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P R O C E E D I N G S

Thursday, April 29, 2021  9:30 a.m.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Good morning, everyone and welcome to the April 29th California Citizens Redistricting Commission meeting.

I’d like to take roll call, please.

MR. SINGH: Thank you, Chair. Commissioner Ahmad.

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Akutagawa.

(No audible reply.)

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Andersen.

(No audible reply.)

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fernandez.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.
MR. SINGH: Commissioner Taylor.
(No audible reply.)
MR. SINGH: Commissioner Toledo.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Here.
MR. SINGH: Commissioner Turner.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.
MR. SINGH: Commissioner Vasquez.
(No audible reply.)
MR. SINGH: Commissioner Yee.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.
MR. SINGH: You have a quorum, Chair.
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Thank you, Ravi.
Great timing, Commissioner Toledo. Perfect.
Okay. So, in closed session yesterday the Commission took action and moved forward with the hiring of one of the chief counsel candidates.

And just a brief little breakdown. We’re going to go over everything in the agenda today, so we’re going to be very efficient, very precise, and very direct.

The agenda items we have already covered are 13, 14, 15. We do not anticipate going back into closed session. And then following the adjournment of our meeting, the Legal Affairs Committee will meet.

And with that, I will open it up to public comment. Kristian, can you please.
MR. MANOFF: Yes, chair. In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting number provided on the livestream feed. It is 98199802683 for this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant I.D., simply press pound.

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

When it is your turn to speak, you’ll hear a message that says, “The host would like you to talk. Press star six to speak.”

If you’d 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, please be alert for when it is your turn to speak, and again, please turn down the livestream volume.

And we do have quite a few callers. Just a moment while we get them queued up, Chair. Stand by.
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. While we wait for Kristian, I was going to say this afterwards, and everyone is very excited. The Commission is excited and very happy to announce that Marcy Kaplan is our director of outreach. Marcy has been our outreach manager, and we’re very excited to have her continue to lead us into this outreach effort. So, congratulations, Marcy.

MR. MANOFF: And once again as a reminder to the callers in our queue, if you would like to make a comment, please press star nine to raise your hand. I have several hands raised at the moment. We’ll be getting to you shortly.

All right, we’re ready for our first caller. Stand by. And we will be imposing a two-minute time limit, callers. I will let you know when you have 15 seconds remaining, and we will let you know when you are 15 seconds over time in increments of 15 seconds.

Go ahead, caller.

MS. LEVINE: Good morning. My name is Debra Levine. D-E-B-R-A, L-E-V-I-N-E. You might remember my voice from when I’ve called in previously about hyperlinks, and page limits, and RFPs.

By doing a quick review of your website I’ve observed that it’s pretty clear that you have a lot of details to deal with, including half a dozen staff roles to
fill, $2,000,000 in outreach grants to dispense, a data management system to set up, and federal prisoners to figure out, over 11,000 of them.

All of those are big decisions that have little nuances similar to prior considerations about whether to count hyperlinks against page limits in an RFP.

So, I’m actually worried about how much time is being spent on this timeline question and, particularly, the recommendation to drag the discussion out for at least another month.

As Commissioner Andersen has pointed out several times, that early testimony before census data is released is the most important, it is the opportunity for the public to give you information about their own communities, free from partisan and special interest groups advocating for specific lines.

So, the time spent now finding ways to make it easier for groups to lobby you at the end of the process comes away from the time spent figuring out how to get the best community of interest testimony that is possible.

The data is coming. You only have a narrow window to gather testimony before the data begins the possibility of changing public feedback. So, please take advantage of these days.

Thanks again for all the work that you are doing.
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ms. Levine.

MR. MANOFF: Go ahead, caller.

MS. GOLD: Yes. Hi. Good morning, Commissioners. This is Rosalind Gold with the NALEO Educational Fund. R-O-S-A-L-I-N-D, G-O-L-D.

And again, thank you so much for your thoughtfulness and your comprehensive review of the factors related to the final date for approval of the maps and the ability to obtain input from the public.

There are no easy choices here. This is a very tough decision, and we really appreciate how you have really been thoughtful about it.

From our perspective I’m working with Latino members of the community, both to mobilize them to comment on redistricting 10 years ago and in other civic engagement mobilization.

We do feel it is critical that there must be time after the release of the draft maps for community members to analyze the draft maps, to understand them, and to provide informed feedback.

You know, community input isn’t just crucial for the overall transparency, but those draft maps have to comply with the Voting Rights Act. They have to comply with criteria with respect to communities of interest, and until there are actual lines to look at, there is just as
much need and value for community input after the maps have been released as there is for that input before.

We just believe that, again, unfortunately, regrettably trying to get that thorough input over the holidays is going to be very, very challenging to the community members we work with. So, if we have to make a very tough choice --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. GOLD: -- we would like the Commission to, you know, look at a schedule that might involve a change in the primary date, if on balance we have to mobilize our community to vote in a primary that has a different date --

MR. MANOFF: Two minutes.

MS. GOLD: Okay. -- we’ve done that before. We’ve had to deal with situations like the COVID pandemic, changes in voting locations, changing in vote by mail. So, you know if that is something we have to be aware --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds over time.

MS. GOLD: Right. -- we would be willing to do that.

And I just finally want to say, you know, again, community-based organizations help bring the voice of the community to the commissioners and to the process --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds over time.

MS. GOLD: -- to help ensure that the maps comply
with the Voting Rights Act and other criteria.

Thank you so much.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ms. Gold.

MR. MANOFF: Go ahead, caller.

MR. CANNON: My name is Peter Cannon. I have called in several times previously, most recently about the importance of Bagley-Keene in the importance of transparency. That is why I am calling in again, to elevate a few other callers from Tuesday.

Former Commissioner Filkins-Webber expressed concerns about discussions outside of public meetings with advocacy groups. From what I heard, those meetings probably complied with Bagley-Keene, but her comments highlight just how easy it is to lose transparency as a value. Doing so has real consequences.

Another caller whose name I missed expressed concern with the term “unity maps” to describe outside groups’ proposals. I found it pointed when he said if the public believes certain groups are getting special treatment, fewer people will participate. That is fundamentally the same problem Commissioner Filkins-Webber identified.

It is a challenge when well-intentioned but well-organized groups call in to say, in essence, meet with us, decide with us, then go out and tell everyone else what we
decided. When transparency is sacrificed, when certain voices are elevated above others, it tells regular people that their voices matter less.

I am not a member of a coalition; I am a retired citizen with free time, but I hope my voice can be heard, too.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Cannon.

MR. MANOFF: Go ahead, caller.


And I’m calling in regard to Item 9A. Our ultimate goal should always be to maximize participation in the democratic process and changing when 22,000,000 people vote should be a last resort rather than a first option because of the obvious negative impacts on voter turnout.

If groups are correct that a January 28th deadline would allow for a June 21st primary, then we should be considering a deadline before January 14th for a June 7th primary.

We also need election officials to weigh in before landing on a specific date.

We think it’s possible to provide some relief from the holidays while still preserving the traditional primary date.
And when the legislature allocated 2,000,000 for outreach they were not considering doing voter outreach over the holidays. It’s completely reasonable to ask for additional funds to ensure voter participation at the end of the year.

You’re already asking the Legislature to approve an 8.6-million-dollar budget increase. If you ask for 10 million instead, that’s about one extra nickel for every voter who wouldn’t have to change when they vote.

We recognize this isn’t an ideal solution, but it’s far preferable over disengaging millions of voters by changing the traditional primary date.

Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ms. Barreiro.

MR. MANOFF: Go ahead, caller.

MS. WESTA-LUSK: Hello, commissioners. This is Renee Westa-Lusk, and I have four questions.

One is once the executive order for having meetings with large groups is lifted by the governor because of the COVID does that mean the only way the public can participate is to travel to the meetings themselves, physical site for the meetings? Will there be no telephonic technology provided to call into the meetings and listen? That’s my first question.

And then, second one is how do I get to the
commissioners a group that was mentioned yesterday that they’re trying to outreach to so that they get the opportunity, if they want, to give public input about where they want their lines drawn. I need to know who do I email? Where do I email it? How do I make sure that the commissioners get the information?

And my third question is I had some input that I wanted to give regarding that draft letter to Senator Padilla, if you haven’t already sent it, and I assume that’s under Governmental Affairs Subcommittee.

And then I also had a comment about the COI overview input meetings, the number of them and how you’re going to do the zones because it looks like most zones are only going to get one hearing. I wanted to know when you say one hearing is that just going to be one day of hearings or will you give two or three days in a row, because there’s big swathes of the state in many of those one-zone areas, and to be fair you’re going to need to allow major cities more than one day --

MR. MANOFF: That’s two minutes.

MS. WESTA-LUSK: -- if there’s mostly major cities in one zone and they can’t all testify just in one day.

Those are my comments. Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ms. Westa-Lusk, and
we will be addressing most of those questions that you had throughout the meeting.

And in terms of the Padilla letter, that would be under Agenda Item 9N, as in Nancy.

MS. WESTA-LUSK: Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And, also, just before we get to the next caller, something that Ms. Westa-Lusk did bring up is how to get ahold of the commissioners. If you go to our website wedrawthelinesCA.org. there will be information on how to provide outreach, how to email us. So, if you email a public input or your communities of interest, that information will get to all of the commissioners. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Would the caller, last four digits 2790 could please follow the prompt to unmute. Go ahead, caller. Go ahead caller 2790.

MR. HULETT: Hi. This is Tim Hulett from Chino Hills. Timothy, T-I-M-O-T-H-Y, Hulett, H-U-L-E-T-T.

And I wanted to call. I was very interested in the discussion yesterday related to the -- I’m sorry, earlier this week when it came to the LGBTQ panel, and that was really great to see the work being done with that community.

That’s not why I’m calling, though. I was interested in one of the leaders of the discussion, Paul
Thomas. He pointed out that you had already been going longer than 2010 census, the Citizens Redistricting Commission did in 2010, and you still had longer left than the last Commission had from start to finish.

I was kind of tuning in and out, but I wanted some clarity on a couple of things. You know, in browsing the other documents for the meeting, you know, I was really trying to have -- I didn’t have clarity on a couple of things and it was a little hard to follow.

It seemed to me that the census is arriving two weeks late from this, that you automatically get a two-week extension because of that. But for the holidays some folks want you to get an additional four weeks. That’s what I heard in part of the discussion, and then that would cause the primary to be delayed two weeks. I hope I got that right. That’s what it seems like, one side says right now.

Anyway, I think there would be some clarity about what’s going on in that if you try to talk about this in weeks not just sort of dates on the calendar, but just really what the impact --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MR. HULETT: -- just really what the impact these delays will have on the Commission’s work. They really help regular people follow what the results of the census, what are the requests for the holidays, and so on, and what
are, you know, these impacts.

MR. MANOFF: Two minutes.

MR. HULETT: Anyway, thank you for all your great service and good luck.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you so much, and I just wanted to let you know that if you will still be listening in on our meeting, Agenda Item 9A, we will actually be discussing that. So, hopefully, you can continue to watch our meeting.

MR. MANOFF: Go ahead, caller.

MS. ALLEN: Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Sky Allen from Inland Empire United. The name is spelled S-K-Y, A-L-L-E-N. We are a collective impact table serving Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. We are facilitating the Inland Empire Redistricting Hub, and we submitted a letter earlier this week in collaboration with a number of local and statewide redistricting partners around Item 9E.

I was listening to the Public Input Committee meeting last night. I was unable to call in, but I did want to thank you all for so strongly considering our recommendations and for being open to raising the floor of meetings from the original 17 plan to the 27-region based meetings as proposed.

Thank you also for clarifying that it was always
your intent to offer Spanish interpretation at every meeting and for raising the issue of broadband access, which we are also very really concerned about.

We’re hoping these recommendations could raise the floor as opposed to creating these ceilings, and would encourage you, if possible, to schedule additional meetings on top of those, hopefully, even in-person meetings offered particularly in rural and low-income communities later this year where broadband issues will make virtual meetings hard or impossible to attend.

One of the commissioners mentioned the northernmost parts of the state, which we agree with in terms of focusing in on areas that would have difficulty with broadband, but it should be noted that there are numerous communities all over the state, mine included, that face those same issues.

We would be eager to continue to think with you about strategies for that hybrid model if you’re open to it, but we also just wanted to thank you so much for being open to our suggestions and recommendations in the first place.

Thank you for your time and for your consideration.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ms. Allen.

MR. MANOFF: And we do have several more callers
in the queue, Chair. As a reminder to those who have called in, if you would like to make a comment, please press star nine to queue. Please press star nine to raise your hand.

All right, moving to our next caller. Go ahead, caller.


Community Coalition is a nonprofit social justice organization working to address the social and economic conditions in south LA by empowering residents to fight for policy solutions that build up the community. We elevate the voices of our members, shift power to the community and tackle the root causes of poverty, crime and violence.

Community Coalition also serves as colead for the People’s Block with the Advancement Project California.

Now, the People’s Block is a countywide redistricting coalition comprised in the grass roots organizations focused on racial solidarity and balanced maps that increase political power in BIPOC communities. And we’re a member of the IVE Redistricting Alliance as well.

So, I’m calling today to uplift our recommendation to January 28, 2022 as the deadline to
finalize maps and to express our support to move the primary election to no later than June 21, 2022 to accommodate any necessary shifts to the 2022 elections calendar as a result. We believe that we need adequate time to engage, prepare and mobilize residents for submitting maps and providing input to the Commission’s draft maps. And we want to ensure that we have enough time for community to input into the redistricting process because we believe that it’s imperative and no community is disempowered for the next 10 years.

So, thank you for your time, and I look forward to the meeting.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Samuels.

MR. MANOFF: Caller last four digits 9500, please follow the prompt to unmute. Go ahead, caller.

MS. GOMEZ: Good morning. My name is Julia Gomez. I am calling on behalf of the Voting Rights Team of the ACLU of southern and northern California. Together we seek to ensure that all communities, and in particular historically underrepresented communities, have meaningful and fair access to engage in our democracy.

This morning we submitted a letter to the Commission respectfully requesting that the Commission adopt a timeline that includes sufficient time for the post-map process. We are extremely concerned that the
overlap of the post-map process with the holiday season will shut out many Californians. Holding post-map public hearings adopting a final map during this time will no doubt prevent Californians from being able to attend hearings, submit proposed maps and review and provide input on the maps you ultimately do adopt, including on whether the maps capture the communities of interest.

We are also concerned that the current schedule does not provide the Commission with adequate time to ensure compliance with the Federal Voting Rights Act.

Redistricting is an iterative process, and after the Commission releases the first set of draft maps the public will need time to assess whether the maps comply with the VRA and propose amendments to the maps or even propose their own maps.

In response to public input the Commission will then tweak existing maps and/or propose entirely new maps. At every step of the way you will need to assess whether it is necessary to draw majority/minority districts. The Commission will also have to confirm that any districts you do create actually provide minority communities with an opportunity to elect candidates of choice.

These analyses take time, and the current timeline makes these tasks difficult, and rushing through this process may make the final maps vulnerable to legal
challenge. We, therefore, urge the Commission to set a schedule that provides adequate time to confirm that none of the final maps dilute the vote of minority communities in California.

    Thank you for your leadership in finding necessary solutions to these challenges as well as your commitment to a fair and inclusive redistricting process.

    CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ms. Gomez.

    MR. MANOFF: Go ahead, caller.

    MR. WALDMAN: Thank you. My name is Stuart Waldman. I am president of Valley Industry and Commerce Association, VICA. We represent the northern portion of Los Angeles, the San Fernando Valley, and we’re working with community groups for a fair and balanced redistricting process.

    We support for a deadline in late January to allow maximum time for the process. We believe that it’s the Commission’s duty to provide fair representation to California residents, not preservation of the primary election date or accommodating interest of elected officials.

    We’re concerned about the ability to develop maps with sufficient public input and confidence if the process is rushed.

    A deadline in December overlaps with the holidays
which provides a challenge for drafting and adopting maps with sufficient public buy in and input.

The state’s decision to extend its own deadline, the Commission’s deadline, could have a beneficial ripple effect, paving the path for cities and counties to have more time to redistrict as well. We’re concerned about a rush process, obviously. Allowing for more time to redistrict allows the Commission and local jurisdictions to carry out a redistricting process that prioritizes community input, and the success of redistricting process will determine public space in state and local government for the next decade.

And I think you all for your service. It’s an important Commission to be part of.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Waldman.

MR. MANOFF: Go ahead, caller.

MR. MEHTA-STEIN: Good morning, Commissioners.

This is Johnathan Mehta-Stein, executive director of California Common Cause.

As you know, Common Cause is a champion of independent community centered redistricting and was the proponent of the initiative that created California’s independent redistricting process.

I haven’t spoken to you in a while and I want to express my thanks for the enormous time you are dedicating
to your role as commissioners, and for your deep commitment to an independent and inclusive redistricting process. We all know this has not been an easy job.

Common Cause and the League of Women Voters submitted written comment last weekend that highlights the principles enshrined in the State Constitution that we believe should guide your decision-making about the time needed to successfully complete your line drawing process.

At the heart of that process is the California public. Input from communities across our state should drive your work, and hopefully, protecting opportunities for that input should be a top priority.

I’m calling this morning to voice support for the January 28th deadline proposed in the letter submitted by organizations from across the state representing a wide swathe of California. That deadline allows the public to be in the driver’s seat of this process at the very end, likely the most critical period in your work.

As you know, Common Cause’s redistricting consultant previously did a presentation for you on various deadline scenarios. She would be happy to adapt those to map out the timelines that would result from a January 28th deadline if that would be helpful. And she and I, of course, remain available to answer any questions.

As a final note, I didn’t catch whether an
earlier caller suggested that you consult with election officials or elected officials to examine questions of the election’s timeline and the primary date. Of course, election officials and their needs need to be part of the conversation to ensure our democracy can function properly. By contrast, though, considering the partisan political needs --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MR. MEHTA-STEIN: -- of incumbents would be contrary, of course, to our independent process here in California.

Thank you again for your service and for your leadership.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Mehta-Stein.

MR. MANOFF: And we do have some more callers in our queue. As a reminder, if you would like to give a comment, please press star nine to raise your hand. And we’ll let the next caller in. Stand by. Go ahead, caller.

MS. BAHN: Thank you so much. My name is Thos Vinh Bahn, and with Disability Rights California. My name is spelled T-H-O, V-I-N-H, B-A-N-H, and my position is I’m special counsel for strategic partnerships and community engagement at Disability Rights California.

So, I wanted to -- what I called to share with the Commission today is that with the current advent of the
census results, California lost a seat, and I think with California losing a seat there’s going to be some angst and some anxiety from Legislative members. I think we can have sympathy for them, but I would remind this committee and this board -- this Commission and this body that your charge is at the core of the people of California. And I think if at any time you’re needing to be grounded in terms of the directions, in terms of who you should respond to, in terms of what your work should look like, turn to none other than your own document that created this very body which says to conduct an open and transparent process in aiding full public consideration and comment on the drawing of district lines. And it actually warns against influences of the Legislature as well. So, I think to be very mindful that in these very uncertain times there may be additional pressure on this body, potentially from power players that may not represent the views of the American public and the common folks that may not have the power structure to lean on, to share.

But I want to assure you that because this is a beautiful California you’re not doing this work alone, that you’ve got lots of allies who are -- of course, you’re on the Commission because --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. BAHN: -- you’ve got some (indiscernible) and
you’ve got connections to communities. But you don’t have
to do this work alone. There’s a lot of folks waiting to
help you. Get folks to provide comments that are from the
public, itself. So I appreciate all that you do and I
thank you for this opportunity.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ms. Banh.

MR. MANOFF: We do have several members of the
public called in and listening. As a reminder to those who
have called in, if you’d like to make a comment, please
press star nine to raise your hand.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: And, Kristian, I think some of
them have already provided comments. I’m not sure.

MR. MANOFF: We do have someone else who wants to
give a comment, Chair.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, great.

MR. MANOFF: Stand by. I’ll let them in.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Go ahead, caller.

MS. MALLOY: Good morning, Commissioners. This
is Connie Malloy. I recently retired from a 10-year term
on the inaugural Citizen’s Redistricting Commission here in
California. I have been cheering you on from the
sidelines, and the topic at hand regarding the timeline is
so important I’m calling you internationally today so as to
weigh in.
I’ve been in your shoes and I’m just wanting to really remind and encourage you that the California voters intentionally put you in the driver’s seat, and the most important thing that you have to do is ensuring fair maps.

My experience being in your shoes was that a primary way that we were able to develop fair maps that stood up against seven court cases and won every time was really by an effective public process and incorporating the really robust and complicated communities of interest testimony.

From the experience that we had, we did a round of COI testimony before we did our first draft maps, and it was only once we had draft maps developed that the public comment became clear, detailed and actionable enough that it was really able to fine tune the maps that we did from there on out.

The public really needs time to be able to analyze, to dialog and respond, and for the Commission to be able to process the information that you get back from their responses. That’s true whether you’re talking about groups of stakeholders, and particularly true when you’re talking about everyday people and individuals who may not have staff. This is just something that people are doing around the living room table.

MR. MANOFF: You have 10 seconds.
MS. MALLOY: So, there may be a cost and an inconvenience by extending the timeline, but it is a much greater cost to come out the other side with not creating fair maps and risking the appearance of --

MR. MANOFF: Two minutes.

MS. MALLOY: -- influence by politicians, or candidates, or election administrators. And, so, I’ll just close by saying, you know, you are the decision makers. You are independent by design.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds over time.

MS. MALLOY: You’re the ones driving the timeline, and, you know, we’re all counting on you to do the right thing on behalf of everyday people like myself. So, good luck. I know that it’s a tough job and we’re all really grateful for you being willing to do this for the state.

MR. MANOFF: Plus 30.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ms. Malloy.

MR. MANOFF: Go ahead, caller.

MS. TRIGUERIO: Commissioners, my name is Toni Triguerio with the California Teachers Association, T-O-N-I, T-R-I-G-U-E-R-I-O.

We’re calling today about Item 9A, and we realize the turnout is historically lower in primary elections, and in particular, gubernatorial elections.
In California, while 81 percent of the registered voters cast ballots last November, just 38 percent cast ballots in 2018 primary.

In that primary Latinos made up just 16 percent of those who voted. Asians voted at eight percent, and those at 35 years of age or younger voted at 14 percent.

After the 2020 historic voter turnout, it is tempting to minimize the impact changes to the electoral calendar on historically underrepresented populations may or may not have.

It’s easy to develop a false sense of confidence, but for the very first elections in which your lines will be used it is important to remember in the last gubernatorial primary three out of four registered Latinos did not vote, two out of three Asians did not vote, and four out of five under 35 years of age did not vote.

We face a huge task next year turning out voters. We urge you to show caution before making that task even harder by changing the primary date in June, 2022.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ms. Triguerio.

MR. MANOFF: As a reminder to those who have called in, if you would like to make a comment, please press star nine. And we have nobody with their hand raised at this time, Chair.
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, Kristian.

We’ll move on to the next agenda item which is Agenda Item 3. Are there any general announcements or commissioner updates for areas of interest? Okay. We’ll keep moving.

Agenda Item 4 is the Chair report. I kind of gave my chair report earlier with announcing Marcy as our director of outreach.

And then, also, I noted what our schedule looked like today.

And with that we will go on to Agenda Item Number 5, Executive Director’s Report. Executive Director Hernandez.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yes, thank you, Chair Fernandez.

As you heard, the director of outreach has been selected. Welcome aboard, Marcy. Looking forward to working with you some more.

And then also, as the Chair mentioned, the chief counsel has been -- is being worked on and I’ll defer to the subcommittee to provide additional information.

We are going to be moving forward with the field lead staff. We’ll be conducting interviews on Monday, Marcy and I, for all the different regions. We are currently working on and looking forward to seeing many applications for the outreach coordinator. As you all may
recall, Patricia Vasquez Topete will be leaving the Commission as of today, in fact, the 29th. So, we are working to replace her and find someone who can help us with the outreach coordinator activities.

We’ll also be posting for a data manager, the vacancy that was just created, and we’re going to move forward on that hire as well when we get that announcement out.

I think I mentioned last time videography, the RFP. We have signed a contract with our videography folks, VSS, and so we’re moving forward with that. Thank you so very much.

Full schedule for the Commission to consider, we’ll be discussing that later on today as far as the schedule, but I truly think that we need to start putting dates on the calendar for the various activities, and I know that will be coming up with the Public Input Design Committee.

As far as the budget, we have and will continue to track our expenditures. We are going to provide information to the Legislature. We’ll be scheduling a meeting with them just to go over the proposal for our budget. We did submit the May revised letter, and we’re waiting to hear back if they have any questions.

That’s the extent of my report. Thank you.
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Director Hernandez. I believe -- you said that you’re moving forward with I thought you said data manager. I believe it was outreach manager position, correct?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: That is correct.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, great. Are there any questions or any comments for Executive Director Hernandez?

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Do we know when the data manager position is going to be posted?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: We will be working on that, and I’ll defer to the subcommittee. The position that we requested has been approved, or was approved, and so we’re just moving forward to create the job announcement that we’ll post as soon as it’s ready.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Any other questions? Move on to Agenda Item 6, outreach director, Ms. Kaplan.

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Thank you so much. Good morning, Commissioners. I am so thrilled to be here today in my new capacity as the director of outreach, and as Alvaro noted, I look forward to building our team to further engage all Californians in the redistricting process.

I know that you have a lot to cover today, so I’ll quickly go over my report also.
I just want to thank all of you for the great work that you’ve been doing to present to organizations across the state. Today we received 129 requests. We have 79 presentations that have been completed, and 33 upcoming that are scheduled, and then we’re in the middle of processing the remaining requests.

And just a quick note. Please make sure to redirect organizations as much as possible to the speaker request form just so that we can streamline scheduling now that we’re a little limited on staff, but hopefully just for the short term.

And I also wanted to highlight that this month we held two successful CRC hosted Redistricting Basics presentations. One was in English and one was in Spanish. Both of these presentations also included sign language and closed captioning. And those recordings are now posted on our website, on the YouTube page, and were also both sent out to our email list after the event, so thank you to the Coms team for that support.

The April 20th English presentation had 61 attendees and several folks calling in with questions. And the Spanish presentation had 147 attendees. We’re also going to be posting the Spanish PowerPoint presentation and the script on the website, and also just wanted to highlight to the public that commissioners are also
available to do the Redistricting Basics presentation in Spanish.

And I just want to thank everyone involved, the commissioners, Alvaro, Fredy, and Cecelia for helping with promotion, the translation from Spanish and also to the public and partners for tuning in and promoting the events.

We’ve also begun working with USCR to more efficiently track our outreach efforts, so this process will help to streamline our receipt of requests as well as reporting, tracking and measuring our outreach activities for the field staff.

And I’ve been working on going with the Outreach and Engagement Language Access and Grants Subcommittees and I’ll refer to them during their subcommittee reports.

Thank you again, everyone. Hopefully I didn’t talk too fast.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: It was great. Thank you so much. And I did want to echo your -- thank you to yourself, your team, Communications, Executive Director Alvaro and all the effort that went into the Spanish and the English presentations. Definitely it takes a village, so thank you so much for all those efforts. And also thank you all that tuned into the presentations. Again, they’re on the website that you can use for your own use.

Any questions for outreach?
Okay. We’re going to move onto our Communications Director report. Mr. Ceja.

COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR CEJA: Yes, hi. Thank you so much, Chairwoman. Congratulations Marcy. It’s awesome to see you step up to the director position, so congratulations.

Wanted to just keep it short, advising commissioners that we do have the official Redistricting Basics video up on our website. This is the video where you all participated and took turns reading slides, so we will send that out whenever commissioners are not available.

Just for the public listening, if you have -- if you’re an organization that has multiple affiliates or chapters, this would be a great opportunity for you to send out the video in lieu of having commissioners who are tied up with other commitments to present directly to each one of your chapters. The presentation is exactly the same as the commissioners are presenting out in the community, so by all means please feel free to reach out to us for that.

And I just want to let you know that this week was super busy with media. We sent out a statement earlier about the reapportionment data announcement. And, of course, California wanted to hear from our commissioners, so we continue to plug them in. I won’t go over what
interviews we did. I’ll shoot out a report actually.

Commissioner Sinay suggested that we put together a report
for every meeting that encompasses media mentions, social
media, analytics and website analytics. So, we’ll do that.
We’ll send it out so that you have a better picture as to
how the public is responding to our social media, our
website and the videos that we’re producing.

That’s it.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Great, thank you. Are there
any questions of Communications? Again -- oh, Commissioner
Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I’m just going to say,
and, Fredy, you know you and I have talked about this, and
this came up yesterday or was it two days? These are all
type of running together for me this week. But in the
question I think it’s coming up with one seat being lost,
where is it coming from. I think there’s a lot of
speculation in the media about where that seat has to come
from. So, you know, I would just ask, you know, Fredy, if
you could help develop some talking points on that. I know
you and I have kind of talked about that, but it would be
great just to know we’re all on the same page at what we’re
seeing.

MR. CEJA: Yes, we can do that.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to thank the Comms team for putting together that video, the PowerPoint of all of us, and encourage the public to see our -- my favorite slide. I think other commissioners have said it as well, the one where it’s introducing all of the commissioners. It’s kind of a fun slide. And if there’s any unique way that we can actually embed that into the PowerPoint that we’re already doing, so that when we get to that slide, you know, wherever we go everyone gets to hear a little bit from everyone. But thank you for putting that together, and thank you, everybody, for participating. It always makes me smile.

Also, I want to give kudos to my colleagues who did the presentation in Spanish. I’ve looked into it several times just because I had to prepare for a Spanish interview, and each time it makes me smile as well because I feel like I got to know my colleagues in a different way. You know, those of us who speak multiple languages know that sometimes it feels like you have multiple personalities, depending on the language, so it’s been fun getting to know you all in that language.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Yes, I want to triple the thanks to Fredy, you and your team, on the video. I really do like it and I love all of us being a part of it, so thank you so much.
Any other questions for Communications? And I’m going to go back to number 7. I can’t believe I skipped right over you, Ms. Johnston, so for chief counsel’s report.

MS. JOHNSTON: The only thing I have to report is that we don’t have any news yet on what’s going to happen after June 15th when California is supposed to be lifting the COVID restrictions. So, whatever the new rules are, the Commission will be adapting its processes to satisfy those rules. And once we have clarity on that, we will let the public know.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Great. Thank you for that. Any questions for chief counsel? Okay.

We are going to start with our subcommittee reports. We are going to go straight into it. 9A, we’re going to go into 9A, the Government Affairs and Census with Commissioners Sadhwani and Toledo.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: All right, here we go. So, we actually have many things to give a couple of updates on. Of course, the census delay will be one of them.

So, perhaps, Commissioner Toledo, if you’re okay if we start off with some of the ones that might move a little bit faster.

After coming out of the last meeting we had a
list of four things that were requested of us, assistance on prisoner reallocation for Federal -- folks housed in Federal prison, a further memo on Legacy data census action and COVID regulations and Bagley-Keene. So, perhaps we can start with the prisoner reallocation, just providing very initial support to Commissioner Kennedy and Commissioner Turner to connect with Senator Padilla’s office, and I’m sure that they’ll give an update there on the letter that they’re drafting. And I know that had been one of the things that a caller had asked about, so that will be forthcoming from our colleagues.

Secondly, we actually had connected a while back via email with the City of Los Angeles Redistricting Commission, so we had had a meeting with them, also with Alvaro. And it was really interesting just to kind of learn more about their process that’s very different from our state-based process, so it was interesting to kind of hear about their timeline and their structure, as well as also just talking through the fact that as we’re in development and gather COI input, it’s entirely possible that while people are giving us input on their communities of interest and we presumably are going to be mapping those and having everything available on our website, that other Commissions around the state could potentially want to tap into some of that, that testimony while it’s being
submitted to the State Commission, you know, if its
neighborhood based in the City of Los Angeles, or in the
county of San Diego, or Santa Barbara, or wherever else.
But other Commissions might actually want to use that, so
something we might just want to think about as we plan for
the transparency and how we’re going to post all of those
pieces of input that we’re collecting.

And, you know, I was kind of curious, you know.
Alvaro and Commissioner Toledo, we haven’t really debriefed
from that yet, so I wasn’t sure if that was helpful or if
it’s necessary to do more if you feel like there’s -- you
know, one of the things we had also talked about in that
meeting is the possibility of coordinating potentially with
various Commissions around the state, either to utilize
resources together or even simply to share information,
because redistricting can become a very confusing process.
Folks who want to get involved may not necessarily know the
difference between their local redistricting commission
that they might be talking to versus the state.

So, I don’t know if either of you have anything
else you want to add to that, you know, in terms of
feedback from that conversation.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think the only thing I
would add is that, you know, we’re doing outreach to our
communities, and some other localities like the counties
and other governmental groups. And it makes sense for us to coordinate so the community doesn’t have to provide — so they have an opportunity to provide input to us and to other groups knowing that it might be slightly different, but potentially it’s the same people giving input, right, the same hard-to-reach populations that we’re all targeting, you know, in the public. So, as much as we’re able to coordinate and able to work together to increase public participation in a meaningful way, I think that would be helpful, especially in areas where there are other outreach efforts going on.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: And I would just agree with that, absolutely.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay. I wasn’t sure.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to add that Commissioner Ahmad and I have given a presentation with someone from the CHULA (indiscernible) and then the League of Women Voters of San Diego sponsored a presentation with me and a commissioner from the county, San Diego County Redistricting Commission, and that came out really well because we were able to talk about redistricting in general and then give the differences. We didn’t do two PowerPoints. We turned it into a conversation.

So, for those who are interested in doing that or
have counties, another belief shared it with the whole, entire state. So, feel free to use that script.

And if you’re interested in talking to the San Diego Commission, we’ve been, obviously, in contact with the staff so we can connect you.

We’ve also -- Commissioner Ahmad and I have also spoken to the City of San Diego’s staff.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Chair Fernandez.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: And I think that’s great. I think something that might -- I don’t want to say a glitch, but if it’s -- if we coordinate the efforts from the public input that’s very different than an education, and so when we think of public input, again, I don’t believe the full Commission needs to be there. That’s a great opportunity, so, I mean, definitely worth talking about and maybe discussing what that would look like, but, yes, I definitely think that’s a great opportunity to try to combine our resources. But thank you so much.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, absolutely, and, you know, I think for me what I’m realizing, a lesson learned that we can share with 2030, is as more and more local areas are using independent commissions, come 2030 I think that there could be a lot of planning around how resources could be shared or how input could be shared, how education could be shared. I think we’re kind of far along
at this stage to have a robust coordination with the other commissions around the state, but, you know, in general I think passing an olive branch wherever it’s possible to do so makes a lot of sense to me, but I don’t think we have the capacity at this point, given all of the other things we have still to do, to have that coordinated effort. But I think certainly for 2030, that’s something to think about moving forward.

The other piece was the request to draft a letter regarding COVID regulations that is posted for the Governor. That is posted on the website as a part of our handouts for today, and I would just ask if there are drafting issues around the language, please email that to us or to Alvaro or Marian who can get it to us.

But I wanted to just talk about the general concept of that letter. Marian helped me draft certainly the legal components of that letter to make sure that it was accurate to the executive orders and then, you know, we just added to that a little bit.

So I want to just open a discussion if we’re comfortable with that letter, if there are any substantive changes that you would like to see. But again, ultimately it’s asking the Governor to maintain the executive orders at this point in time so that -- and I think it was Ms. Westa-Lusk who had called in saying, well, if we go back to
meeting in person, does that mean that the public has to then travel to Sacramento. I don’t think that that’s something that any of us would want. I think that actually limits public input in many ways. So, the request at this point in time is just to maintain those executive orders for the time being and certainly that in the future there’s, you know, if there’s an opportunity to discuss modernizations to Bagley-Keene, that we would happy to be a part of that or provide recommendations.

Commissioner Fernandez.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes, I do appreciate the letter. I definitely want to be able to do some sort of hybrid in the future, that is if the executive order is lifted. And I’m going to go ahead and give you my comment now because I’ll probably forget to give it to you.

I appreciate the wording. It’s great. The only addition I would like to see, it’s the second to the last paragraph, and the last sentence says, “We ask for clarity on the direction you intend to take as to these key executive orders so that we can appropriately plan and not be sidelined by a return to Bagley Keene provisions that would necessarily end our ability to meet virtually.”

And I think it would be helpful to add to that and say, and we’ll also -- and would end the ability for Californians to meet virtually. So, not just us, but also
the people we’re trying to get input for. But I appreciate
the letter. It’s great. Thank you so much.

And when would you like to get this out so if
there are other comments they can get back to you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: You know, whenever the
Commissioner wants to get it out. Do you want to take the
weekend to review it or --

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Sure. So, by Monday if anyone
has comments if you could just forward that to both
Commissioner Sadhwani and Toledo. Is that okay? Is that
good to both of you? Great.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sounds great, and then
we’ll move forward with sending that letter off to the
Governor’s office, and I know, Marcy, I think you have
contacts there, so perhaps if I can lean on you to help
make sure that it reaches the appropriate staff members.

MS. KAPLAN: Just adding, also, I’m not sure if
this is an opportunity to encourage other partners in the
field to support on this letter that’s just a call to
action for the public who are listening to support this
effort as well.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I agree with you on that.
Do you have a sense, especially from an outreach
perspective of how you would want to go about doing that?
Is it that you want to make this like a sign on letter or
another kind of form for other folks to sign onto? I love the idea, if you have thoughts on how to do it.

   MS. KAPLAN: I think coordinating with the Comms team to see part of that approach, but, Angela, I think maybe you have something on that as well.

   MS. VASQUEZ: I was just going to say I think a press release would be great so that we could get it out. Other boards are thinking about this, hopefully, other commissions are thinking about this, and so, even if we’re not asking them to sign on to this particular letter, because that could get a bit unwieldy given our limited administrative capacity, I think if we put out a copy and urge folks to consider something similar and asking, you know, if you’re a citizen ensuring that your local commissions and boards, et cetera, are talking about bringing up this issue. I think that’s maybe like our act two to the public is to urge local commissions and boards to take this issue up as an agenda item.

   COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I love that. I saw Commissioners Turner, Sinay and Akutagawa with their hands up.

   COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Sadhwani, I wanted to just express my support to you and Commissioner Toledo for the letter. I like the upgrade including all -- making the adjustment for all Californians
for virtual meetings. In total agreement. Yes, Ms. Kaplan, beautiful. I do not think we should hold it up for a sign-on attempt. I think that the letter should go out as soon as possible after commissions have had their opportunity to give any other feedback by Monday.

Love the press conference and the call to action for those that are watching now, and we can incorporate that in the press conference, as I think Commissioner Vasquez has said as well, so that I think it benefits everyone to continue in this format and have opportunity to continue and then also be able to have virtual or in-person meetings where possible. So, thank you all for the work.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Perfect. Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I thought that you all did a great job on that. Thank you. Commissioner Fernandez, that was a great input.

And just on -- I don’t think we should hold up the letter, as Commissioner Turner said. I also would like -- two reasons. One is I think sooner the better, but also, two, we need to be careful who we ask to sign on things because we are an independent redistricting commission, and as we heard from comments today, independent means from all sides to a certain extent, and so this letter is stronger coming from us for us and other
commissions because then, you know, then there’s a unit there.

But I do encourage the public to send their own separate letters and separate requests.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you for that. Agreed. Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. And thank you, Commissioner Sinay for what you just said. I think that that was a point well taken. I think -- I was going to suggest and I guess I’ll just still put it out there and would love to hear what the other commissioners have in terms of this thought.

I love the idea of I think making the announcement about what we’re proposing to have happen, you know, the retention of these executive orders so we can continue to meet virtually. I do think that actually -- to me I think that actually ensures greater transparency, you know, as intended by Bagley-Keene.

I am curious as to whether or not what our role is in encouraging the public, you know, all Californians regardless of what their opinions are, you know, to weigh in on this. Is it appropriate for us to perhaps put something on our website where we can direct people to either make comment, perhaps provide draft of language they could use and/or a -- not a sign on to our letter, but a
easy way where they can just fill out a form to then have sent to the Governor’s office so that they can see it, or, and this is to Commissioner Sinay’s point, or does that get us into an area that would be a little bit less independent and perhaps more, you know, just letting people just do their own communication.

So, just trying to see if we could make it easier, but at the same time I also, you know, point talking about, you know, ensuring that our neutrality and impartiality is also retained as well, too.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So -- oh, Commissioner Vasquez.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: You can go ahead and respond. I have a different question.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So what I was hearing, though, is that we should most certainly move forward with sending out the letter, definitely a press release at minimum, with a call for others to support this letter and support the ask that we are able to remain in a virtual space and location, even as the COVID situation begins to improve in California so that we can continue to maintain this.

If the Commission feels comfortable after Monday on any final edits to the letter I’d like to hand it off to staff to really think through how to move all of this
forward and to make sure that it’s put on a beautiful letterhead and sent over. Certainly happy to still be that point of contact in terms of the Commission, but would love to just bring in our experts on this to think through all of the implications on how to best put all of this together.

Commissioner Vasquez, did you just have a comment?

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Yeah. This is -- I mean this is self-interested but also in thinking about in placing community access. This maybe more a question for Marian.

I’m not sure what the travel like requirements in the statute are for the Commission, like if that was a requirement that we agreed to when we applied to be on the Commission. I am growing increasingly concerned that we will open up before I am able physically to travel.

And, you know, there’s a few things in terms of the requirements that I find a bit both ageist and ableist in terms of requirements for being able to serve. So, again, self-interested but also just thinking for folks with disabilities who can’t travel like this is an issue, but, personally for me, I am growing a bit concerned that the order will be lifted and I will be left having to make a choice.
MS. JOHNSTON: If Bagley-Keene is in effect you have to -- a commissioner would have to participate from a location that’s open to the public. So, if you’re not able to leave you home, that would mean the only way to be would be if you were willing to post your address and allow anyone who wanted to to come to your home, which is difficult. So, that is one of the provisions that would need to be addressed.

MS. VASQUEZ: Got it, but there’s no -- in our statute there’s not a requirement to travel.

MS. JOHNSTON: No.

MS. VASQUEZ: Got it.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So, we will move forward with the letter and hopefully -- hopefully we won’t have to even worry about that, and that you can remain safe, and we can all remain safe and all Californians can remain safe and still meaningfully participate in this process is our greatest hope.

Yes, Chair Fernandez. I wasn’t sure if you wanted to facilitate, but happy to have you facilitate as we move forward.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: The final piece, of course, is the census delay. I know that we’re missing a couple of commissioners, I think might be missing a couple
commissioners today. So, we’ll see how far we can get in this conversation, and I think I had spoken with Chair Fernandez yesterday I believe it was about whether or not we want to have a full and final conversation today or if we want to hold some of this conversation for next week on May 4th, which we have that day reserved as action items that we might want to take.

So, I will go ahead and start and at least give some of the background. Commissioner Toledo, please feel free to jump in at any point in time. Commissioner Toledo has been actively working also on behalf of the Legal Affairs Committee on all of our contracts with attorneys coming in, so we are certainly both working on the governmental affairs piece together and jointly. But I’ll at least get us started with some of the background.

I wanted to first address some of the callers’ concerns about Bagley-Keene, and just remind everyone, as well as the public, that we are operating somewhat differently than the 2010 Commission, but as advised by our counsel we operate with subcommittees of two members, and we’re only advisory, right. So, our subcommittees aren’t making any decisions. That’s why we created the memo and why we’re doing this report back. So, we believe we are fully compliant with Bagley-Keene. I certainly understand the concerns or considerations of the optics of the
subcommittees moving forward, but most certainly
transparency is something that we all take very seriously.

At our last meeting we had discussed the
Governmental Affairs Subcommittee hosting another meeting
of what we’ve been referring to as key stakeholders.
Certainly Common Cause had made several requests to us and
to me to hold such a meeting.

As I wrote in the memo that is posted on line,
that meeting included a number of key stakeholders. Over
the last several months we’ve had conversations about what
the impact of the census delay means, right, so it means
that we will have to figure out when exactly -- excuse me
-- when exactly we will deliver the maps based on the
Padilla ruling last summer.

To me, this is a legal issue, or at least needs
to be considered through a legal lens, because if we don’t
uphold our legal obligations under that ruling, then we are
leaving ourselves open to having our powers to actually
draft those maps taken away.

And most certainly, our counsel, Ms. Johnston,
has helped me understand the ramifications of the Padilla
ruling as it stands right now. And I certainly understand
that it’s entirely possible for us to go back to the courts
and ask for additional time. But to do so we’re going to
need to make a legal argument as to why to do that.
And so that’s what Commissioner Toledo and I have really tried to lay out in this memo, are the options that we might potentially have before us.

I would also just encourage us to remember and consider that we are in the process of, hopefully, hiring a chief counsel and contracting two litigation firms to be a part of our legal team.

So, to the extent that we need to have a legal strategy around the timeline, if we wanted to go beyond the timeline permitted under the Padilla ruling, you know, my sense is that we would really want to develop that in concert with all of these legal experts that we are bringing on board to be a part of our team.

You know, I have full confidence in the advice that Ms. Johnston has provided to us, but I don’t -- I feel uncomfortable giving a recommendation that we should just go forth and do whatever we want when we know that we’re going to have a lot more legal advice to bring on and to coordinate with.

The meeting that was held last week, I do want to talk a little bit about that. It has all of those same folks that were a part of the initial meeting with some additional folks as well, and that included representatives from the Secretary of State’s office, representatives from the CACEO, the organization of county -- I always forget
the acronym. County election officials, and, Commissioner Kennedy, you can correct me on that.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: California Association of Clerks and Election Officials.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you very much. So, there were two representatives there, representatives from both the Democrats and the Republicans from the Legislature, as well as from Common Cause. The Legislature also asked the attorney who litigated the Padilla case on behalf of the Legislature to join and provide her input on the ruling of that case, and you have a memo from that attorney posted on line.

We also were joined by the California Black Census and Redistricting Hub at the request of Common Cause.

It was very clear, you know, earlier on in this process that we were being encouraged to think about a share the pain perspective, that all of these different key stakeholders are going to have to adjust a little bit given the delay in the census that that could mean that various states and deadlines for the primary would shift, that the Legislature might have to shift them, that we might need to have additional time for our processes. But what became very apparent throughout the conversation was that I think people were really digging in their heels about the
perspectives that they had, right, and the community groups very much wanting that January 28th deadline, or end of January as it is. Legislature and others wanting us to maintain an earlier deadline so that the primary doesn’t have to move.

I’ll be very honest. It became quite heated. I also left the meeting feeling a little salty when I offered that perhaps there’s somewhere in between the end of January and December 31st that we could think about in which we could have additional time and yet not have to move the June primary date, which I think actually caller number four today had suggested, Sandra, I think her last name was Barreirio. I may have had that wrong.

I was accused of not being independent and I -- I -- I took offense to that, actually because I saw myself as listening to the advice of our counsel, and it was a stark reminder that as much as we need to be independent of the legislature, we also need to be independent of interest groups that have a singular interest or desire.

As I thought more about this process, I do think that there’s a number of potential options for us to consider. I have not laid them out in the memo that is before you today. However, the recommendations that are in this memo as of right now are, first, a conversation around the Legacy data and the adoption of it.
As far as we can tell, the Legacy data is the census data. That’s certainly something that we can further discuss, and that might be a part of a legal strategy. But given all of the information that we have received from the statewide data base thus far, the Legacy data is entirely usable, and so I think if we were to go to the courts and say we can’t use the Legacy data we would be asked why, right, and we would have to have a response as to why that is the case. So, that’s certainly one area that we can talk more about.

A second one is that we as the Commission just need to have a conversation about realistically how much time do we need, right.

We have a whole lot of extra time in comparison to the 2010 Commission to go out and start getting community of interest input before we ever receive census data. We could be doing it now.

So, how much time do we realistically need to draw the maps? And if our timeline is falling somewhere in and around the holidays, how are we as a Commission going to handle that? How do we anticipate getting public input during that time period? Do we believe it will be stymied or not, right? And that should inform our legal strategy, what we as a Commission actually want.

And then finally, I do think we should take a
wait-and-see approach as we learn more and more from the census bureau. Just this past week we saw another letter saying no later than August 16th, so the timeline keeps kind of creeping up in terms of when that Legacy data will be released.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I have a couple of things. I think we’re not the only entity dealing with this issue, right. Every state across the country is dealing with the timeline, the constrained time, with various interests from all sides. You know, I mean I could -- any conversation around the issue is going to have some level of tension, and I think that’s what we saw from meeting with stakeholders, and that’s to be expected because it is a very difficult conversation.

We’re starting to see some litigation bubble up across the country. The Michigan Commission has filed a lawsuit, and I encourage anyone on the Commission to take a look at it. They have novel -- some interesting arguments around the Legacy data and the -- that potentially might be useful should we decide to move forward in that direction.

Interesting arguments as well. Different context and different set of facts, but they have some interesting legal arguments.

And so, certainly I agree with Commissioner
Sadhwani that we need to -- when we think about our timeline and what we need -- how much time we need to meaningfully engage the public, especially once the draft maps are created. Because certainly engaging, everyone agrees we need to start getting feedback now with communities of interest -- community of interest information and get as much of it from the public now.

But, there has been a couple of commentators and previous commissioners who have pointed out that really the feedback starts to get a little bit more nuanced once the draft maps are created, and I think that is a point well taken. And, so, I do think we need to have a conversation about that. I know that’s been ongoing in various committees, and I certainly absolutely agree with more of a wait and see approach. We do have various options, so we are able to drive the conversation, and that’s why we’re getting this -- we’re getting quite a bit of communication from the public because stakeholders are looking to us to help other stakeholders move this conversation forward.

And, so, whether it’s us asking the Legislature to look at different options and explore different options with regards to moving the elections deadline, adopting other types of wavers, I mean there’s various other strategies that can be implemented, asking for additional funding. Those are some of the things that have been
brought up during public comment, more outreach. I think what we’ve been trying to do is to figure out what are the options -- as the Government Affairs Committee what are the options available to us and then for this Commission to give us some direction as to what we should be advocating for, right. And, so, continued conversations with stakeholders I think is important, as long as we have the direction as to where we want to be headed, and I think that can only happen we know how much time we need post-draft maps.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: We’re getting close to break, so should we take a break right now? It appears to be a good stopping point. I’m sure there’s going to be a full discussion of this. So, thank you so much. I appreciate the thoroughness and all the information, as well as all the comments that we received in public comment. So, let’s take a break and be back at 11:15.

(Off the record at 10:59 a.m.)

(On the record at 11:15 a.m.)

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. So, here we go again. It’s going to be déjà vu right now. So, welcome back everyone. We are continuing our discussion on Agenda Item 9A regarding the delay of census data. And I was checking with Commissioners Sadhwani and Toledo to see if we’re ready for questions or was there more information you
wanted to provide?

    COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think we’re ready for questions. Commissioner Toledo, anything more to add?

    COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No, I think we’re ready for questions.

    CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. And before the break I know I saw Commissioner Kennedy and then Commissioner Sinay, and then Commissioner -- wait, hold on. Commissioner Fornaciari and then Commissioner Turner. Anyone else. I’ll put myself in the queue, too, then.

    Okay, Commissioner Kennedy.

    COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I have spent a lot of time since last week going through all of the handouts, some of the multiple times. I’ve gone back. I’ve reread the Supreme Court decision. I’ve reread Secretary Padilla’s filing before the decision, and I have prepared some remarks. So, if you will bear with me, it won’t take too long, but I’ve spent a lot of time thinking about this.

    Any date that we might imagine for the final maps that we set before the census data are received by the state is speculative. The Padilla decision sets a deadline that is relative to the date on which the state receives the data. As I count it, we’re looking at 93 days after that date as the deadline for the display of the
preliminary draft maps, and 137 days after the state receives the data for the submission of our approved final maps.

To me, the most significant difference between using Legacy data and newer format data is the additional time, whether it’s one week or two, required to make the Legacy data usable, and we should be discussing how to recover that time.

The subcommittee’s memo also doesn’t mention the potential impact on the general election, which cannot be moved. As commissioners we are sworn to uphold the Constitution of the State of California, including the requirement for periodic elections.

Now, while I may be more sensitive to the demands placed on election officials as a result of having been involved in administering elections in various places, I believe we should all do our best to understand the bigger picture here. We cannot function in a bubble.

And while one of the purposes of last year’s suit and ruling was to give us and election officials certainty regarding our timeline, we remain, nonetheless at the mercy of decisions taken elsewhere, whether they be changes in the data release schedule from the Census Bureau or suits by other states to speed up or slow down the release of redistricting data.
While it is important to take certain decisions regarding the direction we will take, we must retain the flexibility to respond to those external factors.

Even this week Secretary Raimondo said, “Work isn’t over. We look forward to delivering the redistricting data no later than September 30th,” and later in that press conference Acting Director Jarmin said, “States will receive the data they need to begin redistricting by August 16th.” So, we’re not even getting clear messages from the Commerce Department and the Census Bureau.

While we can debate the intent of the 26th March letter from the Legislature, but there really should be no question about this Commission’s commitment to independent public participation and transparency. We are drawing lines, not the Legislature. We are doing it in public, not in private. And we are encouraging public participation in every way we can think of.

Even if we proceed with drawing preliminary draft maps on the basis of the Legacy data as prepared by the Statewide Data Base, the people of California will have had at least six months since the launch of the communities of interest tool to provide input on their communities of interest, even before we receive the census data. And if we can, indeed, recover the time required for statewide
data base to reformat the data, we will have the same
amount of time as in the 2010 cycle for the community to
provide input on the various draft maps.

Four-and-a-half months, the time between the
State’s receipt of the data and the deadline for our maps
as set in the Padilla decision is four-and-a-half months.

Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner
Kennedy. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to share that
I think that we’ve really -- yeah, it’s a perfect storm,
what we have walked into, and I think we need to sometimes
start there because we’re just living it and this is our
normal.

But, you know, we’ve had the pandemic. We’ve had
major census delays. I don’t even want to say census delay
anymore. Let’s just be honest, it’s a major. We have a
recall election which the groups are talking about in
public their concerns about how do they engage individuals
in the recall election, which is probably around the time
of our first -- you know, if you use kind of the path I’m
using, and we’re losing and San Diego and California has 52
seats versus 53 seats.

So, I just want to remind us that we are in the
perfect storm. I’m very proud to be working with all of
you through this perfect storm. I feel like we’ve all been very graceful and have great, yeah, humor through it all, and it’s just our normal. But just to be kind to ourselves and remind ourselves that what our reality is. So, when others say, you know -- in Commission 2010 we just -- or whatever. This is a whole different. No one ever could have predicted that this was going to happen. So, I have complete faith in the 14 of us moving forward in the right way.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay. Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I want to thank Commissioner Kennedy, well said Commissioner Sinay, well said to Commissioners Sadhwani and Toledo, thank you two, wow. I mean, oh, my gosh, this is -- I mean it’s a tidal wave coming at you and you have been able to distill it down to an understandable and digestible form for us. You know, I appreciate that.

I want to -- I just want to emphasize a point that Commissioner Sadhwani made. This is a legal issue at its core, and we have to be prepared to stand up in front of the Supreme Court of the State of California to defend any decisions that we make.

And, you know, I mean I wanted to emphasize that, and I know we don’t take it lightly, and I know it’s all
obvious, but I mean the Supreme Court made the Padilla decision, and I think it’s pretty clear, you know, the direction that they’ve given us based on the Padilla decision.

And, so, if we want to go a different direction, you know, we have to have some basis in law and a basis to defend that. You know, I feel in some ways that this end of January date is -- I mean I don’t know where that’s coming from, and I don’t understand the basis in law that is being used. You know, I looked at the memos and handouts that we’ve been given, and, you know, maybe, I don’t know, Commissioner Sadhwani or Commissioner Toledo can help us understand what the defense of that date would be or how we might defend that date. But I also want to say I agree with Commissioner Sadhwani that, you know, ultimately getting our legal team as quickly as we can is important.

And again, I just want to reiterate my personal thanks for your hard work on this.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari. Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Thank you so much. What an exciting time to be a commissioner.

I do want to also thank you. Thank you Commissioner Sadhwani and Toledo for the work that you’ve
done.

Commissioner Kennedy, I wanted to actually have you probably read what you said, your statements, twice. I was trying to stay in tune with every line and take a couple of notes and what have you, because I’m coming from a totally different perspective.

I deeply resonate with a lot that has been shared from a community side. It’s where I’ve lived and hung out for a while in representing community groups. Even earlier, I think Commissioner Sadhwani, I think when you said we must be independent of interest groups and independent of legislature, I kept thinking through that and it sounds like -- and then I kept thinking for the different coalition partners that’s speaking, I don’t think -- I’m part of enough coalition groups in my other day job. I don’t think any of us think of ourselves as having a voice from a coalition. I don’t think we think of ourselves as an interest group. We represent people and only reflect and show up with the will, the wishes, the testimony, the shared experience of people.

I’m thinking about the public comment that came in from the individuals, particularly the one, and if you’re still listening, that said will my retired, single, independent voice matter and count, and, yes, it absolutely will. But I want to just kind of talk through -- try not
to totally make my mind, so I’ll have to -- you’ll just
have to listen to me talk through this for a bit.

There is another, I think, element at play here
because we know historically that the people that -- the
voices, we’re trying to have all California voices show up
and represent and weigh in. But we know the fight is not
for all California voices. There are Californians that
have always participated, have always been aware, and have
always had the time to participate, and we want them to
continue. And in addition to that, if we’re going to
engage in the voices, it cannot be based in the way that
we’ve engaged in the past.

A caller a couple of days ago talked about
redistricting to be something that’s not easily
approachable. Yes, we’ve had more time now to talk about
redistricting and communities of interest, and it’s not
more time enough. Because it’s been an additional four
months, it’s not been forty years, it’s not been a couple
of hundred years that we’ve talked about redistricting.
This is still very new. In our Redistricting Basics we
talk about we’re trying to make redistricting sexy. You’re
trying to make them accessible, interesting, and it’s been
a struggle.

As you talk to people, and I’m sure all of the
commissions have, as we’re out talking to people, people
are either already very well familiar with redistricting or they’re like what. What is it? Okay, why does it matter?
And after I give it my best opportunity -- I’m so grateful. I wondered about coming on to this Commission initially, and I’ve not been shy, I’ve not been private about saying I did not know a whole lot about redistricting coming into this space. I’m so glad that I didn’t because I can fully relate to people now that’s saying how difficult this will be to get people to engage and to be able to lean in and understand the importance.

It’s taken me all of this time through, you know, COVID and a whole bunch of other things, it’s taken me all of this time to get my mind kind of wrapped around. A lot of the earlier meetings I was really quiet, really in a learning mode just trying to -- felt like the kid at the front of the seat, desperately leaning and trying to catch up to where some of you have been for years in your background, have (indiscernible) it, have lived it, have traveled it, and it’s like, indeed, if this is a process that all Californians should participate in, then certainly I should be able to grasp what it is that’s being asked.

I’m starting to put it together; I’m starting to get it, but it’s taken all of that. So, to me, to have four weeks, six weeks, two months, and oh well, you should get it now participate, jump in. Let’s make it happen.
This is enough time, and to ask it over a holiday period where holiday family is the only thing a lot of our communities have to celebrate in life. So, for those that are retired, and sit back, and just doing this voluntarily and weighing in because this is their entertainment in the time that they have in the day, good. Not made at that. That’s a wonderful aspirational place to be. For most people that’s working, struggling in life, competing priorities, things that they’re trying to work on, and now to have to also understand redistricting, this is a difficult process.

I’m grateful for the community groups out there that’s really trying to hold people’s face with two hands to say, listen, this is important. This will shape your future for the next 10 years. I need you to get this. I need you to weigh in. And people desire to do that and then life happens and they’re focused and pay attention to something else. I’m not certain. We’ve got some bright folks here. I’m sure we can figure out how to go back to the Supreme Court or whatever else it takes to say we do need to look at this differently. We do need to figure out how do we allow, if our focus is getting all Californians hearing their voice, if that’s our primary focus, I want to say that I am concerned that for us to -- and, oh, by communities of interest right now, yes, people are starting
I heard another caller that said it did not -- I think it was Malloy that did redistricting before -- talked about it did not land for people. They really did not begin to understand it until they saw draft maps, and then it was like a minute, I don’t care what you said, I don’t care how you told me about it, and how you trained me and everything, now it’s starting to make sense. Oh, my, I do need to engage.

I feel like we’d be penalizing those folks that can’t get it until they get it to say that do it right now, participate, understand it. You just should. I think that we owe them the additional time after we present draft maps to kind of now do education. Why aren’t they educating now? They are, but it will land differently once they see draft maps, and I think that additional amount of time is needed. And so I’ll pause there and probably come back later with, oh yeah, and I wanted to say, but for right now that’s just some of my initial thoughts.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Turner. Okay. I am going to bypass me and I have Toledo, Vasquez and Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So, in going back to Commissioner Fornaciari’s point and Commissioner Sadhwani’s point, that this is a legal issue, I certainly agree that
it is a legal issue, and I think, you know, certainly legal arguments can be made either way, but I think we need to base them on our facts.

So, I think if we determine as a Commission independently that our time -- that we don’t have enough time to meet our Constitutional requirements of engaging the public, and providing a transparency, and getting the feedback that we need to do our job, then certainly there would be an argument there for additional time that we would be able to make.

Now, that’s -- it has to go back to our timeline. We have to go back to figuring out do we have enough time after the draft maps, after we begin the mapping process, to be meaningfully engaged and involved as a public, and end up with maps that we feel will reflect the voices of Californians. So, otherwise, I think, you know, we have a weaker argument.

And, so, if we want to have a strong one, it has to be based on our assessment of the timeline that we need to get the work done and get the public’s feedback on the maps, and be able to use that feedback effectively.

That would be my comment. Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo. And I have Commissioner Vasquez.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: I won’t repeat what
Commissioner Turner shared, but I think you put into words the attention that I’ve been wrestling with for some time now in my head but didn’t have the words to describe.

That said, there is a word that has been particularly on my mind that I’ve been sort of teasing out, and it’s this idea of independent, and we’re an independent commission. And I think for me that downplays the interdependence of this process in the process that came before, which is the census, and we’re very much seeing how dependent we are on that process and the quality of that process. And likewise, elections which is -- I mean that’s -- the end game is elections. The end game for all of this is people putting in their ballot on election day, or election week, or what have you, right. That’s the end game.

This process is interdependent in a bigger civic engagement electoral process, and I don’t want -- I don’t want us to get into a conversation where we neglect -- we neglect those facts, right. Like the quality of our work directly impacts the end game, which is voting. And, so, I do want us to be mindful of those particular facts.

And I also just want to echo a particular point that Commissioner Turner made in that I don’t necessarily think that it’s fair to characterize community input as interest groups or sort of like one voice. These folks
represent their communities, and I think are independent
and ability to be impartial, those are requirements so that
we can be influenced.

The whole point -- the whole point of community
engagement is so that we can weigh all considerations and
know inherently that we are all bringing biases to this
process, and that we were selected because we are mindful
enough to know that we have biases and that we can
hopefully bracket those to the extent humanly possible and
be open to influence. That’s the point. That’s why we
have public comment. That’s why we do all of this in
public, because we are necessarily in a dialogue with
community.

And because we cannot have a conversation with
every single Californian, we are dependent on community and
community groups and community representatives to help us
have this conversation.

For me, I think sometimes we get hung up on this
idea that we’re independent and that we’re just sort of
like up here on Mount Olympus doing maps, and that’s the
gold standard for this process. And for me, that’s the
antithesis of a democratic republic, right, that we’re
representative and we actually have to -- in my opinion we
have to be open to influence from communities. That’s why
we are here. Otherwise, we could give it back to Olympus
if we want it, right.

   So, for me, it’s been bugging me the way
sometimes we as a group frame our independence, and I don’t
want the other pieces -- our dependence, our
interdependence on community and this whole wider electoral
process to get lost in the conversation.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner
Vasquez, and Commissioner Akutagawa, and then we’ve got
Kennedy, Toledo and Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: First off, I just want
to just acknowledge this great conversation, and I think
this is part of the reason why the work that we’re doing is
so important and I appreciate, you know, this full range of
comments.

I think I kind of fall in the -- and maybe this
was expressed by Commissioner Toledo. I may be falling in
the middle and I’m just trying to think about, you know,
what are the other ways.

I will say that coming into this I was just
thinking, you know, what do we need to do to ensure that we
are at least minimally following what is legally required
so that our maps are not invalidated. And I think to me
that’s the most important perspective that I think we need
to keep in mind.

With that said, I mean, and hearing everything
that’s being said, I think one thought is, okay, do we move up our own timeline, do we move up our own schedule and release draft maps earlier so that then we could increase the comment time and still retain, you know, the timing that we need to ensure that we don’t have to move the primary. Because I’m hearing -- the issue really is ensuring adequate time for community to comment, so that’s one thought I want to put out there for perhaps consideration and discussion.

The other thought is, okay, and I think Commissioner Toledo kind of -- at least this is what I heard and interpreted from what he said is. I think we just need to then come up with the case to go back to the Supreme Court and say we need to clarify, but we also want to suggest moving and saying that we will submit final maps by, you know, X date in January, whether it’s end of January, mid-January, whatever. If there’s any questions about us being on a bubble where the date that we’ll be maybe working towards could be outside of what could be legally required. This way, then, if we have confirmation from the Supreme Court we know that we will be within the legal limits of what we need to follow so that our maps will not be invalidated.

So, just wanted to add those two things.
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa. Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. You know, Commissioner Turner’s comment about it not sticking with people until they see the maps, because all literature on making things sticky and, you know, I’ve enjoyed that literature on stickiness and I agree. You know, I can see how that’s the case.

And that was, in fact, one of the reasons that I had tossed onto the table early on the idea of going out and getting people’s reaction to the current districts. You know, not necessarily anything to do with not necessarily basing new districts on the old districts. But at least if we could get public input on how they felt about their existing districts, that might be enough to really engage people and get them interested. This was part of the early conversation, I think, that we had, and we were talking about, you know, we’re approaching this or we’re looking at putting in place a new paradigm. It was the 2010 paradigm which had a very short timeline, the newness of the Commission, et cetera. We’re dealing, as Commissioner Sinay said, with a completely different set of circumstances and thinking of this in new ways is, I think, part of our challenge.

And, yeah, Commissioner Akutagawa’s idea of
putting out preliminary maps earlier, I’ve seen conversations in the press about states that are, you know, taking ACS data, so, no, they’re not actual 2020 census data, but taking ACS data and at least using the ACS data to put out preliminary maps that can be a focus for discussion.

So, you know, I’m happy with the course of this discussion. I just -- you know, let’s all keep in mind that we are charting our own road on this, and, yeah, I loved Commissioner Vasquez’s formulation of interdependence. I think that really is phenomenal thinking and something that we always need to keep in mind.

Thanks.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy. Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Many thoughts here. Let me get myself in order here.

First, on the piece on interest groups, I chose that term with purpose. I, too, have a long background working in community-based organizations. I think there are differences there, however, and I think in the last two weeks it was a healthy reminder for me of the differences between various kinds of organizations who are making requests of us, and also, even just as we are seeing in the comments that we received today, that communities come in
many different forms and have many different opinions and perspectives. And I think we heard from many different kinds of community folks today who were calling in.

And I will just say -- I’m trying to choose my words carefully, I -- you know, I think that throughout the last several months we have received a lot of really great input from a host of organizations who are very involved in this process throughout the creation of the RFIs, the RFPs, excellent feedback from many of the organizations that were a part of the creation of independent redistricting -- this independent redistricting commission here in California, and who are charting the path for good government reforms across the country. And I think that that’s entirely important work, and I really want to uplift that work.

But I think also some of those organizations wear multiple hats and, so, if you’re promoting good government while at the same time promoting a very specific recommendation for a set of community-based organizations. And part of this is that the accusation came at me because I didn’t want to follow exactly what that organization wanted us to do, that I’m not independent. I didn’t -- I didn’t appreciate that at all and I felt like, no, you don’t get to have kind of a paternal relationship with this Commission because you were a part of forming us and, you know, push us and accuse us of not being independent when
we don’t follow exactly what you say.

So, I just wanted to kind of uplift that because I take the considerations of community-based organizations to heart. I absolutely agree. I think there are barriers to this process. I think it’s incredible that this process exists and I am an ardent supporter of independent commissions across the country and having a fully community-based informed process across the country.

But I do also think that, you know, we are term limited, right. We only get one shot at this and then we’re out. We come in inexperienced and we’re going to do this, and then we’re gone for the next round.

And there’s also, you know, many studies that look at term limits for legislators, and one of the prevailing wisdoms that come out of that is that while term limits open pathways for new folks to join the process, they’re relatively inexperienced and then ultimately will have to rely on interest groups. And I wonder if that’s a little bit of what’s happening here. And, so, for myself I wanted to be really mindful of that.

I wanted to uplift -- I agree with so much of what has been said here. I wanted to uplift Commissioner Akutagawa’s perspective, as well as Commissioner Kennedy. I didn’t want to bring specific dates for us here today because I think we need to talk in general terms, but I
actually do agree very much that I think that there’s a real opportunity to draw maps before the deadline for draft maps and post them and get plenty of feedback.

And, as we talked about, I know Commissioner Andersen and I talked for months as we were thinking about the line drawer contract and thinking about, well, what does this process look like? What are the lessons learned from 2010? The lesson that we kept hearing was make sure you leave more time so you can take your draft maps and go back to community and hear about everything that we did wrong, because, undoubtedly, there’s going to be a lot of people that don’t like our draft maps, and that’s okay, right. That’s kind of the whole purpose.

So, if we plan -- if we were to set a deadline in advance of what is set forth in the law, right, and then -- and I can share all those dates with you if you want. That would put us at actual line drawing in the month of October, potentially releasing draft maps in early November, so that we have plenty of time to solicit feedback and make changes to those maps, right.

I think that there’s a lot of potential options in front of us to ensure community feedback, and I think that we can figure this out, and I think as Commissioner Kennedy said from the very get-go, we don’t know when we’re getting the Legacy data just yet, and so, until we have a
clear sense of that, it’s all speculation. But it can be informed speculation as we move forward. And I do think we have to continue to lift up the legal component of this to make sure that we are on solid legal footing.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: So, I have Commissioner Toledo, Vasquez and Yee.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So, I just wanted to touch on something that Commissioner Vasquez spoke about, and that’s, you know, we are dealing with people’s fundamental right to participate in democracy, their ability to vote. And our timeline will impact that ability to vote -- potentially could impact I should say.

And when we started off the conversations with our key stakeholders we start off with the core value of wanting to be collaborative, but wanting to work together to make the timeline work for everyone so that the paramount, fundamental right of the public and of our citizens of all Californians is upheld until we can have an election where the people of California decide who represent them. And so, that’s when we went into these conversations with our partners, and so far, you know, from my opinion, and I do have -- from my personal perspective, all of the groups have been collaborative and have given their perspectives. We may not actually agree with and some of them might be a little bit less, you know, flexible
than others. Some have very strict timelines. But we have
to do our internal work of figuring out how we can work on
our calendar to be as collaborative, but also go without
stakeholders and ask each one of them to also be -- to do
the same. And, so, identify areas -- and they’ve been
doing this. The Legislature, the Secretary of State’s
Office, the local elected -- the local elections registrars
(indiscernible), and so -- and others, and all the
community-based organizations as well.

And, so, I think as much as possible I think we
need to continue to have an open conversation with these
groups and identify a path forward that protects people’s
fundamental rights to elect who they want, understanding
that the timelines are, you know, are intersectional and
depend on -- are interdependent, and we’re interdependent
with all of these different -- to come up with some
decision jointly. And I do believe that if we were to go
back to the courts, it would be best if we were aligned on
a deadline.

So, if we all can agree -- if we can agree on our
time limit and everybody else can agree on theirs, and we
come together and we make it work, and we go to the court
as a joint -- as a united front, I think that would be a
stronger position and potentially the stronger position in
the public, the stronger position with the court and the
stronger position with the public as well.

So, thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Vasquez.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Thank you. First wanted
to apologize to Commissioner Sadhwani. I was not implying
that you should not have taken offense to, you know, being,
you know, sideswiped, if I can use that term, or feeling
sideswiped, whatever the intent was with focus on impact.

To that end, again, I think for me I’m trying to
push us to be more clear with our language, because I think
also when we talk about community and community groups,
we’re lumping in a wide variety of community groups, and it
may be clear to us as a Commission, but it’s not
necessarily clear to the public, and I’m probably going to
make some people mad by telling these secrets out of
school, but there’s a hierarchy in these groups. There’s
the grass tops groups and there’s the grass roots groups,
and often they work together, but not always.

And, you know, we’re sort of -- we’re in this
world of, and I’m part of it because I’m employed by a
grass tops group. You know, we’re part of the nonprofit
industrial complex where, you know, that’s also about
power, right.

And, so, when we are talking as a commission
about working with communities and community groups and how we respond to community and how we have conversations with community, you know, for me it feels important to be a little bit more clear when it makes sense about, you know, we’re talking about grass roots groups.

And I think this is going to be more important, honestly, again as we start to actually go into community for feedback as we start to receive feedback on maps and get communities of interest.

When we’re talking about the grants, you know, we want the grants to go as close to the ground to the people as possible, at least that’s my understanding. And, so, that’s a very different set of stakeholders than, you know, sort of folks who are representing, I think, larger communities and perspectives and have sort of broader lenses than someone, the neighborhood groups, right. That’s just how the hierarch of information in relationships work.

So, just also wanted to flag that in the same way that, you know, I want us to be clear when we call ourselves independent, what that means. When we talk about community I think we should also be clear about sort of what we’re talking about when we say community and when we say community groups, because it’s not always clear to the public in the space or in these conversations on a regular
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Vasquez. Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. Really appreciating all the hard work that went into the background for this discussion and the discussion, itself. It’s really very engaging as well as very important, and this is why we’re here, to talk about these things.

Very quick observations. For members of the public who might be confused by the term “Legacy data,” I know that may sound like old data. It’s not old data. It’s Legacy format data that the census is promising to put out mid-August. So, it will be the fresh, new 2020 census numbers in an older format and will take some processing.

This whole discussion about interest groups, I mean I think we wanted both in, right. We absolutely want to give the fullest, fairest opportunity for individual citizens to be heard as well as to encourage and give full hearing to more organized groups and so forth.

The 2010 Commission, the public input meetings were mostly designed for individuals to give comment, but there was also, I believe, at least one special session set aside for groups to present, and I don’t know how those groups were selected, but, you know, they get more time than the two or three minutes that an individual would have
at a meeting.

So the hope is both and, I believe, and, of course, that will include us making, you know, a legitimate effort to hear, to discover, to unearth the concerns of groups that are less organized or not even organized, right, but do have legitimate community of interest concerns that should be reflected in our maps. So, hopefully, that is both and, but not to pretend that -- I mean we’ve had some groups given an hour of time, right, to present to us, whereas an individual only gets two minutes. So, not to pretend that that isn’t a distinction we do make.

About the deadline. So, yes, I mean the discussion starting with Commissioner Fornaciari about the legal considerations, I mean that’s a hard consideration, you know. That’s -- the January 28th date, you know, as nice as that is, I mean if that doesn’t have a legal basis then it’s a nonstarter.

And what we’ve read so far, I mean the things I’ve seen, some of the memos and comments, I’m not seeing a promising route to making a strong argument for additional time. Maybe we can come up with one, but so far I’m not seeing that.

So, assuming we are in an end of year deadline situation, I do like the idea that Commissioner Akutagawa
started about perhaps giving ourselves an earlier deadline, let’s say early November, let’s say Monday, November 1st, for our draft maps. That means a very busy October, right, if we don’t get our full redistricting data until September 28th, possibly, probably, then that means we have exactly -- almost exactly one month to actually produce the draft maps. So, of course, preloading tons of work before that, maybe some pre-draft maps based on ACS data and so forth, tons of community of interest work to really key in, focus in on the issues that are most (indiscernible) are most -- have, you know, high demands on judgment and debate over where lines fall, to preload as much as possible and to come into October just really ready to get those draft maps done.

That’s a discussion. Is a month really feasible with any -- with an amount of preloaded work that we can actually anticipate? I guess that’s the discussion, especially getting testimony from or input from our line drawers and our VRA counsel that comes in would be very key to making that decision.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Yee. I have Commissioner Toledo and Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Well, I’m not sure if we’re going to be able to make a decision today. I do think it would be helpful to get direction from the Commission, or
at least guidance from the Commission, on our ask, right. But I certainly do think that we should, at minimum, be asking our partner or key stakeholders for additional -- either additional conversations around or at least more information about the flexibilities that are available to us should we move them? In order to ensure that the elections occur in a way to -- occur in a way that we’re protecting people’s fundamental rights to vote in June, and so, whether we have a specific ask or a general ask, we may want to consider -- and it could be as simple as asking the Legislature, because we have not done this. We have not asked the Legislature to even to have a conversation about potentially looking at other methods of waiving some of the electoral -- maybe not the -- we have not asked the Legislature to consider moving the election cycle calendar, but we also haven’t asked about other potential waivers that they might have at their disposal to help with making sure that the election does happen.

So, is that something that we could do? We’re looking at -- we’re looking at all of our flexibilities and ask them to look at all flexibilities, and I’m sure they are, but have that conversation with us as well.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you Commissioner Toledo. I have Commissioner Sinay and then Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. I keep
going to back to what are the legal issues, and, you know, the Supreme Court said if you need to seek further relief in the court, feel free to come back. And that was one of my questions was why weren’t we, and I know in the memo it says that Marian doesn’t advise it, that we weren’t part of the original lawsuit, and what are we legally asking for.

But I think that they did open the door for the Redistricting Commission to come back to them, even if -- you know, you don’t necessarily always hear a court say come back if you have more questions, so, I think they did open that up directly to the Commission. I don’t think -- you know, and I’m not a lawyer and I’m not pretending to be one, but that’s not legalese. That’s actually one piece I could understand without looking it up.

The other piece that’s concerning me, and that I think we’re not bringing up as a legal issue and we do need to talk about as well is if we agree to use the Legacy data, how much does that leave us open for the potential of being sued? Because the census has been very clear that they’ll do the best they can. You know, they’ve got some language around it that they’re not standing up behind it as much as the data that’s being released later. And I think that’s the question that we also need to ask our legal counsel once we’ve got the full team.

And, so, there are some critical legal questions,
and I don’t feel that comfortable moving forward until we can actually write down these questions and talk to legal counsel because I am a strong believer in civic engagement and the promotion of democracy and making sure that people feel that they are a part of this process.

I’m not that concerned about moving the primary date because I think most people don’t know what the primary date is right now. So, I think that argument -- I mean I don’t want to mess up the November, 2022 date, but I do feel that your -- the question of this is a legal issue is a good one, but what are the legal issues that we need some clarification on, and I think that’s a place to start.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. And to start there, Commissioner Sinay, I think we could actually move the primary all the way to sometime in July before it impacts the general. But beyond that, I don’t think that’s necessarily what’s being asked.

A couple of things. I think I want to start when we -- I also want us at some point to have a conversation again about the limitations of the time. Commissioner Yee reminded me of it when you brought up the people, the hour for special groups and then two minutes for the other people.
The community groups that typically go out into the community and kind of pull together what the community wants and, you know, bring it forth a synopsis of what they heard. The alternative, I guess, would be for community groups to just do turnouts, because two minutes, that’s 30 people. They can do turnout of 300 people and we’d be there for days listening to all of the various individual voices and what have you. So, I think we are really going to have to think about what that should look like and the amount of time that they should be given.

We, again, I keep being driven by the testimony by our initial mandate providing best opportunity for all Californians to participate here, weigh in. I’m really intrigued by the opportunity lifted by Kennedy and others -- actually I think it was someone else. Akutagawa talked about the earlier maps and being able to maybe try that on, that conversation, to see what that looks like and getting responses that will even provide a better training base for people, et cetera.

That’s the -- but our driving factor to provide all Californians an opportunity to participate, I also wanted to just name the thread that keeps being lifted as far as our maps being invalidated, whether or not we respond in a manner that the Legislature wants us to one way or the other. I really do want at some point to have
more conversation about that. I don’t think -- or I don’t come from the perspective so much so that we have to maintain a law that may or may not still work for Californians. I think we should try to be mindful of it. I appreciate Commissioner Toledo saying and others if we’re going to go back we do need to determine what is the just cause, what’s the rationale, be really sure that we’ve done everything else. But the threat, you know, if we, you know, move wrong, if we whatever our maps will be invalidated, I would love to have clear cut, these are the taboo cannot be moved, cannot be -- I don’t want that to govern all of our conversations, and if this happens, well, then our maps can be invalidated, and then our maps can -- because I think it even keeps us from having conversation. I think if the law is set and was set at a time that could not have known, there wasn’t such a thing at the time of a Legacy data, there wasn’t the pandemic. A lot of this other information has shifted, then I think we could go back and say what your best thinking was at the time is not working right now for whatever the reasons are. Laws are changed, shifted all the time, and even when we get our chief counsel on I’m hopeful that those that are the ones that are coming on is, yes, I’m interpreting the law, but not using it, again as something that says that we can’t imagine something different and
begin to push for something that works for today for people
currently as opposed to what was historically or even 10
years ago. Things are rapidly shifting and changing.

And, so, I want us not to be afraid to explore
what would it look like to shift the guidelines we’ve been
given, and I think with all the due diligence in us trying
to include all the voices that we area, I think we’re all
doing a really good job trying to make sure that we draw
maps that are appreciated by the masses at the least.
Nothing will make probably everyone happy. I don’t think
we should be the punished or made to feel that we can’t do
our best for fear of though we are independent, there is
some governance over us for doing what I think we were
called to do.

So, I can hear more on that, but it starts to
feel like don’t think, don’t move, don’t do anything
different about this threat about invalidating maps. And
right now we’re just having conversations, and so we know
we don’t want our maps invalidated, but I also don’t want
us to get to the end of the process for 2030 and anyone
else is looking saying we didn’t do all we could because we
wanted to be cautious that we didn’t have our maps
invalidated.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.
Commissioner Kennedy and then Commissioner Sadhwani.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. You know, I go back to the one issue that I think is very clear as far as what harm we might suffer and, therefore, what standing we might have to take something to the Supreme Court is this question of the time required to process the data. That is a nonzero length of time. We don’t know if it’s one week, two weeks, 10 days, whatever, but it is an amount of time that we would otherwise lose from the timeline that the Supreme Court had in mind.

So, as I said, I think that’s where we really need to start from. If we can come up with some other, you know, concrete harm that we as a Commission would suffer or the -- you know, that would give us standing to take something to the Supreme Court, let’s have that discussion. But in my mind we already have that, and I will be happy to move forward with that.

The one thing that I really, you know, want to continue to emphasize, you know, we’re talking about an earlier deadline for maps. Are we talking about maps based on ACS data or are we talking about maps based on actual redistricting data? If we’re talking about maps based on actual redistricting data, I want to remind everybody that we are talking about not four maps. Four maps makes it sound very easy. We are talking about 176 discreet districts that we have to draw. That is a lot of work.
And I think I did the math at one point and said, you know, if we’re lucky and we only take Sundays off we’re looking at having to draw four to five of those maps per day. You know, maybe we have two hours per map. So, please, please, please keep that in mind and imagine, imagine us sitting down trying to draw each of these 176 maps in the course of, you know, two hours. I think I’ll stop there. Thanks.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy. Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. A couple thoughts. Just in response to Commissioner Kennedy, I would not recommend drawing maps using ACS data. Given the presentation that we had the other day, I think what we -- what that lacks of the ability to go all the way down to the census block level.

So then we’re drawing it based on estimations that -- when we’re talking about being precise about the lines, themselves, I don’t think the ACS data ultimately will allow us to get there, but I think your other point can we just get feedback on the current maps, that, to me, is a point well taken. I completely agree with that, especially as it relates to assembly and senate, the number of those seats are not changing, so getting feedback on the current maps makes a whole lot of sense to me.

And what I ultimately actually had raised my hand
about was Commissioner Turner and Commissioner Sinay’s point about let’s leave no stone unturned, right. And I think, for me, that’s why the recommendation and the memo that Commissioner Toledo and I developed was let’s wait and see, right, because all these legal kinds of questions, let’s not close the door on them, but instead, let’s -- we know that we are ramping up our entire legal team. As we do so, let’s have a strategy session and figure out like what are our potential options. What would it look like to go back to the Supreme Court if we wanted to? What kinds of legal arguments would we need to make in order to do that.

And I wondered also if Marian would -- I’m sorry putting you on the spot here, Marian, but if you’d like to just jump in and share a little bit about like if we wanted to go back to the Supreme Court and ask for an alternative timeline based upon whatever we decide we want, what might that look like? What would we need to have kind of in our back pocket ready to go?

MS. JOHNSTON: The problem you’re facing is that you’re dealing with time that was set up by initiative by the two propositions that were passed. And those propositions set out specific time limits for how long you had to do your first draft maps and how long you had to complete your mapping process.
I don’t know of any legal argument that would allow you to expand that time. The only question is when does the time start to run? The point of going to the court was with the Padilla case was that we thought the census was going to be delayed for so long and we wanted the time not to start running until the census data came.

So, Commissioner Kennedy’s point about whether or not you want to consider the Legacy data, and if so, it shouldn’t be until that data becomes usable. That might be an argument that you still need to have after the two-week waiver period of time it is. You still should have the amount of time that the initiatives provided to the Commission to do its work.

I don’t see an argument, a legal argument, of how you could say it’s not -- the initiative did not give the Commission enough time. If you have all the time -- if you’re given all the time that is proposed by the initiatives, you may not think it’s enough time, but that’s not a legal basis for challenging the amount of time that you have. And that’s my dilemma.

I’d be happy to answer any questions about that.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, Marian, for that. I do know that Commissioner Kennedy has something else, but I’ve been waiting to go ahead and give my two cents.
I do think it’s valid to hold off this conversation because I do feel once we get our chief counsel and all of the other VRA and litigation, I believe it is -- it would be a good strategy to have a strategy session with them to kind of schedule that out and see what it looks like.

I really like the idea of getting maps out earlier. I think with most of us, and I think we’ve said it in meetings, if you have a blank page it’s kind of hard to provide feedback versus if you have something, at least you have something to respond to and to react to. So, I really like that idea of, you know, not waiting until the last day that we’re supposed to have our drafts and put something out, because, again, I think that it does make sense that a valuable part of our feedback will be after the draft maps.

But then I also feel that we can move up that draft release earlier, because I’m hoping and hopeful that quite a bit of the public input would already be in our COI tool if we’re doing a great job and, you know, Commissioner Andersen is great at advertising, hey, go out there and put it in the COI tool. You don’t even have to come to a Public Input Meeting, which is great. I’m just reminding everyone that’s out there as well.

Sometimes when I share some communities say, I
think in our Public Input Meeting yesterday, oh, we’re waiting for you to go back to our communities. Don’t wait. Go to your communities. Let them know to put in their public input. We’ve got a tool that’s set up for that. I know there’s other activities that they’re waiting for as well, which I truly appreciate.

So, I will look to you, Commissioner Kennedy, but I think it’s been a great conversation, and I just feel like we need to really make a decision on how much further we need to discuss. I think everyone had a chance to provide their input, and we do need to provide direction, obviously, to the subcommittee.

So, my opinion is let’s hold off. There’s still time. Oh, my other opinion is I agree with Commissioner Kennedy and Ms. Johnston that I think the only piece we can argue will be the one to two weeks extra that it takes to -- the extra time that it’s going to take with this Legacy. I’m still a little upset about deciding to take the Legacy data. I wish we would have just waited until the (indiscernible) because then we wouldn’t have to worry about there potentially being issues with this Legacy data, and that I’m not comfortable with.

So, I think that’s it. I’m just going to let it go, and I’m going to pass it on to Commissioner Kennedy and then Commissioner Turner right after.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Just very briefly. You know, looking at the Padilla decision, again, it seems like, you know, part of the reason we find ourselves in this, and I’m reading a very interesting book entitled “Upstream,” about anticipating problems. You know, no one anticipated, as one of the other commissioners said, no one anticipated the existence of Legacy data. All everyone was thinking about was there’s the PL94-171 and that’s it.

If the decision had based -- had been based on the date on which the Commission received the data, there would be no doubt as to what the timeline is, but because the decision is based on when the data are received by the State, then we have this added issue of the time required for additional processing that was not part of the 2010 timeline, was not anticipated by the court last year.

Thanks.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy. Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSION TURNER: I just think -- I had a question. If we adopt the Legacy data, I didn’t think we had to share.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Good. Good point. Thank you. Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: We have not formally
adopted it, so one of the recommendations of the memo is to formally adopt the data. The reasoning that we have behind that is certainly that’s something we can discuss. I don’t see us doing that today, but I could be wrong.

But in conversations, in particular with Statewide Data Base, looking at the memo that they sent to us as well as in that meeting that was held, Karin MacDonald reported that this is for all intents and purposes PL-94 data, just not in the format that they would otherwise send it.

The memo that she had laid out for us some months ago, and it’s linked within the memo that we prepared for you all today, laid out the useability of that data, and in particular, that the State of California has the infrastructure from the Statewide Data Base as well as the State demographer to receive format and handle that data.

And so I do think that if we’re going to go to the courts and say we can’t use the Legacy data, we’re going to have to have a good reason as to why we can’t, because we received documentation that it would be useable.

And, so, I think that -- I think that if we want to say that we won’t use it, that’s one strategy. I don’t know how well that’s going to hold up for us in the long term. Again, I think this comes back to ultimately being a legal issue if we don’t use it. It could be a legal issue.
if we do use it.

So, I think that we’re going to need some strategy on this as well. Certainly, if other states are deeming the Legacy data useable as redistricting, that’s an activity that’s going to have to occur in all 50 states, we’re going to have to have a really good reason of why we don’t think it’s useable given all of the infrastructure that we have here to handle it.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, and then we’ll have one -- thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani -- one more comment from Commissioner Toledo, and then we can move forward to what you need.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So, within that I -- you know, in reading the Michigan court cases, they’re pressing forward, they talk about the risks of accepting the Legacy data and the balancing act, the balance that they had to make, and so, as well as -- and part of that is -- so, my understanding in my reading of it is, or the history of it is, that they accepted the Legacy data to begin work on some of the map drawing, but have given themselves the discretion to -- or are pushing, rather, to not -- you know, until there’s a reconciliation of the official data from the census and the state data, so they’re essentially saying what if -- because the risk is what if the data is not -- not perfect or doesn’t match -- rather to be exact,
doesn’t match the Federal census data numbers. So, if the State numbers don’t match those Federal numbers, then that would leave them in a precarious situation, so they’re basically tying it to the reconciliation of the receipt of the Federal numbers, and at that point if the data is correct, then using the Legacy moving forward for their map drawing. So, there is some tension. I don’t think it’s as clear cut.

I think we’re a little bit more comfortable in California because we have Karin McDonald and her -- just one of the best line drawers in the country and the depths of knowledge in the State of California through CalTech and UC Berkeley, so we’re more comfortable with moving forward with the data, but that doesn’t mean that there might not be errors and that the reconciliation isn’t important. In fact, the reconciliation is part of that process in making sure that the data is correct. And, so, I just wanted to bring that up and highlight Commissioner Fernandez’s point.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.
Okay. We have Commissioner Turner and Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: So, in regards to the Legacy data, because I know that’s a conversation we need to have, it seems to me when we first heard of the Legacy data that it was presented in a manner that said it may
take up to four weeks is what I recall in order to be able to translate the data. And then we learned that it was two weeks, and then we learned that it was one week.

So, I still have healthy skepticism over the Legacy data. I’d like to know, is it being worked on before we’ve approved it or why the change. Why is it four weeks, to three weeks, to two weeks?

I’m curious about the Legacy data, too, and I’m wondering about interest of those that would prefer us to use it and thus move the timeline as opposed to just utilizing the PL data when it comes forth. And, so, we’re not talking about the shifting date, but I also have questions about that in trying to determine should we be using the Legacy data or not.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Turner. I do recall the presentation. They had initially said it was -- they anticipated two weeks to do whatever they needed to do with the Legacy data and then four weeks for all of the other whatever they needed to do with the data that included part of it, that included like the incarcerated people.

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, everyone for the wonderful conversation, and, yes, Commissioner Turner, basically they did say the two weeks -- this is Statewide
Data Base said there’s the two weeks to filter, verify the data as such that it gets to the point where it would be at the same level as it was straight appeal 91 data. And then after that, for prisoner reallocation it takes about a month, which is the four weeks. So, that’s why -- the four week, we kept on talking about that. It was the two-week window to work with the Legacy data.

My understanding is that -- well, so there’s that. What I would recommend because there are legal issues which we do not quite define. We’re trying to define them, trying to define them, but we don’t have answers for and we still have more questions.

Also, virtually every day the census data is putting out more data and more refined. It seems like they’re getting all the people who had been shifted to good reapportionments at different times are now just back doing their regular jobs, and it’s like data is coming out very quickly now. So I think it’s going to get more exact.

And so what I kind of recommend here is that we do the tour with our legal group here, that is asking for a recommendation, is that we do sort of their recommending that we essentially “wait and see.” It’s not quite just the wait and see, but please come back to us with what actually are legal issues. Who do we need to then address those with, and we need to get more information from the
Statewide Database? So, that’s what I would like to see on this. I totally agree, right now we cannot say, great, we’ll take June 28th -- January 28th. We cannot do that right now. We don’t have the understanding. We don’t know what that would mean. It’s like take an arbitrary date.

And while I loved Commissioner Vasquez’s whole description of the integration, yes, we’re independent, but we’re not in a vacuum. You know, we have to -- there are certain players who we’re told to depend upon, you know, the Census Bureau, and want to have people’s input and we want people to be able to vote on these maps, so, which leads go back to the map.

So, that’s my recommendation is that we say yes, let’s go with the wait and see, provided you ask for this additional information and plan to come back to us with.

As far as the draft maps early, great idea. But I want those to be good quality maps, which is why I’m saying please, everyone out there, you’re realizing, whoa, this is really important. We’re talking about the January 28th date. Now that we have your attention please use that COI tool and give us as much information as you want. You know where your communities are.

This is true. This is not me. Not everyone understands redistricting. We don’t understand redistricting. I’ve never done this before. But I do
understand what’s involved in creating maps and drawing, and looking ahead, which is why, Commissioner Sadhwani, we are saying we can do early maps but we want those good quality maps and we cannot do that if the community waits for the maps to be drawn. Then it’s like we could draw something now. It’s like, well, what the heck. And that’s not it. We want the community input. And it doesn’t mean we’re going to get everybody, but all the groups who have connections here, start your people putting those in. If they start looking at the COI maps, it will be a process that they have, oh, now I understand, and then their information will be on that draft map. We can loop that up.

There are a couple of others. I do love Commissioner Kennedy’s idea of what do you like about your districts right now, what do you not like. And, specifically, don’t just think, well, the line is here. If there is information about why that line was not drawn someplace else, we need to know that information, too, because we might say, oh, sure, we’ll divide -- I don’t have a good example right now, but, you know, like a freeway. You know, yeah, that freeway was there for a reason, and say we don’t want it there. Okay. But what did you not want it someplace else? Because, oh, no, you can’t do that. So, that’s the information we could get if
we go around with the districts, which is a great idea.

And I agree with Commissioner Sadhwani, we have to use the current information, and we could move the draft maps up early.

I do have one question to Marian. If we move the drafts up early, that does not change -- please refresh everyone’s memory here. The date of the draft doesn’t then cause sequencing for anything else, does it?

MS. JOHNSTON: That’s correct.

MS. ANDERSEN: Great, okay. Then, yes, we can easily move that draft up early, but only if we get everyone’s input in. And it’s still 176 maps. Brace yourself, everybody.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, everyone. We’ve got about 12 minutes left before our lunch break. Commissioner Kennedy, I was trying to move forward here.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I wanted to maybe tantalize people, give you just something to think about, not to discuss. A best-case scenario for us, which I would love to see happen, you know.

The apportionment data came out four days earlier than we expected. If the reapportionment data comes out a week before we expect them, then we have data received date of 9 August. We have a data reformatted date of approximately 19 August. We have data submitted to the
Commission of approximately 16 September. We would have a preliminary draft maps posted deadline of 10 November. We could do it earlier, but 10 November. If it is 10 November, the public review period would close out before Thanksgiving, and then we would have until Christmas Eve, until the 24th of December, to finish the process.

So, you know, that’s just a best-case-scenario if the data happened to arrive in the state a week early, I think we’re looking at, you know, what could be a fairly comfortable scenario.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you for that. So, we need to provide direction to the subcommittee. Commissioner Sadhwani and Toledo, did you want to lead that discussion?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So, what I’m hearing is that commissioners are asking for some kind of memo, legal memo, with our options and detailing, you know, and have it in writing. I think it would be good for us to have a legal memo, because we’ve heard from Marian for maybe having it written out in terms of our options, and we can determine whether we want to have that as attorney privilege or we want to have that as a sh document. At this point it makes sense to have it open, since we want to be transparent around these issues, then to bring back -- to gather more additional information about possible
options with our stakeholders and not just the Legislature and the Secretary of State and our local elected elections officials, but also the data base, the Statewide Data Base and their timing issues, and I think to continue to be collaborative to get input through this process and bring it back to the full Commission in a transparent manner.

So, that’s what I’m saying. Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I mean I think that’s right. I guess for clarity, is this legal memo that you all would like to see an outline of potential courses of action in terms of those dates and the legal ramifications of them? Is that -- is that -- am I hearing that correctly? And, if so, I would just say I’m happy to also receive input perhaps through Marian or some other channel from the Gantt Chart Committee that I know has also thought a lot about the timeframe and timelines as Commissioner Kennedy just kind of outlined as well. Is that correct?

And also, in terms of the timeframe of receiving such a memo, next meeting or after we have chief counsel on board, then litigation counsel, I guess just a little bit more clarity of that next step I think would be really helpful.

And I would also just say, I am certainly of the
belief, I think one of the callers was saying don’t wait, don’t wait, and I very much agree, but I don’t think we should have -- have us be holding off from collecting communities of input information which we must certainly be moving forward, and beginning those hearings, or meetings, or however you want to call them, you know, in the very near future.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. Right to you, Commissioner Andersen. Let me just -- my opinion is that we wait for the chief counsel because this is -- it’s something that the chief counsel needs to be involved with, and we should have his or her opinion and research on it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I was saying what I envision this memo is actually to have the holes in it of this is what we don’t know. This is what we don’t know, not say, oh, here are all the answers. This is -- you know, these are the things we do know, and we don’t know which is why we can’t go here, you know, that sort of scenario. Because there will be holes in here, and the idea is who do we need to talk to to fill those holes, you know, where can this information come from. Some of it might be our California Supreme Court. This, there’s several options. With our counsel we might be able to resolve that. This, Statewide Data Base. That’s how I’m
kind of envisioning just a little bit more of a layout.  
Here, this was a great document. It has lots of robust 
information, more of a -- now filtered.  

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Toledo, are you 
responding, and I have Commissioner Kennedy also.  

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Commissioner Kennedy first 
and then I can --  

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thanks, and you may be 
able to answer what I’m about to say.  

Yes, chief counsel should be involved as soon as 
possible. I’d like the delay in order for chief counsel to 
be involved to be as short as possible. So, maybe once we 
have a formal acceptance, salaries negotiated, et cetera, I 
mean I’m hoping that’s not going to take the entire two 
weeks that we expect, you know, between now and the time 
chief counsel starts. So, is there a way after there’s a 
formal acceptance, even if it’s before the two weeks has 
run out, to share this with chief counsel? Thanks.  

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: In terms of timelines, 
certainly for the hiring of the chief counsel, you know, 
Commissioner Andersen and I are doing reference checks. 
So, we’re hoping to do those today actually, and then 
shortly thereafter we’ll be contacting the candidate if 
everything is good and working with Commissioner Fernandez 
and Commissioner Ahmad on a -- on compensation and the
offer process.

So, certainly I think -- and I would hope or want Executive Director Hernandez to chime in. Certainly I think we can’t require them to work before they’re hired, but if this is an area where the applicant may want to provide -- become involved a little bit earlier on a pro bono basis, that might be possible. On a volunteer basis is probably the better word for it. But I would want to hear from Executive Director Hernandez because there may be some government -- and from Marian. There may be some government regulations that prevent that.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: And before I go to Executive Director Hernandez, I just want to remind everyone that we do have a meeting scheduled for May 4th, on Tuesday, so we could finalize -- potentially finalize what we’re talking about right. Executive Director Hernandez.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yeah. We can ask, but we can’t require them to do any of the work before they’re actually hired. We can at least put it out there that that is what they will begin on on day one. That way they know what to expect on that first day.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: And Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And I’m hoping this is a wrap-up comment on my part. But, you know, I think hearing all of this, I think what does make sense, as Commissioner
Andersen was suggesting, perhaps laying out the various scenarios that we have discussed today, including the January 28th suggestion from many groups who have called in, including many of the other scenarios that we’ve discussed today, an August 9th drop of census data is included, and laying out what are some of the open questions about any of those, so that we as a Commission can have that, but also it can almost serve as an onboarding memo for our chief counsel so they can have a brief of really the kinds of conversations we’ve had and hopefully be pretty specific about the kinds of questions we have for them once they get started. And, I mean, I’m assuming also working with Marian in that capacity as we figure out that relationship.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: In addition to that, it would be helpful, I think, given all of the community input, both in favor and opposed, to explore the questions about whether there’s a legal argument to be made because it doesn’t -- certainly our counsel doesn’t believe that there is an argument at this point based in terms of communities’ ability to give input, but might there be -- you know, to develop that a little bit further and try to understand what the best argument would be for that, and
even if it’s not a strong one, so that we know what the
argument would be and would be able to weight that as well.
So, we would want to at least understand, given all of the
public feedback on that issue whether it’s even possible to
take that into consideration, or how to weigh that a little
bit better, because at this point it doesn’t look like
we’ll be able to, but potentially, I mean, we should at
least look at that issue a little bit more and delve into
it and analyze it and have a memo on it.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. We are out of
time right now, and I think is everyone in agreement in
terms of moving forward as Commissioner Sadhwani and
Commissioner Toledo have mentioned.

Again, I want to thank both of you for doing just
an outstanding job pulling all this information, meeting
with stakeholders. It is a sensitive and people can become
very passionate about it, so, thank you so much. And, yes,
we are independent, so just a reminder to all of us.

Everyone is okay with that? Just give thumbs up.

Okay.

So, thank you so much again. We’ll move forward
with that. We are going to break for lunch, and please be
back at 1:45. Thank you, everyone.

(Off the record at 12:46 p.m. for lunch.)
(On the record at 1:46 p.m.)
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Welcome back, everyone. We are going to continue on this journey of getting through the subcommittees.

We have, as far as I’m aware, Commissioner Sadhwani and Toledo, we are done with 9A, correct? Yes. Okay, good. So, we’re moving on to 9B, Finance and Administration, Commissioner Fernandez and Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I don’t think we have anything. No, nothing to report.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: No, but I didn’t want to say anything. Oh, the only thing I did want to follow up on, Executive Director Hernandez, if you could please -- I sent an email yesterday or the day before asking for -- what was I asking for? Oh, the transcripts, because I noticed that there haven’t been any transcripts that have been uploaded. So, if we could please find out what’s going on with that.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Okay. We’re still working on that, but I will get back to you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. And we’re moving on to 9C, The Gantt Chart, Commissioners Kennedy and Taylor. Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Nothing further to report after this morning’s discussion. Once we have a little
more clarity I can go back in and update the Gantt chart.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I guess you can’t hear me when I said that. Thank you. I’m sitting here talking to myself.

Okay. 9D is the VRA Compliance, Commissioner Sadhwani and Yee.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I don’t think we have anything more to update. Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I would hope that the report from Eric McGhee was helpful to everyone. We’ll continue to digest what he presented as we think about our maps.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And the VRA counsel, I think that contract is being worked on, and Commissioner Toledo will give that update as part of Legal Affairs.

COMMISSIONER YEE: That’s all.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I do have a quick question. If the subcommittee please look at and bring back to us the idea of starting just for general viewing, not working with, but the CVAPS maps before we get counsel on, you know, get that rolling now, so when counsel does come aboard we can actually be ready to go. If the subcommittee could look into that.

COMMISSIONER YEE: We can do it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. And Item 9E, Outreach and Engagement. Commissioner Sinay and Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I’ll go. I think Commissioner Sinay is chewing. So, let’s see, we kind of are at a transition point in education outreach stage here, transitioning to, you know, public input. You know we’ll still obviously continue our education program, but we’re looking at transition to begin to really push to get COI input.

And in looking at ways to do that we had this idea of a COI blitz where we could engage community partners, you know, as trusted messengers and kind of train the ideas to -- you know, to work through them to get them to, you know, generate input for the process. So, we’re working on that. You know, it’s probably going to be closely connected with the grant-making process and what that ends up looking like.

So, you know more to come over the next couple of weeks on exactly, you know, what the thought is and how that’s going to roll out.

We have the labor panel coming on what date? I forgot the date.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: The 14th, I believe.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: The 14th I thought it
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: May 14th.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. And, so, that will probably be the last panel that we bring forward, I think, and that’s kind of where we’re at. Did I capture it all? Okay. Any questions? Thanks.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Agenda Item F is Language Access. It’s Commissioners Akutagawa and myself, and Commissioner Akutagawa is not back yet.

So, we’ve been -- we have biweekly meetings with our outreach staff, and right now I just want to make sure everyone is aware that the translated materials are online. It’s just very exciting for us. And we just continue to have discussions regarding language access, and also we bring forward information to the public, what is it, Public Input Design Committee meetings. Any questions with that?

Okay, we’ll move on to 9G is Materials Development, Commissioners Fernandez and Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Just to say that I think at this point you and I had started talking about sitting down with the Redistricting Basics presentation one more time and some of the other materials just to go over and make sure. We have small things like updating the language
about how many U.S. House seats California has, and the fact that we already know now how many we will have in the future. So, there are a few minor updates that we need. I guess we would like to get an update from staff on the status of the paper COI tool, for one.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes. Director Ceja.

COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR CEJA: So, we did chat about that with yourself and Chair Fernandez. So, I made the changes and I just shot it over back to both of you to make sure that I captured it correctly. We can meet one more time before we present it to the full Commission and then send it off to the printer.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Great, thank you. And Commissioner Sinay, I saw your hand up.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. Part of the COI blitz that we’re envisioning is to actually shift -- you know, go to the intermediate -- redistricting intermediate that focuses more on communities of interest. And, so, we have been sharing some ideas with Fredy, but just wanted to put that bug in your ear as well to start looking at moving that way so we can focus on people to do the action, not just learn.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Great, thank you. Any questions on that? Okay, we’re moving right along to 9H, which is the website. Commissioner Kennedy and Taylor, so,
Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. I have gone through, or I am going through the website. I’ve got a few things that I need to discuss with Commissioner Taylor first, and then we can come up with some further recommendations.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Any questions regarding the website? Okay. We’re moving on to --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Commissioner.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Oh, Commissioner Yee, sorry. I was just anxious.

COMMISSIONER YEE: No problem. Just a quick note. Not our website, but the auditor’s website and the Shape California’s Future, the old selection website that we all went through, that’s down now. I just found that out. Maybe you already knew that, but --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah, I had brought that up at the last meeting and had asked Director Ceja to liaise with the auditor’s office to see if there’s a way to get that content for our website. So, he has said we have to keep ability of posting the information. It’s just a question of getting in touch with the auditor’s office and actually getting the material so that we can put it on our website.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Very good. Sorry old news, my
bad.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Not old news because some of us may not have known that, so thank you. Director Ceja.

COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR CEJA: Yeah. So, it is not old news because there was an article about that today from the California Globe blasting the auditor’s office for having broken links. So, it’s not just us that are asking for that website to come back up.

Raul did check in with the auditor’s office working to get us at least the initial applications for all the commissioners so we can add that to our website. It would be nice to have the whole website up, but if there are additional items you want to transfer over, let myself or Raul know and we’ll make sure we get that information.

And I just wanted to mention briefly that in the conversation with the LA City Redistricting Commission, they were boasting about our website, and I’m not just saying that because I created it, but they said everything makes sense, all the information makes sense, and they said it’s very easy for people to follow along to the point that they want to redesign their website to mirror ours, so that’s awesome.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: That is awesome, and that’s wonderful news and it is a great website, so thank you.

And I have Commissioners Kennedy and Fornaciari.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. Mr. Ceja, if I understand you correctly, you’re looking for the application materials for the current commissioners, or for the entire application pool, or for the 35 that went into the random draw?

COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR CEJA: Just the current commissioners for our website.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. So, when the first eight sat to review the remaining applications we were given all of that material, so I have all of that material on my computer. I transferred it over from the old computer to this computer, so if you need that, I can provide it.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So I think, in addition to that, I mean we talked about archival interests with the information and all the deliberations that the first eight did. I don’t know if we have that now, but we should have that on our website, too, because the auditor’s office hosted all those meetings.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Great points, and there possibly could be some press releases, I believe, when the first eight were appointed that might have already been transferred over. I did ask for that to be transferred over.

Commissioner Andersen.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And also, the training for the different phases of line drawing, have a look at all that. That was very, very valuable and would be extremely helpful for any onboarding. I was actually trying to share that with people and all of a sudden it was gone.

And there were two sessions, what they trained the advisory panel, and then training the first eight, and they’re slightly different. So, that would be very good to have over.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: If it’s going to help to have a letter from the subcommittee to the auditor’s office, I’m happy to draft that.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, great. And so just Director Ceja and Executive Director Hernandez, if you do need a letter, please reach out to Commissioners Kennedy and Taylor for that. Thank you.

And other questions regarding the website?

Okay, we’re going to move on then to 9I which is Data Management, Commissioners Ahmad and Turner, and hopefully everyone had a chance to download the document that was posted. So, I’m turning it over to you.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. Well, first you all have heard the update from earlier today that
the position for the data manager has been established, so
that is going to move forward, hopefully quickly. So,
that’s great news to start with.

Commissioner Tuner and I have posted a document
for your review. I’m hoping everyone had a chance to look
at that document. It is a high-level overview of what our
recommendation is in terms of a data management software.

We have met with USCR and our line drawers
multiple times to go over the pros and cons of various
platforms that exist out there. We’re looking for
something that’s off the shelf, not looking to create
something from scratch. And we have landed on the
recommendation of purchasing a pro license for Airtable.
And then we will be working -- if that is approved by the
Commission, we will then work with USCR to start building
out that data base which we were told will be relatively
quickly so we have a skeleton format and start testing out
how that input, whether it be from the COI tool, whether it
be from snail mail, whether it be from verbal testimony,
how that input will land into that centralized data base
that will be accessible to the commissioners and to the
public.

Commissioner Tuner, am I forgetting anything
else?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: No, I think that’s all we
need for an update.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay. And I know in some of the previous meetings you all had given us the blessing to go forward with the data management piece, but Commissioner Turner and I felt the need to bring this forward as we are looking to start some expenditures on this. The pro license is $20 per month for a user, so it’s extremely less expensive than we were anticipating.

And we’re going to lean on staff and the data manager that we hire to determine the number of users for that and how it will be accessed with our internal data management team as well as the line drawers.

So, that is our recommendation. We’re here for questions from commissioners, and after that we are ready to make a motion.

So, I see Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thanks. I think this recommendation is great. My only concern that relatively quickly doesn’t really give us a lot. Do we have a better sense of the timeline, or can we get a timeline with, you know, a more concrete timeline?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: A timeline for what?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: For when it will be built and up and going so that we can do the other things we want to do with the data.
COMMISSIONER AHMAD: At this point I am not comfortable giving a date as to when it will be up and running. This is the first step in getting that process moving forward, and once we have run our internal tests to see how that data flow works, we’ll be able to better determine how -- what that timeline will look like. But, unfortunately, at this time I’m not comfortable providing a date.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: So, Commissioner Ahmad, your estimated timeline on the document, is that -- that’s something we can refer to now in terms of estimates, right?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Sure. You can refer to the estimates, and this is based off the expertise from our partners on this, but again, it was very intentional that we didn’t put a date on this.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I get it.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I think we all know things shift and change, so we just wanted to make sure we account for that.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fornaciari and then Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, this is great. Looks great. Outstanding. This version of Airtable, we can -- you have, I think, unlimited basis, right, with this level, and so, I mean, cause we’re talking about using
Airtable for the outreach thing we’re building and, you know, if we’re going to build a queueing system for public input meetings, you know, that might be an Airtable, too. So, I was just wondering if this license could be applied to all those things. I think it can, but --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I think my recommendation, and we still will need to talk about that in conjunction with the table that they’re building for the other queueing purposes is to keep this one pure. There -- our understanding is that it’s not unlimited. There’s a records limits base of 50,000, and we do have plans should we start to approach that number for getting a secondary license, but we would not want to go in using the same license for the queueing system.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you for that.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thanks. I feel like you have said this before, so I just wanted to confirm -- now I’ve lost the memo in front of me, but you have on her ability to make restricted views of data publicly available. And just remind me, does that mean that the system is set up in such a way that if we can link it to our website when we receive an input into Airtable it can automatically be generated onto our website from the perspective of making sure all of the input we receive is
publicly available? Is that what that means, or after we input it into Airtable would we secondarily have to post it to the website? Is it auto-generated or --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I think this tool, the reason why we landed on it is because -- it can be -- let me figure out the right word. It can be displayed on line without replicating it. So, there won’t be an additional touch to the data from the database to make it available for the public.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That’s exactly what I was asking, and that’s really super exciting news.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Any other -- I do have a question. You probably -- I’m going to say the same thing that Commissioner Sadhwani said. You probably already mentioned this. But, so will be -- I’m trying -- like in my head I’m trying to just get it altogether. Will the public input from the COI tool automatically cede into the database that we’re going to build or how will that -- I mean is it going to be like almost like a real time, you know, coming into the system or -- you understand what I’m asking?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: No, my dream would be to get an API from Statewide Database that connects the COI tool directly to Airtable, and then as you punch in that data into the COI tool it will automatically move over to
Airtable.

I’m not a tech expert; I won’t pretend to be one. So, that’s where we’re leaning on USCR and Statewide Database, their technical side of the team to give us the information, if that’s possible. Currently what we have learned is that it’s more batch loads. It’s more batch loads that will jump into Airtable, but there’s an opportunity to try something differently and use some of the new technology that’s out there to expedite and make our processes more efficient. So, as soon as we learn more we’ll definitely bring that forward.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Great. Thank you. Are there other questions for the data management? It’s actually exciting news.

So, at this point do we -- Marian, do we need to have a motion to move forward with the Airtable? Is Marian here?

MS. JOHNSTON: I think you can leave that just up to staff if you direct staff to do it.


Okay, now we’re going to J, 9J is Grants. It’s Commissioner Akutagawa and Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Good afternoon.
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Oh, he’s here, great.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Good afternoon. So, we’re prepared to give an update. As you all know, we entered into this process pioneering our approach to expand community involvement at a grass roots level and really support those efforts through this process. And we thought we had had it all sorted out, and we talked about it for months and explored various paths.

And the hang-ups -- I know you’ve probably been wondering what is going on with that subcommittee because we’ve been deferring each meeting to the subsequent meeting with regard to a more substantive update.

So, what we were grappling with was this question of our authority as a Commission to actually grant. And, so, we have consulted with -- we’ve gotten advice, legal advice from multiple sources to support the new recommendation which is to go with an RFP, so we’re going to need to go with an RFP process. It was also what is the path to make this happen.

So, we’re in the process right now of putting together that draft RFP, working with staff and plan to have a -- I’m hoping as early as tomorrow a draft scope of work that we can put forward.

So, there’s two things that we think is really important because the seemingly complexity of this process,
as well as being very, very intentional and direct of what we’re asking a contractor who would be dispensing this money on our behalf, making sure that we’re very, very clear in what the work product on the back end needs to be.

So, our goal is to have posted a draft scope of work for the Commission’s review. We will agendize it so that we can have a robust discussion about it, as well as have the public be able to weigh in on it as well. And depending upon -- and we’re trying to do that as early as the series of meetings attached to make our team. And then dependent upon on far we get and the discussion, itself, we’ll dictate whether or not there will be any formal action taken at that time. We’re not wanting to rush this, as much as we understand that timing is of the essence, we feel like it’s going to be very important that commissioners fully understand and feel like they’ve had appropriate buy in and support to what the final scope of work will look like as well as the public.

So, I know some of the feedback we’ve gotten in the past is that, you know, people don’t have enough time to really digest and feel comfortable with a full understanding of the process before the process sort of moves ahead. So, we’re really managing for that as well while keeping in mind that we still need to move expeditiously on this process, because it’s several steps,
in order to get the resources to the community so that the work can be done.

What we anticipate is the primary focus of the work is going to be at the map response level, so, it’s not going to be a high emphasis on this early education piece that we’ve been doing ourselves. That’s not going to be the primary focus of the work. It’s going to be more focused on the community involvement or feedback with the draft maps and subsequent follow-up maps.

So, that’s where we are. It’s a little bit more information. Again, you can anticipate, I’ll know better tomorrow whether we’re going to be able to have that draft scope of work ready to post in time for that May 13th meeting -- no, I’m sorry, take that back. It will be posted. Our goal is to get it posted as early as possible to give commissioners as much time and the public as much time to review it prior to that next series of meetings.

That’s where we are.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. I guess it’s -- the direction is different I guess in my understanding. I thought it was more -- the outreach was more for the public input prior to the maps, like the education phase, and so I guess it’s a little different than what I thought.

Any questions from the commissioners?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I’ll just say that’s not
in stone, of course, and we also have to manage this against timing, right. So, we’ve got to get the most result for the money as to where we are in the process. So, we’re already in May might as well say, right. Saturday is May. So, we’re going to be -- and I think considering the robust discussions we’ve had earlier today about the possibility of then moving what we might do sooner, I think it’s got to be -- I guess the long and short of it is going to have to be aligned with our timetable, so that will influence the scope. But it is going to focus more on really getting that feedback to the maps, which is what’s really, really important, right, in our work. But again, that’s not in stone and we want to give commissioners as much time to review the scope ahead of time and provide -- and we’re going to set aside enough time in the agenda to have robust discussion about it, and again, also be able to get any feedback from the community as well.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. I had Commissioner Sinay and then Toledo. Are you passing, Commissioner Sinay? Okay, Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No, I’m just remembering that the timeline that was proposed back in January had us releasing funds I believe, if my memory serves me, in March, and correct me if I’m wrong. So, I’m just
wondering, when we come back with the package, when would you -- and maybe this is too early, I don’t know, but I’m just wondering when would the release of funds be in the revised budget to the community groups or to the foundation, or if the subcommittee has thought about that.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Well, we certainly have thought about the impact at previous times (indiscernible). And I am going to respond quite like Commissioner Ahmad. I’m not comfortable addressing the timeline at this time or direct release, but that will be a part of that discussion in our next series of meetings.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Okay. Appreciate that. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Of course.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Le Mons, if there are ideas on how -- well, let me put it this way. Yeah, the libraries are going to be critical for the community of interest input and over summer, especially in rural areas.

You know, is there a way to have a conversation with the Grants Committee to see how we can support that over the summer versus, you know, wait to support them at the map drawing.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Absolutely. I would say
if there’s any strong request as it relates to focus to send that to staff, and then that way, even if it’s put down as discussion points, because again, none of this scope is moving forward until we’ve had the discussion I’ve described. And, so, I think that that will be the time, but if you have some strong desires now, I would say move those forward, send them to the director of outreach, Ms. Kaplan and Raul, and they will make sure that at least they’re noted in the documentation that’s going to come forward, and then we’ll have that discussion at that time. I think that’s a very good point you’re raising, and again, we’re going to have to look at what are our priorities. Some things will be specific based upon that operation, like libraries, where the summer is the optimal time, you know, how does that impact what we’re doing? How does that impact timelines? So, I think those are all considerations for that discussion.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: You’re welcome.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Any other questions? Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons.

We will move on to 9K, Communities of Interest, Commissioners Akutagawa and Kennedy, so Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. We did
receive a report that we requested from Statewide Data Base regarding the communities of interest tool. So, as far as statistics there were as of earlier this week 221 registered users of the communities of interest tool from which 167 submissions had been received. They have chatted with 34 individuals via the chat function, and so far there is one submission in Spanish. The remainder are in English. They’ve had no phone calls for support as far as FAQ’s.

Apparently there are quite a few account verification emails ending up in people’s spam folders, but Statewide Data Base does not have any way to override, you know, internet mail providers spam filters and so forth, so it doesn’t seem that there’s a whole lot we can do for that other than to advise people to check their spam folders to see if their account verification email has landed there.

They are continuing to recruit staff for the access centers. The Statewide Data Base and their legislative counterparts have asked be added to the agenda for our May 24th and 25th meeting. I believe that’s on the agenda document.

Now, as far as the issue of a heat map showing where communities of interest input is coming from, the response from Statewide Data Base is that that is not something that they are offering. So, this may be
something that we need to take up with the data management team or find some other way. But we continue to believe that it would be very helpful for us to be able to show the public the areas in the state from which we are receiving communities of interest input through the online tool.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Commissioner Kennedy, did you get a chance to talk with the Statewide Data Base about the content of the email that gets sent back to the -- you know, people who put COI input. I don’t know if you recall at the last meeting while we were having the meeting I submitted it. The website was wrong and it also said there were going to be several attachments, but only the PDF was attached.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. I have not yet, but I will pick that up and get back to --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I think I forwarded you the email.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay, very good. Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Commissioner Kennedy, when the Statewide Data Base, when they said that’s something they’re not offering, does that mean they
have the capability? You may not know. Does that mean
they do have the capability or don’t have the capability,
and if they do have the capability, that’s just not
something they’re offering?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: That I do not know. I
will remind colleagues that the whole idea of the
communities of interest tool is something that was
developed before this 2020 Commission was established. It
was discussed, negotiated between Statewide Data Base and
the Legislature. I have asked on multiple occasions for
any documentation as to scope of work or anything, and I’ve
been told that there is no such documentation that we’d be
able to get. So, can’t help you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, interesting. It’s
interesting there wouldn’t be a statement of work. If
you’re giving someone funding to create something, you
would think there would be some sort of deliverables. So,
interesting. Thank you, though, I really appreciate you
bringing that forward.

Any other questions for community of interest
tool? Commissioner Andersen looks perplexed.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, that’s certainly
not the understanding that we had in discussions. I’m
wondering why. Is it a distinction of roles? Is it not
tough? Could you give us a little more feedback of this
is what we are doing, these three things, that’s that?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: The response was in terms of the map showing the areas covered by submissions, this is not something the Statewide Data Base is offering. This may be a question that you intended to direct to Haystaq/Q2 as a part of the line drawing RFP. While it would not have been something that I would have posed to Q2 and Haystaq, if anything, I think it is something that our data management team might be able to assist us with.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No, this is -- okay, this is a question of roles, then. Okay. And we’ll continue that conversation with the line drawers.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: What Commissioner Kennedy is saying is exactly what they said to me way back when I did the first -- you know, when we did the first -- when we played with the COI tool the first time and gave them input, and I asked about a heat map and can we do it. They said you can do whatever you want, but that part is going to fall on the Commission, not on us. You know, we just do the tool. So, what Commissioner Kennedy is saying is, you know, after it that we do need to think how we are going to do it with the database and the website subcommittee.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I think this is a
line drawer question. In the proposal that Q2/Haystaq had sent us they had in it that they would create a -- I think they referred to it as a PinMap, not a heat map, but ultimately whatever we want, right. I’m assuming whatever we want.

So, I do think that the Q2/Haystaq team would develop it as a part of their contract with us, not Statewide Data Base. That was my understanding.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And there is a -- the way the contract actually reads is they will work with a contractor, so it covers, and that’s part of the line drawing, so who’s exactly doing what. And, so, we requested the information from Statewide Data Base. Now we will go back and talk to the line drawer with data management as well. So, that’s certainly something that we will bring up with the line drawers and then proceed, because it is part of the contract.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Any other questions for the community of interest tool?

Okay. We’re moving on to 9L, Cybersecurity, Commissioners Fornaciari and Taylor, so Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, sure. I mean nothing substantial to report other than just think about password and password protection, strong passwords.
Probably not the best idea to write your password on a post
note and then take a picture of your computer and share
that. It’s a thought.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. I’d better take it down, then.

Any questions for Cybersecurity? Thank you for the useful information.

Okay, 9N is Incarcerated Population. So, we opted to split out Incarcerated Populations. One is state and local facilities, which his Commissioner Sinay and myself, and then another one is for federal facilities, which is Commissioners Kennedy and Turner.

Commissioner Kennedy, do you have a question for the Cybersecurity?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: No. This is a point of clarification on this.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Oh, okay.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: There was a proposal to set up a separate subcommittee on federal facilities. I was chair at the time and did not act on that suggestion, so what we have is Commissioner Turner and I acted as an ad hoc drafting committee to draft a letter to Senator Padilla which we have done, and that is among the handouts for today’s meeting, so we’re happy to receive feedback and direction on that letter.
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. So I’ll officially establish a subcommittee of incarcerated people for federal facilities with Commissioners Kennedy and Turner, but first we’ll go to 9M, which is incarcerated populations for state and local facilities, and that’s Commissioner Sinay and myself. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. We have nothing to report right now. We will be working on outreach plan to bring back to the full Commission.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: All right. Thank you. Any questions? We’ll move on to 9N, incarcerated populations for federal facilities. Commissioners Kennedy and Turner.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: You have before you our draft letter.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I thought the letter was excellent, and I just -- I just wanted to clarify, did we send you the update from the Statewide Data Base on what they had? Okay. So, I didn’t know if that changed anything for the letter.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, the letter was obviously drafted before we received that, so we’re happy to receive suggestions or direction from the full Commission as to how we might change the draft letter.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Any comments? I did write
something down. I put federal inmates can claim residency in other states as long as they have a family or someone that sponsors them, which is vice versa if there’s inmates in -- incarcerated people in other states, they can claim residency in California. But I can’t remember where I was thinking that should go in the letter. But thank you so much for drafting the letter. It’s good.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. And in response to Commissioner Fernandez, I think for me the intent of the letter -- that is, what you stated is corrected. I think the letter was just basically seeking support from Padilla to encourage the release of the data from Federal Bureau. We -- instead of just waiting until 2030. This was our attempt to push it along and hopefully receive information that will be reusable for now in this particular cycle, and if not, it begins conversation for where we certainly believe we should be going by 2030.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes, great. Thank you. Any other comments or feedback regarding the letter to Senator Padilla? Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: First of all, great letter. And to follow on exactly what Commissioner Turner just said, we’re actually sort of asking for two things, but we need like another sort of punch line after, you
know, we’re requesting for the April 2nd because it blurs
right into the next one, and until Commissioner Turner
brought that to my attention I didn’t catch that those are
two distinct things.

    And you know how when they’re really busy they’re
going to zip right through this, and so I think adding --
you know, I’m not sure exactly what, but adding something
else under the first one to emphasize that, then we further
ask is the secondary because I didn’t catch that, you see.
See, it’s basically just one sentence. You need to have
another sentence in there. I’m not exactly sure what, but,
otherwise, it’s very good.

    COMMISSIONER TURNER: So the -- go ahead.

    COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I was going to say maybe
we can just bullet the two requests.

    CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay.

    COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. So, the Statewide
Data Base let us know that they were able to get from the
Bureau of Prisons on April 1, 2020, they claim the State of
California, those who claimed as State of California that
were in their residence was 10,326, but it’s not broken
down. And, so, they -- we still need to have the
conversation of what we do -- you know, if we can get
better information and what we do with that, with the
number that they did give. And, so, I just want to know,
we’ll have that discussion at a later date or just wait until we hear back from (indiscernible), we can get more information -- more detailed information.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: One piece that we may consider, and Commissioner Kennedy is just incorporating because the key for me in the request, it says any useful information, and again, that bulk number does not necessarily provide us with the level of detail that I would consider useful, so we can perhaps mention, though, we received this, the 10,000 figure, and, you know, grateful for that, and still looking for this other information so that we’re able to actually allocate the population of individuals in their proper places.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: That’s a good point because to receive the input in 10,000 in California, yet 14,000 are in the facilities, so there’s a gap there, too, so we have no idea where they’re located throughout the state, in which facilities.

Somebody else’s hand was up. I apologize.

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. I have something like -- we are requesting your assistance, blah, blah, blah, April 2nd. Our purpose is to have data in a form that would enable us to reallocate Californians into their -- using the same word you used before, into their -- I
don’t want to say where they live, but however you used the word before. Does that help?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So, our purpose is to have data in a form that would enable the reallocations of Californians into --

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I’m just going to put my Finance and Administration Subcommittee hat on, and remind us all that if this is going to go out on behalf of the entire Commission, the policies that we approve it, and we can approve it with revisions.

So, if we’re comfortable with the revisions that we’ve asked for at this point and want them to go ahead, then we can make a motion, or, you know, if you want to bring it back to the next meeting, that’s fine, too, but I just want to remind everybody of the process.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So, should we approve all three letters we talked about today with revisions at the same time, because we also had the letters that Government Affairs drafted. Maybe it was one letter. I can’t remember, Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I believe it’s one letter.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah, one at a time
probably.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ:  Okay.  Commissioner Fornaciari, remind me again of the policy that you and I drafted.  It’s been a while.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI:  Yeah.  Well, I just reread it to remind myself.  Yeah, if correspondence on behalf of the entire Commission, it will be drafted by the appropriate people, reviewed by the ED Legal and the current Chair and Vice Chair.  The final will be brought forward to the full Commission, and the Commission will then vote to determine what action to take, approve, deny revise.  And then the current Chair or designee will sign the final version prior to release.

So, we’re at the last bullet points, I guess.  So we could approve with revisions and then, you know, go ahead and finalize the letter, and then you, you know, put it on letterhead, you sign it and send it.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ:  I thought -- I don’t remember.  When we were talking about if it’s a letter under the full Commission we thought it was like everyone pretty much signing it, like it’s their signature versus a subcommittee that is sending the letter.  That’s a different process, correct?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI:  Well, the other process is just a response by the Chair.  So, if there’s a request
that comes in that doesn’t need the full Commission’s approval, the chair, you know, at the time can send a response.

But this one is on behalf of the entire Commission, so it requires the Commission to approve it.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. All righty then. So, we will -- based on that -- maybe we’ll go back to the policy. We’ll look at the policy again to see if there’s another way to do this that might be a little bit more efficient.

So, part of it is we could actually approve the letter, right, with potential changes based on if -- and I’m talking about the one for the governors -- for the governor regarding COVID and lifting the executive order. Potentially we could have a motion that would move to finalize the letter, and move forward with the revisions. We don’t have to have the actual final, final language, right, Commissioner Fornaciari. Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Right. We can approve it with the requested revisions and have those incorporated in the letter sent.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: And we could do the same with the letter to Senator Padilla, then. So we could take both of them with the changes, similar to how we did the policy, the policies would have changes and then (indiscernible). Okay.
Okay. Any other comments regarding the Padilla -- the letter to Senator Padilla? Okay. So we would need a motion to move forward, unless we want to wait for two weeks, which I don’t know if we want to wait two more weeks for this to get started, conversation. I think the sooner the better.

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I will also report that I was advised that I could send a letter as Chair alerting the office to the issue and telling them that a formal letter from the full Commission would be forthcoming.

So, this was because time was of the essence to get this onto the Senator’s radar in time for the hearing that was being held like 48 hours after we discussed this last time.

So, I was able to get a letter to his office just in my capacity as chair, not on behalf of the entire Commission, and I did speak with staff who said that they weren’t sure whether he was going to have enough time to bring this up in the hearing but that he would ensure that the question was at least entered into the record and the staff would follow up with BOP for a reply to the question that was entered into the record.

I have not heard further from him, but that is -- so, in my mind you’re not under time pressure because we
were able to get the question in front of the Senator before the hearing. This is, you know, the promised formal letter from the full Commission that I indicated would be forthcoming.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. So, would you prefer for us to wait or -- I mean my preference would be to move forward with it.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: That’s fine. That’s fine.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, all right. Okay. I will make a motion that we move forward, and I think I’m going to make two motions and do both letters and then go to public comment at one time.

So, this will be that we move forward with the letter to Senator Padilla with the discussed changes as a Commission. So, that’s my first one.

And then the other one is we move forward with the letter to Governor Newsom. Thank you for someone helping me. To Governor Newsom regarding the COVID -- the potential executive order being lifted and the impact that would have on the Commission.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I second.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Second.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Wow, it’s a tie between -- okay. So, I need to write this down. Executive Director Hernandez, did you get it?
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yes. That’s what I’m trying to do right now. So, I have the motion to move the finalized letter to Senator Padilla regarding federal incarcerated population with discussed changes; is that correct?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: And that motion was brought by yourself, Chair, and then it was seconded by whom?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: We’ll give the second to Commissioner Turner.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. And then I’ll have to do the second letter separately. As you know, we’re trying this new system and process where we’re capturing the information real time so that we can do the vote. Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Wait. So, you’re not writing it down right now?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: I wrote down the first one. That one is ready to go. I can share it on my screen if you’d like. I know that we have to more than likely go to public comment, then we take a vote.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Right. So, I wanted to go to public comment for both of them at one time instead of having to do one vote and then having the public comment,
and then do the other vote, public comment. So, I’m trying
to be a little bit efficient.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yes. I will do my
best to incorporate that second request here. And this is
the letter to the Governor’s office regarding COVID?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes. And while you do that,
does anyone have questions before we go to public comment?
Is Katy back for public comment, Kristian, or is it still
you? Oh, Katy’s back. Yay. I’m pretty sure Kristian
missed you this morning.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: He sent me a text. I
felt very bad. I was on another job, though. Okay, so are
we good to go?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: We are good to go. Thank you.
And this is public comment for the two letters, one letter
to Senator Padilla, and the other letter to Governor
Newsom.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Okay.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes. 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 a meeting number provided on the livestream feed, it
is -- wanted to make sure I had the right number --
98199802683 for this meeting. When prompted to enter a
participant I.D., simply press the pound key.

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

When it is your turn to speak, you’ll hear a
message that says, “The host would like you to talk, and to
press star six 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, please be
alert for when it is your turn to speak, and again, please
turn down the livestream volume.

And the public comment at this time is the two
motions that are on the floor relating to the two letters,
one to the -- I know it’s a Senator.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: One to Senator Padilla.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: You said Secretary of
State, though.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: That’s correct.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And then the other letter is to --

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Governor Newsom.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- the governor, okay.

We do not have anybody in the queue at this time.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. We’ll wait another minute or so. We did kind of give a forewarning that it was coming, so, hopefully, people are dialing in if they would like to comment now. And we have a comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We do have a caller. I would like to remind all callers to press star nine to raise your hand indicating you’re calling in to make a comment. Star nine will raise your hand. Perfect. Thank you so much. I will open the line. And go ahead, the floor is yours.

MS. WESTA-LUSKE: Hello. This is Renee Westa-Luske. I support sending both letters, but I would like to make a suggestion regarding the one for Senator Padilla’s office. I think you should make a bold subject, colon, and then put, urgent, need previous residence of individuals held at federal facilities for CRC accurate census data, so that it grabs their attention right away. They’re going to pay attention to it quickly, and it hones in on the most important point of that letter is you really want the data this year and not have them thinking, oh, I don’t have to
do this until 2030. I think it needs to be made to look urgent, which it is and important for accurate census data for this year’s redistricting.

That’s my comment. Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you for your comment, Ms. Westa-Luske.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And that was our public comment at this time.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. Okay.

Executive Director Hernandez, are you ready? Okay.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: I am ready.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: So, again, this is the first motion, a letter to Senator Padilla to move the finalized letter regarding federal incarcerated population with discussed changes. Motion made by Commissioner Fernandez. Time of the motion 2:43. Motion seconded, public comment would be one. And we will begin here.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: It’s 2:43 p.m.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Thank you. It feels like a.m. What can I say? All right. And we will begin here after Commissioner Fernandez. So, Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Taylor.

(no audible reply)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Vasquez.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Ahmad.

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Akutagawa.

(No audible reply)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fernandez.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: The motion passes.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Now the second.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yes. The second motion is letter to the Governor’s office, move to finalize letter to the Governor’s office regarding COVID-19 restrictions; is that correct, with changes?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: With -- yes. And again, it’s p.m., not a.m. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Ah, yes. It defaults to a.m., so I’ve got to remember that. Okay. Again, it was made by yourself, the Chair Fernandez, and seconded by Commissioner Turner, correct?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: All right. We will begin.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Taylor.

(no audible reply)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner
Vasquez.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Oh, sorry.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Ahmad.

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Akutagawa.

(No audible reply)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: And Commissioner Fernandez.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: The motion passes.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Great. Thank you, and thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari, for reminding us of our policies and our protocol.

Any other -- anything else on 9N, Incarcerated Populations, Federal Facilities? Okay. We will move on to 9O, which is Lessons Learned, with Commissioners Ahmad and Kennedy.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Commissioner Ahmad, do you have any remarks at this point? I have nothing other than to --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: No new updates. Just continue to send over your lessons learned.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. I don’t remember if I forwarded this to you, but it would have been nice looking back now as people are submitting their communities of interest public information either through the tool, through mail, or whatever, it would have been good information to know where they heard about and what caused them to actually submit input. And I think it would be helpful for our future outreach efforts. So, maybe for Lessons Learned if we can remember that for next time, that would be great.

Okay. We will move on to 9P, which is Outreach Director Recruitment, Commissioners Ahmad and Fernandez.

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: We would like to sunset the subcommittee as we have fulfilled our charge.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I concur. Okay. We’re going to move on to 9Q which is Chief Counsel Recruitment, Commissioners Andersen and Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think we gave our update earlier that are doing reference checks and will be working with Chair Fernandez and Chair Ahmad on, hopefully, making
an offer and coming back on the fourth with, hopefully, an acceptance.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: And I did receive more information from Marian on that process, and because we’ve already taken action we wouldn’t actually have to come back on the fourth to continue on with that process.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I was just referring to an announcement, hopefully.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Right.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Hopefully be able to make an announcement of who it is.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes. Correct. That would be great. Any questions regarding that?

We’ll move on to 9R which is IT Recruitment, Commissioners Andersen and Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Now that the IT Manager role has been approved I think what we’re going to do is circle back with Director Hernandez to try to understand, you know, what all the roles for IT are and how, you know, whether or not we actually need an IT Manager or what that looks like.

So, hopefully, we’ll have an update next time we get together.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Any questions. Thank you. We’ll move on to Agenda Item 10, which is Legal
Affairs Committee Update, Commissioners Yee, Toledo and Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: We have a Legal Affairs committee that is scheduled for after this meeting.

In terms of updates, we continue to work on the VRA counsel and the litigation counsel agreements. We have a draft contract for VRA that we just received earlier today, and so we continue to work through that process and hopefully we’ll bring something back for approval at the next -- at least for the VRA counsel at the next meeting.

And, of course, if you have the stamina, you can join us after this meeting for a couple more -- for a little bit longer to go over some of these issues in detail.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes, Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: We’ll also be discussing this afternoon two personnel additions. That’s Strumwasser, Woocher, Becker, and we’ll bring that to you at the next full Commission meeting, hopefully for approval. They look to be routine additions.

There’s also a couple of memos in the handouts. One is a proposed revision to the RFI language. As you’ll recall, we had an issue of ambiguity whether or not individual political contributions had to be reported or only firm political contributions, and so we put together
some language that would make that unambiguous. So, I refer that to the Lessons Learned Subcommittee. Hopefully that will help the 2030 Commission.

There’s also a second memo following up Gibson, Dunn disclosures, and I’m actually losing track of where we are on that story with the full Commission. There were some additional firm contributions by Gibson, Dunn that were not included in their original disclosures, nor the follow up disclosures. When we brought them to the attention of Gibson Dunn they researched it and basically told us they were inadvertent omissions, which does not look great for them, but they were forthcoming about it, and we don’t believe this alters our recommendation. The reasons for recommending Gibson, Dunn still hold, we believe. These were publicly available records that we used to find contributions and they were acknowledged promptly by Gibson, Dunn, so that is a consideration, but it is an (inaudible) admonition that we’ve already moved on.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I’ll just add that I was working with Marian last week to try and get a copy of the fee agreement or contract that Gibson, Dunn has with the City of Santa Monica to guide our contracting process with
them so that we could have additional access. We put in a request for that contract. Thus far, the response has been that that contract cannot be released.

I don’t know, Marian, if you’ve had any -- we haven’t had a chance to talk about that since we received that communication. I don’t know if you have any additional thoughts about it.

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, the question is whether you want to pursue it further. The way to pursue it would be to file an action against them. We could by letter back saying we disagree with their reasoning, but since that’s their position, I doubt it would affect anything. They’re doing it based on it reveals attorney work product, but we’re not asking for what they’ve paid. We’re just asking what the rate of pay is.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I know -- we can certainly discuss it more in our Legal Affairs Committee, but also if the full Commission wants to weigh in and give thoughts on this or not, whether or not spend additional time trying to get this information.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So, it’s not a ticky tack. Here’s another one like, no, sorry, we’re not going to give you hours. So I would like the committee to discuss an actually give them point blank, why not. I mean
why?

So, in terms if we’re feeling this frustrated, how does the public feel about any kind of transparency? Now, it’s different legal, but --

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: This is the request for the contract, not from the --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, no, not --

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Not from Gibson, Dunn, right?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No, Gibson, Dunn gave us their hourly rates, so they were transparent with that process. What we’re talking about today, and I’m sorry if it was unclear, what we’re talking about today is we actually requested the -- through the Public Records Act process, FOIA process, right, we want access to a copy of the rates that they’re currently getting paid by other governmental entities that they’re doing so that we had a foundational -- so we had a basis to compare what their proposing with us and be able to compare what they’re getting paid through other entities.

So, it’s not really Gibson, Dunn that’s not being transparent; in this case it’s the City of Santa Monica who is claiming attorney/client privilege here.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay, right. I’m sorry. Thank you for that clarification, and I take it back. They might like to, but it’s attorney/client privilege so they
cannot do that. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And our issue is where we’re asked -- the issue brought forth by Marian is whether it actually constitutes attorney/client privilege, because we want is rates. We’re not asking for the scope of work. We’re not asking how much they actually billed. We’re not asking for anything that can potentially be attorney/client privilege, but just the terms of the contract.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And as usual, Marian is correct.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Any other comments? And I believe that they should have to disclose that because it’s just the terms of the contract. It isn’t related to specific litigation, or whatever other work they are doing for the City of Santa Monica, but it’s my understanding they should be disclosing that information when requested.

MS. JOHNSTON: I agree, but the question is how far you want to push it.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Right. Any comments regarding that, if we want to push it further, move forward with it?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I would ask for a clarification and this is just being very, very specific. It’s literally for the hourly rates that were involved in the contract. It is not for anything more than that, which
should be in public domain. So, thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I think I’m leaning towards not pushing it and wondering is that information that can be received from a different source?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I’m leaning in that direction as well. I mean we are working and we -- we haven’t received their follow up to our request, but we did ask them to come closer to the 2010 rates that were given to us by our previous contractors, and so -- and that’s public domain so they know what that is. And that’s a little bit more reasonable, so we are working through the negotiation process, and I think we’ll be able to get their rates through our process. So, I don’t think we’ll need to get the Santa Monica rates, although it would be nice to have that to compare, but it’s not necessary, especially if we would have to file -- if we would have to take legal action together. I don’t think it would be worth it.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Marian, am I on solid footing to report back what was said to me when I checked references and spoke with the --

MS. JOHNSTON: Sure.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. So, one of the, you know, the interim city attorney of the City of Santa
Monica was one of the references that Gibson, Dunn had listed, and so when I had spoken with him upon checking references he did share that when he came on he was able to renegotiate the rate of Gibson, Dunn and get a much better rate. But that was kind of all that was said, and so that was what the impetus was for pursuing this and trying to find out more information about what is that rate so that we have a better sense of what we should potentially be paying.

MS. JOHNSTON: The rate they recorded was awfully high.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right. Right. And so I think it would be interesting to know or helpful to know if the City of Santa Monica is also paying such a high rate, or perhaps they were able to negotiate something better.

With that being said, again, I don’t know how far down the rabbit hole we want to go, so we look to you for any additional input you may have.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I’m probably leaning towards not continuing to pursue it. I just find it interesting that for legal contracts you go through this process without knowing what the fee structure is going to be, and then potentially it could be way out of your budget. So, it’s just an interesting process considering everything else you have to cost information.
So, I have Commissioners Andersen and Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I believe that the committee has already requested or given our permission to please go ahead with then renegotiating or negotiating realizing that it’s a business deal and they’re an honorable company certainly, and so we’re to negotiate. I believe you already are, so go ahead. That would be my recommendation and not to the legal pursue because that’s -- we’ve gotten the information that we need, negotiate.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Do we have any way of determining whether they have any other public sector clients in the state that we might check with?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: The City of Santa Monica is certainly the most visible, so it goes in the space of redistricting, and so that’s why we went there, but no, not that I’m aware of.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Any other questions, concerns? Well, it sounds like -- it seems like the best use of our energy at this time is to not pursue it further, but just to continue to negotiate with them. Okay.

Anything else for Legal Affairs? Okay.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I don’t think there’s anything else. I think we’ll be meeting after this meeting, if you’re interested in following along, and we’ll
be going into all of these issues in a little more depth.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Great. Thank you for that. I’m actually going to skip to Agenda Item 12 only because 11 is somewhat related to future meetings. So, we’ll go to 12, Line Drawer Updates Training, Commissioners Andersen and Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So, just a very quick. Line drawers are looking forward to hearing about these new dates, and at that point we’ll be coming back with suggesting adding on to possible training topics on the agendas, and we’ll follow up on that, the COI heat map, with the line drawers. And they happily enjoyed, though, working with the USDR or -- I always get that mixed up -- and the Data Management Group.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. Any questions for line drawer updates or training?

Okay, with that, we’ll go onto 11, although Commissioners Ahmad and Fornaciari, we’re about five minutes from break. Do you think it’s best to take a break and then come back and have this discussion? I’m thinking it probably is. Okay.

So, let’s take a break now and we will come back at -- oh, the minute time just changed on me. We’ll come back at 3:20.

(Off the record at 3:11 p.m.)
(On the record at 3:25 p.m.)

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Kristian. And welcome back. We’ll continue on with the agenda. We have two items left, Item 11 and 17. So, we’re going to go to Agenda Item Number 11, which is the Public Input Design Committee. That’s Commissioners Fornaciari and Ahmad.

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. And just so that everyone is aware, Commissioner Sinay had given the opportunity for others to step up during the Public Input Design meeting, not yesterday’s meeting, but the meeting before. So, I took that opportunity and stepped up into more of a leadership role with that, and I appreciate you, Commissioner Sinay for offering the opportunity. I also encourage my other colleagues who serve on that subcommittee to please do take the opportunity when you do deem appropriate for yourself. It’s a great learning experience.

With that, I have asked Chair Fernandez if we can present this item in close proximity to scheduling future CRC business meetings so that we can see a full holistic agenda or schedule for all of the different types of meetings that will be on our calendar moving forward.

We had a great conversation yesterday in the Public Input Design meeting about the number of meetings. We talked about, you know, whether these meetings would be
held in person, a hybrid approach, or virtually. A lot of that was unclear given that we don’t have that clear direction yet from the governor’s office about what June 15th and beyond looks like. So, just wanting to throw that out there.

And then full disclaimer. We did not come to a committee consensus on the proposal that Neal and I had -- or Commissioner Fornaciari and I had brought forward to the subcommittee. However, I took diligent notes during the conversation, mapped out the similarities and the commonalities between the different commissioner’s requests and suggestions. I spent a little bit too much time yesterday after the meeting putting it altogether so I could bring a more updated draft and version here for the full Commission to consider.

So, if you have that document open under Item 17 for this meeting you will see that there’s a schedule for the day of the week, the date and the meeting type. So, I just want to -- for our agenda item I just want to focus on the COI Input meetings at this point, and then Commissioner Fernandez will take on the full CRC business meeting.

So, for the COI input meetings on this tentative proposed schedule we have a total of 33 meetings. Every zone has two meetings scheduled, with Zone C having three, Zone F having three and Zone K having three, and Zone H
having four. There are two scheduled statewide COI input
meetings and four scheduled group COI input meetings
currently on that proposed calendar.

COI input meetings are not the only method for
the commission to receive COI input. We have the COI tool.
Folks can send in mail. Folks can call our office and
leave a voice mail. There are other methods to get that
COI input to the Commission. This discussion is just
focusing on COI input meetings that will be held virtually
and “live.”

I will also throw out there that I, personally,
in working through this draft proposed schedule am not and
will not be taking into account personal calendars of
commissioners to move meetings around. If someone else is
interested in taking on that impossible, and I emphasize,
impossible charge, by all means I will step back and let
you all go for it. But I will not be willing and able to
do that at this time.

Neal, am I forgetting anything else at this
point?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I just want to
say thank you for putting this together. We had initially
come up with kind of a straw proposal that included 17
statewide -- or 17 meetings throughout the zones and
statewide. And some community partners came forward with a
proposal that was focused on calling statewide meetings in the zones in proportion to the population of those zones. So, the number of meetings would be in proportion to the population of those zones.

And, so, we took a look at that and, you know, I think in general the community thought that was a reasonable approach, but there were some strong feelings about three of the zones only have one, so we were proposing here a compromise where we move forward with the proposal in the rest of the zones and ensure that each zone has two.

We scheduled this in a way where the meetings are as best we kind of could adjacent in adjacent zones, you know. So, as we transition, if we transition from virtual to some sort of hybrid or full in-person meetings, that we can execute the schedule, you know, on kind of a road show basis.

So, I mean, that’s what we were thinking. Did I miss anything Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: No, you got it. You got it. I guess then at this point we’re looking for input from the commissioners on this schedule, and I will take notes.

Commissioner Fernandez, do you want me to facilitate?
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: How about if I facilitate so that you can take notes?

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Yes, that works.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Does that sound good? Because I won’t be able to do that. So, any comments, feedback?

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. I’ve got a number, but yes, thank you for putting this together. This is enormously valuable to be able to look at it in this format.

First of all, so that I don’t forget it, I do not understand how Zone K has three meetings, and Zone I, which has a million more people and is about, oh, almost three times as large physically has only two. Plus Zone I, particularly western and southwestern Riverside County is an area of significant growth as we saw during the PPIC presentation. You know, I’m happy to work with Zone K. Maybe we can schedule things in very close proximity between the two zones or, you know, going back and forth so that we get the best bang for our buck, but I really don’t see that as a fair allocation.

Second of all, I’m wondering, the start of the COI input meeting season as I see it, we’re looking at June 1st, and yet, you know, there’s just a big gap starting there, so I’m wondering if we could move some of these up.
Both statewide meetings that I’m seeing on here are 9:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. I’m thinking it might be good to have one earlier, one later.

The first of the meetings in Zone I doesn’t happen for almost two months after the start. I’m thinking people are going to get a little antsy if we’re not getting round to their zones for almost two months on this.

And then -- well, two other things. One, I was curious, all of these dates over all of these months there is one Sunday in the whole batch. There’s a Zone H input meeting on Sunday, August 15th, and that’s the only Sunday that is scheduled in this whole calendar. So, I was just wondering how that came to be.

And finally, the very last of the zone meetings in early September, it seems to me that those would be better moved earlier in the week so that we’re not having input meetings on Labor Day weekend when there’s available time earlier in the week.

I guess the only other thing is did the language issue come up or has that been factored in? What are your thoughts on factoring it into this schedule? Thank you.

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy. I only have, I think, one response to all your questions, and maybe multiple.

The start date is based off of the lead time that
our staff need to get organized and prepared. We heard six weeks would be a good cushion time, and we’re not even giving them that. June 10th is not even six weeks away. So, that was a compromise that we came to in the subcommittee meeting. I don’t know how strongly folks feel about moving it up versus leaving it where it’s at, but obviously this is a draft proposal.

In terms of Zone K having three meetings and Zone I having two, why? I don’t know. Theoretically we’re all in virtual worlds. Anyone can come to any of these zone meetings. Just because someone is attending a meeting as Zone B and they live in Zone A, we can’t turn them away, whether it’s in person or virtual. So, if there is a strong preference to change things one way or another, I’m definitely here to support the vision and mission of the Commission in this work, so, please let me know.

And I totally forgot the other points. Neal, I’ll have to bounce to you on that.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, so, yeah, the proposal that we got had three in Zone I. I think it’s an error, so we’ll go back and look at that.

As far as language goes, the only thing we floated is possibly having a Spanish language input meeting statewide with -- that we would have -- potentially have live translation back into English for the commissioners.
And, so, we floated that, but we’re floating it again now, I guess, to the full Commission, if we want to do that.

And as far as language access goes, you know, we certainly committed to having translation of these meetings, or translation services available for folks.

We didn’t quite get to the nitty gritty details of the meeting design yesterday, so we don’t have that to bring forward at this time. But one of the things we need to talk about and come to some conclusion about a recommendation is an approach for folks to sign up for a time to -- you know, some system for signing up obviously, whatever that looks like. And that system would include a request for interpretation, or we envision that that would include a request for interpretation, then we could group folks together that needed interpretation and language together potentially. But, you know, again, we didn’t quite get to that discussion. You know, we spent our time talking about the schedule and the number of meetings at this point.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Does anyone else --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And I just want, you know, the other thing we talked about that I think deserves some discussion here is -- and it’s closely related to the schedule and scheduling -- is whether or not we’re going to absolutely require all commissioners to be at these
meetings or not. You know, so that’s something we need to
talk about. I think, you know, if we’re going to have that
requirement it’s going to make it super difficult to
schedule. I think that -- so, I won’t start that
collection. I just throw that out there.

Commissioner Ahmad.

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Yeah, Neal -- Commissioner
Fornaciari, that’s a really good point. And when we do
start that conversation, if we do decide to in this
meeting, before we do I would highly, highly recommend that
we get the legal opinion on attending these meetings as
commissioners and what our role is at these input meetings,
and then from there figure out what we want to do in terms
of all commissioners attending or not.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Marian, what’s the requirement,
because these are public input meetings. We’re not making
decisions. We’re not taking action.

MS. JOHNSTON: Since you’re not taking any
action, you don’t need to have a quorum. If you want to
have a quorum, that only requires nine, but if there are
fewer than nine you can still go ahead and have public
input. Since they’re all going to be recorded posted,
commissioners who cannot attend at that time can catch up
later.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. Commissioner
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just regarding Zone I, we did look at there’s a lot of -- you know, counties are fluid in a lot of southern California, and so we did look at your recommendation that far east Riverside with Imperial as well as far east Riverside, Imperial and then maybe west San Bernardino with Orange County. So, we were looking at how do we attract people and do outreach in blended areas.

VICE CHAR AHMAD: And I think another good point to keep in mind with these zones, yes, we have a map with delineated zones, but geography is more fluid than that, right. Like we can have a meeting that borders one zone and is geographically close to another. Just because it’s labeled a certain zone doesn’t mean we can’t take input from folks elsewhere.

And then I really hope we don’t get into the personal calendar piece. I didn’t look at my own personal calendar while I put this together. I probably won’t be able to make every single meeting that’s listed here, but this is a challenge for us as commissioners to the commitment that we made that we will weigh every single piece of input that comes to us equally, whether it comes to us from a live public input meeting, or the COI tool, or a letter in the mail. I should be able to look through
that data base and weigh everything equally regardless of
where it came from.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And I wanted to
talk a little bit about all commissioners attending or -- I
feel that for us to come up with a policy that every
commissioner has to attend so we have to have a minimum of
nine, it might be restrictive. Of course we would never
restrict someone from attending, but I would prefer to move
forward with something where we’re not saying there has to
be a quorum.

As Commissioner Ahmad mentioned, there’s going to
be a lot of meetings and there’s going to be conflicts with
schedules which I’ve already identified in the chart, and
to try to come up with a schedule for the next however many
meetings where everyone can attend or is available, it will
be impossible. So, I’m just cautioning everyone. And
again, all of the input that we receive will be in -- will
be in the database that we have, whether we hear it. I’m
hoping that the majority of input will not be at a public
input meeting; it will be in our COI tool or in some other
mechanism. So, that’s just my opinion.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I wanted to
weigh in. I think from the beginning all commissioners
aren’t at all meetings. We just know we do need to have a
quorum. And I think even in scheduling these meetings my
preference would be that there is a quorum as we’re hearing testimony, as we’re receiving community of input information.

Stories make a difference, in addition to having data input into the COI tool. I was hearing that today, landed differently for me. So, yes, we want to look at the information that’s submitted through the COI tool. I think my reference, given the opportunity, would be that we are sharing from all Californians if we’re going to have these meetings as opposed to -- the likelihood of -- yeah, so I still prefer having the hearings attended by and the communities of input meetings held and heard by as many commissioners as possible.

Also, on the zone that was presented, the number of community input meetings in each of the zones, we went back and forth with that quite a bit in the previous meeting looking at the updates that’s here.

I want to know how do we because people can show up and give testimony in any meeting. If we’re going to go through this process to ensure that we are at least naming certain days for certain areas how do we -- I guess we can’t have those meetings not like hijacked by a certain group. So, you can set up even if you want this is going to be a meeting where, you know, Northern Central Valley is going to participate, and if some other group gets together
and says, hey you guys, this is the best day for us, let’s just all show up and give our community of input testimony on this particular day. It’s still going to push back a group and perhaps not allow them the air time that we would have imagined. And, so, I don’t know if there’s anything different we can do. I know that people -- Marian has told us a few different times you can give input in any meeting, et cetera, but I am concerned, particularly since we’re having such at-length conversations about how many meetings.

I love the presentation, the submission, I should say, from the group that submitted earlier that was based on population estimates. I hear the testimony about at least two which changes things, particularly because we’re virtual. I thought it was very fair to allow, based on population, voices to be able to call in in a designated time for them. And for me when we I guess strayed from that I’m still looking to see if we’re setting as a minimum two. Perhaps there are other areas that we need to build in additional meetings for as well.

So, certainly I would be an advocate of the Central Valley having three so that there was one North, Mid and South. And I know that we heard testimony about Sacramento, the same thing with that.

So, I don’t know. I think this will be a
difficult process to try and determine what’s best and what’s fair, but for me, I’m hoping to be able to hear from as many Californians in as many sessions. And even with the language access, if we have an area that we think is heavily, you know, Spanish speaking, then maybe the whole meeting needs to be held in Spanish and we are listening through technology that’s doing the real-time translation for us so that those meetings are held in Spanish and we’re getting the interpretation, and so that, you know, is another thought I have. Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Yee, did you have your hand up?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you. At these meetings, so, you know, when they’re in a particular zone of part of a zone, of course, anyone can give input on any part of the state in any meeting, but will we not be focusing on geography of that zone, you know, more or less, right, and the majority of comments will be on that zone. We will, you know -- I suppose the line drawer will be there and will be adept, you know, at projecting with whatever is under discussion. But as we announce a meeting would we not announce some focus on the geography of that region, right. Is that not right?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes, and I have Commissioner Ahmad and Kennedy.
VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I think that’s a fair and valid point, that we are trying to designate specific areas for these public input meetings. But our denominator here is 40 million. It’s not population of this zone or that zone. Our denominator is 40 million.

And another thing that really helps me finally under public input meetings versus line drawing sessions was our purpose at these meetings is to just take in the information, whatever information comes to us. It’s going to be each of our individual responsibilities as commissioners to sit down and sift through all of that information in preparation for those line drawing sessions so that we can draw and, hey, in this particular area these comments came in. Some might have come in during these input meetings, some might have come in from the COI tool, some might have been mailed in, but that’s going to be on us to organize that.

And the way that Neal had drafted out — Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner Sinay had drafted out this first iteration that they were working on left time at the end when we paused COI input, not end but paused for us to go back and actually digest that information before we step into our first line drawing sessions. Of course, that’s pending all of the census
conversation which I’m not going to go back to that, but
the intent was there that we would have a couple of weeks
to actually through this data base and actually go back and
revisit all of these comments, go back and rewatch some of
these input meetings and pick up things that we might have
not seen the first time around or not heard the first time
around. Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Thank you.

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I’m
imaging, and this may be just be me, I’m imaging a
situation where, you know, all of these have to be publicly
noticed, obviously, but, you know, when we’re saying that
this one is for zone, you know, C or whatever, that, you
know, the bulk of our promotional work is targeted in that
zone. So, others from outside the zone have access to the
regular, routine public notice of it. But we’re not
necessarily focusing our promotional efforts outside of
that zone for that event. Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Anyone else?

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I’ll just also
highlight this piece of input that we got from the public
that suggests an approach for scheduling in the zones, and
other public input that we’ve gotten from community groups,
from organizations that will be activating the community to provide us input are pushing for a schedule to see if they can get is so that they can engage and activate in the areas where we’re going to focus.

So, in addition to our own outreach through Fredy and team, there are organizations that will be reaching out to their constituents, doing some training, doing some activation so that they’ll be prepared to engage at our zone so there will be part of that going on, too.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I know a lot of work has gone into this, and I really appreciate the work of the Public Input Committee and everyone else who has been working so hard on this.

I’m just curious. In terms of the grant process that we heard about, you know, and how that plays into this or if the committee had any thoughts on what is considered the grants process and how it might overlay with this or maybe -- well, maybe it doesn’t, and I think what I heard is that it may not earlier, and I think Commissioner Sinay may have an answer to the question.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I don’t have an answer, but I wanted -- there’s two pieces that I think are kind of overlapped in my mind, and, you know, we have heard --
yeah, this is virtual, but at the same time we need to keep in mind that seven of our zones have rural communities that have past time with wifi. So, as much as we’re virtual we still need to make it accessible. And the Outreach and Engagement Committee is looking at different ways that we might be able to do that.

Yeah, some of it may be even creative ways of, you know, so we’re looking at that. That also goes into the question I was asking earlier when it was the grants, can we -- how can we -- there’s certain libraries that are very excited to be engaged in the process. There’s a few, and we’re working on getting more excited and kind of giving them guidance, but also to them to kind of propose to us how they can be part of a process. You know, there’s a library in most communities, if not two, and that’s where a lot of people go for access. So, we’re hoping if -- this is kind of a twofer answer because I figured next was the question of accessibility and internet access. So, we are going to follow up with the library and then follow up with the Grants Committee to kind of think through that piece.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Vasquez, did you have your hand up? Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. So, I just want to say yeah, I mean in addition to activating the libraries, you know from a perspective of broad band
access, of course, getting the paper COI, you know, input
to the libraries, too, and, you know, potentially doing
some training with the -- you know, with the librarians in
all of areas, you know, on the COI tool so they can help
there. So, a number of thoughts about engaging libraries
that the Outreach Committee is working on.

And as far as how this plays with the grants, it
sounds like the grants be out a little late -- a little
later. So, I think folks on this library maybe we can, you
know, do something with the Grants Committee in libraries.
I don’t know what, but check in on that.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Vasquez and then
Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Now I have something to
say. Just wanted to flag, I know we had a great panel with
like education stakeholders. The fact of the matter is
that we’re going to be having summer school for most school
districts, and I think even more so potentially than
libraries, rural communities, you know, they all have to
have at least a school to serve whatever kids are in their
sort of reaches. And so, especially during the summer
months connecting with schools and the civic leaders in the
rural areas would be especially important, because if
nothing else, the family hopefully has access to technology
for distance learning purposes, so, you know, we may be
able -- we may be able to jump in on some of that, and if
nothing else, again, they have -- schools will have had the
last year to figure out how to reach and engage families,
whether through technology or through physically distanced
effort, that hopefully we can sort of ride on the coattails of.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry, my brain is a little slow still because of the vaccine. To go back,
Commissioner Toledo, to your question, yes, I think one of the things that we said at the public information,
whatever, the Public Input Design Committee was that we do need to take, you know, originally when we thought of outreaching grants we thought of, okay, it will be good. Yeah, we’ll use the money to help us do outreach as well as get the COI tools as well as the maps piece, and each time that we’re going a little later it means that we as a Commission need to take on more of the responsibility, and so we did the education piece and we did it really well. And we’re still doing it, you know, and the information said now we also will need, that’s what the COI blitz, what Commissioner Fornaciari was saying, was, you know, we’ll need to take on more of that piece as well, so we’ll work grant training if there’s some good ideas that maybe work now. So, that’s what we’re just trying to -- keeping that
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. In terms of I think it was Commissioner Turner probably brought it up, I do agree that if you’re purposely going to a zone they should somehow have priority in terms of with public input, and so maybe we can come up with some sort of system where maybe the first few hours are for people specifically from that zone.

Also, I’m going to go back to my comment regarding all commissioners being there. If I understood Marian correctly, if we didn’t have a quorum we could still receive the input, so I think it’s a nonissue, I guess, at this point for that.

And then I did in the Public Input Design meeting I did -- for Sacramento I thought there should be one extra -- at least one extra session, and for that -- my reason behind that is there’s been a lot of migration from the Bay Area into actually San Joaquim Valley, and also into the Sacramento El Dorado Hills, my Zone D area. So, in terms of what the figures, I don’t know the population numbers, how current they are, how recent they are. It would not be reflected in the census because that actually happened after April 1st, after COVID and people realized they didn’t have to live in the Bay Area to work.

And I think that was it, and thank you,
Commissioner Vasquez. I was thinking of the schools as well, like what a great opportunity. Commissioner Ahmad.

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. As we speak of internet troubles, am I frozen? I would caution us against giving priority to people from a certain zone because our denominator is not that zone. Our denominator is 40 million, the people of California.

It gives the public the opportunity maybe to come forward and say how come you are giving preference to people meeting in Zone A or Zone B, and that’s not our purpose. Our purpose, from what I see it as, our purpose is not to prioritize one zone or another. It’s trying to maximize our reach to get this input from people who choose or are unable to give us their input through some other mechanism. That’s all.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. With -- hearing Commissioner Ahmad’s response, I’m wondering if we need to strip the zones. Initially we talked about having zone areas basically to assist the line drawers and those that are doing input. I think that was more so when we were talking about actually drawing maps to have things that were set up and prepared to show. But if we’re just going to receive information, and if 40 million and since 40 million is our denominator and our base, perhaps we need to
just say we’re going to do 30 or 35 public input and leave it up to community to determine which of those spaces, which of those times, and then no one will feel like they are prioritized or not prioritized, but they can show up in any one of the meetings, and it will be up to individuals to choose or community partners to rally the folks that they represent and have them go to any one particular meeting.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I have Commissioner Sadhwani, and Commissioner Andersen, and Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. A couple thoughts. First of all, thank you for all the work that you’ve done. This is really expecting to see and I’m super excited to actually get out there and be a part of this work.

First, in terms of the quorum issue, I think what we’re hearing from Marian is that we don’t have to have a quorum, but my sense is that we probably want to strive to have it, right. I hear you, Commissioner Turner. Like I think that being there, seeing folks, hearing those stories, you can watch the video later, but I think that actually interacting with folks is like the -- is the best way, right, where possible.

But at the same time I also recognize there’s lots of other things that go on in people’s lives, and I
also just want to put in a pitch that we all have to take care of ourselves, too, and so sometimes -- I’m looking at the schedule and realizing there might be one or two that I’m not able to make. This looks like a grueling schedule, and that’s okay also. But I think if we strive to hit a quorum at each meeting, I think that would be really helpful, especially since we’re putting in time and resources. I think having plenty of us there makes a lot of sense.

In terms of this question of whether or not the zones, if we’re focusing on zones, my understanding was that we want to do that so that we can -- but from a mapping perspective we’re honing in, we’re kind of hearing over and over that we will be able to kind of compare right then and there, if we’re getting a lot of communities of interest input from one area. So, this is like the one day that we’re really dedicating to, hey, let’s go deep in this area, let’s start to really understand the boundaries, almost like a steady day for ourselves to some extent to understand, okay, this freeway is here, there’s this rail station over here, there’s this other consideration that we’ve never really thought about, and it’s a way to really get to know an area by hearing from a lot of different folks from that area, what their considerations and concerns are, recognizing that there’s going to be, you
know, competing perspectives potentially.

So, I was actually always in favor of having the zone perspective. There’s a lot of parts of California that I’m not as familiar with or have never been to, so I do look forward to kind of having a coordinated effort in order to really dig deeper into them.

I hear this point around, you know, whenever someone can reach us, they should be able to reach us, and I agree with that in principle. I’m wondering if, you know, maybe the last hour of our input session is open to anywhere in the state, or something like that.

And then just in terms of like an appointment system, I don’t know if this already came up, and I apologize. I had to come a minute or two late here, but I believe Andrew Dressler in one of the meetings that we had with him from Haystaq had mentioned a system called the Q-minder, which kind of like Tableau, it’s an off-the-shelf queening system. I don’t know if that was like a strong recommendation of his, but I feel like he had mentioned that at one of our meetings at one point in time, so I just want to pass that along. Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Just a couple of things. On the quorum I would recommend for calendaring purposes is
that when we are in like that zone, those two commissioners who are kind of the organizer of that zone be there. Other than that, yes. Who can be there I don’t know, but I really recommend that.

Then the idea of the zones, and this is from the line drawer perspective, is it is that the -- what they were saying is how is the line drawer going to participate in this. And what they told us is they will have the geography. If they know we’re going to the zone, they’re going to have the geography and they’re actually going to have any COIs that they actually have on a map that you can see.

And then, now, as far as their input, they will not be putting it on that map as we’re looking at it. That would actually have to come in, people would be trying to write that down to put into our COI tool so that it can then be drawn from the map later. But it will actually have -- it will enable the people to say, no, no, no, that’s -- so you can kind of with like a laser pointer almost go, now you’re talking about this area? Yes. That area, ah. Okay, okay. Got it. So, someone else can be transcribing that information.

So, that’s the benefit of having a zone. If it’s every single person comes up with a different area, I mean you could instantly realize, wait, wait, so now I take that
down. I have to reload. So, you’ve lost all that time, and it’s to make things more efficient for everyone who is coming to present. They don’t have to go, okay, well now, let’s wait until -- oh, sorry, I want to go to a complete different zone. Oh, okay, so hang on for several minutes while we reload and get that information up, or you could just get a straight -- that was the idea, is to make it simpler because one of the huge issues with people is standing in line, waiting forever. The idea of make an appointment and you have -- we’re really going to concentrate on this zone now.

If we want to and then say at the end, okay, now that’s everything, and then they can back out and just have a geography. So, it wouldn’t have all the COIs on it, but then that could be accessible. But that’s something the particulars of we can work out with the line drawer. But that was the rationale behind it. It would be more efficient for everybody, not just us, but specifically for the public. So, that’s it.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. I have Commissioner Kennedy and then Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I’m not opposed necessarily to de-emphasizing the geography when we’re doing these. If we are going to de-emphasize the geography, then I think we need to pay more attention to
the timings and the days to make sure that we’re giving a wide variety of options as far as days of the week and times of the day for people to participate.

    I know it’s going to be hard on us. You know, we may -- I think we’ve heard that the 2010 Commission was often in meetings, sometimes combined business meetings with input sessions going from, you know, 9:00 a.m. to midnight or something. So, you know, we need to think in terms of making this convenient for the people and not necessarily just convenient for us.

    That said, you know, de-emphasizing the zones is fine as long as we’re in a virtual mode, but if we switch to a face-to-face mode, then the geography suddenly becomes much more important.

    And as for attendance, you know, I think if we say, all are strongly encouraged to attend. I like Commissioner Andersen’s, you know, emphasis on ensuring that the commissioners responsible for that outreach zone be there, but otherwise strongly encourage commissioners to attend and go from there. Thank you.

    CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Commissioner Turner.

    COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. As long as we have to take or we get to take testimony and public comment from anywhere in the state at any meeting, I think our line
drawers absolutely have to be prepared to pull up and down maps. We’re not going to tell people to wait. It’s not your turn just yet. And, so, it makes total sense. Thank you for the word, Commissioner Kennedy, “to de-emphasize” for me. The counties, and to just say we’re giving you a broad base, a wide number, 33, 35, whatever it is, meetings that’s split between Sundays, and Saturdays, and evenings, and mornings, and allow people opportunity to call in, it is just, again, public input. We’re not making decisions on it. We’ve not yet talked about how much time we’re going to give people, but it was two minutes initially, and even if we give them three minutes, they’re not going to have a lot of time to say, oh, now redraw it this way, or I want to see based on what else is already on the screen and all of those other things. They’re going to need to come prepared to say this is my community of interest. This is the story behind it, almost like a one-way dialogue. And we see now how quick that time runs out. And I don’t know, to me it doesn’t even seem like line drawers in this particular setting that is going to be doing a lot of interacting right in the moment. I don’t see that there will be time for it. So, I think the more the conversation continues, I just really want to make a strong case and push and have us consider making this equitable for all 40 million Californians and determine what is the total number
that we need, how do we make it accessible throughout the day, and allow people, then, the autonomy to select which dates, which they can do anyway, that they’ll show up and give their public comment.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay, did you have your hand up? No. Any other comments.

So, I’m going to hand it back to Commissioners Ahmad and Fornaciari. Well, actually, we need to settle on a number, right, and the dates, correct?

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Yes, that would be extremely helpful. I did hear, though, Commissioner Kennedy call out Sundays, and I mean I’m fine with going back and working with Commissioner Fornaciari and the team to start adjusting the days to sprinkle in, some Sundays as well, because I do recognize some people might not be able to make it Monday through Saturday on a consistent basis, and Sunday may be the only day that they are available to provide that input. So, that’s a very fair point that we should definitely adjust the schedule for.

Are there any other recommendations that the Commission has in terms of adjustments for the schedule so that we can go ahead and make those adjustments and then hand that schedule over to the team so that they can start actually putting together ASL Videographer Translation Services, and all of the other things that I don’t even
know what goes into planning a meeting of this magnitude so
that we can hand that over to the team.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yeah, and I think it’s very
important that we do settle on dates because at some point
in time if the executive order is lifted and we’re going
out, then there’s actually quite a bit more involved with
staff in terms having to go out and solidify a place, and
the arrangements and everything else that goes along with
that. Plus, if it’s going to be a hybrid or we’re allowed
to do a hybrid model, I mean that just kind of doubles the
effort.

So, I just feel it’s important to get dates out
there. We can all plan. We know what the dates are. If
we can’t make it, everything fortunately is videotaped, so
that definitely helps.

Commissioner Vasquez.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: I’m good.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I think also just for future
planning, Commissioner Fernandez, if I may, an asterisk to
keep in mind. Although we are giving these dates to the
team, there might be a situation some time in the future in
which we are now required to report in person. And our
team will have to find a venue for, I don’t know, I’m just
going to pull a date out, August 19th at 4:00 p.m. in a
certain area, and they may not be able to find a venue.
So, we have to be extremely flexible about the dates and the times. Granted, yes, we would want the dates to stay so that we can advertise properly to communities and get everything in order, but that’s just something to keep in the back of your mind, that the event is not official until it’s over.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And I think along those lines, you know, I mean we’re looking at virtual meetings. This is the plan, right, at this point and we’re scheduling for virtual meetings.

If that changes, then, you know, then we would have to identify regions where we would host in-person meetings and go through that process, and it’s -- you know, that’s like six-week lead time at least, to do that.

So, we’ll get this schedule together based on the input that we have and sort of I forget the term Commissioner Kennedy used was, you know, the zone neutral or whatever. Forget it. I forgot, but Commissioner Ahmad has it, and we’ll put the schedule back together and get that to staff and get them started. And then we’ll regroup when we hear, you know, as the COVID restrictions are listed -- lifted.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani and then Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Maybe I missed it, but
what is the turning point for having a hybrid meeting?
Certainly it’s not the lifting of the executive order. I
guess I don’t know exactly where we are yet with -- at what
point do we make determination to switch to a hybrid
meeting? My personal preference is hybrid, right. I would
feel comfortable having at least a couple of us in person
while maintaining virtual, of course. For me, in part, I
feel like I just want to see some of the places before we
start drawing lines around them. I don’t know, at what
point do we make that decision?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Refer to Marian.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh, okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: I’m not sure if they do a hybrid
in changing what the rules are. If you go back to Bagley-
Keene, you still can have locations or electronic ways for
people to come to your meeting. So, you may have to be a
publicly accessible place that you can also have either
telephone or Zoom facilities that actually someone could
appear before you virtually. Bagley-Keen more applies to
you have to be there in person. You have to be a publicly
accessible place. The public can be anywhere.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So, just to clarify,
Commissioner Fornaciari, is the idea that we are scrapping
the zone concept?
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: It felt like that was the consensus of the group. If it’s not, let us know.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: If that’s the case, I’d say we have double the meetings because it’s going to take us a lot --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: We don’t have budget for double meetings. We have budget for 30 meetings.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: We need to then figure out exactly how these meetings are going to run and timewise.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Right, right. And we didn’t get to that conversation.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That’s not what the line drawers were saying, so we need to rethink it.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay and then Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I don’t -- I like keeping meetings with a name, yeah, with a zone number for a couple of reasons. One is people see themselves in it and it adds this urgency that, hey, this one is for us. We’d better be there.

Second, it allows us to be more focused on outreach for that session. We can, you know, go through our contact lists and all that and just be very targeted on outreach to assure that people from that zone.
And -- and, finally, we will take input from everyone, but I would like us not to just be general because I’m afraid that if we go general people will feel missed, and I feel like the more we can put a name to it, the more people feel like we’re calling them to come. If we say this is a Spanish session, I mean we had 150 people come to our Spanish session. Or even if, you know, we say -- we don’t call it the zone but we -- we call it by names of counties or whatever. But I think that will bring more people and will help us do outreach.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, Commissioner Yee, Executive Director Hernandez and then Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. I think the zones are fine for our internal planning, you know, since we are organized that way, and just helped us think about this day, and it’s fine for the various zone leaders here to advocate for their zones.

But from the public point of view, I was just glancing over the 2010 list of input meetings, and, you know, it’s just names of cities. And it’s just the optics. It should be very clear just glancing over that list that they cover the state and our list will show that we cover the state, and it’s legitimately a statewide effort.

And, so, I don’t think we need to drop the zones, but I think they’re really just for our internal planning
than for -- you know, nobody from the public is going to say, oh, you know, Zone G, dah, dah, dah. I mean they’re not going to think that way. Why should they?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Executive Director Hernandez.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yes. I concur with Commissioner Yee’s comments. The outreach zones were only intended for our purposes in planning and being strategic in our outreach efforts, so it’s not for any other purpose than that. And I think focusing our efforts from a staffing perspective allows us to focus on specific cities within a zone in which we can target our outreach and when we do go to in person meetings, it will allow us to focus on locations as well. So, that’s it. Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I wanted to go back to Commissioner Sadhwani’s point about the trigger for when do we go back to hybrid sessions. And maybe this is a question for Marian.

So, my understanding, the Governor has been making and the Public Health Department has been lifting -- making it easier for people to meet in public in a public setting. I’m wondering in terms of the trigger, when -- if we wanted to, and that’s just a question, if we wanted to couldn’t we have a hybrid meeting and invite a limited number of the public to our offices in Sacramento or
wherever we wanted to at this time, or is there still a
limitation on that?

MS. JOHNSTON: I’m not sure. It depends on what
he does on June 15th. I think there are different counties
now under different rules. I’m not sure there’s one rule
for the whole state yet.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Do we know what the rule is
for Sacramento?

MS. JOHNSTON: I don’t.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Okay. Because I know here
locally we’re able to have public meetings in Sonoma
County. It’s just limited to the number of people inside a
room. So, that’s why I was asking. And if we have a
county ordinance on that.

MS. JOHNSTON: And then it depends on what size
location you get, also. You have to decide in planning
what size location you can have.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So, just going back to
Commissioner Sadhwani’s point, I think we may be able to do
some of, depending on what the requirement is, we might
actually be able to start meeting, even invite a limited
number of members of the public to meetings, but we need to
look into that a little bit more. And maybe that’s
something staff could come back to us and give us more
information on what we can do at this point.
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes, that’s a good idea. Executive Director Hernandez, if you could just look into that for us. And then I have Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: So, on that point I was just going to say that if the public held approach of this COVID response has been very patchwork style, and it gets really complicated, like if my county has, you know, opened up certain number of people to me, sure, potentially we can (indiscernible). But if where you live in that county you have a restriction after you travel that you have to be home for two weeks or something like that? Then do you not show up for two more weeks of other public input meetings that are located elsewhere? I don’t know. And I think we had this conversation very early on that it would not look good if the Commission were associated with, not causal, but associated with moving hot spots of COVID cases. So, we would want to be very careful about that. I think it’s -- never mind. I’ll leave my public health perspective elsewhere right now.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And I certainly wouldn’t want to be known for spreading infectious diseases, and so -- as a Commission and, so, you know, but there may ways to do it safely right, or safer, and so that’s the only comment. Thank you.
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I just wanted to say that I think that zones we’ve gotten locked into for sure, but I think it would cause just as much frustration for a zone to -- we want people to rally behind whatever their zone area is, and to do turn out, and to make sure people participate. Hopefully, we’re doing all that through the COI tool first.

But if they’re going to show up I think they could be just as much frustrated to show up and somehow they think that they own that day and that time space and have other people also participating, which they should also participate.

And to me it’s a real clean and easy process since we’ve discussed and talked this through. It’s not where I came into the conversation. But to say that means are all opportunities for people to participate in, and anytime we start to externally promote cities, or zones, or anything else, there is an implied ownership of that particular time period for the folks that we’re reaching out to. It makes no -- I would really need to understand why that would double cost because we’re ultimately still trying to reach out to the same number of people, whether we put a zone number on it or did not put a zone number on it, its meetings, it’s the same meetings and we’re want
everyone to participate, so I don’t know why that would
change anything.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And I think the
change is going to be right now is virtual. You know,
anybody can call in. I think once we get to this point
where if we can go out --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Oh, absolutely. My
comments are all about our virtual meetings.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, all right.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: All about our virtual
meetings.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. I think we may have
to think that further in terms of do we decide that our
meetings are going to be eight hours long. I mean what if
we’ve got a thousand people? So, maybe like the
appointment system might work out better that way. You
sign up for an appointment like you did with your vaccine.
So, I don’t know. You could have a thousand people.

I saw somebody raise -- oh, Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I’m just wondering on the
impartiality requirements that we have, right, which
reaching everyone across the state and being impartial.

If I remember correctly, and this is a question
for Marian, the court did look at and appreciated the fact
that the Commission did go out many places across
California and called those places out, and did specific targeted outreach to them in the public input sessions and the COI sessions. And, so, I’m just wondering if you could speak to the impartiality requirement as it relates to our outreach efforts and then -- and the difficulty in doing what the 2010 Commission did, given that we’re in the virtual environment.

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes, the virtual environment, and the other difference is that you’ve got the COI tool. Before if people wanted to submit something, well, I guess they could do it by email, but the main way of submitting information to the Commission was by coming to these meetings, and that isn’t necessarily going to be true for this round.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Can you speak also to the impartiality requirements.

MS. JOHNSTON: It was true that the Supreme Court looked at that, but I think by having electronic availability, either by the COI tool or by appearing electronically in front of the Commission statewide you’ll be doing the same thing even if you’re not physically in the outlying locations. I don’t think anyone is going to fault you for not traveling to locations given COVID.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And I wonder if, it sounded
to me the tie in, is there a way of thinking and not having
named a zone we were being impartial to certain zones or
I’m not sure. That’s kind of -- I was trying to wait to
see if we’re going to go down that path, or what have you
because right now already we have a grant process that is
in play. We’re trying to get it figured out. We’ve done
outreach. We’ve created the zones in advance. We’ve done
outreach. We’ve put -- made videos. So I think we’ve
already reached into as many areas as we can
technologically speaking.

We know there is the whole, you know, broadband
access issue, which no matter what, if we’re talking
virtual none of this is going to solve that as an issue.
We still do need to figure out something different.

But short of that, I think we’ve been very --
we’ve reached out to all of the areas and will continue to
do so, so I don’t think we’ll be seen as impartial based on
our efforts if we do or don’t put a zone approach. I think
that even with the systems, if we put in our queue system
and if we determine we’re only going to take however many
public comment, that’s going to be problematic and limiting
if say we’re only going to take them until midnight, that’s
going to be problematic, again, because if someone gets in
the queue ahead of that zone area, and that was my day that
I thought I should have, I don’t know, to me it just feels
like what would keep everything equitable, because even if we go back to the virtual -- and I’m just talking virtual meetings -- but even if we go back to the public comment that was submitted based on some formula, I didn’t take the time to figure out what it was, we’re already, I think, if anything there would be perhaps showing a favor over certain areas just in the way that we’re thinking about adding in extra virtual meetings for zone area that anyone can call in that has broadband access at any time.

I don’t know, I think we’re making it -- it feels like we’re making it more difficult than we need to, and I think we’re already being impartial and already trying to reach out to everyone, and the key would be just to have enough meetings where people, if they can’t get into a queue, they have several other opportunities to get into the queue on other days at their will, whatever the date and time, evening, Saturday or Sunday they choose.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I have Commissioner Vasquez, Commissioner Le Mons and Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: I think, for me I’m still really compelled by trying to organize this even externally and digitally through the zones. I think in some ways we talked a little bit about -- earlier today about sometimes people need something to react to and respond to in order to be activated. That’s not everybody, but it’s a large
portion of people who are just sort of interested, but, you know, they’re not the diehards, but if there was an opportunity where they feel specifically compelled, you know, the message is for them, there’s something to respond to or concrete impact on their community, I think -- I think we -- we potentially would miss a lot of folks if we just sort of say we’re holding 40, you know, digital meetings, come when you’re ready. I’m not sure how -- I’m not sure how to make sure we get deep into communities in these outreach meetings. Otherwise, we’re basically holding office hours, and come one, come all when you’re ready, when you have your map, when you’ve thought about it, and we’re leaving it to community organizers to sort of decide what day works best for their community, or maybe we’ll do, you know, five people here, and we’ll have another -- we’ll have people come at every meeting for, you know, to give input, to give public comment. It just seems -- it seems really difficult to both ensure cohesive or like -- not cohesive -- it just seems messy. It seems really messy from start to finish to do what seems to me like office hours across several months versus this is your day, and I think I am comfortable, I understand we’re going to have to make tradeoffs. I mean that’s our whole process. We’re going to have to weigh some tradeoffs. And for me, I feel, at least right now I feel like I’m more
comfortable potentially just saying these are your
dedicated times. We’ll come up with other avenues if you
didn’t make it, or this time didn’t work for you, or what
have you. But for me it feels much more intentional and
inspires more activism from sort of our mid-tier folks.
Like not our diehards. They’re going to be there. We
don’t have to worry about them. They’re going to be there.

But I’m trying to think about those folks who
need that warmer touch to say like this is my day, this is
my opportunity. Let’s all go and show up to this meeting
to talk about our community in this zone, whatever that is,
right, or in this county, because the county is in the
zone, right. Like I think people are still organizing
themselves around their geography, and so, we’ve created
our own geography with our zones, and I think people are
savvy enough to understand -- to be able to understand this
is the time for my community, and if we don’t make it,
there are other opportunities to even give public comment
and to tell their story. But I just -- I feel like I’m not
sure I’m ready to like lose the specificity of the zones
for our public outreach.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Commissioner Le
Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you, Chair. I’m
conceptualizing a little bit differently because I think at
some point there’s going to have to be a prioritization. I know what the overall objective is is to reach every Californian. However, every aspect of the state is not going to face the same considerations when it comes to the line drawing specifically.

And, so, there’s two things that comes to mind. One, and I’m glad that Marian -- I was thinking the same thing before Marian lifted that up. The mechanisms that we have this time around are different, and the COI tool is a big part of that, so, what they did before was limited to what they were able to do in person.

In some ways I feel like we’re still kind of thinking about what we’re going to do in person as similar.

I venture to say that as we look at the prioritization that shakes out as to where there’s going to be real question of needing to shift here or there based on migration and population change, and competing interest from multiple communities of interest in a particular area, that, to me, would drive where focus would need to be because that’s where we need the input.

Certain places, say, for example, in LA County will be a moot point, so it’s like we don’t need to have our meeting there. We don’t need to just have a meeting because it exists in the zone, so to speak.

The other thing that comes to mind to me, and I’m
conceptualizing this idea of hybrid, is where are the -- it
would seem to me that we would want to be present in the
areas of the state that suffer from access to virtual.
Like that’s where we want to make sure we have in person
because, to me, if you have access to virtual and you
choose not to use that to connect with us, oh, well, you
chose not to do it.

But if we go -- if we say where are the areas
where having a virtual meeting or having the input come
even vis a vis the COI tool, is prohibitive just based upon
the infrastructure, then that makes sense to me that would
be a place that we would want to have an in-person meeting.
So, I think that we need to be thinking about why we’re in
person, separate and apart from Bagley-Keene, just why
we’re in person. I think we have the benefit and the
opportunity to have had COVID affect our society in a way
because I don’t believe we go back. I don’t think anybody
is ever going back to whatever existed pre-COVID. It ain’t
happening, throughout all industries, and should it, right.
Why do we need to go back? We’re continuing to go forward.
So, I think that we continue to leverage this virtual
opportunity in a way that wasn’t available before from a
COI perspective but as well as from an input perspective.
And at the same time not abandon the analog which we are
all committed to, and meeting in person to me, it sounds
silly, is kind of more in the (indiscernible) category. It’s like we have to go through that personal touch there because there isn’t another mechanism to get that feedback.

So, I just wanted to add that to the conversation as we continue to grapple with this moving forward, and designing our outreach access plans. Let’s maybe think about it not just in how many meetings we’re doing and what areas of the zones, but why are we meeting in these particular places and in what format, and does it meet what the community needs are.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. We’ll have to take a break in about 12 minutes, so I’m just wondering where do we want to go with this at this point because there doesn’t really seem like there’s an endpoint. But there is direction in terms of how to move forward, and we do have dates out there, and I think maybe at this point it’s important to at least get the dates solidified so that people have them on their calendars. I’m not sure. I don’t want to take away from the committee of Commissioner Ahmad and Fornaciari. So, what are your thoughts on this?

I did have two other commissioners, Andersen and Turner, but I wanted to take a quick break to see where we want to move from here.

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: If I may, this was an extremely helpful conversation. We’ve gotten to a point
where we can actually start identifying what the design of each of these meetings will look like and why, the preliminary set being getting these dates on the calendar. The feedback that I’ve heard so far is that why are Sundays not included, which I will go back and work with the team to edit.

But after that, just looking at the dates, is that something that we can move forward with and then take all the feedback that you all have provided here back to that subcommittee to incorporate, you know, why are we having certain meetings in certain locations? Is there a way that we can capitalize on this virtual environment to the best of our abilities? And then if we and when, and when, asterisk, when we move to in person how can we ensure that our meetings, whether hybrid or fully in person -- probably won’t be fully in person. There will be a hybrid. How can we better utilize the resources and technology that have to best reach as many Californians as possible?

But in terms of closing out this conversation, I think we’re in a good place if we can get the okay on moving the dates forward and handing that over to our team to start actually planning at least the first set of meetings which will be in the virtual setting.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. So, Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I’ll wait on my other
comment, but I still do have. But to respond to how we’re trying to move the conversation now, what I heard from what Commissioner Ahmad said is that we’re going to change the dates to include Sunday and perhaps move some of the other dates around, but then we’re saying are these the right days? Are just saying let’s change them so that they cover the full week because now we won’t have the dates to look at to make that decision?

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: So, based off of what I heard was that there are no Sunday meetings. I can keep the schedule as is, or take it back reorganize those dates throughout the week at various times. I intentionally didn’t put -- we didn’t put times on there yet because we don’t know how long these meetings are going to be scheduled for.

And, quite frankly, I don’t think we’ll know the dates until we know the dates. There’s just too many out there for us to be able to calendar and then stay married to them as they might change.

If you all want Neal and I to bring this back to the full Commission in the same format with the adjustments, we can, or we can take your recommendations on the adjustments and just hand it off to staff to move forward, either way. Just need some direction.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. We’re getting close.
Right now we have May 4th, which is Tuesday. This coming Tuesday we have a block of time from 4:00 to 8:00, and I feel that it may be best use of our time if the dates are adjusted, we come back and we take a holistic look at the calendar. Everyone has a chance to go back, look at the calendar, not only the Public Input meetings, but then also look at the full Commission meetings, our business meetings and then be ready to come back to provide feedback for that. Because I think the conversation is going to go longer than this.

There’s also other agenda items that we have for May 4th, so we will meet regardless. So, I’m just trying to think if we all take the information we learned today, go back, let it sink in, and then hopefully continue and come up with some further recommendation and action items where we can get to the point where we can hand this off to staff so they can start planning. That’s my suggestion. Commissioners Andersen and Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: On this, how does one say if the idea being the two commissioners who have a zone, who if they know already they can’t make a particular date that they’re supposed to be scheduled for, how do they say that? Who do they tell?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: You could tell Commissioner Ahmad.
VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Can I respond to that?
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Oh, sure.
VICE CHAIR AHMAD: I will not be taking into
consideration anyone’s personal calendars on this. We will
put together a schedule, you adjust your life around these
COI input meetings. If you can’t, you go back and watch
the recording. But there are 14 of us, 33 meetings, CRC
full business meetings in the span of three-and-a-half
months. I don’t have the capacity to look at everyone’s
individual calendars to take into preference those aspects.
So, if someone else is willing to step up and do that, I
will definitely hand over the reins, but I’m not going to
do that.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I just wanted to clarify,
just in case I’m the source of this understanding about
Sundays, my only observation was that in this entire
calendar there was one event scheduled on a Sunday. You
know, I think we need a day off a week. The day off can
rotate from week to week. You know, I was simply observing
that it was -- I was curious as to why there was on a
Sunday, and it was the only Sunday event in this entire
calendar. So, I wasn’t necessarily advocating for Sundays.
I’m okay with occasional Sundays. So, I just wanted to
clear off any misunderstanding.
VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you for that, Commissioner Kennedy. I was working off a template from my colleague whose identity I will protect. So, that’s why it’s like that. But if there is no strong affinity to adjustings sprinkled throughout the week, then we can leave it as is. If there is, just make it known.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. So, do we have agreement, at least, to move forward -- I don’t want to say move forward -- to go back and look at some of the dates, and they’ll come back on the full -- I don’t believe there’s an action item needed right now. Does that sound like a plan with everybody? If we can, please everyone, look at the calendars, look at the dates.

Again, as Commissioner Ahmad mentioned, there’s 14 of us, and the dates it’s -- I try to do it for our business meetings and that’s difficult enough. Public Input meetings makes it even more difficult. And again, with the Public Input meetings, you don’t necessarily need a quorum.

And with that, are we okay, because we’re coming up on break time, so --

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Just one last clarification.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, go ahead.

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: I need to move forward on this. Why are we going back and looking at the dates if
we’re not --

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Well, I thought you were going
to look at the Sundays.

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Well, Commissioner Kennedy
just said, you know, he was just a bit curious about it.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, fine.

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: So --

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Well, I think everyone needs to
digest the information, needs to look at the dates, needs
to maybe take all of the information that was shared today
and maybe go back and see how this can happen to reach out
to 40 million Californians.

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: That’s fine.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Vasquez.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Dumb but simple question.

I’m assuming the holidays, any major holidays, have been
taken into consideration in this calendar.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I believe they have. I’ll
confirm that.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Okay.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Oh, Director Kaplan.

Sorry.

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: There was just that
Labor Day, like Friday and Saturday for Labor Day that may
want to explore moving.
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. And Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Does it make sense for the next step to be like thinking through what -- I mean we’ve talked this out. The why, I really appreciated Commissioner Le Mons’ statement about the whys and where we would to emphasize in person the possibility of hybrids. I does there’s a reasonable next step include like someone taking that on and thinking about whether that’s staff, whether that’s the subcommittee and really starting to put like some, what is the phrase, like meet on the bottom, to kind of give this a little bit more -- I’m fine with the dates for the most part. I mean I don’t know. I have no idea my calendar. I’m going to try to make it to all of them, but I would love to like see more of like where are we going with this, what’s the shape, what does this actually look like. For the first one in June what’s the format going to look like? Is that a reasonable next step?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: And in terms of the format, I believe Commissioner Ahmad mentioned that the Public Input Design we haven’t gotten to the format piece of it. That’s our next discussion in the committee meeting, and so I’m assuming that’s what we’re going to try to tackle next time. Do you have anything else to add, Commissioner Ahmad or Fornaciari? Okay.
So, we only got to this point, so we’re getting to the rest.

Kristian, I know we’re right up on the hour, but I see that there’s some callers. Do you want us to move forward with the -- do you want us to take a break or just kind of plow through with the public comment?

MR. MANOFF: The captures ask that we take a break, please.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. All right. So, regardless we need to take a break, so everyone can please be back at 5:15.

(Off the record at 4:59 p.m.)

(On the record at 5:15 p.m.)

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, great. Thank you.

Welcome back.

Let’s see, from here we have Agenda Item 17 which is Future Meeting Dates and Agenda Items, and that I’m going to put off because it appears that we will need to meet on the fourth, May 4th, on Tuesday.

The Legal Affairs Committee meeting will not be meeting after the adjournment. They’ll be meeting on the fourth at 4:00 o’clock. So, we at that point also will go over the future meeting dates. And those dates that I’m proposing are based on everybody’s information. It’s also on the schedule that Commissioner Ahmad put together, so
please review that before the meeting on Tuesday.

And is there anything else before we go to public comments? Okay.

All right, Katy, can we go to public comment, just general comments. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We can. 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 number provided on the livestream feed, it is 98199802683. When prompted to enter a participant I.D., simply press the pound key.

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

When it is your turn to speak, you’ll hear a message that says, “The host would like you to talk, and to press star six 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 commissioners are taking general end-of-day public comment at this time. And we do have several callers, and we will start opening them up.

Go ahead, the floor is yours.

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

And thank you again, commissioners, for your hard work, especially as you’re going in through these late evenings.

We would like to emphasize that it is -- we actually feel it is extremely critical and important that the Commission retain an approach to the community of interest hearings from a geographic focus or some geographic emphasis with each or with many of the hearings.

No, we don’t take the position that if you’re not in that particular geographic area you don’t get to testify, but we really do feel that community members, knowing that there is a sense that a particular hearing is going to focus on a particular geographic area will be beneficial for several reasons.

First of all, it will make the testimony that you
hear as commissioners, it will add some coherency and cohesiveness, because you’ll be looking at the same geographic area, but you will be hearing a lot of different perspectives, diverse perspectives on how different communities within that same geographic area see themselves.

Secondly, as we organize, you know, we want to coordinate with each other so we don’t duplicate efforts in our ability to coordinate. There are many of us who are doing this work and work with partners who do have geographic focus, it will, you know, really help us leverage our resources and be more effective to have some kind of geographic focus.

And then finally, just in terms of civic engagement, you know, we know that people like to engage civically as part of networks. And one of the networks people have are with their community members with people who are in their same geography.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. GOLD: That’s part of the civic institution and engagement. So, we really do want to encourage to keep some kind of geographic focus or approach with respect to the hearings. Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ms. Gold.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And to our next
caller, and I would like to remind those public in the queue to press star nine to raise your hands. We do have raised hands. Just reminding those. Go ahead, the floor is yours.

MS. ALLEN: Hello, everyone. My name is Sky Allen, spelled S-K-Y, A-L-L-E-N with Inland Empire United. Quickly, before I get into it, I want to clarify that the letter I submitted earlier this week, the population estimate came from 2018, 2019 ACS data. So, they aren’t perfect, but they are reasonably based. That came up a couple of times. I just wanted to clarify.

I’m calling right now, though, to push back a little bit against the idea of a zone list public input strategy. I think we’re a little bit concerned as local organizers. Your obligation is, of course, to the state as a whole, but your objective as the Redistricting Commission is to create equitable maps.

I’m not really sure how you group our communities, and since they are in equitable districts, without understanding of our regions. And I’m not sure how you understand our regions without taking them piece by piece.

I would imagine having COI meetings without consideration of zones, similar to facilitating a meeting without an agenda, you’ll get comments that will be made
and uplifted that will be really difficult to capture and
digest all of those without any structure.

Fluidity is really important and necessary, and
I’m glad that’s something that you are all taking into
account. But it would make our work as organizers much
more difficult in terms of rallying our communities,
tracking our constituents to show up, following the
direction of your meetings. And I would also imagine that
would make your work and practice more difficult as well.

As an organizer on the ground I just wanted to
uplift that I’m concerned about that potential direction
and I would really encourage you to be fluid within a
particular geographic-based structure as opposed to having
a 100 percent free for all.

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. ALLEN: Regardless, I do want to thank you
all for your time and your thoughtfulness. I know it’s
been a really long week, and I just want to say your work
is valued and appreciated. Thank you so much.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ms. Allen.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: All right, and on to
our next caller. Go ahead, the floor is yours.

MS. WESTA-LUSK: Hello, this is Renee Westa-Lusk.
I am opposed to having a free for all, 35 or 40 hearings,
whatever the number you’re planning to do, public input
meetings. I concur with the other two speakers, but I’m concerned about rural areas being left out, because with a free for all like that you can have hundreds to thousands of people going to those meetings virtually from the urban areas, and it will be so crowded out that anybody from a small rural area that desperately needs effective representation will be pushed out of giving any testimony at all.

And I can’t convey to you how important rural areas. They need representation just as badly as the urban areas do.

And then, secondly, I want to ask is written public comment via letter or U.S. mail, or email rather, more important or carries more weight than giving face-to-face virtual physical testimony, because that’s what I’m kind of getting out of this discussion today.

And then the other thing is I tried to find the handout that you were all discussing regarding the COI Public Input meetings, and the one I saw that was on the handout list showed 23 meetings, and it didn’t -- it just showed LA County with four, Bay Area --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

MS. WESTA-LUSK: -- with three, San Diego, with two, and all the other zones were only getting one meeting. But then when you were discussing the meeting, the numbers
went up to 35, and then you were saying there were going to be more meetings in the different zones than just the ones that only got one.

MR. MANOFF: Two minutes.

MS. WESTA-LUSK: So, I need clarification on that.

Those are my comments. Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ms. Westa-Lusk.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And to our next caller. Go ahead, the floor is yours.

MR. SUKATON: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

This is, again, Sam Sukaton. That’s S-U-K-A-T-O-N, from the California League of Conservation Voters Education Fund.

I know that it’s the end of a long day and a long week, so thank you for your time.

I just wanted to cosign Rosalind and Sky’s comments with the added emphasis that there’s a number of regions where, again, high biodiversity, I think some of you are familiar with the neighborhood I keep referencing, where folks are -- it’s hard for folks to plan to come out to meetings, and so, because of long distances. I know that Commissioner Kennedy within the Morongo Valley has expressed bits and pieces of the sentiment.

With that in mind, I do want to emphasize that it
makes more sense, I think, speaking as environmentalist, to organize folks to something that speaks so specifically to their place.

You know, a lot of the groups that we work with are very committed to, as I mentioned, too sensitive a habitat to organize (indiscernible). So, what that in mind we’d like to underline the request of emphasizing kind of -- avoiding geography-neutral hearings wherever possible, that we understand some issues in some regions may cross areas, and people from other areas may speak at meetings that are really not in their geographic area of interest. We do want to make sure that there’s some kind of geographic bucket framing the discussions as they’re settled. Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Mr. Sukaton.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And I would like to remind the last caller in the queue, if you are interested in making a comment, star nine will raise your hand indicating that your wish is. Otherwise, that is all of our public comment. And they are not raising their hand.

All right.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And I just want to re-emphasize, I think we’ve said it a few times today, that all other -- there isn’t a weight factor in terms of how important, if it’s provided in the COI tool, if it’s mailed
in, if you testify or come to a public input hearing, it’s all the same weight. So, please don’t feel that there’s different weights attached to public input.

With that we will adjourn. Again, we’re going to have a meeting on May 4th. It will start out with the Legal Affairs Committee, and that will go from 4:00 to 5:00. Will that be enough time do you think? Okay. Yeah. Four to 5:00. Should we take a 15-minute break in between then because we’ll be using the same -- okay, so from 4:00 to 5:00 will be Legal Affairs, and then at 4:15 -- I mean 5:15 we will come back into the full Commission meeting.

Anything else? Commissioner Turner, did you have something?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. I wanted to say I’m grateful for all of the public comment. We’ll take all of the desires and wishes of those into context. I think, though, it’s a -- I still just want to name that it’s a false, forced choice as far as thinking. We still have not addressed the issue that people will call in at any given time. And unless we change those rules, that will continue to happen. People will not have special times to call. People will call throughout the state at random times. And with given dates there’s always ways to organize around that. So, I just wanted to lift that up again and make sure that everyone listening understand that regardless of
what time, what date, what day is given to a particular zone, people will be able to call in and take that time in the queue to be able to give their public comment anywhere in the state.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you for that.

Commissioner Ahmad.

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Chair Fernandez, you deserve a round of applause. You’ve got us through such a long week with such a wild schedule. I just wanted to express my appreciation for your strong leadership. I have big shoes to fill following you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I’m looking forward to you filling those shoes. Thank you all very much. Thank you all for going on this journey with me for the last four days. And we’ll see you again on Tuesday. Thank you.

(Meeting adjourned 5:31 p.m.)
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