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CHAIR TOLEDO: Good morning, California. My name is Pedro Toledo, the rotating chair for the California Citizens Commission.

After public comments and roll call, we will -- I'll go over the agenda for the next couple of days during the Chair report.

With that, I'm going to turn it over to Ms. Sheffield who will be calling roll call.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Good morning. Here.


COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Kennedy.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sinay. I see you.

Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Present.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Toledo.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Katy, please instruct the public on how they can participate in public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. Good morning.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Good morning.

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. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted to enter the meeting I.D. number provided on the livestream feed, it is 93047167360 for this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant I.D., simply press the pound key.
Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press star 9. This will raise your hand for the moderator.

When it is your turn to speak, you will hear a message that says, "The host would like you to talk. Press star 6 to speak."

If you would like to give your name, please state and spell it for the record. You are not required to provide your name to give public comment.

Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call.

Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when it is your turn to speak, and again, please turn down the livestream volume.

The Commission is taking general public comment at this time.

And we do have someone in the queue, and again, if you would like to comment and you are in the queue, please press star 9 to raise your hand indicating you would like to comment.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Please invite the caller to --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: They're not raising their hand at this time.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, they're not. Okay.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yeah. So at this time we do not have anybody with their hand raised wishing to comment.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's give it a minute or two. While we're waiting is there any Commissioner who has a general announcement or any update?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Chair, we do have someone with their hand raised.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay, let's do that then.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I'm sorry. Okay. Give me one second. Your line is open.

MS. WESTA-LUSK: Yes, this is Renee Westa-Lusk. I'm just having a question regarding the letter that was in the share column of the handout by Shenkman & Hughes. Is that going to be discussed at today's legal affairs committee meeting report?

CHAIR TOLEDO: It will be discussed during the meeting. It may not be today; it might be tomorrow.

MS. WESTA-LUSK: Oh, okay. I just wanted to --

CHAIR TOLEDO: It will be discussed, yes.

MS. WESTA-LUSK: I think it's real important. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. We agree.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And we do have another caller. And your line is open.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

MS. BANH: Thank you so much. Good morning, everyone. I want to first commend for the good materials related to the Redistricting Basics. I actually like the new stuff as well and appreciate the graphs. I hope you don't mind. I'm going to be very real and maybe a little raw.

So the materials, itself, I think spoke wonderfully of inclusiveness, any and all voice for Californians, but I fear a little bit that the language part, like not having the meetings in different languages, may send a very different and an opposite message.

You know, I don't sense this intentional, but in the past it's often not those who speak English that have been left out of things, but rather those who don't speak English.

So if I may, indulge me, like if you folks are all English speaking and I want you guys to come to a meeting, and when you come to this meeting, the meeting goes something like this, you know, (speaking Vietnamese).

So if you came to a meeting and it was in Vietnamese, and the materials were all in Vietnamese, but
you only speak English, I mean, there's multiple factors for me to bring you to a meeting that didn't have translation for you jeopardizes my relationship with you. So I know that there's a lot of communities, Asian Americans Advancing Justice, for example, MALDEF, for example, NALEO and so forth, that want to help this body bring people to the meetings, but if they use their capital, their relationship capital, and their other capital to bring forth folks to a meeting and the meeting isn't translated, it jeopardizes their relationship with that community, and it also sends a signal to the communities that they're not entirely welcome, they're not entirely invited.

So I can't imagine that would be the message and the intentions of this body. You folks are very busy. You folks have other things to do. The reason why you came to this body is because you want to make sure citizens of California and all Californians, regardless of status, are well represented. So I just -- you know, I just want folks to be thoughtful of that.

In terms of ways around it or ways that we could potentially improve, I know there's going to be savings related to not having to rent spaces, savings not having to buy equipment related to hearing devices, savings not having to hire multiple translations. I've done meetings
in Zoom where there have been, like, three other foreign language lines, so once you get a language line, let's say Spanish, which includes ten million people, so we've got to have at least Spanish. For Spanish, if you hire a Spanish interpreter, it could be five people that joined a Zoom meeting or 500. It doesn't matter. They all listen to that one line.

The savings that you get from having Zoom meetings versus having in-person meetings where you have to have 500 equipments, so I think there's leverage that you can use because of this way of being, the Zoom process that may be maximized.

And I can share thoughts around that. I've had to finagle with that. I've done trainings where it was Spanish, Japanese, Chinese, and Vietnamese at the same time, so I've learned -- a lot of mistakes along the way, but have some knowledge around that as well.

So I hope that we -- I don't know. Here's the raw and the real, I guess. You know, the North Star is our guiding post, and I hope we create spaces where folks are welcome, where folks are invited, and if we want folks to fully participate, I mean, California at the very least, we've got to include Spanish because that's ten million people. We have twenty million people that speak English, over ten million that speak Spanish. If all the
meetings are in English except for the comment part, it
does not send the vibe that you're welcome here. It
doesn't send the vibe that we want to hear your voice and
that you matter.

So I hope -- I know I'm starting the meeting quite
heavy. I apologize for that. You know, I hope that
we -- that cannot be our intentions, and I think as
Californians as a body, we can probably do better.

So I thank you for your indulgence. I thank you for
allowing me to be in this space, this date and this way,
and I hope you take that with wholeheartedness.

That's all. Thank you so much.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you for your comments. We are
committed to meaningfully engage all communities,
including the linguistic -- delivering our message in a
linguistically competent manner.

Any other comments in the queue -- commenters?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: So if you would like to
make a comment, please press star 9 to raise your hand.
Other than that, Chair, there's one person in the queue
that has not raised their hand but they've been listening
the entire time. Everybody who has had their hand raised
has commented.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Katy. All right, with
that, we'll go to general announcements and Commissioner
updates. Does any Commissioner have an update or a
general announcement they want to make? Seeing none,
we'll go to the Chair report.

And I'm just going to go over the agenda for the
next couple of days. So at 10 o'clock we'll be going
over item 11, which includes the line drawer RFP
presentations, evaluation, and scoring. I anticipate
that we'll go to lunch at about 12:30, and at that time
we'll enter -- after we come back from lunch we'll enter
closed session. I don't anticipate coming back to public
session today. We'll likely be coming back tomorrow --
or we will be coming back tomorrow at 9:30 where we'll do
subcommittee reports, staff reports, legal affairs
committee, and item 12, data management.

We'll then hold a closed session on 9:30 on Friday
and return to the public session after that closed
session.

So it's about 9:43. We have time for just one short
staff report, so I'm going to ask Fredy to give the
communications report.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Toledo.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Do I have a -- oh, Marian.

MS. JOHNSTON: One point. You should report that no
action was taken during the last closed session.

CHAIR TOLEDO: We did report when we came back
last -- we came from -- to public session after the last closed session, if I remember correctly.

MS. JOHNSTON: Did you come back into public session after that? Excuse me, I didn't realize that.

CHAIR TOLEDO: If I'm -- so with that, let's go to Fredy.

MR. CEJA: Thank you so much. Good morning, everyone.

I just wanted to announce that the new website is up. We have -- I'm been fixing content throughout the weekend. I didn't realize, but transferring over the agendas from the old website to the new one is going to take me awhile. I was doing that yesterday. I managed to get three meetings over because of all the content and collateral materials, public comments that's attached to each meeting, so that's going to take me maybe a week to finish. So I'll be working intermittently throughout the day doing that.

I did include a splash page on the new website, so the first time you enter into the website it tells you we're in transition. The 2010 content will be .CA.gov. Click here to go there. The 2020 content is at the .org site, click here to go there. And it gives you a picture of both so that people can identify where they want to go. So that is up.
I did want to share that we're continuing to do media trainings. I know we had to reschedule some this week. Apologies for that, but we had some unforeseen circumstances. We will get right back to that, rescheduling those so that Commissioners have the skills that they need to get in front of the camera and talk to reporters.

And I also included in this week the duties for the communications team, just so that Commissioners know who's responsible for what. The biggest change that I added in there in the responsibilities, and I would pull it up but my computer is acting up this morning so I can't, is that Cecilia will be in charge of all social media. I am going to be in charge of updating the website just because I'm in front of my computer most of the time and it's easy for me to just update things. And she will be in charge of doing the media training in addition to all the social media channels, and stations, and monitoring to make sure that when we are mentioned that that information gets to the executive director and the chairs for the meetings immediately, and then we strategize on how we want to respond, if we want to respond.

I will continue to be in charge of reaching out to do media pitching throughout California. So I'm
currently doing a media list for every zone. I have
completed two so far, and I'll share those with the zone
leaders as soon as I'm done with those, so that you can
do an initial hello, I'm the Commissioner, pretty similar
to what you're doing with the CVOs with the media, and
then I'll do the second follow-up to get stories and
picture stories and anything of that sort.

Then my other report would be the materials, but
that has a committee report pending, so we'll leave it at
that.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Fredy, I was just wondering.
Does it make sense for you to make the first call to
media contacts and then introduce us versus the other way
around? I'm just -- until we get our media training
course and everything and our talking points I'm just
wondering if that makes more sense.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Fredy.

MR. CEJA: Yeah. I think, yeah, I can certainly do
that. I'll go about it that way. I'll make the first
round and I'll include or cc the zone leaders. There are
some Commissioners that have already reached out on their
own, so I'll leave it up to the discretion of each
Commissioner. So I'll say that I'll do the first round
and cc Commissioners unless you want to reach out first
or have already done so.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Any other questions for Director Ceja?

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I just want to say, Fredy, the website looks great, and I know it was a long time coming. The redirects look really good, too, and very useable and very attractive, so good work on this.

MR. CEJA: Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I agree. The website is looking -- coming along really well. With that, I did actually -- I was mistaken previously. We did go back into closed session last week, and so I want to make sure that that gets captured and corrected in the record. And we did not take action after -- during that session. So thank you, Marian, I was a little bit confused in terms of time line.

With that, we are going to be preparing for the line drawer session. I'm going to turn it over to Commissioner Andersen, who will give us a little overview and prep us for the meeting, or the interview process.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, thank you, Chair. Good morning, everybody.

So I'm hoping that people notice that is on the agenda this morning that they're interested in hearing
about what happens -- what are the results from our RFP for a line drawing consultant.

And we did announcements. It is on our website. We did the opening Monday morning, and we did receive one proposal.

Now, this may seem a bit like a surprise. It should not be. California is over forty million people. It is big. This is a daunting task. I apologize. I had a little camera issue this morning. It's a daunting task. Many, many of the consultants who do this type of work will have multiple contracts rather than doing one large contract like the State of California. As you can imagine, cities, counties all across the United States have, you know, the need for redistricting, and so there are multiple, multiple tasks that can be done, or you do one large very arduous task, which is California.

So that said, we were very pleased to receive this one proposal from a very qualified group. And they will be doing a presentation shortly. And what they've been asked to do is to give us a plan of what they envision is how to redistrict our great, large state.

And so given -- they've been asked for many different factors, given the pandemic issue, given our diversity, both geographical and in terms of populous, and actual -- the Voting Rights Act with California, and
all these considerations, public input, how do we do this during this time, and how to engage with all the Commissioners.

So that is what we'll be hearing shortly. Then there will be a break after the presentation. We'll come back after that for a question-and-answer session, after which the Commission will then go into discussing the entire proposal, and we will actually come to one decision about what to do with this group.

So with that in mind, I will let them present themselves when they do come on. I don't know -- I don't see anybody on yet. I don't know if we've heard -- Kristian, have you been in touch with anyone this morning about when they're coming in or anything like that?

MR. MANOFF: Commissioner Andersen, Karin Mac Donald reached out to me, and they have received their invites and are expecting to log in at 10 o'clock, so about seven minutes.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. That's really all the introduction I have. Commissioner Sadhwani, did you want to say something and are there any questions before we jump into this?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. You know, I'll just add on that this has been a process a long time in the making, so we appreciate the support of the full
Commission throughout the many steps that we've had to go through and the creation of the RFP, and you know, sending out the RFP so that folks can see it and respond, so we very much appreciate everyone's input thus far, and we're looking forward to a great conversation today.

I think just to underscore what Commissioner Andersen has already said, we asked in the RFP that proposers submit to us a plan. That is not necessarily the plan, but simply for them to bring their expertise to bear on our process.

We will, of course, retain the responsibility of finalizing an ultimate plan, but I do hope that you've all had a chance to review it. There was a lot of interesting ideas in there. It seemed as though the proposers had been -- it sounded like they had been paying careful attention to our deliberations, which was less interesting to see, and so I look forward to a fruitful discussion following their presentation.

Commissioner Andersen, do you want to mention anything about some of the documents that have been posted for Commissioners, evaluation criteria? You're on mute.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yes. We're basically -- originally this would have been -- if we had multiple proposals this would still go to the same
procedure, and to make it -- we're actually -- this is --
our RFP was considered an RFP2, which is this is not a --
many contracts that go before the State, it's a cost
basis only. Clearly, this is -- the need and the
requirements for this position are not just something
automatic, particularly given our situation with COVID,
how it's changed. You know, look how we're meeting, just
for obvious reasons. So this required some different
ways of looking at things, different planning, different
actions, which is why we went with -- we really need
qualifications here. It's not the bottom dollar.

So as a result, there have been -- you still have to
compare a similar product, and to do that we did come up
with a rather elaborate scoring procedure. We still have
done the same evaluation, it's just we don't necessarily
need to talk of the numbers at all because really it's
all qualifications, and we're talking about, you know,
are they well qualified, are they qualified moderately,
that sort of thing.

And what we're -- the criteria that we have been
looking at and we ask the -- everyone to kind of consider
is the proposers -- the plan was actually -- should
actually be addressing, you know, the following issues.
Based on your experience, being the line drawer, and the
present pandemic and the challenges of redistricting
California, what approaches would you suggest the Commission to consider in accomplishing the redistricting and why?

And for each of these items we need to consider their approach, their consideration of public input, their consideration of all the RFP requirements, which we're not going into right now, and their consideration of Bagley-Keene.

The other item is we did actually say Commission may decide to hold simultaneous four-to-six-hour remote public input meetings in two to three different parts of the state. Describe how you would approach these meetings and manage the line drawing, keeping in mind the RFP requirements for line drawing in public. Then based on your experience, how would you recommend the Commission approach VRA compliance during the line drawing process?

And so important items that we're looking for as the public as you're watching this, these are items that the Commission should also be looking for is the plans, are they -- the recognition of the importance of public input. How important is that in the plan? Inclusivity as in integration, is it important? How important is it? What is the role of Commissioner versus the role of the line drawer? Interaction with other consultants that we
are planning on hiring. The plan's recognition of the importance of transparency in the line drawing process, and their understanding of inclusion of many of the different RFP requirements into the plan, which one issue that we will talk about is the disclosure request, because as contractors for the State usually don't have to disclose all the requirements -- basically, anyone who wants to work for the Commission must also disclose all the requirements that we as Commissioners had to meet, such as of the ten years before taking on this job, what political parties are we involved with, the money we've been given, all those criteria which are in the -- in our Voters First Act.

So there will be -- there is a very large disclosure portion in the RFP, and we will go over some of those items today in our Q and answer session.

So those are basically the items that I was going to discuss. Sara, any other things?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No, I think you've covered everything, and it looks like some of our guests have arrived.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Mr. Drechsler and Ms. Mac Donald, are you there?

MR. DRECHSLER: We are.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. At this point we
might -- welcome, and we'd like to turn this over to you
for -- to introduce yourselves, and please continue with
your presentation.

MS. MAC DONALD: Yes. Good morning, Commissioners.
I just got a notification that my web camera is not
working, so I apologize. Luckily, all of you know what I
look like, and hopefully, I will be able to fix that
momentarily while my colleague Andrew starts with the
presentation.

I'm Karin Mac Donald with a different hat on today.
I am here as the owner of Q2 Data and Research and the
lead of this team that has provided this proposal to you,
and my colleague Andrew Drechsler who will be doing this
presentation with me. He is directing the PowerPoint.

So I will give you just a couple of introductory
points about Q2 Data and Research. We are, of course,
California based. We are in Oakland, California proudly,
and we're women owned and operated. There is one
exception that we have to the women-operated item and
that is Guang-Chen Li who is part of this proposal. And
you will hear a little bit about Guang-Chen who has
worked with us for quite some time also.

We are strictly nonpartisan, and we specialize in
working with independent redistricting commissions. In
fact, if you had a chance to look at our qualifications,
which I'm sure you probably have, you saw that our
redistricting experience with commissions goes back to
the redistricting commission in San Diego in 2001, which
was a very successful project. And really when I think
back of the independent redistricting commissions that
I've worked with since, San Diego was really the starting
point of a lot of the methodology that I have -- I and my
colleagues have used in every commission-based
redistricting afterwards. So it was a great project, and
it kind of set the tone for things that came afterwards.
When Proposition 11 was on the ballot, if you look
at the language of that commission, it actually included
a lot of the items that we started in the San Diego
process also so this has been a pretty long journey for
us.

And we love working with independent redistricting
commissions. I mean they -- a colleague of mine always
says that every commission is different, and I think that
is true. And we really embrace that uniqueness of
commissions, and we're all about collaboration, and you
know, designing a process with the commission that the
commission just can embrace and that really fits its
needs.

So with that, I will move things over to Andrew
while I try to fix my video camera here, and hopefully, I
will see you very soon. Thank you.

MR. DRECHSLER: Thank you very much, Karin. Thank you, Commissioners, for giving us this opportunity to present to you. My name is Andrew Drechsler. I'm president of HaystaqDNA. HaystaqDNA is, you know, a big data predictive analytics firm, so we do redistricting work, and I'll talk about that in just a second, but we -- as Commissioner Andersen was talking about, the amount of work that has to do with recommissioning -- redistricting comes along usually once, once a decade.

So in the meantime, we are a big data firm where we have a lot of different clients. If you looked at our disclosures, we have some political clients. About a third of our work is political. But we have a lot of work in the healthcare industry. We've done a lot of work in auto industry, entertainment, so we've worked in a lot of different spaces and places over the last decade.

And one of the things that we did a decade ago was work for the Arizona Independent Commission. Our firm was selected to do the work in Arizona. They had a little bit of a smaller commission, with five commissioners. But the work was still pretty big. We traveled collectively. The commission and parts of our team traveled nearly 30,000 miles around the state,
having -- participating in, you know, dozens of public
hearings and public meetings, getting input from numerous
different individuals around the state of Arizona.

So we understand the importance of the independent
commission, the importance of your job, and you know, we
were excited to have this opportunity to, you know,
present a team with Karin and Q2 to present the
Commission the team.

The other big thing we've been working on for the
last couple of years is the Redistricting Data Hub. The
Redistricting Data Hub, I think a good example is taking
what the Statewide -- California Statewide Database has
done for California, and what we're trying to do is do
that for the rest of the country.

When it comes to redistricting information, what
we're trying to do is democratize it so that individuals,
groups have access to data and that they are not spending
a lot of time pulling together the tremendous effort of
pulling together all the different data sets. So that is
something we've been working on for the last two years.
It is a completely nonpartisan effort. We're very proud
of that, and so when this opportunity came to submit a
proposal to the California Citizens Redistricting
Commission, we were excited to do that.

Together, our teams -- I think we have unmatched
experience with statewide redistricting commissions, both, as Karin mentioned, in 2011 what her team did with California and then our team did in Arizona. And that's sort of -- we knew about each other back then, and had admiration for each other, and understood sort of the challenges of what goes through an independent commissioner -- independent commission.

So we have experience in the line drawings and doing this in public, you know, moving the lines with the direction of the commission and not going off doing it in secret, and you know, I think that sets us apart in terms of making sure that we're listening to you. You guys are our bosses. We are the technical consultants, and today we have a plan for, you know, your request. We presented you with a plan, a well thought-out plan, but of course, as we will say multiple times, you guys, we're taking your lead.

So besides the experts -- you know, being experts in the redistricting software, we've had success with the Voting Rights implementation, both clearly in California, but also in Arizona. While Section 5 has been removed from the -- is not a requirement for preclearance anymore, Arizona did need to get precleared by the Department of Justice in 2011, and we were excited to be part of the team working closely with counsel and getting
the maps precleared for the first time in Arizona's history -- on the first time in Arizona's history. So we were excited that we, you know, were able to do maps and that were in place and stayed in place for the entire decade.

And I think we have a pretty comprehensive approach. We wrote about this, about data security, monitoring, and storage that we've added in an appendix. We wanted to -- we thought that was a very important part of it. You know, we didn't squeeze it all in into that ten pages, so did add that as an appendix. So we wanted to make sure that that was part of what we had.

So you're different, and we feel like we are different. You're both, as we mentioned, you're an independent Commission. You have been doing this for many months now and you sort of understand what it takes, and I think one of the big things is transparency.

We, you know, filling out the documentation, attachment D, where we all had to list our disclosures of every client that we worked with for the past decade. We understand that the disclosures that you as Commissioners had to go through, so understand the process and understand the importance of the transparency that we come to as a team that what we're doing is understood, and it's understood not only by the Commissioners, but
the public as well.

So that's why we think that it's -- we believe that it's very important to be transparent through this entire process. Our conversations, what we're doing with the maps is, you know, directed by you, that it's in an open deliberation and talked about in collaboration so that there's an understanding of what's going on.

So that's what you have to do, and we feel like we do that as well, both Q2 and Haystaq. We welcome the transparency and feel that it's very important, and we have a record, both in terms of working with statewide independent Commissions and working -- collecting public input, listening to what communities of interest are. So that's something that we have done, and we feel like we're highly qualified to be your partners on the mapping process moving forward.

So the plan, the ten-page plan, we'll go into this a little bit more -- per the request, we're going to talk about this. So it is a ten-page plan that, again, is a recommendation, as Commissioner Andersen pointed out. It's not by all means what needs to happen. Clearly we wanted to present you a plan, work closely with you to make sure that there was comfort in what we were suggesting, and we are open to listening to you and making the appropriate suggestions.
So our plan includes regional line drawing. We're going to see the regions broken out in the next slide, but just basic big picture. We're going to have four different mappers tackling each of the regions, each of the four regions, and then we also have a mapper that is going to help bring the four maps -- the four regions together to make sure we're combining them in an appropriate way. So that's what the process of the fifth mapper is.

And when we -- I think this is a very important point. When we talk about the regions that they're not representing any proposed lines. I think that's an important point that we needed a part -- as you know, there's forty million people in the State of California. How do you start tackling this and how do you do this appropriately, and that's something that we gave a lot of thought to and wanted to present it.

So at each meeting we're going to have at least one line drawer and a senior consultant. We'll have back-end support on the team who will be supporting us to, you know, capture information, because there's going to be a lot of public information and public input that are going to be happening at these meetings. So we want to make sure that they're going to -- that it's going to be -- that we have the appropriate team in place to capture
everything and then present -- you know, provide you with comments, what we heard, to make sure that we're all on the same page as we work on this together.

Furthermore, besides the line drawers, which will be a very big part of the team, and the support staff that will be working closely with the line drawers, we have two people, two additional people. One person is dedicated to managing data, security and information, data transfer of very large files. As you know, a data analytics firm we have a lot of experience with this, and you know, as I mentioned, we have a couple healthcare clients, so know the importance of making sure that the data stays and is transferred in a secure way. That's something that's extremely important to us. And then we have another person on the team that will be working to help with some of the administrative details as well.

So we have a pretty, you know, a robust team that we feel like we can handle everything that is in front of you and is in front of the Commission.

As I mentioned, we talked about this and we went into further detail in our proposal. We have a box in there sort of breaking down, and I can't stress enough this is just a proposed plan of how we are suggesting to break this down, and there's going to be some things that make sense. Intuitively, I think you look at LA County
with nearly ten million people. I think having a mapper
focus on that alone I think is going to be very
important.

But then breaking up the rest of the state, we broke
it out into the outreach zones. Again, we feel like this
is a proposed plan and want to work closely with the
entire team to go through this to make sure that this
makes sense and how we're approaching this makes sense.

We listened in to some of the meetings. We haven't
been to every single second of the meetings, so
there's -- you know, working with the, you know, the
Commission as a whole, but subcommittees I think is going
to be very important to get feedback on how we approach
this.

And then, finally, I just want to talk about the
team a little bit more. Karin introduced herself and she
is going to be the project leader, and I will be the
project manager working closely with the CRC staff to
make sure that we're in place when there's meetings,
making sure that the team, the appropriate team members,
are at the meetings and ready, prepared for the meetings,
working with the staff with any logistical.

You know, if we get to a point where we're in
person, where we're printing out maps and making sure
that those are available, or if there is a request for
maps on the website. I will be working with the, you
know, the staff to make sure that the needs are set and
making sure that everything that we're talking about in
the meetings and any, you know, proposed maps, draft
maps, that those are available to you. So that's
something.

Jaime is going to be the lead line drawer and
regional coordinator and she's going to be working
closely with the rest of the line drawers which will
include Tamina, Brad, Willie, and John. So together
that's the core mapping team. That doesn't mean that
those are the only mappers, but that's going to be the
core mapping team that we are going to have assigned to
this project and feel that each of the and all of their
resumes are in our proposal, so you can go look at their
experiences of what they have done over the last decade
and previously in terms of mapping. So you do have a
very experienced team here.

Three other people that we have on here, Adriana is
going to be working closely with the mapping -- the line
drawers, and she's -- there's going to be times where as
we get into meetings where there's a request to pull up a
map that would be part of the COI tool that we are, you
know, working with that the Commissioners may want to see
a little bit more in detail, that's something that
Adriana will be helping with and doing some of the meeting support.

And then Sue as sort of a dual role, will be doing some of the meeting support, but really helping us with the administrative part of this contract. As mentioned, this is a very large contract, a lot of moving pieces, so we wanted to have Sue, who has experience in this, be part of the team who is going to be bringing in her expertise and making sure that all the T's are dotted, T's are crossed and that we're fulfilling our part of the contract.

Guang-Chen is our -- I don't have a line directly to him to any one person. I think from a data security standpoint he's going to be working with the entire team to make sure that we're all aware of, you know, any data transfers that will be going on, that they're done in a safe and a secure way, that our personal machines are protected, that we don't have any issues with that, and we want to make sure that we're not compromised in any way. So we take that, the data security and information in a very serious manner, and we have a very qualified individual who will be working with us on that.

I'm now going to turn it over to Karin who is going to talk about, you know, the plan in a little bit more detail.
MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you, Andrew. And my video is now working, so hello, Commissioners. And I should also tell you that was the first time that Andrew has ever mispronounced my name. Go figure.

So good morning, again. I am going to walk a little bit more through the plan that we have presented to you, and I should tell you that plan was not always ten pages. I think at some point it was sixteen pages, and then it went to fourteen pages, and you know, we were limited to ten pages, so there are quite a few things that -- there are some other ideas that were floating around on this team, and we're, of course, very happy to share them with you, you know, as we move forward with this.

So I'm going to just take on some of the bigger ideas while not, hopefully, boring you with repeating the entire ten pages.

One big thing I think that's happened for all of us is, of course, the census delay. And it's turned something that we all planned for into really interesting times. The census delay, however, may open possibilities for more preen-up meetings because we have a little bit more time now, and that may actually be a good thing, especially looking at what happened, you know, if you're comparing in 2011 there was not that much time, and you know, while the line drawing time is essentially the
same, you do have more time to prepare and to go out into
the communities, and of course, you have other tools
available also. So this is a really interesting time
that we could all take full advantage of to get into the
communities and get a lot of input.

Another thing that really has changed over the last
many years is that we are now all, unfortunately, we're
all used to online meetings, but also the technology, of
course, of online meetings has changed dramatically. And
online meetings can save so much time on travel and
really increase the time that we can spend on meetings,
because you are not going to be sitting in cars going
from meeting to meeting, and neither are we.

And Andrew was talking about how many miles that
they covered in Arizona. I mean if you look at Arizona,
Arizona is, you know, so much smaller than California,
and you can imagine the kind of traveling that the
Commissioners and also the line drawing consultants did
the last time. It was a lot of being stuck in traffic
and just, you know, trying to get from A to B, and that,
of course, came at the cost of the time that we actually
had to have meetings with communities. So that is
something that has, you know, really changed and that we
can take advantage of. So you know, it's a time to make
lemonade, essentially.
Another idea that we had when we looked at how meetings, you know, in our experience have worked with independent redistricting Commissions is that it was really -- it's really difficult and of course, everybody who has ever gone to a city council meeting has tried to present or give input on a particular item knows this, you just don't know when you're going to be up. So you know, you could be up at 8 o'clock, or you could be up at 10 o'clock, so you'd better bring a sandwich, as I always say.

And I think that is something that we could really improve on by perhaps creating an appointment system, and again, these are ideas that we're having, and you know, I'm not saying that we have all of the answers at all, but it's something that we can perhaps collaborate on and figure out whether, you know, we can create something like that will work for you and that will work for the public so that the public can plan in advance and kind of just know, you know, that they're going to be home for dinner because, you know, their slot is going to be the first one in the meeting and so forth. Because, you know, everybody had childcare needs and they need to be at work the next day and so forth. So it just allows for better planning for the public, and it also allows for better public for you.
If we create this appointment system, we could incorporate an advance request for interpretation assistance so that people are lined up and we don't have to sit in the meeting and go, okay, do we have an interpreter available. You know, you're up now making sure that that person knows that their services that are required at that particular time.

So again, this is just all about better planning, a more smooth process, and perhaps saving a little bit of time on the logistics and just coming in, and you know, having more time for the actual meat, so actually, I say this as a vegetarian, so for actually the presentation itself.

Next slide, please, Andrew. Thank you so much.

So another idea that comes along with this is that we could perhaps ask people to pre-identify the geography when they're coming in, and that could be something on the meeting sign-up form or so. You know, what area would you like to talk about, or perhaps even, you know, did you submit something, because if you did submit something, I mean we've talked, of course, about the COI tool quite a bit. There is going to be a link on there that people can -- that we can click on, that we can pull up there their community of interest. And if people are coming in and they want to talk to you about it, if
they're pre-identifying this is what they want to talk
about, or if they even just say, I want to talk about,
you know, the City of Oakland, or you know, the City of
Sacramento, then the mappers in the meeting can be
prepared for that and they can pull up the geography
already, and in particular, if it's geography that's a
lot smaller that may be a little bit harder to find. The
conversation is just a lot more efficient when we know in
advance what's required.

But as Andrew also said, we have a very
comprehensive team, and we thought about how to make
these meetings more efficient, and you know, having
mapping assistants, having the senior consultant there
and mapper and mapping assistant, all of this will turn
into just a smoother process and us being faster. And
faster on our end means that you can have a more
efficient conversation with the public.

A really big deal, of course, something that we all
need to keep in mind always, is that we need to mitigate
the digital divides. And one idea that we had was that
perhaps you might look into collaborating with the
outreach grant recipients to see if they might be up for
or able to assist with an appointment system, and also
with requests for assistance. You know, I think that
would, again, just on the front end make for a much
smoother entry point for people that may not be as used
to, you know, using a web forum and so forth.

And again, this is a collaboration that the
Commission could have with outreach grant recipients,
with the line drawers, really with the entire team. And
it goes to my last point, which is, you know, the five As
of technology access, availability, affordability,
awareness, abilities, and agency, you know, all of these
items need to be taken into consideration with every
piece of this conversation.

And to that point, reserving time for people that
don't have appointments, that's a really big deal, too.
You know, I've been looking with my neighbors into how
people can gain access, for example, to COVID
vaccinations right now, and if you've looked at it, you
know, most of the scheduling for the appointments is in
web form, and those web forms are really difficult. And
you know, a lot of my neighbors, I mean, some of you know
where I live, a lot of my neighbors don't have web access
to that point.

So there are barriers that sometimes we're not
obviously aware of as people that hang on computers and
stare at screens all day, and you know, I think it's a
good thing for everybody to just remind themselves every
day that, you know, we're -- there are people that are
not operating the way that we do. So of course you know all of this, so anyway.

Next slide, please, and I'll get off my little soap box here.

So option to participate, this is something that we also discuss at length in the plan. We think it's a really good thing, even if people -- if the COVID restrictions are loosened, if perhaps COVID magically goes away, that you continue to offer this remote meeting participation. It was really difficult for people to get to meetings last time. Some people were driving many, many, many hours, and not everybody has that luxury.

So remote meeting participation, you know, figuring out where people can access meetings also. Of course we're going to have access sites and so forth, so there is going to be some infrastructure there, again working with outreach partners and so forth. I think this will bring more people into the process, and so we think it's a good thing to continue to offer that moving forward.

It definitely allows those that can't travel to participate just in general, and you know, I think it's just a good thing, in particular now that many people are used to it. So it will bring more people into the process for sure.

And then, also to continue to stream and post
videos, of course you're already doing this, but you
know, again, it's good to be mindful that there are a lot
of people that are working right now, for example, and
they may be watching this video later tonight because
they want to know what happened. And so that's a really
great practice that the Commission has already
implemented and we think it's a good thing moving forward
and of course, it aids in transparency and acceptability
also.

Next slide, please, Andrew. Thank you.

One really important thing I think is just conduct
some dry runs when we move into, you know, actual line
drawing and looking at -- you know, when you are moving
into line drawing and looking at maps to collaborate with
the video and streaming consultants.

We had a great working relationship in 2011 with the
videographers that were hired the last time that are
currently also streaming this particular meeting, and I
think that that was a very important one because
sometimes there are hiccups. Obviously, they are experts
in things that we're not, and it takes everybody to make
sure that this is a successful process. So we know that
people that are watching this online need to be able to
see the detailed maps, and you need to see the detailed
maps.
And so conducting some dry runs, really collaborating with the video and streaming consultants is important, and of course, we want to do this before the public is, you know, subjected to us figuring out whether we should be clicking this button or that button, because there's nothing more aggravating than watching people figuring out technical difficulties. And I apologize again for my video not working earlier.

So there are multiple avenues that I think you are already exploring, of course, to provide input, and we just wanted to let you know we are with you. I think this is great that you're thinking about these various ways for, you know, input collection.

I think the bulk of the public testimony will probably not be received in public hearings, if our experience is any guide here. And you know, even if you are doing what you're doing already, which is, you know, having public hearings and opening things up and so forth, but there are still a lot of people that feel that mail and email are their most best-used options because they may want to say more than what they can say in, you know, two or three minutes. And you know, they may just seem more comfortable with it, and that goes to my last point here.

There are a lot of people that are not comfortable
speaking in public or able to speak in public, so you
know, making sure that there are many different options
available, you know, the sky is the limit pretty much, is
a really good process, and we're here to support you with
whatever you want to do.

Jaime, in particular, just pointed out that a really
good thing to do would be just to have a simple input
form that can be filled out online that will be really
simple to do and that we could do on your website. We
could help you with this, of course, and you know, just a
few items and a pretty quick run, something that could
also be printed perhaps that people can give to their
neighbor to fill out and then, you know, send your way.
That's a pretty good thing to do also. And again, I know
you have probably thought about this even more than we
have, and we're here to support you.

Then there's public map submissions, so we -- the
last time there were a couple of days where the
Commission, the last Commission, 2011 Commission, invited
various groups to present maps. And you, of course, have
heard the term unity map and unity mapping and so forth,
and that was one of the examples of the maps that were
presented.

There were two days to do this and I think because
there are just more options now, there's more
accessibility to online mapping tools and so forth, I think there will be more maps. You're obviously going to get a whole lot more COI maps because of the COI tool. But you know, considering when and how to schedule hearings for maps that are provided by the public I think really, you know, deserves some time. You may need more than just a couple of days because there may be more people that are now in the process that are capable of developing maybe statewide maps and want to just because the technology is available. And you know, there's some free -- there's going to be, obviously, some free technology available also.

And one important point to consider is to create some criteria for selecting presenters because you may get a lot of people that want to present, and you know, just figuring out, like, who should be presenting there and that's really a pretty tricky conversation to have, but I think it's good just to think about these criteria in advance and then let people know, you know, who is going to be invited to these and who should be presenting.

Then, you know, figuring out the most appropriate time for the public plan presentation, so when in the schedule. I saw you have this really great Gantt chart, and you know, took a look at that, and so figuring out
where this might fit into the Gantt chart will be a great thing to do, also in advance so that people can plan ahead.

And one other thing. I think there was an idea presented that the CRC, that you should not be working on any maps until you've seen some of the groups' maps. And I think that that may not work with the time schedule, and again, this is just my take on it, and you know, Andrew's and my and our group's take on it. We think there is definitely an opening there to start working on visualizations, so on some hypotheticals, before you see the group presentation. But also you know, being mindful that some of the public plans in the group presentations may actually provide you with some solutions or scenarios that you haven't thought about, you know.

I mean this is a big state. There are a lot of things that are happening here. There are -- you know, there isn't just one perfect map, and that's something that I usually tell people on the local level. You know, sometimes people come into this process and think there is one perfect map that is going to do the right thing for absolutely everybody, and that's not true. There are many, you know, good maps. There are many perfect maps. There are many things that -- there are many maps that will do something really great for some area and maybe
not so great things for another area, because things are interconnected.

And it's really difficult. My colleague Tamina talks about redistricting like, you know, trying to put -- trying to seat a wedding party, you know, were Aunt Gertrude wants to sit here, but doesn't want to sit next to Aunt Mabel and so forth. It's a difficult process, and you know, taking advantage of public plans and figuring, you know, just really looking at the solutions or perhaps the ideas that are coming in with public plans. It's a great thing to do before perhaps you start creating your draft maps. But again, that doesn't mean you can't do any work before.

And then there's another point about the submitted community of interest maps and geography. It will be really great that if the presenters, and I mentioned this earlier, could pre-identify, you know, submitted communities of interest and thus it doesn't go for, like, group presentations of big maps perhaps as much as for, like, the smaller presentations of communities of interest.

So if, you know, the COIs could be pre-identified so that the line drawers can quickly access them and pull them out so that you can look at them in greater detail, that again, goes to smoother process, and you know, that
also actually goes for the maps. If group presentations are scheduled, the line drawers should presumably have the maps in advance, so you know, if you want us to do some work on them, if you want us to run some reports on them or make sure that we have them available to show to you, then we just have to figure out how to load them in advance so that this can be a streamlined and quick process.

Again, I'm thinking about shaving off time so that you can have maximum time talking about the substance of the presentation and you're not waiting for us to find a map, you know, the line drawers to find a map or a community of interest to be pulled up.

Next slide, please. Thank you so much, Andrew, for doing this.

And so you've heard the term "collaboration". Really it's a thread through our proposal and that is because that's what we really believe in, and I think collaborations are what make these projects successful. And you know, a collaboration is, of course, what we're doing with Haystaq. We, you know, work together on some projects, and you know, related to data access and so forth, and we realize that we're really good collaborators. So collaborations really make the world go around.
So data management, you have some data management people right now on staff, and you know, we've collaborated with them to bring them up to speed on things, and we just see that going forward, of course, with whoever you're going to bring on. And you know, this is really an important one. And you've heard me talk about just making sure that the files are available. Some of these things will have to go hand in hand.

We think that probably what makes the most sense is the line drawing team is responsible for the GIS data portion, so anything that's, like, a GIS file and so forth. And you know, you're going to get a lot of GIS files I think from, again, the COI tools and the online tools and the available GIS softwares that are there. And we just need to be sure that there is this streamlined process any GIS file that gets submitted to you that comes into the data management team arrives with us, and we're very happy and looking forward to working with anybody you designate, obviously, to figure out how that, you know, stream of communication works best.

Once we get the GIS files, you know, we'll be working with you to figure out what we need to do with these data. They, at the very least, need to be processed and then probably integrated, because you're going to want to see them in a greater scheme of things.
And then, you know, again we need to just assign some responsibilities. You know that there will be some PDFs that are coming in, so just static files, and again, maybe the famous napkin will come in with a map. And you know, we have to figure out what to do with that napkin, and also with the PDFs.

And you know, what should go to the data management team to make accessible. We think it would be a great thing if the data management team could, you know, deal with the PDFs that are submitted, since that's not something we as line drawers would necessarily work with, and that's something that needs to be digitized, you know, that they can be made accessible to the Commission and the public very quickly so that they can have the same weight as other public input that comes in.

And then there's this idea of having a statewide COI map, and I am not going to say that this was our idea. I think pretty much everybody on your Commission has had that idea. So we are aligned with your idea; let's figure out how to best do that. I think it's a really great idea to, you know, use something like a pin or so to figure out where we have submitted COIs so that we can figure out where there is a COI desert, you know, where are there no COIs. So what now do we do in those areas? You know, do we focus more meetings in those areas? Is
there going to be more of a push to work with partners in those areas to get the word out?

You know, I think these maps, they are just a really great visual tool for all kinds of different reasons, and you know, figuring out how that might work best and how to design something like that, we're, you know, looking forward to working with you on that, and you know, seeing what works for you and bringing, you know, our experience to this.

So then also, again, developing protocols for evaluating submitted district plans. This kind of goes hand in hand really, I think with this idea of who presents in the group meetings. I think there's a little bit of overlap there. So you know, we need to -- we're going to have to collaborate with the data management team on a system to publish plans that are, you know, consistent with other testimony to make sure nothing falls between the cracks, and you know, just get guidance from you on what you would like to see, figure out, you know, what's possible and in what time frame and so forth.

Next slide, please, Andrew. Thank you.

Again, Andrew has said this, and I just want to reiterate this. We understand that the "we" in We Draw The Lines is not us; it's you. You know, you are the
selected and the chosen ones, so we understand that. And so on that note, you know, you direct us and we see our role as being implementers. So we see you as providing direction and then, you know, we will respond to that by documenting that direction and then publicize the direction.

Like, for example, we have an input meeting and it's pretty clear that, you know, you all come to the decision that, you know, a certain area should really not be split because you've heard a lot of, you know, feedback on that. We'll make sure we write that down and then we'll make sure this get publicized on the map, whatever we understand you to direct, you know, any direction that you're giving to us.

And I think that's a really important one also to make sure that we're all in the same page, that we don't have miscommunications, and also that the public can participate, because just imagine how upset you would be if you're sitting there for, like, a week and you're developing a map of your area only to find out later that, you know, the CRC has given direction to, you know, keep a particular jurisdiction whole and you have just split it, and you just didn't know about it.

So I just think it's a good thing to do all around to work with the public, and it's good for us as line
drawers to understand what the direction is, and you
know, for you to know that we really understood your
direction. So this goes, like, all over this, you know,
transparency and access idea.

For us, we can, you know, assess the possibilities
based on the direction you're giving. We can provide you
with some options.

Again, we were talking about visualizations earlier,
and this is an important thing. You know, as line
drawers -- line drawing is a tricky thing. It really is.
I mean even though California, you know, we have ranked
criteria, you know, those criteria are not easy. So you
know, you just have to think about all these different
things when you're putting something together, so for us
to, you know, just assess some of these possibilities and
bring them to you, give you some options and then, you
know, having you think about them and giving directions
about where you would like to go, you know, like any of
them, go back to the drawing table and what not. This is
kind of how we see our role of, you know, doing some
preliminary work that just based on efficiency, just for
efficiency purposes needs to be done.

And again, We Draw The Lines means you all make the
decisions and we don't make the decisions. You know, we
can give you suggestions, we'll collaborate with you, and
that's what we're dedicated to do.

Line drawing live and in public whenever possible, I will tell you that there are very, very few consultants that are comfortable with this. And that's what I liked about Haystaq when we first started talking, and I think that's what Haystaq liked about us, because we like this. We think that this is a great thing to do, especially for independent redistricting Commissions. This is where transparency lies. This is the root of everything. This is where, you know -- and I'm not saying that this is easy. And it takes time, it takes longer, so you know, just knowing that all of you are dedicated to this I think, you know, the more live line drawing we can do, the better.

And again, this little sub-bullet here goes to, you know, working with multiple, you know, consultants that you either already have on staff or will have on staff like, you know, your streaming, and videographers, and so forth, to make sure that this can be, you know, viewed properly and people can participate.

Again, it's not always going to be possible. Not all of this work can be done in public. I've outlined already the work that may go into, you know, assessing some possibilities and providing options, but you know, again one more time, whatever is not done in public, you
know, we are of course committed to presenting every option, everything that we've done to you. And I think our software is set up to provide, you know, transparent records and so forth.

So I think any work that would be done between meetings, just again for efficiency reasons, might best be done with subcommittees, and you're already mostly set up for this, so this is just our idea of what could happen, so obviously, you know, it's just an idea, and you know, a technical subcommittee could perhaps work with the line drawers to, you know, work with them on how the work is being done and then report back to the full Commission.

There's a legal one that's going to be a big one, obviously, about where and how to implement the Federal Voting Rights Act districts. And then regional one, where perhaps Commissioners assigned to the outreach zones may work with respective line drawers, because obviously you're going to become experts on certain areas, and we view the respective regional line drawers as kind of fulfilling that role on the technical end also.

And then continuity, that's just, like, the overall process, administration and so forth; that's, I think, also something that you already have in place. And you
know, some of your subcommittees may just be able to pivot and take some of this work on. After input hearings, this is also something that I've touched on, you could provide some broad direction, for example, to the line drawers, and then again, these directions could be summarized and made publicly available, and those directions can then be used to create some visualizations and then be perhaps incorporated in the draft maps if, you know, you agree that these visualizations work for you, or we can use these visualizations just as a starting off point, a jumping off point to, you know, develop a map that may work for you. Some of these visualizations, I can tell you this from experience, and I've worked with visualizations for a long time, and some of them are probably not going to make a lot of sense, and you know, you're going to hear from the public about it, and that's part of it. You know, you're going to put this out there and you figure out what works. You figure out what works for you and the public is going to let you know what works for them, and then, you know, you come to some sort of an agreement on where the lines go. So it's an interesting process definitely.

And then, finally, training. I think training is
critical for everybody who is on the team to make sure that we have, you know, good collaborations, good communications like, for example, how is live line drawing going to work? You know, getting a couple of the line drawers in there and actually, you know, showing you how this works, and having you ask questions. This is an interesting training to have, and I think you all enjoy it.

And the handoffs, the handoffs are really interesting, and that's also something where you may be interested and you may want to have a separate training on that, or maybe we'll, you know, roll it into the first line drawing training.

And then, finally, how are these visualizations constructed and you know, really the sky's the limit on this one, and we would ask you to, of course, just let us know where you feel like you need training, and then we'll design it and we'll present it to you.

This is going to be our last slide, I think. Yes. And last, but definitely not least, this really by some accounts should have probably been the first slide. You know, it's the collaboration with the Federal Voting Rights Act counsel, and I know you're looking at applications now, and you know, obviously we'll work with whoever you will choose. We've, you know, worked with
quite a few people in that field already, and you know, Haystaq has worked with some of the people there, and we've also worked with some of the people that have applied, so there's not going to be many surprises for us. And you know, I think determining an approach to Federal Voting Rights Act assessment and implementation really will rely on working with counsel.

And you know, counsel is going to drive this process. Obviously they are going to be the expert on it. But we have some assumptions, and those are that we'll have a very close working relationship and that this will be an iterative process.

And for example, the line drawers could identify some areas of potential section 2 districts, Federal Voting Rights Act district early in the process. I mean we know we have the CVAP data, citizen voting-age population data are out already, and you know, some of this work can be frontloaded.

And then, you know, beginning with some large pockets, figuring out where these areas may be, you know, communicate those to counsel perhaps, wait for racially polarized voting analysis and some direction, and then figure out some general options. I mean I assume -- we assume that, you know, counsel is going to talk to you and then we will get direction from you on what to do,
and then we'll, you know, we'll kind of go back and forth
and figure out, you know, how to implement this.

In between, you know, all of that is we'll wait for
direction from you regarding the implementation. We'll
assess perhaps some more details options. Some of this
is real, like, fine-tuned work, and then, you know, work
with the subcommittee perhaps if you choose to go that
way and definitely counsel, and kind of go back and forth
a little bit, present some options to the Commission and
then, you know, districts are refined, perhaps tested and
then perhaps integrated into the larger map.

And one of the questions you may have to consider is
whether the Federal Voting Rights Act counsel is
responsible for guidance on the other criteria because
that's not the only criterion you have, of course.

Then our last slide is we thank you very, very much
for your time and for considering our proposal, and I
know I said "we" a lot, and I don't mean to be
presumptuous here, okay, just kind of slipped out that
way. And we wish you a happy redistricting, and we're
available for any questions you may have. Thank you so
much.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Karin, and thank you,
Andrew for a great presentation.

We're going to take a fifteen-minute break, so we're
going to take a fifteen-minute break now and then come
back to questions and answer after that, so we'll be back
at 11:10 for questions and answers.

MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
MR. DRECHSLER: Thank you, Chair.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 10:55 a.m.
until 11:10 a.m.)

CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back. With that, I will turn
it over to Commissioner Andersen who will be leading our
question-and-answer period.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. Thank you, Chair. So
at this point basically it's open to the Commissioners
for any questions that they'd like to propose to the
group.

And I would like to say thank you very much for a
wonderful presentation. It certainly well filled the
hour and it was well worth it. Thank you. Commissioner
Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, and thank you to Q2
as well as Haystaq, slipped my mind. Thank you, Karin
and Andrew for your wonderful presentation.

I was particularly interested in the proposed plan,
which I understand are just ideas at this point, the
aspect around data management, as I sit with Commissioner
Turner on the data management subcommittee, I just wanted to gain some understanding on some additional ideas you all might have in regards to that aspect as we move forward.

So particularly, what role does the data manager on the team that you had outlined, what does their role look like, and then, additionally, how would you foresee a data manager from our side on staff at CRC complementing or supplementing the responsibilities of that line drawer?

MS. MAC DONALD: Yes, thank you very much for that question, Commissioner Ahmad. I think those are two different roles, really. When we say data manager, data security, it really is about internal data management for us to make sure that we are all safe and secure, that our files are properly backed up, you know, that we have files available to us internally that we need.

So as you know, there's four -- actually five line drawers that we're proposing to bring on, plus perhaps, you know, some more mapping support, and depending on what people are working on, there are the handoffs to consider and so forth, so people may need to have access to files at certain times, and we need to make sure that, you know, these files are secure, that after every meeting everything is properly backed up and so forth.
I think your data management team deals with much more than that, perhaps. I don't know if your data management team is also charged with providing overall security, because that's kind of more a specialized IT function, which is really what Guang-Chen is, you know, an expert in. And of course, he also used to work at Statewide Database, so he really understands, like, large databases and large data sets and protocols and whatnot.

So I'm not entirely sure how you are really envisioning that role for your data management team. We know that we need to be able to interface with them. I think their role is larger with respect to the file types that they're working with because I think they're going to have, you know, the public input that's not geographic to deal with perhaps, you know, posting things, making sure that things are available to you, the Commissioners, when you need it. And we see our little piece as being the geographic input piece.

Having said that, I think there's also a little bit of collaboration there in terms of -- potential collaboration, depending on, you know, who you bring on, like who you want us to work with, if it, you know, goes that way, but with making sure that files that are submitted are indexed in a particular way that are perhaps easily -- more easily accessible.
I think one of the things that this entire team brings to the table is that we understand longitudinal data sets and that's -- I know some of you have dealt with longitudinal data. That's a totally different ballpark than just getting one data set and having to make sure that that works and is understandable and properly indexed.

So you know, we may be able to interface with your data managers, and you know, assist in naming conventions and so forth. But I think that's basically the difference, and I hope that answers your question.

Of course, it's also something that we could talk about for a really long time, so --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: No, definitely that does provide some insight. As you all know if you've been watching our meetings, we haven't full flushed out that aspect, so we were really hoping to get insights from our applicants for the line drawer position to see how we can best make a very robust process overall.

And just one follow up question I had. I saw in the proposal that the preferred tool is Caliper's Maptitude for Redistricting. Is there any significant difference between using that tool and the COI tool in terms of drawing those lines, whether it comes from -- from public testimony meetings? I personally don't know Maptitude
well enough to be able to identify any differences, so if
you could help me understand what the major differences
are, just so we're all on the same page, that would be
great.

MS. MAC DONALD: Of course. Thank you. Let me take
the COI tool aspect and then I'll hand it over to Andrew
to talk about the Caliper aspect.

The COI tool is really not a line drawing tool.

Like, I sometimes refer to it as a one-trick pony, and I
hope that doesn't sound dismissive because I think that's
actually the strength of the tool is that it does one
thing and it does it very simply, and it's super easy to
understand and use and all that. Line drawing software,
that's a totally different ballpark.

So essentially, the COI tool is really just to
define COIs and it's not for line drawing. For line
drawing you have to have data sets and all kinds of
stuff, and you actually have to put things together. For
the COI tool you're just, like, creating your community
of interest and you're sending it off to the Commission.

And I'll let Andrew talk about why, you know, and we
talked about this a lot, why we were thinking of using
Caliper's Maptitude for Redistricting software. And this
is internal, so this will be the line drawers using it.

Andrew, go ahead.
MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. One of the big reasons that we use Maptitude or suggesting to use Maptitude is because of the ability to take snapshots. In Arizona -- and that helps with the transparency aspect and sort of ties into your initial question about our data security person, is to make sure that we are backing up everything at the end of the night, that any changes that are made --

I think we had a total 40,000-plus different snapshots of the maps in Arizona throughout the process, something probably very similar that we will see in California, if not many more, but that is -- that's one of the reasons that we like Maptitude is because of the ability to have the snapshots, have them available. If there is a -- you know, ideally we're not going back and looking at them, but if we need to go back in time to say, all right, how do we decide on this -- this sort of -- this line change or why did this line go here, we have the ability to do that.

And then just one other thing that I think we want to, you know, besides recording every change with Maptitude, I think one other thing on the data security is we take PII, personal identifiable information, very seriously, and we would work with your data person to make sure anything that's publicly submitted, that
people's names, phone numbers, addresses, are, you know, retracted properly before that information gets out into the public. So we take that extremely seriously.

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah, and if I may add, my copresenter Jaime just texted me that I should point out that the COI tool also relies on an internet connection, and in public meetings we may, if we're using Maptitude for Redistricting actually the database may be on the local computer, so you don't have to send the lines over the web, which otherwise, you know, that little spinning wheel, that can become quite hypnotic. It's a big state.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, thank you for the proposal and your presentation. Really appreciate all the hard work behind putting something like that together.

I have two questions. The first question is do either of your organizations have other line drawing jobs going on right now, and if so, how would you guys manage sort of kind of prioritizing the work in the case there might be some conflicts or anything?

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah, maybe I should take the first stab at this, Andrew, if that's okay.

So we -- so Q2, we have a few contracts, some of them in the works and a couple of them signed, and so the
only one really that kind of overlaps with this project or would overlap with this project is a county where all we're doing is helping them with training of a commission, and so this is really just a few meetings and kind of helping them sketch out the process. So this is a county that has an advisory commission, and you know, we're just helping with, you know, basically the materials and it has a few meetings. I think it's a total of seven meetings or so. And they have, like, roughly the same deadlines that you have, whatever that deadline may turn out to be.

And then we have a couple of other small jurisdictions. One is a commission that we also worked with the last time. They are not -- they don't have to be ready for the primary. So all the other clients, they have to be ready for the general election, so it doesn't coincide with the work that's going to be done for this particular Commission. So that's all we have at this point going on. And I don't anticipate a whole lot more happening.

MR. DRECHSLER: And I would second that, and the one project, you know, full disclosure, that we did apply to -- for Michigan, they have an independent commission there as well, and Q2 and Haystaq teamed up to apply there. And there's other members of the team that will
be -- that are currently not on the California project
that will be if we were to get the Michigan project, and
we are a finalist in Michigan, so a significant amount of
their time would be dedicated to Michigan.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I had one more question.

Sorry.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So you know, Andrew, your
firm does analytics. I know, Karin, you have a great
deal of experience with data. How do you guys envision
sort of helping us make sense of all this input we're
getting, and I mean, we'll be talking about hiring a data
analyst, but I'm just wondering what your thoughts are on
how your team, this team, would help us, you know, think
through the data, think through what it's telling us,
think through what we can glean out of the data to be
more effective in executing our job?

MR. DRECHSLER: I'll start and then, Karin, you can
jump in, but I think that's a great question, and you
know, we, Haystaq as a firm, deal with big data sets all
the time. And I think one big thing that I like to tell
clients is we help tell a story. So there's a lot of
data and there needs to be a story that needs to be told.
And we work with clients to make sure that they
understand what the data is.

In Arizona, what we did last time is we worked with the commission staff to set up a system that categorized every single piece of data that, you know, any comment that came in, and worked with the commission staff to set that up and implement that, and that was very important. You know, we worked with the legal counsel as well because they needed a lot of that information to preserve and have ready in case there were any court cases, that information was available.

So that's one thing that I think we could work closely with the CRC staff, and you know, we have that ability to deal with large data sets. We deal with the census data all the time. We have -- our firm has a national photo file. We have a consumer file of 250 million Americans, so we're used to, you know, taking large data sets and making that, you know, more assessable and understandable to the client.

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah, and just to add to that. Thank you very much, Andrew. There's not much that I have to add to that.

I think just making sure that the data are available to you, I think whoever you bring in as the data manager. Again, I see this as a collaboration. We'd be happy to sit down with you and kind of go through what your
thoughts are currently and give you some feedback. Because most data management firms or people that are qualified to do data management, they haven't worked on redistricting. I mean, that's generally the problem you have when you're dealing with redistricting is that there is very few people out there that have worked on it because there's not that much opportunity to work on it, right.

So there may be some overlap with datasets that they have worked on in the past, but when we're talking about communities of interest, and you know, there's input coming left and right about these different topics, this categorization, classifying of data, coding data, which, of course, many of you are very familiar with because you've also worked on data. Anybody who's done a data research project on, you know, with qualitative data has dealt with this. This is something we also did with the last Commission. I think it can be much improved, and we're very happy to figure out what needs to be done and collaborate with you and whoever comes in to make that work.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you. Thank you for this presentation. Wow, I'm actually getting excited about line drawing. I know it's still a little while off, but
very inspiring.

Two questions. The first question has to do with data management. And this is something we've discussed on the Commission ourselves, and it may become more obvious once we're actually, you know, receiving public input. So some public input will have GIS information with it and others will not.

So as you're imagining it, the line drawer will have a role in public input that has GIS information. But it seems to me this creates two different paths for the information. You know, you have COI tool submissions and you have napkin or just narrative, just emails. And I'm trying to figure out how do we treat them all -- how do we get them all together, you know. And I guess that's really the Commission's responsibility ultimately, probably through its data management team to integrate that and you know, give us everything that has to do with Redding, you know, and that will have come from a lot of different sources.

So I'm wondering from your point of view, the line drawer staff, what's its particular role there in that flow and how do you -- I mean, if you're -- let's say you're predigesting 200 submissions about Redding and characterizing it. Well, that's treating that data differently than other submissions about Redding that did
not come through the COI tool, right. So I'm wondering how you see that and what your thoughts are about how to approach that. And then I have a completely different question then.

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. So if I may take a stab at that. I think that is the -- that is such an important topic because I think, you know, submitting input to the CRC shouldn't be a popularity contest, you know, in a perfect world. So I think we've all seen some people -- some neighborhoods in particular perhaps more, you know, disadvantaged neighborhoods where perhaps one person is able to put a submission together about where their community of interest is and send it off, and that Commission in whatever form -- that submission, I'm sorry, in whatever form it comes in should, you know, probably have the same weight as, you know, somebody who was able to go on Twitter and say, hey, here's this map. Everybody vote on it. And they have 8,000 followers, and they all give them the thumbs up. You know, then the question is for you, you know, how do I weigh these things, you know, does one have more worth than the other?

I think one of the answers to that question is that, you know, you have to be attuned to that fact, you know, that this may happen. I think we can help in taking some
of the information that you're, for example, getting in
written format where people talk about their community of
interest and they did not use the COI tool. I mean, we
have mapping support available. The technical term for
that internally is baby mappers. And this is the next
round of mappers that we're developing, you know. And
they can help with digitizing things from public input,
for example. So there are various ways by which we can
assist with that.

When we are talking about, for example, doing a pin
map of the entire area and you're seeing that you have a
lot of, you know, submissions from one particular area, a
lot of it is probably going to be the same. So you know,
you're going to have to weigh that information. I think
that's one of the really difficult things that
Commissioners have to do, right, is to weigh that
information, figure out what is the value of it, how does
it factor into the greater scheme of things, and then,
you know, compare that to other information that's come
in.

And you also see where there is perhaps not a lot of
information, and you can still take a look at that and
see, do I need to support that somehow? Do I need to do
more outreach? Do we need to go into this community? Do
we need to, you know, talk to our outreach partners and
so forth?

So I think it's in the collaboration. I think we can help, again, with digitizing some of these things and make them available to you. I think it's important that you have the information available when you need it, and we most certainly can help with that.

And Andrew, do you want to take a stab at it?

MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. And I think the key thing as you were saying, Karin, is it's making sure that the Commission prioritizes, you know, what you want. So if you're hearing a bunch of comments and you're looking at it and it's about a particular area, if you have 200 comments in Redding, and say, all right, could you take these and do a map. That's something that we could work with you, and it's driven by the Commission and what is your prioritization. So you're right.

And the one good example, I think, is in Arizona where we had a lot of people last time who came to public hearings and they said, we want two maps -- or two congressional districts on the border with Mexico. There's other people who came and said, we want three congressional districts. And the Commission looked at us and they said could you map out these two scenarios? Could you show us what these two look like? So I think that's a really good example where it's driven by you.
We obviously would work with the data management staff and help visualize what you guys -- what the Commission is prioritizing.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Go ahead, Commissioner Yee, with question number 2.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Sorry. Question number 2. So this is for Karin. So you're here with your Q2 hat, but you also have a Statewide Database hat, and so I'm trying to think as a member of the public how I would perceive that, and I'm not thinking of conflict of interest so much as, wow, that's quite a bit of role concentration in a couple of people, you and Jaime and so on.

I'm just wondering what you would say to the public in terms of having both those roles, which you also did in 2011, and you know, I don't think there was any -- I'm not aware of any criticism that came up about that. I'm just wondering, once again, as you put yourself in both these roles, how you wish to be perceived. Also wondering, kind of a follow up to that, how things might be different now that you're bringing Haystaq in, how that compares to 2011.

MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you for that question. Yeah, it is a little bit of a juggling process. I think one way that I -- that I differentiate is that I'm always very clear what my role is at any particular time. Am I
here as Statewide Database or am I here as, you know, your consultant.

The interesting thing about Statewide Database is that as soon as the data are released, our workload drops dramatically. So we're super busy, you know, right now, maybe a little bit more busy because of all the things that have been happening with census, of course, you know. But our workload will be dropping dramatically at that point.

I should also tell you that I currently have, I think 57, days of vacation that I have to take at UC and clearly, nobody is going anywhere. Holiday markets in Europe are not going to be happening, and I'm very happy to spend my vacation with all of you. So I would like to say that.

It's not unusual for you know, academics, people that work at UC to also, you know, do consulting work, you know, and I know you've had some people, of course, on other consulting roles present to you and it's the same for them as it is to us.

I think I have a unique skill set that is, you know, was kind of partially developed because of Statewide Database, but really a lot of it has to do with my own academic work. My "obsession" with communities of interest came out of my academic work. I've been
working, you know, working on communities of interest since 1997. You know, that was work that I did when I was in PhD program. I wrote my master's on it and so forth, so that has very little to do with Statewide Database because it really, like, informs other pieces of redistricting work.

In terms of a conflict of interest, you know, I have looked at it, others have looked into it. There really is no conflict of interest because the Statewide Database is a publicly available data set. Whatever I know, you know, everybody knows. I don't have access to any data that you don't have access to, you know, or the general public has access to. And yeah, I think it's a busy time, but you know, as academics I think we understand how busy we can all be when we're on projects, you know. So I would actually say now that you've got me thinking it, I think my, you know, my academic work and my redistricting work has really benefitted the Statewide Database, and the way that we make the data available.

In particular, if you're looking at the map stuff, and I'm now going a little bit off on a tangent, but you know, now cities and counties have to use the Statewide Database for line drawing, for example, and you know, the fact that I've actually worked with cities and counties and I understand who may be accessing these data and how
they're looking at these data is informing the way that we're going to be presenting the data at Statewide Database.

So I think that, you know, the information that I've gathered and the work that I've done as a consultant, or as an academic, or you know, pro bono, much pro bono, has really benefitted that project. So I hope I've answered your question, Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: It does, and maybe some thoughts on bringing Haystaq in this time around.

MS. MAC DONALD: Oh, yeah, Haystaq. So yeah, this was an interesting one too. I mean, this is a big project that you all have in mind, you know, and we don't -- we didn't have the capabilities of doing it by ourselves, but we also thought we would benefit from bringing some partners on that perhaps have other experience, you know.

I mean, Jaime and I were basically -- Jaime, Tamina, and I, we talk to each other and figure things out. So sometimes it's good when you talk -- that you talk to somebody else to figure things out because, you know, there's some perspectives that we haven't looked at, perhaps technological solutions that we haven't looked at. And you know, in walks, you know, Andrew and his team with this fantastic idea of basically replicating
the Statewide Database on a national level.

And you know, kind of -- for me it was, of course, love at first sight because Statewide Database is like my, you know, my everything, as you know. And you know, being able to work with people that I had already heard a lot about, you know, I heard of their work in Arizona. I knew that they had done a good job. They basically used the same methodologies that we have used in California in terms of, you know, transparency and so forth.

And having access to more seasoned line drawers, to Andrew's, you know, expertise, to having a company that knows a lot about big data, and you know, data analytics in the way that we in our little niche perhaps don't know about, you know, it just seemed like a real asset.

And you know, looking at the fact that they have done transparent work and they're moving -- they have their redistricting hats on in a completely nonpartisan way. That just makes sense to me.

So you know, we were working well together on the Redistricting Data Hub. I was working with one of the Haystaq people at the MGGG Voting Rights Conference two years ago, the voting rights project where I was teaching. And you know, so there was a lot of overlap there already, and there just seemed to be a synergy.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.
Commissioner Toledo, did you have a --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. It's actually concerning just Haystaq and just questions about -- about impartiality and conflict of interest specifically. I did see your disclosure regarding Congressman Ro Khanna, South Bay Congress member. I'm just curious as to -- I did read your statement, and I'm curious as to the perception -- the Commission, as you know, has the requirement to be impartial and to do its work in an impartial manner. Given that your firm has worked with many political candidates -- does work with many political candidates, many of them on the Democratic side, how have you and how would you ensure impartiality in all of the work that you do and ensure that there's no conflict of interest as it's applying in the statutes?

MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah, that's a great question, and I think what we have done in the past in terms of -- and that was the same question that we faced in Arizona when we went and did the project there in 2011, and I think that is why we are so big on transparency. The software we choose, you know, has the ability to take snapshots with every single line change.

We are committing that while we were working on this project that we don't do any California -- the team that's working on this project doesn't do any California
political work because we want to make sure that we don't want to even present -- it may be unrelated, but we want to be able to show that we are not, you know, showing any favoritism or any, you know, favors to any political candidates.

And that's something that we think, you know -- and the big thing is we're not off mapping in a dark room at night. We're doing this in the public, and we're taking direction from each of you, the fourteen of you, you're our bosses and you're the ones who are telling us where to put the lines, where to move the lines.

So that's something that we are fully committed to, full transparency, and you know, by doing it in the past, having a track record of this, I think is very important. And when it comes to redistricting, you know, the fact that we've been brought in to help set up with the equivalent is the Statewide Database on a national level as a nonpartisan, you know, organization, that's something that was very important and one of the reasons that we were chosen for that is that we could, you know, when it comes to redistricting it's we have a nonpartisan hat completely on.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Follow-up to that. So when we signed on to be on the Commission we had to give a ten year -- had to commit to not to run for office for ten years, not
to be appointed to office because of the perception, the possible perception about impartiality and conflicts of interest. I'm just curious. I didn't see this in the documents. Are you also committing to not working with politicians or elected officials who potentially might be -- where districts might be redrawn through this process over the next ten years, or just during the line drawing process?

MR. DRECHSLER: We had talked about it just during the line drawing process. Part of it is, you know, being a, you know, a firm that, you know, does redistricting every once a decade when state commissions come together. If we could do redistricting all the time, I think there's a lot of members on our team that we would only do that, and part of this, you know, being a relatively small business as well, like, there's times where we can't, you know, there's times where, you know, it's a business decision where we choose clients.

So that's something that we were fully committed to doing throughout -- you know, and we understand that there's litigation that often happens, and so we are committed to making sure nobody on our team does political work in California for that, and I really hope it doesn't go for ten years for your sakes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Are there --

because I do have several conflict of issues (sic) items to address. Are there other questions by the

Commissioners that aren't just the conflict of issue (sic) items at this point?

Commissioner Akutagawa and Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It's not conflict of interest. Did you want to ask yours first?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: No, actually. Please go ahead with anything that isn't, then we'll sum up with that.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay, thank you. So Karin, thank you very much and Andrew, thank you. I do appreciate your presentation and also your proposal.

I actually have two questions. There's one that has a subset and then the other one is a completely separate question.

I'm just kind of curious, because you mentioned that in 2010, I guess the last CRC was challenged in organizing the deluge of the written public comments, and we had heard this as well, too. I am just kind of curious. What happened? I mean did you -- you know, was that data not used? And how is that going to be -- and I think this is kind of a different take on what Commissioner Yee had also asked, but I think I'm asking
this mostly also because we've been talking a lot about language access as well, too, and we're going to be translating, you know, public input, whether it's written or submitted through, obviously, the COI tool.

We're going to be encouraging as broad and as wide of submissions that we can receive, you know, through different means. I think this Commission has made that kind of commitment that we want to (audio interference) that, and it's reflected also in your proposal as well, too.

But I think about when translations also occur, too, you know, there's some words that just don't translate easily from one language to another, and I'm kind of curious as to how that's going to complicate what you're going to be doing in terms of really, I guess, I think the words that you used was categorization and coding, you know, the data, like, so that it's going to be usable for us in a way that Andrew has said, it tells a story that we can then use for, you know, for the line drawing. So I'd be interested to hear how you would address that. Is that even on the radar screen at this point right now?

MS. MAC DONALD: Thanks for those questions. I'll start with the second one. I think that we would need to work with you and also with the translators, obviously, and probably also with the public to make sure that, you
know, kind of terminology issues are resolved properly. I totally agree with you. I've run into this in the past. I mean, there could definitely be some tricky situations, and you know, I'm not going to sit here and tell you that I have the answers to all of those, but I think that's something that we all have to work on. It's not going to just affect our work; it's going to affect your work also. The timeliness of these translations is going to be a factor. Like, who do you bring on?

You know that what's happening with the COI tool is that it's going to community review, and you know, when you look at translation companies and figure out who you want to bring on, you're going to be looking also at some, you know, translation companies that offer community review, which takes longer. So some people offer it, some people don't offer it. You know, some people don't offer all of the languages, so this is going to be an interesting one, and again, this will be something where we need to work together.

And I agree with you also that it can affect categorization. I mean, I am not proposing that we, you know, categorize everything. I would say, you know, some broader categories that we worked out with the specific subcommittee perhaps and then, you know, bring to the full Commission to see how the full Commission thinks
about it, whatever is most useful for you, and then, you
know, just have these data a little bit better available.

So going to what happened in 2011 was, you know,
it's just redistricting, here we go. Everybody always
seems to be getting thrown some sort of a curve ball, and
you know, in 2011 there was no time, there was no money,
there was just -- I mean, it was just -- and it was the
first Commission, so essentially, everything was
literally inventing the wheel.

So you know, that Commission hadn't really thought
about the fact that they might get this much input. In
fact, I still remember the first meeting that -- the
first input meeting that that Commission had. We were
sitting there and we were all worried that we would
travel all the way to the meeting location and nobody
might show up. I mean, we have no idea whether there was
any interest, you know. And then all of a sudden it was
a lot of interest, and then, you know, we have to deal
with the exact opposite concern, which was like, oh my
goodness, now what do we do with all of this input,
right.

So a lot of these things were developed as a
response to what we were seeing on the ground. And I
mean, I would say that that's what you also want in a
redistricting consultant is somebody who can basically
pivot with you, depending on what happens, if they can come up with a solution.

Because I still remember Guang-Chen, who is on this project, he put a COI database together on the fly, essentially, or just a database that could log input. And the Commissioners did have access to it, so the input was, you know, was considered. But it was perhaps not as pretty as if we had been able to, you know, frontload it. And it didn't have all of the input in it.

So there were different ways of -- there were different streams of input that were in different locations. And again, there wasn't a dedicated data management team. We had no money. You know, we had no time. So you know, we basically strung it together. And I'm pretty confident that all of the input was considered by the Commissioners, but a lot of it also required for you know, the consulting team to remind the Commissioners or to point out to the Commissioners that perhaps there was a piece of input that they either didn't have time to read, or you know, that just came in, or that had been submitted a long time ago and you know that they perhaps wanted to take into consideration.

So you know, again, it was an all-hands-on-deck kind of situation and yeah, I think you have some time. You have a better infrastructure, you will have a bigger
team, and there's a lot of know-how on this Commission, so I think putting everybody's heads together and coming up with something good is really going to benefit this process.

I hope that answers your question, Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, it did. Thank you very much, and I appreciate that, that's helpful to know, and I think it's something that we're also quite conscious about in terms of the reasons why we're considering the data management system that we're looking at and also the data analysis.

I have one more question, if I can ask. I was also quite interested in understanding your suggestions around the regional teams, you know, kind of similar to the zone methodology that we've taken so that we ensure that the entire state will have someone to turn to.

I am kind of curious as to what -- can you explain a little bit more what you have in mind, because I was reading some of the other areas where Commissioners are going to be (audio interference) your team, if this is successful, in terms of whether it's the finance and administration, whether it's the -- you know, what's currently the line drawer RFP subcommittee which could then morph into, you know, them doing something related
to it. I'm going to perhaps think that there may be other subcommittees that'll get pulled in, including the zone team.

So can you explain a little bit more what you see around, you know, like even the zone or the regional liaisons that the zone teams will have in terms of working with your zone or regional teams?

MS. MAC DONALD: Yes. Thank you. Thank you very much for that question. You know, it's a little bit -- it's a unique approach, but it's an approach that, you know, we've at least tested, and it works.

So California is an incredibly large place, and it is -- you know, if the last input process is any -- you know, gives us any suggestion or any indication about how much input we're going to get this time, it's going to be so much more just because, you know, you're out there, you're promoting, we have different tools and so forth. You know all of this.

So having a mapper who becomes an expert on a section of the state is going to give you more quality, I think, in putting the maps together. I think assuming that a mapper can become an expert on, you know, the input and the kinds of concerns that are perhaps in some of the areas of the state, like I'll just grab a couple of points out of my hat from last time.
We were talking about watersheds. We were talking about, you know, small counties working together on, you know, perhaps certain agricultural issues. We were talking about coastal access, you know, issues that are very predominant around the coast and what's happening there. There were so many different facets that affected the different regions, and being able to go to one regional expert, "regional line drawer", and asking them for advice and having them be able to jump basically from plan, to plan, to plan where they can -- by which I mean from Assembly, to Senate, to Congress and so forth.

It can happen many different ways, because they already know what you did in the Assembly, so if you, for example, said in the Assembly, oh, we're going to try to split X area because of these particular considerations, but we don't want to do that in another plan, they can remind you of that. They can tell you whether it's possible. They will have mapped it on a smaller unit of analysis and on a larger unit of analysis. So that's essentially the idea.

As Andrew said when we were looking at this map, this is not set in stone. I think it makes a lot of sense to have one person assigned to LA because Los Angeles is like its own country, really, in many different ways. It is super large, and it has pretty
much every concern you could possibly consider. And you know, there are a lot of opportunities, a lot of challenges there, and having one person just focus on that, it's going to take all of their time to become an expert on it, and then also remember, there will be a Voting Rights counsel who will work with the mappers and with you, obviously, and you know, not everybody needs to be in the same room for the conversation about Los Angeles.

So it's as much about knowledge as it is about efficiently deploying this team and making sure that somebody is available as a contact point for the Commissioners that perhaps are working in that region.

And you know, we try to speak to your outreach zones because it seems like you've organized yourselves around those. And I agree with you, you know, looking at some of these subcommittees, figuring out who needs to be and should be in the room, and you know, maybe modifying this a little bit is a really good idea, and obviously we're open to that.

And I hope that answers your question.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. I'm just seeing where our time is getting shorter here.

Commissioner Kennedy, I know you have some questions, and then I might ask a few more and wrap this
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I only have one question, and this is something that I had put out on the table for discussion several months ago during the Commission meeting.

I just wanted to get your thoughts on possible value. We're talking about how to make best use of our time, particularly before the census data reach us. We know that once the census data reach us, the whole pace and focus, everything will shift. But before the data reach us, do you see value and how would you see best making use of soliciting public comment on the existing 2010 cycle districts? We're not asking them anything about the future districts that we're going to draw. We would essentially ask them what was your reaction? How do you feel about, what changes do you think should have been made to the work product of the 2010 Commission? Is that worthwhile? Could it be worthwhile to us?

MS. MAC DONALD: That's a really good one. Yeah. So let's talk about the congressional maps. Let's start with that.

We are going to know in April whether we're even going to have to have the same, you know, number of districts. And so that particular map may go into a totally different category with respect to this
conversation because, you know, we just don't know.

I think sometimes people really like to -- a lot of
people like to focus on something, comment on something
that's already in place, right. So if you already have a
map and you ask people what works and what doesn't work,
that could potentially work. I have not personally tried
that out. I think we need to consider that we have
population changes that may not make it possible to
respond to those comments. So you may run the danger of
kind of inadvertently suggesting that you'll be able to,
you know, "fix" a particular problem in a district that
you may not be able to do once you see the data, because
the districts have to change.

So you know, on some level it could be a good idea
because you have something that people can comment on.
On the other hand, it could backfire on you because you
may be creating expectations that you can't meet. And
also the question is, you know, how much will you rely on
those and can you rely on those districts, you know.

Again, there is some Voting Rights concerns probably
that may not have been there the last time. So it's
something I think you have to carefully think through.

But going to the first part of your question, which
is how to utilize that period of time, perhaps that month
before the Statewide Database out, I mean, you will have
the PL94 data, and I think that you may want to have a
correction about starting with the unadjusted data and
using the unadjusted data to do some visualizations.
Because you can make some assumptions, presumably, about
which areas are going to be affected by the prisoner
reallocation most tremendously, because, remember, the
big areas that are affected are the ones where the
inmates are removed from, right, and then I'm thinking of
it as a sprinkling of people throughout the State of
California, with, of course, some communities being more
affected than others, but the biggest effect is going to
be on the area that gives us those populations.

So I think you could make some reasonable
assumptions and perhaps get a starting point that people
can actually comment on using visualizations and then,
you know, not drawing, obviously, because you don't have
the adjusted and the official data, but that could give
you a head start on some of the conversations and then
people do have something to focus on where they can give
you feedback. It's just an idea.

Does that answer your question, Commissioner
Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, thank you, and thank
you to both of you for your presentation and your proposal. I enjoyed reading them and hearing more about the details of it.

I wanted to go back and ask you both a little bit more about the application that you mentioned to the Michigan commission and get a better sense of if you were to get that contract, how you would split your time between California and Michigan and what that would look like as well as thinking more about -- certainly there aren't exact conflicts of interest between California and Michigan. Are there appearances of conflict, however?

Are there appearances of conflict to the role of independent commissions at the same firm is ultimately doing redistricting for many of the independent commissions?

MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah, I'll start with that. That's a good question. And I think in terms of -- I think the biggest conflict is going to have to do with timing of meetings and public meetings and public hearings, and that's why we have additional individuals on the team who are not working on California and only working in the State of Michigan. So we want to make sure that they're separate there and that we're not stressed out.

I mean there is the time zone advantages where, you know, Michigan is two hours ahead, so that there's
meetings that overlap. There will be some advantages
that we could take place there.

But I think largely how we were planning to sort of
staff the -- if we were to get Michigan, and again, we're
not in there, so if we were to get Michigan and
California I think that's something that we have
discussed a number of times.

And I think the other thing is there's not a lot of
redistricting firms out there because this happens only
once every ten years, big statewide redistricting in
terms of the congressional and the State seats. So I
want to make sure that when we're committing to
California, we're committing to California, and that's
something that we'll work closely with the staff to make
sure that we're hitting deadlines.

And part of my job as the product manager is to be
working with the staff, and you know, the appointed
people, the appointed Commissioners, to make sure our
project plan is rolling out smoothly, address any, you
know, hiccups that may come up. We don't anticipate any,
but we want to make sure that we have open lines of
communication that we're continuously addressing the
needs for in the event of both states, that we're
addressing the needs for both states, but we're fully
committed to -- and making sure we're not stretched too
thin, and we have plans in place to bring on additional people if they're needed.

MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you, Andrew, for that, and I would like to add to that that, you know, all these applications come out pretty much at the same time, and you know, we knew that our team was pretty uniquely qualified to work with an independent commission. But you know, we don't take anything for granted. We may feel we're really qualified. We don't know what everybody is looking for. So yeah, so obviously, we, you know, didn't just put all of our eggs in one basket, and we applied to another state. We, you know, talked about it in advance, and you know, Q2 will be taking the lead on California if we -- you know, if you decide to hire us, and Haystaq will be taking the lead on Michigan if, you know, if it turns out that way.

And so we just want to make sure that you understand that you really do have our full -- you know, you've got us if you want us. We're here for you, and again, as Andrew said, we all have a larger team. We did not put the entire teams that we have available internally onto this project. We pulled the people that we thought would work the best, and so you know, we put it together that way for a reason. It's very -- we're looking at this very strategically, who can handle X, who has the
qualifications for X. And you know, Michigan is a very tiny little state compared to California. It's really a totally different ballpark, you know. You're looking at -- you know, LA, of course, is large, but Michigan in terms of population, it's like the population of LA.

So it's a different ballpark, but I just -- you know, I want to assure you that you have our full attention.

MR. DRECHSLER: And just one additional thing, and I think we put this in our proposal, that we understand this isn't a 9 to 5 job. We understand that there's going to be meetings that go very late into the night, start very early in the morning, and you know, we committed in the proposal to, you know, as the project manager to, you know, be available to you seven days a week, because there's going to be questions that come up on the weekend about something. So we just want to make sure that we're available to you during those times, both on times and off times that we're addressing your needs.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. That's very helpful. And if I may just ask a little bit more pointed of a question regarding disclosure, and I think this will begin to weave into some of the questions Commissioner Andersen might have prepared for you also.

Of course your firms do do other work. You have
completed, to the best of my ability, I can tell, a lengthy disclosure form for the RFP that, of course, is a disclosure of those projects you've had in the past. As we move forward over the next year or beyond, as may be, is it something that we can ask of you, to continue to disclose any projects that you might take on and clients that you might take on during this time period for the purposes of full transparency?

MR. DRECHSLER: Speaking for Haystaq, a hundred percent yes.

MS. MAC DONALD: Yes, absolutely. For us, obviously, yes.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Very good. Thank you.

Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah, that does dovetail exactly into -- essentially there are two items, and the good news is I have only a very few questions because most of the Commissioners have picked everything up. So mine are very specific and very pointed, and it does deal with the disclosure.

And specifically, there are two sections in the proposal itself which deal with disclosure, one of which is -- there are two different attachments to the proposal. One is your confidentiality and nondisclosure statements, and it definitely says in there that
you're -- basically the nondisclosure statement essentially says, you know, everything that you're doing belongs to the Commission and you acknowledge that.

We actually do need that form to be filled out by not just the president of the company but actually all the project personnel, and I'm sure that was sort of an oversight on your part.

And also the project personnel as they get added need to actually be able to sign that form. Go ahead.

MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. I was just going to say that was an oversight. Attachment -- I believe it was attachment H, and we are -- today we were pointed to that, and we are gathering for each of -- not only the current staff, but we will do that for anybody that we add on as well to disclose that.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. And those are lead positions, obviously.

MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. And the other item is, and it's called Attachment D, and this is the full disclosure. It's actually conflict of interest. I take that back. And it does have to, just from the public's perspective, most of the public is aware that we have as Commissioners this ten-year history of anything we've done ten years before. We also have five and ten years
in the future. And so what we have done in this
disclosure is ask you to disclose any and all connections
in your previous ten years, which you've actually all
been very diligent about, thank you very much. It
appears everything is there, hence Commissioner Toledo's
question about the Ro Khanna issue.

There is one other person which I definitely have to
bring up because it would be a bit remiss not to, and it
is your John O'Neil who has done great work on the
Arizona districting and has done marvelous things in the
Princeton work, which I won't get into. However, the
last four years he was actually an elected member of the
LA County Democratic Party and a delegate -- was actually
was elected as a delegate to the State Democratic Party
Central Committee.

So do we have -- that's something that I'm glad you
disclosed, and I really appreciate that because it was
exactly what you're required to do. It is up to the
Commission to decide, you know, whether that -- what we
do with that information. I just want to bring that
forward, and I'd like you to be able to comment on what
role you thought Mr. O'Neil is doing and how, you know,
what he -- you know, how could he remain independent. I
sort of ask you to comment on that, please.

MR. DRECHSLER: Yes. And so John O'Neil is going to
be a member of the mapping team, and the role that we specifically had envisioned for him is to help merge the maps together. When we talked about the zones, the different zones, as those maps come together we wanted to make sure that we, you know, had somebody who was going to be able to bring those maps together.

Furthermore, John O'Neill is somebody who is the director of the Redistricting Data Hub, so the last two years he's been in that role, and you know, carrying out that nonpartisan role very diligently, so I would comment, just note that as well, but wanted to make sure that, you know, he is somebody who understands redistricting, also in his track record as he's done work in Florida, and he -- you know, and this was a project that, you know, he's responsible for the maps that the Supreme Court -- the Florida Supreme Court chose and the State of Florida for both the congressional maps and for the State Senate maps, and you know, that the Supreme Court -- the Florida Supreme Court, chose those maps because John O'Neill did those maps in a nonpartisan way.

So when it comes to, you know, his ability when it comes to redistricting, he has a proven track record of being nonpartisan and would continue that on this team as well.

MS. MAC DONALD: And if could perhaps add to this,
Andrew, about the role that that particular -- that John would have. We just figured, you know, it's COVID, and we better just look for somebody who, you know, add somebody to the team who could be an emergency mapper, if, you know, something happens, if somebody got sick or so. So essentially it spoke to the continuity of the project, so he's kind of -- I mean, like a floater, so to speak, should something happen to somebody which we, obviously, don't expect, but you know, it was just built in that way.

And as Andrew said, the handoff, so the person that does the handoffs actually doesn't map. This is a person who kind of works and perhaps comes in as a collaborator between the two people -- like the LA person and the person that maps the coastline or so where there is a handoff, and assists them in negotiating how those two maps are put together.

We just thought having, you know, another person helping out with that, with that particular technical piece would be a good thing to do. We didn't have that last time. The people -- you know, the mappers last time had to figure it out themselves, but we also know that it would be smoother if somebody else were there who has a lot of mapping expertise who could help them with that.

So I think at that point when John would kick in,
that would be the point when, you know, your guidance and
your districts were already on a map, and it's just
making sure that things match; it's kind of like a
puzzle, right. So we have these four puzzle pieces and
then integrating them with each other and then
communicating to all of you where there may be issues.
So that's just about the technical piece.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. I wanted
to give you a chance -- certainly the credentials are
very good, and I just wanted to give you a chance to
explain the issues involved and the credentials. So I
really appreciate that.

It's a wonderful presentation. You certainly
covered all our bases; I believe answered all our
questions. Unless I see another -- oh, Commissioner
Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: This might be a quick and basic
question, but what is a handoff? Just to better
understand that.

MS. MAC DONALD: I apologize to Commissioner Sinay.
Thank you for asking that question.

Yeah, the handoff is basically how you go from one
region that you've mapped to the other region that
somebody else has mapped. So it's essentially
integrating, and I call it, like, a handoff, you know.
So essentially, I'm now done with LA, with this particular very tricky district, and it reaches into somebody else's region, and you know, making sure that that works. So that's the handoff, kind of like a handshake. And I apologize for the completely made-up techy term.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: All right. At this point, I think we're done. We might thank you very much and excuse you, and the Commission might continue on with our discussions.

MR. DRECHSLER: Thank you very much for the opportunity to present, and we would be very excited if we were to work with you, each of you. This is an incredible project and understand what you guys are going through, so would love to be part of the team.

MS. MAC DONALD: Yes, ditto to all of that. Thank you so much for your time, and for talking to us, and for considering our proposal.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you both very much.

MR. DRECHSLER: Good-bye.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: So Chair, I can turn this over to you, or at this point do we want to -- it's now 12:15. I guess we can go to 12:45 before we require a break.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's have some discussion now and then -- so let's have some discussion around the
VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. So at this point what we'd like to do is any overall comments and I think in your mind you probably already -- the criteria we've been looking for ultimately out of this is for the presentation is are they qualified, not qualified, highly qualified, that sort of a ranking kind of, ultimately, and then Commissioner Sadhwani and I will give you our recommendations. We'll discuss a little bit about the entire proposal itself, and put the whole package together and give -- you know, make a recommendation.

So at this point, do you want to just -- let's sort of just discuss about the presentation and the plan itself. Any questions or comments?

Sara, you went on mute.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sorry. I said or reactions, reactions to the --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Linda -- Commissioner Akutagawa, and then Commissioner Fernandez after that.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I guess just reactions and just in terms of the plan itself. I mean, I did like reading through what they proposed. I thought that they had some great ideas.

I will also say that, you know, I guess maybe one of the advantages of having someone like Karin who's also
involved in it is that they've been listening to our conversations, our discussions as a Commission, and I feel like some of the things that we've been grappling with they tried to also address in terms of proposing perhaps may not necessarily just a solution but just some ideas in which some of the things that we're raising as areas in which we want to focus on was reflected, and I was really happy to see that in the proposal.

And so yeah, I would just say I just really appreciated the things that they put down on paper for what they would help to do so that we could accomplish our goals.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez and then Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, I agree with Commissioner Akutagawa. I believe they're qualified. It is an advantage because they've been involved already, and I guess I'm just wondering, normally, and maybe this is just part of this process, but normally when we come forward as a subcommittee we'll say what our recommendation is and then we discuss it at that point. So I'm just wondering why you don't have -- you didn't give us your recommendation first and then we can discuss it. So yeah, I don't have any concerns in terms of their qualifications.
VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: If I might jump in. Commissioner Sadhwani, did you want to answer that because -- we did discuss that, because yes, that's usually what we would do. We didn't want to prejudice the Commission one way or another, so we wanted you to have a look, see what you think, and at this point, I mean, we could just take a straw poll about, you know, qualified.

Also it's a little different in that we have the one proposal. Normally we would be adjourning, you know, we'd consider, we'd be writing down, you know, okay, what do we think of this presentation, qualified, well qualified, you know, the different types of essentially ratings, and then we would break and we'd have the next proposal, next presentation. And at which point then we'd collect those and Commissioner Sadhwani and I would say, now, because in the RFP there are many components of this, and we have essentially a rating for the rest of the components of the RFP, which we could discuss. So that's the reason why we're doing it in a staggered step.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's go to Commissioner Taylor, hear from him, and then do a straw poll, and at that point we'll entertain a motion from the -- a motion or a recommendation from the committee.

Commissioner Taylor.
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you, Chair. I thought as a reaction to the presentation that they spoke to being collaborative and especially agile to be able to suit our needs, and I think that's an extremely important component when we talk about the relationship between data management, data analysis, and interpretation. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.

In terms of -- let's do a straw poll first just to see where people are and then we can continue on with the conversation.

Everyone who believes this proposal meets the qualifications -- I don't remember the exact language you wanted to use, Commissioner Andersen. I believe it's meets the expectations.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, actually, it really is. The cutoff line is qualified, and anything above that, you know, does anyone think that they're not qualified?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Or vice versa. Does everybody believe that they are qualified? Let's start with that. Does everybody believe that they are qualified? Raise your hand if you do.

I'm not saying one Commissioner raise his hand. Does anybody think that this proposal -- this proposer is not qualified, raise their hand? So no one. It looks
like we have consensus that the proposal is qualified at this point.

Commissioner Fernandez, Commissioner Ahmad, and Commissioner Sinay, and then we'll entertain a motion if there is one on the floor.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, I was just saying that I thought they were qualified, but I can submit a motion if you want. That's fine. I was just saying, yes, they're qualified.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I did raise my hand and I agree that they are qualified to complete the task at hand. I am curious to understand though, does qualified also mean minimal conflict of interest as well, considering the discussions that we've had with the proposers themselves?

My other question is actually related to process. So are we actually voting to potentially hire this applicant today, or are we just trying to get on the same page in terms of whether they are qualified or not?

CHAIR TOLEDO: My understanding there is a potential for up or down vote on this applicant today -- for today.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay. And then in that, I think I need more clarity in terms of what does the negotiation process look like in terms of the plan
itself, and who is taking that on on our team, and what that time line looks like as well.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Good question. Commissioner Sadhwani and Andersen, do you want to tackle that question?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, a couple of thoughts. So in terms of process, and Commissioner Andersen, feel free to jump in here, one of the key steps -- had we received multiple proposals one of the key steps -- first steps, would have been to identify whether those proposers are qualified or not qualified. And so that's really the piece that we're doing at this point in time. From there, we can -- we can then discuss, do we actually want to hire them. My understanding is that we can vote today as to our intent to hire and intent to develop a contract with them, in which case then we would go forth in advancing that contract.

As far as I'm concerned, the plan should not be a part of that contract for the most part. The number of meetings, perhaps, the finances, which have not been revealed at this point in time, are all of the components that we would still have yet to -- to determine. I see Commissioner Andersen shaking her head, so do you have something different than that?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. Let's see, yeah. Okay, there we go. The cost portion has been released. It
was -- as part of the contract, as part of the way this works, as soon as we begin talking about the proposers, the cost portion is posted.

So essentially what we would be doing today is saying, yes, we do, indeed, think this is qualified. Even if we were at the end of all the different presentations we would be talking about -- if someone we saw not qualified at all we would dismiss that proposal from the group. But then we would be discussing the entire proposal and at one point then voting on the different people.

So what we're doing this time is essentially the motion would be, since we have one proposal, we would like to propose that we intend to award the contract to this particular group. And at that point -- and that would be a full up or down vote.

We need to discuss it, and as part of those are, indeed, what exactly do we want for essentially the nondisclosure portions, you know, do we say, yes, that will work, no, that won't. These are portions that we would then add and discuss in terms of can we go forward with the contract.

In terms of numbers of meetings, that sort of thing, that is written in the RFP. There's a minimum, and then they have to give costs for additional meetings. So that
is to be determined by us. That's not a make or break on
the contract.

So hopefully, that did answer a few questions.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I have a question, and then after
that, Commissioner Fornaciari and then Commissioner
Sadhwani. And my question is does the subcommittee
envision itself being -- if we were to motion and move
forward with an intent to award, would the subcommittee
be the entity that would be negotiating the terms of the
contract? Would your committee be taking on the lead?

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: In the negotiating of terms, working
with staff on finalizing the contracting process.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: There's -- actually there's
very little -- from the Commission in terms of we say a
particular -- essentially, you know, when I mentioned
this item H, you have to fill out, item D, if we say we
actually did add in, and they've already publicly said
yes. The issue is, yes, we have to know everything about
what they're doing up until the ten years. Can they work
on other projects during? Right now they must disclose
anything that they may be contemplating. If we wanted to
put an additional, no, you can't be working on anything
while you're working with us. That item would then -- we
would take that idea but legal would actually work on
this because ultimately the contract gets -- we can put these little parts in and we can say with the proposer, yes, we would agree to that. Then legal, actually -- legal being I think it's OSL actually comes up with this is the final contract, bingo, yes, and they sign it. So we're more of a -- we are the people who work with the proposer and hand it to legal, if that helps.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you for the clarification.

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I think Commissioner Sinay was ahead of me, and I was just going to answer -- try to answer Commissioner Ahmad's question.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sinay, and then we'll go back to Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. So I completely blanked out on my question again. Go ahead.

CHAIR TOLEDO: We'll come back to you.

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So Commissioner Ahmad, you asked about the plan and how are we going to manage the plan. And I was going -- I'm going to propose later in this meeting to revisit a suggestion by Commissioner Sadhwani that we put together a larger subcommittee that would meet in public that would be some combination of the outreach committee, the line drawing committee, the
language access committee, probably the data management committee. You know, we have to figure out how we manage it in a way that we don't get a quorum for this. But you know, just like the legal subcommittee gets together, we get representatives of each of the committees that are, you know -- that have, you know, interest in the plan and work with our outreach team, work with the line drawing organization that we bring in, and develop a plan for our public input and line drawing meetings. So I mean, that's what I was going to propose.

I mean, it's up to the Commission how we go forward with it. But I thought, you know, it would be a collaborative effort with the line drawers and our outreach committee -- I mean, our outreach staff and the various subcommittees.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani and then Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh, I was actually just going to respond to Commissioner Ahmad's question about disclosure. And at this point in time the RFP merely asked for a disclosure of conflicts of interest, and that didn't preclude people from applying or being qualified if they had potential conflicts of interest, simply that they had to be disclosed.
I think there was -- in many of the conversations that Commissioner Andersen and I had with individuals who are engaged in redistricting, there's a clear sense -- they said it multiple times today. It only happens once every ten years, so in the meantime they have to do something. So most firms are going to have some kind of conflict of interest potentially. We didn't want that to stop people from applying, which is why we opted for disclosure. That's certainly something we can discuss further as we move into the contracting phase.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I just want to say, yes, the plan -- working on the plan is something -- this was their idea. And we've already had a bunch of discussions in through our meetings back and forth of, that's not exactly what we're thinking. And oh, that really is -- back and forth, and this -- even just on the discussion of time lines, this is another idea that -- so what we're looking for here is, is this a group that we go, we could work with these guys. These guys are interested. It isn't like, this is what we want to do, period. This is take it or leave it. Do we feel that they have flexibility, that this a group we could work with, because we know amongst the whole Commission in terms of things that would work?
I know the outreach plan has many issues, is like, that's not quite how we're saying it, and a little bit -- we have more input for the plan that we want to use. And I believe that would be a further discussion of what do we want to do with the time frame, like Commissioner Kennedy brought up.

These are all items that we will discuss in the next portion of one of our meetings, and actually set up time of once we kind of know our window, you know, when is that, is it February 15th, is it not, that part, we actually work on what do we want to do in this extra period of time. But that's not a discussion we need to have now, but the idea -- my intent on all of that was it's a full Commission, not just a few of the subcommittees, because I think everyone has ideas, and then we can break those portions into our subcommittees.

But I don't want us to work -- I don't want us to focus on what is our plan right now. This is, do we like. This is an idea that has never been completely formulated as much as it has been right now. And I love that we're all trying to jump in on it, because that's exactly what we want to do. And let's do that. I think we've allotted some time in some of our meetings coming up that we can actually specifically do just that. So I would like us to move forward.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen. At this time is there a motion on the floor for an intent to award? Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I move that we -- that we -- I move that we go ahead and vote to -- that we approve the Haystaq/Q2 team with the intent to award the contract.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Second.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Discussion? Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think one of my big concerns is if they get the contract in Michigan and they get the contract in California. Yes, Michigan might be small, but it is a new redistricting effort and so that takes a lot of effort. I know it's up to them how they balance that, but I did want to put that out there.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. To that point, did I understand them to say they had a larger group of employees or people that are going to work with it, and that would be something that would be parsed out specifically perhaps to a different group, and maybe if we need to get clarification about that, we can, but I'm walking away thinking that if they are awarded also Michigan there would be a different group of individuals...
working on that.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sinay and then Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think clarity would be great, because they did say that they were going to have a different group, but it didn't sound -- it sounded like the two -- the program director and the program manager, the two top people would be working on both, and so I think that's where we need the clarity.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, I was just going to validate what Commissioner Turner said, is that that question was raised to them and they did say that they would have separate set of individuals and line drawers working on that effort, so personally I'm not concerned if they are awarded that contract. And again, they are a business and you can't rely on just one -- one contract. So that's it.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I just wanted to share, I failed to share earlier that Commissioner Andersen and I did contact all of the references that were listed, and happy to answer any questions there, but overwhelmingly all of the different individuals that we spoke with spoke very highly of both firms, of the work here in California
and San Diego as well, as Haystaq's work in Arizona in the 2010 commission.

So I just wanted to add that, that we have done that due diligence, and as expected, right. We don't typically put references that wouldn't say bad things about you, but a host of different political parties and positions within the redistricting process, and all of them came back with very high regard of both firms.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Any other comment before we go to public comment? I am seeing hands being raised in public comment. Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: On the line of the references, and I did bring up Mr. John O'Neil, I spoke to the -- in Arizona and they were extremely divided. It was there -- they actually had five commissioners, two Republican, two Democrat, one independent, and to the point where they actually had Republican legal counsel, Democratic legal counsel. I mean, they were extremely -- and the maps, not only were they -- I mean, the group did have to write out a -- because Q2 -- not Q2, Haystaq was more of a Democrat, and my understanding if by the end of it all the Republicans were saying, wow, where was the Republican version of these guys. These guys were actually fantastic.

And John O'Neil, as I said, this was the first time
in Arizona's history, he was responsible for putting together the map and it precleared Section 5. It was the first time in Arizona's history.

So yes, he does have serious Democrat connections, and I think that's something as a Commission I was expected to talk a bit more about that, how do we feel, what's the perception on it. But he does have amazing credentials of impartiality. And you know, unfortunately the redistricting portion only happens for about, you know, two to three years maximum, and then what do you do the rest of the time until another ten years. So I just thought I'd bring that up. But raving, raving reviews about everyone and each member on the teams.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen. Any other comments before we go to public comment?

With that, Katy, can you please open up the phone line?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Chair, I'm seeing Commission Kennedy, real fast.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I just want to say that I'm not expressing opinions on this out of an abundance of caution. I've had a sporadic professional relationship with Karin Mac Donald since 2007, and so just to -- out of an abundance of caution,
and particularly if my vote is not necessary, I don't intend to participate beyond listening. But just wanted that to be out there. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'm sorry to ask this question, but I am curious. I know we have people in queue for public comment. I also want to just note that I think we're getting past the time that we're required to take a break, so --

CHAIR TOLEDO: I just asked the question to Katy and to Kristian about a break.

MR. MANOFF: Chair --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes.

MR. MANOFF: We are good to go, if we can just -- we just want to get through public comment.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's do public comment and see where we're at that point, given that we're planning to go to lunch after that and then not come back for public -- not come back to public session. Thank you.

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

To call in, dial the telephone number provided on
the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted

to enter the meeting I.D. number provided on the
livestream feed, it is 93047167360 for this week's
meeting. When prompted to enter a participant I.D.,
simply press the pound key.

    Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a
    queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press
    star 9. This will raise your hand for the moderator.

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

    If you would like to give your name, please state
    and spell it for the record. You are not required to
    provide your name to give public comment.

    Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream
    audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your
    call.

    Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when
    it is your turn to speak, and again, please turn down the
    livestream volume.

    The Commission is taking public comment at this time
    on the line drawing -- item 11. Sorry.

    And we do have someone with their hand up, and I
    will open their line. And the line is open for you.

    UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I was listening to the
presentation earlier, and I understand that it is a challenge for a firm to work with the Commission to know what to do for the next ten years. And it's one thing for Commissioners to say they won't run for office for the next ten years, but when you have actual jobs to go back to it's more difficult for these firms that are doing -- putting the bids in for the redistricting. And I assume you're not planning on paying your consultants enough so that they don't have to work for anyone else for the next ten years. Paying them that much would honestly be a terrible waste of taxpayer dollars, so conflicts may be inevitable. It is a challenging balancing act.

And I will say you should give these firms credit for the fact that they actually did disclose to you. You asked a lot from them and they provided a lot of information to you. As I said, I was listening a little bit earlier today.

You saw a letter about another firm not doing all of their disclosures. This team, on the other hand indicated they were not only happy, but thought it was important to do those disclosures. That speaks an awful lot for their willingness to live up to the spirit of the law to ensure citizens and not politicians draw the lines. And I have no doubts, based on their
presentation, they will work with the Commission to
address any issues that may arise.

I want to thank you all for the work that you do,
and thank you for taking my comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And for those in the
queue, if you would like to make a comment, please press
star 9 to raise your hand. But as of this time, that was
the only person that had raised their hand.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Katy. We'll wait a
minute.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Just so you know, Chair,
the instructions are complete on the stream.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Appreciate it. Thank you. With
that, we'll close public comment and go to a -- are we
ready to take a vote? Commissioner Andersen.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I do want us to mention,
because, you know, the cost portion is open. We have not
actually discussed that, which we should. And it's on
our website. It actually was forwarded to us -- I see
Commissioner Sinay. Or I can just give it.

Essentially, the basic cost is at 1.5 million, and
with the additional meetings that we asked for you know,
based on different ones, it's 1.6. So that's kind of
what's in our -- I think people were thinking about that.
I don't remember exactly what it was in 2011. Well, I'll
just say that. I'll just say that. And I see other hands up.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just wanted to comment on that, that we had budgeted 1.5 million for line drawers, so it's right in the -- basically the same amount, and that was -- did I go off? That was 1.5 without additional.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez. I don't see any other hands up at this point. Given that's the case, I'm willing to ask Ms. Sheffield for a roll call, or for a vote.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Ms. Sheffield is not here, so I will go ahead and do that. This is Executive Director Hernandez.

Okay, so the motion is to move ahead and vote to approve HaystaqDNA and Q2 Data and Research with the intent to award. It was motioned by Commissioner Andersen, seconded by Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Ahmad.
COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Akutagawa.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen.
VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fernandez.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fornaciari.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Kennedy.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Abstain.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Le Mons.
COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Taylor.
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.
MR. HERNANDEZ: And Commissioner Toledo.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay, so we have all but one.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Director Hernandez. We will be going to lunch at this time, and coming back into
closed session. So we won't be coming back to public
session today. We'll be coming back tomorrow at 9:30.
In terms of closed session, we'll be starting at -- it's
almost 1 o'clock right now, so let's aim for 2 o'clock
for closed session, and go from there. So we'll see you
back at 2 o'clock at closed session, and we'll see the
public tomorrow at 9:30. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the CRC Business Meeting adjourned
at 12:52 p.m.)
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