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CHAIR KENNEDY: Good morning, everyone. Welcome to our meeting, the third day, Thursday, the 3rd of December. I will ask staff to call the roll, and then we will go into announcement.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Good morning.
Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Present.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Vazquez. No?

CHAIR KENNEDY: She hopes to join us this afternoon.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.
MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Akutagawa.

CHAIR KENNEDY: She'll be joining us at 10 o'clock.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: And Commissioner Kennedy.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

As far as announcements, first of all, today, the 3rd of December, is the International Day of Persons with Disabilities. And having worked to promote awareness of disability rights, and particularly political rights of people with disabilities, I wanted to take the opportunity to highlight the day and to point out a provision from Article 29 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, which says that: States Parties to the convention -- and the United States has signed but not yet ratified the convention -- are obliged to promote actively an environment in which persons with disabilities can effectively and fully participate in the conduct of public affairs.
And I believe I speak for the Commission in saying that we are committed to promoting an environment in which people with disabilities can effectively and actively participate in this element of public affairs, the redistricting of California.

I'd like to acknowledge and thank our ASL interpreters and our captioners who are perhaps the most obvious face of our commitment to these principles, but to assure everyone that we will continue to engage with the disability community throughout California and do everything that we can to ensure that that opportunity to actively and effectively engage in this process is there at all stages in this process.

Second of all, I had been asked by the legal team to inform commissioners that, at least for the time being, legal queries will be responded to after a break, whether it's a fifteen-minute break or a lunch break or a break until the next day. But we should not, for the time being, expect immediate answers to our legal queries so that the legal team can consult and ensure that we are being provided with the best possible legal advice.

Next, I would like to invite Commissioner Fernandez and Commissioner Ahmad to share some news with us.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, chair.

I have some exciting news for you all. Commissioner
Fernandez and I are retiring from the hiring of the
deputy executive director subcommittee. As of late last
night, we received notice that the position was
established. We got a hold of our candidate through
various attempts, we contacted him through every channel
we had, and Mr. Hernandez has accepted the offer. We
have put him in touch with Raul, who will be starting the
transfer process. We have put him in touch with Fredy,
who will be drafting the press release for the
announcement for his position. Yay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yahoo.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: In terms of a start date, Mr.
Hernandez will be communicating with Raul. He wants to
make sure that he has things set up with his current
employer before moving over.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So on behalf of the entire
commission, I want to thank the two of you for your
patience and persistence in helping make this happen.
I'd like to thank Raul in advance for everything that he
will be doing to make the onboarding process go as
smoothly as possible.

Thank Mr. Ceja for standing in in the interim and
taking on some additional responsibilities until such
time as Mr. Hernandez is able to join us.

But this is something that the Commission has very
much been looking forward to, and we are indeed very
excited in being able to share this news.

I would also like to take the opportunity to thank
our supporters in the legislature, legislative staff, and
elsewhere for all of their support throughout this
process. We do believe that this is an important
position to enable the Commission to go beyond what the
2010 Commission was able to achieve as far as public
outreach and education about the redistricting process.
so thanks to them. And we look forward to moving forward
with this.

Let me also go ahead and review the agenda for the
day.

Well, first, before I could do that, Director
Claypool, do you have any announcements?

MR. CLAYPOOL: I do not. They stole my thunder.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So reviewing the agenda, we
will head into public comment in a moment. I see there
are individuals in the queue already, and we look forward
to hearing from them.

At 10 o'clock, we have a panel presentation
organized by the Global Access Subcommittee. After the
break, we will return to agenda item 10 with the Outreach
and Engagement Subcommittee to finish up. We would also
need to have time before lunch to discuss the paperwork
related to the line drawing RFP.

After lunch, so approximately 1:45, we would open another period for public comment. We will then discuss future agenda items and meeting dates. We need to set some more meeting dates both in the near future and pushing out our calendar in 2021. After which, we will have a discussion on Commission Dynamics as set out under item 13 in the agenda. And we would close the day with public comment.

If we end up with additional time, we can go back and perhaps revisit any items that there are lingering questions or comments on, but that is the outline for the day.

So with -- Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Will we be discussing at all the letter we got from the legislatives on the COI tool?

CHAIR KENNEDY: We can do that, I would say, perhaps as we are discussing future agenda items, so after lunch and public comment.

Okay. So with that, let me ask Katy to invite our first caller to join us.

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

To call in, dial the telephone number provided on
the livestream feed. The telephone number is 877-853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed. It is 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 that says, press star nine. 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 six 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.

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

I've been trying to follow the commissioners' thoughtful discussions, including the contracts, and I wanted to inform you, if you're not aware, of the ongoing controversy about the Secretary of State's outreach for the November election and the contracts involved there. Their request was to limit proposals to fifteen pages, and there were two bidders that ended in a dispute because one of them included hyperlinks which increased the actual size of the proposal to forty-nine pages. This is not a criticism of the Secretary of State; it is to be aware of the issue of what is the actual number of pages submitted.

I did see on your agenda for your next meeting that it included outreach grants. Hopefully, it will be clear on the number of pages if you are to have page limits. Are they to include appendixes, attachments, or hyperlinks? I am primarily interested in the outreach grants, and I did notice page limits in the request for legal counsel and line drawing. So limiting venters, let's say up to five pages, is not enough to lay out a plan to redraw the state. If it is increased, let's say, to ten pages, it should be clear what those ten pages actually mean.

I did want to thank you for allowing me to speak, and for your service, particularly in these difficult
times. And good luck. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much, Ms. Levine, for that. That is important information for us to be aware of as we move forward with these RFPs.

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

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And I promised Commissioner Akutagawa that I would (indiscernible) until she arrived at 10 o'clock.

Does anyone have any matters of general interest that they would like to share at this point? Commissioner Sinay, and then Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think the speaker -- the public comment, that was a really good point. And if we just want to take a few minutes just to think through what -- how we want to present that. I did think fifteen pages looked short, and now I know how people get around the fifteen pages for all the information we were asking. I know we want to keep it so it's doable, but we also want to make sure that it's equitable for everybody applying. So thoughts -- those who have already been thinking about the RFP, what were your thoughts on that? I know that when people submitted their applications, I did look at all the hyperlinks and that was really helpful. But do we limit the number of hyperlinks or
CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I have a different comment in general, but yes, I agree with you, Commissioner Sinay.

I had heard a little bit -- I had read a little bit about the issue with the Secretary of State. And in all honesty, I hadn't even applied that to the RFPs that we are putting together, so I very much appreciate Ms. Levine calling in.

So thank you very much. And certainly, we will take that into consideration as we continue to refine the RFP, particularly for the line drawer. We have had a page limit there for sure. So absolutely. And thank you for that.

The other piece I just wanted to mention, we had been talking about Twitter communications, and this morning I had seen a piece I just wanted to share with you all. They had -- it was from Redistricting Partners -- they had included the -- our handle, @WeDrawTheLines, which is the Twitter account for us, though relatively dormant right now -- that there is a panel coming up tomorrow, I believe it is, on the 2010 Commission's use of LGBTQ as a community of interest. And so they are having a discussion. It looks like a
nationwide discussion. They have folks from Virginia and
other states also, but the focus is talking about the
2010 Commission. I don't know if I'll be able to make
it. I believe it's at noon. I'm happy to share that if
other commissioners haven't seen it, but I just wanted to
flag that for everyone.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And that was from the Redistricting
Partners?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: You know, Redistricting
Partners tweeted it, but it's actually a panel of the
Victory Fund with Equality California and others. Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And that's noon Pacific or noon
Eastern?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: It's 3 p.m. Eastern, noon
Pacific.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. It looks like it
might be a part of a larger conference or something like
that. It says it's a breakout session.

CHAIR KENNEDY: There was an article in The
Washington Post, if not yesterday, sometime in the last
two or three days, Professor Andrew Reynolds, who
recently moved from University of North Carolina to
Princeton, is one of the major researchers in the area of
LGBTQ representation, author of the book Children of
Harvey Milk: How LGBTQ Politicians Have Changed the World (sic), I think, is the subtitle. Andy's a long-time colleague from all of the international work, and I'm helping him connect with a journalist in the U.K. who's doing some major work on this as well. So thank you for bringing that to our attention.

On the -- back on the subject of hyperlinks and RFP responses, you know, I certainly recognize the value of the hyperlinks. I'm wondering if one way to address that would be to say there are certain elements that must be included in the RFP response itself in the body of the response, that hyperlinks are not excluded from the responses but may or may not be considered depending on time. So if you have all of the required elements in the body of the response, that would ensure that there is consideration of those in this case that each response. And then recognizing the importance of hyperlinks, we would do our best to take a look at, but if it leads to a thousand pages of material, it simply could not be -- we could not give assurances of considering all of that material. So I put that out for thoughts from other commissioners.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, Commission -- oh.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I actually like that as
an idea because it will force then the meat of the 
important elements into the main body, which then will 
come back under the required number of pages. And even 
if we choose to set pages maybe at a higher number or -- 
but I definitely think that -- I -- when you were 
talking, I almost thought of the conversation we had 
earlier about people taking the time to put some things 
that we're not reading, but if there -- but if indeed we 
are naming it up front as the critical elements need to 
be in the body, perhaps that will drive that behavior.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Director Claypool, did you have any 
thoughts on that approach?

MR. CLAYPOOL: So first of all, I didn't -- I wasn't 
thinking that there would be any limit to the number of 
pages that a response would come back with. I've seen 
responses be quite voluminous, but I wasn't thinking in 
terms that someone would go ahead and put hyperlinks in 
it when it was returned to us. We just need to take a 
look at it and talk amongst ourselves about how we feel 
about it.

I think that what we've said right now makes a lot 
of sense, that if it's something that you really need us 
to address, it needs to be in the body, and if it 
dresses the elements of what we're asking for, it needs 
to be in the body. And then if you wish to use links for
other things, that's fine, they just may or may not be
something that we review, particularly if they're
lengthy. But that's the best I can do.

I also think that our legal counsel should probably
get together and just give us an idea at some point in
the future -- near future -- about the use of hyperlinks
and whether there's any precedent with the thing that
happened with the Secretary of State's office. That's
all.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I agree. And I think
if we just come up with this -- what's standard for the
Commission and how we're going to handle it, I think that
that would be fine.

My sense just from reading, I think was in the L.A.
Times, a while -- a few days ago -- the piece around the
Secretary of State, I believe, has another political
layer, that he ended up using a communications firm that
was associated with the Biden campaign rather than
Mercury, the big communications firm, which, former
Speaker of the Assembly Fabian Nunez is a part of. So my
sense is that there's another political layer to this,
that the hyperlinks are one component, but that there's
other -- that there's certainly other pieces. So I agree
for the clarity that we should figure out what our
precedent will be. And I'm certainly open to suggestions
to make sure that there's fairness and equity in the
process.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

Any further comments or items of general interest at
this point? Okay. If not, and respecting my promise to
Commissioner Akutagawa, let's take a -- just a five-
minute break, come back 9:58, and be prepared for our 10
o'clock panel.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for rejoining
us after our brief break. It is 10 o'clock, and we now
have a panel organized by our Global Access Subcommittee,
so I will turn it over to the subcommittee to make the
introductions of the panel and the speakers.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Good morning,
everyone. I do see that Chairman Smith is online, yes?

MR. SMITH: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. And also is Chris
with you as well?

MR. SMITH: Yes, he is.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. And is Jesse there
also? Am I missing Jesse?

MR. FRAIRE: I am. Good morning.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Where's Jesse? Oh, okay.

Will you be using your video?

MR. FRAIRE: I will be, yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Chairman Smith and Chris, will you also be using the video, or are you just phoning in right now?

MR. SMITH: We're just phoning in right now.


So welcome, everyone. Is -- oops. Is my fellow subcommittee commissioner not here yet? So I'll go ahead and get started. We are just very happy and honored to have two -- or actually three -- individuals that will be talking about the Native American communities. I will first like to introduce Chairman Smith. He is the chairman of the Pala Band of Mission Indians, and he -- also if you have read his bio, it is online, which is so impressive -- he's the -- he successfully negotiated the first tribal state contract in California with the -- with Governor Pete Wilson in 1996. And if you just read his bio, it's just all the wonderful work he has done for the tribal members and area residents. I'm not sure if you actually ever sleep, Chairman Smith, but we thank you.

MR. SMITH: Thank you. I try.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Thank you so
much for your work.

And then also with him is Chris Nejo. I don't have a bio for him, but I do believe he's a legal analyst in research, and I'm sure he's right along with Chairman Smith and just doing wonderful work for all of the tribal members.

MR. NEJO: Yes. Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And then we'll -- okay. And then we have Jesus, which is Jesse Fraire.

Did I pronounce your last name correct, hopefully?

MR. FRAIRE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Whew. He's the statewide census manager and Southern California Regional Outreach manager with the California Native Vote Project, and he focuses on civic engagement advocacy and outreach for tribal communities across the state.

So with that, I'm not sure who's going to go first. Should we let Chairman Smith go first? Is that okay, Jesse? Yes? Okay.

Chairman Smith, would you like to start?

MR. SMITH: Yes. (Indiscernible). Can you all see the presentation fine? Can you guys see the presentation?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.
MR. SMITH: Okay. (Indiscernible).

Okay. I'm going to talk a little about cultural awareness and language access panel presentation for the Pala Band of Mission Indians. Again, we're located in Northern San Diego County. We have 936 enrolled members. We have our own community, so we have a youth center, child care center, learning center, fire station, sports complex, gym, transfer station, skate park, and more.

In addition to gaming, the tribe operates the Pala Fox Raceway; manages avocado groves, citrus groves, a vineyard, alfalfa project, shooting range, RV park with all the -- all while within the reservation boundaries. Today, the tribe has over 16,000 acres of trust and fee lands. Again, there's a map of our reservations so you can see all the tribe trusts land and the fee land, so that's our reservation. We're, like, eighteen miles east of the ocean.

Again, California American Indian/Alaska Natives' population in the country according to the 2010 Census, California represents twelve percent of the total American Indian/Alaska Native population; approximately 720,000 identified themselves as Native American. There are 109 federally recognized tribes in California and seventy-eight petitioning for recognition. So there are eighteen federally recognized tribes in the county of San
Diego. I'm also the chairman of all those tribes. I've been there kind of -- you know, voted in because I started young. And my predecessor was there for fifty years, so now I kind of steer the community, but it's a good -- all the chairmans are there, so we meet once a month, and we do social programs for our members.

So the four indigenous peoples in the county are the Cupeno, Luiseno, and the Kumeyaay, and the Cahuilla. So again, I'm going to touch a little bit on sovereignty. Sovereignty refers to inherent authority of American Indians/Alaska Natives to govern themselves. The U.S. Constitution recognizes Indian tribes as distinct governments, and they have, with a few exceptions, the same powers as federal and state governments to regulate their internal affairs.

So again, sovereignty constitutes a legal political status, acknowledges the right to self-government, recognizes tribal government as distinct, independent entities, and with unique authority. Means the rules, customs, and cultures, and protocols among tribes of communities will vary.

Interaction with federally recognized tribes must be conducted on a government-to-government basis. This is in addition to what goes on beyond any public involvement and community outreach efforts.
Each tribe is independent. We need customs, cultures, laws, protocols. Below are some procedural and cultural considerations to keep in mind when working with tribes throughout the state. Tribal councils need to be consulted before any work is done; give some time for the council to make decisions. Often, there are multiple steps in decision-making processes. Many tribes, different communities, departments are consulted before final decisions are made. Respect confidentiality and right of a tribe to control information, data, and public information about service provided to the tribe. Try to learn how native community refers to itself as a group tribal name. Some of us in Southern California are Bands of Mission Indians; some are just tribes, so we all vary. Be honest and clear about your role and expectations to be willing to adapt to meet the needs of the community, show respect by being open to their ways in thinking and behaving.

It is uncommon to come across Native Americans who have a low level of trust in government. This is expected due to policies enacted over time and local, state, and federal government intended to disfranchise or even terminate tribal communities. It is recommended that outside entities work with tribal leadership or tribal organization leaders to identify trust -- trusted
messengers that can serve as community access points.

Trusted messengers are active in community and know how to engage with other (audio interference) respectful and genuine manner. Working with trusted messengers helps increase census participation. We know it works if you spend time and educate the messenger. We know they can refine the message in ways to connect with the community, who trusted messengers then will be very little, if any, communication participation. Again, trusted messengers, along with the tribal council, will develop the appropriate materials to distribute if necessary.

In addition, the trusted community member messengers can also be tribal organizations. TOs in our area include Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association, California Indian Manpower Consortium, Indian Health Council, California Native Vote Project. So again, SCTCA is a multiservice nonprofit corporation established in 1972 for consortium of federally recognized tribes in Southern California. Currently, we have twenty-four members, some in Riverside and San Diego, the majority in San Diego.

Our mission is to serve wealth -- health, welfare, and safety, educational, cultural, economic, and unemployment needs of the tribal members and descendants.
in southern region of the state. The board of directors compromise the travel chairpersons from each of the tribe members governs SCTCA. Again, I'm currently the chairman of the board. We allow guest speakers -- excuse me. We allow on our monthly meeting guest speakers come before the board and do a presentation. So again, Riverside, San Diego County, and help connect non-tribal organizations, tribal groups throughout the region.

Recently, Tribal Chairmen's Association formed a compromise with representatives from SCTCA Central Tribal Chairman's Association and Northern Tribal Association, so we have a statewide group now.

So again, ever since first contact was already colonizers, efforts have been made to eradicate indigenous languages. We have family members who attended Indian schools, Christian schools that were punished for speaking our language. Many of our ancestors chose not to pass on indigenous language in order to protect future generations of racism and discrimination. As a result, many languages in California are sleeping. Efforts are being made to teach new generations to speak; some revitalization programs are really taking off.

It is recommended to ask each tribe individually as a sovereign nation if you would like any outreach
conducted in their language. Some tribes may not want to share their language just yet, may dispute its written form. The decision needs to be made by a tribe or tribal group. Language can be a sensitive topic, so it needs to be approached delicately.

It is important to acknowledge that California is home to over ninety indigenous languages in hundreds of dialects. In fact, that's often forgotten. Some tribes may not have the manpower or resources to actually engage the community members in the way we want to, so let the tribes know what resources are available for them.

It is difficult to visit each tribe individually, especially since we're so spread out throughout the state. It would be helpful if public hearings could take place on or near tribal lands and that if a tribe agrees to it. You may be met with some resistance. Again, find someone hard -- trust -- you know, a lot of us don't trust nontribal groups, so try to get somebody like me, Chris, or -- that we have resources, connections, and work with organizations like SCTCA with all the tribes in one room.

And also, broadband is an issue. Most tribes are located in areas without limit broadband access. Satellite internet service can be expensive and unreliable.
Okay. We worked with the Census office to ensure accurate and complete count. The state educated, trained our trusted messengers, who took the information back to the community and provided it to be a success, so the same efforts can be done in redistricting efforts. So thank you.

Again, just some contact information for our tribe -- our address, our website, and also Southern California Tribal Chairmen's executive director, and our website, so. I'm open to any questions.

(Indiscernible). Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

Chairman Smith, I forgot to ask. Do you have a hard stop? I would like to have Jesse go right after you, and then we'll have questions at the end. But if you can't wait, then --

MR. SMITH: No, go ahead. I'm fine.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: You're fine. Okay. Thank you so much.

And then I just want to ask Chris, if you could forward that presentation to us -- or to me, and then we'll have it posted. So thank you so much.

MR. SMITH: Okay. All right.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you so much. And we're going to pass it on to Jesse now.
MR. FRAIRE: Awesome. Thank you.

And thank you, Chairman Smith, for the amazing presentation.

Let me go ahead and -- I believe I may need screen share access. Or I think we might need to --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Kristian, can you help him with that? Oh, here we go.


Good morning, everyone, and thank you so much for the opportunity to speak today. I'm really looking forward to talking about some of these pieces that Chairman Smith brought up. I think our presentations are very similar.

So my name is Jesse Fraire; I'm Tohono O'odham and Chicano, and I'm with the California Native Vote Project. Our organization first started in 2016 leading up to the presidential election, and here are just a few of the different areas in which we work in just as a quick review. Community organizing/issue advocacy. Some of our other forms of civic engagement that include voter registration, education, getting out to vote, election protection, census, and our redistricting work as well. Always looking for ways to do leadership development within our tribal communities across the state, and
ultimately engage with tribal community members.

We used to have a lot more in-person interactions before COVID. We were known for our strength -- our strong canvassing team, which was about thirty-plus canvassers throughout the state. And it could be small, meetings, big gatherings; we would attend in person and share information with folks on the ground.

And then one of the pieces we're working to integrate more is a Native American candidate recruitment and preparation program. I just wanted to go through that real quick.

This map here shows the areas of influence, so mostly the counties in which we've been active in. Please keep in mind it is a little bit outdated. We did this leading up to some of our major census work. I know Chairman Smith brought up the census. We were one of the statewide contractors, and yeah, worked closely with Paul (ph.) and Chairman Smith on that great project.

So some of these areas here that are not more intensely yellow or orangish, some of these may have changed through time as we moved forward with our census work, but this gives you a quick glimpse as to what areas we've been active in. So we are based out of L.A. but have a strong canvassing team based out of L.A., Sacramento, and Humboldt, and Del Norte counties.
All right. And Chairman Smith touched on a lot of this. So real quick, there are a 109 federally recognized tribes in California and dozens that are filing for federal recognition. So we have seventy-eight, and those numbers continue to increase.

One of the neat opportunities here is that there are really strong networks of tribal governments and tribal CBOs throughout the state. So as Chairman Smith was mentioning, the Southern California Tribal Chairmen's Association and now the new statewide Chairperson's Association, which I think will be a really good organization or network to connect with. And I think that's always a best bet, too, especially when we talk about redistricting and the land here in California. I think it's always the best bet to connect with our California tribes directly. So just like he was mentioning, just making sure that we're aware of the uniqueness, the nuances, the individual tribal sovereignty for each tribal community here in the state.

Many tribal lands have challenges with reliable broadband access and mail services. I know Chairman Smith was talking about some of those broadband access challenges, and we noticed a lot of this during our census work as well. So when it comes to communication with education, sometimes it's a little bit more
difficult to do given some of these challenges, right?

Sometimes we don't have the luxury of just being able to rely on digital means of communication, and even physical mail to some point, to get the message across or to share some of these educational pieces. So we have to work directly with community members and tribal leadership to figure out ways to get through these barriers.

Again, each tribe is unique and sovereign. There are some similarities depending on the region, but always the best practice is to approach individual tribes and see how we can work together. And recently, we saw this in our census work. It impacted us big time, but COVID-19 has had a really negative effect on a lot of our reservations and rancherias throughout the state. Many of them were closed as COVID-19 was intensifying. So again, we want to keep some of these pieces in mind as we continue to work closely with tribal governments here for the next decade around redistricting.

So there are a lot of external factors that may affect access to tribal government, or to, you know, maybe having like an in-person meeting with reservations or rancherias. But hopefully, we're all hoping that the pandemic is over within the next few months.

I wanted to touch on a quick issue that we saw during the 2010 redistricting cycle, specifically with
our Karuk Tribe up in Northern California based out of Humboldt and Siskiyou counties. So the tribal lands are basically part of two different counties, and what we saw is that during 2010 redistricting cycle, they were actually split into two different State Assembly Districts -- Assembly Districts 1 and 2. So we want to make sure -- and this is my last point here -- to keep tribal lands and tribal peoples in mind as communities of interest while we think about redistricting.

And I did include a couple of contacts, which I think would be great. The first one being the Tribal Chairperson's Association, which tribal -- which Chairman Smith talked about, and I have their email address here. And yeah, he's part of it. And then they have the separate Southern California, Northern California, Central California as well, so there are a lot of opportunities to connect with tribal leadership.

I would also recommend reaching out to the Governor's Office of the Tribal Advisor. Her name is Christina Snider -- the tribal advisor to Governor Newsom. Amazing advocate, knows our communities really well. So I have her phone number and email address. And yeah, I think another strong recommendation is to start that communication early.

I know Chairman Smith was saying to give it time,
the trust building, the relationship building piece is really big within our communities, so we want to make sure we're being respectful of time and respectful of any local customs, any local protocol. So we want to make sure that we give the best opportunity possible to have these informational sessions. Which, when I checked in with one of the commissioners from 2010, they were saying that there were basically no meetings on reservation or rancherias during the 2010 cycle. So yeah, ideally having some of those informational sessions, educational sessions with tribal governments and tribal peoples would be ideal, both in person or virtually, depending on the situation.

And just in terms of outreach, I know Chairman Smith was recommending, and I agree, connecting directly with tribal governments around language access, language needs, and with tribal CBOs as well. We have a few examples here that were really effective for our census work. So again, just simple one-pagers with bullet points with information on them, I think, are really effective and committee members really seem to like it, and be able to basically extract the information from them, so.

Imagery, and you can always work with us as tribal CBOs. I'm sure a lot of our tribal governments, too,
would be open to helping out with the process as well in terms of imagery and language that can be used.

And I included our contact information here. So I included myself, and then our executive director and co-founder, Chrissie Castro as well. And that concludes my presentation. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Great. Thank you. Just two very wonderful presentations. So thank you both.

Chair Kennedy, did you want me to monitor, or do -- how do you want to how handle this?

CHAIR KENNEDY: You can go ahead and moderate the discussion.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

Oh, Mr. Ceja.

MR. CEJA: We taking questions already?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: We can take questions. I was just going to ask one question really quick, though. Is that all right?

I thought it was very appropriate when we talked with Chairman Smith and Chris the other day --

And Chairman Smith, I know you probably remember your comment you made to me with, now, what are you trying to do? Which I thought was just perfect because
it really does highlight our education outreach needs. And you brought up you were able to connect it with -- you mentioned a school district. I think you went through the same process. Could you kind of give us a little bit of background on what that effort looked like and how you organized your tribal members and how you went forward with that?

MR. SMITH: Yeah, we're part of Monson Union School District (ph.), and our kids attend the middle school, primary, and high school there. And you know, in the past, before I was born, we had a board member for forty years that was a tribal member, and then they changed the district, so we weren't really represented well, so our Indian reservation and the local community just to the west of us, so. They redistrict the voting area, and then we got a seat on the board, which is a role member of our tribe, which is good, because we have a charter school on our reservation, so we have kids here, and we have kids that go into the public school system, so it goes hand-in-hand, so just really gives us a good voice on the school board, so.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: All right. Yes. Thank you.

I will open it up for questions.

So Mr. Ceja and Chair Kennedy.
MR. CEJA: Yes, quickly. Thank you so much.

You did mention, Jesse, that in 2010 we did not hold any public meetings on tribal land. That hopefully will change. And as we start crafting our outreach protocols, how have you gotten around COVID-19 in your particular communities? Is your community apt to using social media or going online for meetings?

MR. FRAIRE: Yeah, great question, Fredy. Thank you for that. Yeah, so I think for our census work, when COVID-19 hit, like I had mentioned at the beginning, we were so used to being out in the community in person, so we kind of had to pivot our outreach strategy. So what we saw was really effective is that we did both phone banking and text banking. We have an internal membership base of close to 14,000 individuals here just alone with California Native Vote Project, and we opened it up to our tribal CBO partners, our tribal government partners, so we were able to reach out in that way, and we saw a pretty good contact rate and good responses from community members.

But yeah, we were also really good about posting daily on social media regarding census information. We had contests, just shared basic information, so you know, multimedia, finding different ways to get the message across. We had virtual events mostly through Facebook.
And then we also really used email campaigns as well. We use a platform called "Action Network" to send -- we were sending out basically weekly, bi-weekly emails to folks from within our membership based on partnerships. So yeah, those were some of the ways.

And then we were -- we also had a chance to experiment a little bit with geofencing. So we had a chance to do that mostly through Facebook, and that really helped us in terms of base building and getting the message across.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

I have Chair Kennedy, and then Commissioner Turner.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

I just wanted to highlight I enjoyed listening to a piece on KCRW NPR last night on my way home talking about Assemblyman Ramos, who is one of our former county supervisors here in San Bernardino County, who is the first Native American elected to the California State Assembly. And not only that, but the fact that three of his bills were signed into law this year, including one promoting Native American political participation. And so it just -- it does really show the importance of having Native voices at the table making the case and getting these bills passed to engage the -- our Native American population in this state comprehensively in the
political process, and also the work that he did, the
bills that have, I'm sure, great meaning to tribal
members such as repatriation of remains.

And then we were talking about repatriating remains
from a museum in Chicago in them that belonged here in
California, and how important that was to Native American
peoples in this state. So I just wanted to raise that as
evidence of the impact that our work can have, and
certainly the work of California Native Vote Project as
far as candidate recruitment because it is important to
identify people who are interested in running for office
and have some background that will help them succeed once
they get there. So thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

And for Chairman Smith, Mr. Fraire, thank you so
much for the presentation; appreciate the -- just the
education, the sharing, the reminders, et cetera.

Just something pretty, perhaps, basic, but you
mentioned the challenges that we're aware of, of course,
with broadband. And one of the things that we don't talk
about often is the challenges with mail. And I'm
wondering if for this Commission you can talk a little
bit about -- because we tend to think that if broadband
is not available, that mail may work. And can you just
speak to the challenges of mail so that we're understanding as we're trying to do our outreach for your communities?

MR. SMITH: Okay. I'll speak first. It's Chairman Smith. We have a U.S. mail system, so I get mail at my street, and we also have our -- our tribe owns our own Postal Annex, so all our tribal members have a -- we call them "PMBs" -- like P.O. box. So we have both, so it works pretty good, and that's how we get the word out to our community.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay.

MR. FRAIRE: Yeah, what we saw from several communities during our census work was that -- yeah, mostly the use of P.O. boxes complicated the outreach efforts, and I think it was mostly due to, like, classifications of physical addresses where the homes are, and then basically ensuring that they're able to receive information in a timely manner. So I think it usually requires pretty close coordination between maybe the county, and like, the local postal office in the region that serves our reservations and rancherias.

And then yet, like Chairman Smith was saying, depending on each tribe, too, and their sharing situations. But yeah, it usually deals with, like, the physical location, and then coordination in terms of how
to access all these P.O. boxes within reservations and rancherias, which is a possibility. We did it up in Humboldt and Del Norte counties, where we had relationships with the local postal office and -- or offices, and they were able to basically let us know how many P.O. boxes there are that cover the nearby reservations, and that we would ensure that -- that folks in the community were able to receive the information through P.O. boxes.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. Thank you. Just as a quick follow-up, because I noted that you mentioned that some of the reservations/rancherias were shut down because of COVID, which, I would imagine would further the impact the issue of being able to reach out and get the mail through.

MR. FRAIRE: Exactly. Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you so much. This was really helpful. If it's okay, I'm going to ask just some basic questions since you're here. And I really want to make sure that we walk away with the -- I had noticed that in all the PowerPoints, Tribal, the "T" was capitalized. So I just wanted to confirm that that's something we should be always being aware of?

MR. SMITH: Yes.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. And then second, when we're talking about the Native American population in California, what is the best term? And I apologize if Native American isn't the best term.

MR. SMITH: (Indiscernible). The term that we (indiscernible) --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Whoops. We can't hear you.

MR. SMITH: Sorry. Terms we use (indiscernible)

American Indian Alaska Native --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry, we can't hear you. Can you get closer to the mic?

MR. SMITH: Can you hear me?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

MR. SMITH: Okay. It's Alaska Native/American Indian is the term that's commonly used.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Alaska Native (indiscernible) American Indian.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And then when you use rancherias, how is rancherias and reservations different? And can you use tribal land to refer to both?

MR. SMITH: Yes. Yes, some of us are reservations, some of us are rancherias, but they're both tribal land.

MR. FRAIRE: Rancherias tend to be in Central and Northern California and are smaller in size than the
reservations down in the southern portion of the state.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. Thank you. Thank you for entertaining those questions. I know they're very basic, but they're the -- where I find I slip up the most, and I wanted to be -- I know for -- I know that the California Native Voter Project wasn't ready to apply to the California philanthropy association's grants program when they were offering -- when they were accepting proposals, and so I was wondering, Jesse, how are you all getting ready for redistricting, and how are you being supported on that effort?

MR. FRAIRE: Yeah, great question. So we are part of a couple of different redistricting groups here in California, the Redistricting Collaborative, as well as the IBE Redistricting Group (ph.). So, yeah, we've -- we are, I think, one of the only few groups, especially in terms of tribal CBOs, who are doing work around outreach regarding redistricting here in the state for tribal community members. So yeah, it's been a learning process. Learning a lot of best practices from organizations and communities who have been doing this work for a while, so that's been really good. But I think that's mostly the two spaces in which we've been engaging in regarding redistricting work.

We did include some of the messaging -- you know,
the importance of redistricting when we did our census work since they're so closely connected. But yeah, it's been to -- it's been through those two redistricting collaboratives that we've been able to really learn and kind of modify messaging and share information with tribal community members.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And in addition to the learning that they're providing, what other resources do you feel that -- and this goes for both -- that the tribal community -- or sorry -- that your communities would need to be able to engage your members in redistricting?

MR. SMITH: I think from the -- from my tribe is a tribal contact person like Chris, is when we did the census, we hired our own people that worked with the U.S. Census in collaboration, and we got more people that did the census and participated. So again, community within the community is a great tool.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Right. Thank you.

MR. FRAIRE: Yeah, I agree with that, too. And I think to whatever level possible, too, maybe just talking on some of those technical pieces when it comes to redrawing the political district lines. So I think really getting into some of those specifics around how redistricting works, so kind of demystifying the process is what I'm trying to say, I think is really big within
our communities. We saw it -- you know, it still happens
for voting for census there was a big campaign to just
educate community members about what it is and why it's
important, so something similar would be great.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And then just -- sorry, just
one last -- an invitation is in January and early
February, the commissioners will be going out and kind of
doing redistricting 101 sessions, mainly Zoom calls and
such, just an overview of fifteen minutes. So if there's
any meetings or any opportunities where you think it
could be helpful to have staff or one of the
commissioners present just to start those relationships,
please do let us know. Just want to give that invitation
to both -- or -- entities.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Yeah, for my group, SCTCA, we
meet the third Tuesday of every month. We've been doing
an in-person Zoom, so you have twenty-four leaders at the
table. So that'd be a perfect opportunity. You can
contact me or Chris, and I could set you up for either
January or February just to make the introduction so you
have a contact -- both a leader from the tribes in our
area.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. Well, we'll follow-up.
And just so that you know, Chair Smith, I am one of your
neighbors in Encinitas, so I'm close by.
MR. SMITH: Oh, okay. All right. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Commissioner Le Mons, Yee, and Andersen.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Good morning. Thank you both for the presentation. I have two questions. The first question is, as we go out to do the one-on-ones that Commissioner Sinay just referenced, are there specific types of information or things you would want to make sure that we include in those presentations?

MR. SMITH: Yeah, I think the current districts as they lay out currently and how the change affects our area would be good to explain to our people so they understand it, and also partnership with a tribal representative also.

MR. FRAIRE: This is Chris. Just to add to that, just start with the basics. I think that that would help a lot. We know that one of the first questions people are going to have is, what is redistricting? Why is it important? How does it affect me? So that early education will be really helpful for them moving forward.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: And then, Jesse, my other question, as you mentioned, that, you know, COVID has, quote, unquote, shut down the reservations in Rancherias. What exactly does that mean and what is the impact of them being shut down on someone trying to do what we're
trying to do?

MR. FRAIRE: Right. So I think it varies. There was different levels, but basically meaning closing the borders of the reservation of Rancherias. So you know, some tribes didn't allow basically folks from the outside to come in just, you know, out of the safety of their own community members.

And even to the point where, you know, depending on the situation in the area, but you know, in-person meetings were limited. Even, you know, when we saw some of the census workers, right, we had tribal partnership specialists serving as liaisons between tribes and the U.S. Census Bureau. Even scheduling those meetings, you know, became a little bit more challenging.

And I think just the added, you know, responsibilities, added pressures to tribal leadership who already have, you know, a ton to deal with. You know, given the seriousness of the pandemic and you know, potential, you know, negative impacts, it just adds another layer of -- you know, of what they have to focus on so it complicates the communication, you know, cycle all the way around.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Great. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chairman Smith and
Jesse and Chris. We're honored by your presence and grateful for your help in helping us do our work in a way that respects and honors native -- American Native Californian presence here.

An observation and then a question. Observation is in our -- in our redistricting criteria, the communities of interest paragraph talks about states, cities, counties, and actually it doesn't explicitly state tribal boundaries, unfortunately, although of course it's included in the general language. I did notice though that in the community of interest tool that we'll be rolling out in the statewide database, the mapping layers do include tribal boundaries. So as we roll out that tool, hopefully we can make good use of that and promote that as one of the layers to especially use.

My question has to do with the tribal sovereignty. So we need to respect that, but wondering how that works in practice. I guess it's kind of a parallel world, you know, where you have U.S. and state government in place, but also tribal sovereignty. So I'm wondering if you can give us any examples or highlight or alert us to examples where we would especially need to navigate differences in how that sovereignty affects the work that we are trying to do and what we can anticipate. Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Again, sovereignty is a -- you
know, it's a big word, but I think it more -- it's a
government to government. So you would be dealing as a
commissioner directly -- near my -- Chris, or whoever I
point -- so you -- we meet face to face, and that way you
go to the leader and then it flows down to the worker
bees and works well with the community.

So we pass our own ordinances which are laws, so we
have a peace and security ordinance. We have, like,
three-two ordinances, but we have a -- every tribe is
different. We have a constitution that governs our tribe
so that's the highest letter of the law, kind of like the
Constitution of the United States but it's the
Constitution of Pala Band. And every reservation in
Rancheria is different. So that's how we're structured
in Pala.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Commissioner Toledo had his
hand up before me.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, I'm sorry.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Well, thank you. And that
actually dovetails with Commissioner Yee's question.

Because oftentimes government to government, especially
for tribal governments, we -- you know, there is tribal
consultation. Oftentimes in the state of California, we'll do tribal consult -- and it's required to do tribal consultation on changes to healthcare issues, on actually various issues that impact tribal organizations or tribal -- tribes, I should say.

And I am wondering what your thought process is in terms of how we invite tribes to participate in this process. Should it be through some kind of consult -- government to government consultation process where we're getting feedback from them or -- or some other type of process, because it is -- to a certain extent, it is government to government, right, where we'd be reaching out to the tribal governments to invite them to participate in this process. So I'm just curious about your thoughts around that.

MR. SMITH: Yeah, I think that's a good idea, because, like, the state government does it, the federal government, so -- and some tribes have their own consultation policy. So I think that's the best practice because tribes are used to it so that would be -- I would be for that.

MR. FRAIRE: Okay. And I think -- another approach I've seen too included with the one you mentioned is, like, an initial invitational letter, informational letter, talking about the, you know, potential
collaboration and work together. And it's fairly easy to
pull the list of our federally recognized tribes through
the Bureau of Indian Affairs. And I think they have
updated tribal leadership and updated tribal leadership
contact information as well. So I would recommend a
physical mailer as well.

MS. FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you very much for this
presentation. My question is a little bit different
rather than just how do we contact you, but a little bit
more about the logistics of the -- where the people are
in terms of geography. And specifically this came up
when you were mentioning about the census. In the census
most of the tribal members who are on tribal land have I
think (indiscernible) and PMBs or you know, post office
boxes essentially.

So my -- I've got a couple of questions, but one,
how do the census locate people on the tribal land? And
then obviously, like, particularly in Alameda County, the
actual tribal lands are smaller but the tribal members
live all over. So how do you -- and we need to locate
the entire community as well as respect the tribal land.

So could you sort of give us a walkthrough of that
in terms of where members are located, and specifically
we're thinking of the data we get through -- from this
census bureau locates people in certain areas. And so I'm wondering on the tribal land, are they just sort of assuming because of P.O. boxes that they're all lumped in one area, or if you could give us more information on that please?

MR. NEJO: Hi. This is Chris Nejo. For the census work they did on the ground canvassing, they went and actually physically saw the homes on the reservation and made sure that the numbers that we provided matched what they had in their system as well. So they did do on-the-ground work to make sure the homes were there.

The majority of the homes, at least in Pala, they're not on the mail route, which is why we use PMBs or P.O. boxes. And for other reservations, I know a lot of their tribal members, they live off reservations for various reasons, but if you work with the tribal governments, they do have the -- the information for all of their tribal members.

MS. ANDERSEN: Great. Thank you very much. So the -- our com -- your community of interest, as we are calling them, your entire group member is not just your tribal land, but it can be in many other areas. So we'll definitely need to reach out to collect that information as it pertains to our line drawing. So thank you very much.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Jesse, in the slides that we -- that are -- that we have, and I don't know if it came up in the one that you shared, you actually share an example of redistricting in tribal areas for the Karuk tribe in Humboldt and Siskiyou counties. Did you just -- did you talk about that in your presentation and I -- and I missed it? Okay. So sorry.

MR. FRAIRE: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So sorry. I was -- I got really into the drawing. But that's an example -- when you shared that, were -- is that the difference -- there was a -- tribal areas aren't necessarily all tribal lands like what Commissioner Andersen was saying, right? It's knowing what people are living?

MR. FRAIRE: Can you repeat that again, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No. It's okay. You've already explained it. So I'll just go back to the video. Sorry.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I think -- I think that's a valid question. I think what Commissioner Sinay was asking in that -- in that one -- the PowerPoint slide that talks about how it was split, that was -- was that the reservations or was that where the population is?

MR. FRAIRE: Okay. Yeah, that was the physical
reservation. So those were the tribal borders or boundaries. And it's split between two counties and then split between two assembly districts.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen and then Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Just on that same note, that picture on -- that you did draw the Karuk up in Siskiyou County, that is certainly much more what the tribal lands look like through the Bay Area. They are very small little localized areas and you -- and certain tribes have connections and other don't.

So that's the -- it's a little bit more -- in terms of how most of us sort of think of that, I think generally if you don't -- those coming in without any knowledge would sort of assume it's a little bit more like New Mexico or Arizona where they're very large reservations. And that's not the case throughout California. So if you could kind of give us a little bit more education on that, that would be great. Thank you.

MR. FRAIRE: And you know, you'll also see there's a lot of basically tribal lands that are checkerboarded, you know, for political reasons when they were established. So you see some of those complications too. Several examples in southern California and then there's stuff up in northern California as well. But they're not
always like in a -- like in a block or continuous. They may be checkerboarded geographically as well, which makes things a little bit more difficult.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Commissioner Kennedy.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And Jesse just made the point that I was going to make. I'll just say that Palm Springs is one of those examples. So indeed the 2010 or 2011 hearing at Palm Springs City Hall was -- was not on tribal land, but it was about a block away from the nearest checkerboard square that is tribal land. The Palm Springs -- you know, when you're coming into Palm Springs, you see the sign, welcome to the Agua Caliente reservation. And Palm Springs is one of those examples of checkerboarding.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Any other questions from the commissioners? Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, Commissioner Sinay. Sorry.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: If there was a fund that was kind of to support the -- the tribe -- you know, doing outreach to the tribe, is there -- as a philanthropist I'm just going to ask it. Is there an opportunity, Chairman Smith, to have some of the other tribal leaders
match that fund so that we can do outreach to the smaller tribes?

MR. SMITH: It might be a possibility if you explain the importance to them.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen and then Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, I do have one other question. This might be -- again, because we get a lot of our data from the census and in the census questions, there is of course the -- you know, I believe the wording is Native American, and then there's always the other. And as unfortunately we know that Native American, there are very few a hundred percent Native American. And so can you give us an idea in terms of -- because there's been an issue with other nationalities in terms of they would check, like, the other box as opposed to what -- you know, the Native Amer -- well, whatever they particularly are.

But so can you give us an idea in terms of the census data how accurate you believe that to be based on actually indicating Native American or -- because I believe that's the term they use?

MR. FRAIRE: Yeah, what we notice is that the best approach is to use -- so there's an American
Indian/Alaska Native alone category. But we always recommend is that we also use the American Indian/Alaska Native or you know, in combination with any other race as well, to give them a more accurate number.

And yeah, when -- when we ask questions to the census bureau regarding the funding stream, I think that's where it usually got a little bit more confusing regarding race and ethnicity and how many different, you know, labels or groups people identify with and how that would affect the funding stream for census.

But yeah, I think I would recommend that, just in terms of when you're looking at the data, make sure you include American Indians/Alaska Natives in combination with any other race as well.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Kennedy?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Just going back to Commissioner Sinay's question a bit. I'm aware that there are I guess what are generally called casino tribes and non-casino tribes. I mean, are the -- are those with funding from casinos, have they traditionally helped fund initiatives that benefit all tribes in the state? Do they -- do they fund the Native vote project for example?

MR. SMITH: As far as tribes in -- overall, yeah, we do support initiatives that help all California Native American tribes, so there is a possibility, yes.
MR. FRAIRE: Most of our -- our funding comes from foundational grants, but yeah, we have seen some projects where -- you know, it could be regional or benefits -- intentions of benefitting tribal members statewide from tribal governments.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Any other questions from a commissioner or staff?

Okay. I wanted to thank Chairman Smith, Chris, and Jesse. Thank you so much for coming today. This has been very educational for me personally. But it -- unfortunately that's how much how much I don't know, and I'm actually looking forward to learning more. Thank you for the -- the recommendations that you've given us and also some resources that we can also count on and look into and we look forward to the partnership. So thank you so much.

And I will hand it back to Chair Kennedy.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And before you go, I will also in my role as rotating chair thank all of you for coming and sharing this -- your perspective and all of this good information with us.

Commissioner Toledo, is your hand up currently or was that from previously?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: That's from previous. Thank
you.


So again, thank you -- thank you all so much and we do look forward to being in touch with you and if there is anything that you would like us to be aware of at any point in the future please don't hesitate to let us know through public comment, writing us, or any other way. We certainly are here and want to make sure that we are always listening.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

MR. FRAIRE: Thank you so much.

MR. SMITH: Thank you for having us.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we now have our morning break and let's be back at 11:15 please.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Welcome back from the morning break. Thank you again to the global access subcommittee for organizing this morning's panel presentations. Very useful to us. And I would now like to return to item 10 on the agenda with the outreach and engagement subcommittee.

So I turn it over to Commissioner Sinay and in her absence, Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair and colleagues. And Fredy will be part of the presentation
at -- kind of. There's a few things that we wanted to
kind of catch up and maybe get some input on.

The first was if we could just quickly go around and
do round-robin on -- around the regions and the regional
teams, and what's worked and what hasn't worked and
then -- and then we can have a conversation of how do we
want to continue using the regional teams. One of the --
I think in one of the questions that I want to keep
putting out there is are there regions that make sense to
split up or add. There's two that are in the back of my
mind.

So again, these are just -- they're -- these have
nothing to do with the maps that will eventually be
drawn. It's just been a way for us to organize ourselves
and start collecting information. And then one of the
questions that I have for Fredy is -- sorry, Director
Ceja, is how do we start getting information to Director
Ceja, especially of organizations, their addresses,
contact information, those things. You know, the whole
idea of capturing people is -- capturing that information
is really critical for -- for the next step, for some of
our steps.

And so after everybody kind of goes -- does their
round-robin, maybe then if, Fredy, you can kind of share
some thoughts on that. I know I'm just throwing that at
you, so I apologize. So hopefully -- so why don't we
start with Region 1.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. That's Commissioner
Le Mons and I.

So I have to admit, we got off to a really slow
start. We did reach out to the census -- the two
individuals and did not receive a response for -- I'm
going to say probably about a month and we did go back --
you know, I did send a -- we did send several requests.
But we actually finally made contact, which is great.

So what we started doing was, because Region 1 is
seventeen counties, actually started reaching out to the
counties. And Commissioner Le Mons and I had meetings
with three of those -- three of them on Monday. And we
are continuing to schedule more meetings but of course
realizing that with seventeen counties it can be a little
overwhelming.

But what we have found is that during the census,
they contracted with these various foundations. So I
think moving forward, that's going to be the key for us.
And I don't know if Commissioner Le Mons would also agree
with that. Because these foundations then were
responsible for the outreach effort, either for their
county or for various counties. So that's what I think
we're going to focus -- our attention will be on the
foundations because that's kind of where we're getting additional referrals to versus individual counties.

So again, that's only -- I think that was four counties that we made contact with, because one of them was for Sutter and Yuba so that was good.

But it's good information that they've been giving to us and forwarding to us. And I did like -- one of them said, you know, come out with a -- some sort of something quick -- I forget what they called it.

Commissioner Le Mons probably remembers. But anyway, so you know, like, to wear your shirt or something and a slogan. So he came up with, you know, something like be a voice for your community. I'm like, oh that sounds really good. So anyway, it has been helpful.

We could really get into detail in terms of all the information, but I think ultimately I guess what I also want to learn is what do I -- what do we do with this information. I guess we sent it -- we send it to Director Ceja? Is he -- and what format do we give it to him? Just so that -- because I just have, like, pages and pages of notes, but it's like, I'm not going to give you my notes because I can't even read my notes anymore.

So but anyway it has been a very interesting and eye-opening experience.

And Commissioner Le Mons, if you wanted to add.
VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I think you -- you covered it.
The only thing I would add is people were really 
receptive and wanting to help. And a couple of them said 
very directly that they didn't need any resources to 
help, that they are a very close community and they 
really want to be involved. And so that was really nice 
also. So I think that allows those resources to be used 
in other places that need them. So I thought that was a 
good takeaway.

I think people are very enthusiastic. And I think 
what it reinforced for me is -- and I'm sure as get more 
into this discussion, this will become clearer again -- 
is who are target really is. So yeah.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And I just want to add one 
more thing. As Commissioner Le Mons said, they are very 
receptive. And one of them -- I even said, so like, for 
resources? He's like, no, we're -- that's what we do. 
Don't worry about that piece of it. But they did -- one 
of the -- two of the counties said that if you want, you 
can send us the draft of whatever you're going to publish 
out there and we can review it for you.

You know, because they're basically -- keep it 
simple. Keep it simple so that easy to understand. So 
pretty much everything we've been hearing. So there are
so many more resources out there than -- that we know of or have called in. So it's just -- it was really heartwarming I guess at times. So thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you so much, Region 1.

Fredy, I'm just going to move on to region -- or well, go ahead. Sorry.

MR. CEJA: Just a point of clarification, so just as I get caught up with the work that we're doing here, nine regional teams and what we're building is a database of partners -- ten regional teams.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So I'll send you the information. We created ten regional teams. We basically use the census map that -- kind of how the census broke up the regions. And so that's why that -- you know, that was -- it was an easy way to start because of a lot of the census work already and there was some overlap, like we heard earlier today, that some of the folks who did census work starting talking about redistricting.

And we asked the teams -- people -- we created teams of two -- two commissioners, one who knows the region and one who doesn't, and we tried to mix it up with someone who you're not already on a subcommittee with as well as your political affiliation. And the first task was really to reach out to the census folks to -- either
the -- the staff person as well as the CBO, just those
two.

And through that, different teams have -- some
census ones were better than others. And so the question
after this initial conversation will be, okay, how do we
want to continue as teams, because I know a lot of you
are like, now what. And so we just wanted to do the
initial round-robin.

Anyone want to add anything?

I also wanted to say that Angela really -- I mean,
Commissioner Vazquez really wanted to be here, but she
was able to get an appointment she really needed, and so
she apologized. My apologies for not saying that sooner.
But she and I did go over all these aspects yesterday.

Region Number 2. Commissioner Toledo and
Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Good morning. I'm not sure if
Commissioner Toledo is on right now so I'll just go
ahead.

So after -- it took us several rounds to finally get
ahold of our census lead -- and excuse me that I don't
remember her name offhand. We were finally able to get
ahold of her and have a conference with her.

I think one of the most interesting things about our
conversation was again that need -- and it's been
reiterated to use these trusted partners. They had
established -- up north they had established a network of
the -- of the trusted partners that they used and were
successful with. And their recommendation was that we
follow again on that spider web that they outlaid.

So they were willing to share those trusted partners
with us that I guess in turn we'll give to Director Ceja.
And their advice was to follow along those lines.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: My apologies. For either
one -- either Region 1 or 2, are there any
recommendations on changing your regions, splitting your
regions? I know that Region 1 has seventeen counties.
So I just wanted to -- you know, just keep that in mind
to let us know.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: In our conversations, there
was -- there was not -- again, we're working through the
census lead and they felt that they had a modicum of
success, so they're like, let's use this -- use that
blueprint. So we -- we didn't get any feedback along
splitting -- splitting up those regions.

They did acknowledge that there are differences
between -- and Commissioner Toledo knows it better than I
do. They did explain that there are differences within
the community and you do have to mindful between tribal
lands, between rural and then the semi-urban. So they
were -- they did hit those points. But no one mentioned
that it needed to be split.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sounds great. Thank you.

Yes, Alicia. I mean, Commissioner Fernandez.

Sorry.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I would agree with
Commissioner Taylor. I think for right now, because we
finally made a contact with a census and individual and
we're going to meet with them soon -- I haven't had a
chance to get back to her yet -- I would like to hold off
on making the recommendation until I speak with them
first to see what that is, since I was kind of venturing
off on my own little journey and Le Mons was following me
and we're going together, so it was a great pairing.

But I would like to wait to see what they have to
offer. But again it is -- they did mention -- I mean,
seventeen counties. I mean, they're just so different
just like Commissioner Taylor's area as well. So I'll
hold off.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. Thank you.

Region Number 3 and that would be Commissioner
Toledo and Commissioner Yee. And I'll let -- leave it to
you, Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Sure. So this is the Bay Area.

And Commissioner Toledo took the northern counties and I
took the southern counties. Two takeaways for me.

One is in talking to these census outreach leaders, wow, it was just really humbling to be reminded of the blood, sweat, and tears that went into the census effort. And a lot of that is, you know, for us, for our work. You know, they did this us, to make our work successful. And so it was really a -- almost a rededicating kind of experience for me, to be reminded of, you know, the huge effort that has gone into the data that we will be using. And they're counting on us, you know, to make a good use of it. So that was very inspiring for me.

The other big takeaway was basically that, you know, you aim for the grass tops, the community-based organizations, you know, trusted messengers. So many different resources out there. Come with a specific, clear ask, and if at all possible, come with money. You know, and don't bring along unfunded requests because these folks are strained to the max, all the COVID work, so on. And so make a clear ask and bring resources to back up those asks.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: All right. I would echo that. That's what we heard as well. And one thing that -- that did -- that did resonate with me, one of the organizations of the county government basically said
they're going to be doing county redistricting, city redistricting, and then there's also going to be the statewide redistricting happening all around the same time.

And if there was a way to get those align a little bit better because the hard-to-reach populations are going to be asked to participate over and over again. It's going to be the same people over and over again. And they're just afraid that they might not -- there may not be the capacity or the -- you know, the interest or even the knowledge on -- on how the three kind of play together and come together.

And so how do we -- the thought process was how -- is there a way to bring all three, but there may not be, but that was just something that the county was -- county administrators office wanted us to think about and see if there's a way to -- especially for a smaller community you're depending on the same CBOs and same individ -- local organizations to try to engage these same people to come to different forums.

So if there was a way to -- to do joint forums, et cetera, et cetera. There may not be, but that was some of the process in thinking that came out of one of the meetings that I thought was interesting and maybe -- maybe not something that we can do this time around, but
something that we might want to think about in the future.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. I mean, it -- that has come up a lot. And so I'm writing down the big questions that are coming up that we can -- we can kind of discuss and then we don't lose them. And how do we -- do we take the lead on that before the statewide effort or -- it's great, valid point.

Region Number 4. Commissioner Turner. We never did confirm, but what I'm assuming that you were okay with our assignment.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Absolutely. It was assigned for me and Commissioner Andersen, and unfortunately I moved so quickly because I was excited to have a Region 4 that I kind of left Commissioner Andersen out of it.

But team, Region 4 CBOs were pulled together. We actually did and was granted the ACBO for Region 4. Some of my partners which included Pablo from Communities for a New California, Deep Singh which is the Jakara Movement, Cha Vang from Hmong Innovating Politics or HIP, and then Tomas Evangelista that does a lot of work in the foothills and has a radio station there, and then my organization Faith in the Valley.

And so the five of us came together for this CBO. So when I called them to tell them that this was our
assignment, rather than putting us off, they were like, yes, we pulled everybody on a call, let's do it right now. So we didn't have time to grab Commissioner Andersen.

So the team has been very clear. We intentionally pulled Region 4 together because we do similar work, year-round civic engagement, and we engage the community in a similar fashion. So we knew that we would be on the same page for all of our strategy, et cetera.

And what I want to say about that is that Region 4 sees census as a power-building strategy for racial equity and we engaged in that effort because of redistricting. So they see it all the way through as one issue, and so they're already working on redistricting and then trying to determine how they're going to again engage -- I'm going to spell the names of the five organizations.


So let's see, lessons. Some of the things they talked about. They are for sure excited about
participating, intend to be a part of redistricting. They're already working with common cause, trying to come up with -- looking for resources to be able to fund the work, definitely interested in any funding that will come this way.

Wanted to be real clear of the commission, what they asked me to go back with is to ask what would be specific measurable goals. What is this commission expecting them to do? So that as we do the work that we typically do, is it people turnout? Is it Zoom participation? Are you looking for a certain number of maps? So as we extend the RFPs if we're going to extend grants just to very detailed in what it is that we're wanting the community to do -- the organizations to do, I'm sorry.

Let's see. I took a lot of notes. Lessons learned from 2030. One of the things that came up is that they're hoping -- this is more so not so much for us, but maybe for our lessons learned team, that we are including redistricting at the moment we start talking about census so it doesn't look like it's just a heavy lift. We've educated about census and now we're coming right back with education about redistricting like it's a separate effort, as opposed to it being one long effort that we want to ensure, that we're talking to the community about.
Our -- Region 4, our census, we started covering census area early. So all of our areas was actually covered by October pre-COVID, so we were very successful in the effort because we went right out with canvassing, with phone banking, et cetera. So our tracks were all covered by October 5th, about five months ahead of time. And we still believe even with COVID we'll be doing the work through phones to make sure that impacted people still have a say, to make sure that we're ahead of the curve. I'm trying to see if there's anything else.

Bottom line, the whole discussion was just like, yes, let's move. This is what we do. We do want to be involved in redistricting and I think that's about it. They were excited, they're like, let's do it.

And there was no mention of needing to change. Tomas Evangelista, he does most of the work in the foothills, almost exclusively. A lot of our other organizations overlap in the areas that we cover, anywhere from Kern County all the way through San Joaquin County. And depending on whether it's the Jakara Movement or Hmong, they may have pieces in there, but all of those were heavily covered. And then Evangelista was the only one that does foothills.

And so we are aware of that and will need to put in some -- ensure that that area is covered at a -- at a --
I guess a bigger slice, because it was covered. We want to just ensure that there's more coverage in the foothills. But no mentioning of changing the district. We work well as partners and feel like that will still be moving forward with redistricting as well.

Vazquez and -- go ahead, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Region 5.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh, sorry, 5. I saw 5, but --
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: 5 is me and -- myself and Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Let's see, when I initially reached out to former Commissioner Aguirre and the census staff lead Patricia Vazquez-Topete, got a response right away. And we were trying to set something up but then, you know, the -- the central census -- state census organization put a halt to it. And ever since then, I did nothing. And so I've reached out several times and I have heard nothing back from either of them.

So I mean, that's where I'm at. I didn't -- I guess I should have thought to reach out directly to the counties, but I didn't. I was hoping to get some feedback and some ideas on how to move that forward, but I haven't heard anything.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: And it may be helpful -- and we can -- we can talk about -- you know, as we're thinking about next steps, is there's some strong community foundations in that area that might be able to help as well in thinking about it. So we can brainstorm on that offline.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. And then Region 6 --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- since Commissioner Vazquez isn't -- is not with us, she and I had a phone call with some folks from the Sierra Health Foundation who led the effort for that region. They were very enthusiastic to talk to us and enthusiastic to be engaged. They just got back to us a couple days ago with a list of the organizations that they work with in the -- in their region. So that's helpful.

And the messages are basically the same. They were enthusiastic. The message engaged the trusted partners to engage the -- the hard-to-reach communities, and B, have a specific a clear ask.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. Region 7?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Region 7 reached out initially to -- well, let me back up. We had a very good first meeting with -- and let me pull her up -- the Center for Social
Innovation at UC-Riverside who alerted us to the creation of a brand-new organization covering both counties called IE RISE. So I'll be following up with IE RISE to engage with them.

I'm also working on a cataloging project just so that eventually the 2030 Commission has a complete database of, you know, local governments, media, educational institutions -- both higher education and public schools -- community-based organizations, et cetera. So I'm working on that cataloging effort in parallel to these meetings.

When I reached out to the census, and I did wait until after the director of the California Complete Count spoke to us, I got a message back saying you might want to touch base with the individual county contacts. So I now I have those individual county contacts. I found an organization called the Center for Religion and Civic Culture at USC and so I -- I'll be speaking with them tomorrow to see if they have any interest in working with us.

My -- I've sent out a number of emails to San Bernardino County schools as one of the lead agencies for the civic engagement initiative. I have not yet heard back from them. I sent a note to -- I think it was the San Bernardino County clergymen's association. Haven't
heard back from them yet. So there are a number of those feelers out there that I'll have to follow up on. And the big one of course is IE RISE. So I'll be in touch with them.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And IE RISE, they were started by the organization that Linda had sent out to -- I'm sorry, Commissioner Akutagawa sent out to us earlier this week. And they are also one of the regionally funded groups, so they receive 75,000 from CPA to do this work. Thank you.

Anything you wanted to add, Commissioner Le Mons?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: No. Commissioner Kennedy covered it.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Great. Thank you both. Region 8.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Hello again. Region 8. So I jokingly say I had to stalk the census lead, Cecil Flournoy, who also happens to be a fellow Morehouse alumni. So it wasn't too bad since we went to school together. But we finally were able to -- to touch bases along with Commissioner Ahmad. I think we had a wonderful conversation. We were able to bring in some other leads and community partners, Sara Pol-Lim and Ebony Hamilton (ph.).

And again, the theme of trusted partners continues
throughout all of this, using those same networks. Having trusted partners within the community to touch those hard-to-reach -- hard-to-reach places. They discussed some of the novel approaches to -- to getting that community engagement. And again, I was fascinated by the census's -- the census' use of food drives, as an example, to spread out their message. So again, I think they took a very novel approach to -- to being effective.

As much as we know about Los Angeles, and it is so vast, you know, such an urban center, when we look at the census response, there are a lot of hard-to-reach communities within L.A. County. We think that -- we think that it is what it is, it's a metropolitan area, that it would simple, but civic engagement is an issue within the county. So we are reminded that we do have to be deliberate with our actions to get an effective response.

And I would even go so far as to say, especially as it relates to our conversation today, didn't even realize that L.A. County holds the largest percentage of Native Americans and Alaska Natives. So that just shows you how vast the county is, and that we're deliberate -- that you have to be deliberate with your outreach.

I will say -- and I'm happy that this is the case -- is that there's a wealth of resources in L.A. County.
And even, you know -- and I hope I wasn't biased in my vote of approval. We even -- our director of communications has ties to Los Angeles. So I know that -- and along with other commissioners. Several commissioners on -- several commissioners have ties. So I know that we have -- have the ability to be highly effective in this area.

Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you. So in addition to what Commissioner Taylor shared. So I'm not from L.A. County. So when I was assigned to this area for this initial outreach stuff, I pulled up a map of L.A. County and just stared at it for a good half an hour. I've heard of many of those cities, areas, but I never truly sat down and looked at it in the structure that we are working within.

So it was really great partnering with Commissioner Taylor and listening to the conversations with the census folks who have been doing the work on the ground. And I think we caught them right before, you know, they were going on their well-deserved breaks from census work. So that was great timing for us coincidentally.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Great. Since --

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Lastly, I -- lastly, I'll share, you know, just a little bit a levity.
Commissioner Fernandez, I think I ate in almost every city in L.A. County.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: That's awesome. But since L.A. County is so big and it is so diverse -- I don't know if the L.A. team knows, but I also grew up in L.A. but I grew up in the South Bay Area. So -- which is totally -- and then I went to UCLA, so I know the west side of L.A. You know, we all have different parts.

Does -- and does it make -- have you thought about -- is that a reason or one of them that we should think about how to bring in, you know, more support?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I look at -- I look at more as in -- in the context of the whole state. We all have -- we all have areas that we're responsible for. So I mean, I almost feel like the wealth of the resources that are available to Region 8 can sort of compensate for -- for the fact that it is a vast area. So the network here is immense.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Right.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: So I feel that we can be effective if -- if -- and it's not like we all wouldn't lend a hand --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Right.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: -- if there was a area that's lacking. So I think we were to see a need, we could
reach out and fulfill it. But I wouldn't -- I don't necessarily know if we need to assign a third commissioner to it or anything. I think we picked up the needs as we see fit.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: The only one I want to -- I know from working with the veterans community, is that Long Beach is -- Long Beach is the center of services for the Orange County -- for Orange County versus L.A. And a lot of times Long Beach is kind of torn between the two. So I just wanted to -- just to put that out there.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No argument that that made sense to attach Long Beach to Orange County. Or we can work that in conjunction.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. Region 9, Orange County.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, so we had -- I will say that it sounds like I have some more work to do because some of the others have done more extensive conversations, but Commissioner Sadhwani and I did have a chance to -- using the census documents we did have a chance to speak to the census lead, Sara Pol-Lim, that Commissioner Taylor and Commissioner Ahmad also spoke to. We also had a chance to speak to the census government liaison and the ACBO, the administrative community-based organization. There was one person that
I just never heard back from but to be honest, we were running up against, like, the holidays and I just didn't follow up. But we had fabulous conversations with the other three.

And that is leading to additional conversations that we're going to be having next week. We've been invited to come back and speak with a group of Orange County based CBOs that our ACBO, the administrative community-based organization for the census invited us to come and have a conversation and join on a -- actually I take that back. It's all with all the CBOs yet, it is her and one of her colleagues, and then we'll be presenting to the group of CBOs.

But I think just -- just to start, would just say that I think there's -- one of the interesting things is that in talking to the three different people that we spoke with, we got some very different kind of perspectives. I think in terms of speaking with the census lead, she -- she reiterated a lot of the similar things that the other commissioners heard in other regions, specifically around one -- some of the harder to reach communities.

She did say that personal outreach is needed. She says there's going to be need to craft and educate -- craft appropriate messages to educate the different
communities. She says that there are -- in Orange County, there's a lot of underserved communities facing a lot of inequality which is very, very true.

I think I will just say that as a resident of Orange County, I do get extremely annoyed when most people -- it's kind of like, you know, when Beverly Hills -- you know, the whole everybody thinks L.A. is like Beverly Hills, Baywatch, you know, and everybody walks around wearing red bathing suits.

I get really annoyed when everybody just thinks that Orange County is the OC. One, I hate when people say the OC because we are not the OC, we are just Orange County. Secondly, I also dislike when people just stereotype us into a very narrow point of view of what this community looks like. It is extremely diverse. And you know, that's what we heard from Sara. She said one of the things -- and I heard this from the other commissioners who spoke with their contacts -- we need to put things into concrete terms. What are the benefits of adequate or better representation?

One thing that I want to note that she said that I thought was interesting is that in Orange County, like I said, it's very diverse and yet there are some very large pockets of very -- I'll say population-wise very well represented communities. And with that, one of the
things she commented is that certain communities may not
be looking at redistricting as seriously or as an
important kind of issue that they have to be really
overly concerned about because they feel like we have the
numbers, we have representation, it's not something that
we have to be super, hyper concerned about.

But yet in other communities, especially smaller
communities, they're starting to realize that there is a
need to -- to be involved in, be engaged and to
understand redistricting. And interestingly, she did
bring up Long Beach because in Long Beach they have the
largest Cambodian community and she says they're only
just now starting to realize the importance of it.

And of course because it borders Orange County, Long
Beach -- I would also say, like, Cerritos, Cypress, you
know, which has also a very diverse -- Artesia, which has
a South Asian, Filipino, Korean, Chinese communities,
particularly in fairly significant numbers in those
particular areas. It borders Orange County so
sometimes -- you know, technically, it's L.A. County, but
sometimes I think people mistake it for being Orange
County.

But anyway, she was just saying that some of these
communities that are now just starting to really grow up
in terms of their size, she says they're starting to just
now understand. She did mention that there are some --
she said that there are some interesting reports. She
says California Complete Count, she says developed the
statewide report.

One of the contacts that we spoke about that I'll
mention, the Charitable Ventures Orange County, she said
that they have some great -- they did some great data
management and they have a report to help us understand
some of the nuances in -- in Orange County.

And so on that note, I do want to mention that we
did -- Sara and I -- Commissioner Sadhwani and I had some
very interesting conversations with the government
contact. And he was just saying that -- his advice to us
is, one, they're willing -- he's willing to help. He
says if he doesn't know somebody, he will know somebody
who knows somebody.

One of the interesting things that he mentioned --
or he emphasized to us is to look at the school
districts. He says they will be our best friends. They
know the community the best. He says they will be able
to help explain the differences between the cities and
the nuances because they are the ones that -- that work
directly with the different community members.

He also says that the city representatives are also
good sources of information in terms of really
understanding the nuances. And again, he offered to help connect us, you know, when we're ready for more deeper engagement.

He also mentioned that -- he made this comment. He did say that a lot of nonprofits usually kind of have this kind of way of wanting to do stuff, which is -- when he said it, I totally understood. He said, you know, nonprofits, like, set up a table somewhere and just pass out information. He says during COVID, you couldn't do that. He says what worked best in the region is canvassing and phone banking.

They went to events where there were, like, COVID events, anything that drew crowds, he said, was -- for other reasons were good places where they were able to get the word out about census. And he just suggested that we think about that in the same way for redistricting. Go to the places where people will already be gathering. He says, you know, not a lot of people are going to come to, like, a redistricting town hall.

And then he just says, they also employed a strong social media presence. He says that they had passive posts, but they also took out advertisements. He says that they had other impressions that were active. So I think those are ones in which people were actually
posting. He says it would be worth the time to canvas areas to test where we're considering drawing a map.

He says, talk to people who represent in the area, ask -- ask them who should or shouldn't be a part of their district. He says, they have a good idea who -- you know, and I think he was talking mostly about the city representatives. He says, they have a good idea of who they represent and who they don't represent or who they shouldn't represent.

Another interesting thing he mentioned was food distributors, because in a lot of communities with the hard-to-reach communities, he says the food distributors will know where the biggest needs are and understanding that we can be mindful of when -- how we should be putting -- or ensuring that they're going to be put into the right districts where their needs will not be overshadowed by other areas where it would be, let's say, much more affluent. In a place like Orange County, for example, if you were to break up parts of Santa Ana, Garden Grove, and Anaheim and you put them in with places like Costa Mesa, Newport Beach, or then Huntington Beach then to one area or somewhere else, then those needs are going -- the needs of some of the harder to reach communities will be overshadowed.

He also mentioned family resource centers as also
being really good places because he says they're essentially the community resource centers. It's where families go to get help without knowing where to go to get help. So they usually turn to these resources. So these are also places where we should -- he was suggesting that we should look at partnering with them.

The last one I want to just mention is Charitable Ventures Orange County. She was very fantastic. She's the one that will -- Commissioner Sadhwani and I will be talking with further with her and her colleague to talk more about the various CBOs - community-based organizations -- in Orange County that we can be working with. They were the ones that coordinated a lot of the work in the region and really just a fountain of information.

She did mention that they started the Orange County census table and they currently have 453 unique members. She said originally they started with fifteen but they grew it. It's primarily nonprofits. But she says it's also grown to include the cities, the agencies, higher education institutions, clinics, local businesses, philanthropy. She says they took as broad of a coalition of people who would be -- who would be -- who would have stakes and interest in this. And they were the ones that were the funded partners that then gave money out to
eleven other funding partners. And she definitely
reiterated the trusted messenger message, as well, too.
They were also the ones that partnered to help ensure
that translation services were also provided, as well,
too.

And so the last thing I would also mention is that
as a result of her, she connected me with Census Legacies
initiative, which is out of UC Riverside that was just
mentioned. I did send out the link to the staff to then
share with the rest of the commissioners. I did send it
directly to Commissioner Sinay because I thought it would
be good for her to know. I'm only mentioning them to
everybody else because they are the collection of all of
the statewide census, I guess, contacts. They don't want
to lose all of the work that was done over the last
several years.

So all of the people statewide who worked on census
efforts are all coming together to share and retain and
to think about how to ensure that what was collected
doesn't get lost. It is also part of a national effort
as well, too. So in case for each of your regions,
you're interested in also understanding, you know, what
you might be able to learn from people affiliated with
the Census Legacies initiative, it may be, you know -- it
may be useful for you to find out, you know, who else you
could connect through them to people within your regions.

And so I'm sorry, I kind of like popped --

Commissioner Sadhwani, I'm going to turn this over to you, because I think you can definitely add, you know, much more detail as well, too, so.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No, I think you were really comprehensive. I'll leave it at that. You know, we've had some great conversations. I'm looking forward to the additional outreach. Just to underscore that point about Long Beach that was raised. You know, Long Beach is a city approximately the same size as Atlanta right here in Los Angeles County. And so I definitely appreciate Commissioner Sinay bringing that up. I would be happy to coordinate with the LA County team wherever it makes sense to do so to make sure that we do adequate outreach to Long Beach. I have a number of colleagues and contacts there.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. And I would offer myself for LA. My office is in LA and I have a lot of -- obviously a lot of contacts because of it in LA and I grew up on the east side. And trips to the west side were not often. It's a long drive. So if you need east-side representation, then I'm happy to help out on that, too.

COMMISSIONER SIDHWANI: Thank you. And you know,
it's too bad, Commissioner Akutagawa, that you didn't get
more phone calls, you know, because you've got no
information for us.

I wanted to go to Region Ten -- last but not least.
Would you like to represent Region 10, Commissioner
Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I can start and then I'll leave
you space to add. So we met with Connie Hernandez from
the Census Office and Michelle Silverthorn. Well,
Commissioner Sinay met with Michelle. So a lot of the
same themes came up. So organizing with a purpose,
engaging with trusted leaders from the community.

Specific to Region 10, there was a conversation
about hard-to-reach communities within that region. And
it was named -- so non-English communities, refugee
communities, children, renters, seniors, people with
disabilities, low broadband, and then also language-
access communities. As communities, we should be
prioritizing in terms of our hard-to-reach efforts.

There was talk about contracting and organizing and
partnering at the local level as an avenue to reach these
communities. So with folks who are leaders within that
general area.

We had conversations about the federally recognized
tribes in the area, as well. So it was a great
supplement to -- the presentation today was a great
supplement to our conversation earlier regarding that.

There's talks and, maybe Commissioner Sinay you can
add more on this area in terms, of the contracting,
specifically for the census outreach and the process that
took. And what, kind of -- what we should be aware of as
we embark on our own potential journey of contracting
with community organizations.

Commissioner Sinay, would you like to add?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sure. I think the biggest
piece on the contracting is just the reason why we really
are saying let's do grants versus contracts. They were
hoping to do grants and it turned out -- it turned into a
huge bureaucracy. And I think when the director spoke to
us, she kind of explained that. But at the same time, I
think that most groups, most regions -- well, I'll just
speak for San Diego and Imperial. They really appreciate
working together, the government -- the census contact
person working with the CBO -- that it really created
that -- a good partnership. And I think -- we haven't
met with a lot of other groups. And that's mainly my
fault because I had -- well, both I knew Commissioner
Ahmad was busy with a lot of the research that they were
doing and we were busy with our subcommittee work.

But it -- I think the one piece that we'll
constantly need to think through -- San Diego is unique because it's a border with Mexico, which is -- there's a lot of border. Of course, we've got borders all around, but the border with Mexico makes the southern part of San Diego very different than the northern part of San Diego. Just like Commissioner Akutagawa, I always got annoyed when people thought of San Diego as beautiful beaches, beautiful people, and I was like, no, what makes us beautiful is our diversity and our inclusion.

And that's where, you know, in Imperial County it's very different than San Diego County, even at the border. And so it's just understanding that those two, you know, kind of those counties and how they interact. So that would be helpful.

And I also will -- what I wanted to do, one of the thoughts that Commissioner -- one of the reasons we did this was we wanted to quickly connect with the census folks before they left, if they were leaving, and get whatever we could. But also, this was the team approach. The regional team approach was used by the commission in 2010. And it seemed to work well for, kind of, having a team that is focused and, kind of, shepherding that region, right, and making sure that we're -- that building those relationships and thinking through where to do outreach. And it's not that you all need to do
work, but it was also we're going to be listening to a lot of people. And so one of the things that the 2010 Commission found helpful was if you had to listen especially careful to your region, you know, to have two people that were being those eyes and ears for that region, they found that helpful.

And so I wanted to put it out to ask you all do you -- are you enjoying having these, you know -- having a region that you're, kind of, assigned to? A lot of you kept talking as if you've started taking some ownership, which is great. But I didn't want to make that assumption. And then I know the next question is so what else do we need to do? But let me ask that first question. Thumbs up, thumbs down. Are you feeling good being on a region team? Some are saying yes. Some are saying no. Okay. So those that didn't put a thumb up or thumb down, why don't you share?

Alicia, go ahead. I mean, Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I have to do a little shout out first. A shout out is a term that we used in the '90s in case you (indiscernible). Sorry I had to say that too because everybody mentioned their foundations. I feel deficient if I don't mention the foundation that Commissioner Le Mons and I spoke to. We spoke with Bill Robbie (ph.) from the El Dorado Community Foundation
and he was absolutely wonderful. He was the one that said you don't need resources, just tell us what the message is. Also, Brenda Stranicks (ph.), she's the president of the Southern Economic Development Corporation and she was the one that offered to review our draft of any material. And then I also met with Frank Pisi, who is the Director of History Science with the Sacramento County Office of Education. And I had mentioned that previously that we did talk to him and that was very helpful because again, I'm trying to remember who brought up the school districts, but they do touch so many people. And I do know -- not necessarily the school district, but then they send information to the schools themselves. And the schools do know their community. So it was a quick, easy way to get the message out. But anyway, aside from that, in terms of why I raised my hand --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Wait. Before you go there, isn't he the one that worked with the census to create the curriculum that was spread throughout? Okay. I thought that name sounded familiar.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. And I asked (indiscernible) about what about adding redistricting because I also used to work for the California Department of Education. So I'm familiar with the whole curriculum
piece and how -- what it takes to get curriculum. And he said they didn't go through that. They were able to get the curriculum out a different way, which is fine because you don't want to go through the whole bureaucracy of going through the State Board of Education. I hope they're not listening.

Yes, and I did mention redistricting. He was open to that conversation in terms of if at some point we want to get some sort of language in the curriculum. So that could be maybe a lessons-learned piece because it's obviously too late for us now, but it would be good if we could get that in there when it comes around in ten years.

And the reason I didn't raise my hand in terms of I actually am liking this. I think I just felt a little overwhelmed. And I don't know if Commissioner Le Mons felt the same way. When I started sending to the counties, and I've got seventeen counties, they responded -- like, six of them responded right away. And I felt like the pressure of oh, now I've got to, you know, talk to all -- set up interviews and all that, which I think will be fine. I think in that couple of weeks I'll be in a better position, have more time to dedicate to it. I do like it. I enjoy it. I think I just have to catch up to it if that makes sense.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: It definitely does. Others?
Yes, Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I mean, I liked it for the opportunity to work with all the commissioners on a task. I think it fills in some of that space that doesn't exist for us because of Zoom. So I think that aspect of it and this particular structure of communication is, kind of, handcuffed in general. So I think having that just freedom to riff with another person. So I think that part of it is very enjoyable.

In terms of the reason I didn't raise my hand is because I think this fits into a bigger picture and I'm more interested in seeing how it fits into the bigger picture. And this was, I thought, a very specific task to do some initial -- as you described earlier. And so that's been done. So where do we -- to the degree that it could be done, right. So where do we go from here and how that plugs in? And that may be the same configuration. It may look different. But I think what our next step should be tied to a very specific outreach plan.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So thank you for bringing that up. And our thought on the next step is when you look at the plan that -- the roadmap because it's not a plan because we're waiting for staff to create the plan.
Which reminds me, one of the things that Commissioner Vasquez and I wanted to, kind of, share is that, you know, we started all this thinking we would have had more staff support by mid-November at the latest. And now, you know -- so we've been moving forward and we're excited to have Director Ceja. But we keep, like -- we can run with a lot of this stuff but we also have our day jobs and then we -- so we apologize if we haven't been as far ahead as everybody hoped or if we've gone too far ahead. But just wanted to make sure that we shared that that's been, kind of, one of our biggest challenges.

The thought on what the next step is for us as commissioners is we've got the -- we discussed in the roadmap to look at January and mid-February as our time to go out there and just, kind of, do the Redistricting 101. I keep calling it that -- an overview of redistricting. And answering those critical questions that folks have of what is redistricting? Why is it important? And how do you -- what actions can you take?

And we're really looking at Director Ceja just create the short deck that we would use of a few slides, no longer than fifteen minutes. And where we all could be helpful is to connect with some of the groups that we've already connected to to our own network. So in some cases, this isn't -- Commissioner Le Mons, you're
part of two regional teams that's not Los Angeles, but
you have a network in Los Angeles, as well. And so we
definitely take that as an example.

And so it's who could we start doing those overviews
so that we start getting a buzz about redistricting and
answering people's questions, especially in -- people are
looking for speakers during Zoom. And so I'm just going
to -- some of the thoughts that I had just based on my
experience -- and some of them -- some of the
organizations we may be the appropriate person or someone
on the region team might be the appropriate person or it
might be someone else. So it might be statewide entities
or it might be local entities. And I'll stop there
because I see Commissioner Le Mons and Commissioner
Sadhwani.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Yeah. So I think this is, kind
of, what I'm talking about. I was thinking that we're
moving next to a process to craft a plan or we present at
something and I think we can plug in. I think we should
all contribute to how we plug in. And I feel like it's
sort of been piecemealed out to us or spoon fed to us in
a way. Like, you have a whole idea in your mind about
how it's going to work. And I just feel like we don't
really get to be a part of that conversation collectively
and I think we should.
And so I don't know if I'm mishearing but I'm still just -- what is our process for getting to what our plan is going to be and then how we plug into it, I think can vary. It could be more organic. It could be any number of things. But I just feel like there's no real opportunity to do that or at least it hasn't been yet in my mind.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We apologize for that. We thought that when we shared the road map and it had the different stages and we, kind of, said, well, you know, we can't go in much detail. And we said we would come back next meeting with -- well, staff would come back next meeting with a plan, but we still don't have the director. And so we're like, okay, well, can we at least come back with a plan through February for that first stage of the four stages that were in the roadmap.

Having said that, part of it also is if we want to get out there and do presentations and stuff, we have to do it now just because the holidays are coming and everyone's filling up their calendars. And so it's kind of this balancing game. But we apologize. We felt that, you know, it's -- that we've shared that a couple of times and that we had gotten feedback. And so we're open to any thoughts.

Go ahead, Commissioner Sadhwani.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Commissioner Le Mons wanted to respond. So if you want to respond and then I can.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Yeah, I don't -- I'm failing at communicating what I'm trying to communicate. I'm not suggesting that there isn't a road map. I'm not suggesting that we don't have to get out there.

We don't have the tools. We haven't talked about the tools. Are we just leaving that to staff to develop the tools? A lot of the people that we talk to ask for input. Is there going to be an opportunity for them to give us input to the tools? Or are we just going to show up with what we have? I'm talking about those kind of brass tacks things.

I'm not confused about us giving presentations, the importance of giving them, or any of that. That's not what I'm talking about. I'm talking about the actual tangibles. Yesterday I asked multiple times, what are we asking for? Like, we still had not even had a discussion about what are we specifically? Because I think it would be a missed opportunity to go out and talk to these groups about what redistricting is without a very clear and decisive ask.

And I know how long it takes us to get to things. So if we're not even clarifying that right now and we're talking about who's speaking, I think who's speaking is
not our issue. What are we speaking about is much more important in my mind, because there's fourteen of us. We'll figure out who does the presentation. That's what I'm really -- I hope that's a little clearer to what I'm trying to say.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. And to that end, I'll be honest. A lot of that we were putting on Director Ceja as the expert that we hired.

So Director Ceja, do you want to speak a little to that?

DIRECTOR CEJA: Yeah. So part of the process when I was brought in was to figure out what is this grant-making structure going to look like? And so we've been having conversations offline with several partners, one being Grantmakers in southern, central, and northern California, other groups being community foundation partners, and then two university partners, one being UCR, which have had been mentioned several times by different groups, and USC.

So what we're trying to do right now is quantify for the commission a series of questions. We're having one-on-one conversations with each of these groups and we're gauging them to see what their experiences with grantmaking, what their capacity is to help us do grantmaking, what they would be able to -- would they be
able to have money out in the community by March 2021
following the deadlines that we have in this plan. What
would they charge the Commission to establish these
grants? What would be the strengths of partnering with
this particular organization or this group? What would
be the weaknesses? And how would it be perceived by the
public?

And so this is a larger conversation that we're
having before we present to the commission and have the
larger conversation if we're going to do grantmaking
internally or if we're going to contract it out to
external bodies. So I think that's a conversation that
still needs to happen before we start having further
conversations with community groups. Because I love that
throughout this conversation, some groups in the
community are saying, hey, we're ready to help out. Just
tell us what you want us to say or give us some
messaging. And other community groups are like, well,
don't come at us if you don't have any funds or any money
for us to do the work.

And I think what the public needs to understand
really is that this is not census. We don't have the
budget the census did. Census had, like, a $46 million
budget. We have a $2 million budget we're talking about.
It's higher? Okay. They had a much higher budget then.
But we're talking about apples and oranges, right?

So first, we need to -- when we have these conversations with community groups, let them know what our intentions are, like you're saying, Commissioner Le Mons, what we're expecting of them, the resources that we actually have, which is not a lot. And then continue having conversations as this process evolves, not just with outreach teams, but we're also going to be tapping into these organizations for messaging. How do we message to your particular communities? How do we take collateral materials and give them to you so that you can alter them and reach your communities in a culturally and linguistic-appropriate way?

So I think having the conversation that we had yesterday about a lot of the communities were starting to integrate. I think this is a perfect time to have those conversations because these same groups that we're talking to for outreach, we're going to be talking to about other issues regarding the commission.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And one of the things, just to add to what you were saying, Director Ceja, one of the things that we need clarity on is there have been ten groups who have been funded for redistricting and really understanding the work that they've been funded for and what they're doing around redistricting. What are the --
and so that would be an opportunity for them to share their materials and share some of the talking points.

And so Director Ceja, is, you know, we asked, you know, is it possible for him to start bringing together those groups and having those conversations and collecting that information and creating? What are the -- you know, we need to start creating some of the drafts of the information -- of the talking points and such. And I see -- I do see Commissioner Sidhwani, Commissioner Turner, and Commissioner Akutagawa. But I don't want to move ahead without going back to Commissioner Le Mons.

Do you see us as a commission having those conversations about talking points or letting -- or staff starting, you know, creating a draft and then -- and working around that?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: That's directed to me?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to close the loop, just make sure that we were doing okay by our assumption.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I feel like I appreciate all the information that Director Ceja just shared. It is absolutely not the answer to my question at all. That's something completely different. The grant process I understand what we're trying to do there.
We, as the commission, have to give some direction on what it is that we want. Right. That's the first thing. What do we want? What are we expecting the community to do? That fundamental question has -- maybe it is assumed, I don't know. But we have not defined that very fundamental question which everything else springs from. So I think it's a very critical -- and I'm just asking us to pump the brakes and do those steps because that's so important. Everything else will flow from it.

But they can't go off and make talking points. Talking points about what? What do we want to hear from the community specifically? How do we -- I don't need to reiterate all of that. I think it's getting a little more crystallized what I'm asking.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, and I agree. And I get and part has -- that's been complicated in even presenting that is we're not sure what the community's already -- what the gaps are, but I guess that doesn't have to define what we need.

Let me go ahead and go to Commissioner Sidhwani.

COMMISSIONER SIDHWANI: Yeah. I think just on this point, I think the next thing that we're scheduled to talk about and I'm hoping we still have time to talk about it is the line drawer RFP, and not to go into the
details of that, but these questions that Commissioner Le Mons is asking, I completely agree with that because we can't really put together a good RFP until we have some of this clarity.

Like, what's the number of meetings we're going to have? When are we going to start doing them? What are they going to look like? Right. Like, we need that level of specificity to move that forward. And the RFP is going to take a while, right? Just like the whole state budgeting process. So the sooner we can -- I'm hoping we can actually answer some of them today. And I recognize that even in answering them, it makes it kind of a clumsy process. Right. Like we are still flying the ship while we're building it. But you know, some of these things and I hear it like we were waiting for staff and, you know, they're coming. I'm so excited -- but we have to start putting a little bit more shape on this so that we can get some of these pieces out the door. As we talked about -- I don't even know -- the days are all a mess to me -- yesterday, I think, you know, our vision of this work was, like, pre-census meetings, post-census meetings, and that actually those education meetings would include capturing testimony from the communities. And as the conversation yesterday also put into laser focus for us, what kind of testimony, what
is that realistically going to look like? Is every piece
of testimony ultimately going to be a shapefile, the
narrative, et cetera? So I think all of those pieces we
really need to hone in on and come to -- start coming to
some -- start crystallizing.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. And just for
clarification, the first -- the January one, we're
looking -- what Commissioner Vazquez and I were looking
at was the five-touch model. And so even though the
community groups will do a lot of the touches, it's just
that initial getting the word out without talking about
the -- just saying the tools coming going in. But I hear
what you're all saying, so we may need to shift.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yep. Thank you so much. I
was wondering when the question continues to be asked, I
just wanted to try on what I would say -- I would be
telling the community so that we can say that's still not
what's being asked if it's more to it or not. Because
I'm thinking, why aren't we answering the question? Why
are we still having conversation about what we're going
to do something? And I'm probably oversimplifying it and
missing a piece.

I just wanted to try it on out loud so I can get on
the same page because I'm thinking we would go to the
community members basically telling them, of course, that we are the redistricting commission. We're in the process of drawing the new congressional lines, state legislative district, et cetera. In order to be able to draw the district maps and explain that we have to do that with equal population, can't discriminate, give some more of the bullet points about VRA, and say, therefore, because of that, we also are coming to you to ensure that our end product is exactly -- is something that would represent your interests. We would like to hear from you and currently what is your -- currently what is your community? Because that will be the basis of how we'll begin to build these other piece parts.

And so if we go to them saying something like that, then their response -- and so is it that kind of thing that we're looking to ask or is it more? I guess I'm asking to all the commissioners because that's what I'm thinking we're going to ask them in probably a lot more concrete manner. But that's where my thought is.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry, I keep doing the opposite. Before I go to -- I see you, Commissioner Anderson. Before I go to Commissioner Akutagawa, does anyone want to -- let's respond to Commissioner Turner -- give Commissioner Turner feedback and lunch is at 12:45.

Commissioner Taylor?
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes. And I hope this is again starting to answer the question. You know, as we've been informed over these past months, we received a lot of information. But it seems that we're trying to reach out to the community. We're trying to get their input in geographic terms that we can translate to a GIS map of some sort -- a shape map. That ultimately seems to be what we're trying to glean from the community in different manners and different methods of input. But we're trying to get their input as it relates to a geography so that we can assess and amass all that information. So that ultimately seems to be what we're trying to get out. At least that's what I'm getting. If someone else can inform me different.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So let me ask, you know, our initial thought was that we needed to do some just preliminary outreach just so folks knew what redistricting was before we went into the deep asking about your community because that was one of the pieces missing last time. And a lot of the -- a lot of the communities didn't understand redistricting and they didn't want to hear about redistricting. They just wanted to give their input at the meetings. And so am I hearing that maybe we don't need that aspect?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Wouldn't that be a part of --
wouldn't that be a part of what we're trying to do?
That's the lead to being able to get that answer?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I definitely hear you. And
maybe Director Claypool can answer, but my understanding
was that last time when people did -- when people had the
hearings -- and we're not doing hearings, so maybe
because we're going to blow up, kind of, a hearing idea,
they were anxious to give their input and weren't as
interested to hear the bigger picture and I may be
misinterpreting.

Yes, Director Claypool?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So last time, most of the people
that came to the public hearings didn't have the bigger
picture. They just understood that redistricting was
occurring and that it could affect their lives in some
way. And so they would come and they would want to talk
to the commission about the things that they needed and
so forth. So a lot of times you would just hear we need
better representation in Arvin because our representative
just ignores us and so forth.

When I was -- when we were talking about this
possibility and what you were going to do as you move
forward, I thought of this initial period in January,
February, March as the funnel -- the again moving people
to you, getting them to understand what you do -- very
similar to what Commissioner Turner said -- that educational piece, that this is how it affects you. The money that you get to your communities and stuff is directly affected by this redistricting effort. And then trying to start that conversation with them early about what their communities of interest were so that when we moved into the second phase, when you actually have the census data, that they would -- these individuals would be better informed to come and have this conversation rather than the way it was with the first commission where they had to almost instantaneously be informed at that moment and try to structure what they were going to try to provide.

So I was under the impression, as we move forward in this first phase, that we were going to do what Commissioner Turner said, get this explanation out and then at the same time, start gathering in that community of interest testimony that Commissioner Anderson has talked about that, you know, well, here's my community and start informing us and that way always with the funnel headed towards those final maps. So that's what we did in 2010 and that's how I think you can improve on that process and that's what I thought we were doing.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: All right. I will confess
I'm a little frustrated right now. So here's what I think I'm hearing or maybe this is maybe more what I am looking for. One, I understand what you're saying about waiting for the staff, but yet I think to Commissioner Le Mons's point, I think we're giving direction and I think we're talking about grants, talking about what we're going to do in terms of, like, how we're going to speak to people. I think that's getting into the weeds. I think we haven't even built the larger framework right now.

And I think that's where -- if we have that larger framework, I think then we can direct the staff to help us build those talking points. And we'll obviously, you know, massage them to fit the way we're all going to talk and to the audience that we'll be presenting to. So I think that's what I'm looking for is even if it's just the larger framework of a plan, I don't think we should just continue to say we're going to wait for staff.

I think now that Mr. Ceja is on, I think we'll obviously work with him. But I still think that this is where the fourteen of us -- I mean, frankly, I think this is just the way we're all working anyways. We're going to want to be involved. We're going to want to have a say. I mean, just yesterday's conversation alone already spoke to that. But I think it was a really useful
conversation. But I think what I'm hearing is that as much as we're trying to rush, trying to get those decisions made this time around, what struck me is that we may not have all of the answers or the information to get to the answers in this meeting.

And what I'm proposing is a couple things. One is I think what we need to be discussing is what are the other questions that need to be answered to get us to this broader plan? Because it seems like in dribbles and drabs these questions come out. I think we need to be having a larger conversation amongst all of us about what are all of the (indiscernible) questions that we need to be asking and that we need to be considering.

And then on top of that, I think what we should do is to say, okay, who is going to be responsible for getting at least some semblance of basic information so that we can all make an informed decision the next time we meet two weeks from now?

So after yesterday's conversation, one of the things that I did is I reached out to Commissioner Fernandez and I said, you know, it's sounding like some of this is going to intersect between the Language Access Subcommittee and the Outreach and Education Engagement Subcommittee. You know, we should have a conversation.

I talked to Mr. Ceja last night also, and I
thought -- he also mentioned something and we talked
about the intersections starting to converge. And I
think we need to have some of these more larger
conversations so that we can then have a more educated
conversation based on answers that we're prepared to give
to the rest of the commission so that the rest of the
commission, all of us together, can make some more
informed decisions.

But right now, I feel like we're just, kind of,
skirting around certain things. I mean, you know, as
much as I'm interested in the grants, to me right now,
that is a detail right now that we're -- that's nice, but
how does this fit into the bigger picture? And I don't
think we have that bigger picture because right now what
I'm concerned about is okay, so we're going to go out and
make presentations. We're going to talk to different
people. But do they even know that we're open to doing
that right now? Or is it just, kind of, like, ad hoc as
it comes along, as it comes up in our meetings that we're
doing? That's what I'm feeling like right now.

And even if we were to do it, we have no materials,
so we can't even just say, like, okay, let's get
materials. Let's start letting people know that we're
open to these presentations by January. You know, we
want to start, like, you know, whether it's us reaching
out or others reaching out to us. Let's get some of these education meetings going so at least it's something. And then, you know, at the very least, you know, have a broader framework. I think that's what I'm looking for. And sorry, like I said, I was a little frustrated, so I needed to get it all out, so.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. And Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Okay. I realize we have five minutes. I think we should make our framework now. We're discussing and then we want to talk and we want to bring it back. I think we all have a good idea and let's rough out that framework now and then assign the pieces. Because we already, kind of, have a good idea who is working on the pieces.

And Commissioner Sinay, you're talking about your five touch. I think we might have -- can only do three if possible, because I'd like to touch -- I'd like to connect the touches to numbers of meetings. And what are the -- what is the number one thing, I believe, in our first touch -- if we could do three touches, that would be pre-census. It's with our message and we need to have who is writing up the message and the message being what is redistricting. How is your -- how is your community affected by a redistricting line drawn through it? Think
and -- because we're talking about geography.

And then here's a way -- maybe the second touch if we could. Again, pre-census -- by that pre-census time frame, these are methods you can contact us to tell us geographically where you are. And these are ways we would like to have that information come in so that we can easily access it. We'll try to do our best on everything else, but we know we can grab these.

And then post-census, that's the big -- everyone once they have all these pieces, they've tried to send in as much as they possibly can and we've gathered all the other items, put it all together, and then we're having another whole chunk of meetings with everybody. So there's, you know -- we need to say what meetings are happening in this part? What meetings are happening in that part? Guess at it. We should all do that, kind of, I think, you know, if we need a little bit of time to, kind of, rough that out or get a chalkboard or something like that, this is what we need to do, I believe, you know, today because -- and then we know, okay, who is going to do the message? Who is actually going to write that together? As Commissioner Le Mons said, we absolutely know we can assign people to do the different -- who'd like to speak.

And this is not to belittle any of the other items.
They are all very, very, very important. But how they
fit together we need to work out and I think we can do
that. I don't think we need to wait and have all those
pieces really defined. We just need to get a framework
going. And I think we can use, kind of, like, the Gantt
chart and, kind of, like, the outreach chart and the plan
that Commissioner Sadhwani and I put together just the
other day. I think those all are -- we're all attempting
to do the same thing. Let's just do it. And I know that
means it's after lunch, but.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We have two minutes till lunch.

And I did see that Commissioner Le Mons put more
exclamation point in the chat box. So I did want to
bring it back to the group. And that was, I believe,
after Commissioner Turner had said her point. But I'm
not sure so I wanted to make sure that we had it in the
public and we knew and it had clarity.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I think I'd rather get into
it after lunch, but I definitely think it's more than
that. I use the old basic who, what, where, when, why
model, right. And we should be able to answer all of
those questions.

And with any messaging, the first thing you have to
be clear about is your target audience. I think we've
talked about this at a lot of different target audiences.
And I'm not talking about diversity and target audiences. I'm talking about whether we're talking to community-based organizations versus individuals. The big distinction between our work and the census is the census was interested in individuals and individual households. We're not -- an individual household is not a community. It is but not in -- not for what we're doing. So we're not looking at individual households. We're not even looking at individuals. So to me, those aren't our target audiences. Now, there may be commissioners that disagree, but I don't think that's our target at all. So something as very simple as who are we talking to. Like, we haven't decided that as a commission. That's just me saying I don't think that's what we're talking to.

So I think though, that kind of building on your target audience will help us to design our message. I think from a procedural point of view, I think we should be -- us should be in the template business and really give these organizations the opportunity to make sure our key points are in what we want them to get out and let them write it however they want to, as long as our key points are in there.

So these are the kind of things that I'm talking about. So it isn't so much that we've got to get very, very granular about the delivery. It's more about what
is the frame? What do we want? What are we asking, et cetera, et cetera. So that's why I think it isn't just, yeah, we know the big picture of what we want, but that's not where the problem is. The devil's always in the details. How are we going to get that and ensure it. That's what I'm getting at.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. And there is a couple -- it is lunchtime and so I just wanted to ask Commissioner Kennedy regarding the afternoon how you want to set it up. And also, I do have one other piece, you know, that would be better after lunch, as well.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Well, as I mentioned this morning, the idea was to finish up item ten and discuss the line-drawing RFP before lunch. So we're running well behind. We really need to discuss future agenda items and meeting dates. After lunch, the commission dynamics -- I had scheduled a good bit of time on that and, you know, we can certainly shorten that. If the Commission feels that we need to continue with this discussion, then we just need to find another time to put that commission dynamics discussion on the agenda.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I did take on what Commissioner Le Mons asked us to do to look at the agenda for the next meeting and to see where we may be able to, kind of, create a working meeting that not everybody has to be at,
you know, and maybe everybody does want to be at. But there is the plan -- originally, we had hoped we'd have staff would be -- not us, but staff would be delivering the plan. But on that agenda item, it could be where we bring in some of those conversations -- those cross conversations, even though I'm feeling, you know, frustrated like others are on that there's a lot of questions that haven't been addressed.

But I did want to put that out there, that that is one of the areas where I saw where language access, line drawing, VRA, and community outreach could come together to put together that framework and answer some of those questions.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Le Mons and Commissioner Sadhwani?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I'm just was going to say, I agree with Commissioner Sinay. I think the urgency is there. I think we opened up the necessity of the discussion. I think we could plan to utilize the next set of meetings to do that. And maybe what we could do today, if we want to spend a little more time, is just get a laundry list of outstanding questions that maybe all of us have. We just list them, but we don't try to answer them.

And then over our break, meaning this week, between
this week and next, we can be pondering those questions so that when we come back to the 14th and 16th meeting, we're already, sort of, thinking about how we plan to contribute to the actual discussion. That's a potential process to get us where we're trying to go.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. I actually love both Commissioner Sinay and Commissioner Le Mons's ideas. Selfishly, I'm wondering if after lunch we could have a little bit of time to think about the line-drawer RFP and that framework that we showed you last time. At least as much to get a little bit more clarity and I think if we do that, it could help create that list of questions that Commissioner Le Mons was mentioning and that could help set us up for the next meeting and also allow Commissioner Anderson and I to just clarify what on earth that RFP is going to entail because I think we do need that in order to move it forward.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, very good.

Commissioner Yee, I had seen your hand up. Did you get to speak?

COMMISSIONER YEE: No. But we should probably wait till after lunch so we can continue the subject.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good. Okay. So we will be back at 1:50, please.
(Whereupon, a recess was held)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome back after lunch.

And at this point, Commissioner Sinay, did you say you needed another few minutes on item ten or can we proceed to the discussion on the line-drawing RFP language?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. I just wanted to follow up on the point that we tried to make last week. Both Angela and Commissioner Vazquez and I feel that we need a subcommittee for the grantmaking that that's going in a different, you know -- that that's more detailed than what we, you know -- than the outreach. And so we wanted to put it out there to see who would like to serve on that committee or for the chair to assign someone for that committee to work with Director Ceja, who's been collecting the information.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Are there volunteers? Or any discussion about the need for a subcommittee?

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. So I've been thinking a lot about our conversation over lunch. And one of the things I was thinking about was, you know, the outreach plan, grantmaking -- you know, the approach to grant making, the amount of money we have.
Director Ceja, just to, kind of, put it in context. I'm pretty sure that the director of the census said they had $184 million. So that would be ninety-two times what we have or if we round off 100 times what we have. So now we have $2 million, not a lot of money.

First of all, I cannot envision a way that this commission and the staff could manage granting that money themselves. If we average twenty grants -- I mean, $20,000 grants, that's 100 grants. We'd have to create our own bureaucracy to manage that. And so, I mean, to me the decision is made for us. We only have 2 million bucks. We don't have a lot of time and you know, we need to get rolling on this.

And so, you know, not to mention this potential conflict of interest issue that's been brought up. And so, you know, I think I mean, for me, it seems to me we can make -- I think the decision's been made for us in some ways. But I think we can make a decision, you know, and get that decision behind us to seek an outside agency to grant our money. And then we have to answer, I think, a couple of questions. Right? What do we expect from them and the grantees and what is our message? And we can get that ball rolling in that direction and I think we need to get that ball rolling really, really soon.

I do have some comments about, kind of, the overall
plan and that sort of thing. But since we're focused on outreach at this point, I just wanted to share those thoughts.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari. Commissioner Le Mons and then I will ask Katy (ph.) to read the instructions for public comment.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I guess I just -- I have a difference of opinion. I'm not convinced that we can't manage the granting process. It depends on what we want it to look like. So I'd be more than happy to be on that committee to help give some shape to that. And maybe the first order of business is to determine whether or not it is feasible. So I'm not convinced that it's not feasible, so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Katy, could you read the instructions for public comment, please?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, sure. 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 livestream feed -- I'm 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 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. 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 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 -- general afternoon public comment at this time. And we do not have anyone in the queue.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Katy.

Further discussion on the creation of a subcommittee on grants? Anyone else interested in serving on such a subcommittee?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'll serve with Commissioner Le Mons.

CHAIR KENNEDY: That would be an interesting dynamic.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Well, it's okay. We can work it out.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent. Okay. So --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Commissioner Akutagawa also has her hand up.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I'd be interested -- I'd be also interested in serving on the subcommittee, too.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I have three.

Marion?

MARION: Just a reminder that you can only have two people on a subcommittee or else you have to have noticed meetings.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I was just going to bring forth the political party difference that we were trying to go by. I'm interested, but I didn't raise my hand for that reason.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I would suggest that we have noticed meetings and that our meetings be conducted in public. Given, I think, what is going to be a rather interesting process and so I think that -- I think with that in mind, I was thinking that's why we would go
larger with this committee, also. And right now we have
one Republican and two I guess decline to state or
nonaffiliated I think is the term. So I think if
Commissioner Ahmad, you were to join, you'd be the lone
Democrat on the Committee.

MALE SPEAKER: No, she's the --

FEMALE SPEAKER: Oh, that's my state, too. Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Well, that puts us in a little
bit of a quandary in terms of what we can do if we have
to wait to conduct our business in public. So keep that
in mind. If it will expedite things, I'll step off of it
and let Akutagawa in for -- Fornaciari, what I was
signing up to do is a feasibility. And to bring that
back. Because I think we need to make a decision whether
we're going to move forward on this. And as a
commission, we have a difference of opinion. So that was
what I was signing up to do.


COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I kind of saw it as a
two-fold, like, you'd have your initial committee that
would decide or come back with a recommendation in terms
of which route we're going to go. And then maybe we
would have a full -- a bigger subcommittee. But refresh
my memory. I know we've talked about the two for
subcommittee. But then we've also had conversations that it can be more than two. Was it in our very first meeting that we said we're only going to have two per subcommittee? And so now we're tied to it?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No. It's because of Bagley-Keene. An advisory committee of no more than two persons does not have to comply with the notice meeting requirements. But any committee that has power or any advisory committee of more than two members must comply.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And I just wanted to comment on the -- having someone else do it for us or us do it. My only concern with having someone else do it is, I really do want -- if, you know, we're going to do these grants, I really do want it to get down to the -- the grassroots organizations or whatever you want to call them. Because my fear is, if we hand it off to someone and these small grassroots organizations aren't affiliated with them or aren't associated with them, they're not going to have -- they're not going to also get some of the resources that I really want to get out to about all of California.


COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. There are -- there are organizations, some of which Director Ceja has mentioned, and is also in relationship with that this is
what they do. And there isn't an affiliation of sorts that people can only apply for these grants if they're part of an affiliation. They just do need to be aware of it. And so I am leaning towards, for sure, wanting someone else to manage it. Because I think it really, it gets into too much detail. What I don't think this commission has -- I don't feel the commission has as a bandwidth to be able to handle.

I think the money amount is not large enough to go far, which means that it will definitely need to be carefully managed as far as who is going to get it. Various -- and even I think people that typically is used to having oversight over it, I think they will be the right ones to look out for the money to ensure that it's going to the grassroots, yes. And then to ensure that it's doing what we desire for it to do.

All outreach does not yield the same results. And so you can send out fliers that may get a response of, you know, maybe 50, 40 percent, et cetera. If you're doing phone banking, we know that the response somewhere is around 65 percent higher. So you'll need someone to be able to say not only, what are you going to do, how are you going to do it? And what is the evidence that whatever your efforts are actually yield results.

And so to do scatter-spray fliers and magnets and
different things may have to be something that we fall back on in some places. But I think that there are organizations that will be able to look at what someone's plan is and be able to tell, yes, this will actually have an impact that will drive results. And that's all very time -- it takes up a lot of time to be able to do it. And so I think that we should not automatically believe that other organizations won't be able to do it. And I think we really do need to take a long look at, if we have time to manage this process.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Mr. Ceja.

MR. CEJA: Yes. So my earlier comments indicated that I'm working on a spreadsheet of sort. Some sort of a -- I'm doing an activity where I'm talking to different bodies that might have an interest in serving in this judiciary responsibility in grantmaking. And so my -- my point in doing that was to present it to the Commission, maybe at the next meeting so that you can have this conversation and make an informed decision.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Do we need to name a subcommittee this time or are we better off waiting for that report and naming a subcommittee at the next meeting? Commissioner Sinay and then Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I would recommend naming it now so they could work with Director Ceja on the
recommendation they bring back -- bring forward to us at
the next meeting.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I echo that recommendation. I
further think it's -- I echo Commissioner Akutagawa's
recommendation that we go big with this. Make it --
agendized in public because it's such a publicly, you
know, the public has a very special interest in this and
decisions that we make affect people in a very special
way.

So I say appoint a two-person subcommittee now to
work with Director Ceja on the short list as well as
other assessments of our capacity. And then also go
ahead and at least anticipate or agendize or get the ball
rolling on the larger committee now so that we have the
proper notice, timeline in place.

And the further reason for delaying for that is, I
think having our new deputy executive director on board
for this would be crucial. And so, you know, to try to
get things rolling, but to anticipate that when that
person comes on board, that this will be -- certainly be
one of the items of greatest interest at the very
beginning of that person's work.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good, thank you. Commissioner
Fernandez.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I do also agree that we should name the subcommittee. And one step further is if the recommendation is to go forward and try to award it to just one. I don't know if it's going to have to go through an RFP, RFI, whatever it is, but I would -- I would hate to have to wait until our meeting in January to review any sort of RFP or approve RFP or RFI. So I guess the sooner we can get this going, the better.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Director Claypool, on the question of what procurement modality we would need to use for this, engaging an outside entity to manage these grants.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So it's my understanding that we would simply have to have a proposal from that -- from that entity. We would review it, we'd have to have a schedule, get some type of schedule of deliverables from them. But this isn't a standard, I believe, a request for proposal. DGS doesn't handle grants. So this is -- this isn't going to go through that mechanism. As I understand it, it's just going to be, to come to us and we have a program in place to make sure that we can monitor the deliverables and then at some point write a report on what we received for what we had expected to receive.

So that's probably a little simplistic but that's my
understanding of the grants from the people that I've
talked with who have done them. And from my review of
the material that's in the state administrative manual.
I will check with Kary (ph.), however, to make sure that
that's correct. But like I said, DGS won't be involved
with this.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, very good. Commissioner
Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. On the agenda
for next meeting we did include exactly what Commissioner
Fernandez was saying was recommendations and also having
bullet points or whatever ready in case we need to do a
proposal so we can get it out quickly so that if it goes
to a third party, we're ready, you know, that's going to
add some time. So those are the two items on the agenda
for next time.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Yeah. I'm not clear on this go
big idea. And I'll tell you what I'm not clear about.
It sounds like the belief is that expanding the number of
people on the committee is a difference between whether
or not we discuss something in public or not. We've had
subcommittees of two since the inception. And they bring
information for us to discuss in public all the time. To
me, what it does is really hampers the ability of the
subcommittee to exist outside of the eye of the public.

And I'm not quite sure why this level of scrutiny is being brought to this particular subcommittee as opposed to all the other subcommittees that we've had prior to today.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. Thank you for that point. Okay. At this point then, I would appoint Commissioner Le Mons and Commissioner Akutagawa. And I understand that both are in the same -- Director Claypool.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Oh, you were about to say that they're both in the same party. So that was what I was going to point out.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes. And this is one case where I think having both from the other pool might actually be an advantage. There is gender balance in this, and I think the experience with dealing with grants on the part of both individuals. So I would like to appoint Commissioner Le Mons and Commissioner Akutagawa to the subcommittee.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I accept.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa, are you still with us?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, I am. And I accept. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, thank you. Okay. Are we --
have we finished item ten, Commissioner Sinay? Okay.

Then we need to move to the review and discussion of the proposed language for the line drawing RFP. And I will turn it over to that subcommittee.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. So, you know, Commissioner Andersen, feel free to jump on if you want to leave. That's perfectly fine. You know, yesterday we shared with you briefly that PowerPoint, just a couple slides with some general -- a general sketch of -- what we're trying to just figure out is whether, you know, where we are as a commission as to what our outreach will look like. Because ultimately, to finalize this RFP, we need -- we need some additional clarity.

And so I'll back up just a little bit. And please, Commissioner Andersen, jump in at any point. When we approached the RFP, we really, you know, we had a number -- as we've reported previously, we've had a number of conversations with line drawers, including Karin McDonald, who was the 2010 line drawer, as well as others who are active here in the state of California.

What was clear to us is they have their own set of lessons learned. And so we wanted to craft an RFP that would allow us to have folks bring sort of their approach to it and their lessons learned. And so if you're reading the statement of work, you'll see that at this
stage. And this might change if we had -- if we as a Commission can clarify our approach, that we've asked them for an approach plan. And what we mean by that is, how would they approach line drawing in the state of California? Right. We are a very complicated and enormous state.

And so what we were trying to glean from potential folks who are going to submit applications is what they see as this work looking like. And I think we've heard how it worked in 2010 but what could it look like, and in particular in the state of, you know, under this pandemic and COVID 19, what might be some best practices using their expertise?

And a lot of this also was because we don't have a plan, we don't have a clear sense yet of what it's going to look like when we go out. I think -- I think we, you know, and we've talked previously about the RF2. We wanted to do that instead of the regular RFP. It allows additional flexibility. It allows the evaluation. So all of those are kind of components that we are trying to put together. In our conversations, however, with Raul and Dan, as we kind of got to this point, it became more clear, at least to me, that this proposal, as it is right now, would not probably pass muster at DGS.

And so we're going to need additional clarification.
Things like the number of meetings, et cetera. And I
very much appreciate many of the community groups getting
together and submitting some very detailed comments to us
yesterday. I believe those are being posted now for all
to see. We will certainly be taking those into closer
consideration. But to me, I think one of the things is
if -- and this goes back to our earlier conversation, if
we can spend a little time continuing to clarify -- and
as Commissioner Le Mons mentioned, that might be, just
clarifying a list of questions that we have, and a
general broad framework, just to get us all on the same
page about our timeline and what the general scope of our
outreach would look like. I think that would help us to
refine this RFP so that we can get it out the door.

And I believe our hope is that at the end of this
discussion today, we will have enough clarity that the
full commission would give us the go ahead to continue
taking all of this this feedback and input from our
colleagues, as well as from the public that might come in
over the next couple of days and really finalize an RFP
that we could then move forward and send to DGS because
time is of the essence.

So similar to what, you know, what was done for the
RFIs for VRA attorney and outside litigation as well as,
you know, yesterday we did for the data management, our
hope would be to leave today with the sentiment of the Commission that we would be able to move forward and that we would all be on enough the same page that we would be able to do that. Commissioner Andersen, I'm sure I've left things out. Would you like to --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No, no. You've done a great job. The only thing I want to say is that (coughing) excuse me. The document we have, it obviously looks like it goes into a lot of detail and that it doesn't in certain areas. And the comments, which were wonderful and received from our public partners, are really very specific and very refined and are accentuating the idea that you've got to make a bid, you got to make low bid. And we didn't -- they weren't quite aware that this is a secondary. Because their emphasis was, we want to make -- we want to make that the -- make sure that the Commission receives proposals from -- based on experience and qualifications. And I think in the -- just our -- because we sort of say approach plan and don't get into the specifics in that -- right in that immediate first introductory paragraph, that they were very concerned it wasn't there and what happened.

And I just -- this is a bit more for the public's benefit. I have quickly gone through that. Those -- the specifics are indeed in here -- will be flushed out.
They're -- it's just that the initial approach versus the
details of a workplan have -- are a little vague. And
that's the only thing based on the information we need to
get from the full commission.

And, you know, as I said, as we -- we've -- if we
knew a little bit more about the approach. And the
approach plan is a couple of pages. And what we're
saying, that's our only page restriction. And it's
actually an overview. Because then, there is the full
working plan that -- items required. And those are in,
they are in this document -- those works -- I don't know
if the whole commission has read through every bit of the
document that you received or it's posted. There's quite
a lot of information in it. We've sort of directed, you
know, the initial statement of the work paragraph and
then the table of, you know, our considerations in terms
of weighing a -- what is -- evaluation process.

And the idea being, now remember, this is not the
bottom -- it is not based only on cost. 30 percent of it
is based on cost. 70 percent is based on qualifications.
So with -- sort of with that in mind, I think, Sara, just
that was a little extra -- if you want to continue about
going through the questions that we need answered.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So I'm thinking just in
terms of structuring this conversation, if we want to
take a few moments just to answer any clarifying questions about the state of the RFP right now.

If there's very key questions about what is written in the RFP. And then secondarily to me, I'd like to actually go back to those slides that we had showed yesterday and actually do a little brainstorming with the Commission. And I understand it's not going to be the full brainstorming but I think that if we can at least clarify where we all stand. And certainly whatever we have on those slides does not mean that that has to be the plan.

We're just trying to figure out what, you know, where everyone is at, at this point in time so that we can move this forward and hopefully begin to, you know, develop that list of, well what are the questions that we need answered in the coming weeks to actually be out there. If we are talking about being out there by mid-to end of January? We certainly need to move forward with that.

Does that sound like an okay setup for folks? So the first portion, we'll just take a few minutes. If there's specific questions about the RFP, the language that's in that document. And again, it's very much a draft. And I feel, like, as get more clarity on our plan, we can fine tune that. And I think there's a lot
of opportunity to fine tune that. But are there any
overarching, major questions about the RFP?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, and my understanding was this
first segment was going to be about the status of the
RFP, not the language itself.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: The status of the RFP?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. That's what I heard you say.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh, well, I feel like we
shared that. That this is a draft and we need we need --
we need input from the full commission. Right? And so
ultimately, this RFP will have to go to the office of
DGS, as we've heard previously, it'll probably take at
least a good month to get through that process before it
can even be posted and begin to receive proposals.

So we're likely talking about like a two-month
window before we can start making some decisions.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That is decisions based
on -- on the proposers who come -- who will, you know,
give our proposals, not the Commission making decisions.
So it's much more. Basically, yes, the status is, we'd
like to proceed forward with as much input as we can at
this point. And the specific questions that we would
like you to answer or need you to answer, I think is more
exact.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Yee.
COMMISSIONER YEE: I just wanted to note that Director Claypool just sent out a long public comment from Lori Shellenberger, representing several other organizations, giving very detailed feedback to the proposal. And so, not going to able to work through it for that point here. But just to note that its comments of all different scopes of weight and extent. And we'll definitely need to take time -- the subcommittee I suppose will have to take time to work through those.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And Commissioner Yee, I just might jump in and say, I have actually gone through those. And a lot of those are, oh, yes, yes, right, right, clarifications, absolutely, that's not a problem, part of that is -- right, you know, these are -- it seems like an enormous amount of material. It's very specific of word changing. It's, in terms of content, and that's where I really want to make sure that our public partners understand, we totally understand where they're coming from.

It's just that this right now doesn't look like it has all the material in it to give a hard bid number. And that's the part that they're concerned about. But once we have meeting numbers, the number of meetings, we can put that section in. And again, this is not a regular RFP where it's only the bottom dollar. And so a
lot of those concerns -- why they're absolutely -- and
they will be incorporated, it's just like regular
comments. In terms of concept, there's nothing
different.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So you saw this letter earlier?
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes, correct.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Oh, Okay.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, she sent it right
away. And then it just took time to get posted.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Right, right. Okay, I see.
Thank you.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, just a quick question.
Did the full RFP, RFI get posted? All of the boilerplate
language that our public commenters was requesting?
CHAIR KENNEDY: Director Claypool.
DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: I don't believe that the -- that
the boilerplate has been posted yet, Commissioner Turner.
We have a format for it, but I made a request. It said
20 of 63. I wanted to make sure we had all the pieces to
it. But it will be posted -- it'll be posted at our next
possible posting. But it is very much standard state
boilerplate.
So and I did point out also that it will be part of
the RFP. Once it gets posted, it'll be up for public
inspection for the full thirty -- for the full time that
it's at OLS, the Office of Legal Services. So there'll be plenty of opportunity to review it. But I want --
we'll make sure the parts that are going to go in, get
posted as soon as we -- as soon as we have our next
regular posting.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I think -- and I just want to remember the -- our response because the request was that they actually have an opportunity to see it before it was posted and sent out, even though it was boilerplate language. And so our response in that is, no, we're not going to have time to do that because of the timing issue. And they will only get to see it after it's posted 30 days or did -- how we're we to do about that?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Director Claypool.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: When the request was made, I had, and I believe it was Ms. Shellenberger who had asked for to see the full amount -- the full boilerplate. I did point out at that time that it was going to be posted while it was at OLS. And that seemed to have ended the conversation. We did intend to post it. I don't know that there can be any conversation about it, given that the parts that we all post up that -- that she's requesting aren't negotiable. They're small minority
business clauses and everything else. But we will post it up and it won't -- just, if we get the permission from the Commission right now to do this within the week, there would be time for them to make public comment on it before it ever went to the Office of Legal Services. And if there was something that was dramatic that we were unaware of, then we would have time to pull back on it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you to Commissioner Turner. I will start then. I do have a number of questions and observations, starting with I -- I still believe that the characterization of the Supreme Court ruling at the bottom of the first page is not an accurate characterization of the ruling. The ruling itself says we grant the Legislature's petition and issue a writ of mandate as follows.

And point two is the Commission is directed to approve and certify final statewide maps to the Secretary of State by no later than December 15, 2021. I mean, there's no maybe about it. The deadline is currently the 15th of December 2021. That, to me, is how the Supreme Court ruling reads. And I don't want to mischaracterize it. We can put all sorts of notes in there about it may be subject to further litigation. But the Supreme Court ruling says, "This decision shall be final upon the filing of this opinion." Far as I know, it's been filed
and therefore it is final.

I agree with the comments that came in from Ms. Shellenberger and colleagues that are asking for supporting meeting services is incredibly vague. That's a problem that I've had with this all along. And I do agree that we need to provide enough information about what meeting services we have in mind to enable them to bid on this.

Likewise, staff support. Saying, "Contractors shall provide overall staff support to the Commission's redistricting effort sufficient to meet project goals and objectives." Well, yes, I know I agree that that's what we want, but I don't see that that gives potential bidders enough information on which to bid. 24 hours for a report, I don't know, seems -- seems a little tight for me. I understand that we'll have a point in time where we need that. But maybe earlier in the process, we allow 48 hours or 72 hours. And later in the process we have a shorter turnaround. Likewise, I agree with Ms. Shellenberger and colleagues that it's the Commission that has to issue a report. The line drawer is not the one issuing a report.

So any reference to contractor must issue a report for each of the four final maps, to me, is a nonstarter. They are expected to support the Commission. They may be
asked by the Commission to provide a first draft, but they're not issuing the report.

Under public meeting participation, yeah, integrating public testimony, that's going to be hard to bid on, I guess.

Copies -- under minimum qualifications. Copies of current business licenses, professional certifications or other credentials. That to me is not qualifications and experience. It might be a requirement to submit those, but that's on a separate list. It kind of felt out of place in the midst of qualifications and experience.

The other issue, and we've heard from some of our outside speakers about this, is whether requiring experience in California for the line drawer is going to narrow our pool too greatly. Line drawers draw lines in jurisdictions all over the country. Do we necessarily want to limit ourselves to someone who has done this in California and is very familiar with California law and the courts and so forth? Or is that merely desirable? And we can list that as desired experience. But I think if we listed as required, we may be limiting ourselves too much.

Finally on the scoring. Personally, I would take five points from presentation and put it to reference projects and still come up with a hundred. I would give
greater weight to actual redistricting work done rather than the beauty of someone's presentation. So those are my comments there. There are some smaller matters, but those are the main ones at this point. Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Good points. Thank you. Since it's not going to be -- since it's not clear when we'll have numbers around how many meetings or so forth, I'm wondering whether it would work to move things along by asking for bids in ranges and to base those ranges on ranges of numbers of meetings, you know, 20 to 25 meetings, 25 to 30 or so and so forth, in the same way the counsel bids based on an hourly rate.

With that -- does that work in our contracting system? And would it make sense for us? Because that would -- then we wouldn't have to wait for a final number of meetings in order to get a final bid.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, if I may. And you know, Dan has mentioned this multiple times. That we could set -- we could give a minimum number, right, of meetings. And then say -- and then give us your per-meeting bid, right. So then we have some sort of way of costing that out. And Dan, please feel free to jump in here.

But you know, I think at the end of it, we still
need to have some clarity about, what is the sense of the
Commission and what is the minimum number of meetings?
Right. I think in 2010, it was 34. 34 was the total
number. It was a lot. We're talking about doing even
more. Is that actually feasible? Do we need the line
drawer there for all of them, even the pre-census
meetings? These are the kinds of pieces that we really
need some clarity on.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari and then
Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. So I -- part of my
question was going to be -- you've just answered. You
obviously look back at the meetings. And there were
meetings last time. And where they had the meetings last
time. And you know, just one thing to note, in the,
what, 20 counties north of Sacramento where there are 2
million people, there were two meetings last time. So,
you know, I think we need to be sensitive about that.

I think we also need to be, you know, thankful in
some ways that we're not taking the road trip. For those
of you haven't had a chance to look at it, it was an
onerous, onerous road trip.

And I just have one comment on the proposal. Is --
under the technical aspects, the scoring criteria, is
clarity and succinctness of the proposal, is that -- is
that kind of a typical scoring criteria? I mean, sounds
like we're grading them for their writing capability.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: If I might answer that one.

That did come out of sort of a generic -- you know,
there's a kind of a template. And most of them were like
that, quite frankly. We tried to condense it all. Just
basically the intent, I believe, is, you know, how
closely are they following exactly what we want? And so
that was my understanding with that one, which is why we
condensed it to 10 percent. It actually had about three
different categories of -- I wasn't quite sure exactly
what they were basing it on, but --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, I'd offer that, to
follow Commissioner Kennedy's lead that we kept it to
five and add the five to quality approach and
methodology.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Just my thought.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Director Claypool.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL So that category disqualified one
of the two candidates last time. The clarity and the
conciseness of the report because we received a report
that -- we received a proposal that the pagination wasn't
right. It went 1, 7, 3, 5, so you couldn't follow it in
the page -- in the table of contents. There were
elements that were supposed to be in it that were missing. And we actually offered to have the person go back and kind of redo it. So there is -- there is something to say -- you can reduce it or put it in -- I don't know that by percent, but I just wanted you to know that it was a very important element last time because it became the basis of not being responsive.

As far as the meetings go, you will absolutely do 40 meetings with your line drawer. Just -- start thinking about the number of meetings they did to just draw the lines. And your line drawer is going to have to be at every one of those meetings. And then you're going to have whatever public meetings you're going to do. And then if we have them early for your first phase of your education meetings and they're available there, there will be a lot of meetings.

The basis of the way it was structured with the state auditors RFP was to give us a basis of comparison so we could see this person's 40 meetings would cost this, this person's 40 meetings would cost that. And then afterwards to make sure -- and actually in three different categories, if you go, if you go back to that RFP, we said, give us the basis of extra meetings if you have to, you know, if we have to have more so that we could make sure that the line drawer gets equitably paid
this time rather than just putting them into a box and then asking them for more.

The second one was with services to the attorneys, to your outside litigation. We said give us a base cost for, like, 120 hours, and after that, give us an hourly basis so that if it goes over that, we can pay you for that. And I'm trying to remember what the -- there was a third -- there's a third category in there where we did the same thing.

So the main thing that I think when I read Ms. Shellenberger comments, she's, you know, we have to give this line drawer something to base their estimation on. And then we have to also give them a way to -- to whoever does it, to say, if you go over that, we're going to make sure that you're going to get compensated for it.

So we want to draw that line as closely as we can. It might be 60 meetings. But that's why we need to have that plan first so that we can be as close as possible because then that's going to guide us into whether we're going to go over by a certain amount. And then we can look to the spring finance letter to help us with that if we're going to actually need additional funds. So that's all.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Director Claypool, I would have a quick question on that and that is, were they -- did you
feel that they were able to accurately estimate down to a single meeting? Because I'm wondering if we could start with, you know, a base price for 40 and then a price for each five additional meetings or fraction thereof kind of modality.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So certainly we could consider a structure like that. And this is probably one of the advantages to having this approach methodology. If a line drawer came to you and said, really what you're looking at, we would have to do 30 meetings with you to -- in order to do the line drawing itself. And then we would see this, you know, our approach would be to have 60 meetings doing this and this and this. Then that would be helpful.

But before they're going to be able to do that, you're going to have to tell them what you plan or what you think you're going to plan. For instance, when I look at this, and what I've looked at this all the time, but it's -- it's the same as in 2010. I see you having a regional approach. You're gathering information by regions. That you would try to touch all those regions so that, in some way, so that people actually saw themselves being part of the process. Being in the north, as Commissioner Fornaciari said, there were only two meetings last time in the north.
But if you start with your outreach and engagement and you hit the north, then you start with your first round of regional meetings and hit the north, then it gives you a little more, if you will, cover for when you go to your refinement, because your refinement will be in the heavily populated areas, particularly at Los Angeles. Again, I said it the other day it, and I'll say it again, almost all line drawers in 2010, not almost, all line drawers in 2010 said, all redistricting starts in Los Angeles and ripples out because of that huge population base.

So that's how I would see it. And you could do 40, but I think you could easily say 60, given that you're planning having these series of meetings. And you will, if you have the line drawer on board, you would use a line drawer services for those meetings as well, before we have the census data. Even if something happened that didn't occur, it's hard for me to see, with 34 meetings and then the line drawing, you'll hit 60 meetings with your line drawer. I'm just -- I'm fairly confident of that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Andersen and then Commissioner Sadhwani

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. This is going back to the, you know, there was vagueness in the actual
wording here. If you say meeting services, that needs to be defined. We couldn't because we didn't know. Is data management doing it? Is the line drawer doing it? That's why it's meeting services.

And they'll actually in terms of the approach, they're actually going to type of -- types of meetings because if the data management people are gathering, and that also comes down to public testimony, it's a bit vague in that sentence, in that paragraph that Commissioner Kennedy and one of our Common Cause actually gave us is, that is specifically vague because in the public testimony, our -- is the line drawer incorporating it? Or is the line drawer just taking the GIS format that they've already gotten from the data management and incorporating that? Those are two different things.

And so but -- and there will be different -- as types of meetings in terms of after census and if the line drawer is -- oh, we also have an option in there in terms of is the line drawer actually doing the racially polarized voting and helping us do that? Or do we have another person in there coordinating that? You know, they're doing the work, you know, essentially with that other person.

Now, all of this first of all, all of this is under our supervision. At no point is the line drawer doing
this on their own. Okay? So that's just right up front.

This is all under our direction. But as you can see,
there are different types of meetings. So in terms of
what's a meeting cost, there's a different cost. There's
different staff personnel for the line drawers. If they
are capturing all of the information the public is
test -- the public testimony or if they're actually just
waiting for us to say, now, draw the lines here and here
and here.

And so we need, as a Commission, that's the
information we need right now. So we can clean up that
meeting services, clean up the public testimony, clean up
these little pieces and throw these numbers in. So we've
done -- we have the rough, the bulk here. And everyone
wants to go through the particulars of it. We need a
little bit more information. So if we could get --
please, please, please, do we like the idea of 60
minutes -- 60 meetings? Say you want to do 20 of just
education and the -- we do as the line drawer will be
partially involved in those? Do we want to do 40 the
others as just a -- so that's a ballpark. If people want
to say that sounds good, we'll go with it.

And then on the -- if we're trying and our RFP is --
indeed the data management people are going to be helping
us gather the public testimony, we'll go with that. So
that's the information that we need right now. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Sadhwani and then I have a brief comment.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I think that that was great, Jane, because I think you did a great job of laying out, like, all of the questions that we've kind of been wracking our brains with.

A couple additional pieces. So in our conversations, particularly with Karin, right, who was the line drawer for 2010 and Q2? I think what -- I remember being surprised when she had told me about her whole staffing for 2010. So when we're talking about meeting services, it's not like just Karin who was there, right. She has a full staff. And she, I believe, and I'd have to go back to my notes, but I believe she had split up some of that staffing towards northern California, towards southern California. There were multiple people from her staff, from her line drawing staff at each meeting. Right.

So a part of when we're talking about, you know, tell us your approach plan, a different line drawer might do that differently. We don't know. Right. So what would that meeting service kind of look like? And that's where we wanted to leave that level of flexibility, so
that -- so that a professional firm can approach it in their own professional way. We may say, well, we want three, three staff members there, but they might say, no, you need two or you need four, or you need six. I don't know the answer to that. And so we wanted to leave some of that flexibility.

In terms of the number of meetings. I agree, we need to pin that down. But the one other thing I wanted to add, one of the pieces we've talked about is that there would be this pre-census time that we're going out for education and hopefully beginning to collect testimony on communities of interest. There's a post-census time when the line drawer is fully active. We are with the -- with the line drawer, actively looking at districts, collecting additional testimony, putting things together.

After our draft maps are done, are we going back out? Are there additional meetings? Right. And I just want to put that out there for folks. So there's potentially three time periods that we need to look at in which there might be meetings, in which we may or may not need the line drawer. The pre-census thing, I think we can get away without the line drawer if we have a data management someone or other to assist us in the collection of all of these materials that we can prepare
those materials, whatever they are, we had that
conversation yesterday, for a line drawer who might start
just prior to census data coming out.

During the census, we're going to have a bulk of
meetings. We're going to develop draft maps. Are we --
as a commission, do we want to plan to go back out after
the draft maps are done? In 2010, there was outcry over
their draft maps. There was a lot of concern and they
didn't have enough time to do a lot of additional
outreach at that point. Can we move our timeframe up,
put out those draft maps a little earlier to buy us some
time to go back out and hear from folks. What did we get
wrong? How can we make this better? How can we make the
very best maps possible?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

My concern on the generality or specificity of meeting
services, I mean, I've organized meetings, you know, from
small to multi-day, international conferences. So I
mean, to me, meeting services could be anything,
including identification and rental of the venue, the
sound system, or refreshments, tables and chairs,
interpreters, headphone systems. So when I just see
meeting services, I'm left, you know, with this huge
thing in front of me and I have no idea what the
commission means or needs. So, you know, I don't want to
make it so specific, but I think we need to zone them in so they know what we're talking about. Meeting services means different things to different people.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That's very fair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay, did I see your hand up --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: My hand was up. And I think you have to answer some of the questions that Commissioner Sadhwani asked because it's hard to put questions out there and not get responses. I would think pre-census, we would not need the line drawer. That we would want the line drawer around when, you know, before the census information comes so they can get themselves organized. But we don't know when the census data is coming.

But I would -- and I would think that we would want to be out. We do want to shop the maps around and have people's input. And my understanding was that we may, you know, I mean that piece is important. So I think that answers two of your questions at least. Or a little bit of your questions. But I do feel that the pre-census -- some of the questions I have are we're not going to be doing all those meetings. Some meetings, the community is just going to be doing and we'll just be getting through a lot -- yeah, there's a lot of questions
around some of the information we'll be getting. And I
don't think we need the line drawer for -- if we want to
really be focused on when, you know, we need them the
most and be efficient.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: One of the other tasks that
came up in talking to Karin McDonnell, and this was part
of in terms of what were services and some issues that
are indicated in the comments from the public -- there
are items -- the outside litigation costs -- the line
drawers were also involved in, once the maps are done,
them also -- were involved, you know, as sort of
expert witnessing or not. And that is actually a
separate item. That's not part of this because it comes
out of a separate pile -- pool. But it needs to be
considered as part of this.

Then also, a huge amount was training. And in terms
of meeting services, some of that is not just how they're
interacting with -- but how are we putting the whole
presentation together? How are we as a group going to
look? How are we, you know, we need to have a run
through, have a workshop with the line drawers. And also
particularly in terms of how the racialized polarize --
polarized -- I want to say racial -- help me out here,
please, Commissioner --
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Polarized voting.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right. How that portion -- because, you know, that -- our number one criteria is, you know, there's numbers that the VRA -- And that's how the line drawers and how we all work through that. We need to have that done in a business-type meeting. You know, like one of these meetings. So the public can watch and maybe participate. But we need to be trained.

So that is another type of meeting service. So in terms of -- and that the open -- the opening statement is, you're going to do some technical -- we won't go right there and there, exactly what all the technical services are. So it's then, you know, what are you responsible for? And then you start delineating. You're the technical services, you know, here are the meeting services. And that's when we're going to put all those details in. Because remember, all of this is statement of work. All of that, not just that introductory paragraph.

So yes, it's a little bit -- it's like, okay, you can do A, B, C, D. Now, here we're going to explain A, B, C, D. So that's how this was put together. But I just wanted to mention those other items that we had not talked about. So initial address -- Oh, and then the other item is -- absolutely, this is so important. On
our slide last time, when we say initial draft maps and we have the 14-day period where we don't touch those. And the public looks at that, sees how this affects them. And then we absolutely have to hit everybody because that's when people want to talk to us. And this is the process of reiterating, we will redraw, we'll redraw, we'll redraw until those final maps happen. And last time, as all the Commissioners, or many of the Commissioners said, if only we had time to go back and review things and do it again.

I actually, quite frankly, I think they only were able to make essentially two sets. And I'm hoping we do several. Because that's the way to make sure this is what we're thinking. Yes, the public says, wow, that's right. And they'll be people who, of course, will not agree. But until -- so we find that -- that final map looks pretty good.

So we absolutely have to have meeting times after that initial draft map is done. So that's what I'm thinking we have if we do the 40, you know, with census data. You know were what, 15, 25, something like that in those timeframes? That's just a ballpark. And if -- and I'd appreciate other thoughts about that. Including if the public wants to chime in on that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, okay. So I'll chime in. At least 40. I mean, I think 40 might be a good baseline to start with. And then from there, I like the idea of incremental, you know, adding five -- chunks of five maybe. Because I think, what -- what did the last, the original RFP say? Something like that 40 or something and then add ons. But at least 40, easy.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani. No?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No, I didn't.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I'll see you and raise you. That's go 60, you know. So 34 regional meetings last time. And not as many as they would want to do, because they had to do them all -- they chose to do them all in person. Whereas we have the option of doing some virtually or maybe all hybrid, you know, some were -- so I'd say 40 public meetings and 20 mapping meetings. So that's 60, which is the number that George Claypool floated. So I'll recommend 60.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Can I just clarify? What do you mean by public versus mapping?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Public input is when we're going to the different regions and different localities and getting public comment and getting input on communities of interest. Right. Versus mapping, which is when we're
actually sitting down and actually drawing draft or final districts. Right. Which we're not doing in public meetings yet, you know, quite yet. Right. I mean, we may float things and so forth, but that's not where we do the actual district mapping.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And I would just point out that we collectively and individually need to be ready in case at some point in this process, the executive orders terminate and all of a sudden we are expected to hold these events in a face-to-face format. Might not happen but, you know, it's kind of like when I go into a country and say, where's your provision for a tie vote? And they're like, well, the statistical possibility of a tie vote is so infinitesimal that we haven't sat down and written. I was like, well, you better write one, because one of these days, you never know. It may be your turn to have a tie vote and you don't want to be without a plan for how to address it.

So we need to have a plan for how to address a transition from virtual sessions to face-to-face sessions. Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: -- required to have face-to-face sessions?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Pardon me.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Are you saying that we are
required to have face-to-face sessions and the only reason we are not having them is because of COVID? Or we can design our outreach plan any way we want to?

CHAIR KENNEDY: No. I'm talking about the sessions for public input into the matter.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I know. I understand. But what I'm saying. Are you saying that there is a mandate that they be done in person? So therefore if we put together a non-in-person plan, that's only because we are riding on a COVID exception, which to me would then make your statement make sense. But if we're not riding on a COVID exception and we can actually -- if we design the model to get the feedback and draw the lines in a different manner, that we're not necessarily required to pivot. I guess that's the question I'm asking. Are we legally bound to pivot?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Director Claypool?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So specifically to that, I believe -- and Marian and Kary can correct me if I'm wrong -- but I believe it just says you'll have public meetings. I don't believe that it says that -- directs you to have the public meetings in person or virtually. Marian, is that correct?

Can't hear you.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Sorry. I had to find the
unmute button. What it does -- what the executive order does basically, is not required to have members of the public at your meetings. You could still meet by teleconference, but you would have to have a meeting location that is open to the public. And your teleconference locations would not have to be open to the public.

So it doesn't have to be that you all were there in a public meeting, but it must be a public meeting.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: For the purposes of allowing people to come in and give public comment?

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Exactly.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Right. Similar to, by the way, what the state auditor was doing initially when they did the transition. They had individuals coming in -- when some of you were coming in for your interviews and there would be members of the public, and as soon as the governor gave the order, then it excluded those individuals from being able to come in.

But as I understand it, that's your one requirement is that you have to have a place where a person can come in and physically give a public comment. You don't necessarily have to be in public with your meeting.

The transition, as far as cost goes is going to be relatively easy. What we found was there's not a lot of
difference if you were transition over into going out
into the field versus -- if you made that decision --
versus doing virtual. There are tradeoffs in cost both
ways, depending on how you do it.

So I don't know that cost would be a huge
disqualifier. The transition itself is a little bit
sticky only because, depending on how -- for instance, if
you decided that you were going to have public meetings
in Sacramento, Auburn, and Davis right here in this area,
and you were going to put satellite -- say a satellite
video team out there to take public comment and you were
going to do it virtually, which is one way to do it, not
suggesting that it is the way, and then you decided that
suddenly we could do it publicly, you could put four
commissioners at one location, five commissioners at the
other two, and you would have public in-person meetings
with about the same setup. Because anywhere where we're
going to have that video place, you would probably be in
a location like a city council hall where you could
actually accommodate people to come in and see you.

So I mean, the transitions in my mind aren't going
to be that great. It's just you have to -- you can
decide how you want to do it as long as once it comes
into public, you have a place where somebody can come in
and make a comment.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Yee?

Commissioner Le Mons, go ahead.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: So you're saying that what we're doing now is only an acceptable format because of COVID. This technically would not be a public meeting, the fact that people can call in and give public comment if we -- is that what you're saying?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: What I'm saying is to make that conversion to what you're absolutely required to do, all you have to do --

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Yeah, but I'm not asking about the conversion. I'm sorry, Director Claypool. I'm asking a very specific question about what --

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Right.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: -- we're doing right now.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Right now --

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: That's what I'm asking.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: -- we're under COVID.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: What you're doing right now is only because of COVID because they don't want to have person to person meetings.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Got you.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: But if I could just make one clarification.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.
DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: To transition, if the governor ended that order today, you could continue this meeting exactly the way it is. We would only be required to bring individuals into this room as a place where they could come and give you public comment. We would not have to be in -- all of you in public.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I did understand that part.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I have Commissioner Yee and then Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER YEE: That makes sense to me, but I guess I don't want to belabor the point. I'm just looking at the language in the statute, and it says we must have an open hearing process for public input. The hearing process shall include hearings and receive public input before the Commission draws any maps, and hearings following the drawing, display of any maps.

So the public, I guess it all hinges on the definition of public hearing, you know, whether bodies have to be present or whether it can be entirely virtual. That does not actually seem entirely clear to me here. It seems to be that virtual is possible as long as it's public in a legitimate sense.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I am going -- I would
like to direct to Counsel Marshall. If you could actually look further into this because I know -- I'm just going to say when I was on the school board, I could not virtually attend a meeting unless I made the place where I was virtually signing into public.

And the only reason we were able to go to virtual meetings was because of COVID and because there was an exception by the governor in that.

So I'm not sure if we're addressing Commissioner Le Mons' questions correctly. I'm of the opinion that once that's lifted, we can't remotely attend a meeting unless we're going to allow people to attend where we're meeting from. Does that make sense?

MS. MARSHALL: And that's correct.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So if we're going to have a public meeting, we have to be at the meeting unless we want to open up our private --

MS. MARSHALL: You could have multiple public meetings. You could have them first at city hall or something like that.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. Yeah. I hadn't finished my comment, but thank you. Yes. That's what I was getting to. And then my second part of it was we're talking about, like, splitting up meetings. So when we have public comment meetings, we're not required to have
a quorum?

MS. MARSHALL: You do have to have a quorum, but it can be done by teleconference.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I mean, again, I -- all right. I would like to -- I would like to have some more research on that, please. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Fornaciari and then Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I think the missing piece here is Director Claypool has a vision for how we're going to collect public input in the COVID environment. And his vision is that we would have, like, three venues set up for one meeting and we'd alternate between the venues to collect data -- to collect the input.

And he's saying if the COVID restrictions go away, we have these three venues set up on the same day at the same time and we send a few of us to each of those venues. I'm trying to explain the context of the response. That's all. Not validate them at all.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

Commissioner Yee and then Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. I think we lost the details that -- you know, the question is whether every venue in which any of us is at is public or whether simply there is one of the venues that is public so that it can
constitute a public meeting.

Just like now, part of this venue is in the Commission office, a public setting. My house doesn't have to be a public setting to be a part of that meeting. But one of the venues has to be, I think is the point.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner and then Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I think Marian's responding, but it was muted.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Oh, sorry.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Under the executive order, none of the meetings have to allow members of the public, not the Commission's office, not your home, not anywhere. If there were no executive order, then every place you are and the Commission office would have to allow members of the public to be there.

But you would not have to attend in person. It could be by teleconference.

COMMISSIONER YEE: But the place I'm teleconferencing from doesn't --

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: It has to be a public location.

COMMISSIONER YEE: It has to be in public. Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And it's all spelled out in
the (indiscernible) handbook about Bagley-Keene. If it would be helpful, I can send a link to that to everybody.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. So Commissioner Turner and then Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Pass.

CHAIR KENNEDY: You're passing? Okay.

Commissioner Sadhwani and then Director Claypool.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I mean, I was just going to say I so appreciate everyone's thorough attention to this. I think the likelihood of a vaccine rollout statewide or nationwide before these maps are done is highly unlikely.

So I think we're okay moving forward with the plan. We can get additional clarity as we go. And you know, hey, if June rolls around, we'll figure it out. We're going to figure it out.

I would like to just bring us back to the RFP. I want to make sure that we have enough to go on. I loved -- Commissioner Le Mons, you had suggested, let's identify the questions we have so that next meeting, we can start to address them. And I don't know if -- we're probably running out of time. I think we're up against a break pretty soon. But I'm wondering if we could do that a little bit.

What I've heard -- and I've heard Commissioner Sinay
say this and I so appreciate it, but precensus, we
probably don't need a line drawer, but to me then, that's
a signal to data management, we're probably going to need
data management, right?

So that's a question we should ask ourselves. Is
that something we can have in place? We need to clarify
all those questions from yesterday about the formats
they're coming in, what we are asking community groups,
the education piece, right? We need to start putting
some shape on that, right?

What are the regions precensus? We have nine
regions. Let's come into that plan, right, around those
regions -- oh, ten regions. Excuse me. I apologize.
Are the region leads going to come up with a plan for,
like, how many touches in terms of the education are
connecting with the CBO's so they can do the education?

Like I think we're in December and if we want to say
we're moving things out in January, we need to start
having details. And you know, I get it. I wish we had
had more staffing earlier. We don't. We're moving in
that direction. But I think we need some of these
questions kind of -- at least the questions so that next
time, we can start answering them.

Hopefully, we have more staffing by next meeting as
well. I don't know what that start date is. But these
are some of the pieces that I am capturing from this, right? And trying to then pull all of these puzzle pieces from the different subcommittees together, because I think we're at that point we have to do that.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sorry. Can I jump in with that too before we get -- and clarifying, specifically for this RFP, we were talking about sixty meetings. And so with that being -- none of that is occurring with a line drawer. None of those are occurring before we get, you know -- I mean, just a few before. When does that sixty start, I guess. And I'm hearing two different things.

I'm hearing some people say, yes, we do need them as we're making this second contact. But if data management is doing that, are we just having some meetings in terms of training us, getting the data together meetings, and then what then -- essentially, as soon as we start drawing, then we have them all.

So you know, and that's what I'm kind of -- I want to make sure that all of us are on board with that same clarification in terms of where -- how we're throwing our numbers of sixty around.

So if I could -- because I think I heard Commissioner Turner and Commissioner Yee say two different things, and I think Commissioner Le Mons might
Chair Kennedy: Okay. Director Claypool next, followed by Commissioner Sinay and Commissioner Le Mons.

Director Claypool: I'm going to pass.

Chair Kennedy: Okay. Commissioner Sinay?

Commissioner Sinay: I went through all my notes during the break and stuff and wrote down all the questions that have come up since mid-October. I didn't go through my first notebook. But I did email it to Commissioner Le Mons and Commissioner Kennedy since they were the Chair and the Vice Chair. And I'm still taking notes as you guys were asking more questions.

So if that's helpful, it's just -- it's there.

Chair Kennedy: Very good.

Commissioner Le Mons?

Vice Chair Le Mons: Yeah. I think when we come back from the break, it might be a good idea to read all those questions so we can all just hear them together.

I was going to offer up the first question to our list that we were going to structure today, and that is, what are the various types of meeting that we need to have.

Chair Kennedy: Commissioner Andersen?

Commissioner Andersen: Sorry. Can we get back to though, just that -- we kind of jumped away. Can we
please pin down the meetings? So are we talking about --
and Commissioner Sadhwani, if you want to jump in here
too -- are we talking about all sixty, essentially four
or five of them happen before we get census data and
fifty-five happen afterwards in various stages up to the
initial map, and then the rest after the initial map?
I mean, those are things I'm kind of wondering. I
just want to make sure that we're all on board. Because
if we say, no, we don't want any line drawers when we're
Going out and collecting all the COI information, we're
not going to have any line drawers. I mean, if we want
some, we need to say this now.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Go ahead, Commissioner Sadhwani, and
then I'll comment on that.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Is it helpful if I do that
share screen again so we can see something? You can
disagree with whatever's written on that screen. That's
totally fine, but then we can -- on every single page, I
asked number of meetings. And then we can just kind of
target that.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Is that okay?
CHAIR KENNEDY: Why don't we say --
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: How much longer do we have
until the break? I don't actually --
CHAIR KENNEDY: We have six minutes. Let me say first of all that if we have line drawers at what is intended to be merely the collection of community of interest input, we're going to confuse people.

And so I would say my preference would be, we have day management at those meetings, but no line drawers. Let's draw a clear line. Let's not have line drawers in the room leading to confusion.

Commissioner Le Mons?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I absolutely agree with you, 2000 percent on the statement you just made.

I wanted to say to Commissioner Andersen, you've mentioned a couple different types of meetings, even as you've talked about this, which is why I think defining what are the types of meetings -- because you want us to say twenty or sixty or whatever. But even on the post-census, you've mentioned a couple different types of meetings.

So if we don't even know the breadth of the types of meetings that we want to have, it makes it a little difficult to say how many of that particular one.

I think the line drawing one is probably the easiest one to guesstimate. And people are throwing out some guesstimates, where literally, they're going to be in the community, post-census, drawing lines.
But it's all those other little ones, the nuanced ones, that we still need to figure out also.

So maybe if we start by just saying, there's probably a finite number of types of meetings we want to have, right? This is what they are. Boom, boom, boom. You've mentioned a training, you mentioned a workshop that you would want the line drawer at. Then there's the community meetings. Are they giving -- you know, so I think if we know that and say this the types of meetings, we need fifty of this type, ten of that type, or whatever.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons. Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. It just occurs to me, first of all, I want to confess that when we initially took a subcommittee coming up with what a process tool, what could hold this information, I was not thinking in terms of a person. I was thinking in terms of what system structure would be there.

So okay, we can make that pivot and I understand the importance of having a person to enter in all the pieces that we've talked about. Right now, we're thinking about before.

Here's the question. If a data management person
now is going to be onsite to gather that information up front when we're going to out to put things into the COI tool, and the other different formats and stuff, at what end, if that point is to put information into a system that will turn into shape files or whatever, why does the line drawer need to then later be at the meetings if they're not -- is that they can just hear it again?

Again, I'm trying to follow the conversation, but we've gone from a person data management and line drawers. Does the line drawers need to be at the meetings if they're not going to do anything with the information? There's going to be another person that's actually inputting it into a system?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: If I can just answer that, no, they don't. That's exactly it. No, they don't. If the data management person is that person, they do not, which dovetails with what Commissioner Kennedy and Commissioner Le Mons were saying that we don't have a line drawer there. This is just collecting the information, collecting a building block, not drawing a line yet.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So I'm confused because what tool do you envision the data management person using to collect the shape file, the COI tool? I mean,
the reason that the line drawers were there before is that they were actually drawing the communities of interest on a map that was projected up there in real time based on input from the public, so that public would walk into a meeting and say, my community of interest is this group of, you know -- my church folks all live in this neighborhood or area or whatever. And then the line drawer would actually draw the map, and they captured the narrative in some way and captured the community of interest, and then saved it and then went to the next person.

And I think part of the reason why, you know, we do that after the census data comes out is because then we have the latest census data and census blocks, with which they use to draw that, and it'll map right in when we're drawing -- when we're actually the lines.

And I believe, it's my understanding that they did the line drawing at public, but they were in Sacramento where they drew the maps. And then they put the maps out.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Le Mons, if it's quick, please go ahead and we'll take our lunch.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: It's quick. So I was just going to say, Commissioner Fornaciari, I think the big distinction is they did all of this post-census. And so
we're left with the question -- so that's the confusion that Commissioner Kennedy's talking about could propose. We aren't drawing the lines post-census. We're not doing that because we're not --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Precensus.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I mean, precensus. I'm sorry. Yes. Precensus. We're not drawing the lines precensus. So if you want to confuse -- that was his confusion point. So that's it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good. I want to acknowledge that we have three callers, and unfortunately -- two callers now. We are required to take a fifteen-minute break for staff.

So we will take those calls as soon as we come back from our fifteen-minute break. So 3:35. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much for bearing with us. I see that we still have one caller in queue, and if the others who were in queue want to rejoin the queue, we would be happy to take the comments at this point.

Katy, could you please read the instructions and then invite the first caller to join us?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair.

In order to maximize transparency and public
participation in our process, the commissioners will be taking public comment by phone.

To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. The telephone number is 877-853-5347. 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, nine. 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, six 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 located on
the website.

The Commission is taking general public comment at this time.

And if you are in the queue and you would like to speak, please make sure to hit star, nine to raise your hand.

If you'll please state and spell your name for the court reporter?


It's Rosalind Gold, Chief Public Policy Officer with the NALEO Educational Fund.

Commissioners, again, thank you so much for providing the opportunity for us to submit some comments. I particularly wanted to address the dialogue -- the really good dialogue that's just occurred regarding both the types of meetings the Commission will be holding and which meetings the line drawer should be at.

First of all, I think it's helpful to think about as many as four different types of meetings from what we've heard about from the Commission so far. One type are the very, very initial meetings that might just be a place where the Commission provides public education, does basic public education about the redistricting process, some kind of public education opportunity, but which is not emphasized or is not focused on collecting community
of interest information.

It also sounds like the Commission is envisioning meetings where indeed, there would be collection of community of interest information.

We also envision meetings where community groups or voting rights organizations and other groups actually provide formal presentations of maps. And then hearings, both before and after the draft maps that the Commission presents, where the line drawer is engaged in drawing or revising maps.

So we think it's more helpful, not so much to think about when the meetings are going to occur, although, yes, that's good in terms of figuring out when you need -- by when you need to have your line drawer. But thinking of it as the type of the meeting.

And we also think that, you know, it's not necessarily helpful to think about whether the meeting is going to occur before or after the census data comes out because the Commission may be having community of interest meetings after the census data comes out or the census data may be quite delayed.

Because of all of that uncertainty, like I said, we feel that the best way to conceptualize meetings is with respect to what is the primary purpose of a particular meeting.
Secondly, we would strongly support having mappers at the meetings where community members are talking about communities of interest. The mappers were present at those meetings ten years ago. And you know, if we use this analogy of what the mappers are doing is to basically draw a portrait of California and what an artistic type of endeavor that this is, a mixture of art of science, you know, it would be -- assuming that the data management person is just going to put all this information together from the COI testimony and then hand it over to the mapper isn't the most -- in our viewing, the most constructive way of thinking about it.

It's like asking someone to do a portrait of California based on a bunch of specifications, drawings, and written information that the data manager provides, rather than hearing directly from Californians themselves, and doing it, like having an in-person interaction or a virtual in-person interaction with Californians who talk about their communities of interest.

So we really do feel that envisioning that, the line drawer would be available for meetings where the community is talking about communities of interest would indeed be very helpful.

I'd be happy to take any questions about these
CHAIR KENNEDY: Mr. Le Mons?
VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Ms. Gold. You might be able to answer a question I was curious about previously. If you could help us understand how we would utilize testimony sans a map, particularly based upon what you just said. Does that make sense what I'm asking?
MS. GOLD: Okay. Would you mean utilize -- when you say utilize testimony without a map, I mean, I think --
VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Yeah.
MS. GOLD: -- you start to listen to the testimony and basically think it through in terms of what are people saying about their building blocks, right? And use it as an opportunity to ask questions about the building blocks, right?
If a community member says, we're a community of interest for this reason, this reason, or this reason, if you have the people, you know, in a virtual situation, you can find out more about why it is they are feeling that this is their particular community of interest, and what other types of things they're taking into consideration.
And so that, you know, again, it's like if you're using building blocks to create a structure of some kind,
it's kind of like turning the building blocks all over and looking at them in all directions so you could get an idea of how they might fit together.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: So how does that square up with what you were just saying about having mappers present so when the individuals or community members are describing their community, et cetera, that someone is actually being able to take that information in and turn it into a portrait of some sort.

MS. GOLD: Right. Because they are going to be hearing that information and learning about why it is that somebody wants their community of interest kept together. So when they then start to sketch districts, right, they can remember, right -- they can remember, wait a minute, these group of people said that they wanted to be in this particular geographic region because they have these interests.

And we may want to also include another similar community of interest in the same district because they are sharing interests, right? So that hearing from people and hearing why helps them understand why you would or would not want to keep different communities of interest together in the same geographic district.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. I still don't -- maybe I'm just confusing myself. I still am trying to --
if we don't have someone drawing -- if the narrative is not in relationship to a geographic location, how is that used?

MS. GOLD: Oh, okay. Usually people will tie communities of interest to geography. Okay? They will, at the minimum, say, we are from this part of the state. And in fact, we encourage people to include -- when we work with community members, we encourage them to add that geographic component, right? Because the fundamental purpose of community of interest testimony is why do we need to be geographically together to make sure that the people we choose to be our representatives can be accountable to our interests.

So yes, geography -- we do feel geography has a role to play in defining your community of interest. I'm saying there's other things that come in also. But we do feel that it's important to learn about what is the geographic component of communities of interest, when people talk about what interests they have in common.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. That crystalized it for me. I don't know if you said the same thing just in a different way, but I've --

MS. GOLD: Yes, yes.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: -- taken it in. Thank you so much.
MS. GOLD: I didn't realize you were focusing on the geographic component. And this is why when one of our recommendations -- and I know this is something the Commission has been discussing -- is that when their community of interest testimony is obtained, that there be some general idea that, you know, this hearing is going to focus on this particular geographic region of the state.

Now, that is not going to guarantee you that somebody from a different region of the state isn't going to show up at that hearing and say, oh, by the way, you know, I know you're talking about the Sacramento area, but I want to talk about Orange County.

But I think it will allow by focusing, you know -- being explicit about what regions are being focused on at different community of interest type hearings, it will make the testimony more cohesive.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Any other questions for Ms. Gold?

Okay. Seeing none, Ms. Gold --

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Just real quick. Mappers and line drawers are the same thing?

MS. GOLD: Yes. Yes. My apology. I'm using the terms -- for this purpose, I'm using the terms interchangeably.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Ms. Gold, for joining us and sharing your thoughts with us, and we look forward to hearing from you in the future.

Katy, we have other callers?

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

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

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And the floor is yours.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Thanks as always for the opportunity to comment. And I had called in in response to the question about the presence of the line drawers. And my colleague Rosalind Gold, I think, covered that. But I'd like to offer a me too on the importance of the line drawer being there for the community of interest testimony. And in response, I think Commissioner Andersen.

I first got in the queue this afternoon when Ms. Andersen -- for Commissioner Andersen asked about the importance of line drawers being present after draft maps have been posted and having additional meetings on those.

So I just wanted to reenforce her statement that
that is a really critical phase of the line-drawing process, as community often weighs in even more significantly once they see things on paper.

And just to respond to Commissioner Le Mons' really excellent question drilling down on, sort of, that relationship between the line drawer and the distinction between what the data manager would be doing and why it's important to have the line drawer there.

I think the other thing -- and that's what gets -- why the BRFP is so important, is that you are going to have a relationship with this line drawer and a dialogue. And they going to be really hard -- this isn't all going to fit together and fall into place in a nifty little puzzle. There will be really hard decisions you'll have to make, and sometimes prioritize one community's interest over another in order to get final maps.

So having the line drawers there to hear the narrative, as well as the geography, is going to be really important for that dialogue that you'll have with them as you make those really tough decisions. So I just wanted to respond to that.

I also wanted to raise a couple of other things that came up in the discussion, and one that hadn't yet.

So the first was just regarding, kind of this range of bids or per meeting bid, I think that's a really good
idea, and I would encourage you to follow Director Claypool's recommendation regarding sixty meetings because it seems to me that you're going in that direction, and it would be really helpful.

The other thing that I understand now better -- I think Commissioner Sadhwani explained what you meant by meeting services, I still don't think that's clear in the way it's written. And in order to elicit consistent responses that you can evaluate, I think it would be helpful to clarify you want to know how many staff would they consider appropriate to have, or that they would need at each meeting, and what you mean by that in terms of the presences and what services needed at meetings from your line drawer.

The other thing that I think you may want to ask in this RFP is because this is such a huge project and pieces of it will be incredibly time intensive later next year, to find out what other projects the line drawers are undertaking or may have on their plates because as I think the subcommittee has discovered, there is a narrow pool of folks who are going to be eligible for this for a project of this magnitude, and there's going to be a lot of redistricting happening at the same time next year, and so understanding what their other commitments may be is going to probably help form your decision.
And then I wanted to just encourage you to have a
discussion about the progress report component of this
RFP that you have outlined. In our comments, we had
asked what the goals of those were. And so I would --
that's something that I would leave to just a tweak later
on. I think it wasn't clear to us in reading it what the
goal was of having regular progress reports and leaving
that hanging there with the possibility with wanting
reports at the whim of the Commission or executive
director or staff without understanding what the purpose
of those are could be really burdensome to the line
drawer.

And I'll use the artist analogy again, as a line
drawer I know had used, which is like tapping the artist
on the shoulder as they're painting. It's going to be
very involved when things are really rolling, and to ask
them to stop and do reports that may be redundant of
other documentation that you have may be unnecessary.

So I just appreciate hearing from the subcommittee
and for you all to discuss what the goal of that would
be.

Finally, I just, on the boiler plate language,
because I know that came up, appreciate the efforts of
Director Claypool and his staff to get those posted so
that we would have a chance to look at it and just make
sure there isn't anything in there that we want to provide feedback on.

And those are my comments. I realize it's been a little long. I'm happy to stay on if there are questions.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

Ms. Shellenberger, we've had conversation about the data manager and the role that they would play, and then the line drawer or the mapper and the role that they would play. How do you see them interacting in a meeting?

MS. SHELLENBERGER: You know, I'm not sure how much they would interact in the meeting itself. I think having that data manager, as I see that position evolving in your discussion, be the person who compiles all of that in a way that you can go back to it, right? Because you need -- and there is other data they'll be compiling that's outside of the meeting, written comment that's been submitted, what's come in through the COI tool, potentially.

But during a meeting, I'm not sure. I'm not sure there would be a lot of interaction between the two other than potentially as you move further along and -- I'm sorry. I'm just thinking off the top of my head as this
might play out. I can see the line drawer potentially asking the data manager to -- if they're doing a live drawing, to pull up past testimony or certain items that have been submitted that they may want to reference while they're moving lines.

But otherwise, I would say that data manager is someone who's really doing the documentation as it comes in, and the line drawer is actually engaged in moving lines.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: So to follow up on the question that I'm trying to still gain clarity on -- also, I appreciate your kind of imagining with us -- the data manager person compiling data, ensuring that information is retrievable as the line drawer would need it, are you thinking through that person also being live in the meetings, or just ensuring that the information is accessible?

MS. SHELLENBERGER: I'm not sure -- that's a good question, and I'm not sure I know the answer, and there are probably those who -- I would actually suggest you ask a line drawer about that, and in particular, you may want to ask Karin and her team since they, I believe last time around, had to do both of those things. And I'm not sure if they would need that to be simultaneous during the meeting, or if they would just be looking back at
notes.

But in terms of -- I guess if I were the person doing it, and I'm not a data manager, I might also want to be there to hear the testimony as it's coming in, especially the beginning, to think about how I'm going to be organizing that and tagging it.

But I would pose that question to Karin's team from Q2, and how they handled that last time and what would've been helpful to them or what they wish they had had. And I think they would be better suited to answer that probably.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: And then a data -- whoever -- and maybe someone with data management experience, or some of those folks that you had on Tuesday may be able to answer that as well.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you for your perspective. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Any further questions for Ms. Shellenberger? Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: This may be similar to what Commissioner Turner was asking, but as little broader. I mean, one of the questions we will need to address is do all commissioners need to attend all of the community
input meetings, or last time, they were called hearings.
And I know the last commission chose to -- because they
wanted to make sure that everybody had access to the same
information, and that's kind of the response we heard for
the data manager and line drawer.

But I wanted to take a step back and say if all
input is equal and if someone submits something through
the COI tool as well as at these hearings, is it that
important to have everybody there if we're going to be
reading everything anyway?

I'm not sure if I'm clear. Sorry.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And if I could, before you respond,
Ms. Shellenberger, I think another way to put it, if I'm
understanding Commissioner Sinay, is if one person is
attending in person, and the line drawer is there
listening, and another person is simply inputting through
the COI tool, are we giving the information from the two
contributors the same weight? Or by the fact of the line
drawer being present for one but not the other, are we
giving preference to one over the other?

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Yeah, I understand your
question. It's a great question because we don't want
to -- you know, we want access to be equitable and we
don't want to prioritize, right, certain kinds of
testimony over others. And so prioritizing live
testimony over what's been submitted through written and others, that said, I think that's going to be up to the Commission to decide.

There is something important, I think, about being as present as possible at those meetings. But I would need to think about that a little bit more. And I can certainly pose that question to some of the groups that I facilitate and engage with and get back to you, if you would like to me to do that. Because I think it's a very good question, but I don't want to answer on behalf of everyone.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. That's fine, but we would very much appreciate hearing your thoughts and the thoughts of other partners on that question because I know that that's something in my mind, and part of the reason that I said earlier, I would not want to confuse people by having line drawers there if all we're doing is taking community interest input. Because that's not map drawing. That is gathering information about building blocks. It's not map drawing.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Right. I mean, I think the preference is to have the line drawer be there. That would be my preference, but I will talk to other organizations and we can get back to you with a recommendation on that.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: I think it's helpful. I think it's helpful to the line drawer. And I would also -- I'd encourage you to also talk to the line drawers about that too. And this may come up in your -- this will probably present itself in the approach plans that they submit, which are a really important part of the proposal.

But given that this is informing the decision you're making about the number of hearings you want to put in the bid, and you're thinking about budget and other items, I'd encourage you to reach out to them to get their perspective as well as their thinking about line drawing in this new landscape where there's more technology available and more mechanisms by which people can submit testimony.

But historically, line drawers did want, I think -- good line drawers want to be there to engage the community and hear that testimony.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think this is -- so Lori, thank you very much. I appreciate your calling in and also impromptu answering our questions in this way.

I think I've heard from the previous presentations that we had, and I'm not saying that this was explicitly
said, but this was perhaps my interpretation of what was implied, that some organizations working with specific communities would gather up various community inputs to then submit maybe a streamlined map on behalf of the community.

So just for the sake of maybe ease, I'll just say, is it better that we receive one map that, let's just say 100 people have inputted, versus asking those 100 people to submit their own individual maps, even though they are exactly the same. Because it's like a vote, right? One map reflects one person, one perspective.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: I think it's going -- if folks have worked together on a map, I don't think you need each of them to submit that map. If it's a reflection of a collective, unified map, right? Then you wouldn't need to hear from the individuals.

But I also don't want to -- and I think there will be a lot of -- there will be organizations working to ensure that happens, and a lot of those organizations are going to be doing engagements. They're going to be -- their goal is to do that. I don't think that, you know, you want to overshadow folks who may, for whatever reason, slip through the cracks and do present their own maps as well, or smaller groups who do that.

You know, it's always, I think, challenging -- in my
experience with redistricting, it's always a challenge to figure out who is representing who. You'll have self-proclaimed voices of communities, but you know, for you, the challenge will be who is really speaking on behalf of whom.

But I think for you, it will be easier to have some of those unity maps and those collective maps rather than just 200 maps. I mean, it's not going to -- it's not a simple answer because there will be some folks who aren't in those groups and will present their own maps too.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. And I think I wasn't thinking about the unity maps because I think that makes sense to me. I think I'm just thinking about -- to your comment. And I think it goes back to the earlier kind of like, you know, does one get prioritized over the other because a specific community shows up and says, we represent a thousand people, and you know, this single map represents the voice of, you know, these thousand people.

And to your comment where you said, you know, there's a lot of people that purport to represent a lot of people. And I think I've been thinking about that and just, you know, is that a then question that as a commission, we need to also consider along the lines of how we've been talking about the communities of interest
tool and being certain that, you know, individuals will have a chance to input by providing, you know, their version of what they feel is their community of interest through that tool.

And I will say that thinking along that particular tool, it makes me think of an individual versus -- you know, as we started talking to organizations, it sounded like it was less individual, more broad-based communities and groups of people. So we won't be receiving so many maps, but more maps that represent a lot of people.

Does that make sense? And I think it goes back to, again, are we ensuring that the maps truly represent all those people that they say it represents, or are we still better off, even though it may seem a little tedious to just say we want to hear from every single one of those people so that we know it's every single one of those people's voices represented?

MS. SHELLENBERGER: I mean, I hope what will happen is you'll get a sense through the process from groups that are engaging. That would be trust that will be built and relationships built where you'll understand some of those organizations who have been working in community for many years, and work in coalition, and are doing work that represents the communities they say it does. And then I'm sure there will be others where you
may have questions.

But I think there are a lot of really trusted --
just like you're talking about trusted messengers that
will be doing outreach to communities, that those are
groups you can trust to bring that work in community and
are really careful about making sure they're representing
the broad perspective of their communities.

And then it's always hard to predict. I've seen in
local redistricting ten years ago, it was the City of San
Diego, and they were adding a new district, so there was
a lot at stake. And you know, there were a lot of groups
coming forward that were very organized who were
presenting maps and presenting districts that they wanted
drawn. And all of a sudden, the draft maps were up.

And there was a community that hadn't really been
paying that much attention and ended up feeling it had
been divided. And they gathered 2,000 signatures in, you
know, twenty-four hours, and showed up at the hearing.
And all of a sudden, the Commission -- City of San Diego
has an independent commission -- was like, where are
these people that they -- this is 2,000 people who really
care about their community and where the lines should be
drawn.

So it's just a little unpredictable, and sometimes,
you can be moving through the process and others will --
groups will pop up later who, all of a sudden, are aware of the process and the impact it has on their community. And you'll have to be a little bit nimble and cautious in understanding whose voices are being represented and whose you trust.

But I think that's the challenge when you're trying -- and for you at the state level, it will be the challenge. And I think the more you're in community and the more you're engaging with the communities, the better the sense will be for all of you of who those trusted messengers and voices are.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you very much. That was very helpful and very indicative of the complicated nature of what we're facing.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Yes. Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much, Ms. Shellenberger. We --

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- look forward to (indiscernible) --

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Of course.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- in the future.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Yeah. And I'll get back to you on that question, and appreciate all the work you're doing and your discussion.
CHAIR KENNEDY:  Perfect. Perfect.

MS. SHELLENBERGER:  Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY:  Thank you so much.

Katy, I see that we have another hand raised?

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

MS. GOLD:  Yes. This is again, Rosalind, R-O-S-A-L-I-N-D, and the last name is Gold, G-O-L-D. Rosalind Gold with the NALEO Educational Fund.

And I just wanted to circle back quickly to part of the dialogue that you were having with my colleague, Ms. Shellenberger about whether you are inserting any kind of inequity in terms of analysis of information by having the mapping person or the line drawers being present in person when not everybody is going to be able to come to all meetings and testify in person.

You know, this kind of tension existed ten years ago as well, because ten years ago, you had people who could show up to hearings in person, but you also had people, because of working or professional or kinds of responsibilities, or family responsibilities, or just whatever they were most comfortable as, could only submit through something in writing or something through email.

So that is going to exist, you know, no matter how you structure this, and we would not want to deny access
to the mapper to in-person meetings because there's just no way to say that that's going to somehow make things more equitable because the mapper will only see testimony that's submitted through the COI tool or submitted through other means.

We think more information is better, and the ability of you to work with a mapper to sort of sift through how to give weight to the different testimony, that's again, as you've been talking about, going to be something that's a big challenging part of what you're doing. But you know, again, we think in this situation, it is better that there be greater access, rather than less.

And similarly, you know, I think we are going to see, as those of us who are going to be working with community members, sort of gauge level of comfort with individuals submitting as opposed to individuals submitting graphic representations of communities of interest, as opposed to having a community of interest sort of signed onto by several people.

And you know, I think as this evolves we'll be able to get a better sense of anything we can help in terms of, you know, elaborating on how to give weight to testimony.

But you know, I think all of you have had experiences in one way or the other, even if you've had
to kind of like listen to children in your families
arguing about something and having to figure out who is
the kid you're going to side with, right?
I mean, I think that's just part of any kind of
process that has robust dialogue and a part of the thing
that you'll be doing in terms of determining how to
evaluate the weight testimony should be given. Thank
you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Ms. Gold. Thank you for
sticking with us and coming back around on that.
MS. GOLD: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Katy, do we have any further
callers?
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Nope. That was it,
Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good. So to the line
drawing RFP Subcommittee, what do you need from us at
this point that you do not have?
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, I mean, I think that
the callers were extraordinarily helpful. Is there
agreement with some of the things that were laid out by
them? For example, Rosalind Gold laid out four different
types of meetings, public education, community of
interest, collections, CBOs, line drawers. But
ultimately that community of interest is a line -- would
have a line drawer at the -- do we feel comfortable with that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I don't think so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Le Mons, was that your hand? Please, go ahead.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Yeah. I thought they were extraordinary helpful -- extraordinarily helpful as well. And I want to recant my earlier support of line drawers not being present at the -- if the COI-type meetings that they described. So let me just -- let me put a frame around that. I'm shifting from how I was conceptualizing this before, sort of, this building-block model and looking more at it from this portrait model, where the artist is there. And that's -- I'm just using that example, because that was, sort of, the way it was spelled out.

So it's one thing to give people the pieces, in this case the line drawers the pieces of the puzzle to put together. And you can put something together from that. I'll look at that as, like, the kind of Langel (ph.) model. But then, the artistry side, where you have the artists actually there taking in the information and creating the visual. And at the end of the day, I think, well, at least in my mind I'm thinking that we really are trying to get to that. Like, that's our -- and we're not
trying to get to a narrative report at the end of the day. We're trying to get to a visual map that is a picture, right, for lack of anything else to really compare it to.

So I think that to not have those individuals present that can translate what's being shared with us into a picture creates either another step where that has to happen at some point. Because at the end of the day, yes. And this has been my struggle with what do we do with narrative only? Yeah, I keep, kind of, running it into my head. What are we -- I'm not saying it's not valuable, but what do we do with narrative only? What do we do with it? We try to either have it -- have us land somewhere, based on a conflict, right, that we remember, oh, yeah. And we have over here some written information that suggested it supports us leaning in that direction, sans a picture. But when that narrative has been translated into a picture, we have a picture comparison, which I think is a lot of what we'll be doing as well, is looking at those pictures.

So my thinking would be that as much as we can have that present, and using the COI tool to do that same function. So I mean, sometimes that can be a real live person, or we have this tool that does that same idea when we're in the public. So that's a little bit
different than a person going on. I also am not of the
belief that this is going to be an individual sport.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I know that.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: So even if I'm logging on to
the COI tool as a person, Joe Antonio (ph.) that lives in
Toluca Lake, I had probably not coming on here drawing a
map in isolation. I'm either doing it on behalf of my
community of interest, which means it involves other
people. I probably have talked to them. We, kind of,
all agree. We're a group. We're concerned about X. So
I just -- I throw that part out there for other
commissioners' thoughts on that. Because, I think,
again, when we talk about this, we kind of slip into
this -- talking about it from an individual -- I don't
think we're going to have a lot of individuals. Because
this is about groups. It's about communities. So maybe
that's a duo? I don't know. I'm thinking it's more than
that, but okay, maybe a duo, but not individually. So --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I think there is some
individuals.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: -- those are my thoughts.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons. I
just want to say that I have not recanted.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I believe we are the artists.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: The line drawers follow our instructions. It's almost programming a computer in my mind. You know, I'm not trying to impose my vision of this. But I really think that we are trying to shift the paragon from the 2010 Commission's paragon to the new paragon. And I see the community of interest input as very separate from the map drawing. We'll have plenty of input during the map drawing. And you know, even though we're the ones instructing the line drawers, yes, I would like the line drawers there during those mapping sessions. But you know, I still am thinking in terms of a different, a very different paragon from last time, so.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you for saying that, Commissioner Kennedy. Because I think I've been more on your -- you know, what you're saying is more in what was in my mind. But I keep trying to figure out if I've just been in a different world, which could be also.

But the -- it's interesting, Commissioner Le Mons, to hear you say, I don't see this as an individual sport. Sorry, if I'm not using the right analogy. I actually did see it as an, in this day of COVID, that some people would find this really interesting. And even myself, I sat down, and said, okay, let me think through what
communities would I map? How would I define communities?

And it was really an interesting experience for me to think about it, you know, how would I define it at the county level, at -- you know, at all the different levels? And yes, you would hope that it would be based on other people. But people define -- self-identify to a community. And then, sometimes communities identify themselves collectively. But some people self-identify. And so I've always -- I've seen it both ways, that individuals will do it. And if you share it with a friend, and say, hey, what do you think? You know, what are your communities that that people would use?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes. As we think of about line drawers being present, I also felt that there was a issue of transparency with them being present, that the public wanted to see their input physically come to form and shape. And so I don't think that can be overlooked that the public wants to see their input in action.

And speaking to the narrative, as the narrative has to be translated to a like kind for the mapper or for the line drawer to synthesize. So I don't see as one having more weight than the other once it's translated to the same. So they just have to be put into a equal value of use, so they all can be used in the same manner. So I
feel that the data management piece can, sort of,
equalize the narrative and the -- or the written or the
COI tool. And I guess that might come to the funnel that
we were talking about prior. But again, I don't think we
can overlook the importance of the transparency of having
a line drawer present at one of the meetings.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that.

I've got Commissioner Fornaciari next, then,
Commissioner Sinay and Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So I guess I have a
question for you, Commissioner Kennedy. If we're
collecting community of interest testimony, and as
Rosalind Gold said, it is a geographic-based notion of
community of interest, is a geographic-based notion, if
we don't have the -- if we don't -- I mean -- and I think
it's maybe a semantic thing too, but if we don't have
someone there to draw a picture on a map of what the --
of the testimony, then how do we capture that in a way
that we can use it?

CHAIR KENNEDY: No. That's a good question. And
Commissioner Taylor's formulation of it really helped me
think this through further. I'm certainly -- I'm not
fully persuaded yet, but I definitely see the point. I
mean, I guess, I think that the data management people
could be drawing or taking the input into the COI tool
and displaying it during those sections. But yeah, I'm putting together a picture.

  Commissioner Sinay, Commissioner Toledo, Commissioner Turner, and Commissioner Andersen -- and just a note for everyone, we still have to have the discussion on future agenda items and meeting dates. And so we need to be asking support staff if we could come back after a 5 o'clock break?

  DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: I will --

  CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner --

  DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: I'll look into that, Chair.

  CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

  Commissioner Sinay?

  COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor, for your comment. And you know, I keep going back to the equity and transparency trusts. Those are all, you know, kind of, our values that we've brought up at different times.

  And I think we need -- whatever we do -- and I might be jumping way ahead, we need to be clear. And I think the way you've just described it was clear. But that when we're at a community of interest forum, or any forum, that the lines are, either if a COI, you know, it's one piece of what we're looking at, or it's the actual maps that are being -- you know, I see them as two
different, one is the building blocks and one is we're getting to finalize the maps. And we just need to be very clear on what we're doing throughout the process, so people don't -- we -- if we had the line drawer there, they drew a -- drew the map, and someone went away thinking that was the map. And then, they came back -- we come back with a different map, they're, like, wait. What happened with the map I drew? And so -- and that just goes into communication in how we talk about all of this. But that's going to be very critical in this.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No. Actually, I'm grappling with this. The possible confusion that might occur with the COI, the line drawers being at the COI and drawing the maps. And then, but then not being the maps. And the maps looking different. But I do think it's likely a communication issue. It's an education issue as well. And if we communicate clearly we might be able to ensure that there's minimal confusion, or try to reduce the confusion. That's just something I'm grappling with right now. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. Thank you.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair.
I agree to end with what -- start with what Commissioner Toledo said. I think it is a communication issue. I think at the start Ms. Gold gave the four different types of means that I thought was very helpful, public information, and I put slash education, collecting COI information to those rights groups, CBOs, and then the line drawers. My thought is that in the first meetings that we have, the public information education meetings, that we don't need line drawers there for public information, public education, line drawers and perhaps not even data management, because we truly are giving out information sharing.

Now, from the other pieces, from the collecting of COI information, my thinking, even in having the line drawers there, if we have a very clear, concise messaging up front saying that we will have line drawers here. They're here to begin to get a sense of some of the types of information. So you know, whatever the explanation would be, it would minimize any confusion. And I think it's important that they're there. Because I was -- I've been thinking, and even tie it into the conversation about whether all commissioners will be at a meeting, or just some commissioners will be there, et cetera, to me, they're kind of closely related. Because I'm watching and very aware of how we're working as a commission.
And when we have something that we're owning, we really hold onto it. And it seems that we also prioritize things that we have experience in. And so I'm thinking likewise from just human nature, if you're hearing something firsthand, it provides color and shading and some life to it that's different than if you're just being told something that is, kind of, mechanical, a step removed, and becomes just maybe a technical drawing, as opposed to the coloring that can be had from hearing firsthand conversation and testimony. So from that reason, I think it's important that they are involved. They're hearing the colorful conversations, testimonies, et cetera as people are describing or drawing their communities of interest.

And then, therefore, when it is time for them to begin to draw, even hearing from the CBOs, because I think, again, they'll be talking a whole lot about their communities and the importance of it and what have you. So for me, it would be that second meeting -- second, third, and fourth meeting, we would want to have both the line drawers and the Data Management person.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Andersen?
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So I like and I appreciate what Commissioner Turner was just saying. In terms of, you know, the mapper and -- you know, does the line drawer need specifically to be there? If the line drawer and the Data Management people -- the issue is, who is exactly doing what? And I believe as we've -- the Data Management people have already been said, here, you go, find out a little bit more. I would -- I'm hoping that you will do the same with the line drawing. And because I believe both us need to immediately go to, in our case, Karin MacDonald and the people who actually -- the line drawers who were taking the input from -- in 2010, and get their insight.

And the Data Management to go to the people at the Data Management, who can give an idea of, yes, we can do that, or you know, we really can't. And let us, kind of, put the two together, in terms of delineate. We understand that as a commission our intent. We need someone to help us draw the communities of interest. We need someone to help us. Because it's -- we're, just the commissioners or the community -- if the commissioners aren't going to be actually drawing the communities of interest tool, we're not going to be doing that. We need a person to be doing that and taking that information in. And exactly who if it is the line drawer, if it is the
Data Management, if they can both there. I think we need just -- right now, I believe, both RFIs and the -- or RFPs include both. And I think we need to delineate just a little bit more in terms of what people can do. So -- and that, I'm hoping can move us along. I'm seeing a couple of hands.

So obviously, I'm not explaining this well. But in terms of, you know, when we really have to have the line drawers, it's certainly, and actually it's the artistic part. I also have to agree with Commissioner Kennedy, we are the artists, and line drawers are, indeed, they're going to give us an idea. But you know, it's not -- they're not the only people. And they certainly aren't going to be drawing it. We are. They would be assisting us. So I -- you know, I still think there's a possibility. We just need a little bit more input.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

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

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

And yes, I think, you know, it comes down to very practical roles during meetings. Like, who controls the display? Who generates a line that gets drawn on the screen, you know? In my thinking, Data Management is a past role in a meeting. It takes in information, right?
That information comes in through meetings. They're also managing information that comes in just through COI tools, you know, people that submit things that don't show up -- and don't show up at meetings. In fact, that's going to be a lot of input probably, including individuals. It's actually -- you know, I think we're going to get all kinds of input from groups. Myself, I would, as an individual, absolutely. I would absolutely submit a map of my own, or maybe several, you know. But who controls the display? And as I'm thinking about it, I'm thinking that would be the line drawer. Because that's the person with the technical expertise to handle maps and lines. Now, the testimony, I mean, some people will come with a COI tool product to display it. And I guess the line drawer actually -- would actually help us display that, that submission for that member of the public.

But I'm guessing a lot of people, maybe most people, would just come in with thoughts. You know, don't split my town. Or somebody from Long Beach, yeah, sure, actually I feel closer to OC, to the Orange County -- to Orange County -- sorry, to Orange County than to LA County, include me, you know? And if you actually showed them a map of their city, they'd actually might be surprised at what the actual boundary is. Because they
don't think in those terms, right? They're not thinking of -- if I showed you a map of Oakland, I mean, it's really surprising how much of Oakland is actually above Berkeley, you know, more than Berkeley. People don't think in those terms. They just think in terms of who you include me with, don't cut me in half, and so forth. So if someone makes a comment like that, to then draw a map of it, that's almost an educational task, you know, for the line drawer. Oh, do you mean this? So don't do this? You know, when they weren't thinking of exactly how that looked on a map.

So for those reasons, I think we do need a line drawer, as long as we are clear, absolutely Commissioner Kennedy's point is well taken to make it super clear what stage of the process we're at, when we're at a particular meeting, you know, to tell them when we are or are not actually drawing potential district lines, versus just a community of interest, or so on and so forth, and to make that part of a good and clear and robust educational component of our meetings.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

Commissioner Le Mons?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: So as far as my recanting, it was based on the -- my support was based on the confusion. And I agreed with all the commissioners who
feel that that can be resolved through clear communication. Because that was the weight of that for me, is that we wouldn't want to confuse what we were doing. So I'm happy to hear that we have a potential solution for that.

Also, in how I'm wrapping my mind around this, the thing that keeps throwing me, because we keep getting corrected, that we're drawing the lines. And so I want to understand, when I think of it the easiest thing that comes to me is wire frames. And I think Commissioner Akutagawa brought this up yesterday. So I have been involved in very detailed wire-frame development for building, not just websites, but you know, really robust tech programs, right? I'm not the one doing the coding. I'm not the one doing the technical aspect of it. But I am the one giving the narrative. I'm telling them what I want. And I can tell you having gone through processes like these for months, like, working with the architects, or actually creating the wire frame, they're taking what I'm saying and translating it into the wire frame. If I'm not there really telling, like, really richly telling them, because their interpretation of what they think they hear is different if I just wrote it down and gave it to them and say, yeah, they could -- you know, they could do it that way too. But it's so much more robust
when I'm actually able to be in the room with the architect and share what I'm trying to get across. And then, they show me some examples. They move it over here. They move it over there.

So I, kind of, imagine that's what the line drawers are doing. We're tell -- giving them some information. And they're moving things around, or am I mistaken? Are we actually have some kind of device or mouse or something in our hands, and we're all sitting around drawing that? I am unclear on this. Because I keep getting -- hearing commissioners go, oh, no, no, we are drawing the lines. And so I need to get clear on what that really means? Who's drawing the lines?

And then, as far as the individuals are concerned, I don't think that individuals who are interested in this as an individual won't participate. That is not what I'm saying at all. I guess, what I'm simply saying is that I think the complexity of this, the fact that there are -- we've heard from groups who talked about -- and I was so impressed with the group yesterday who acknowledged they're vulnerability by saying, it took me years to really understand what we were doing, and I'm involved in this. And it took until this point to really grasp what we were really doing. So to think that the average person is going to be participating in this process as an
individual the same way these groups, and the groups are
teaching individuals, so they can learn and know how to
participate, I mean, that's going to be the bulk of -- if
guess is just what I'm saying, that's going to be the
bulk of where the feedback is going to come from.

But I'm not for one moment suggesting that there
shouldn't be mechanisms that people like Commissioner Yee
in his spare time wants to draw multiple maps from all
different, maybe community perspectives will happen. I'm
sure there are individuals out there who would do that.

So I just wanted to clear that part up. I'm not
suggesting we ignore individuals.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. And in response to your
first part, you know, I think it's clear that we will not
have our hands on the mouse. But it's also clear to me,
and I may be wrong, but it's clear to me that the line
drawers aren't going to move that mouse until we tell
them to, you know. And maybe we all need -- I haven't
done it yet, but maybe we all need to sit down and watch
at least one public mapping session from 2011. Go back
to the video archives and sit down and watch it. And I
think that would help all of us have a clearer
understanding of this process.

I have Commissioner Vazquez next, followed by
Commissioner Sadhwani.
COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thank you.

And apologies to my commissioners for missing most of today's discussion, although, I've been listening for the last couple of hours.

Agree with, I think, most of, if not all of what has been said on this particular topic. I personally think, at least it sounds reasonable to me, to have line drawers at our community of interest phase of public meetings. I will just say, my addition to this conversation is that that is going to be a much more time-consuming process in terms of this dynamic back-and-forth conversation we're really hoping to have facilitated between someone who is actually drawing the lines in response to comments that they are getting from a community member. It's very different from, you know, me stepping up to the mic and saying, hey, this is my community. And then, sort of, on the back end, the audio file or the video file of my comments or the written transcript then gets ported over in some form or fashion to a map.

I think what we're proposing is a much more transparent and publicly accountable process. So that, again, I think several folks have said, you know, so that a community member can go, oh, no, no, no, no, I didn't mean that. I meant this. And so we'll get more authentic and genuine, I think, community of interest
maps, building blocks, from that process. But it is
going to be in real time more time consuming. So we
should, again, sort of mentally and practically budget
for that kind of dialogue. Because it's not going to be
just a queue of two minutes in series comments. So those
are my thoughts.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.
Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. Thank you.
I think this is great that we had this conversation.
I think we've needed to have this conversation for a
while, so that we can all figure out what this is going
to look like. You know, I will share that Commissioner
Andersen and I had many of these conversations with line
drawers. And so I feel like we've benefited from that.
You know, originally, we had thought about, we should
bring all of these line drawers in to speak with you.
And at the same time, one, it's a lot of time; but two,
as we've mentioned before, you know, with the VRAPs
(ph.), there's a bazillion different experts out there
that we could potentially find to bring in and talk with
us. And there's not going to be a conflict of interest
at all. In line drawing, there's not that many folks,
right? In 2010, we had two applicants. We would be very
fortunate if we have one this time, maybe we'll get more.
But the -- you know, when it came to, like, should we just ask Karin to come and share with you what 2010 looked like? You know, we kind of stopped short on that. And perhaps we should've just asked her to come in. But at the same time, I think we'd be very fortunate if she were to be willing to apply this time around. And my sense from the conversations we've had, I don't know how many more applicants we're truly going to have. I think that this -- but I think that -- you know, if it's -- if the commissioners feel like it would be helpful, we can certainly reach out to her or others to come in and share more about what does the profession of line drawing look like? Are they -- I think what we have heard from multiple people is that Q2 did an excellent job in 2010 of really following what the commission wanted.

That being said, you know, I don't see Q2, Karin, or any of the other line drawers we've spoken with as just pure hacks, who'd just sit there and do exactly what they -- they have ideas as well. So which is why we wanted this approach plan, so to speak, in an RFP to glean from their expertise. And so I think it's -- you know, it's touching on both sides of this conversation of, you know, who's the artist here, right?

Having listened to everything, I went back to the slides that we had yesterday and just started to sketch
some of what I'm hearing from everyone. One of the things that I'm hearing -- and so if you don't mind, if you'll indulge me for an extra minute, I'm -- would like to share my screen. I literally just made this, but happy to make it publicly available when it's possible to do so. Would that be -- is everyone cool with that?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Just a quick --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- a quick share screen and a plan -- or a draft, the beginning of a draft plan. So previously, we were thinking about this in terms of pre-Census and post-Census, and then, after the draft maps. I think that's still fairly there. But I hear the concerns of the community, the -- you know, we don't really know when Census will be out there. We heard from Rosalind Gold. But there are these various meeting types. I think she was really synthesizing what we all were talking about. So I just -- I included that.

What I'm thinking is that in mid-January to March, first of all, we won't have a line drawer by then. The RFP process is going to take too long. So even if we want to go out and collect community of interest information, we won't have a line drawer set up by that point to actually do that work. So that time period
during mid-January and March, then, should be our educational outreach, all of those things we've already talked about. I'm not going to say what that all looks like, Outreach can come up with that, or our staff can come up with it, whatever that looks like. We know we have ten regions. I would still continue to ask us to think about how many meetings, how many educational Outreach meetings would we want to have? What do we think that looks like, right? Maybe there are educational videos. Maybe it ties into the grants. I don't know. But that time period is that educational piece. And we don't have a line drawer anyway, because the RFP will simply be out.

Perhaps, I don't know how quickly the RFP will move for the Data Management system and/or a manager or a person, if that system ends up being -- having a person attached with it. Perhaps, during that time period, we might be securing that. We'll also be having, hopefully, fingers crossed, the RPV analysis that's going to be public statewide, which will give us recommendations of how to be VRA compliant, what additional analysis we need. Come March, right, hopefully, we'll be able to secure the line drawer and Data Management person or system. I know I've heard -- I know Commissioner Andersen's workshop is really important. So one of those
meetings, then, is a workshop and/or training for the CRC. How are we going out and collect community of interest info and how to map it, right? So in March, we have to make sure that whole plan is there and ready.

And I'm sorry, just to go back, I think a part of the education, then, part of that message -- and I know people have asked, well, what's our message? I think a part of it is, this -- you know, what is redistricting? Why is it important? All of those key pieces. But also, we're coming back to these regions. We're coming back in March to June to collect this information on communities of interest. Here's what that's going to look like. Here's how you can prepare yourself. Here's how you can use the COI tool, et cetera, right?

So in March, we're going to be more internally focused. We're getting all of these data points together. There's other pieces I don't have on here that Commissioner Andersen and I talked about, water districts, school boards, et cetera. We can be collecting all of that data. And then, March to June, and again, sometime in this time period we're going to get Census data. But regardless of whether or not we have Census data, we can go out and start collecting the communities of interest with a line drawer, right? I think that that's ultimately what we keep coming back to,
is we're going to need a line drawer present. That doesn't make them the artist, but simply that they can capture and be transparent with the community about where their community of interest is. We need to figure out how many meetings that would be. Is it thirty-five maybe? I don't know. I'm just throwing that out there. Rosalind Gold had also mentioned formal meetings with CBOs and VRA organizations, who are going to want to present their draft maps. I don't know if we want to do that or not. I heard that from her. But I would say maybe five meetings there. And I see I have a typo in here somewhere as well.

June, we move into drafting maps. And again, who knows when we'll get Census data. All of this is a rough timeline, right? That would again be public meetings with the line drawer. I don't know if ten meetings is realistic. I think that they met for an entire month every single day in 2010. But on our end, we need a sense of what these different meetings are and how many they'll be and a rough time frame for the RFP. If that were the timeline, then June -- would July we release those draft maps? And then, we go back out with the draft maps and collect feedback, to find out what are we getting wrong? What are we missing, right? Undoubtedly, there will be improvements to make. Again, we have ten
regions. Will we do about fifteen meetings there?

So that's kind of what I've just been putting together as everyone's been talking and as we're thinking about that. I'm going to stop there. But I'd love to get a little feedback. You know, as with anything that I present, I present it just for your feedback. We don't have to use this at all. But I feel like we need to start moving some of this forward. And certainly, we need some additional shapes for us to move forward in this RFP.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay. And then, I have one quick comment. And then, I'm looking for other hands, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you.

Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani, for putting that together as we were listening.

You know, I think the numbers are fine, just because I'm -- you know, I'm new to this. But I want -- I did want to share, that last time the way they did the community map was they did one day, and they had two-hour slots. And the groups, kind of, just signed up for those two-hour slots. So they were able to do it all in one day. And each one presented their map. So I -- five days may be too much on that end. We may want to do it
in two days. But the -- but I thought all the other ones looked great.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

My one comment would be, I would suggest moving the workshop back to February, instead of March. I think, you know, we may be looking to make good use of time in February before things start getting busy.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think -- I love that idea in principle for the VRA and outside litigation. We already have those RFIs largely written. And they're ready to go. And they have a shorter process to go through at OLS. And we still don't anticipate actually hiring until the end of February. So I think the reality for us is that I don't know, and maybe Dan can add something here, but I don't know if we'll get a line drawer onboard by February.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. But we could perhaps use a fair and reasonable contract to bring someone in for one training event.

Director Claypool?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: First, I'd like to say that getting together with Karin and Jaime Clark, and maybe even drawing in Angelo Ancheta for a discussion about what you're going to encounter is an excellent idea.
They -- you know, so that might even be a presentation possible for next time. But that -- they're really a wealth of information there. And they're willing to give it to you.

As far as the training, I believe that as in a role as at the Statewide Database, Karin might be willing to simply give you the training without being necessarily in place with a contract, if -- or even if she's going to, hopefully she will be one of the bidders on the contract. But she's a willing person like that. She likes to spread that information.

And then, finally, I have one other thing. We keep talking about the data manager. And last time it started with Karin's group, Q2. And then, it pretty much was taken over by the commission, because when we saw the volume. We never had anyone there. We would just pull the information straight across. Karin would send it over. And then, we would categorize it. I don't know that the data manager necessarily needs to be in the same room or in any of the meetings. I do have a strong belief that the line drawer needs to be there. Because they really do -- they really do add to the process. But we'll see what the data managers say.

And then, finally, we're going to keep our fingers crossed on that line drawer contract. It's going to
depend a lot on whether we can get some expedited services. And DGS has been very good at -- particularly the Office of Legal Services, has been very good at -- to the last commission. And I'm expecting they'll be good to this one. So I think perhaps we'll see what we can do. But as far as having that training, I wouldn't hesitate to ask Karin.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

And thank you, Dan. Yes. The -- for our subcommittee, we do also intend to reach out to Karin, as well as to ask the questions of the digital response that we had. So we'll get back to you on what we're hearing as well.

I'm wanting to make -- and thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani, for just, kind of, moving us along and presenting it. It looked really good to me. The question, and maybe in the wrong placement that I had was, in thinking about the number of meetings, thinking in terms of the regions and what have you, I think we initially said that we were not set on these regions. And that we would leave this with them again. And it somehow sounds like we've, kind of, solidified that these are the regions. And so I just want to keep talking
about that, or at least lift it to make sure either we have definitely determined that these are such, in which we need to say that, and if not, let's just keep in mind that based on how we ultimately -- what -- where we ultimately land with regions, the meetings can begin to shift too. So maybe that's another conversation that we need to quickly have.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I want to support what Commissioner Turner just mentioned. I think, given also our earlier discussion about the size of some of the regions, I do agree with what she just said, that -- you know, I think we may just need to make it a little bit more manageable. I know that some commissioners, for the purposes of the -- I'll call it the data gatherings, you know, doubled up, and you know, participated in more than one region. I think if whatever solution it is, whether or not, you know, whatever -- anyways. I just wanted to say I do support that. I think LA County alone is huge. The far north is very, very large. And even the Inland Empire and San Diego County, you know, those could be broken up into maybe smaller pieces as well too, just to make it so that we're ensuring that we're covering these regions adequately.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Can I respond really quickly to that?

CHAIR KENNEDY: You can respond. And then, I have Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Absolutely.

For me, it's not even about the regions, right? Like, I feel like that's still, yes, totally. I just threw that on there, because that's what we're working off of now. I have no -- what we need is a number of meetings, right? And we know, generally, are ten regions. So for me, the regions are important. I think that's an important conversation. I think we can also overlay that. Like, do we want in each region to do one evening of just Spanish language, one evening of, you know, Asian languages, or other languages that are needed in those places? But to me it's like, well, okay, how many meetings, right? So I hear you. And I'm totally onboard with that. But for the RFP, we don't need the regions to be figured out.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Commissioner Le Mons?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I actually was thinking the same thing that Commissioner Turner and Akutagawa. When you were presenting Commissioner Sadhwani, I kind of was thinking we do need to know, because it kind of is the
math. So if we're talking about three touchpoints, or
going with yet -- well, the education, I guess, wouldn't
be tied to the line drawer. But we're talking about
those other different types of meetings being tied to the
line drawer. And we know that that's multiple trips.
And knowing where we're going and how many different
places we're going helps us get to the number.

Now, we could guestimate it. We could say, well, we
have ten now. I don't know how many they had last time.
But let's say we carve it up a little bit differently,
because of some of the big counties that people just
mentioned. And we say, okay, we'll have somewhere
between fifteen and twenty. Let's say we'll have twenty
retouch points, sixty meetings. Like, I think we need to
do some kind of -- we don't have to define the regions.
But I do think we have to have some sense to give you a
answer to the number of meeting question that is built on
something, other than just pulling it out of thin air.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Even though I said everything
looked great, afterwards I remembered. Is July late for
us to have the maps? I mean, I know that's when they did
it last time. But I guess I always, kind of, thought we
might do it in June, or you know. So I just wanted to
bring that up.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Director Claypool?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So you have a requirement to have, and I think we looked this up, fourteen-day display of maps in July. So automatically, you have to be there. The last commission actually -- there were, Commissioner Sinay, there were two large group meetings. There was in Northern California and one in Southern California, but exactly the same format that you were talking about, they were given expansive time. After that period, so they did twenty meetings, or about twenty meetings, maybe it was eighteen, then they did the large group meetings, the two. And then, they went to what they called a blackout period. And that'd been requested by one of the groups. They had actually requested two of them. But we did a five-day blackout period where the commission didn't do any work on any maps. Because they were going through so many iterations that it was just hard to follow which direction they were going in. After those five days, they received public comment regarding those maps. And then, there were another -- it was either fourteen or sixteen days of going back out and doing refinements with those maps before they reached the July -- the July display. Then, after the July display, they went into a final refinement. And then, there was a brief period where Q2 needed to, kind of, solidify what
they had. And then, they had their final maps. But all those were done after July. All that work was done at McGeorge Law School here in Sacramento. So that was, kind of, the pattern and the pace. So they had phase I, large groups, blackout period; phase II, July maps; and then finished up.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. It's 5 o'clock. We need to take a break. We need to have the discussion on future agenda items and future meeting dates. We may need ten or fifteen more minutes to provide everything that the subcommittee needs from us. So I'm estimating that we will be here until 6:15. So I've alerted the support staff to that. So let's take a break, and be back at 5:15.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 5:00 p.m. until 5:15 p.m.)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, everyone, for joining us after the break. Hopefully, we will be able to wrap everything up within the next hour. So first order is to get the subcommittee everything that they need. So Commissioner Sadhwani and Andersen, what do you still need?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I mean, I think, we have rough sketch here. You know, I know that there are definitely some lingering pieces around regions, et
cetera. But if we're all in agreement that something like the time frame that I put together -- and again, things can adjust, et cetera. Certainly, we don't know the time frame for the Census data, et cetera. But this is no longer exactly based on that. We can continue to work with staff and try to push out an RFP, hopefully, before the December 14th meeting, at least to get it to DGS for review, if the commission feels comfortable with that. And certainly we would have it -- would be reflective of this meeting and all of the comments we've had here, as well as all of the public comments that we've received.

Commissioner Andersen, do you have any follow up to that?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Can I --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I totally agree. I think we've gotten -- this conversation has really moved along. We certainly have enough. Because as you say, you know, we're not saying there's a specific number. But we have a range that we can work with. And that's what we need to put in the RFP. Because that's a -- and then, we have, you know, the variations. So I believe, and with the comments and things, I believe we have enough that we can certainly move ahead. And I know that our wonderful staff is more than willing to help us. And
we should have this done, I would think in well before.
We will have this done and be able to put it up on our
website rather quickly, so. If the commission goes ahead
with it, then we're ready.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. The one thing that I would
say is that Ms. Shellenberger indicated that there would
very likely be more public comment forthcoming, that
those were their preliminary high-level, et cetera. So
we might expect some further input to arrive from
partners.

The one other thing I would ask is if Commissioner
Sadhwani could share the presentation with Commissioner
Taylor and me, so that we can update the GANTT Chart.
All right, and we will update the GANTT Chart with that
and with Director Claypool's revised procurement
timelines and have that ready in advance of the next
meeting.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'm absolutely happy to do
that.

Question for Council, do we need to -- because I
screen shared, do I have -- do we have to make that
publicly available in general? Okay. So perhaps --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. And -- we want --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: We want it shared in general. But I
just -- I'd like to get a start on updating the GANTT Chart.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: All right.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I don't want to -- I don't want to slow it down. But I'd like to speed my part up.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. It's a Google doc. So I'll share it with you right now. And I'll send it to Dan (indiscernible) for posting it at whatever point in time that can happen.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good.

Are we agreed that we can allow the subcommittee to move forward with finalizing this between now and the next meeting? Thumbs up. Thumbs up. Okay.

So thank you both for your work on this. We all know how important it is to the success of our joint effort. And we just want you to know that we appreciate the work that you've put into this, and we'll be putting into it.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, just quickly. Is that -- was that your expectation, or did you want us to approve this based on our comments, so you can go ahead and get it done?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: This was it -- this was the expectation for us. I think there's a lot of pieces that
we need to change and clarify.


COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I wouldn't want it to be based on words or anything like that. Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. So well, the plan is we approve it then at the next meeting?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No. I'm taking it like the other ones. We have, sort of, approved it. It's going to go ahead. And we'll actually see the final, final document at the next meeting. But it will -- hopefully, at that point, it will be just like the others. It'll be into -- was it GSL, or you know, the -- sorry. I don't what it was.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: OLS.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: OLS.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari? Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. With that, then, I would like to actually turn it over to Commissioner Le Mons, who is going to chair the next couple of meetings to lead the discussion on agenda items that need to be on the next couple of agendas.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Chair.

Myself and Commissioner Taylor will be chairing by share beginning at the December 14th meeting. What I'd
like to do in this meeting is, there aren't any
additional dates officially established, at least that
I'm aware of. If you look at the agenda that we posted,
it had a TBD. So if we can get through that part, that
would be helpful. And then, I'd really like you to use
the Google doc for additional agenda items, just post
them there. And we will incorporate them in the
subsequent meeting to follow. So I think we really need
to focus on between now and the end of the year, if we're
planning on scheduling some more meetings. So we
probably need to get our calendars out.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: My understanding was that we
did have January meetings that were scheduled. We had
January 6th, if we needed it; January 11th through the
13th.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Excuse me.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: So I'm talking about before the
end of the year, before January? So what I -- so let
me -- let me restate that. What we discovered is that
there may be some things that need to get handled
business wise between now and the 31st. And we didn't
have anything scheduled between now and next year. So
that's why I had TBD on the 1st -- I mean, the 14th
through 16th. And so I guess we need to, A, decide, do we need to do a couple of placeholder meetings? Even if we don't use them, but we actually have them scheduled. Because we may have business that we need to come and vote on or to address before the 31st. So that's really the discussion from my point of view. And I would imagine that if you think about future -- if you think about in the context of future agenda items, do you have things that can't wait until January?

And maybe Director Claypool might have some thoughts on that as well. Because staff may need some things from us.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you.

The one piece that I know the VRA Subcommittee will need a little time on is to present a potential contract for a stage I RPV analysis for review and approval.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Okay.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Are you thinking the week of Christmas, or the week between Christmas and New Year's? Because I agree, I think we should at least put something on the calendar. So that if it is needed, it's better than to not have it.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I was thinking that maybe what
we could do is put one day. Like, I'm talking about a one-day meeting, not a multi-day meeting. So maybe we could pick a day the week of the 21st, then we could pick a day the week of the 28th. And just one each. It doesn't mean we have to use them both. But we would at least have -- let's see, the 20 -- where are we? We need fourteen days, right? So today is the 9th. So I guess the earliest -- and we're not going to post today, right? So the earliest we actually could do one is Christmas Eve. So I don't anticipate we're planning on meeting on Christmas Eve, Christmas Day, the day after, so we're talking about the week of the 28th.

CHAIR KENNEDY: All right. Today is the 3rd.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Oh. I jumped to the 14th. You're right. You're -- thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

So today's the 3rd. So I guess the earliest -- yeah, so we could meet the week of the 21st, if we wanted to choose one day that week, and then one day the week of the 28th.

Yes, Commissioner Fernandez? Then, Commissioner Anderson.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm just going to throw out dates, not that I am in a rush or anything, but how about December the 22nd and the 29th? That's a Tuesday, Tuesday meeting.
VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Those were -- that was exactly what I was going to say.

Thank you very much, Commissioner Fernandez.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Is everybody comfortable with -- are everyone comfortable with those? Show of thumbs up. Okay. Well, it looks like we're going to pull together agendas for the 22nd and the 29th.

Yes, Commissioner Kennedy?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Also, I would like to apologize. The intent, Commissioner Le Mons and I had intended to have this discussion of commission dynamics, which, unless people are wanting to stay even later tonight is not going to happen. And so I want to apologize for that, and say, you know, we do want to have this. And so it's just a question of when it does go back on an agenda.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you for that. I also wanted to mention Director Claypool's email that we all got yesterday about the chair rotation, and this would start affecting us in January. So Commissioner -- I think he mentioned that Commissioner Sadhwani is choosing not to be in the rotation. Where that affects us is that our policy directs us to -- then she would be followed --
she replaced by the next democrat, not the next in order
and the rotation would continue.

However, at this point, that means it would be three
democrats, four non, and five republicans in the
rotation; and if we continue in that fashion, then
basically the remaining three democrats would serve
rather more than others. So at some point we'll have to
decide whether to continue with that policy or change it.
If we even out the work, that's all fine, but that means
then republicans would serve more than others -- I meant
serve more often than others if we even out the work, so
we'll have to cross that bridge at some point.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: So Commissioner Yee, I just
invite you, if you'd like, to have a discussion about
that in one of the meetings that we have upcoming to add
it to the Google doc, and we'll incorporate it.

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'm wondering if we could
have the social meeting to talk about our dynamics?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: My understanding is,
Commissioner Kennedy -- we were actually agendizing that
as opposed to a social meeting, so unless there's an
objection to agendizing it, we would go with that model
and just handle it at one of our future meetings.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I was just thinking
it could be sooner rather than later that way.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Turner, then
Commissioner Fernandez. Thank you, Commissioner
Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: One, to the meetings that we
are potentially scheduling the 22nd and the 29th, would
it be with the intent of needing to vote on anything that
would require a majority vote, because there are a couple
of folk that have indicated they will not be there on one
day or the other?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I'm sorry I didn't catch that.
I thought I had a pretty unanimous thumbs up on that, so
let's ask Kari (ph.) if that is the BRA -- excuse me --
Commissioner Sadhwani, you're going to want to vote,
right?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Do I want to vote? I --
(Indiscernible, simultaneous speech) (audio
interference)

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: What I'm saying is, we're going
to need a vote, right?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, that will need a vote,
I believe --

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: All right.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- to move forward.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: And so we'll -- Chief counsel,
will that require a super majority -- is that what that's called?

    CHIEF COUNSEL: Yes.

    VICE CHAIR LE MONS: It will?

    CHIEF COUNSEL: Yes.

    VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So let's go back to the dates, so we're looking at the 22nd, how many people cannot make it on the 22nd?

    COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: I can't.

    VICE CHAIR LE MONS: One, two -- okay. So I think we would still have a quorum, and we would still be okay. That's one democrat, and one non-party affiliate; am I correct, counsel?

    CHIEF COUNSEL: Yes.

    VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So there's no conflict there. How about the 29th --

    COMMISSIONER TURNER: Is --

    VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Pardon?

    COMMISSIONER TURNER: Is either the 21st or the 23rd an option? I mean it seemed like there was random selection of the date.

    VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Well, what I did is ask for dates, and those were the ones that was offered up, and then I asked for straw poll, and that's how we got there; so if we want to try another day, we can. The 21st?
Does any -- do we want to try a different day? Yes,
Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'm sorry. I didn't realize I
was still on off mute. What also may help with that, I
don't want to offer a different date, but I'm wondering
if that will help with the days for the just-in-case
meeting for the BRA; are we anticipating a full day
meeting, because maybe that'll make a difference in who's
available when as well. Are we going to try to -- I'm
sorry -- are we are going to try and build in a full
agenda or are we meeting to be able to address that
issue?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: We could take guidance from
commissioners. I mean, I think it's going to depend. I
didn't think we were really wanting to get into it
tonight, maybe we need to, but if we looked at the
requests that are put in the Google doc, and we can build
a full day and take advantage of being together and
having that time to take care of things, I would -- that
would have been my intention. However, if the commission
feels like we only want to have that day for emergency --
not emergency -- but things that require a vote and
that's the reason we're having it, then I could limit the
agenda to those type of things, which would then dictate
the length of the meeting for that day.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. So for me, my preference would be that if -- since we're building in the day to take care of business issues that we don't want to have timing compromised -- I would prefer that we choose a day and just schedule in time to take care of the time-sensitive issues.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: That would be a preference. I'm not stating that's all I could do.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Does most commissioners feel that way, time-sensitive issues only?

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Does that change your availability if it's a half-day meeting, Commissioner Vasquez or Commissioner Agutagawa on the 22nd?

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Not for the 22nd, but it does for the 21st.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. How does everyone feel about the 21st?

(No audible response)

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: That means that I need to have the agenda built and ready to be posted on this coming Monday, so just to let everybody just be aware of that. So hands/thumbs up for the 21st?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Could you do maybe a hands
down, for (unintelligible) --


COMMISSIONER TURNER: Hands down.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: You guys are making -- okay. How about the 28th or the 29th?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Commissioner Le Mons, if I may --

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: We have actually already discussed to the, conceptually, the idea of this analysis. The problem is we just didn't get the information. We don't have a contract ready yet. We could probably have it ready for the 14th to the 16th meeting, and just do it as part of the subcommittee report, I just know that people like to discuss, and I know and we are trying to keep those subcommittee reports to 10 minutes. If there's a way to just make a little bit extra time for any discussions --

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Sure.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- then we might not need that meeting. I don't know if there's a lot of other agenda items. We just -- and that -- it was on -- I failed to get that information.
VICE CHAIR LE MONS: No worries. No worries. We can certainly do that. We'll go to Commissioner Fernandez, and then I do want to check in with Director Claypool, because I know staff are working on multiple things behind scenes; and I think we should have at least one day between now and the 31st scheduled for a business meeting. It doesn't have to be the week of the 22nd, that gets right up on Christmas, then we'll look at the last week as an alternative.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. If I was the only one for the 21st, I mean go ahead and have the meeting. I just -- that's my last official day, and I just don't want to.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Understood. Would it matter, Commissioner Sadhwani, whether it happened the week of the 21st or the week off the 27th?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well I know I won't be available the week of the 27th, so I don't know if that is --

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- I mean if Commissioner Yee can be there to explain it, then I feel very confident with that, but that's what --

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner
COMMISSIONER TURNER: I was going to -- yes, Commissioner Le Mons, back to our original date 22nd, I think I saw heads that if it was a time-sensitive meeting that was specific, that it seemed like there were at least one of the commissioners that would not have been available, so we might be only missing one the 22nd, if we needed --

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- to address.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: You're correct. I think we'll be missing Commissioner Vasquez. Is that correct, Ms. Vasquez, if we go with the 22nd?

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Yes, there may be -- it may be possible for me to join, but I will not guarantee it, so yes, you should proceed without me.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So, I think, because Commissioner Vasquez was so gracious to suggest that we proceed without her, we'll go -- because we'll be in the same dilemma, either we be without someone on the 21st, or we'll be without someone on the 22nd; so we'll stick with the original 22nd. I have until the 8th to get the agenda, and I'd like to do that by Monday the 7th -- so if there are any -- and we will have an abbreviated -- so it'll be just if you have business that needs to be taken
care of in terms of votes or pressing matters, we'll build in. We'll build in the time around what we have on the agenda. It won't have to be necessarily, a full-day meeting. Everyone in favor of that?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Fantastic. So I know I've said I was going to ask Director Claypool, so I have to -- Director Claypool, would that suffice for staff if there's any business that the commission needs to address that can be handled on the 22nd of December?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: That would be great. That's actually perfect timing. The only real issue that we would have outstanding is the interagency agreement, and we would want to just get approval, so that we could move it to see what type of a quote we're going to get on it. Other than that, it's strictly an emergency -- if something came up, but --

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Perfect.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: -- so that works for us, 22nd.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Perfect. Okay. There it is. We'll schedule December 22nd. Again, please, if there are any issues you'd like us to address, I have taken note, but I would like to actually use the Google doc; so if you would go there, subcommittee Yee and Sadhwani and enter it there. We'll capture it from there and any
other commissioners between now and next Sunday. I'll send out an email reminding you, and then we can establish that agenda by the 22nd and get it posted on time.

So with that, Commissioner Kennedy, I'm going to turn it back to you. I think we accomplished -- I guess -- not yet.

Commissioner Agutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AGUTAGAWA: Can you just repost that link to the Google doc?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Yes, I'll include it in the email. Chair?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Fornaciari, were you about to say something?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: No.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. We also need to be looking at dates in February and perhaps even into March, so let me flip over to January. We currently have a meeting scheduled on the 6th, if needed. We have the 11th through the 13th. We have the 21st, if needed. We have the 26th through the 28th -- yes, Commissioner?

FEMALE SPEAKER: I have it -- it's not the 27th through the 29th?

CHAIR KENNEDY: I have it down as 26 to 28th.

FEMALE SPEAKER: I'm glad we're reviewing. Thank
DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Could you repeat that? So we have the 6th for the just in case, and then we had the next one, Commissioner Kennedy, was January what?

CHAIR KENNEDY: The 11th through the 13th.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Then we have the 21st if needed. My calendar says the 26th through the 28th, for me, I have a potential speaking engagement on the 26th, so, I'd be happy with the 27th through the 29th, but my understanding was that we landed on the 26th through the 28th. We have plenty of time to change that. We still have several weeks during which we could change that.

FEMALE SPEAKER: I'm actually good either way. I just had it wrong, so I'm glad that we are reviewing.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So then we go into February. Director Claypool, I wanted to ask your thoughts on what we might need from your perspective in February.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Okay. I'm just looking at the timeline because at that point, we will have posted RFP's across the board. We'll have some stuff coming back from the review. Most of our contracts will be either in in February, but they come back late, if we go with 30 days and we don't get some type of relief. So I would just say that from February 15th through the end of February,
there's the possibility that we're going to need staff review, and the committee reviews of different people coming back with their proposals. So at the end of February, at the earliest, we would have to have votes on those contracts.

The only other thing is going to depend on your public engagement schedule, and so staff will be working through. So as far as votes go, we're really only looking at about the end of February, 1st of March; everything else will be taken care of during January, the 30th, the litigation and so forth, the RFI's. So that's the only thing we have going. End of February, we'll have a slew of votes to do, and then whatever we're doing in support of the commission for engagement.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Let me ask, are commissioners better with two days a week every week, or alternating one day, if needed with a three-day meeting agendized for the following week, and then one day, if needed, and three days the following week?

Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I kind of like one day if needed and two days the following week, and if we need to add it on, we'll know that session before based on how we build the agenda that would be my thought. Three-day meetings are tough, I know, three days in a row.
FEMALE SPEAKER: Seconded.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Director Claypool?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So before we do that, we're looking clear into February. We're looking into a period where you are now also going to start scheduling other events. Do you want to wait until possibly, at least through the next meeting set, to see what that's going to look like for your schedule before we start planning business meetings on top of it all, or do you want to spot your education and engagement meetings in between your meetings?

CHAIR KENNEDY: I guess, my understanding was that we needed to start scheduling some meetings in February, so that's why I brought the subject up.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So if you recall when we updated everyone on the VRA and outside litigation RFI's, we need to identify states for interviews and such. Now there's an outstanding question as to staff about whether or not those interviews need to be public, if so, the parameters for them, et cetera; but we have proposed a number of dates. We are under the assumption, at this point, that those interviews will be public and therefore would need to be in a publicly noticed meeting. And the recommendation of our two-person subcommittee was that we
expand at least into three people to conduct those
interviews in the subcommittee, and then bring it back
for the full commission.

Regardless, those need to be noticed to meetings,
and so the dates that we had suggested were February
10th, the legal committee would review the applicants,
publicly. February 16th, public interviews, and that
February 24th that committee would make a recommendation
to the full commission, somewhere in and around there,
right.

CHAIR KENNEDY:  Okay.

(audio interference)

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI:  And I --

CHAIR KENNEDY:  Direct --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI:  Oh I --

CHAIR KENNEDY:  No --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI:  Oh, sorry.

CHAIR KENNEDY:  -- yeah, no go on.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI:  Oh, I just wanted to note,
so did the other piece of removing myself from chairing,
thinking about all of these pieces that I'm already
working on -- and I've had some home issues as well, some
family issues -- that was why I removed myself. I'm
happy to serve in the future and to chair, so it doesn't
necessarily mean that there's only three democrats that
are carrying, but if I could just be removed and put to
the end of the list, that was my question. I just have a
lot of family obligations as well, and especially during
COVID.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good. Could we
tentatively -- Director Claypool.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Well I just wanted to clarify
what Commissioner Sadhwani had asked whether those
interviews have to be in public. Our counsel would have
to say whether they have to be in public or not; however,
in 2010, they were in public with the legal subcommittee.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy, can we
have Commissioner Sadhwani -- invite her to put those on
the agenda building list with the dates; and then that
way, the chair that's building that agenda for that time
will build it in. So I mean, I don't know that we, as a
committee right now, have to establish the February
dates. If we start to use that tool to drive what we
need to do businesswise, and the chair, sort of, takes
the responsibility of building it; and if we see it
already on there, like she said it publicly, we know to
kind wrap our mind around it and then go from there,
would that work?
CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, I'm proposing that we
tentatively schedule meetings, and this could include the
expanded legal committee so that not all members need to
be present; but if we go ahead and schedule two-day
meetings for the 9th and 10th of February and the 16th
and 17th, and the 23rd and 24th -- so that would be
Tuesday and Wednesday of three consecutive weeks. And we
will figure out, in the next few weeks, which of those
days all commissioners would be needed, and which of
those days only a subset of the commissioners would be
needed.

Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I think we might be saying the
same thing, and I'm just suggesting a different process
to get there. I think if we post that there and invite
all of the commissioners -- so for example, if
Commissioner Sadhwani, if it's just a three-person
meeting, then she could note that in the agenda builder.
And then I still would imagine that the chair of that
particular period of time would be responsible for
building that agenda, not the commissioner asking to have
space; so I don't even know who that chair is --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: -- but I think at this point, I
just kind of feel the energy of the room and wondered, do
we really want to get that deep into February dates, and
trying to figure what we want to do or don't want to do
today, but we do have time in January. But I would
eourage to put them in that agenda builder now, so that
people can start to look ahead.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

Commissioner Agutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AGUTAGAWA: I just have a question.

Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons, I do agree with you. I
think it might be a little early -- and it's late right
now -- but I do have a question. I'm looking at the
dates, and I know that at some point, we did say that we
would try to vary the dates so that then we're not having
meetings every week on the same set of dates. And then
for those of us where certain dates of the week might not
be as good will have to be away, and we just all agree
that that's just what's going to happen and we're all
going to be good with it.

So I just wanted to ask Commissioner Sadhwani, the
dates that you've selected are essentially all, I think,
Tuesdays or somewhere along those lines. Can you vary
the dates a little bit so that we can -- if we need to
have three consecutive weeks -- we can shift the dates
like by a day every -- for each week -- so then --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Absolutely. Absolutely.
And I think, and I hear you, Commissioner Le Mons, and I will most certainly do that. I think for Commissioner Kennedy, the one day that we would need everyone to make a decision, is probably that February 24th date; and again, we were just throwing those out there so that we have a sense of the timeline of the weeks. We can most certainly change to a different day within the week, um-hum.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. So we will leave the setting of a firm --

Commissioner Agutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AGUTAGAWA: Yeah, just one more question. I just want to also clarify, did we -- are we agreeing to date change for January because I did have the 26th through the 28th on my calendar, and if we make a shift, it does impact. I'll be away for about three hours on the 29th if we shift it forward or whichever way we're going to shift it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: No, we have not shifted it, it was just a matter of Commissioner Turner updating her notes, so we are still set for the 26th to the 28th.

COMMISSIONER AGUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Director Claypool?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So a point of clarification, so we have Commissioner Le Mons, and Commissioner Taylor up
next. Then they have the first meeting in 2021, but they will be -- they will cover the one day just in case is on December 22nd and January 6th. Then their second actual meeting will be January 11th and 13th; is that correct?

CHAIR KENNEDY: What do you think, Commissioner Le Mons?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: That's what I understood.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: And then the --

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: -- is that what you what you understood, Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: That's what I understood. I figured we would also have a conversation about that on our usual Sunday mornings --

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- and then we would discuss whether or not what is optimal for us to cover that or how that would factor in, so that we could present a plan or a willingness together to cover these emergency days.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. I'm good with that. So it will be one of us on the 11th or the 13th.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: I get it. Okay.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: It might be both of us or opened with Commissioner Taylor --

(Indiscernible - simultaneous speech)

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: -- and his policies.
DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Commissioner Taylor,
Commissioner Toledo will pick up the emergency day on the
21st, and then they start their first meeting set January
26th to 28th. That's the way it looks to me.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Agutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AGUTAGAWA: Just again, clarification.
So are we -- I thought it was every two meetings, or is
this now every -- they're going to take a month?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Well it isn't that we're taking
a month. We were -- it's because of either one day
insert meetings, so rather than have somebody just pick
up a one day -- I think that's the thinking behind that.
So the 6th may or may not happen, but you have to prepare
for it, kind of thing, so we just see that through to
back to certainty, which would be the 11th through the
13th, and then we switch. Because we would have done two
full-set meetings, but we might have a couple extras in
there. I think that was the thinking, if everybody's
okay with that.

MALE SPEAKER: I would agree. I think one of our
concerns was continuity, and we're just trying to ease
that continuity in the shift from one chair to the next.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Commissioner Yee, I
apologize for skipping you.
COMMISSIONER YEE: No worries. I think the current agreement was two full meetings, so these inserted meetings are, we can count them with one of the preceding by the following meeting. The meeting that Director Claypool just mentioned just now, with Commissioner Toledo coming in, that's the point at which the rotation -- that's the point at which we need to discuss, the rotation, so I will put that on the agenda for the next meeting to discuss.

For the BRA Committee, the dates we chose were Wednesday/Tuesday/Wednesday because we didn't know which part of the week the full meetings would end up being, so there is some flexibility there. It could be the first day or the last day of a two-day meeting and so forth.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So we will proceed with commissioners who are aware of items that are -- that need action on a particular day, to put that in the agenda building document, and we will not have set dates at this point for February.

Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Just as a point of clarification. It sounded like Commissioner Sadhwani wanted a firm commitment on the 24th; is that accurate or did I misunderstood -- of February that is? February 24th.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Either way -- I was actually just saying that because it sounded like Commissioner Kennedy had wanted to be able to put it on his calendar, so I would add to it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: My calendar is flexible. I'm trying to be sensitive to those who move to know farther in advance than I do.

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Just, again, I agree with the views of everyone this, and it was the staggering, and it was just trying to get people to have an idea of when their calendars would be. In which case, I would say in February, if you want, if we're penciling it in, why don't we pencil it in as the 8th/9th, which is a Monday/Tuesday, then the 16th/17th, which is a Tuesday/Wednesday, and then the 24th/25th, which is a Wednesday/Thursday. Does that give people who really want to stagger those days -- that's just the two day/two, day/two, day/two, but it's just instead of being Tuesday/Wednesday all three weeks, it's Monday/Tuesday, Tuesday/Wednesday, Wednesday/Thursday. And it covers the days -- well except for the 10th -- you have to move that one, but it covers the days that the VRA Committee was talking about.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Yee?
COMMISSIONER YEE: Could we then adjust that just to the 9/10, 15/16 -- no that's President's Day, yikes -- sorry. I can't pack up into Monday. We got a 9/10 -- oh gosh -- 16, or 10/11, is 10/11 better for people if we stagger it that way? 10/11, 16/17, and then 22/23, I mean is staggering it that way desirable?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Agutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AGUTAGAWA: If we can avoid that 10th, that's just like a really, really bad day. So the 8th/9th was ideal, so I was, like, yay, Commissioner Andersen, I like that suggestion. That works.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So that's that the subcommittee said it would review the submissions in open session, so maybe that's when our new Legal Affairs Committee does so, and not the whole commission.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Right. We're saying that some that of these days may not be the full commission. They may be a subset.

COMMISSIONER LEE: In which case, Commissioner Andersen's suggestion or proposal is fine.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Right. I did just -- I thought that those days were arbitrary, they hadn't already been set. That's why I proposed changing it. I didn't realize that you had actually gone ahead with the temp.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. But are we able to go with the 8th and 9th?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. 8th and 9th, 16th and 17th, 24th and 25th. This is tentative. This is tentative, and it is not necessarily that all commissioners will be required both days for any or all of those meetings, but this is to help people block out time that may be required for commission business.

Okay. Director Claypool, is that your hand that's about to go up?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: I just wanted to -- just if we've come into a conclusion here, I'd like to just like repeat on the dates. We're saying, the 8th/9th?

CHAIR KENNEDY: 8th/9th, 16th and 17th, 24th and 25th.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Perfect. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And with that, we have a caller in two. Katy (ph.), you can invite them to join us.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Can you please state and spell your name for the court reporter?

MS. HUTCHISON: Hi. My name is Helen Hutchison, it's H-E-L-E-N, H-U-T-C-H-I-S-O-N. And good evening, and thank you, commissioners, for sticking with this really
long meeting. I'm Helen Hutchinson, with the Legal Board
of Voters in California, and I just have a really quick
suggestion for you to add to your future agenda meeting
that -- some of us are thinking that if there's a
reflection on your onboarding and training doing that
sooner rather than putting it off until after all your
work is done might be a good idea. You're now kind of
really up and rolling, and so having that time to sit and
think about what could have been done better with the
good to do now, sometime in the near future, rather than,
too far in the future. So thanks, that's it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Ms. Hutchinson. As one
of the members of the lessons-learned subcommittee, I
appreciate the suggestion, and I'll confer with
Commissioner Ahmad, and we'll look at when would to
schedule that.

MS. HUTCHISON: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Katy, do we have anyone else? Katy,
do we have anyone else online?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: No, we do not. That was
it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So one, are there any
questions, comments, announcements before we adjourn?

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So sorry. The dates for in
February, the middle dates, were 16th/17th?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Correct.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. I wrote them down as 12/13 -- it's late.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Director Claypool.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Go ahead, and per Commissioner Ahmad's suggestion, put this -- I just put all the dates and left it the way it was without making any adjustments for democrat and so forth. That one can go next, but I'll put what we have right now into our Google box, so everybody can have access to it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. I want to thank all of you for your patience, not just for today, but for all three days. Things have gone -- I've tried to be flexible enough to get done what we needed to get done, and also allow time when it seemed that discussions needed to go beyond the allocated time. I hope that this has worked for all of you, and I think, I mean -- I actually keep a list of who has raised their hand so I can check people off, and we've had a lot of participation from commissioners, and I really appreciate that.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Well, thank you, for all your hard work. I think you did a great job. I really want to appreciate you and the work you've done on the agenda.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much.

MALE SPEAKER: Good job, Chair.

(Unintelligible - simultaneous speech)

CHAIR KENNEDY: With that, unless there are any objections, we stand adjourned until the 14th of December. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the CRC business meeting adjourned)
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