after lunch, we anticipate public comment period at approximately 1:45. And then I anticipate that we will be spending the afternoon looking at draft scopes of work and other documentation related to our RFPs with a public comment period before the close of business for today. So that is what we have on tap.

And with that, I will turn to Katie. Good morning, Katie. And ask that you read the instructions for public comment.

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

To dial in, the telephone number provided on the live stream feed -- wait, I'm sorry -- to call in, 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 92738068918 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 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 located on the website.

The Commission is taking general public comment for the start of the meeting at this time. And we do have someone in the queue.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And you can go ahead and invite them to join us.

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

MS. MARKS: Yes. My name is Julia Marks. That's

Good morning, Commissioners, Director Claypool, and staff. Just wanted to say thank you again for all the work you're putting in to this effort and all the great thought and discussion.

I'm calling regarding translation. And I just wanted to follow up a bit on some discussion you had yesterday of the COI tool. It sounds like there are some open questions still about how non-English language inputted comment into the COI tool will be translated so that the Commission can review and work with that material.

Obviously, I can't speak to the -- you know, all the logistics of the process or who the appropriate person is to do the coordination of the translation itself. But I just want to uplift and note that it's important that the translation is done by translators rather than an automated system like Google Translate or another computer program.

You know, when our organization has worked with translations in the past, we found that automated systems lead to incorrect and confusing translations. When we do translations, we try to work with different community groups and community members to review. The quality and
automated systems are often inadequate.

It's preferable to work with certified translators, or if certified translators aren't available, other translators who have been identified by the community that speak those languages as reliable and accurate translators.

And we're happy to help connect you all with translators if you're having difficulty with specific language groups.

And we just want to also note, whether a community member submits through the COI tool or through something like written public comment through email, if they do submit in a language other than English, we would like to see that translated so that that information reaches you all and can inform your maps.

And the COI tool itself, taking that extra step to translate the submissions, we believe will be really helpful to your process, since you are structuring the COI tool to really elicit the information you need, and it'll be paired with a visual component. So taking the extra time and investing, you know, the extra costs for translation, I think will lead to more robust input from limited English proficient communities into the redistricting process itself.

So thank you for continuing to look at language
access and be very thoughtful about making sure that it's built into all these different pieces of the process.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Ms. Marks. I just wanted to confirm that I heard correctly. You are asking that we provide both the original input and the translation of that input? I just want to make sure I have my notes correct.

MS. MARKS: I wouldn't say that was a key concern, but I do think it's important to keep both. Yes. So that if later on, people want to read the in language version or the translated version, they can. Our primary concern is that you don't rely on automated systems.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Right.

MS. MARKS: For the translation? Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good. Thank you so much for the comment.

MS. MARKS: Great. Thank you all.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And that was the only person in the queue at this time.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good. With that, then I will turn it to the Admin and Finance Committee for our discussion on policies.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I guess I'll go ahead, Alicia. Okay.
Let's see. So we've submitted two draft policies for you to review. I'll just step back a little bit and give you the background.

The statute requires the Commission to have five draft policies: Personnel, Communications, Commissioner Code of Conduct, Staff Code of Conduct, and Records Retention Policies.

Last time we reviewed the Commission Code of Conduct and then we also created last time policies on travel and per diem, how we manage those things. So today we've brought forward the Records Retention Policy and the Staff Code Of Conduct Policy to review.

And then next meeting, we'll be bringing forward the Personnel and the Communications Property Policies for you to review. And in that personnel policy, we're going to incorporate the discussions yesterday about how to manage hiring, you know, get a consistent approach to the managing approval of hires.

So I guess, at this point, we'll open it up to feedback on the policies, any changes or additions that anybody would like to see or comment about.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, good. Perfect.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I'm not seeing hands, so I'll kick it off. On the Staff Code of Conduct, the one thing that struck me is talking about persons hired directly or
indirectly to perform the tasks of the Commission. Well, in my mind, the Commission performs the tasks of the Commission and persons hired are supporting the work of the Commission. So I would suggest that we strike, "perform the tasks" and replace that with, "support the work," that's in the first paragraph.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Are you attacking this, Commissioner? Okay. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And on the Record Retention Policy, I'm wondering if it makes sense for us to include something in the policy about conversion of paper records to electronic records.

And I would ask Ms. Marshall and the legal team if there are any provisions that we need to be aware of in that regard. But you know, there are certain things that we might want to keep electronically that we don't want to keep in the hardcopy or we want to keep both. So I'm just suggesting that we contemplate something in the policy about the conversion of paper records to automatic records.

Director Claypool?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: At the end of the process, this Commission will be required to transfer all of its records to the state librarian. Last time we did it, we
transferred it on a two gigabyte hard drive, and the only paper documents it transferred were 11 major contracts with the signature contracts. So we will be moving everything onto an electronic drive. It's just a matter of how much this Commission might personally wish to keep. And if you did that, you'd have to store it somewhere because it would still be available with the state librarian.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent. Okay. And my question or suggestion is -- it deals, I guess, with the ultimate format of documents, but also in the meeting time. I mean, are there paper documents that we would immediately want to convert to electronic documents and then dispose of the paper documents, or do we want to have any sort of policy on that? And so first step is to ask if there are any legal requirements in that regard.

MS. MARSHALL: Good morning. In regards to how we maintain documents, I think it's all preference, not so much a legal issue, but how would you like for us to maintain those records? Do you want us to maintain it in paper form? Do you want us to automatically convert them to electronic form, or keep them as their as received? And then in the end, ultimately, they all are going to become electronic, with the exception of a few.

CHAIR KENNEDY: My own thought on that is the sooner
we can have everything in the same format, and that would be electronic format, the better because we would only have to search in one format rather than searching across formats. Not that that's impossible, but it seems to me it would be easier just to search across one format.

So any comments from other commissioners?

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Just that perhaps on a kind of separate kind of thing. I was just thinking about digital records. I'm going to assume that that includes like the video recordings of our meetings and other things like that.

But yesterday's conversation around, you know, inputs through Twitter and other forms of social media. Is that something -- are there certain ones -- like, I'm just kind of thinking about like, you know, I was reading through, like, where does this fit in under like, for example, the Records Retention Schedule, because that's kind of like the high level version. And I was just thinking that kind of falls under records of public input.

Do we want to keep certain kinds of records of, you know, social media postings? Is that necessary? I know that that kind of falls under the preference of the Commission. Does that kind of fall under just under,
quote unquote, digital? I think it's just -- I guess, that was just more a point of curiosity for me.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thoughts from the Admin and Finance Committee?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, in terms if it is a public input record, the retention policy says that we keep that for ten years, so we'd have to figure out how to maintain that for ten years.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think there's also -- what it sounds like is it's going to be used as an outreach tool that I'm assuming that other written forms of outreach would also be retained as well, too. So it's not just going to be public input, but our outputs as well, too.

And is it going to then be incumbent upon Mr. Saylor to maybe take screenshots, or -- you know what I mean, like, do a PDF save of the screen. I don't know. There's just different things that I guess could be done. But again, just a curious question.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I have Commissioner Sinay and Commissioner Vazquez.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Maybe we're going to say the same thing, Commissioner Vazquez. But with social media,
that's the easiest, because as long as we keep the account, everything is on there. So that's really not -- it's kind of a nonissue with social media. It's more the other types of public comments. Because you can go back to social media right now and look -- if you go to We Draw the Line on Twitter, you can see everything that they used.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Vasquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: The internet is forever. Even if you delete -- even if you delete accounts and tweets, there are dozens of internet scrapers that are archiving every single public tweet. So yeah. Internet is forever.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think I do agree with Commissioner Vasquez. It is forever. I am thinking, though, that if that were the case, then all of our current public records would be forever found on the internet.

But do we want to do it in such a way that it is easily accessible and archived properly? I also will not assume that ten years from now the same social media channels will be still available. Maybe, maybe not.

I think technology does change, and I don't want to assume that it'll be here. For all we know, it may not
be. And while it could be available through other means on the internet, it may not be the easiest means. And if there is an intention to try to retain some of this -- I don't know. I don't know if it's -- I think I'm just bringing it up because it just seems like in line with the other things. I think we need to think differently about some of these other sources in which we are providing communications and not just assume that it will be there, even though, yes, the internet is forever.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. And actually, I have one other point on the record for the retention policy. Under litigation it holds says records relevant to pending litigation must, at a minimum, be retained until the litigation is finally concluded. And I just want to make sure that we understand that, finally concluded includes any potential appeal. So we would have to retain documents not only until the pending litigation is concluded, but until the end of any period during which an appeal might be filed.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So do you want us to add language to that effect?

CHAIR KENNEDY: I would suggest it, and again, I would ask the legal team for their advice on how best to phrase that.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, that was going to be
my recommendation. And we did forward this to our chief
counsel, Marshall. And so I think what we would need to
know is we would need to know what's the time frame of
filing appeals, right? Because that would determine the
period for them to file an appeal.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Marion.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Actually, we sent it to the
chief counsel.


MS. MARSHALL: Depending on what court you file it
in, it would dictate, you know, the timeline for the
appeal. But what I can do is take a look at it in terms
of the language, if you want some modification to it, and
get back to you all.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: As I understand it, pending
litigation refers to the entire course of a case. So if
a case continues on appeal, it's still pending. So I
don't think there's any need for modification. You can
add it if you want to until all appeals are concluded.
But I think that the current language encompasses that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: This is Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. I understand we're
talking about until it's concluded. But does that
mean -- I mean, then there's the records retention. You
don't just ditch -- I mean, aren't there legal
requirements in terms of holding on to material from a
case?

MS. JOHNSTON: No, the Court holds on to records for
the case, but there is no requirement that individuals.

Generally, attorneys do hold on to them for a
reasonable period of time until they dispose of the
records. But that's not something that's really within
the commission's control, because it would be records of
whatever outside counsel --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. And so we just keep
our -- and our records are already covered elsewhere.

MS. JOHNSTON: Correct.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari, anything
further from subcommittee's side?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, I just want to check
in with Commissioner Akutagawa. I mean, did you -- were
you just -- I mean, thinking out loud that we need to be
kind of cognizant of the fact that we need to capture our
social media and maintain that? Or did you have
something specific you wanted us to add -- you were
proposing to add to the policy?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think it was more the
former and to just think through, you know, how does that fit in with what you already have? Does it require a clarification?

I think just the way technology does move, I think we sometimes forget about it. Like, it's a tool that's there, but we forget about it. But yet it's also has become quite a source of information and communication sharing.

And so I think I just want to make sure that we remain mindful because I think back to a lot of the kind of stories about how laws have still not caught up with the kind of digital age. And it's still written in a way that assumes that technology and the use of technology is not as widespread as it is.

And so I think it's more just food for thought for us to think about. And whether or not it requires explicit language or if that you feel that it's already encompassed by what we have. I'm comfortable with that, but I think I just wanted to ask that question because it just seems like something that, as we go forward, you know, we can't predict what ten years from now what it's going to be like. But I do feel like the more forward thinking we could be, the better we'll be served.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Many social media sites,
including Twitter, also include a way to download an
archive of everything, should you ever want to do that.
So I don't know. I just, I would hate to add an
additional bureaucratic process to our one communications
staff person right now at the expense of having us look
relevant on social media and be responsive.

I can't imagine that we would be tweeting things
that aren't documented elsewhere in terms of content.
It's another avenue to push out messages that we are
pushing out in other avenues so there are records.

I can't imagine we'll be seeing things particularly
differently online in social media places anyway. I
mean, unless we're planning on, you know, responding to
direct messages with personal -- you know what I mean?
Like there's -- I just can't imagine that there is a lot
of -- there's going to be a lot of new content in social
media that is only on social media.

And there are also just ways to back up and archive
content should we need to do that. But to create a
process where we're sort of double documenting social
media seems like overkill and probably not a tradeoff I
would recommend this Commission do.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

So Commissioner Fornaciari, any comments from your
side at this point?
COMMISSIONER FORNASCIARI: I think Commissioner Yee had a comment.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Just to add another category, I'm learning what happens to our own notes individually as commissioners. And the same way we sent in our notes from staff hires, you know, what about all of the other paper we each generates, not copies of things that are already archived, but you know, our own handwritten notes, anything else we generate. You know, I imagine at the end of this, we turn our computers in with whatever is on them and our new nifty cell phones. But what about everything else?

COMMISSIONER FORNASCIARI: So it does address notes. I'm trying to find that.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It does, and I'm not as quick right now.

COMMISSIONER FORNASCIARI: It's in (indiscernible) notes in my recollection -- I can't find it off the top of my head, but my recollection is, you know, if there's anything of critical substance in there, then they need to be retained. But for the most part, notes are just, you know, something to jog my memory and it's captured somewhere else.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. Because it's discarded when you're -- what we have here, is it's discarded when no longer needed.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Under 4, under document and other materials, under the description says, informal notes, and the retention period, it should be destroyed when no longer needed, unless they are otherwise required to be retained and are necessary to the functioning or continuity of the Commission -- or have legal certificates.

So I think for the most part, our personal notes, you can just, you know, destroy them when you no longer need them.

COMMISSIONER YEE: In fact, we're supposed to destroy them for these -- for this policy.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Director Claypool, is there any additional equipment or tasking required for the implementation of this policy as it's drafted?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: I don't believe so. I think that as I was listening to you, I realized in the spirit of transparency, we'd talked about notes and everything else. There are great many things that we should keep. I think if you decide to destroy personal notes or anything else, that you should discuss it with our Counsel first. Kary can tell you whether we need to hang
on to it or not.

But we will have a lot of stuff that we're going to store all the way through, particularly all the public input. And that was what went over to the, actually, state archives. I had said The state librarian. They're in the same building. But The state archives will pick it up.

The one thing that I went over and asked Raul, so what's the policy for State Archives on maintaining what was sent over in 2010? And he said, well, they will go through it and glean it for things of historical value.

So we do need to remember also that we're required to maintain the state's retention policy. And I had just spoken with Kary and asked her, you know, can we just match us up and make sure that we're on the conservative side of the state's policy because we don't want to not adhere to what's required by law.

And then we -- you know, that will probably capture us as far as we need to go. But for right now, it's just maintaining what you've got on your computers or in your personal records. And then when we get to that point to where we -- or when you get to that point where you want to get rid of things, just consult the attorneys.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani, do you have any thoughts to
share on permanent record value and research use of anything that we might be producing now or in the future?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Nothing in particular. I mean, perhaps someone would want to do archival research, but I -- you know, I can't speak to that per se.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thanks.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. I just wanted to respond to Director Claypool's comment regarding having legal look at the state retention. I think that's what Marian did.

Correct, Marian?

Because Marian is one that drafted the policy initially, and she told me it was perfect, so I'm pretty sure she's right.

MS. JOHNSTON: I'm sorry. I was answering a phone call right when your question came. What was the question?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So Director Claypool had mentioned that we just wanted to make sure that what we had in the retention schedule was in line with what the state retention schedule policy is. And I believe you've already done that, correct?

MS. JOHNSTON: Right. Although it never hurts to have a second person look at it. But for instance,
Commissioner Yee's comment about sending in the notes on employment, that's because of specific state and federal requirements for keeping notes related to the employment of someone until that person's no longer employed. So that's why we asked for those to be sent over. But we'll let you know if there's something like that that applies to a particular kind of document.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So I'm just going to -- oh, I'm sorry. I was going to summarize what has been said, but Commissioner Taylor has a question.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Hi, good morning.

As we delve into sort of the record retention as it applies to the notes, I know that personal can be a sliding scale. And so where do we get into the distinction between what was a personal note that we took as it relates to how we go about our business and what was something that might be deemed material and relevant to past litigation. So I know that I would be extremely cautious with destroying any notes as it relates to our work.

And I think of two instances of, you know, what's required from some civil servants. Some civil servants are required to keep all of their notes until the end of their employment. And then further also think of how a
jury is handled when you're sitting in the box, you leave all your notes in the box at the conclusion of your business, and then it becomes the court's discretion.

So I'm sort of the opinion that -- and of course, counsel can ultimately make a decision, but I'm sort of the opinion that all these notes that we take, if you put it down, it need might need to be retained.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Marian?

MS. JOHNSTON: I'm sorry. I'm still getting used to this equipment. I think that's correct, as far as the Commission -- while the Commission is still active, because you never know when there's going to be a public records request, or when there's going to be some kind of litigation going on. So at least while the Commission is still active, my advice would be to hold onto all of your notes.

On the other hand, if you were to destroy them and they weren't in a category that's required to be maintained, there's no legal damage in that. It's just for good practice to keep them until you finish your work.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Okay. Are we at a point where we want to move towards adopting these two draft policies officially? Do we have -- are we clear on any minor modifications required?
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. So for the staff code of conduct, I just have the one change, to put, "support the work of," instead of, "perform the task of."

And then for the --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible) --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, sorry. That was really cute, whoever said that.

And then for the record retention, counsel was going to, I guess, do one more double-check to make sure that the retention schedule was in line with the state retention schedule. And chief counsel was also going to look at the language for the litigation holds and adjust it if needed.

But basically, that's it, in terms of the changes that were discussed. We could move forward with this, and if there's a motion that we just move forward with the changes noted, that would -- we could do that. Unless you want us to bring it back tomorrow, possibly.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. My sense is that for the staff code of conduct, adopting now with the one change would be fine.

The record retention policy, if counsel is going to take another look at this, I would prefer to hold off. As you say, we could bring it back before the Commission tomorrow if counsel is able to review it between now and
then.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair.

I wanted to just say, I really appreciate the work that was done in both of the policies. I thought they were well-written, and I was going to move that, yes, we adopt and my motion would have been for both policies, though one, with the changes that were suggested, and if I'm not mistaken, if we adopt the other policy and approve it now, if there are other changes to it, perhaps it can be an amendment to it at that time, and if not, we'll be set and ready to go. So that would be my motion that we adopt it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Is there a second?

Commissioner, Yee is seconding.

Is there a discussion? Further discussion? Okay.

Then I will ask Katie to call for public comment before we take a vote on this.

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

To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. The telephone number is 8778535247. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on
the livestream feed. It is 92738068918 for this week's meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound key.

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

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

The Commission is taking public comment on the motions on the floor at this time.

And we do not have anyone in the queue.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. We will standby for 2 minutes to let the live feed catch up.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. While we have a minute, I just -- one more thing I wanted to share with
the group. We're putting together a shared folder. It's going to contain policies, procedures, and memos and you know, just kind of the general documents that we need to have available to everyone as a resource.

So we already have the first policies that we've approved up there. I haven't shared it yet because I wanted to check in with Director Claypool to make sure I wasn't doing redundant work here, but he gave me the go ahead this morning.

So we'll incorporate the new policies into the policy document and put the memos up there and share that with everyone so there'll be one place where we can go to find all this documentation.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent.

Director Claypool?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: First, thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari, for doing that. It takes -- you know, it helps staff out when you pick something up like that for us.

I did notice one thing in the retention policy that we need to add. I just was scanning it as we were talking. The very final thing, it says, we're going to keep permanently, the final redistricting maps. We need to also include the final redistricting maps and accompanying report. The reports that stand in support
of the maps. They're companion pieces, and I just think
that we should make sure that it's understood. That's
all.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The queue is still empty,
Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So just to make sure that
everyone understands, this would add and accompanying
report to the final redistricting maps on the last page
under redistricting records. So we would be including
that change in what we are voting on.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I was just going to say
the same thing you did.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good.
Okay. Could I ask staff to call the vote then?

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Le mons?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner, Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Sinay?

Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Turner?
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Kennedy.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Motion passes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. That is our discussion of policies, which went smoothly and quickly. So we will now move to subcommittee report.

First of all, the subcommittee on Action on the Census, Commissioner Sadhwani and Toledo, do you have anything to report?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Nothing new, at this time,
beyond what Marian had updated yesterday. Unless
Commissioner Toledo has anything.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No updates.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

Next, the hiring of the deputy executive director.

Commissioners Fernandez and Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: We're both so anxious to
talk about this. Not.

I believe Director Claypool provided an update
yesterday. We're no closer, unfortunately, today than we
were two weeks ago or two months ago. So okay. That's
the update, unfortunately.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you.

Finance and Admin, are there any nonpolicies that
you are -- issues that you would like to update us on?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I don't think so.

I don't have anything.

Commissioner Fernandez, was there anything else to
update on? Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Gantt chart, I would ask Director
Claypool to provide any updates to me or to Commissioner
Taylor and me in writing that we need to take into
account in updating the Gantt chart. And I will try to
get an updated version of that on the website before the
next meeting.
Director Claypool?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: And per our discussion, I'll be working today on updating that timeline, that contracting timeline that you discussed and that that will need to be incorporated into the Gantt chart. I was holding off on presenting that until we actually knew that we were putting our contracts into review by DGS and OLS. But I will work on that and distribute it to the Commission so we can see where the time is now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent. Thank you.

Line drawers RFPs, we will take up later. VRA compliance -- your RFPs, we will take up later. Is there anything else that you would want to update on other than the RFPs?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I don't think so. I think just to say that we'll talk about this a little bit with the update on the RFIs. We continue to think about trainings for the commission, and we're projecting that to be in kind of January, February, but we'll also mention that with the RFI. I don't know if Russell has anything more.

MR. RAWLINGS: That's all. Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Commissioner Andersen?
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I do have to say, and I apologize if people don't realize this, I must be away from 2 to 3:30 this afternoon. And I know we're talking about doing all our RFIs. There is an item which I don't know if we want to get into now. It does sort of affect the timeline, which is sort of the Gantt chart. It's kind of a piecing all of this together.

Commissioner Sinay actually mentioned, you know, what meetings, how many meetings. This, at some point, really does have to come up. And I don't know if now might be a very good time to do that because it directly affects the timing and the synthesis of all of the RFIs, including the data management and the tasks involved.

And I don't know if we want to bring this up at this time, considering it's a fairly, you know, try to, you know, to put all of us together when we all have our heads here and in place without going through the specifics of the line drawing RFP.

I think this might be a good -- and I see Commissioner Sadhwani is kind of nodding your head.

Director Claypool, I think this is something that you also were mentioning in your items. How many meetings? When are we having meetings? Would the Commission be -- entertain discussing this at this point?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Director Claypool?
DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Yes. I think yesterday I had actually said that I would send out the 2010 schedule, so you could kind of see what 34 meetings look like. And unfortunately, I did not have the time to do that. I will do that today.

And also, there will be a piece that shows the attendance that they had. So just give you a flavor of what it looks like when you're on the road.

Of course, we have the advantage this time of not having to travel, which will greatly reduce the stress that will come upon you when we reach April.

We talked also about having it be split. When I spoke with Commissioner Andersen and Commissioner Sadhwani, we talked about having the desire to get a lot of this COI testimony ahead of that census data so that we would have more time after the census data to actually refine the maps and go through the process of developing the maps.

So we can talk about it right now, and it's a good time. I think the first thing the Commission may want to consider is, what do you as a Commission think you would like to do as far as a meeting, an actual meeting? What would it look like to you to do a public meeting? We've heard several suggestions, but I think that right off the bat, we need to think about that. And from there, we can
expand to how many of those you can feasibly have. So
I'll let it go there.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And on that, I might sort of
step in. Commissioner Sadhwani and I have put together
basically a visual that we can all look at, and I think
it will help in terms of time frame and the components of
this.

And this is for -- it's -- we might walk through it
and talk about our ideas, and you'll see how all the
different components will possibly fit in. And we'll
need clarification. Without getting into the specifics
of meetings, but you'll see how it all fits together.

So I might -- Commissioner Sadhwani, you want to
share your slides here?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. Yes, I will do that.
Is that okay if I share screen?

And I will talk through all of this? This is not
posted as of yet. We actually just made it this morning
just to make it a little bit more clear for people to
follow. We certainly can post it, and we can talk
through the entirety of what I'm sharing.

And I will, just to uplift kind of this piece around
the reason we need to talk about this now. It's very
difficult to develop the RFP unless we have a plan,
unless we have a sense of what these meetings are going
to look like. And I think that's where we're really struggling. It's been a struggle even for me, for Commissioner Andersen, for Director Claypool to all kind of get on the same page and really understand, oh, well, this is how you're envisioning, this is how someone else might be.

So I think to the extent that we can begin this conversation and get some clarity and get everyone on the same page about whatever our plan is going to be would be very helpful. So I'm going to go into screen sharing mode.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. I see a question from Commissioner Vazquez.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. Thank you. I'm glad we're having this conversation. I'm sad that Commissioner Sinay is not here because we have -- the outreach committee, I think we concur with Commissioner Sadhwani and Commissioner Andersen, it's been incredibly difficult to get concrete about our outreach plans without knowing the how and the what we want to get out of our public meetings, both for the communities of interest, but also for, you know, receiving feedback. And it's hard to plan even a grant structure if we don't know exactly what we are going to be asking community
groups to be supporting us in.

So again, appreciate this conversation, and we sort of had also scheduled for item 10 a discussion similar to this regarding outreach. So I don't think these are separate conversations. So just wanted also to add that additional lens and framing for folks during this discussion that all of this is very relevant and inseparable from our outreach planning.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So I might just say, thank you very much, Commissioner Vazquez. And I am sorry, Commissioner Sinay. I believe she'll be back shortly.

This is -- it looks like line drawer RFP update. It is part of that, but this is really an overall.

And I might toss the data management group under the bus too here. This also directly affects you because the interaction between the line drawer and the data management is a crucial piece that we need to figure out because it is pertinent to both the RFPs, and the VRA. All of these tie together. This is sort of the -- and the Gantt chart and the -- so we're all -- and that's where this -- the gist of this is for discussion purposes to hit on different things and to tie it all together. This is kind of more of a -- and get at visions of how things are fitting together and when, you know, doing our best. I'd like, you know, and this might not work. But
we're actually getting it down and moving it forward.

So go ahead, Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, no, absolutely. And I just completely agree with you, Commissioner Vazquez, that this is just for discussion. And at some point we all have to finalize a plan.

So some of the things that we were thinking about.

Right, taking the lessons learned from 2010, we have additional time. We have time prior to census data dropping. We also know that when we get census data is not entirely clear, so we're just going to operate for now off of that April time frame, August 15th time frame. I get it. That may not be the time frame, but we need to have something to work off of.

And so what we're thinking is from mid-January to April, that we can begin some of this outreach prior to having census data, that we can begin -- as the outreach committee has talked about, and I believe that Mr. Ceja is also a part of planning this at this stage, that there's this educational component, right. But that we can also begin to collect testimonies. We can begin to have some of these conversations around the state to give us additional time, even before we have the census data.

We'll have to think about, however, what that looks like in terms of the submissions that we get. The COI
tool will be available, so we'll have to have the data
management system in place in order to capture that
testimony.

The line drawers, with all honesty, right, in terms
of the timeline of an RFP, we could start going out in
mid-January and collecting information, but we probably
won't have a line drawer yet, right. That contract, just
given the RFP process time -- you'll see when we talk
about the VRA attorneys and outside litigation, it's
going to be a while, in order to meet all of those
deadlines.

So that would be kind of a public comment piece.
And then from the CRC side, right, we have already talked
about conducting an RPV analysis. Right. And
Commissioner Yee and I are actively working on trying to
develop an agreement for an outward-facing public
document, conducting a broad RPV analysis, and that can
help inform, you know, what we all need to think about in
terms of VRA compliance, as well as nontestimonial data
collecting information about school districts, about
water districts, et cetera.

Commissioner Andersen, do you want to jump in and
add anything, if I've left anything out?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I do, actually.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Basically, what we've done here is, there are two time frames. There's the pre-census and then there's once we get the census data. And 2011, basically, they didn't do any of the public outreach, the meetings. That all started once they had the data. And as the commissioners also said, lessons learned, don't do what we did. You have extra time and use that time to get as much of the testimony -- the public testimony as you possibly can before the data hits. And that was said multiple times. And I want to be very, very clear. So the idea is maybe two contacts with all of our partners going out, one, education, two, we're actually getting that testimony.

Now, knowing -- understanding that, some of that testimony has to change because of the -- when the actual census data gets there because the people who -- particularly groups who are racially based and say, we're in this area, and then the census data comes in and it turns out, well, a lot of people have moved, so that COI has to be arranged.

But before that April 1st deadline, you have actually done a lot of those meetings. They're general. But you've done that, and you've gotten -- and where I have here, the data management. Data management needs to be at virtually all of those meetings. They have to
collect all this stuff. If this is their task, they have to be taking all this in and converting it into GSI format. Otherwise, as Sofia Garcia was mentioning, line drawers were taking that all in and changing into the GSI format. And that's so -- so in terms of when do those people come on and what tasks are they actually doing, this is what I want you to be thinking of. Is -- that's going to happen, February, mid-February-ish. And who needs to know what? Then -- and what -- at this time what's the CRC doing? We're trying to reach all our outreach people.

We are also doing the VRP analysis, a rough one. And this is to get where are -- you know, what areas do we really need to tackle. But another idea which came, again, from the 2010 group is nontestimonial data. Which testimonial data is all of public coming in and talking to us. Nontestimonial data is school districts, water districts, other than just city maps it could be economic groups, neighborhoods that are -- like, cities call our neighborhood this. This is not necessarily the people coming in and telling us. And again the 2010 Commission said, "You should get both". We didn't really get much and we wish we had.

So then, sir, if you could go to the next line --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Before we move on, I just
want to stress and kind of underscore here, if we go out and start doing these meeting during this time frame, we may or may not have a line drawer already under contract. Just given the time frame for the RFP's, right? That we're going to have to have it sit basically for a month and get approval from -- I think the office is DGF? You can correct me. I'm still learning all of these acronyms.

So how that will -- we'll have think through what does this meeting look like. It's going to look very different from how 2010 was conducting those meetings. And those meetings that -- they conducted then; their line drawer was there with them. And when they received testimony the maps were shifting. You know -- they were taking a look at a screen with different maps. That was my understanding of the meetings in 2010.

If we adopt a timeline like this, those meetings would be -- would look very different. And so I think we just need to be prepared for that.

And then moving on to the time period with census data, and again April to June or July, you know, in that time frame. At that point, we can be doing the RPV analysis that -- the more fine grained analysis that we discussed at our last meeting. We still have to figure out whether or not that's going to be, you know,
attorney/client privilege, work product, et cetera. We'll have that conversation in the future. But that analysis will have to be conducted regardless. We can begin incorporating all of the testimony that we've had, as well as continue to conduct additional testimony, right? So at this point we would have the line drawer on board, we can do those meetings that work more similar to the 2010 style where a line drawer is there. We're really, you know, playing with the testimony, playing with maps, all leading towards those draft maps being established.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'd like to jump in here --
Chair Kennedy: Let me -- let me interrupt --
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Go ahead.
Chair Kennedy: Let me interrupt you for a moment.
Commissioner Le Mons has a question or comment and then I have a question. And then I'll hand it back to you.
Commissioner Le Mons?
VICE CHAIR LE MONS: First, thank you, both, for bringing this conversation forward. I agree with you. I think this is very critical. What I need some help with, and I don't know if other commissioners can benefit from this, is -- so we've been -- we're talking about this in the context of -- and I'm talking about just this presentation. But you know, where -- what we're going to do. We're talking about in the context of how it was
done before, how we want to do it different. I'm not clear on those distinctions. So that would be helpful to understand. What are we really trying to do that's different? What are the pros and cons to doing it differently?

And I'm not talking about the education piece. I'm kind of taking the education piece out. I fully understand the purpose and intent of the education piece. Or at least I'll try to sum up what I think the point of the education piece is to, of course, expand understanding and education around this process, why it exists. Ultimately, to have more and more people be involved. So that we increase the public participation over what it has been in the past and hopefully set up the future to have even more participation. So that's just sort a fly-by sum of what the education piece is about.

But the draft -- the map part is the part that I often get kind of lost on what it is we're really trying to do. And how much of that pre-census testimony -- the value of the pre-census testimony in comparison to the post-census testimony, so that we understand how much emphasis and effort to put in. So I think -- I see Commissioner Sadhwani nodding. So I think she's -- so there's a whole laundry and I won't spend any more time.
But I really think that I need a comparing contrast, I guess, approach, so that we can talk about the value of these alternative, or different, on enhanced, or new approaches, and what we're going to get from them. And that kind of is a piggy back off of what the presentations yesterday -- they gave a very simple example of kind of the dog park thing, et cetera.

So we can get an enormous amount of information. It has -- but what are we trying to very specifically accomplish? And that will make it easier for me to contribute, you know, a point of view, or come time to vote to vote on it, because I'll better understand our intention in a more laser, surgical way. So I hope I was clear there.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think so. Oh, go ahead.

Sorry.

Chair Kennedy: It's okay. So I will -- I will make one quick comment on that and pose my question and then turn it back over to Commissioner Andersen and Commissioner Sadhwani.

So I have tried all along, I have sought all along to draw a clear distinction between communities of interest and districts. So in my mind, collecting communities of interest's input before the census data comes out, you get the clearest most un-tarnished, un-
biased, depiction of what a community of interest is.
And then we know from the legal framework that
communities of interest need to serve as building blocks
for districts.

Communities of interests are not districts.
Communities of interest are building blocks of districts.
And the better understanding we have of what the
communities of interest are, before we start into the
actual drawing of districts, the better.

So then my question to the two of you is, we have --
we know from previous briefings that we anticipate
receiving ACS data, American Community Survey data, in
February. And does that influence our thinking on this
big-picture calendar? So back to Commissioner Andersen
and Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. On the ACS data in
February, that one I have to think about. And
Commissioner Sadhwani might have a better idea on that
one. The -- Commissioner Kennedy, you did a quick
summary of the benefits, of certainly the mass-of-pro to
the item that Commissioner Le Mons has actually asked me
about.

The idea -- last -- okay. The last time versus this
time. In 2010 all public meetings were one and the same.
They were collect the communities of interest and draw
the maps. They were virtually the same sort of thing.
And they did -- they overlapped. So the idea -- and so
it was complicated, they got changed, some of it -- it
was a question of are they all real? Doing that all at
the same time also resulted in -- we didn't have time to
go back once we made a map, and people put comments in
about, "Oh god. It's terrible". We said, "Right, right.
We'll adjust it." And then they were out of time and had
to just post those maps and go.

And a lot of people -- a lot of the public, who had
really valid questions -- they didn't have time on the
screen. Right now, you say reiterate, they didn't have
time to do the reiteration.

And the lessons learned were try to move as much up
as you possibly can to give yourself more time. Because
once you have that first initial map drawn, the actual
real map, you have to let it sit for two weeks. You
can't touch it. And then you can start adding in all the
comments. So everyone can comment once -- because the
idea is you don't want to hit a moving target, which is
totally understandable. But it does take two weeks out
of there where you can't do any kind of reiteration. So
I -- Commissioner Le Mons want's to jump in right away I
see.

Chair Kennedy: Well, I -- hold on. I'm -- I'm --
I've got this. So Director Claypool's hand was up first, and then Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: I wanted to address Commissioner Le Mons' question about what's the difference between pre and post. The first Commission didn't have that opportunity to actually go out as far as they wanted to and to meet with as many groups. Once you get the census data, you're going to be concentrating quite a bit on large population areas. That really -- as we were told in 2010 -- or -- Los Angeles. Everything starts in Los Angeles and then it kind of ripples out. And so a lot of our -- a lot of our meetings ended up being in large population centers. And we would go to smaller places, but once we started refining them -- or once they started refining them, it got even more and more concentrated to Los Angeles and San Diego and the Inland Empire and so forth, where you really needed to get a lot of testimony to divide up those very compact districts.

So in my mind, Commissioner Le Mons, the difference here is that you have what I consider a luxury of being able to reach out to people that weren't reached out to the first time. And to have these conversations, and to understand the Eastern Sierras, and understand Northern California. And you know, as far as the difference
between Eureka and Redding and Susanville and those areas.

You can do those meetings and you will have enfranchised individuals in those areas. Then you get the census data and now you start with a better base from starting to make your decisions. And that's all.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yep. Commissioner Le Mons?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: So I have a question for what Commissioner Andersen was just saying. So if we can -- if you can help distinguish time, like, what you just described with, you know, the drawing and that all sounds like a time constraint, not a process constraint. Or -- so what I'm trying to understand in my question is -- so I guess, first of all, I'm ignorant about the various ways a map can be drawn. So that's -- that's -- and I don't mean the shapes. I'm saying the process.

So it sounds like the line drawers were there, real time, drawing maps with real testimony at the time. And then those were captured. And it sounds like a time crunch happened. There wasn't another round opportunity for feedback. That's a time problem, in my mind. That's not a process problem per-say. If they had had more time they might have went back.

So this data that we're going to be collecting -- like, without a line drawer for example. If you guys --
this -- this particular line drawing group; if you could
share with us, like, how does that get incorporated with
the line drawer?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. If I might --
basically, we're putting -- what we like to do is get all
the building blocks together. And we understand that the
census data is a bunch of people building blocks. But we
also -- to draw districts, we need to know the city
map -- the city locations, we need to know the county
locations, we need to know the locations, IE the building
blocks, of communities of interest.

And in doing our -- every time our testimonials,
it's to get communities of interest. It's to get and map
those communities of interest. So they are also a part
of, on our - you know, little piece that we can up and
put on our big chart, essentially. We have another
picture.

And by going out early, as Commissioner Kennedy
said, you identify who are those communities. And you've
made a contact. And what -- they don't -- they don't
care. They're not trying to -- they're not basing on, oh
I want a line drawn here and here and here. They are
saying, "Hello. Here I am. I believe this is where I --
where my map is." And you're -- so you have all those
without the color of numbers.

So you have it -- they're more -- they're more
accurate, they're more real. They're more -- you know,
they're genuine -- genuine. And so you've made that
contact. And now once that -- so you -- basically,
you've made that contact. You've drawn a picture, so
that you have -- as we come down to here -- once you
actually have data, and you incorporate that. So people
can go and they can look. And on our website you'll see,
"Oh. Here's a little communities of interest. Oh here's
a city. Oh. Here's -- " all the little pieces are
starting to show up on the map, on our big map, before
we've drawn any line anywhere.

So you have all the parts that are there. Then once
the data comes out, you know, or we get that big PO
1010 -- or I can't remember what it's called now. Then
you do the RFP analysis. You know the racially voterized
-- racially polarized voting. To show some areas where
there's another -- this is how -- there's another piece
that you have to do, before you start doing actual line
drawing. And then -- yeah. These are -- these are
all -- you know, you're drawing up little things. Then
you start the idea of, we're putting a map up there with
all the census data and all our pieces on it and actually
trying to draw a line.

So -- and before, what had happened is collecting those little testimonies, those little -- our little COI maps happened at the same time as we were trying to draw a district. So you're trying the two things at the same time.

So it was a process issue. And not just a timing issue. Now, the one thing that does kick all this around and which is why we have incorporating, and it's all at the same time here, is; while we've touched our communities of interests, and we know that they're genuine and real, unfortunately their lines will also change a little bit based on the actual census data.

But we've already contacted them. We're -- we've made a connection and so we already know that -- that they are -- you know, we can help them modify their COI, based on real numbers, as opposed to just an arbitrary thing.

It's sort of a way to move it all forward, to give us all a bit more time, clean up the process, as well as make it a bit more accurate and a bit more transparent, and give the public more chances to contact us, as we finally do all the maps.

Chair Kennedy: Commissioner Sadhwani?

Ms. SADHWANI: Yeah. If I may, just to jump in
here. And I agree with everything Commissioner Andersen has said. I think in response to your question, Commissioner Le Mons -- and let me know if this is helpful or not.

I see time and process as being very intimately intertwined. That we have the gift of extra time. That 2010 Commission gave us the gift of extra time. But how we use that time is most certainly a process question. Because if -- what I heard you asking is, if we don't a line drawer there, how are we going to incorporate it? And I think that that is the challenge that we are facing, especially as we are putting together this RFP. Because I don't know the answer to that. And that's where I feel like we need a lot of our, you know, creative minds here.

I would love to say hey let's just get line drawer on in mid-January and go out and start doing this. So that -- not that we're creating the districts, but so that we have something to really capture those testimonies, capture the COI-tool stuff. So I do think that that will be a process challenge. However, in terms of the time perspective, I agree with Commissioner Andersen. I think that the time and process -- I just feel like they're so intertwined, because one of the biggest lessons learned that I keep reading and hearing
about from 2010, is that they developed the maps, but
didn't -- and then when they had their draft maps, and
I'm sure -- if anyone in the public is remembers that
time period better than any of us do, they can call in
and tell us. But there was an outcry. Right? For the
original draft maps. There was a sense from the
communities that the Commission had gotten it wrong. And
there wasn't enough time for the Commission to go back
and really do a lot of additional feedback -- get
additional input. Because it was such a short time
crunch.

So part of this, to me, is actually moving up the
time in which we're going to have our draft maps,
potentially. Right? In order to have more time for that
reiterate piece, that number 4 here. Right? So that we
can buy ourselves more time.

If we get it wrong, again, the first time with our
draft maps, that we'll also have enough time. So --
afterwards to go back before we hit our deadline of
having a final map.

And so -- I -- to me, the process and the timing is
all very much intricately intertwined. And it's how we
tease that out, which is what we are facing at this
point. Because if we go out pre-census, without a line
drawer, I agree with you. I don't know exactly how we're
going to manage all of that data that's coming in. And that's where I really feel like this conversation coincides so much with the -- with the data management sub-committees work.

Chair Kennedy: Okay. Commissioner Le Mons and then Commissioner Turner and Commissioner Fornaciari.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: So Commissioner Sadhwani, yes. I agree with you that time and process are intertwined. Absolutely. I think the only -- the only distinction I was trying to make there is -- let's say a line drawer is essential, like that function, to getting us to the end results, right? Then it would be -- and I don't know that that's the truth. Right? But I'm just using this as the example. If that is indeed the case, then we need -- unlike 2010, who wasn't able to do anything until post-April -- and if we have the earlier time and we still don't have a key component, like the line drawer, then we aren't able to maximize the value of that additional time that we have. And I guess that's the part I'm a little confused about.

I know what we've talked about wanting to collect. But at the end of the day we're trying to end up with a map. And I understand what Commissioner Andersen said very clearly. I understand everything you said. I don't know that everything you said is accurate in terms -- and
I'm not saying it's inaccurate either. But I don't know that everything you said is -- that is as simple a puzzle that you've described. That we'll just plug this piece. And who's plugging the pieces in? Like, all of that, to me, is like okay that's sounds great, but how do we get there?

Chair Kennedy: Okay. I have Commissioner Turner, Commissioner Fornaciari, Commissioner Andersen, and Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So could I -- would it help if I answered that first?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: No. No.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Because what I wanted to say -- maybe you can answer, you know, after whatever the line -- lineup is, because it's -- it's exactly what Commissioner Le Mons just said. Because the point I wanted to make back when you said, Commissioner Kennedy, I wrote it down. Because for me it clicked in my mind. Made it kind of solidify a lot of conversations we've been having as far as the community of interests serves as building blocks. Right? And I know we're trying to accord districts and we're trying to work up to that, and community of interests is a building block. Perhaps one shape, and then, you know, other
testimonies -- there's going to be another block. We're going to have all these blocks and they'll be on a map somewhere. And from there we'll then be able to see what people that we've said over and over, they know their community. They know where their communities of interest are. So we should be able to trust that. Which on one hand makes me wonder why does that even change for them with census data, if indeed they know their areas, why would it change later based on what a number said? I know why we would want the numbers, because we will have to round out for that equal representation and all those things. But from a COI changing, I'm -- that -- I'm lost on why that would change, number 1.

And then if that all be the case, I'm thinking it may not -- if we're not going to actually draw the lines until we have all of the building blocks, and I really appreciate this -- the -- the document that you all put together that includes testimonial and the nontestimonial that we'll be able to go out and start finding now.

It's seems like the line drawer, whenever they come, will come into a very nice healthy place of them having all of their building blocks of the COIs, and the testimonials, and the nontestimonials, and all they'll need to do now is to draw -- help us draw lines around it. Except for that last piece that Commissioner Le Mons
then threw in and said, "Well, whose setting up these building blocks?" So I was at this one place and then I'm thinking, well, if the line drawer is the one beyond drawing, helping us to draw the lines, if they're actually going to be the individual that captures all of that and places it somewhere, then to me, we -- it -- it's essential that we have them in order to do this. Unless there's a different way that we're capturing the COI, the testimonial, the nontestimonials. Yeah. So that's the piece that I wanted to add it in. So I'm glad for the conversation. It's making a lot of things clear. I want to say line drawers can be later. But let's figure out who's going to hold it if it's not them.

Thanks.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. And thank you, all, so much for keying up this conversation. We've been needing to have this conversation for a while. This is really, really helpful. So I guess -- yeah. So you know, on the topic of capturing COI data -- I mean -- this is -- in my mind, kind of the driver for the COI tool, right?

So anybody at any time can go put in data with the COI tool, and the COI tool captures that data and stores
it for us. And then we pull it all back later, at some point. So I guess -- I mean -- I don't know. Am I missing something? But -- because I was kind of envisioning that we would facilitate these meetings through the COI tool to capture the data -- the pre-census data, the pre-line drawer data, and we could use that tool to capture that data. The data would be stored, and then when we have a line drawer and we get ready to draw lines. You know, we'd pull that back. But maybe I'm not getting the big picture here.

Chair Kennedy: Okay. I have Commissioner Andersen followed by Commissioner Sadhwani, Commissioner Ahmad. I may have a comment at that point, and then I have Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Just a quick -- I think those -- the three that just went, might have helped each -- all of -- hopefully helped all the -- each other understand a bit more. The -- Commissioner Fornaciari said it very well. The idea of the COI tool -- if we don't have anybody out there, at all, to capture anything, the public can indeed use the COI tool to give us input. And the COI tool, it's going to put out a shapefile, it's going to put out a PDF. And that comes to us. So then -- then the issue is, if we go out,
and it's just us, or -- or we have a data management person, or we have a line drawer with us. There are three different scenarios.

If it's just us, we could help someone use the COI tool. We can write things down. And then that has to get incorporated somehow. Or if we already have a data management person with us, we would be tasking that person to capture everything. Making sure that what comes out of it we can sort. Also it creates a shapefile, a something, some sort of coding that's comparable with a GIS. If it's a line drawer, they would also be trying to capture as much -- definitely trying to convert it into a GIS compatible form, however they collect it.

And we have been tasked with asking -- you know, with trying to figure out how to collect -- you know, what questions that we need to ask so we know how to sort things later. We can validate what information we're getting.

So those are the three sort of things. So -- and the issue is, if we don't have line drawers yet do we want to have -- who is doing this part. But Commissioner Le Mons, no matter what, as long as you collect whatever information, and convert it to a GSI compatible format -- coding -- it can be in a shapefile, it can be a bunch of
different things. Even if it's just a picture. You can then convert that to a GIS and incorporate it into a line drawing map. Then the line drawers -- and the line drawers will take all of those GIF compatibles and put them onto a map. They're in charge of grabbing the database, and the map pieces, putting that together, and presenting us with big pictures. That is the line drawers' task. That's one of the line drawers' tasks. So I hope that might have answered a bunch of questions there.

Chair Kennedy: Thank you. And you heard the beeping. We have to take our fifteen-minute break. I hate interrupting this. But you know, when the clock sounds, the clock sounds and then we take our break, and we come back, and we'll tip off the ball again, and keep this conversation going.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

Chair Kennedy: Thank you, everyone. Welcome back from the break. We will resume where we left off. But let me first go down the list of those in the queue to comment or ask questions. So I guess Commissioner Sadhwani had to take off. I didn't realize she was not going to be with us when we came back. But she was next in the queue, followed by Commissioner Ahmad. I may have a short comment. Commissioner Turner, Commissioner Le
Mons, Commissioner Taylor, and Commissioner Fornaciari.

So -- all right. In Commissioner Sadhwani's absence, we have Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Actually, can you come back to me? Or I'll raise my -- I'll get back in the queue. I want to hear out this conversation a little bit.

Chair Kennedy: Okay. I'll put you at the end of this list. The only thing that I was going to say -- and I guess this goes partly to what Commissioner Andersen was saying. I mean -- line drawers are -- again, they support our work. You know -- we draw the lines. So we have to -- we have to keep in mind. We draw the lines. The line drawers may have their hand on the mouse and keyboard, but they're following our instruction. So the most important thing is that we get the input so that we can instruct the line drawers on what do. So that's -- that's all I wanted to say at this point.

Chair Kennedy: Okay. I'll put you at the end of this list. The only thing that I was going to say -- and I guess this goes partly to what Commissioner Andersen was saying. I mean -- line drawers are -- again, they support our work. You know -- we draw the lines. So we have to -- we have to keep in mind. We draw the lines. The line drawers may have their hand on the mouse and keyboard, but they're following our instruction. So the most important thing is that we get the input so that we can instruct the line drawers on what do. So that's -- that's all I wanted to say at this point.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. I wanted to respond -- earlier there was conversation. I had to write it down because of the break so I didn't forget. But here we go. When we were talking about who's going to hold this information, the response was that the COI tool. And we know that the COI tool will not serve everyone. Right? Everyone won't have access to it.
People won't get an opportunity. And so my -- so I wanted state that, that if we're looking for the COI tool to hold what's input, and even for us to input for people, that's great for those that we are -- we have face time with. But we also recognize that there are a lot of people that we won't have access to during that time period, that won't have access to a COI tool. And so when we say as long as you collect the information, I think that gets back to still the who collects. Unless it's as long as you collect it with the COI tool. But again, back to my same statement.

And then, saying something about converting it. I think it was Commissioner Andersen, when you were saying about converting it, the questions still kept popping up in my mind, who's converting if we don't have a line drawer. And I'm hopeful that we're not -- I mean, we may can't do any better. Maybe we'll just understand that until a line drawer is in place we will only be getting information from people that has access to the COI tool. I just think that it will, later, maybe misrepresent something, thinking that we've opened it up for this extra amount of time period, but we've really only opened it up for an extra amount of time period for a smaller set of people.

Chair Kennedy: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.
Commissioner Le Mons?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So I have two questions. Piggybacking off of what Commissioner Turner just said. And I -- I'm referring -- and I think she may be as well, but I'll speak for myself. When I'm referring to the line drawer, I'm not referring to the line drawer purely in the context of who draws the lines. Meaning, I understand what you were saying, Commissioner Kennedy, that we draw the lines. But there's a technical aspect to this. So we inform how the lines are drawn, but I don't think we're the physical person actually moving the mouse and all of that. So when I'm referring to the line draw, I'm talking about that technical expertise. To be able to take whatever information, where ever we've got it from, and apply it to the map in a way that it meets the intention. Right?

So I think the outstanding question is, how do we -- what do they need? Like A, are they the only ones that can do that? Meaning line drawers, or whatever that expertise is. Are they the only ones that can translate information wherever we get it from? COI tool, convert it GIS, et cetera into the maps with these overlays. Because we're talking about -- not just, like, the output that the COI tool will give when someone's talking about a very specific -- very specific community of interest
that they've entered into the system and the system spits out the map. Commissioner Andersen talked about all of these building blocks and puzzle pieces. I'm going to call them puzzle pieces.

So there's someone applying all of these puzzle pieces, and some of them overlay, et cetera. That part is the part that I'm like, who's doing that? So that's one question.

And then my second question was, before we went to the break, Commissioner Andersen mentioned as long as this is converted to GIS, and so I wanted to say is that our end game? Like however we collect, wherever we collect. Whether it's audio, or someone drew it on a napkin, or it was put into the COI tool, et cetera. The end game is that somehow we have to move from the collection to an output that is GIS compatible. And if that is indeed true, that helps us at least narrow the channels at which we can take stuff in. We say, "Oh. We've got six channels that are easily convertible to GIS. So these would be the channels that we would be trying to exploit in the community to give people the widest range of options." Of course, I just made that number 6 up.

So those are my two questions.

Chair Kennedy: Okay. Commissioner Sadhwani, you
were next on the list, but not here. You want to jump in
now, or do you want to wait a few minutes and then jump
in?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Why don't we wait and just
catch up with the conversation. I apologize. I had to
drop off one of my kids.

Chair Kennedy: Okay. So I have Commissioner Taylor
next, followed by Commissioner Fornaciari. And then
going back to Commissioner Ahmad. And then we'll go back
to Commissioner Sadhwani at that point. So Commissioner
Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah. Again -- and I'm still
trying to absorb all of this information and the
conversation is wonderful. So I'm getting from the
Commission that we all -- whatever input comes in, we
want that to -- the end product of that to be a
shapefile. The shapefile is what -- is what -- is what's
used. So that being the case, we can start -- that
information can be gathered at any time because a lot of
information is static. Communities of interest aren't
necessarily static; city lines are static. The value
becomes what we get back from the census. So -- so I'm
just trying to -- oh. So the line drawer then becomes
our tool -- our line drawer then becomes the tool. So
I'm trying to see -- and I'm trying to keep it simple,
but I'm trying to see what our point of -- of contention.

It seems that we want shapefiles. And the shapefiles we
want to turn over to -- to the line drawer. So what
truly is our -- is our point of contention right --

   Chair Kennedy: I'll -- I'll just say, I think at
this point that the big question over all of this is we
had certain procurement timelines that are not likely to
let us do what we want to do, when we want to do it. All
right? Those are going to hold us up to some extent.
And the question is how much of this can we do before
those procurement timelines are -- are -- go through
their process and we're able to do what we want to do,
when we want to do it.

   Commissioner Fornaciari, you're next.

   COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I think Commissioner
Taylor made an excellent point. I mean, the data that
we're gathering -- you know, it -- certainly, at the
beginning, is static in some sense. Right? So we can
gather it and then post-process it later to -- to put it
into a GIS format.

   I mean, conceivably, we can collect data in any
form -- in any format. You know, like drawn on the back
of a napkin. As long as there's enough information there
for someone to take that data and convert it to a
shapefile. Something that the GIS -- or a GIS file.
Whatever. You know. But the file that can be used by
the line drawer to input the community of interests on
the maps so we can all see it when we're drawing our
lines.

You know -- and I just want to bring back a comment
made by Amy O'Hare yesterday. You know, one of the
happenings we could think about using is students to --
undergraduate or graduate students who need a capstone
project. Data analytics type students, or GIS type
students, who can take this massive amount of data,
unstructured data, and structure it for us. But that's
something else we can use the data management team to
help with, too.

But -- so I don't think we should worry about
holding -- holding ourselves up from gathering data,
because we can always post process it. And the other
thing is, let's not forget to the engagement of our
community partners out there that will help us, you know,
gather the data from their communities, or the
communities that they are connected with in various ways.

That's it.

Chair Kennedy: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. And thank
you for this conversation. I'm seeing the overlap
between all of our different sub-committees, and all the
pieces kind of coming together.

So just briefly. In my conversations with
Commissioner Turner about the Data management aspect,
we've had talks about, you know, what -- what kinds of
data are going to come in, and what do we want from
someone who is under the -- the label of data management.
Whether it's internal person, contracted, whatever we
decide as a group. And something that we came up with
was the importance of the retrieval of this information,
given that we are working across a time period. So it
may be that we visit Redding, for example, in April. But
we receive a comment about that area in June or July. We
would still need to be able to retrieve that piece of
information before presenting a draft form of maps.

And so I think the data management piece in this
will be really helpful in the timeline that we decide to
go out, because what we hope that whatever, you know,
service or tool we rely on for that aspect would have the
capability to retrieve the pieces of information across
the time. And then also various formats that we do
eventually receive that information in.

So I see the overlap here. The question being, you
know, when are we going to out pre/post-sentences? That
kind of confused me a little bit, because in my
perspective, that data management would take care of those issues of, you know, if we go out now are we going to have a way to understand or manage this data? And that aspect being taken care of from that regard. So I just wanted to throw that -- those thoughts out there.

Chair Kennedy: Excellent. Thank you. Back to you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, I apologize that I had to miss the beginning of this conversation. I appreciate all of these pieces. I absolutely agree. Like these are the finer details that we most certainly need to figure out in terms of all of this data management.

I really loved Commissioner Fornaciari's idea that there are students out there who could probably fulfill some of these roles for us. I know for sure at USC there is a whole GIS lab with some really great folks who understand and can work with shapefiles. I'm sure that that's the case at some of the -- the various other universities around the state as well.

The thought I had had previously, before we went on the break, is one -- and this was just -- popped in my head as we were discussing. It's not something we've discussed previously that -- perhaps there's a -- perhaps we could, like, hire one person or hire the state-wide database to fulfill some of this role until we have a
data management system set up, until we have a proper
line drawer set up. So I just throw that out there as
one possible passable solution to consider. I don't even
know how possible it is.

And then I -- when I came in, I had heard
Commissioner Le Mons saying he had two questions, but I
didn't hear what those questions were. So I wasn't sure
if they had been answered or they are still lingering. I
don't know if you mind resharing them. I apologize.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Yeah. They're still lingering.
One is, is our end game a GIS file? Like is that -- what
is the end thing that we're trying to -- so Commissioner
Taylor says it's a shapefile. I'm assuming those things
are synonymous. I don't know. But that's just one
question that I think is worth clarifying. What is the
end game that we have to give the line drawer?

Because I keep hearing about the puzzle pieces. And
I think we -- I don't think I'm confused -- I know I'm
not confused on the high-level discussion about this.
But I think the devil is in the details on this. And
that's the part that I think we've got to nail some of.
It can't just be left. I mean, every group that -- and I
don't know if this is just available enough in my head --
but every group that's presented has asked us for a
specificity. Even the groups yesterday, all -- any --
everything can be done. Everything won't be done,
because that won't be possible because of resources,
time -- but the capacity, the possibility is endless.
Like we know that, right? But what exactly do we want to
do? That's what they keep asking us. What exactly are
you trying to achieve? What exactly do you want?

And frankly, none of us have ever answered that
question. What is proposed to us? And I think we
haven't because we don't know. And that's okay. So I'm
asking if of us, what exactly are we trying to do? What
do we want? What do we want? And to me that makes a
difference. So say, for example, it is a shapefile at
the end. Right? And we know there's a gap between not
having that and having that and several paths to get to
it. Right?

It sounds like the one that's already been sort of
defined is the COI tool. So that one is going to produce
that very thing. Although there may be some questions
about the language. I won't go there.

And then we will be collecting this stuff in other
formats. Some of those formats may have mechanisms that
will make that process very easy to translate, whatever
it is. And I would imagine that there is varying degree.
If we get an audio file, how easy is it to convert an
audio file into a map? I don't know. It may be the
easiest of all. But it may not be one that's easy to do. But that's going to be important for us to know what channels are we taking this information in? So those are -- I think I say it more than what my question is. My question is indeed, is the last thing that we're trying to get is a shapefile? And then the other questions was who's going to do this overlay, and is that going to happen prior to census as well as post, or just post? Meaning the puzzle - like the files that we're going to get from district maps, and all the other things that you guys had outlined here; the nontestimonial data, and all of these different things. Somebody's got to put all of that stuff together, or convert it to be put. I'm trying to wrap my mind around how that's going to -- how is that supposed to happen?

Chair Kennedy: Okay. So Commissioner Sadhwani, if you want to go ahead and respond, and then Commissioner Andersen is next.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: My sense -- to take your second question first, I -- to me, that overlay -- putting all those puzzle pieces together happens post-census. Because we want to wait until the census data occurs. Now, don't get me wrong we could -- we could start laying the groundwork, right, so to speak, beforehand. But until we have the census data, I did --
I wouldn't -- I would feel very uncomfortable to beginning to actually draw those districts and think about all of these different pieces, until we actually have the census data. So that we can get to the equal population piece that we have to meet.

To your other piece around the shapefile. In all honesty, I think that is absolutely the right question. I love the idea of converting all testimony into shapefiles. I don't know -- that will be very time intensive I think. If we had, you know, fifteen -- or maybe more -- I don't know how many it will take. A whole bunch of GIS programmers all over the state. Students, right? Who are doing this as an internship and maybe they can get credit for it or something like that? And they can take each piece of testimony and convert it to a shapefile. I think that's really exciting. I would still guess that at some level some of that testimony would be very hard to convert. So I think we will still have to be prepared to be flexible.

But I like the idea of turning everything into a shapefile. I -- you know, I think that there's a lot of -- as you point out rightly, there's a lot of feasibility pieces that we would have to work out to make happen.

Chair Kennedy: Okay. Commissioner Andersen
followed by Commissioner Turner and Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. There's a -- there's a couple of things going here. It's our understanding of the specifics. You know, what's particular items -- what are we -- and then there's the overall of what's the big issues. And so I'm -- in terms of what's the problem, what are we trying to solve, and how are we solving it? So there's sort of two items here.

And I'm going to start off with the -- with the little bits, without getting into too much.

Okay. Just for nomenclature. A shapefile -- a shapefile is a type of file. It's like -- you know Work Perfect puts out -- I mean word puts out what -- you know, doc -- docs. And there's, you know, jpeg files and different types of files. So a shapefile is a type of GSI file. And a GSI is, you know, geo --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yeah. So basically what we're talking about is compatible in GSI format. Whether it be, you know, what the names of the files, da, da, da. It turns out the COI tool, what they put out is a shapefile and a pdf.

Remember you get a pdf, a jpeg, these are all just technical names. So what ultimately what do we need? We need GSI compatible files. COI tool does shape. What
the other things can collaborate them as, what kind, it depends on what software we want to use. But as long as they're compatible. And the -- in terms of then, the question is who? And that's one of the issues. Although that's why we brought this data management group in. But they have two issues as well.

Is as Commissioner Ahmad said, there's the -- how do we want to sort it? How do we want to retrieve it? Because yes, our bottom line is we want maps. We want it to be in GSI format. But then we also want to be able to validate them. Where do these maps come from? Now, who said this? Where did it come from? And that is the retrieval part. The sorting part.

Now, these are my ideas. Okay? And this is the particulars. So when Commissioner Le Mons said, you know, yeah. But I'm sure it's all right. That's true. This is what we're trying to discuss. I mean, this is how -- well, some of it is factual. But in terms of the sequencing of things -- oh. How do these particular items and when? We might say, "Tough. We're not doing any of this stuff until March." And that's -- that's the group decision.

But the specifics -- oh. And the specifics that Commissioner Le Mons was saying about, so who is synthesizing all of that sort of thing, who's creating
the data base? That is the line drawers' -- that's
exactly what they do. They will put all of these
things -- they will do the overlay. Who does the
overlay? They do that.

And we -- at our instruction. Okay. Now, I want
this. I want to have -- can you show me this, this, and
this? And that's how -- in the details of the RFP, we
say, one; you have to be able to show us on the map. And
then if we say, wait a second. What did we do last time?
They have to be able to go back and show us that as well.

But -- and the building blocks, these are all the
pieces put together. I am not talking at all yet about
drawing a district. That's separate. Drawing a district
is when we're actually making our real maps. These are
all putting together the building blocks of it. I think
I've tried -- and the big issue is here -- and now to go
to the bigger part is -- the whole idea here is we need
do some time frames. And what kind of meetings are we
talking about?

You know -- how are we envisioning this, and when,
and numbers of meetings? Because these things all come
into play in our RFPs. And if we're thinking, oh. We're
doing -- we don't do any meetings or none of import until
after the census, that's one scenario. If we're doing a
bunch before the census data, you know, I -- my
preference would be we're doing quite a lot before the census data. We're trying to touch all of our communities of interest. And then we are giving time to come back.

And so what are those meetings going to look like? I don't quite know. And I'm -- I have an idea. But I'm sure our outreach committee has a much better idea. So that's -- hopefully, I've -- that's what I have -- so our endgame is indeed, we need to get GSI compatible forms. All this data needs to come in. And then how do we go back and sort it? So that's why we need that information.

But does that -- does that prevent us from getting any information now? No. We just have to document when it comes in and who's saying it. And the data management people; the sooner we have those people on board, the better.

Chair Kennedy: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Andersen. Commissioner Turner, followed by Commissioner Sinay, Commissioner Ahmad, and Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. A couple of things. When -- so the question that we need to answer about specificity, and what is it we're trying to do, and do we know what we're trying to do? I think we want a
lot. We named a whole bunch that we would desire to have, information that we would desire to track. And what we've heard in each of our sessions as a data management team is that we need the more structured. Steer most of our data into a format that is standardized and readable my machines, et cetera, right?

And so in saying that we want everything -- I think what we have to do -- I have preferences of what I want us to collect, somebody may have other preferences, and we've never named everyone's preferences so that we can start to skinny it out and say that's just not going to happen.

We want to be able to take things that were -- somebody kept talking about it as a -- some piece -- I forget what -- how she talked about it, but anyway. A crochet piece or something. It wasn't crochet. Anyway. Whatever it is that people are drawing maps on, a napkin, or whatever, we want people to not be limited if they don't have technology. If indeed we're not going to take napkin drawings, we need to name that now, and whatever else, so that the public also can know, "They're not taking my napkin drawing maps. So I do have to now present in this manner."

So instead of leaving it so broad, what will be helpful to us, and as we move forward with whoever we're
going to work with, is to be able to say, "Okay.
Structured, these are the things that has to be in. It
has to be in this format. And these other pieces we will
try and do some translations for this, but nothing else.
Everything else is off the table. It prepares people in
how to communicate what's needed to be able to draw their
communities of input.

So I think -- we've said before -- and even -- I'm
kind of concerned, we just -- I just heard, I think, that
our COI tool is going to be providing shapefiles and
PDF's. And I think I captured in some of the
conversations that we had, Commissioner Ahmad, you're in
the lineup, you can correct me or not. But a PDF is not
readable, because it's flat. Or they can't pull any
information off of a PDF.

So if we're getting data that is PDF, that's going
to be a problem for retrieval later. And so I want to
name that. That that does us no good. And so I want us
to, on maybe this discussion, to say this -- it's not all
over the board. We can't take it. And we know that that
starts to exclude people when they don't know in advance.
But let's say this is the only way we're going to take
information. Not to exclude but to inform. So other
opportunities can be made for people to participate,
number 1.
The other piece we've talked about a few different times about having students that can assist us with GIS and what have you. That's a flag for me. If we broadly release this to students, because there is the concern about security and the concern about things being accurately translated or prescribed. Because, for example, if it is an audio, someone literally then will be needing to -- do that transcription. Right?

And so there are students everywhere. If there's a set group of students, great. But I don't want us to open it up. And maybe that's not what we were saying. But I want to just be real careful in the language that we're talking about. We still need a way to cross -- to check and cross-check that the information is being accurately input, because we know the garbage/in garbage out thing. Right? And so I just want to name that as far as whoever is going to be assisting us with the GIS. Thanks.

Chair Kennedy: Thank Commissioner Turner. Just as part of the COI tools sub-committee I'll clarify that the PDFs -- every shapefile would have an associated PDF. There won't a PDF that doesn't also doesn't have a corresponding shapefile. And PDFs are for our use in understanding what's being proposed by the person who input that. Because we wouldn't -- the shapefiles
wouldn't necessarily do that for us. But the PDFs would enable us to look at a piece of paper and see very clearly what was input. But every PDF will have an associated shapefile.

I have next, Commissioner Sinay, Commissioner Ahmad, Commissioner Fornaciari, Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you.

Chair Kennedy: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Turner?

Also the PDF, it will be sent back to the individual and they can submit it to the local level. So if they want it submit it to their county redistricting efforts, you know, it just gives them an opportun -- a tool that they can share with others, was kind of, my understanding. So have we -- I know I missed part of this conversation, so I wanted to see if we had asked staff last time, how were -- how was the verbal -- it was a very diff -- okay, let me take a step back first.

I really appreciated yesterday hearing from the Dolores Huerta Foundation, that they actually call them COI forums. And I was, like, oh, we should probably adopt that language, you know, the meetings before we have maps. So the meetings where we go out to the community and we hear from the community. Because we're, kind of, throwing everything together. And so when they
said COI forums, I'm like, that's -- you know, we just -- maybe we just call them community forums, since no one else but us knows what a COI is. But just to help understand. Those forums may be all of us there, none of us there. It may be that the community's doing some. They did them last time, and then, maps were submitted. Now, we have a tool where some of that can be submitted. And then, we have, after the Census comes in, and we can start building those blocks and sharing maps, there's, kind of, the map sharing forum. So that's, kind of, how I've been seeing the two.

What I'm curious is, do we need to take everything and turn it into a GIS and map it, or there is different ways that we get to put a face to the data. And my concern is that we're talking about data, kind of, separate from humans, and maybe we're not. But for me, getting the testimonies and hearing them is -- remember we were told, make sure you remember to hear the first statement and the last statement that's given to you. And so a lot of it is about listening, and do we have to come up with a way of how, when we're drawing the map and we say, okay, well, let's look at Region -- let's look at the Central Valley today. And you know, I'm not sure how this is going to -- but we look at the COIs and we look at the maps, but then we also hear the testimony. So we
hear the voices again of those folks. The piece that
we're missing this time, that to me is also very
critical, is the experience.

There is something magical, important driving around
a community and seeing the community, seeing, you know,
the farm workers and the oil, you know, think about
Central Valley, the -- yeah. And we're going to miss
some of that. And I have been doing some thinking about
how do we bring that into our map drawing sessions?
Because someone -- I read something on Twitter that's
just hit me like a brick wall -- or I hit the brick wall,
either way, that in this day and age of Zoom every
meeting looks the same. And so it's hard to remember
what someone said or did. And if we were going -- if we
were in the Central Valley, we would have a way to get
that memory back and remember it quicker. So we do need
to try to figure out how we make each meeting a little
different from the other.

So I do appreciate that Commissioner Yee changes his
background. And we're getting a tour of Oakland.
Because I can say, oh, that was the meeting where we had
that. But that just got me thinking about, as we're
going from listening and hearing to actually drawing, we
still need to listen and hear, in my perspective, when
we're looking at the maps. We can't just look at data
and numbers and maps without hearing what people have to say. So I'm curious how it was -- how the last Commission dealt with input that was verbal and written? And did they only take testimony at their -- at their forums, or did they take testimony outside the forums?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Director Claypool, you can go ahead and answer that.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So there was never enough -- because they were all meeting in one spot, there was never enough time for all the people that came to the public meetings. And we only had public meetings. We didn't have this -- we didn't have a forum set up. So every meeting had the line drawer. Every meeting, when a person would come up would -- there would be the ability to show their districts on the wall and so forth, or on the screen, and they could delineate that to the commission. And so it was captured, both in video, and it was also captured by the line drawer. If the person said something or directed the line drawer to give them something, a lot of people would just verbally say, this is my neighborhood. And it wouldn't necessarily be captured. That was my memory.

The people -- we had two big bulletin boards outside. As people would funnel in, they would read the bulletin boards. First one would say, this is how many
people have to be in your district. A district, a congressional district has to be 753,000 people. A senate district has to be 900,000, whatever the numbers were then. And that would start people thinking while they're waiting to testify about, you know, we can't just have, you know, Woodlake, California be its own district, you know, because they're only 30,000 people in the whole area. So we would start them thinking.

The second bulletin board would say, if we can't reach you, if you don't get the opportunity to speak today, here are ways for you to send us your information. And so we had an email address. And we had our address, so that they could mail in things. And then we had our telephone number. Every way that we had at that time to communicate with us, we said, do any of this. And at the bottom it said, anything that is input in this manner will be given the same consideration as any testimony given at this meeting. And then, we would make sure that that information was passed on to the commissioners in big files. And we would try to correlate it with that meeting and so forth with the student assistance we had.

So when we received that information, then we had to, you know, pdf a lot of it, if it was a -- if it was just a document and stuff and try to upload it and put it with the information it needed to be with. The verbal,
we would take it down. And we would type a lot of it into just a form and put it in that way. But there was a lot of manual. But we did try in that way to capture as much of that testimony, particularly for those individuals who traveled a long ways, and then were told we're only doing 110 people. And we're never going to be able to reach you. And so that's what we did.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Director Claypool.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair.

Just, Commissioner Turner, thank you for your comments. A lot of this discussion that we've had within our own subcommittee hasn't been shared with you all yet. We haven't had the opportunity yet to give you all a full debrief of all of our conversations we've had with folks, what our thinking is, and then, what fed into the RFP draft language for the scope of work. And a lot of the things that are coming up are something that Commissioner Turner and I have been considering and have been advised to consider by our informational interviews that we've conducted. And so I look forward to the opportunity. I don't know, Commissioner Kennedy, when we will get to the following agenda items under -- or following subcommittees under this item. But I just wanted to let you all know that once we get to that point, I hope some
of the things that the data management subcommittee has
been charged with and advise will come to light and
hopefully add some clarity to this conversation.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.
Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.

Excellent point, Commissioner Ahmad.

My question really is a data question. So I'll hold
off on that.

But I just want to clarify, Commissioner Andersen,
sometimes you say GSI, but you mean GIS? Okay.

So and then, I just also want to clarify, we don't
just want a GIS compatible file. We also want some kind
of narrative describing the community of interests, so we
understand what it is and who it's from and that kind of
thing, so. I think we don't want to lose that second
part.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

Commissioner Le Mons?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Turner,
for drilling that down so nicely. I appreciate it. I
have a couple of questions. One is, do we want narrative
without a GIS file? The testimony that Director Claypool
was referencing, that people submitted through these
other means, what was the nature of that testimony?
And then, the idea of -- I absolutely concur with Commissioner Sinay in -- from a community engagement lens, the power of listening, the power of experience, like, all of that is crucial and important. I do feel like we need to define how we -- so there's the experience of it, right? So that'll be an action. But what we're told, how are we using that? So it's kind of similar to the opening question of testimony that doesn't translate to a map at all. It's just, you know, this is who I am and this is what I love, you know, because that's what I decided I wanted to come and say that day. So is that the long and short of that? Like, we heard we gave that. That's a different place in sort of this continuing journey of community engagement in a process. It didn't yield this particular outcome map of a community that we could overlay. But it had a different kind of value. These are the kinds of -- the kind of categorical intentionality that I think is really, really important of us being clear.

Unfortunately, the way we have to communicate in this format has been consistently a problem, from my perspective, that we have to figure out how to navigate. Because there is such an intersection between all of these subcommittees. I think we need to have an agenda item. And since I'm chairing the next upcoming meeting,
there isn't something like this. And they may be
informed by what happens between today and tomorrow that
are actually planning discussions where we can talk about
all of this stuff at the same time. But when we're
talking about it in the context of the subcommittee,
first of all the subcommittee report, my understanding is
like a ten-minute update. So we end up having these very
long discussions during subcommittee reports, which is to
me -- what I understood was a different function, the
subcommittee update. So I think how we, kind of,
structure these discussions going forward, particularly
with this -- keeping in mind the time limitations that we
have, I think we've got to talk about all.

And we begin it with this, I'm so appreciative to
this committee. And I'm sure if it hadn't happened here,
when we got to the outreach, it was going -- this
conversation was going to jump off. Because it's
required, right? Because they all influence each other.
So thank you, again, for bringing this up. I'd like to
have Director Claypool address that question around the
testimony that was gathered last time. And then, whoever
can address the intention of how we plan to use narrative
unassociated with any kind of actual map or GIS.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Director Claypool?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So we received in those lines
that we -- that I talked about -- and I should step back
and appreciate this opportunity to provide a little
clarification. Initially, the line drawer was going to
collect everything. And it just became overwhelming.
And so we -- we as a commission, the first commission,
stepped in very early in the process and said, we're
going to put together some student assistance, so that
you can start shipping some of that over to us, so that
we can start just trying to hold onto it and categorize
it. So that's where the student assistance -- we ran a
bank of student assistance. And we would change them in
and out using the fair -- the inter -- the fair and
reasonable contracts that -- up to 5,000 dollars.

The information that came in was really varied.
Some of it would just be, you know, I live in the Central
Valley. And I need better representation. And you know,
I live in Fresno. And so we would take those comments
and we would type them into forms. And we would move
them into the database as coming from a citizen from
Fresno, this comment was made. It was associated with
this meeting, or maybe not associated with any meeting.
But we would -- so we would gather that. We would
receive things as detailed as big maps of -- that would
be given to us to show how we could redistrict California
using alluvial fans. That, you know, how the water flows
through California and everything should be redistricted that way.

So we would just take it all, as much as we could, and we would put it into a format that we could, one, hand over to the commissioners immediately and honor our promise that anything that came in had a equal value to anything from a meeting. And then, two, just so that we could start structuring it so that they might be able to use it at the end. Although, at the end, it was so -- there was so much, that they mainly, kind of, went on their memories of what they had heard. And they would grab certain things. And they took copious notes. And that's why we're moving to this data management model.

So did that answer your question, Commissioner Le Mons?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good.

And yes, thank you to Commissioner Andersen and Commissioner Sadhwani for helping us navigate our way through this very important and useful discussion. With that, and in order to keep us on track, we have a little over half an hour to continue the subcommittee reports. And as Commissioner Ahmad said, we will get back to the data management subcommittee as we go through our list. And we're leaving RFPs, specifically, for after the subcommittee reports.
So outreach and engagement is next. And we will have further time to exhaust item 10 on the agenda. But I just wanted to check with the outreach and engagement subcommittee to see if there's anything else that you wanted to share with at this point, by way of a subcommittee report?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thanks for clarifying item 10. Because we were, kind of, confused if we were going to go back or not to item 10. So I think if we're going back to item 10, we should be okay. There's -- and I think one of the challenges we're having, as Commissioner Le Mons brought up, is this used to be a report out. But now, we're getting to the place where we need to actually do work. And so maybe each committee can sub -- subcommittee can share what question are they grappling with that we all need to give input, or just get us thinking about it? Because I think that's what where we're stuck, is that there's big questions that we want to get resolved, so that we can move forward in the
tplannings.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

Language access, commissioners are good to go? Commissioners Akutagawa and Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Did you want to go?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sure.
So we won't have a panel scheduled for tomorrow. We're having, after multiple, multiple attempts by Commissioner Fernandez, we're really excited that we actually have three panelists who will be joining us tomorrow from the Native American communities. We have a panelist from California Native Vote. And we were very fortunate that we will also be joined by the chairman of the Pala Mission Band of Indians, from the San Diego Southern California region, and also, another individual who is chief of staff to the tribal chairman. And so between the three of them, I think we're going to be in for some very interesting conversations, particularly having the tribal chairman from the Pala Mission Band of Indians. I think he's a part of the tribal council throughout the State of California, so he'll also be able to bring, I think, a rather broad perspective from a leadership, kind of, point of view. And so we're really excited by that.

Commissioner Fernandez, do you want to?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, no -- yeah. Just very excited. Because we did reach out to quite a few different Native American organizations. So we're excited to be able to come forward with someone tomorrow.

And at this point in time, I believe Commissioner Akutagawa and I were at the point where this will
probably be our last panel. And then, we're hoping at
the next meeting that we will bring forward our
recommendations in terms of what we've learned so far
from the language access, global access panels, that
we've had, as well as the research that we've done. And
I think I told Commissioner Le Mons about this. If not,
there might be a little bit more discussion last time --
or next time. Did I? I think I mentioned it. I can't
remember. All right. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And then, I realized, I
think, similar to the conversation that just took place
around the intersections between the line drawer and
outreach and engagement, VRA, we're also running into
similar kinds of, I guess, intersections with outreach
and engagement. And so we're also cognizant of where --
how we'll shape our report to the commissioners, but also
at the same time be able to understand where and how do
we intersect with outreach and engagement as well too,
so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Okay, can we go back to
VRA compliance? So other than the RFP, is there anything
from the VRA subcommittee in the report?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And Commissioner Sinay had
her hand up.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sorry.
Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you.

I, you know, after yesterday's meeting and these conversations, I think we're moving to a place where we may need to create our agendas a little different, where we bring -- we create bigger committees. And that's on -- you know, so we do this -- the intersection pieces. And maybe that's the morning, you have different intersections taking place. And then, we report out. But I think we've got to get -- we've -- we're -- to get things done, I think we're going to have to stop working just in twos, on the -- on outside the meetings. But part of the meetings be that time when we're working on maybe three subcommittees coming together to do some of the intersectionality work. And then, it just feels like it's the right time.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, thanks. I think this is a process question. And this is specifically either for Marian or Ms. Marshall. If, let's say two committees that are looking at potential intersections, if a member of one committee and a member of the other committee have a conversation, is that considered a serial meeting, and therefore not allowed?

MS. MARSHALL: I'm sorry. Could you repeat that
again? You said a member of one committee confers with a member of another committee, would -- is that a serial meeting?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: I believe it is.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Just wanted to check. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Le Mons?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: And just for clarity, I thought there was a threshold number? And I thought that we stated, too, so that we would avoid violating that threshold number. So I'm curious as to, is that what was just described on its face, a violation, or is it putting us on a path to a potential violation?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Ms. Marshall, would you like to reply?

MS. MARSHALL: You know, let me go and review that. But I also want to hear from Ms. Johnston.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And Marian?

MS. JOHNSTON: I think you're correct, that it's on a path to a possible violation. If two people not on the same committee just talk with each other, that's not a problem. The problem is if it gets spread then to someone else to someone else to someone else until you reach a quorum. For various committees meeting together,
if the purpose is, in fact, to establish a new committee that considers all these issues together, then that would be more than a two-person committee and would have to be a noticed meeting that could be held during a regular Commission meeting.

Does that answer your question?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Director Claypool?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: I was just curious about the eight, the group of -- or not going past a quorum. So I'm assuming that because we're merging these groups, that's the issue, not that there couldn't be more than two people in a meeting before you reach that threshold. Do you understand what I'm saying, Marian?

MS. JOHNSTON: Yeah. The issue is whether or not it's a formally formed group of people. If it's just an ad hoc group of people, they together and discuss something, and not a committee created by the commissioner by the chair, then you don't -- as long as you don't reach a quorum, you're okay. And I would suggest you use eight as the quorum, rather than nine. I mean, because it's sort is the opposite of the normal purpose of a quorum, which is for your meetings you've got to have nine. But if it is a formally formed group of more than two people, any -- even an advisory
committee of more than two people, then you have to comply with Bagley-Keene's notice and open meetings' requirements.

    CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.
    Commissioner Fernandez, and then, Commissioner Akutagawa?

    COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I guess what I -- and I just keep going. We keep addressing the same issue over and over, because it just, kind of, gets confusing every time. So let's say, for example, I'm going to -- here's a scenario for you, I have a conversation with Commissioner Sinay. And then, I go back and I talk to Commissioner Akutagawa about our conversation. That's okay, because that's only three of us?

    MS. MARSHALL: That's okay, as long as your -- none of you are on the same committee -- I mean, you're not three of you were on a committee. And so long as those people then don't go talk to somebody else --

    COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

    MS. JOHNSTON: -- about the same subject matter that then reaches the quorum. So that's why we really recommend that you keep your groups limited in number, so you don't -- because you don't know who Commissioner Akutagawa's going to be talking with, unless she keeps in mind she can't talk to anybody else, because you've now
reached your magic number.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And this is just an extension on what Commissioner Fernandez said. And thank you for asking that question. Because that was part of what I was going to ask. So let's say, for example, I -- what if Commissioner Fernandez and I end up both speaking to both Commissioner Sinay and Vazquez, because our work does intersect, but it's informal? So it's the four of us. And our conversation doesn't go beyond the four of us. We don't reach quorum. But is that allowable for the purposes of having more direct communication to coordinate how we're going to report out to the rest of the Commission in open meetings?

MS. JOHNSTON: It's permissible, but it's a slippery slope. Because you then have to ensure that those people don't then go talk to somebody else on the commission. And the more people you involve in the same topic of discussion, the more likely it is that they're going to be talking with other commissioners about it. So I -- my advice is always to err on the side of caution. And if there's any doubt, and for the sake of including the public in those important discussions, to do it during a noticed meeting.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Le Mons, and then, Commissioner Sadhwani?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I have a question about agenda updating. So the December 14th through 16th meeting is hosted, as was required by the 30th of November to meet our fourteen-day requirement. If we wanted to add something, what is our flexibility on adjusting that agenda, if at all?

MS. MARSHALL: My understanding from when it comes to amending the agenda, as soon as possible. Whatever it is that you need to add, if you just found out something, like, just today, and it's within whatever you was going to discuss, but you needed to add it, as soon as you could possibly do it, to give notice.

MS. JOHNSTON: And if I might just add -- if I might just add to that. The critical point is that it has to be something within something that's already noticed. If you're just being more explicit about giving notice on something that's already on the agenda, you can always give more details. But you cannot add a totally new item, without the fourteen days' notice. For instance, you can add participants who are going to be speaking on an issue that's already been noticed. You can flush out the type of conversation you're going to have. But it's got to be within an item that's initially noticed within
the fourteen-day period.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Thank you.

If I could make another comment about that, Chair?

So I would just invite people -- fellow commissioners to look at that agenda. We tried to -- we, Commissioner Taylor and I, really hailed to a hard fast, and most of you got calls from me on this, if your update was more than ten minutes, we made it an agenda item. So we noted there are three categories on there where some of this discussion may actually be able to happen. So if you see on there where you can fit in that blended discussion in any of those agenda items, we can just do that. If you feel like additional level of clarity to make it more explicit as necessary, then let me know. And then, we could facilitate getting that information, in fact, to update it if necessary. It may be broad enough as it is. But I just invite you to do that. Because I agree 2,000 percent that these kind of intersectional discussions are so critical, where we are now and moving forward.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons.

Director Claypool, did you have a clarification there?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: I just wanted to make sure I understood what Marian had said. So as long as two
groups get together, and they recognize that they cannot
talk outside of those groups, so up to four commissioners
from two subcommittees, and they make no decisions, but
just discuss the intersection to bring it back to a
discussion at the meeting, that's permissible? It's got
a slippery slope. But it is permissible. And the second
thing is, within the broad confines of the agenda, if one
of the -- if one of the committees wish to expand beyond
the ten minutes, would they be able to have an additional
agenda item posted, or should they just keep it within
there, but notify the chair that they're expanding in
that item to have a conversation?

MS. JOHNSTON: You're correct on the first point.
On the second point, it's always up to the chair to
rearrange the agenda however it's best to suit the needs
of the commission. So if the chair finds out that a
particular subcommittee is going to have a topic that is
going to take longer than the ten-minute limit that the
Commission decided to impose for the subcommittee
reports, the chair can always reschedule it. It's not
adding a new item. It's just taking that 9-C, or
whatever it is, and scheduling it at a particular time
where more time can be devoted to it.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.
I have Commissioner Sadhwani next, followed by Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I hate to belabor this topic. But so if we wanted to do the subcommittee report for say line drawer, community outreach, and data management, during that meeting and as a part of that report, right? My understanding is in 2010, when people were meeting in person, this -- these larger subcommittees were meeting. They were public meetings. They were a part of noticed meetings. But it didn't necessarily involve the full commission. There was planning being done. And then, you bring back your recommendations, correct, for the full commission. So let's say, you know -- and I know there's so much work that has already been put into the agenda for December 14. But if at some point during that meeting, one afternoon we wanted to have a larger subcommittee, we could just have those three subcommittees all meet. It could be public. We could have the interpreters. And then, the next day we can, you know, still bring that back to the full commission. But not -- the entire Commission doesn't have to sit there for it?

MS. JOHNSTON: That's correct. The important part is that it's open to the public.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Correct. Got it. Okay.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I'm sorry. I'm going to ask -- I don't want to belabor this either, but. The meeting is three days long, if -- and the 16th is fourteen days from now, can we adjust the agenda to add something to the last day of the meeting at this point, or no? Because the first day of the meeting is the 14th.

MS. JOHNSTON: If you want to do a separate agenda for a meeting on the 16th, there still is time to do that, I believe. You could notice a meeting in addition to your other scheduled meeting. You can't amend the original notice. But it can be done.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Again, okay, this is one I've asked about before. There are business meetings and there is public meetings. And it was, the business meetings had a ten-day notice. And the public meetings had a fourteen-day notice. What is the difference?

MS. JOHNSTON: There is a fourteen-day notice for all commissioned meetings.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That, it said for public meetings. It said for public meetings.

MS. JOHNSTON: But this is --
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. It said for public input.
Meetings held for the purpose of receiving public input.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. And then, it had --
it didn't say business meetings here. Yes. And then,
the others were ten-day. So that's an item that has come
back to bite us several times on this one. Because it is
ten days, because this is a business. The purpose of
this meeting is not just -- it's not specifically for
public input.

MS. JOHNSTON: But the problem is, it's the fact
that it's not specifically for public input. It doesn't
mean that you're not going to be receiving public input.
There, again, eyeing on the -- erring on the side of
cautions. If you want to exclude any public participation
in your committee, then you could just have -- arguably,
just have a Commission for a ten-day notice.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: But that is certainly not
recommended. And it would be contrary, I think, to what
the spirit of the fourteen-day notice is.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. But this, I'd really
like clarification on this. Because my understanding is,
the public -- that was specifically for input on maps,
the public, you're gathering all their input, the COI,
you know, the communities of interests and the specific
map. Because the map is a fourteen-day specific requirement. You may have to put -- post it. You can't do anything for fourteen days. And I'd really like some clarification on the input of that, if anyone's sort of listening, like, the League of Women Voters or Common Cause, who helped write this originally. But again, that's another point. So thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Director Claypool?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So Marian, can -- now I'm confused. And I went through 2010. I thought we had fourteen days and three days. And that ten days was always the Bagley-Keene's standard.

MS. JOHNSTON: Right. There's a special three days during your last month of map drawing, where you only have to give three days' notice. But that's only during the month of August. Other than that, at least for 2010, always did fourteen days' notice under the premise that then they can always receive public input.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So then, I was asking the VRA's subcommittee, which I thought I had done earlier, but if there was anything, other than the RFP -- or RFIs at this point, that you wanted to report out?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: You know, my -- when we talk about the RFIs, we have a -- similarly, a slide with
dates to share with everyone. The RFI requires certain dates to be included. So we do just want to run through that with everyone. We do not need to do that now. We can wait until that RFI session. And I think as we mentioned earlier, we're continuing to work on trainings for the full Commission for January and February prior to, you know, actually having a varied counsel onboard. And I don't know, Commissioner Yee, if you have anything else you want to add, please, add it.

COMMISSIONER YEE: That's all. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Is there an intersection between the VRA and the incarcerated question we have? I'm just trying to figure out -- I just -- if it's okay, that we're looking into how to bring that conversation, or if that's part of the conversation around VRA?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, I mean, just off the cuff here, I think it's something we should be thinking about. Because if those folks are -- if we are putting them back into their home district, home locations, right, those are highly likely to be districts that we'll draw that will need to be VRA compliant, right? I mean, if we're thinking about the number of, for example, black and brown people who are incarcerated and where they -- their home addresses might be, there may be a VRA
component that we would want to think about there. But we would have to think about it regardless, if that makes sense. Certainly, it's a piece that we've been talking about also, in terms of the line drawer, to some extent, right? Because from a data perspective, that's going to have to be brought back in. I think it, kind of, touches many of our subcommittees.

I don't know, Commissioner Yee, do you have a better -- I wasn't particularly articulate in my response.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Well, my current understanding is -- I mean, we've been strongly requested by the legislature to do this reallocation. But we had not actually made that decision as a Commission yet, you know, whether we're going to proceed with that. If and when we do, then that will be part of our instructions to our very -- RPV analysts and our very counsel, right? But we -- and that -- you know, that appears to be the direction things are heading. But we have not formally taken that step yet. So it is a discussion we'll have to have, and a vote I think, yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I apologize if you talked about this. I got distracted for a second. But you were talking about a racially polarized voting analyst, and
getting that started right away. Is there a status on that, or did I miss it? I apologize.

COMMISSIONER YEE: We have reported on that. That is a draft that's still being put together with Commissioner Sadhwani, Director Claypool, Raul, and myself. So when we have that ready to present to you, we will.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: We failed to put it on the agenda for December 14th. We hope that we can bring it to you December 14th. I'm sorry. I didn't have the floor.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Perhaps under our subcommittee report slot.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

And Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. This is just to help inform as we're bringing in experts on this topic. So if we're going to be creating a, kind of, a panel or conversation or learning around the, you know, kind of felon, you know, incarcerated individuals and putting them back into their community. The purpose of that really would be for us at the end of it to have a discussion and make that final decision if yes or no.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. I think that's
absolutely correct. And it's most certainly something
that we are looking at as a component of VRA training of
how can VRA compliance help to -- help us to inform that
decision.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Next, is data management. So beyond the scope of
work, is there anything that data management subcommittee
would like to report out to the full Commission at this
point?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. Thank you.

On behalf of Commissioner Ahmad and myself, I have a
lot of information to share, basically, that we believe
will be helpful. And I'll just, kind of, start. We met
with a lot of people, and a lot of different thought
processes one way or the other. But the thing that I
talked about earlier, no matter who we spoke with,
structure really seemed to be important. And so I just
want to begin by reiterating that clean and structured
information allows an ease of searchable material. If
it's clean and if it's structured, it makes it easily
searchable for later. It's, kind of, Commissioner
Ahmad's example that gave, if we get information about
Redding, prior to being in Redding, can we go back and
find it later?
And so -- and what I said earlier, pdf -- and I'm not sure what an SCO is, but also pdf, I guess it's another image type of file, anything that we received like that won't be able to be searched. And we were encouraged to avoid Adobe. Things received on letterhead would be problematic. And so as we were thinking about how we'll receive all this information in, it's great to take it in. But if it's not later searchable, then we will not -- there are -- there's a good opportunity that it won't come up again. And we know the reason why we wanted to receive it in all of these formats for data.

But what we would learn from Stu, for example, is that if we don't have data equity without a structured input, he says any way you slice it, searchable data will be prioritized over nonsearchable. And so we'll say you can -- because there was another suggestion to get as much as you can in a structured format, and then, whereby have a process where there are other pieces that may come in that's not structured. But they won't be searchable. So when all is said and done and we go back and search, that will get a priority. And we know that's not what we want is to prioritized some information received over others. But that typically is what happens.

We were encouraged to use, as we need multiple pieces of software if it be it, or multiple approaches,
and then, hire an internal technologist within our team
to hold others accountable to ensure that the information
is being input, read, et cetera. Let's see, clean and
structured came up several times. Analysis and retrieval
with a strong audit trail to ensure that there's not
manipulation of comments is something that was also
suggested. So those are the piece -- some of the notes
that I've captured. I tried to highlight that. I've got
pages of them. But those -- that's what I wanted to say
for the good of the committee right now.

And Commissioner Ahmad, if you have more, I'll --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Sure. So in addition to what
Commissioner Turner has shared --

Are you all getting feedback? That was weird.

Was really a key point that Stu also, kind of, tried
to drill down with us was, steering most of our data to a
singular place. So if we have some, sort of, like,
Google form, or what we have currently existing on our
website, which needs work, in terms of gathering this
public input. If we have our website, our social media
accounts, our outreach efforts all steering the majority
of people to one source, or one input place, it would be
easier on the retrieval end. And this, kind of, ties
back to something our guest speaker yesterday, Amy, was
talking about as well, in terms of the resources that we
do have. The more people we have funneling in through this structured input format, we have more resources to allocate towards those folks who can't for some reason go through that avenue.

And then, we also had a chance to talk to Derek Poppert, who wrote the article on medium about civic technology. And the conversation was really great. And he really helped us understand that civic technology is -- you can't really point to something and say, hey, that is civic technology. Once you have used a certain type of technology for the purposes of civic engagement and advancement, that becomes civic technology. So something that he said, which kind of made us chuckle a little bit was that whichever software firm, company, organization that we go with, by nature of this work will have become a civic technology firm. So that was an interesting takeaway for us in that regard. And I know that's something that was important for us as a group in our previous discussions to continue to bring forth.

We are really hoping that later when we talk about the scope of work language, which is by no means finalized, we need input from you all, we need input from the public. We also got a note yesterday from Robin who said she would want to meet and talk about the language a little bit more and have some recommendations for us as
well. So we're in the process of scheduling that
meeting. We're hoping that that can be a starting point,
a discussion of all of the things that we've talked about
previously in terms of which data we want to collect,
which data we want to -- in the formats in which we want
to receive that information and get into that nitty-
gritty detail and actually define those metrics for us to
include in this RFP language in the latter part of our
report back.

Commissioner Turner, do you have anything else to
add?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Maybe they'll come out with
questions. I see a couple of hands.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. You mentioned
earlier the pdfs are not machine readable. If pdfs
aren't machine readable, then we need to get data, the
text data, out of the COI tool in a format that is. I
just want to make sure that was on our radar. Because,
you know, we're going to have to search through that
data, do some analytics on that data and search through
it, the narrative part, at least.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. And just to respond to
that, we -- the recommendation is plain text file, CSW
text file, ZIP, FDMS, PST, et cetera, but definitely not
COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah. And in addition to that, I wonder if Statewide Database will be housing those text files and just sending us a pdf, or if their software only produces pdf? So there might be an easy fix to that. It might just require some additional communication with Statewide Database, in terms of what they can and can share with us. But that's something I -- we definitely need to consider. So thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you, guys. This is bringing up a lot of good points. Oh, also the presentation yesterday was fantastic. Thank you. Oh, the pdf, I just realized, yes, when the COI tool was saying about -- they're giving us a pdf of the shapefile. It's a picture of what it looks like. So it's like the drawing on a map. And I believe that's so -- it was like, you know, someone drew on a napkin. I believe that that is -- so when the people get it back themselves, they can see what it is. Because they can't read a -- the shapefile. That's code. So I believe that's what they're talking about. And I don't know, and I might ask Commissioner Kennedy about this COI tool. Then, there's also identifiable information, so. And I
thought that was a text file. So that might be -- that
might all be cleared up.

But at some point, I'm expecting this group, your
data management, to pin us down about what questions are
we getting? What questions are we asking? And I, kind
of, like that survey form that Ms. Garcia, Sofia Garcia,
showed yesterday that they were doing that they had a
little survey format almost to collect information.
Because we have to know what data we're going to look at.
And the way I've been looking -- I've been thinking about
it is, and I think Commissioner Sinay might've mentioned
this or Commissioner Le Mons, when we're actually looking
at all of our building blocks together, and we're trying
to draw a line, a district line, between them, we'd like
to be able to click on that COI and get information about
it. And my understanding is, we can do a little bit of
that. The COI tool will give us, you know, just the name
of it, that kind of thing. If we could also connect in
to that, if it's a video file -- if it's an audio file,
if it's something like. And I think these are specific
information that we need for the data management people
to collect or to hear, so they might tell a professional
what we'd like to get out of it.

And I think we need to, sort of, start thinking
about as we're drawing that line, wouldn't it be nice,
you know, if you're going, boy, you know, right up there in Redding, now what was that? Click. And we could look, and we can, like, almost like, you know, you've seen it before, and it comes out a little pop-out menu of, oh, yeah, let's look at that audio file, or oh, what was the date of it? And just to get further stored further information. In which case, what information would we be trying to hear? And that's -- I think we need to sort of say. And that's one thing I would like.

I think that would be ideal, if you could go into that map and get as much information on that COI as possible.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. Um-hum. Might to respond to that, and the Commissioner Ahmad, you please follow up after me. My response to that is, my perceptive, or perception, on what we're working on is that we would be designing any different questions than what the COI tool was already asking, or will now be having apples and oranges. So we all weighed in on what tools should be on the COI tool. And now, if we create other surveys that ask different questions than what the COI tool does, we won't be able to line up that information, right, or have information coming. So you're asking something different?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. I'm actually asking, yes, the COI is one information. And it's a
about a specific area on a map. We're collecting, though -- remember we go out, say the people that don't have -- they're not using the COI tool, but they're -- they have a -- their own different type of, you know, GIS compatible --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- a GIS compatible file with a bunch of information. And they give us a wonderful presentation, or a wonderful discussion. And we've collected that maybe by an audio. So someone has to take that information and also --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- make it a building block.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So why can't we and the data management people put this data together, combine it?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And I know they can't.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Absolutely. So what the task was, was how do you capture other verbal information that they know they're going to get information through the
shapefiles, through the COI tool? But in addition to
that, what we tasked everyone with was what would be the
tool, the data management system, that would capture what
other people proactively gave us? What I'm simply saying
is, when we go out, we would not solicit different
information, to try and keep the information structured.
And here, we would give them the same prompts. But they
may very well may come back and add additional
information. And the system that we are now, kind of,
have our proposal out for, would be able to capture
whatever verbiage they gave us. And so that we will have
that still in file.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Great. Then, yes.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah. And just -- can I add to
that, just a little bit? Commissioner Andersen, you
bring up a really good point. And this is something that
we've went back and forth on quite a bit. And you know,
as we've shared it in previous meetings, there's no magic
button that exists that can pull out all of this
information in one format, in one software, in all the
different forms that we are expecting to receive this
information. So the idea of retrieval was really
highlighted as important that you all need a software or
a service or some type of platform that will help you
retrieve the information.
And an example that Stu gave us that really hit home with me was that the importance of using this tool to increase our efficiency in getting through all of the public comments. So for example, there are form letters that community groups sent. And those form letters may be identical. We might get, you know, 500 form letters that are word-for-word identical, this retrieval program software service should be able to tell us, hey, you all got, like, 500 letters from this one area that are exactly the same. And here are letters who are similar, but there might one or two lines different. So that would help us as a Commission go through every single comment that comes in to weigh into our decision-making, and inform our decision-making for the final maps.

So the key being efficiency. How can we use this tool, this civic technology, to increase our efficiency in getting through the loads of public comments that we will receive, and then, be able to retrieve that information for the line drawers as well?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, everyone. It is lunchtime. So we will be back at 1:45. The discussion this afternoon will focus on our various procurement documents and reviewing and discussing the drafts that have been provided and posted. So thank you very much and look forward to seeing folks on the flip
side of this.

(Whereupon, a recess was held.)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for joining us for our afternoon session, Wednesday, the 2nd of December, 2020. As usual, we will start our afternoon session with an opportunity for public comment. I would ask, Katie, if she could read the instructions, please?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: In order to maximize transparency -- in order to maximize transparency in 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 92738068918, 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 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 located on the website.

The Commission is taking general afternoon public comment at this time. And we do have someone in the queue.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I will.

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

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Hi. Good afternoon. This is Lori L-O-R-I Shellenberger S-H-E-L-L-E-N-B-E-R-G-E-R. And I am the redistricting consultant for Common Cause.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours, Lori.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Okay. Thank you. Good afternoon. And I wanted to call in and let the Commission know that I submitted at about 12:45 today, per Chair Kennedy's recommendations, some initial feedback on the RFP for the line drawer.

And I just wanted to reiterate a couple of the
points in that email and submission. And I also sent it
directly to Commissioners Sadhwani and Andersen in case
there was some lag time in the public comment getting to
them.

Just a couple of things. First of all, maybe it
goes without saying, but the tremendous amount of work
that went into this already, I just want to acknowledge
that and really, the work of the whole Commission.

I don't think there's anyone who spends even a part
of their day watching one of your meetings and isn't in
awe of the commitment that you're all making to this
process in getting this up and off the ground.

Regarding the RFP, I just want to emphasize
something that I said in the public comment that I
submitted. And that is that there is a lot in that RFP
that groups who had a chance to put initial eyes on it
yesterday felt needed to be revised. And I tried to
capture some of that initial thinking in the email I sent
you. And I listed the organizations' initial thoughts
that reflect.

There were other organizations that we work with,
and I reached out to, who did not have time, on such
short notice, to look it over and provide meaningful
feedback.

So I would just like to reiterate what I said in the
comment. And that is that you not take action on this
today without the opportunity from people, public
feedback, and engagement with the Commission.

There are lots of groups and experts that would be
willing to sit down with the Subcommittee or the full
Commission to discuss our comments. And we would love to
do that and to assist you in whatever way we can to make
sure this is an effective RFP that elicits proposals that
are helpful to you and inform your decision in choosing
this important position and consultant.

And I understand the tension here with moving this
along and avoiding delays. But you also don't want to be
in a position where you post another RFP that doesn't get
any proposals because you'll go back to the drawing
board. So I think it's worth it to take the time that is
needed to get it right and ensure that you get the best
proposals that you can. Yeah.

I appreciate your time and happy to answer any
questions.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Are there questions from
Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. So Lori, I don't know
if you're still on, but thank you so much. I did just
receive those comments. And I'll certainly attempt to
take a closer look at them this afternoon as we are further discussing it. And hopefully it will also be posted in due time.

And I just want to say, we absolutely value the partnership of community organizations and the input of community groups in this process. And I just wanted to note -- actually, in the conversations that we've had with line drawers, the issue that was raised to us was actually not necessarily particular problems with the RFP that was put out by the State auditor's office. It was instead that the State auditor put it out.

So there was a general sense from the folks that we have spoken with that they didn't respond because they didn't feel it was the job of the State auditor. Not that there was necessarily anything wrong with the RFP, but they wanted to wait for the Commission to put it out.

So I just wanted to clarify that that has been the feedback that we have received.

But of course, we recognize there are so many components to this. And I think we welcome your feedback. And would, you know, I don't know how Commissioner Andersen feels, but I would love to take you up on the offer of having the meeting with the Subcommittee to further inform them as to (audio interference).
MS. SHELLENBERGER: I appreciate that. And we're happy to do that. And I do think the previous RFP may have been a little bit more clear on certain aspects of what would be expected and what the deliverables would be for the line drawers.

So I was just -- one of the themes I think you'll see is that we're hoping there would be a little bit more specificity in there and would imagine that the proposers would hope for that as well.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. We agree with you on that. And I think the conversation we had this morning was really, you know, to try and elicit that specificity from the Commissions to make sure that the Commission has a clear sense of what should happen (audio interference).

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Yeah. And I appreciate that. I wasn't able to listen in to that because I was actually drafting the comments. But I saw some notes that someone circulated. And it sounded like you were moving in that direction, which is great to see. If there's nothing else, I want to thank you for your time, and again, for all the work you're doing. I appreciate it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Are there any others? Okay.

Thank you, Ms. Shellenberger for the comment.

Katy, do we have any others?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: No, Chair. That was it.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Then, with that, I would like to -- I think we can finish up the remaining subcommittees in fairly short order. And then turn to the procurement language for the data management contract.

So Communities of Interests Tool. That would be Commissioner Akutagawa and me.

Commissioner Akutagawa, do you have anything at this point?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Not -- other than what we discussed yesterday. I do feel like there is going to need to be some clarifications, I think, with the Statewide database, based on our discussions that we've had this round.

I will ask, just for the sake of ensuring there's coordination with Statewide Database, to Commissioners Turner and Ahmad. If you could send us that list of files or file types that can be readable and not readable.

I'm going to -- I don't want to assume things anymore. And I want to make sure that they are aware that what we're looking at needs to -- I want to just be clear with them and say this is what is advised to us. And we just want to make sure that this is either going to be available on their end and PDFs to us as
Commissioner Ahmad had noted. Or if we need to make sure that they do have that available to us, should our data management team need it. So that would be all that I would say.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

One other issue that Statewide Database had touched base on, and I wanted to bring back to the full Commission at this point, is the question of the domain name.

First of all, to report that they have been moving forward with the name Draw My CA Community. They also have reserved URL's for Draw My Community and My CA Community. So that's on the track that they were working.

The other track was whether or not we want a ca.gov ending on whatever URL. And if so, that would be up to the Commission staff to obtain. Personally, I am not as concerned that we have that in general. But my one thought is, if having that ca.gov ending on the URL gets us more protection for the website as far as State office of technology, or Department of Technology, then that might be a reason to ask for one of those addresses.

So I wanted to ask the Cybersecurity Subcommittee to weigh in on this. And then any other general input on whether we would stick with just a link from our main
website to the URL that Statewide Database sets up for the Communities of Interest Tool, or whether we do specifically want a .ca.gov address for it.

So Commissioner Fornaciari, Commissioner Taylor, any thoughts?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: You know, it's a great question. I have no idea what the answer is. But I'll look into it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. If you could do that, then let us know. And we will be in touch with the Statewide Database on that.

Any -- Commissioner Yee?

Where'd he go?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I keep hitting the wrong button.


COMMISSIONER YEE: Thanks. Yeah, I'm a fan of .ca.gov for whatever security reasons, it may help. But more importantly, because I think as a member of the general public, that would reassure me that this is legit. You know, that it's not some other third party, you know, whatever. So I'm a fan of that.

And you know, I think it should be posted wherever we can post it. Certainly on our website, of course. But, you know, you catch all different people all different ways. So I think it should be very public and
very widely disseminated.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Were there other hands that I did not catch? Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And this has nothing to do with the domain name. And I wasn't sure if I should bring this up now or in lessons learned. But as fellow Commissioner Akutagawa and I were venturing down this Language Access Subcommittee, what we came up with -- and also, it kind of relates to the outreach, was it would have been good to have another question to have them respond to, which would be, how did you hear about the tool?

And I think that would be -- we're thinking that would be important because that would maybe show what, maybe what some of our successful efforts were versus maybe not so successful efforts in terms of outreach. So that could be, like -- I don't know if it's a lessons learned or here, but I just wanted to make sure I put that out there. Because it's too late now to include it for this one. But maybe for next time, it would be helpful.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Okay. The next Subcommittee is in fact, the Cybersecurity Subcommittee.

So Commissioners Fornaciari and Taylor, do you have anything to report?
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, sure. So let's see.

So we've gotten with Director Claypool to specifically focus on this role of IT manager that they're looking to bring in and help define what that role is going to be and what their -- what the expectations and responsibilities are. So we've been kind of iterating on that a little bit. And we're going to get together -- we're going to try to get together Monday to come to some final conclusion on what that looks like.

So that's what we've been working on to, you know, just to ensure that we have a person here or and/or a contractor who's going to be able to have the capabilities we need to manage our IT effectively and securely.

I didn't know -- Commissioner Taylor, did you have anything you wanted to add?

Sorry. That's it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

The Troubleshooting Subcommittee -- Commissioners Le Mons and Andersen.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: We don't have anything to update on today. Is that correct, Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: One thing is, the computers are -- they supposedly should be coming in. They actually have gone to the point where they've been
ordered. They're, like, on the way. And we might
actually get them before the end of the year. Maybe even
sooner. Christmas present.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: A question for the
Subcommittee. And I don't know if you'll know at this
point. But do we have recommendations on what to do with
the material that we have that we will no longer use?
Are we shipping it back to the office? So our old phones
and then, eventually, this old laptop.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I have -- yes. We're supposed
to ship our phones back. We can get reimbursed through
our, you know, our process to do so. I actually have
shipped mine back. So I got a request to send it back.
So that's how I know that's the expectation.

But they, as I was told, are the property of the
State of California. And therefore, we need to return
them. And they will dispose of them accordingly.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you Commissioner Le Mons.

Director Claypool, I know that you had your hand up.
One question that I wanted to ask. I note that the old
phones have asset tags on them. The new phones do not.
And just to check to see how those are being tracked.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So the tags on the old phones


were placed on there by the California State auditor. And so we would track those phones actually by their serial numbers, not by the asset tags. That's strictly their process.

We have offered those old phones back to them. But they have said that we can go ahead and keep them. So they will -- along with your computers when you send them back in, typically those types of things are part of a survey process.

If we don't use them, then we roll them back into the State inventory. And they go out to other State agencies at a discount so that they can continue their use until their useful life is done.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And I'm sure theirs is done.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Don't laugh.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I'm just sure there is support for the idea that their useful life was long ago. But --

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Now, that's subjective.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes. Yes. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I guess they could be used as coasters.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: That's a good use.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Can we just wait until we get the new computers and just send it all at once? Or
do they need to go back separately depending on when the
computers are expected to arrive?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Director Claypool?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Can I have the question again, please?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Should they come back piecemeal, or
can we wait until the new computers are in and ship both
back at the same time?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Just wait and send everything
back at the same time. We have plenty of computers here,
so we don't need them for that purpose. And we won't
survey any of this material until we're completely done
with our efforts. We'll hang on to everything in case we
need spare parts.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And I apologize. I wasn't
quick enough with the Cybersecurity report. It moved too
fast. But I was looking for a note.

Can I just ask either Commissioner Fornaciari or
Commissioner Taylor -- it did strike me yesterday that,
during the presentation, one of the recommendations is
that the person that we will have on staff, he called
that person a technologist that will keep track of all of
the vendors.
So it did strike me that there is going to be perhaps a different level of skill to be able to manage all of these -- the kind of vendors for the civic technology that we're hoping to use -- than just somebody who's going to just make sure that our IT works. So I do want to just make that note. And hopefully, that will be part of the consideration, as -- fortunately, we have not hired the IT person yet, so.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. So you kind of lost me a little bit there. Who said that yesterday?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I believe it was either Waldo -- I think it was Waldo that said that yesterday.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. It was Waldo.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: It was a suggestion to ensure that we have the expertise within our team that we would be able to hold others accountable to ensure that their translation of the information, the holding of the information, that we're keeping all the piece parts together, as opposed to just entrusting it to someone outside of the organization. And it's above what we may or may not know how to do.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I get the impression that he was thinking of a person who was going to be, you know, kind of our in-house data management person. And I --
COMMISSIONER TURNER: He -- the suggestion --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And I was thinking that was a different person than our IT person. But that's not the impression you all got.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: No. No. Neal. I think it is different than our IT person. This is a technologist specifically for the data management piece.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Chair, this is (indiscernible).

CHAIR KENNEDY: Go ahead, Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: So I remember hearing that part. And I took notes. And I think when Neil and I, Raul, and Dan get together, I'll be able to advocate or bring that into the conversation.

So Commissioner Akutagawa, I heard that as well. And I think I can now discuss it with the Subcommittee.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Great. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent. Okay. The final subcommittee would be the Lessons Learned subcommittee.

Commissioner Ahmad, do you have anything to share at this point?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: No, I do not. I am keeping a running Google doc. So it will be readily available at the end of our major work. And we will have some fun
meetings at the end to figure out what to do with all of
the lessons that we've learned.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Good. Director Claypool, if I could
ask you for the phone -- sorry, not phone, the email
address of contact in the auditor's office so that
Commissioner Ahmad and I can link up with their lessons
learned work on the selection process.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Certainly. I'll send that over.

I'll make a note right now. And you'll have it within
the hour.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much.

Okay. With that, we have concluded the subcommittee
updates. And I would now like to invite the --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Commissioner Kennedy?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes. Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I need to go back to 9(c)
real quick. Sorry. My apologies. Just briefly, there
was a request to look into some agenda management
software that we could, you know, display a nice video.
And it's indexed to the agenda. And we've got the agenda
with links in it and all that stuff.

So I had volunteered to take a look at that. And so
I spent some time last week looking around at different
commissions and what they do, in different cities and
what they do. And I was able to get ahold of one
particular vendor. And so next week, Director Claypool, Director Ceja and myself will meet and get a
demonstration from this vendor and see, you know, what it looks like, what it takes, how we think it might work, you know, in the context of this commission.

And we'll have an update, you know, on the outcome of that next time.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Just wanted to say it's moving forward. We're working on it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Good.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Actually, I put my hand up and then I put it down.

Commissioner Fornaciari, if you could let me know when that is, and if I'm available, I'd like to also be part of that since I am very familiar with minutes and how they've been written in the past. So that would be good.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, that'd be helpful.

Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Then I would invite the Data Management Subcommittee to take us through their draft
document. And we can discuss that.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Certainly. Thank you so much, Chair.

So our draft scope of work language is posted online under the meeting handouts for this particular meeting. And we are looking at 9(i) Data Management SOW.

So just a brief background on how this document came to be in its current version. So we worked off of some template language that Dan had shared with us from the RFI for the RPV and the legal counsel draft that was already well underway before we had started. So some of the language is boilerplate in terms of just the introduction of the CRC.

We added in -- because the data management aspect may be an individual. It may be an organization, or a firm, or multiple firms. We included that language in that first introductory paragraph, as well as the very specific inputs that we might be receiving. So the categories of those inputs -- so either written, drawn, oral, shapefiles. We included et cetera in there just to cover our bases in terms of other things we don't know at this point that we may be receiving.

And then, when you scroll down to the statement of work experience -- so this section and the section following, so section 5 and 6 were really informed by our
discussions in the field with the different experts that we spoke to, the different recommendations that they had. We did some searching of -- we were shared with links -- excuse me. They shared links with us in terms of different jobs and data science roles. And the descriptions that are written in those job roles to include as potential guiding language within what we would want for a data manager or management service.

So at this point, section 5, in terms of the statement of work and experience, we have listed out a brief overview of how we expect large amounts of public input data from across the state.

We would want someone to be able to organize this data by a variety of different indicators. So, for example, if, you know, alluding to our earlier conversation, if we are in a certain city, we want to be able to have some sort of management system that would be able to pull up all of the inputs that we have gotten that relate to that city or by any other indicators such as ZIP code, neighborhood, et cetera.

And this is all contingent upon the design of our form, or however we intake this data as well. Right? So if we don't have a ZIP code field, or we don't have a city field, it's going to be a little bit more challenging to code those inputs as such.
And we also used our own website as an avenue to inform this particular aspect, as our own website does have currently a Contact Us page, which is interesting in that it requires someone from the public to submit their name, their email address, the region or county that the public comment is related to, in a dropdown menu. And then, the subject and your message being the only two fields that are optional or don't need to be completed in order to hit submit.

Our online form on our website also includes language stating that file formats that are supported include PDF and jpg's. However, there's no option to attach such a file to the form on our website. So we have brought that to Mr. Ceja's attention as well, if this is an avenue we decide to pursue in terms of the data collection, specifically regarding the public input piece.

When we scroll down to section 6, I believe this is an edit that needs to be made -- the submission format. But the following language in that section highlights the different areas that we would want our future data management firm, or organization, or individual -- the different experiences that they should have, and a detailed description of what they learned/did during those experiences.
So we went off of the RFP for RPV, and then counsel as well -- litigating counsel as well. But we decreased our number to describing five to eight of the most recent data management projects. That recent term also being something that we picked up from conversations on the earlier RFP’s. And then, included all of the different aspects that we thought were shared with us in our informational interviews of areas that would be important to cover and make sure that we have in the toolbox of whoever we contract with.

And again, this is a draft. Commissioner Turner and I have been bouncing our heads up -- back and forth about, did we included everything, are there things that we are missing. We already have heard from Robin that has comments, and USDR has comments on this RFP language. So we're awaiting those comments. Our point in bringing this forward to the Commission today was to gather your feedback on what we are missing. Are there areas that we should be collecting information on that are not on this form, or is there are -- are there areas that are not clear.

And then also, we want to solicit feedback from the public, as well. I -- I'll just leave it at that and let Commissioner Turner jump in to add anything else.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.
No, I don't have anything else to add. I think that's a good place to stop and receive feedback from the Commissioners and then public comment.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioners?

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Well, first, I just want to say thank you. It does sound like it took a lot of time and you put a lot of work into it, but it sounded like it was just really fascinating and interesting. And it would have been great to have heard even more on the presentation yesterday. It was really fantastic.

And I do want to just say, I think I -- I, maybe, more taking to heart what I heard yesterday from the presentation, don't make it so specific and you know, box ourselves in. And so I was -- I -- one, I like really high-level kind of stuff and just get to the point. And I felt like you, you know, you really captured that here where, you know, it gives you enough flexibility for us to really understand what their capabilities are without getting too boxed in by somebody who -- I took to heart what Waldo said about, you know, not being so specific in then being, perhaps, sold by a company that says that they can do it all, and walk on water, and you know, change the world and all that kind of stuff. And then, in the end, not necessarily being able to do all that we
want. So I just want to just put that out there that I just really appreciate what you've done here. And this looks really fantastic. So thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I am sure I was not next.

CHAIR KENNEDY: You think Commissioner Fornaciari is next?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I think Commissioner Fernandez was before me.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I'm sorry, I was looking at the document and hands appear and disappear. So Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. I forgot, I had my hand up. So thank you. And I just want to thank both of you for the RFP. It's really well written and very thorough. The only suggestion I would make, in section 5, under the statement of work, just like in the first sentence you talk about, to manage large amounts of data in various formats. And I realized that you say as described above. But what happens sometimes when vendors look at RFPs, they kind of just go straight to the statement of work.

So my recommendation would be to, again, put -- as you put up there various formats, you put in parentheses
with written, drawn, oral, shape files, et cetera. So
I -- that's the only thing that I was thinking of because
they kind of like to, you know, go to the meat of it to
decide whether or not they want to submit something.

But thank you very much, it -- appreciate all the
work you put into that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Sure. Yeah and -- just I
want to also thank you all for your hard work. And it
did seem like it would have been a lot of fun to spend
time talking to all of these folks and learning stuff.

My suggestion would be -- bless you, Commissioner Le
Mons.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Bless you.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Oh I'm sorry, I had
no idea my microphone was on. My apologies.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I guess my suggestion
would be, in the first paragraph, maybe expand upon that
a little bit, the narrative about the Commission because
it's really brief. And what I was thinking was, you
know, what the data is, how we're going to collect it,
and how we'll use it. And so that they just have a
bigger, a better, more well-rounded picture of what we're
doing here.
I think I -- you know, if you -- if you look at the line drawer RFP, and in that section in the beginning, with the detail about the Commission, I think that might be a good -- a good place to do a little plagiarizing and use some of that content. But I would just suggest also just focus on the data in those three aspects.

So that -- but thank you all very much for your hard work.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you. Yes, thank you to the subcommittee especially since this is one of those pieces that's new, right. This is a piece we're adding from last time and so plotting new ground and doing a great job of it. Thank you.

Two comments, one is language access, right. It's long discussion we had. You know, where does the translation happen and is the data management contractor responsible, or do we provide it? So need to address that one way or another here.

The other comment is -- I guess, if I were bidding on this, you know, I'm trying to think. So okay, responsible to organize this data, it comes in over an eight-month -- nine-month period. There's interim reports and a final report. I'm not -- I -- in terms of
how much work that ends up being -- it's not quite clear
how many cycles, you know, kind of, I'm responsible for,
which would really affect my sense of how much to bid.
You know?

So I know we can't get that specific but I'm
wondering how we can help with -- get better -- get a
better sense of, okay, how many deliverables do I have.
You know, the ongoing -- I guess there's an ongoing
organization of data that comes in that is made
accessible to the Commission that's ongoing and -- for
this time period. And so I'm just thinking as a vendor,
I might need a little bit more help to know exactly what
the deliverable is here -- deliverables are.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Let me -- Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Yee just got
me thinking about two things that, perhaps, I want to
just maybe build upon what he said. Perhaps -- and I
think you were saying that perhaps it could written in
that the bulk of the work will be over a certain period
of time. And then following that, it may slow down to
more, you know -- to, you know, X amount of times or
maybe once a year or something like that, after the
submission of the maps might be helpful in terms of
giving that time context that Commissioner Yee was
talking about.
The other thing is, I just -- in -- when he asked about language access, and I think Commissioner Fornaciari also mentioned about beefing up the beginning paragraph a little bit more, it also got me thinking about what Commissioner Yee said yesterday about the different types of scripts or fonts. So I realize that it says multiple languages but I think taking a page out of not assuming things, maybe it should also say multiple scripts or fonts -- the scripts, meaning, like, the, you know -- whether it's in Thai or in Farsi or whatever, you know the -- even in, like, simplified or traditional Chinese, being able to handle those.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: (Audio interference) to the subcommittee. This is awesome. I agree with Commissioner Yee, we're charting new ground. In a sense, we had it easier because there were -- there were documents from 2010 that we could basically plagiarize and just change. So well done.

I have two questions. One is more procedural about this RFP. And then, one is my big picture. So procedurally, I would just ask is this a direct RFP or a secondary RFP? And this might be a Dan Arelo (phonetic) question for clarification. My understanding is that
with the secondary RFP and -- you -- the cost doesn't matter as much. It's a -- it's one factor amongst many in your selection process.

And therefore, a selection process has to -- has to be included. Whereas an RFP, I believe, goes to the lowest bidder, unless it's a close bid. Someone can correct me if I'm wrong. But I would just put that out there as something to consider, kind of, procedurally.

The second piece, however, I -- I'm just -- I guess, maybe as clarification, did I hear correctly yesterday that the group that -- I think it was Robin -- is it USDR, had -- that presented from -- that's a project from Georgetown, did they say that they do this for free? And I'm wondering -- I'm wondering if you guys that have thought at all about, maybe, just being a recommendation of, rather than going through an RFP process, if we just contract with them directly?

I have no idea what that looks like. I don't know if they're the vendor we'd want to use. But if they were, it could certainly save us a whole lot of time and answer some of those questions we had earlier about if we got out pre-Census, how we do it. Who's the data man -- who's going to help manage all of this data. If we could just get them on board, January 1, they're helping to build some of this.
And you know, I don't know if that's a realistic solution but I'm just curious if that was -- had been considered at all?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Just to respond to those questions.

The first one, yes, is a Dan question to help us understand that a little better. The second one, in terms of US Digital Response, yes, they are free. And they're not out of Georgetown, they're a independent organization, born out of Covid 19 response and the need that governments have had to have, and in our conversations with them. Since we're not directly Covid 19 response, they have shared that USDR has, kind of, shifted into responding in -- responding to secondary things that have come out of Covid.

And this being one of them. The fact that we have to be, now, taking public comment and probably all virtual format because of COVID-19. Dan, myself, and Commissioner Turner, we need -- we do need to huddle to figure our exactly your question if an RFP is, you know, the best route if we potentially like the work of USDR. And what that translation looks like between RFP language and an MOU. And if -- what that process looks like, because I am unfamiliar with what that process looks
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

So I have Commissioner Fernandez and then we'll go to Director Claypool. And then I have one question.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani triggered something that -- so Waldo, yesterday, he did -- he did offer up -- from USDR -- he did offer up that he was willing to review the RFP, the draft RFP language. So I'm not sure if that's also a -- something that we can look into. And he probably asked a lot of questions and you -- all of the detail could probably be added to it, as well.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez. We're at -- in the process of scheduling that meeting.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Director Claypool?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So Commissioner Sadhwani, you're exactly right. The RFP 2 is qualitative but it -- there's always the component that we want the lowest possible price. Whereas an RFP is always the lowest responsible bidder. And so this Commission is opting to use the RFP 2 to make sure that we have that qualitative touch to it.

A thing that you -- that goes with both of them, it used to be that the RFP 2 is -- was most closely
associated with having interviews, where you could interview the people who were -- who were bidding but you can actually do that with either one. All you have to do is say there'll be an interview involved with it. So regardless of which one you use.

The one thing I would say about the individuals who were speaking yesterday, it would be very important to clarify that whereas their services are free, if there's some component that needs to be procured, data storage or anything else, we -- I'm fairly certain that they're going to require someone to pay for that. And so depending on what that cost is, will depend on how we can take care of it.

I thought that was a great presentation and has a lot of -- it gave me hope that we could go back to being somewhat within our budget because that's a -- that's one of the big contract costs. But let's make sure, as we're talking to them, what they -- what they're going to require us to pay for because it just -- rightfully, we should pay for whatever is necessary to make this work.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes. This conversation kind of got me thinking about a few more things in section 5. You talk about ABCD is experience with data, managing data, storing data, and securing data, but
there's no reference to data analytics, data mining.

Isn't that part of the expectation of this group, that they're going to be digging through our data to help us pull out the information that we need, you know, if we're going to be in a certain area, mine that out for us?

And it -- and so I think -- you know, I'm not sure of all the right terminology that we should use there, but I can imagine Waldo is going to have a lot of good input for you on that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Director Claypool, kind of, related to the idea of interviewing, bidders, I'm also wondering, in my procurement experience, I've organized various conferences. So that would be an opportunity for all of the bidders to be in the same room, at the same time, with commissioner or Commission staff, and have a presentation from the Commission side, as well as answering any questions that come up. And so everyone is on the same page. Everybody has the same information.

Is that something that's done in California State Procurement or is that just something that was unique to my experience?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So I know that in the state, they will have conferences for the -- so they'll have employment conferences periodically. I think they do
have bidder conferences. We're going to run up against having to have a Zoom conference if it -- if that were the case because, clearly, we're not going to be able to be all in the same room.

The only thing that I would say is that that will add time on the front of this process. And right now, time is something that we're, kind of, running out with, with these contracts. So we -- I can have Raul look into it. But it just seems to me that we need to move forward as expeditiously as possible.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And on that, I'll take the opportunity, again, to ask you if, at this point, you're able to give us an idea of what the impact of waiting until the next meeting to approve this might be?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: I finished rolling the dates forward. Actually, just kind of shifting where we're at today and doing it -- you had asked, as of the next meeting, what would be the impact. And so I finished it, but I have Raul taken a look at it. And what I've asked him to do is to tell me, realistically, where can we shave any time at all, because I'm going to give you what it looks like when it typically occurs but I also want to be able to say we might possibly get some help here. We might possibly get some help there. And then, we'll move from there. But that will be this evening. I won't have
it done this afternoon.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I'll just reiterate what I've said on a number of occasions, which is hope for the best but plan for the worst.

With that, Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, thank you. I -- I've just been thinking about -- so -- the vendors that -- or the group that spoke to us and offered their services for free. And while I think that's great and I think that's awesome, I'm also thinking about the budget for the next commission. Not our commission, but the next one since their budget is going to be based on our expenditures. And so by -- just something to think about -- by potentially using free services, are we, potentially, in the future, shortchanging the next Commission and not actually having the expense of this very important line item in our budget for the next commission?

So just something to think about. I'm sure they'll be other expenses that we -- that we'll be able to incorporate, but it's just something to think about in terms of the next commission, and impact to the next commission.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

Commissioner Sinay?

There was a raised hand there.
Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. I thought -- I thought I was -- I was on mute. I was excited that you called on me because I did use the raised hand and I didn't know if it was working or not. So it does work but my unmute doesn't.

Two things, I do agree with the comment that Commissioner Fernandez made at the very beginning about making sure to include the -- at the scope of work, to include everything from above. And the reason being that, one of my notes was, don't we need to include -- diverse medians and then languages. And it was up above. So I had missed it.

And then on the different mediums or however we're using -- the right word is, just a reminder that we've also said digital or video, and that's not in there that people can submit. We're hoping that they can submit a video, as well. And finally, I -- do we need to put something in there about data ownership, who owns the data? Because every time I've ever worked with a database, or a platform, the ownership of the data ends up being a huge piece. So I just wanted to -- to put that out there.

Great job.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. And sorry, I would ask the
subcommittee to work with chief counsel and the legal
team to make sure that we cover that last point from
Commissioner Sinay.

I have Commissioner Fornaciari and then Commissioner
Turner.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So maybe this is, kind of,
common question for the subcommittee, but I was under the
impression that US Digital Response is really, kind of, a
troubleshooting, we build software for you to solve your
problem, kind of thing. And I think our problem is more
complex than that, in that we need capability to do data
mining and data analysis, and that kind of thing too.

But maybe, I kind of missed something from their
presentation. Did they provide that kind of capability
too?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah. One of the -- one of the
pieces that we were really excited about that they
offered is this time period once we solidify a
relationship in determining this is the direction we want
to go. They offered something called a discovery sprint
where we'll come to the table and answer a lot more
questions about what we need. And not so much about what
system or tool we think we need, but what is the ultimate
result. What is it we're trying to achieve? And from
there, they kind of backed in with us -- with
suggestions.

And yes, they're able also, my understanding, to even develop. They have people waiting to develop things that may be needed as well. So I have taken a note as far as -- because we did talk about data storage, as far as what happens with the cost of some of those things. But I wanted to just make note that once we meet with Robin and her team, either later this week or next week, when we get that solidified, we'll probably be answering more questions to get more specifics from them.

And one of the things that I think will be helpful going forward is if Commissioner Ahmad, myself, could get from -- and we talked about it earlier. We do need to streamline exactly what we're asking for. I was reminded about it when Patricia -- Commissioner Sinay just said also video, which video would require then, also, someone also watching and translating, and et cetera. And so again, that gets to the scope of how much work we're trying to take in.

And we initially threw everything out on the table, but at some point, we need to say we're not going to take video or we are, right? But we need to start defining where the parameters are of the information so that when we have the meeting, we can say with surety and confidence, after having come to the decision here, after
hearing from public comments, these are the ways that
we're going to receive information.

And I say that because we threw all of it out and
they hear all of it. But now, they're like yeah, you can
have anything. You know, how big is your budget? What
do you want to pay? How many people do you want to bring
in? But -- so this commission, we have to decide that.
Are we going to keep saying everything or can we now say
the recommendation. I heard over and over and over,
structured information. Structured. Structured. And
there may be a couple of allowances we want to make for
something different. But then that should be the
exception. It should be one or two additional things and
we need to turn -- to determine what that will need to
look like.

And then when we have conversations, they can be
more concrete about, oh no, we can take that all the way
through. We can do all of that for you. even with the
thank you, the language access that we talked about. A
cfew of our -- the different people that we had
discussions with talked about that and they were like --
some of them weighed heavily on the side of no, you'll
need to provide your own translation, right. Whether or
not the system mater -- the stru -- the tools that are
created, whether or not it can read it, you know, we need
to have someone there translating.

And so again, just decisions we need to make so that we're -- we can concretize this is the direction we're going in. and then we'll be able to speak from -- with clarity when we go to -- back to USDR, wherever it is we're going to go.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I will -- I've got a couple of commissioners in the queue. But I just want to call everyone's attention to the "How We Engage" page of USDR's presentation. So the second element is advice. But the first element says staffing. And underneath staffing, it says double the size of your team.

So Commissioner Fornaciari, that, I think, speaks to your question and that we may, actually, be able to double our IT team if we need to. If we're interested ad they're amenable.

Commissioner Sinay and then Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner. I was hesitant to even bring up video because of the conversation we had this morning, but I was like well, if they have everything already in there, let's make sure we don't miss this last piece.

And I think what may be helpful for a lot -- for us -- because I didn't know if we put everything and then we wait to hear what they say. But I hear what you're
saying. They'll tell us everything that they can do, so we need to make that decision. So what I suggest is could you make a recommendation right now so that we can make that decision today? So that becomes a little easier for you all. Because I know those questions are out in the ether are stressful. Because those are critical components.

And then, on using, I would recommend that we -- we post the RFP and if the group from yesterday wants to respond to part of it or all of it -- because we said it might be multiple people -- firms take on different pieces -- I'm always hesitant to do anything this big with just one entity that's free because that leave you really vulnerable in case something happens because they're doing it as volunteers.

And so I would recommend we -- as they said, we can double your staff. So that means you already have staff that can do some of this. And so we just -- we just need to make sure that we're not leaving ourselves vulnerable because we can't back out of -- yeah, we don't have that time and space to correct an error.

So anyway, I really would love to hear your recommendations on how we should be accepting data. I did send out an email to -- the notice with the foundation to ask them about the form that they used and
how did they translate that form, meaning how did they
take it from a Word doc -- you know, from a handwritten
note to actual GIS files or what they did. I haven't
heard back but I did put that question out there to them
since it came up this morning.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.
Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Oh yes, thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: (Indiscernible) --

COMMISSIONER YEE: I wanted to echo Commissioner
Fornaciari's comment. My impression from Digital
Response is yeah, they focus on providing, you know, a
tool to use if, for instance, we have not had the COI
tool in thought. You know, we should have a tool like
this, it would great for helping develop something like
that. Not providing the staffing to manage the data
comes out as such a tool, you know. I mean, that's a
whole different kind of ball of wax.

You have might have tries about that and so forth,
but I wouldn't expect them to -- and as volunteers, I
wouldn't want them to, actually, be responsible for
what's ongoing work. So yeah, that was my impression, as
well. I mean, I'd love to be proved wrong, for free.
But that was my impression as well.
And Commissioner Turner's comments, yeah, I think we need to focus on -- as we were advised yesterday, focus on, you know, the 90 percent of data that's going to come in through the usual channels, the usual languages and so forth. Be open to the exceptions but don't you know, spend half our time trying to provide for them because we can probably handle them, you know, just fine as exceptions, so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you Commissioner Yee.

Director Claypool?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Two things. I was going to say pretty much the same thing as Commissioner Yee that yesterday talked about eighty percent of your stuff is going to come in and you're going to be able to use it, and you're going to have that twenty percent exception. We are undoubtedly going to have to have some type of student assistant response to those things that we have to handle manually. I don't know if it's a student assistant, or an intern, or however we would do it, but I just anticipate that we're going to have things that are going to have to be manually handled and input into the system in a way so that it can be used if we're going to try to get all of our material into that system.

The second thing, we can do this -- we can -- after
we send this RFP out, you can continue to explore all
these options with this group. We don't have to accept
any bidder. If we get twenty bidders for this contract
and you put together something that's viable and
feasible, then we can just say we're going a different
route. So we need to get this out and rolling because
it's our main vehicle, but it doesn't mean that we have
to stop exploring.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Turner, and then
Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. Commissioner, I was
going to move forward with our recommendation. You want
to say something before that, Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Just, I guess, precursor to the
recommendation and why we've come up with that. I recall
with our conversation with Stu he asked us very
explicitly. So if someone ties a napkin to a rock and
throws it through a window, is that a data piece that you
will be accepting. And it was an extreme example, right,
but the idea remains as to what are our parameters of
what we can actually make sense of, and what -- and it's
whatever we decide, and then whatever those parameters
are.

A majority of comments should be funneled through
that manner. And to Commissioner Yee's point and what
was shared with us yesterday, the remaining theoretically could be handled even manually. And we can go old school like back in the 90s or something like that where you would have to look through manually public comments. I don't know if that's old school, but --

Commissioner Turner, to our recommendations.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

So what the sub -- as a subcommittee, what we would recommend is using the COI tool that's being developed, using our website, which (audio interference) to see how we know for sure would need to be updated to reflect the current, I guess, incompatibilities that was already talked about. So the COI tool, our website, and then any onsite verbal information that we receive. So that's either through phone calls or where it happen to be able to be at a hearing personally, at a forum if someone -- so wherever that verbal looks like. And we are saying those three different ways. And that would be the COI tool, website, or some sort of verbal phone call in one of our sessions is what our recommendation would be.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: And to add to that, anything that comes in beyond that, it's not saying that we don't want it. We certainly do want it, but a majority of our services should be able to handle these different platforms so that we can focus our attention onto those
different avenues that might come in in a handwritten letter or a drawn picture, and we would have more resources to allocate towards that, if that makes sense.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. And with that, the other piece that rings in my mind is about the equity of information as far as the attention that it gets. And what I want to even be very public about is to ensure that if we -- as we receive information that was outside of the recommended, we will attempt to give it, like, consideration, but depending on the timing. If you get that thing drawn on a napkin one month, and three months later is your now, you know, will we find it, will we remember it, will we be able -- because it won't be cataloged like the rest of the information necessarily, so, unless we are able to write it in ourselves.

So again, as much as we can drive into the structure. So the COI tool -- the website will have similar questions that the COI tool so that it's in alignment. And then as we're taking information, we're asking questions again so that all of it will line up, will be able to be input, then can be retrieved later. So that will be the recommendation.

I wanted to say -- I wanted to say one other quick thing. Maybe I'll come back to it, because that's the recommendation, and I'll just let that stand so people
can respond, and then I'll say the other thing.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. I think my -- two things. One is I would love -- I like when you use -- every time you say equity of information, that really, you know, reminds me that of the comment of the fir -- you know, everything it -- the first comment and the last comm -- you have to listen to the first comment, as well as the last comment. That whole equity -- so if we can make sure that that's written into the RFP that we're looking at the information that comes to us in equitable -- you know, you say it much better than I.

And then the other piece is -- Commissioner Turner, yesterday, I felt like you were hesitant when you heard what website we were going to be using. And so I was going to ask you at that time if you were comfortable with NationBuilder, or if you were sure that that was a right website for what we need in regard here since the website is going to be critical for capturing data. And this is a time to bring up any concerns versus later. We need to make sure if this is going to be one of the three ways that you all are feeling confident.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: No concern about it. I didn't know it. I hadn't heard of it. So I was like, huh, what is that? Let me look it up. That's all.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think -- so I -- yeah, I have three things. One is I think I just want to point out, Commissioner Turner, can I just suggest that we also make sure that we explicitly say that anything submitted via public comment because public comment will be submitted in various ways. And so I just want to be conscious about submissions by public comment.

Speaking of equity, I think one of the things that has struck me is while we heard from the various communities where I'll call language traditions are a little bit different in various communities. One of the things that did strike me is that, in particular, when the representatives from PANA and also from the Native Hawaiian Pacific Islander communities spoke about the need for perhaps video kind of instructions or opportunities to gather information. It makes me think that perhaps we need to be open to video submissions, because in a number of communities, while they will be probably assisted by different community-based organizations, what struck me is that, for example, in African communities, someone had noted that oral traditions -- or oral communication is in many of those communities a tradition and a norm.

And then also in the Native Hawaiian Pacific
Islander community presentation, what also struck me is
the idea of not to assume a rate of literacy where they
may be able to write their comments or their inputs to
us, but that they may be better served by providing oral,
I guess, input to us. So I know it just complicates
things, but I just wanted to just put that pin in there
in terms of, you know, speaking about equity.

Commissioner Sinay, I think it was more me that had
asked about the NationBuilder. I've had experience with
it, and I'll be frank. It's not been a great experience.
So that's why I just wasn't sure whether or not this is
just something that, you know, was just selective, but
when Director Ceja did say that he's had experience with
it. He knows how to use it well. I thought, okay, as
long as he knows how to use it and knows some it's both
limitations and its benefits, then I didn't think it was
worth pushing it any further, but we did used to use it
at my organization, and we moved away from it.

It was just very not so easy to use. The website
part was limiting for us. And so we did move away from
it, and we're now with Salesforce. But the one thing is
Salesforce does not have a website integration, which was
one of the reasons why we had went with NationBuilder.
So I don't know if that helps answer your question.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I have Commissioner Ahmad,
and then Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair.

I was just wondering, Commissioner Akutagawa, if I can get some clarification from you in terms of accepting the video component as input, because from my understanding, we are accepting all forms of input. What the discussion about the data management RFP is about is which types of inputs can we give to this firm or this contracted agency to handle for us in a large scale so that the remaining efforts could be put on such as video or, you know, handwritten mailed in. So I was wondering if you can elaborate a little bit on what your expectations are in terms of the video inputs.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thank you. You know, I don't know if this falls under the kind of, maybe outside of the eighty or ninety percent, I think I just wanted -- I mean, I think when I hear equity, it makes me think about the various forms in which different communities may find easiest and best for them to provide input. To be honest, I don't know if we're going to get a lot of video input. We could. And then if we do, you know, what are we going to be doing? I mean, are we prepared for it?

I think it's really more that. And if it's more like, you know, we'll get a small handful, and it's
outside the "eighty or ninety percent," you know, will be, like, more the, you know, written kind of through the website or through the COI tool. That's fine. I think it's more just raising these questions for, you know, I guess, the what ifs if we get a lot.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Commissioner Turner and then Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa, thank you for bringing it up. One of the pieces that I was hopeful to that we would still be able to capture, verbal responses, it would be through some of the onsite forms that we're going to hold, and again still through calling in public comment and what have you. So for languages that are traditionally and starkly verbal, that calls for -- I think -- I'm hopeful that we're not excluding them that -- still that they'll be able to come forth there, and then beyond that. Like you said, it probably will be not necessarily the bulk that we'll receive in video.

The other piece that I wanted to name was -- and I forget who, so forgive me -- a little bit ago, we were talk -- someone was saying about this particular project work, the bulk of it being now and then just a little bit for the other years and what have you.

I don't think -- I'm not sure, Commissioner Le Mons,
if you did or didn't, but I think as I went through the 
process, I was thinking in terms of having someone be 
able to pull it together in all the ways that we've 
talked about, whatever we land on, the storage of the 
material, so that it is available for us to free to draw 
the lines, but I in my mind was not necessarily thinking 
about retaining or having someone after that time period 
still. So I just wanted to name that in case there is a 
reason that we should do that, because I'm not -- I 
didn't personally talk about it. And if it was talked 
about, I didn't process it like that at all.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: So my comment isn't specific to 
the RFP. I think the RFP is great, and all the feedback 
given so far on that covers all the bases. I do kind of 
flinch every time I hear that we're taking any and all 
feedback. Like, we say that in one breath, and then in 
another breath, we say, well, there's some -- there may 
be some limits. And I'm not opening up that conversation 
right now because I guess we'll get to it, but at some 
point, there probably going to be some -- so this is the 
caution, I guess, I would say.

I think we should be making that determination on 
usable information, because there's nothing worse to me 
than to create the impression that I'm going to be -- if
I'm going to take my time to give you my feedback in a format that you ultimately can't process, you basically lied to me. And so I think we're really going out on a limb to suggest that we're going to really be able to take it any way somebody gives it to us, and we're going to do something with it.

So it's one thing to say yeah, we'll accept it any way you give it to us, but I think we do ourselves a disservice to tell the community we're going to accept it any way if we can't make use of it, because we're just collecting it basically. So I'd like to -- I mean, I just want us to caution that. I think what the RFP is about finding a firm that can do the broadest or so people can come from whatever angle. So that's why I say this comment is not specific to the RFP at all and not an attempt to affect the RFP's progress, but just from a philosophical position, at some point maybe when we start talking about even outreach, because how we do our outreach is going to have a lot to do with how we need to communicate with people and how we expect them to communicate back. So there's going to be some narrowing of this broadest every possibility approach, at least in my mind. It has to be respectful. Truly respectful.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay, and then Commissioner Ahmad.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Ahmad, did you want to respond to that directly or --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Not necessarily. It was just more of a historical question for Dan. And I don't -- on that same topic, just to understand if what 2010 did in terms of limitations on types of input for the process. And I know we've touched on it a little bit, but would you be able to give us some insights into how they said, okay, this is not going to work for us. Can you please come back and submit it in XYZ format or something like that.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: It was actually -- if I may. It was actually faster to simply have people putting it into the format we needed it to be in --

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Correct.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: -- and putting it in, then was trying to go back to individuals. And many people are just going to submit it and just walk away from it and consider, as Commissioner Le Mons said, that it's a done deal because we're there to take their comments, but that's how it was handled. We just -- we found a way to place it in as best we could.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So Commissioner -- that was what you had, Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Le Mons, did you
just raise your hand? Was it in response to what he just said?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Not to what he said, but more what Commissioner Ahmad said. I'm not suggesting that. That wasn't what I'm saying. And I don't know if she thought that's what I was saying, but that's not what I'm saying. It's more what Commissioner Turner said earlier is we need to let people know how to give it to us. So I wouldn't dare want to say, oh, you gave it to us in a -- come back and give it. No. No. No. No. That's not what I'm saying.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thanks.

So I first wanted to ask do you -- Commissioner Turner, do we need a motion for your recommendation? And if so, do you want to make it? And then second, and this might be a second piece, or I don't know if we need it for this one, but, I mean, what I'm understanding is the only reason we're trying to narrow is just for this RFP and for who we're going to be hiring to do this work. They'll be -- we may accept other ways, and we need to find students or others to figure out how to get that data in a way that's usable.

And so we will -- we still do need to talk about do we take a rock -- a towel rack around a rock and throw it
in and do we accept that. The other piece -- my other question was the translation. I know that -- I think Commissioner Yee brought that up. And are we looking at translation completely with another -- are we going to look at another RFP, another vendor, and look -- so that we do look at all the translation needs we have, or translation and interpretation needs because a lot it will be interpreters. And so I just -- I didn't know if that needed to be in this RFP or that's a separate. We're looking at it will be trans -- everything will be translated, and the data we give this group will be already in English, or whenever we do the translation.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: So what I want to respond to is your first question. So in addition to what we'd like to be clear on for this RFP, too, that we're submitting is that I think it's important that the public also knows now what we're going to accept so that they are also gearing up their community for this is the expectation. This is what we -- this has to be established now, right?

So the recommendation -- and yes, I would think that it would need to be a motion and voted on so that we're really clear -- is that we're using the prepared COI tool that -- or the COI tool that's being prepared. We're utilizing our website, which will be updated, which means people will be able to write in on whatever the updated
website is if there will be an opportunity for people to submit there. And that will also force a structure, and it will force a type that we can pull from later. I'm saying we will utilize as a third piece the onsite, the forums that we're going out to. Why? Because by then, we will also have presumably a line drawer or some temporary person that will also be able to structure the information and capture it, and via public comment. Public comment now is submitted either verbally out loud, and we'll be able to capture it, put it into a structured format right away, or it will be mailed sent in. And if it's sent in, according to the website, it still will then need to be within a structured format. So this is what I'm saying that we need for the RFP, we need for clarify for this commission, for the public that's listening.

Now, period. Pause. Should someone send something else in, I would want it to be real clear that there is then an opportunity. We won't mail it back to them, but there's an opportunity that it will not have the same level of remembrance I would say because now we're relying on muscle memory. We receive something in a format that we can't retrieve from, we can't track, et cetera. If it was memorable enough, maybe I'll remember it one day and say, and we will try to do all of that,
but that is not the guarantee. And I would want to be
real clear with the public so that they're not taking
their time to create some collage of something or other
that they wanted to send in. And then we get it, and we
didn't do anything with it.

And I like what Le Mons said so that we're not
having people waste their time, because theoretically,
we'd want to say, well, we can hold it. And if we have
enough time, we'll go ahead and input into the structured
format and weigh it in later. What if we don't have
enough time? What if we run out? What if we put that on
the side somewhere and we lose it? 2010 Commission as
well had lots of information that they did not get an
opportunity to utilize through the intended format. We
don't -- we can stop that now. We can say this is what
we'd like.

And unless there are other compelling factors to do
something different, I think we should just land on these
four now, because even from a video standpoint, I think
that from a public comment perspective, send the video
through public comment or at a time of public comment.
Says you know what, here -- yeah, she would like -- we
share a screen because we're in this COVID time, it can
still be presented there. I just think we need to force
it into the structure so that we will have integrity of
output on the other end.

As far as the language piece, Commissioner Ahmad, you want to try that one?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: No. The language piece I think is going to be -- as it was introduced in our conversation earlier, it's going to be a little bit more complicated to be quite frank. I don't think I was thinking of data management as translation services. And you all are right, that at some point, that does need to happen. It's just -- the question is where do we house that. At what point do we house the translation; at the first touch of that data coming into us, or do we store it by date or by meeting, and then have someone translate it after the fact? And that's a bigger question for all of us. If that's something we do want to include in the data management aspect and the RFP, that's something we should consider and include in the RFP language, but that's up for discussion with all of us.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Before we go to break, I will just say that if we are thinking in theoretical terms, theoretically, we could receive ten or a hundred times the amount of input that the 2010 Commission received. And if we are not prepared for that volume, that firehose I believe is the terminology that's been used by the 2010 commission, if we're not prepared for that, even if it's
in the format we want through the channels we want, we're not going to be able to handle that firehose.

So if we're going to go to the point of thinking theoretically, let's go all the way and say we are going to make a good-faith effort to deal with what we get, but because there are so few constraints and so many people in the State of California, reality may be that we get input beyond what we're able to handle. So just let's think about that while we're on break, and let's come back at 3:30.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Welcome back from the break, everyone. We have been discussing the procurement documents related to data management. I wanted to check -- well, he's not in his chair. So I will go ahead and call on Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: It sounds like we're heading down a path of making a decision about how we're going to accept input. And I just want to pull that thread a little bit further, okay. So we talked about four different ways of accepting input. One is through the COI tool. And I would describe that as semi structured data. We know what to expect. We know we're going to get a GIS-compatible map. We know we're going to get some text, and that text is going to nominally
answer some questions.

The second way that we talked about it is -- I'm going to describe it a little differently, and correct me if I'm not understanding. So the second way is meetings where we take public testimony. And so I would describe that as structured too because we can write it down in a way that we can use it and manage it and structure it. And we'd have a line drawer there or we could input it in a COI tool in that context. So that would be semi structured, too, and we can do something with it and manage it.

The third one is the website. And so in the website, I guess the vision would be that we would have questions in the website that people would answer, but that gets less structured, right? And where is -- in that input context, where's the map? And if we're -- and I guess that leads me to the question of if someone is going to go to our website, why can't we direct them to the COI tool?

And then the third -- the fourth one that came in is public comment. And then that gets completely unstructured. And there's -- I mean, I don't know what we would do with public comment as an input. So I just -- these questions were rattling around in my head while we were on break. And so I want to -- when we make
this decision, I want to make sure, like, the
conversation has been had that we're going to be able to
do something with the data once we get it. And if we're
going to say we're going to take public comment as input,
someone's got to help me figure out how we use that data.
So thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.
Director Claypool, did you have your hand up before
the break?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: No.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Then I have Director Ceja and Commissioner Turner.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: And Commissioner Yee.

DIRECTOR CEJA: Thank you so much.

Commissioner Fornaciari, can you tell me? You said
you had four points you were thinking of? I got the
third and fourth. I don't think I got the first and
second.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: The first method of input
is the COI tool.

DIRECTOR CEJA: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: The second is meetings
where we take public testimony. And correct me if I'm
wrong on those.

DIRECTOR CEJA: I think that's correct. So my
question was -- or my statement or my comment was in creating a website, and I just got some news from NationBuilder that I don't think we're going to be able to use the service, because after we conclude our services as a commission, we will no longer be able to pay the subscription to continue the website. So we have to look at a plan B or plan C, but we'll discuss that internally with Raul and Dan.

As far as having the COI tool on the actual website, I think that's been one of the biggest asks when I've talked to commissioners is that we actually have that on the website to, one, get people to visit the site, and two, to engage them while they're there, and then lastly, to get input and have that valuable input at our disposal when we're making decisions. So I think that's the plan is to have the COI tool on the website.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Turner, followed by Commissioner Yee, Director Claypool, and Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. In response to Commissioner Fornaciari, the website as a recommendation is there because it is something that people are somewhat familiar with. It was also -- it was already there already existing and using. And when I say submissions through the website, I'm thinking in terms of, right now,
the website asks for email, asks for certain information. And then it also says if you'd like to submit something, you can submit via, you know. And we mentioned to Director Ceja that if that link is connected, people will be able to actually submit in that manner, which can be then -- we can direct that. So whatever format we ultimately determine we need, we can say and submit, and it'll be the via this structure, right? And so we can direct that.

So that would be the COI tool, the website, the onsite verbal as people are talking. We would be able to input. We can do the input into the COI tool or the line drawer. And then from a public comment standpoint, when people call in for public comment specific to drawing their community of interest and wanting to have a com -- the questions is the same. What are your -- you know, what is your community area. And so again, we're inputting that information, but it allows it, instead of a written format, for them to be able to verbalize the information, which is why we're still -- it's still dries in our opinion to that structured place, but it gives people different avenues based on what their comfort level is.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: When we finish this
conversation, I want to go back to the language piece, something that did come to my mind, but I don't want to interrupt this flow.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. I think in our conversations here, we're kind of assuming that as people give us the communities of interest stuff that it's a two-dimensional shape, a shape on a map that has boundaries, but I think some of the input is going to be -- maybe a lot of the input is going to be places, right? In fact, I think we already got a couple of, at least one, public comment some weeks ago. Somebody said my town should be able to hear with this district and not that district, right. So it's just a point. It's a one-dimensional point. It's a name that represents a city or a town or whatever, which is easily taggable, right, as data. And our data manager should be able to certainly handle something like that.

So I wouldn't want people to think they only could make a comment if they could draw lines for us to represent their comment. Just places with names are fine, right, and that would be handleable.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Director Claypool.
DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Just to add to what Commissioner Yee said, you're going to get a lot of people who are going to say don't divide my city. And that's going to be their sole instruction. You know, last time, they divided my city, and they shouldn't have. So those are the types of things that are -- they are codable, but sometimes, it just has to be handled by hand, unless they're capable of coding it when we give it to them. That's at twenty percent that we're going to have to deal with.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you.

Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I realized I think one of the questions I asked this morning didn't get answered. And it's come back up again. And that is -- one of my questions was what it is -- how are we going to use the input. So we talked about the maps having a GIS shape map. That's one piece. And I ask about the narrative part. Like, what it is that we want to glean from the narrative. And I think that hasn't been answered.

I also think that, at least as long as I've been listening to these community of interests conversations over the months, we been thinking about it as from a community perspective. Often we hear people know their community. They can describe their community, but I
don't know that we are just asking them to describe their community. We're asking them to describe their community in the context of a geography. And that part, we don't talk about. We do not really explicitly put that out there.

So -- because I know if you were to just stop me, like, man on the street and stick a microphone in my face and ask me about my community with no context, I wouldn't know what you were talking about, number 1, but number two, is going to be very specific to the geography. My concerns about my community of interest is going to be where you might -- where the choices that we make may have a negative impact on it, but if I don't have that context and that distinction to make, I wouldn't necessarily know how to tell you that.

So if I understand correct, a community of interest is only of interest as it relates to the map or to a geography, right. Not that us drawing a line -- that's the last step, but to a geography. So someone says I live in this particular neighborhood, and I don't want to separate it, that's a great example, Commissioner Yee, because that's the context right there. So I understand, but I could be a part of all kinds of communities of interest, but the one I'm concerned about is this one specifically that it doesn't get dissected for the
reasons that we all know. And I think that I don't know
that we are talking about -- to me, that narrows things
automatically.

I know we been trying to avoid this idea of
shrinking. We want to have the most expansive most open
mechanisms for getting information as possible, but when
I talk about the contraction piece, it's only about
contracting it to its usability. So we have got to
provide the community with a significant amount of
context to give us the information. And I think
dependent upon the usability of the information that we
want for very specific context will begin to dictate some
of the channels in which that makes sense with all the
stuff that the subcommittee just talked about. And then
I think we have the language piece, which we're still
grappling with as well, but I kind of envision is that we
have sort of like a redistricting boot camp that is for
community-based organizations by and large. Groups.
Civic groups. We'll just call them CBLs, but those kind
of people, right, because they're going to be the ones
for all of our hard to re -- so let's say somebody
doesn't speak, doesn't read, but drums, right. We're not
going to have a mechanism for drum translation or drum
interpretation, but the local community would. And so
they'll understand fully what it is that -- the context
that we needed. And so the bridge between the drumming
and the interpretation and translation is going to happen
there, and they're going to plug it into one of the
channels that we've identified to get it to us.

We are not going to have omnipotent channels for
people to be able to get information to us. So I'm glad
that we're at least starting to entertain the idea that
there is some finite channels, whatever that number ends
up being, whether it's four, six, because I don't think
that we have one in there for paper yet, like, when
someone draws something. And like in the four that
Commissioner Fornaciari described, we don't have that
one, like, you scan it in or whatever you do with it,
but --

So there's some more channels I think that exist.
And then we can have a conversation about the bridges
from our channels to the community. And that's where a
significant amount of our outreach effort is going to be
necessary, particularly for the bridges to the hard to
reach, right. So that's just sort of a high fly by of
how I'm trying to frame this stuff in my mind as we as we
actually move forward, because at the end of the day, the
one thing that I've always learned with community, and
particularly when you represent the government.

Many communities don't trust the government. And
the communities are told things all the time about what
government is going to do, or what the people who
represent the government is going to do. Politicians
know about this. And then they do whatever we ask them
to do, and then there's some misunderstanding. Oh, we
couldn't really do that, or, oh, we're so sorry. We got
overwhelmed. Oh, well, we didn't have enough resources
to do that.

I think what -- I thought what we're trying to do is
2010 had a lot of data they couldn't use. They had a
crunch timeline, et cetera. We're trying to open
ourselves up to have the most input possible. I think
the caveat should be that we can actually process, right.
And we are being very diligent about planning for ways to
take all of that content in so we can use it. So I think
we're going to do markedly better because we have time
and a different angle on our side, but we do have to
accept that we're going to have some significant limits
as well. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons.

Commissioner Sinay is next, and then I have a quick
comment, and then I see Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Again, Commissioner Turner, are
you okay with me making a motion now? Well, before I
make that, I wanted to ask one question. I do feel that
I think that Commissioner Le Mons brought up a good point about written, but I believe written is included in the public comments. Public comments are -- they can be emailed, but they can also be mailed in. And then we -- PDF -- scan them, but I just wanted to confirm that written would be considered public comments.

And then I'll -- well, I know that you have a comment, Commissioner Turner, on language. The other piece -- the thought I was having on the translation piece is maybe the Language Access Subcommittee, since we're looking at different parts of language access that where do we put this translation piece? Translation interpretation. The recommendation could come from them as they've been thinking through that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay. My brief comment is when I was working on my very first computer programing project at the library of congress, one of the things that I learned from my IT counterpart was the importance of coming up with a data flow diagram. And I understand that computer programing is done differently these days than it was in the late 80s, but it seems to me that having a data flow diagram that would show all of the different sources of data, the processes that they would go through in order to reach their final resting place, if you will, might be useful. So I don't
know if Commissioner Fornaciari or anyone else has experience with data flow diagrams, but I think it might be a useful exercise for us to engage in. And I'm willing going to sit down and start working on one so that we can all visualize all of this.

So I have Commissioner Turner, and then Commissioner Akutagawa. And then Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. Three points. First of all, yes -- my envisioning, I apologize if it's not clear -- that any written documentation will come in either attached in the website or it would be through public comment that it can be mailed in to us. So I am including -- I am thinking of written as well.

And then also I want to be sure that, and have perhaps failed in this, that when we are thinking and stating structured, we for sure are not just intending maps and shape files. And so structured is even words of people do. We talked about this is important why my community as words will also be able to be captured as long as it's in a readable file. And so that we would later be able to retrieve anyone that was concerned.

Because of the concerns that Redding had, we'll be able to pull a file on that and see what all the concerns were for that area and how they spoke about their communities. That's outside of a shapefile.
And this is where we'd be able to see how many times a certain thing was mentioned, where the variations of the particular thing that was -- so that is part of it. We won't lose that information. So I wanted to state that. And then as it relates to the language, the conversation we were having before break, and Commissioner Ahmad and I both were like, yeah, we remember that coming up language. How do we handle that one way or the other?

And then I flip through my notes and one of the challenges that was lifted up about language is when we try and outsource it or have someone else to handle the languages, is that typically, the default would be or could be to use something like a chrome translation, right, when you're talking about giving someone else the task of trying to translate, and they're putting that as part of their larger, broader work. And we know we've heard testimony today and over and over that we want translations done by a certified translator, which may not happen on that end of things.

And so that might be something we need to hold on our end if we're wanting to or since we're wanting to have the information translated. So I just wanted to lift that up from a translation standpoint. I don't think I'd be comfortable releasing it to some other group
to do translation for the many languages that we're thinking of.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So I think I want to just build upon what Commissioner Turner said. I think -- I guess the way I've seen it is there's -- I guess you could look at it in terms of like different buckets. So there is going to be the input bucket. The COI tool being one.

And I will say that I have an expectation that then output to us that then goes into our database will be outputted to us already translated because the statewide database has already arranged for that translation. Now, they may say differently, and we may need to then negotiate that part, but that was my initial thought.

Now, the other bucket is sources of input, public input, whether it's maps or other comments, things like that in various languages. Yes, I think that too will need to be translated. I think this conversation has made me think in terms of our -- perhaps as we think about, like, the grants and how we're going to interact with the various, you know, community-based organization partners who I think we were going to, at least in my mind, the idea based on their suggestions being the
trusted partners to the communities is we may need to also take into account either -- and I don't -- yeah. We will just need to take into account, you know, will they be providing translated input to us. If that's the case, then there's other different kinds of things that we'll need to think about in terms of whatever grab parameters we'll give.

Will we just take it in whichever way? I'm kind of thinking that maybe we do need to ask, and they may already plan to think that this is what they would be needing to do anyways, is to consolidate the various inputs that they would get from their communities. It sounded like it was implied by some that that's what they may do, is they would collect and then submit. Maybe it's not a single map. Then maybe more consolidated maps.

I don't want to assume, but that was one maybe implication that I heard, or one thing that I heard implied. I think separately, Commissioner Kennedy, I think what you're talking about is kind of a architecture I think is the word that they use in kind of like the tech field around architecting. And it makes sense. Wire framing I think is the right word. Is wire framing what this database is going to need to look like? And I think you're right on that.
I think we'll need to -- and that's something that would not necessarily be all done by us. I think that's what we would need to do with whatever vendor we get, but I think this discussion is going to be important because we need to give direction to the vendor in terms of how we -- at least just on a very, very high level, how we envision that framework looking. And then they would take our inputs, create a wireframe that then shows the flow from inputs to outputs, and then get our approval. At least that's my thought in terms of how we would work with whatever vendor we end up also selecting too. So that's it for me.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you all for -- I tried to listen as much as I could, and a lot of work and effort went into this. And I really, really appreciate it. I have a couple of -- I have three items here. And it's not clear to me reading this everything is -- there is the gathering of our information, which is say when we at the public meeting, and we have people coming to testify for, who is helping us gather that information? Is that the data management? Is that the line drawer? Is that us? Is that our staff? My understanding was
that was going to be part of the data management. And
that's the -- we have to decide who exactly that is,
because that has to go into either this RFP, the line
drawer RFP, or we have to come up with it.

Item 2 is that because this -- the way it reads
right now, I believe it's actually more for just strictly
managing the information. In which case, it says -- in
the understatement of work in the first paragraph, it
says a qualified organization should be successful in
organizing the data by indicators. And you go, for
example, determined by the commission. We need to decide
what those indicators are.

And then 3 is -- which is kind of not in here -- is
the output. Even if these guys are just strictly
managing it and, you know, and categorizing it as we give
it to them, or the line drawer gives it to them, or
whoever is helping to gather it. And by gather, I mean
coding the input, labeling it, et cetera. And these are
indicators. So then it can all go into this information
pool to be put together, be part of a database. And then
you can pull things out of, but the output then we need
to have it relate to a geography with identifying factors
with it with the items we can. And I don't actually see
in here that the output must be GSI. You have to have a
map, or you have to have some geographic connection.
So and this could be my interpretation. I thought that the data management people were going to help us gather as well as. And in terms of our, you know, I -- knowing a lot of tech people, I know quite a few of them would be paying to hear some of our conversations and realize how unsophisticated they should -- basically all of us are. This is not our field. I mean, I'm -- I -- it's certainly not my field. And they'll say, no, no, no. We can do that. We can do this. No, what you want to do is -- oh, you're missing the whole picture. I can hear them saying these things, you know. Oh, what you really want to do is --

So what I would propose is, one, not propose yet. One is who do we believe as a group is actually helping us gather this information? I'd like to have that discussion. The indicators, we need to have that discussion to fill out any of the are the RFPs. And I'd like to, which I believe I heard Commissioner Ahmad and Commissioner Turner say they already have a meeting with the U.S. Digital coming up. So to basically get advice from them on, this is exactly what we're trying to do. How should we do that, because they might say, oh, yeah, you'll have a person there to help you code it all in, in which case, I understand. We don't want to limit what people are giving us. We'd like to tell them, ideally,
this is what we'd like. And then they'll -- we'll get a
lot more of that, but they will -- we will get other
stuff as well.

So if someone -- if we can -- I might have missed it
maybe. We're saying, no, no, they're not helping us
gather it, but if we could answer that one, please, I'd
really appreciate it. Thank you.


COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

Thank you, Commissioner Andersen. That is our
belief. That is exactly what we are looking for them to
do. And perhaps under section 5, the statement of work,
it can be just upgraded to say first sentence adds after
we add in the repeat information from the above, the
Commission is seeking individuals, organizations, or
firms to collect and manage large amounts of data in
various formats with the primary goal of information
retrieval to the Commission. It goes on. And then it
actually says qualified individuals, organizations, or
firms should be successful in organization of this data
by indicators. For example, the ZIP code, the city, the
neighborhoods, et cetera.

And so if you are asking for us to also include have
ability to have a GIS coded, we can add that in
somewhere, but the belief from the beginning of this is
that indeed we are collecting and gathering -- or
gathering, collecting whatever and managing, storing,
being able to retrieve it later is part of this RFP. So
we'll add in the collect there. And the other piece if
it's still, I guess, vague, just give us some language of
what you're thinking about.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: All right. Sorry. Was
that -- Commissioner Turner, was that -- so I should just
give you something to add in or --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, because for what's not
clear, because the -- I said we'll add in the collect and
manage because that's what we've been talking to people
about as far as being able to capture the information for
us, and then have us collect it, being able to analyze
it, have it in a way where we're able to retrieve it
later, et cetera, but if that was not standing out for
you, I'm saying yes. Then by all means we want it to be
very clear like you're indicating. So if there's a piece
that is missing, I'm saying give us the exact words, and
I can put it in here somewhere as well.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. I will -- I'll think
of it, and I'll send that to you directly as input. Is
that okay? Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: This has been such a great
conversation, and one that's so necessary, right, because this is all new, and I think going to be a huge part of our overall processes. And I'm wondering if we're kind of at a point, you know, with the RFIs or the VRA attorney and outside litigation, the Commission very generously got to a point and said, okay, now we give the subcommittee the authority to kind of move this forward and get it out the door. And I'm wondering if we are at a point to do that and to kind of -- I know I am -- to give the subcommittee the seal of approval to continue to collect feedback, right. So if particular commissioners have feedback on the RFP to get the feedback from staff from the individual -- I think was his name Waldo, who said that he was going to give feedback, and to really move this process forward? If so, I'm happy to make a motion to that effect.

I think it sounds to me that that would include, right -- that the RFP would include the COI tool, the website, the onsite verbal public comments, and that the subcommittee can move forward with continuing to gather feedback and advance the RFP so that this process can move forward.

If folks are comfortable with that, I would be happy to make such a motion. I don't know if we still have a lot of additional pieces to cover. I'm seeing thumbs
and -- Commissioner Fernandez has the peace sign. I'm not sure. Is that a good one? Okay. So can I make that motion? Do we need a motion?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I second. I will second your motion.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. Good. I don't even know the languages for this motion, but I feel very confident after this conversation that we -- unless the subcommittee feels otherwise that we've had a lot of feedback for y'all. And I would feel very comfortable moving -- advancing this to the next stage. We need to --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani -- sorry -- could you restate what you see as the next stage?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That they can continue to develop and advance this RFP, soliciting feedback from whomever else they feel is necessary, and actually putting it out. I would feel comfortable moving it that far.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, but do we want to put any sort of time frame around the continuing to solicit input or receiving input?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I would leave -- for me personally, I'd leave that to the subcommittee. I don't know how long it's going to take to coordinate with
either staff or Waldo or anywhere else that they need
to -- for me personally, I'd like to give them that
flexibility.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: However, they would want the
motion structured, I suppose, but I feel like I'm
prepared to -- you know, to allow them to advance this.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. In terms of
timeline, I would actually want to make sure that
whatever process we move forward doesn't hinder our
overall objective, so keeping in mind the length of time
it takes for procurement processes with the state and
working backwards from there. I don't know if, you know,
racially polarized voting or legal -- or litigation
counsel has a timeline for your RFPs that we can sort of
mirror or potentially work around.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: If I --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Please.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sorry. If I can respond.

The VRA/RFI, we have actually have -- do have a timeline
that we are prepared to share in this meeting, but I can
also share it with you if we don't get to it today, yes.
January -- we're hoping to have VRA litigation identified
by the end of February.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Director Claypool.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Just understanding that the counsel, both counsel RFIs are on a totally different track than you'll be on. You'll be on the RFP track, and it will take longer because they're different, there are different rules for attorneys. That will be part of the -- that will be part of the timelines that we'll finish up this evening. You'll be able to see what it looks like tomorrow.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. One point that I wanted to raise was there's been discussion of information that's not machine readable or not structured and as if it is therefore not usable, and the one thing that I wanted to point out is that even some of those things that we might think of as nonstructured or nonusable can be metatagged, and then once you -- as long as you have in your structure a field for metatags, you can go back and retrieve based on those metatags. So you're not looking into the document that might be attached to that record, but you have a field in the record that can be searched on. So you know, there are options, but you know, it takes some level of effort to insert the metatags, but that is a possibility.

Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I concur with that. I guess
that this conversation starts to feel to me like the COI
tool again, and I think that there's any number of
options. I think that we know that there are all kinds
of ways, and at some point we've got -- and I hope this
wireframing process or diagraming process will help us
get close to what that really looks like for us because
I -- I just want to reinforce, reiterate the point that
yes, all of it's possible, but what's probable and what's
realistic? And I think we're very good at keeping it,
you know, very high level and very surfaced, and then we
start to get down to the details, we somehow get nervous
and want to go back to, but there is a way, yes, there
is; however, we will not be able to fulfill every way.

And so I'm just really hoping because what I'm very
concerned about is when we tell the -- we've got to go
back and tell our partners what we want them to do for
us, and we can't tell them, just do whatever and bring it
to us and we're going to figure it out. We have data
managers who's just going to make it happen. That is not
going to be helpful to them. So I just want to reiterate
that.

That's not -- I'm not trying to contradict you,
Commissioner Kennedy, at all. I just feel like we
have -- we realize it, but there's something about us
really drilling down and saying, okay. Here we go. This
is what we're going to do. We just don't quite get there. So I know it's coming though. I feel it. It's coming, and one day, somebody will answer the question that I've asked multiple times as to how we're going to use the narrative, but I'll save that for another day.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Good. Okay. I see that we have a caller. It is not -- we have not yet called for public comment, but I don't want to leave the caller hanging.

So Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, I was just wondering if I formalize my motion, then we could -- if we need a vote. I don't know that that's entirely certain, but if we need a vote on this to move it forward, I'm happy to formalize the motion. We can take the caller as a part of public comment on that vote.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Perfect.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Do I need to formalize a motion?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. Got it. So I -- what I had had -- again, in response to Commissioner Le Mons, what I had originally said, acknowledging all of our limitations, but as -- being as inclusive as we want to try and be, but the RFP is going to include the COI tool, the website, on site verbal, public comment, and that
we're going to leave it to the subcommittee to advance this RFP, seeking whatever feedback that they want from public staff or other experts.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. That is the motion.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Second.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay seconds.

Discussion?

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: You said move this forward. So what does move this forward mean? Does it mean take our input and publish the -- or you know, turn it to an RFP and ship it?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Send to DGS for approval.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I assume that means with staff input and such. I think we have a lot of experts on staff who can help make sure all of the pieces are put together well.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. And I -- I'm in full support of this moving forward. Just one point of clarification that I need from you all is -- and I -- the language access piece, is that something you all hope
that this RFP would include in terms of translation services, or is that something that we would want to keep separate, and then at a later point combine with our -- the rest of our internal services? Second, latter one?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think we need to look at language access as one whole package instead of it -- you know, each individual piece doing it. So --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Got it.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- I definitely -- you all convinced me that it's separate.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: One very important part, if we're asking them to assist us in gathering this information, we need to say we want them to attend the meetings, and is that what you had in mind or not? Was that -- you know, they would have to know that; otherwise, they're at their own place sorting through the -- sorting through data. So I'm looking for that to -- that's a question.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Is that something that maybe the subcommittee could get some guidance from Waldo or someone else on? Because I was under the impression this
was a more someone was going to manage the various
mechanisms that we may come up with those four and maybe
others be -- the ones that have been clearly identified
and possibly some others to manage the inputs and be able
to give us outputs in a particular way of some sort, not
that there are the people necessarily doing the data
gathering, but I'm not -- I guess that's worth
clarifying, you know?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That's exactly my question
because we have -- I know at public meetings, we're --
public testimony was one of the items, in which case, who
was at that pub -- who was at that meeting gathering
information? This is my question of gathering. Who was
gathering? Because it's -- we need someone; otherwise,
it's us.

CHAIR KENNEDY: We don't have to determine --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I'm sorry. So we
don't -- I have got myself for a minute. Thank you,
Chair. Yes. This is one of the things that we can
discuss as well, but we're not trying to hire dual roles.
We talked about higher some sort of person that will be
either our person for line drawing, a technician, et
cetera, and in my mind, we're forcing the information to
come in in a structured format, a structured way. That
could be them, it could be someone that we're lifted up when we're having conversation with Waldo and Robin and an Alex next week to -- for the recommendation and move with what would work best for us, recognizing that we need someone there. So let's ask those questions and see.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. At this point, I would ask Katie to invite our caller to join us.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Would you like me do the full instructions and everything or just --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, please.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: So do the instructions first? Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: In order to maximize transparency in public participation in our process, the commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To call in the telephone number provider -- or 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 927 3806 8918 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 the moderator will be
unmuting callers to submit their comment. You will 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. Please 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 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 motion made by Commissioner Sadhwani at this time.

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

MS. GOLD: Rosalind Gold, R-O-S-A-L-I-N-D, and the
last name is Gold, G-O-L-D. I'm the chief public policy
officer within NALEO Educational Fund, and I just wanted
to make several comments about the very, very thoughtful
discussion the Commission has been having about how to
obtain, gather, and analyze community of interest
information because our organization ten years ago
actively mobilized the Latino community to provide
testimony to the Commission as well as providing
technical assistance to community members and helping them with their efforts in working with the commission.

So first of all, I wanted to go and ask for some clarification on one aspect of translation services, and this has to do specifically with the capabilities of the COI tool that -- COI platform that the Statewide Database is working with. You know, so far we have requested, and it looks like the Statewide Database is open and the Commission has agreed to this, that there be translation into a certain number of languages for the interface between the public; in other words, when somebody from the public wants to go into that tool and use that tool or we want to work with a member of the public or a member of the community of the using that tool, that the interface should be in a language that that person understands.

However, one of the things that we do not believe the tool has the capability of doing and nor should it an automatic tool do this, which is translating what people put in, what they enter, what their testimony is into English. That is going to have to be done by a separate translation service provider. We don't think that should be the responsibility of the Statewide Database just because they are not translators in that sense. They may be able to get translation to help with the interface
because the interface may, you know, be very uniform, but
the things that people write into the COI tool and the
testimony that they provide is not going to have that
kind of uniformity of language.

So it will be necessary for there to be contractual
services for translation services of the testimony that
people submit through the COI tool, and we -- I guess we
were just feeling that was not clear, and so I guess I
just wanted to, you know, emphasize that we do not feel
the -- the database tool is the place to translate the
output, translate what people enter into the computer so
that it can be understood by the Commission and members
of the public.

So before I go on to my other comments, I just want
to know if there are any questions or responses to this
particular comment?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. Thank you, Rosalind,
for calling. I think -- yeah. I -- you know, maybe I'm
just kind of like older, I'll just say. I know that the
idea of having it like a Google Translator or like an
electronic translate came up. To be honest, that didn't
cross my mind. I think I was thinking along the lines of
since the Statewide Database was going to engage, you
know, somebody to translate the interface language, you
I know, in the various languages, then my -- I guess I will just say that I did make an assumption then that the inputs would then be then translated by the same providers who helped them to create the language translation for the interface.

However, based on what you're just saying, and this is more for clarification in terms of what you're suggesting, are -- is the suggestion then that regardless, this -- the Commission should be the ones to take responsibility for that translation, hire our own separate translation services -- service provider to translate the various languages that we'll be receiving possibly in different languages? Is that what --

MS. GOLD: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- versus just -- yeah,

versus asking the --

MS. GOLD: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- Statewide Database?

MS. GOLD: That is the sug -- that's the --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MS. GOLD: -- suggestion because, again, it might -- because the kind of search that the Statewide Database would have to do to get the translation services it needs, for like I said, a very uniform set -- relatively uniform set of instructions is going to be very different
than the type of services that would be needed, and the
type of serve -- for the output, and the types of
services that would be needed are more akin to what you
might need for someone who's present at a meeting
translating oral testimony; in other words, people are
going to be using a lot of different vocabulary, a lot of
different words. So you may want to at least consider
thinking of it in those kinds of translation services and
contracts as opposed to something that the Statewide
Database would do.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. That was
helpful.

MS. GOLD: And then -- I'm sorry. Were there any
other questions? Because I did -- like I said, there was
a lot of really very robust and interesting dialogue
about community of interest testimony and input, and I --
I just wanted to make a few more comments on what's been
discussed.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Is your recommendation also
that that is not an electronic process, but that is a
manual process?

MS. GOLD: Yes, because -- and this is because, like
I said, the diversity of things that people are going to
be saying and talking about their communities of
interest, right? Some people may be talking about communities of interest with respect to what are the transportation routes that they're near. Some people may be saying, we all -- our kids go to the -- these particular schools, our kids -- our families go to this particular cultural center, our family goes, you know -- one of the great little comments I heard is that sometimes people say, you know, these are the kinds of restaurants or these are the different restaurants our -- our -- our community members and neighborhood members go to.

What I'm saying is that the vocabulary that people use in describing communities of interests is very varied. It may be idiomatic, and I -- I don't know if anybody on the Commission has actually tried to use a mechanical translator for just regular conversation, and you start to see how awkward and how inexact those -- those translations are.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. And Ms. Gold, you had another item to share with us?

MS. GOLD: Yes. I wanted to talk about the -- again, the very, very robust discussion about what are the different ways that people can provide input to the Commission with respect to testimony and communities of interest.
Now, I think Commissioner Le Mons, you are absolutely right about it needing to be very clear to the community, and the fact that it's a very, very broad term, and you know, from our perspectives of what we found during our work ten years ago, that people really had a lot of different ways that they wanted to provide input, depending on where they were located, when hearings were occurring.

So in some cases, we were able to mobilize people to prepare testimony, you know, using email, right, and sometimes even, you know, in the day of faxes, right, people would hand-draw a community of interest map, and fax in or fax in testimony, both written testimony and fax in a map. People who had more computer literacy would email in testimony or we would help them email testimony into a portal with PBS. People wanted to come to a meeting, and I realize this may be different in the era of COVID, but we have people who wanted to appear before a meeting and hand over to the Commission or show a hand-drawn map on a -- a posterboard.

So we see the COI tool as just one way that people are going to want to submit testimony. Now, you are right. As -- as community organizations who are mobilizing people, we will want to streamline, we will want to provide and coach and provide technical
assistance and do exactly the bootcamps that -- that Commissioner Le Mons suggested for the -- for the groups that we work with and the community members we work with to make sure that there is the -- that -- that maps and testimony are submitted in the ways that are most accessible for the Commission and will have the greatest impact, but at the same time, we know that sometime we have to take community members at -- where -- where they're at, okay?

So you know, I just want to again agree and that we would be happy to talk to the subcommittee about, you know, how to ensure there are options that are flexible, but clear at the same time because again, you know, we appreciate the need for that, and you know, I just -- I just wanted to again say that we would very -- be very much happy to be part of this dialogue with you about this moving forward because if you ask, like, what will people do? Based on our experiences ten years ago, people will do whatever seems to fit best with their ability to have access to the commission, their particular style of what they feel more comfortable with and how they communicate.

So if we can kind of work together to find as many avenues for people to submit both, you know, words, right, narrative, but also whether it's a hand-drawn map,
whether it's something that's in a -- in a computer file, to submit visual information as well.

Oh, I'm sorry. I had one other thing. In terms of the analysis of this, we would also say that as you think of the role of your data gatherer, that really this should really be something that that constellation of activity is done -- does and really not something that the line drawer, the mapper should do. The mapper should take all this information and incorporate it into the maps, but the line drawer should not gather this -- be responsible for gathering or soliciting this information.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much, Ms. Gold, for joining us this afternoon and sharing your insights.

MS. GOLD: Great. And thank you again, and again, we very, very much appreciate the thoughtfulness and look forward to continuing our work together.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much.

Katie, do we have any other callers?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: No. That was it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Then I would ask staff to call the vote.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Sadhwani.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Vasquez.

CHAIR KENNEDY: She had to leave.

MS. MARSHALL: She's -- okay. Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

MS. MARSHALL: And Commissioner Kennedy.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.
MS. MARSHALL: Yeah. Motion passes. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much. It is 4:30.

So we have half an hour. Let me ask the VRA subcommittee if they would like to make use of that half an hour.

Okay. The floor is yours.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you. Go ahead, Sara.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So -- well, first of all, I would actually just really like to appreciate Commissioner Yee. This -- these past two weeks have been very busy on my end, and I feel like he has just been a wonderful colleague kind of picking up the slack where I wasn't able to during the holidays as well as our staff. So I really wanted to thank you for that publicly.

We do have some dates for you all to take a look at, but I think before that, I think just to say that from the last meeting, we took a lot of the feedback that was submitted from the public, from commissioners, we got a lot of input from staff to finalize the RFIs, and hopefully they are very nearing completion and ready to go out.

One of the key pieces that we have to finalize are the dates that will actually be in the RFI and go out. So we wanted to share that with you. I have a screen share that I'll do. I'm going to pull that up, but in the meantime, Commissioner Yee, do you have anything in
particular that you want to add while I look for that?

COMMISSIONER YEE: So just that we want you to think
with us through these dates because we're kind of make
assumptions as we pick the dates and maybe didn't -- you
know, hopefully thought of everything important as we
chose them, but there could be other things that we
didn't think of that might affect the timing here. So
that's why we're bringing it to you, and hopefully you
can either confirm we chose some good dates or help us
move them around as needed.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That's right. I'm going
begin -- I found it. I'm going begin sharing my screen.
Again, this is not posted. I'm happy to have it posted.
I will read through all of the dates that are on here as
needed. Hang on. Where is this feature? Here we go.

And I -- the re -- one of the main reasons we want
to share this, as Commissioner, you kind of mentioned,
this, we do need your input, we have not -- we have
identified tentative dates for meetings in January, but
we haven't done that for February. At our last meeting,
we also identified -- sorry one second here. We had also
given the recommendation of creating a public-facing
legal subcommittee specifically to review the
applications as they come in so that the public can be a
part of that process.
I didn't hear any major reservations from the Commission about that recommendation, but we also didn't finalize it. So that is something that I think that we would need from you all also so that we can plan accordingly. Hang on one second. Okay. There we go. So these are some of the dates, and again, this will have to be in the RFI, right? So as soon as possible, the RFI will go out. So if there's any last changes, please let us know. It will require the review of the Department of OLS. I don't know what that stands for, but it's not ordinarily (audio interference), but in any case --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Office of Legal Services.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. Thank you. Great. Good. OLS in my world means something totally different. January 10th is the date that we've put on there for any applicants to submit questions. Those would go directly to Kary. If you recall from our previous conversation, the RFI is an attorney-to-attorney contract. It's why we can use a more expedited process than the RFP.

Now, this is all assuming that we're able to push this through OLS relatively quickly. If it's possible to move it in a matter of couple days, we can move some of these dates up. We just didn't really know the answers to these questions. We said January 29th that all of these applications known as a statement of qualifications
would be received, that staff would do an initial review
of all of the applications simply to make sure that they
meet minimum qualifications. If there's anyone that
really is not -- would not serve the Commission well,
that doesn't meet the minimum qualifications, we could
immediately kick them out.

And then on February 10th, we were estimating that
that's about when we might meet again based on the dates
that we had given for the Commission to meet in January,
but a legal subcommittee would meet publicly to review
those applications. So that means for the -- you know,
in terms of all of the other pieces, we would need to
agendize that, and we're going to need the tech support
to figure out how to do this publicly.

I think this came up earlier in the day. We had
talked about in 2010 they had these larger subcommittees
that had more than two people. They did meet publicly.
We need, for example, additional ASL interpretation. I
don't -- I just don't know the technicalities of how we
will make this work, but we would ask the staff work with
us to help figure that out.

COMMISSIONER YEE: That would be the Wednesday of a
week that we're guessing the full Commission will meet.
If we keep meeting every other week, that would be the
next meeting week in February. So that's --
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right.

COMMISSIONER YEE: -- how we came up with that date.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Exactly. Thank you.

February 16th, the -- so the following week, the league committee would conduct interviews publicly. We need the counsel -- you know, counsel's guidance on how to agendize this. We're assuming that those interviews are conducting publicly. That's our intention, but again, I don't know if there's any specifics to how or -- you know, how we do that. And by February 24th, we would -- the subcommittee would make a recommendation to the commission. Our final applicant that we -- that we're recommending would -- would have to be present to answer any questions of the Commission or the public, and so our goal then is that by March 1st, we hire VRA and outside litigation counsel, that those are in place.

One of the things we talked about is the VRA needs to go first. Well, the -- we need to make sure that we have VRA in place sooner rather than later, but we think because it's possible that one entity could fulfill both, we want to just run both of these processes at the same time. It, of course, adds additional -- an additional layer of work for us, but we think it's important to do it at the same time because ultimately, it could be the same entity, it could also not be, but that would help us
answer that question sooner rather than later.

Some of the terms of the contract, we have a couple questions, just based on the language that was put in the contract. You know, these are more so questions for staff, but the contract for the VRA counsel is scheduled to end August 15th through December 15th. That's partially dependent on what date we ultimately use, but we have to have that flexibility in there. As of right now, the outside litigation contract timeline is a little bit curious to us. What is a reasonable end date for the -- I should -- I apologize. This should say RFI. Is it June 2022, is it December? We just didn't have a clear since of how long we would need outside litigation to stay on board or how long these lawsuits might last. So I think we're looking for some guidance on that.

We have some other activities, but I think perhaps we can stop there and talk about that. We mentioned this already, that in December, we are continuing to explore, you know, how to bring on an RPV analyst probably using that interagency agreement for that "stage one analysis," if you recall from the memo we presented last -- at the last meeting. This would be an overview of racially polarized voting in California.

We would still need to find and figure out the plan for analysis at more localized levels. We'll have to
figure out if we want that protected under attorney-client privilege. Our expectation is that our VRA counsel, whoever we select, will help us determine that, and they might decide if they have their own person that they want to use or recommend, if we want to bring in the same person as the stage one analysis. We have also -- you know, later when we get to the line drawer RFP, I know we're also trying to keep that language flexible in case the line drawer could conduct that analysis, if we wanted to go down that route. So I think we have a lot of options there, and purposefully, we're trying to keep that range of options open for us to decide, and again, we'll continue to work on additional trainings for the full commission.

So that's what we have for you. The real piece, however, of course are these tentative dates, and we do have to finalize this before an RFI can go out.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So these dates are actually embedded in the -- will be embedded in the RFI. So you know, if somebody considers applying, they would actually anticipate this is when I will interview, this is when and so forth, the decision will be made. The other reason for doing both the VRA counsel and the outside litigation counsel together now, even though the outside litigation, you know, we anticipate doesn't kick in until
after the maps are filed and we start getting sued, challenged, is simply to save time since our minds are on this right now and we're going to have plenty to do later, why not -- and they're, you know, similar types of hires, why not go ahead and pursue them both now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And Director Claypool?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So a couple of things. When it comes back from OLS, then -- like you said, then we'll be able to really solidify the dates. The final date for the outside counsel will really just depend on the litigation. If it rolls -- if we still have money in that account and they're still fighting some type of litigation in -- after June 30th, 2022, then it would just extend until it was over until the Department of Justice picked up -- you know, stepped into our place, which they did for one. Marian can probably be a better source for this, but they did step into our place for one suit that was still outstanding when the last Commission kind of went into what I call the dormant period.

So -- and as far as the VRA counsel, it's hard to say. You might need them -- you might need them for part of your litigation later on and -- but then they would be picked up under the litigation contract. And then the last thing is, we will use outside counsel before we kick into that $4 million. So there in that kind of rough
budget that I put in, there was some money set aside to
make sure that they can be available for meetings to
discuss what's going on. There will be a lot of little
things that you'll want to have them around for to get
their opinion on, but we'll we want to go judicious
because they're very expensive. So that's -- that's it.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Any questions, comments,
feedback?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I do have a question. Is --
the VRA counsel, are they going to do the 2020
essentially -- let's see, RPV analysis?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: May I respond?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, please.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So they might. I think the
idea is that we don't want to tie or hands any which way,
right? So one of the questions, as we discussed last
time when Justin Lovett was here is that we'll have to
decide whether or not we want to keep the VRA -- the --
or excuse me, the RPV, the racially polarized voting
analysis that's done at the localized level, whether or
not we'll want that to be kept an as attorney-client --
as attorney work product, right, whether or not it would
be released publicly.

If we'd go down that road, and we haven't decided
that yet, it could be the case that a VRA attorney already has someone that they work with or that they would recommend, and it might be best for a to use their person. That was the case in 2010, right? The contract that was established with Matt Barreto in 2010 was because it was the recommendation of that -- the litigation firm that was used, and that was kept as attorney work product.

So we're proposing something slightly different, and when it comes to that more localized analysis, I think we want to keep the broadest array of options open. We have a lot of players already, so I just want to make sure that we're using the folks that they can, you know, gel well, they can get along, they -- you know, that it works well for our commission. I would hate to go out and hire someone at this point in time to do the whole thing, and then realize, okay. Well, we don't know exactly what our needs are.

So that's why we're suggesting that stage one analysis, that overview to help us identify the areas we'll need, and to leave it open for us to figure out, okay. Maybe we're going to use the same person that does the stage one for that stage two, maybe the attorney will have it, maybe the line drawer can do it. We don't know that yet. If there's a way to save money, I think that
it makes sense to do so because this is potentially
another high, high priced item, and so I think we just --
my recommendation is that we stay flexible on that for
now so that we don't blow our budget.

COMMISSIONER YEE: In the RFI, we actually ask the
applicant to indicate whether they anticipate wanting to
find their or RPV analysts or whether they should look to
us to do that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thank you. I see that
in section 4, personnel. Thank you. Section 6.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Any further comments or
questions? No. Is twelve minutes --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Commissioner Akutagawa has --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So given what they just
presented, it seems like we should perhaps before we end
this meeting or at the next meeting determine the dates
for February so then that way you can -- you're not left
up to like a question as to whether the dates work or
not.

CHAIR KENNEDY: We will have the discussion of
future agendas and meeting dates tomorrow afternoon.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And the other final piece, I
think -- I agree with you, Commissioner Akutagawa, and
the other piece I think is also if there's agreement that
there could be a broader legal subcommittee, that we can
review these publicly and that everyone feels comfortable
tat that the if there is a broader legal subcommittee,
we'll handle that first, you know, the interviews and all
of those things. It will all be public, so anyone can be
a part of it really, but we want to also streamline the
process to kind of make it easier.

So I think we do need a little guidance from
counsel, you know, from Ms. Marshall, from Marian as well
about what that process looks like, and then also how we
would do it, right, and you know, and then this is even
like a Christian question, right? Like, how do we set
this up so that it's a public meeting, even if it's a
smaller group. You know, and I know -- I'll just put it
out there, I know we have one attorney on the commission.
I would love for that commissioner to consider joining
this broader subcommittee just so that we can make sure
that we have your input into things.

COMMISSIONER YEE: The draft actually refers to a
legal advisory committee optimistically, which would be
this committee that we're talking about.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: In section 5, and I notice this
to be in the other RFP as well, we ask them to discuss
the cases. Do we care or not what the outcome of the
case was? Or yeah. We kind of asked -- so I just wanted to bring that up.

COMMISSIONER YEE: We didn't think of that. It was this -- we mostly were concerned that they didn't cherry pick the cases. That's why we said last ten, so -- but yeah. Batting average, no, we didn't ask for that. They would tell us. I mean, we would no they -- yeah. That would be part of their application.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Do we need a motion to accept the proposed timeline from the subcommittee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I don't think so because we're already pre-approved to continue moving forward with this. We just wanted to check the dates mostly and to catch anything else that could be caught at this point.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just had a quick question on the conflict of interest for -- I guess for both of them, and it goes down and it -- it's the second paragraph, it's A, second paragraph, second-to-last sentence. It says, "The individual may be cleared to work on behalf of the Commission until final approval," and I know why we put that in there because we don't want to slow them down, but I guess on the flip side, I'm trying to be a little bit cautious of what if we -- what if someone starts working on it, then we realize that
they have a conflict, and it's almost like too late at
that point, and at this point in time, I'm thinking we
might have weekly meetings, so we're talking about maybe
a week in between meetings for them to wait. So I don't
know. I was just going to throw that out there.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So that decision -- yeah.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: If that makes sense.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. So the conflict of
interest section, which is identical for both --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So the situation here, I think is
that they decide they need an additional attorney to work
on our work, and this is someone that we, you know,
did -- was not part of the original application, did not
provide background and so forth, and so we're saying,
well, they could provisionally work, come on board, but
we still need to approve them at some point.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. I understand why
you have it in there. I'm just wondering what the
pitfall of us not being able to hear them first, or maybe
we can put something in there in terms of they need to
kind of do a vetting also before they -- I mean, I would
hope they would, but I don't want to have -- I mean, I
would hope I wouldn't have to put that in the contract language, but maybe we do just to reemphasize it. I don't know. I just try -- I'm being, like, extra cautious.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Frankly, this is part of the draft that we inherited, so I actually don't know how deep the concern runs of -- yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Marian.

MS. JOHNSTON: The reasoning was that again, if they're going to be hiring someone to the team, that if be someone that the Commission is comfortable with, that you've given your approval to this one group of people, now they bring in someone else, you want to be sure it's someone not just that they're comfortable with, but that you're comfortable with. So that's why. It's sort of to give yourselves a way out if you feel after spending time, a little bit of time that it's just not going to work out.

COMMISSIONER YEE: But I guess Commissioner Fernandez's concern is that we're letting them bring that person on board before we actually approve that person. Do we want to give them that leeway?

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, in litigation, sometimes you don't have much control over timing of what's happening, especially with this. This is an appeal directly to the
Supreme Court for a challenge to any of your maps. Time is usually pretty critical. And then I think you're right that they're going to -- as far as any actual conflict, they're going to make sure the person doesn't have that kind of a conflict because it would disqualify the whole firm, but as far as your comfort with them, it's a different kind of a conflict.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Anyone else? Okay. It's six minutes of 5:00. The previous public comment was unsolicited and not at the end of the day, so I will ask Katie to read the instructions one last time for public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair.

In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To call -- dial -- sorry. 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 92737068918 for this week's meeting.

When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound key. Once you have dialed in, you'll be placed in a queue from which a moderator will begin unmuting callers to submit their comment. You will also
hear an automatic message to press star 9. Please do this to raise your hand indicating you wish to comment.

When it is 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 located on the website. The Commission is taking general public comment at this time.

It is general, right? There -- is there any motion?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, yes.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Okay. Sorry.

CHAIR KENNEDY: It's general. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We do have someone in the queue.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Go ahead and invite them to speak.

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

MR. KAUBLE: Matt Kauble, last name is K-A-U-B-L-E.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you, Mr. Kauble.

The floor is yours.
MR. KAUBLE: Well, I -- I'm listening to you talk --
the Commission talk about on -- online submissions, and
I'm thinking what you need is an online submission tool
that you have through your website, and you probably have
to put together requirements documents for whatever
programmer or whatever company does the programming to
create the tool.

Now, this tool would have basically three
components, a form where you'd have the submitter and
their contact information and maybe their -- the city
where they're submitting from; a map tool where you, you
know, select, you know, county precincts, counties. You
know, the submitter could just click on their community
of interest, you know, from existing divisions of
counties, school districts, cities, city districts, et
cetera.

And then your -- your third component would be kind
of a Microsoft Word-like tool where they could explain
the map that they are submitting. That -- I -- I think
seventy to ninety percent of your submit -- online
submissions would be through that tool, especially if
it's easy to use. You're also going to have to do some
air testing with regards to that tool to make sure that
it's easy to use where someone who isn't, well-versed in
technology can get online and use the tool through the
website. So if there's any questions, I'd be happy to take them; otherwise, I'll get off and let you continue your meeting.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much for calling with your comment.

MR. KAUBLE: All righty.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Katie, are there other callers?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: No. That was it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good. Then just to review tomorrow, we have a presentation organized by the global access subcommittee at 10:00. We will be going back to item 10 on the agenda to finish up with that from the outreach and engagement subcommittee. We have the line drawing procurement documentation to review and discuss.

So hopefully get through all of that in the morning, and then afternoon, we have a scheduled discussion on the Commission dynamics, the working dynamics of the commission, and then our discussion of future agendas and meeting dates, and I may flip the discussion of future agenda items and meeting dates to fall just after lunch so that we can get that out of the way and not run into any problems with that.

So with that, thank you all very much. I think it was a very useful and productive day, and look forward to
seeing you all tomorrow morning at 9:30.

(Whereupon, the CRC Business Meeting adjourned at 4:57 p.m.)
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