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CHAIR AHMAD: Welcome everyone to today’s meeting of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. The date is Monday, May 24th, 2021.

Can we please have roll call?

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Yes, Chair.

Commissioner Ahmad?

CHAIR AHMAD: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Akutagawa?

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner
Sadhwani?
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner
Sinay?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner
Taylor?
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Present.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner
Toledo?
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner
Turner?
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner
Vazquez?
COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner
Yee?
VICE CHAIR YEE: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Chair, you have a quorum.
CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you. And while we get ready to call for public comment, I just wanted to briefly give
an overview of the agenda for today and tomorrow.

So, we have our general report outs from our teams, so Executive Director will give his report out, our Outreach Director, as well as Chief Counsel and Communications Director.

Then, we’ll move forward with our subcommittee report outs. I would like to highlight that we will start out subcommittee report outs with Item 9-J, so that we have folks present for that conversation.

Item 9-K has a time certain presentation from the Statewide Database, so that will be occurring today at 2 p.m., when we return from lunch.

And then, we’ll continue to go through our subcommittee report out.

Tomorrow, we start at 1 p.m. And at 1:30 we will have our dry run for the COI, the Communities of Interest Public Input meeting, along with, hopefully, a robust discussion of all of the different moving parts related to the first session of that COI input meeting to be held on June 10th.

We will be going into Closed Session tomorrow, briefly, to discuss some of the data and cybersecurity issues. And once we jump back out of closed session we will close off the day with our usual discussion of future meeting dates and agenda items.
Does that sound okay for everyone? Am I missing anything, Commissioner Yee? No, okay. Great.

VICE CHAIR YEE: That sounds good, all good.

CHAIR AHMAD: Awesome. And I should also mention that Commissioner Yee and I are taking the lead on these series of meetings. So, throwing that out there.

Are we ready for public comment?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We are, Chair.

CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed. It is 9263886526 for this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound key.

Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press *9. This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it is your turn to speak you will hear a message that says, the host would like you to talk, and to press *6 to speak. If you would like to give your name, please state and spell it for the record. You are not required to provide your name to give public comment.
Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call. Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when it is your turn to speak, and again please turn down the livestream volume.

And we do have several callers in the queue with their hands raised. And we will be doing a two-minute time clock.

Thank you. Go ahead, the floor is yours.

MS. PONCE DE LEON: Hi, good morning Commissioners. My name is Alejandra Ponce de Leon, spelled A-L-E-J-A-N-D-R-A P-O-N-C-E D-E L-E-O-N, with Advancement Project California. And also calling on behalf of the IVE Redistricting Alliance.

I just wanted to call and want to appreciate, again, all the work that you continue to do in trying to figure out if this is possible. And even trying to figure out, you know, as the Commission what time it is that you need or how much time you need to carry forward the redistricting process in a transparent and a very public way.

Now, I’m calling because we want to make sure that, you know, that you all received our letter that we sent, submitted yesterday evening to you, just uplifting, you know, first and foremost that you, as the Commission,
you have the authority to set a timeline that lives into
the spirit of the Voters FIRST Act in order to ensure that
the public has the time necessary to fully participate in
the redistricting process.

In our letter, you know, we definitely want to
encourage all of you to feel that you have -- you have the
authority based on the decision from the Supreme Court
where they made two things very clear in granting the
extension to the redistricting deadline given the delays,
and the further delays for the release of Census data.

So that the Voters FIRST Act is a priority for
the Commission.

AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 30 seconds.

MS. PONCE DE LEON: And, therefore, you have the
right to ensure there’s enough time for the public to fully
participate.

And the other thing is that we want to just
uplift that, you know, the Commission, you know, even
though you have the right to go all the way through --

AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 15 Seconds.

MS. PONCE DE LEON: -- February 14th to consider,
you know, having a plan deadline for January 28th. This
balances the interests of the meaningful, and robust, and
engaged public participation process against the need to
finalize maps to facilitate a timely primary process.
AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 2 minutes.

MS. PONCE DE LEON: So, thank you for your time. We hope the letter is helpful to you. And let us know if anything -- any additional information that we can help with and provide. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And thank you. On to our next caller. And I would like to remind those in the queue to press *9 to raise their hand, indicating they wish to comment.

And go ahead, the floor is yours.

MS. HUTCHISON: Good morning, Commissioners. This is Helen Hutchison with the League of Women Voters of California. The last name is Hutchison, H-U-T-C-H-I-S-O-N. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We have -- there are two comments on your webpage for this meeting. The first is a slightly delayed posting and reflects some previous comments that we made.

The second letter, which is listed as the League of Women Voters of California letter, is about attempts to influence your work. You’ve already received a lot of advice and you’re going to receive a huge amount more. We urge you to use your good sense, your “Spidey-senses”, if you will, as you decide how to respond to all of this input.

Most of what you will hear will be straight
forward input about your process and California communities, and will come with the best intentions attached. However, some will come from those with ulterior motives, those who want to influence your work for some reason other than ensuring good district maps that fairly represent California communities. These people aren’t going to explicitly tell you their motives for their ultimate goals, but you were given a big responsibility and we trust you to use all of your resources, especially your good sense in making all of these important decisions for California over the coming months.

AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 30 seconds.

MS. HUTCHISON: Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And thank you. And on to our next caller. And thank you everyone for raising your hands.

Go ahead, the floor is yours.


First, I’d like to thank the Government Affairs Committee for including a potential January 7th deadline among options for discussion. As I said during previous public comment, there are options to provide some relief from the holidays, while still preserving the traditional
primary date.

However, there appears to be a false narrative being offered to the Committee. This narrative assumes that a year to prepare for the release of Census data is not enough time and that productive work cannot be done over the holidays. It also falsely assumes the election calendar can be squeezed and changed without consequence. And it seems that within this narrative any nonconforming voices are ignored or considered suspect.

In reality, balance between preserving the redistricting process and the election calendar to maximize voter participation can be achieved.

So, I’d like to again thank the Committee for challenging this narrative by considering a potential January 7th deadline. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And thank you. On to our next caller.

Go ahead, the floor is yours.

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

I called last month to provide statistics on turnout among historically underrepresented communities. For example, three our of four registered Latinos did not vote in the last gubernatorial primary. However, when
talking about turnout it’s easy to lose track of the scale of the problem.

According to the Statewide Database, in the last gubernatorial primary 3,693,701 registered Latinos did not vote, 1,158,486 registered Asians did not vote, and 4,395,045 voters under the age of 35 did not vote.

This Commission and your redistricting-focused community partners obviously face significant challenges reaching the goal of engaging less than one percent of the population, or 39,500 Californians. I don’t want to minimize that.

But it’s also important to weight that against the scale of the challenge and also maximizing the number of people who will take advantage of your hard work when they vote, especially when even seemingly miniscule changes can impact hundreds of thousands of voters.

AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 30 seconds.

MS. TRIGUEIRO: I hope this continues to be a factor you consider in your deliberations. And thank you very much for your hard work.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And thank you. We’ll go on to our last caller at this time.

And go ahead, the floor is yours.

MS. ALLEN: Thank you. Good morning Commissioners, this is Sky Allen for Inland Empire United.
My comment’s going to be a little bit different today, please bear with me. Over the past few weeks I’ve been noticing a growing narrative that positions community groups like my quote/unquote special interests, with some scary hidden agenda and, therefore, we can’t be trusted. Certainly, we can’t really be speaking on behalf of a community official organized, so you all should be wary of us.

And that’s really been bothering me. It’s not only a disingenuous argument, but it’s a dangerous one and I urge you all not to fall into that trap. If we have power, our groups wouldn’t exist. My organization would not need to exist if the black and brown folks in my community had an equitable voice. If the warehouse workers, and the farmworkers, and the people impacted by the warehouses, and by our injustice system would considered by our policymakers I wouldn’t need to be in this job. But I’m here because too often democracy doesn’t work for all of us unless we make it. That’s why all of our community groups are here.

The people we’re here to represent can’t attend these meetings. They have jobs to work, they have kids to feed, they have to keep a roof over their heads. They don’t have the mental capacity to follow along this technical esoteric process. We’re all here to offer their
perspective to you and to translate these processes for them. We’re organizers. Our job is to educate each other. It’s a mobilize run if you’re going to impact our communities.

And redistricting is absolutely an issue that impacts us all. Please don’t allow back bay skeptics to turn their nose up to us because we’re organizers.

AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 30 seconds.

MS. ALLEN: I’ve been sitting here the past few weeks trying to figure out how I can mobilize the people in my own community to engage with you all in a way that isn’t quote/unquote too organized, in the fear that all of our work might be thrown back in our face because of this narrative that we are -- if we’re too organized, we’re untrustworthy. That can’t be the answer here.

AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 15 seconds.

MS. ALLEN: I don’t expect and I’m not asking for you to do everything that we ask for. You know, we voted for an independent Commission, we advocate for this Commission, we show up to engage with this Commission because we believe in your model and your purpose --

AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 2 minutes.

MS. ALLEN: -- and all 14 of you. All I’m asking is that you don’t hold out organizing against us and that you extend your own process as one that welcomes the input
of grassroot groups and coalitions like mine. Thank you so much for listening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
And that is all of our callers at this time.

CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Katy. And thank you everyone who called in. And we will be taking public comment once again before we recess for the day.

So, moving right along are there any general announcements from Commissioners at this time?

All right seeing none, the next is the Chair report. I don’t have anything new to report that won’t be reported in subcommittee report outs. I would just like to highlight that our first Community of Interest Input meeting will be held on June 10th. And this is a statewide input meeting that will be held virtually.

If you are so excited to submit your input you can do so now at drawmyCAcommunity.org.

And now, I’ll hand it over to Executive Director for his report out.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair and good morning Commissioners. Regarding staff and personnel issues, I wanted to let you know that I will be submitting a candidate to the subcommittee for the Outreach Manager. More to come on that.

Data Manager, also wanted to let you know that we
haven’t had a lot of applicants, yet. I believe there’s been one application received so far. So, again, please let folks know that it’s out there and we’re looking for folks.

Moving on to the contracts, we do have a new contract with our ASL. And we’ll be talking about contract issues later on through the subcommittee reports.

Regarding the budget, we’ve been informed by the Department of Finance this week that we will hear this week on the release of funds that we’ve submitted a request, the $1.3 million.

Our Fiscal Director, our Chief Counsel and I met with members of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee to discuss the proposed budget language as it relates to our requested augmentation. And that’s in the budget that was posted on March 29th.

We’re providing additional and supporting information to them. Our augmentation was approved by Department of Finance and now it has to go through the legislative budget process to put things in the appropriate context.

That’s the extent of my report this week. Thank you.

CHAIR AHMAD: Are there any questions from my colleagues? Yes, Commissioner Sinay?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. Which staffing position are we having trouble -- I mean we’re not receiving a lot of applications for?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Data Manager.

CHAIR AHMAD: Any other questions at this time? All right, if you think of something in the meantime, feel free to just jump in the queue. But for the sake of time we’ll just continue moving along.

Next is the Outreach Director’s report and I’ll pass it to you, Fredy.

COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR CEJA: Thank you so much. I will keep this short. So, just wanted to announce and thank you Chair for announcing that Twitter is now opening their processes for verification, so we will be seeking that over the next few days. I talked to them this morning, so thank you for the heads up. We’re going to be getting verified for our Twitter account. We already did that for other accounts on social media.

We’re still putting together our Ad Buy Program, so we’ll get that plan to you all. I know that we do have a budget for that, so we’re identifying the areas of greater need around California and then we’ll share that with you as soon as possible.

Look out for an invitation to the PSA Brainstorm, we’re still planning on having that. And I’ll send details
shortly on that.

This Thursday we have a Latino media briefing. We’re partnering with the Latino Community Foundation to work with our Latino media partners around the state to let them know what redistricting is and how they can help us get the word out. Commissioner Sinay will be presenting to them in Spanglish. So, we’ll be adjusting the presentation to both English and Spanish so that we can educate them on how to say (speaking Spanish) and other words that are very popular in our field.

And lastly, I just wanted to announce that we’ve made a fix to the website and have updated some of our documents. And I don’t want to steal their thunder, but I’m sure our subcommittees will report on that.

And lastly, just want to uplift that many of us have been working on that June 10th public input meeting, but no one has been working harder than Marcy Kaplan. So, I just wanted to uplift her and thank her for all her work during the past week.

CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Freddy. And I said Outreach Director and I passed it to you. So, thank you, Freddy, for that update from the Communications Director.

Just one more question for you, Freddy, in regards to that documentary, do we have any updates on that item?
COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR CEJA: Oh, yes. So, I did ask the documentarian to provide me an updated proposal for his work. As you all recall, at the last meeting I posted a proposal. There’s a documentarian that wants to put out a documentary on the Commission’s work. Wants to mostly cover when we do line drawing with the community, but also wants to do one-on-ones with each Commissioner.

I do have an updated proposal. I was going to funnel it through the committee process. But he did indicate that he has no ties to any political group. I actually did a search on the federal and the state donations pages for the Secretary of State, and the FPPC, and I did not find anything. So, that correlates with his announcement that he has no political affiliation, and he indicated that in his proposal.

So, we hope to ease those concerns for Commissioners, among others, but we will take it through the committee process to vet it a little more.

CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Fredy. And just to be clear, which committee does the documentary land in?

COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR CEJA: That’s a good question. I was going to take it through -- it’s either Outreach or the Material Subcommittee.

CHAIR AHMAD: Do we have volunteers from either of those two subcommittees?
Yes, Commissioner Sinay and then Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I was just going to say that we can take it. We started the review process. But I think both committees actually started the review process, so I’m not sure.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Ditto.

CHAIR AHMAD: All right. Can I -- yes, go ahead, Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can I make a recommendation, maybe just Alicia and I, one from each committee, or is that not allowed?

CHAIR AHMAD: It is certainly -- can be allowed. I would just establish a new subcommittee so that you all have the authority to work together outside of open meetings. And is that a route that we want to take as a group? Maybe? Yes? Yes, Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I would just say, you know, materials development is for materials that we produce, not for materials that somebody else is producing. So, I mean I would support the Outreach Subcommittee taking it on.

CHAIR AHMAD: All right, great. Commissioner Fernandez, are you good with the Outreach Subcommittee taking this item on?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sure.
CHAIR AHMAD: Okay, great. So, the Outreach Subcommittee, who’s Commissioners Sinay and Fornaciari, will be responsible for communicating with you, Fredy, regarding that documentary.

All right. And now, I will pass it back to the Outreach Director, Marcy Kaplan, for her report out.

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Great. Thank you so much, everyone. Good morning, Commissioners. And thank you, Fredy, for your -- I know we’ve definitely been working as a team a lot lately. So, thank you everyone.

I just want to also acknowledge all the work that Commissioners have been doing, presenting across the state. We’ve been doing a ton of presentations. To date we’ve completed 116 presentations, and there’s 42 upcoming scheduled, and about 15 more that we’re processing.

I have noted in the past that we’re now scheduling into the summer, a few trickling into July. And I will defer to the Outreach and engagement Subcommittee, who will discuss the educational presentations more later.

I’m really excited to share that our Outreach Coordinator has joined last week, and our Field Leads, two of them have started today. I’m so thrilled to be building our teams. And really, the expertise and knowledge that each of our new staff bring. And even we had a little bit of time to meet in person, some of the staff last week, and
really get together and think more strategically around planning. So, I really enjoyed how thoughtful and collaborative our team has been, and working with the Communications Team and others, on staff as well, as well as with the Commissioners.

So, I wanted to introduce Sulma Hernandez, who is our new Outreach Coordinator. She started last week and she really jumped right into the work. She will play a pivotal role in the Outreach Team, working with our Field Leads to engage Californians in the redistricting process.

Sulma most recently managed her own community relations firm for nonprofits, businesses, and developed communication programs, outreach, and strategic planning for community projects. And I’ve also just seen, in the short time that she’s been with us, the wealth of knowledge and expertise that she will bring to this role.

So, I will go ahead and let Sulma introduce herself and say a few words.

OUTREACH COORDINATOR HERNANDEZ: Hello. Good morning. Thank you, Commissioners for allowing me some space and time to speak, and share my story.

My name is Sulma Hernandez. My gender pronouns are she, her, hers, ella. I am a first generation professional. I am from the Los Angeles area, of firmly Tongva Land. And so, I just want to take a few minutes
just to acknowledge indigenous people in the State of California.

I grew up in Boyle Heights. I was inspired by my parents who did a lot of community organizing with Father Greg Boyle, of Homeboy Industries. Really involved in juvenile justice reform. And so, that really pivoted the way I’ve carried myself and what I wanted to reach to my community.

So, over the past decade I’ve dedicated my time to public service, working in the local municipality of Los Angeles to try to foster public and private relationships.

I’m most excited about helping to promote transparency, inclusivity, and participatory governance here in the Commission. And so, I just want to thank you again for the time of allowing me to be able to organize at a statewide level.

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Thank you so much, Sulma.

Next, I want to introduce Kimberly Briggs, our Field Lead for the L.A. and OC regions. She has started today as well. Kimberly is based in Los Angeles and comes to us after working with Mayor Garcetti’s Census 2020 effort. I’m just thrilled by her enthusiasm and her expertise, and so really excited to introduce her to all of you, now.
Kimberley, go ahead.

FIELD LEAD BRIGGS: Hi, good morning Commissioners. It’s a pleasure to meet you all virtually. My name’s Kimberly Briggs. Yes, most recently I worked Mayor Garcetti’s office spearheading public facing materials for the Census. It was the most challenging and rewarding job in my career. So, I’m really proud of the work I did.

I signed on to this opportunity because I want to continue the work. Representation and equity is really important for me, so I’m ready to put the fight in and get what’s ours.

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Thank you so much, Kimberly. And I just want to acknowledge, also, her expertise of the L.A. area, and OC, as well as communities and local governments that she worked with.

And next, I wanted to introduce Jose Eduardo Chavez Garcia, who is our Central California Field Lead, covering Zones E, F, G, and Z. Most recently, Jose was a district representative with the California State Assembly. And really, also want to emphasize his expertise with local communities, including indigenous populations, and other diverse communities across the Central Valley and other parts of Central California.

So, go ahead, Jose.
FIELD LEAD CHAVEZ GARCIA: Good morning Commissioners, it’s a pleasure to be here. And I am excited to be part of this amazing team and just salute you for all the work that you’ve already been doing.

I appreciate the space of sharing my story as well. I am not even a first generation, I immigrated to this country at the age of 10. And so, it’s just an honor to be forming what California now looks like, a state that welcomes everybody, and a state that is diverse such as this. And I’m just fascinated to be a part of this amazing team.

And the reason why I signed up on this position is I am passionate about equity and the work that I’ve been doing in the past seven years of my professional career is trying to forge that sense of belonging through -- a sense of belonging when it comes to representation. And so, I believe that this is a pivotal role that you’re all playing and I wanted to be part of this amazing team. Thank you.

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Thank you so much. I’m not sure if you guys had questions for them or -- I’m really excited for everyone to be on board.

And then, I will just continue. I have been working closely with the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee, who I mentioned will be talking more as well about the public education sessions, the Public Input
Design Subcommittee who will be discussing the agenda and logistics for the June 10th meeting.

And thank you, Fredy, we all -- it was a big staff effort working together to help the subcommittee prepare for this discussion.

And I am thrilled that we were able to post the draft RFP to the Commission and the public to review, that the Grant Subcommittee will be going over. This has been a long process that I’ve been working on since day one, and so I’m really excited for this discussion today. Thank you.

CHAIR AHMAD: Great. Marcy, how would you like us to field the questions? Do you want my assistance in that or would you like to take the lead on it?

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Sure.

CHAIR AHMAD: Sure, okay. I see Commissioner Sinay and then Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Director Kaplan, I just wanted to know how -- you know, how we’re going to transition in the team, the Outreach Team, and how you would like -- how you would like Commissioners to share the data that they have already collected, you know, the relationships that you’ve made, all the -- you know, will we have a plan and you’ll present it later or, you know, what’s the scoop? Just kind of what is everybody’s role
here?

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Yeah. I know many of you have shared different organizations that you’ve been in touch with in your zone. So, if you haven’t already, please go ahead and share that with me. And Sulma and I are working together on -- we’ll be diving a little bit more deeply into how we’ll ensure the field team is reaching diverse communities across their zone, incorporating the strategies and demographics that are document in the outreach strategic plan, as well as identifying reporting, and ensuring that we’re monitoring and identifying gaps across the state of communities that have not been engaged as well. So, I will follow up with more information as well on that.

CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Fernandez, and then I saw your hand earlier Commissioner Taylor, if you still want to just in the queue.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. Director Kaplan, just a few questions. I mean first of all I do want to welcome Sulma, Kimberly and Jose. I’m very excited to have you on board, and I just love the energy, so I’m really looking forward to working with all of you.

I’m going to lead into my other question of how’s the recruitment for the northern part of California working?
OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Thank you. I’m so glad that you brought that up because we would also encourage you all to help spread the word. It is a very large region. And so, I will make sure you all have the posting that’s still on our website. But we are still looking for a Northern California Field Lead.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, and then just my other quick question. My one document I had forwarded to you and the prior coordinator for Zone D, do you want me just to forward that to Sulma also, or how would you want me to handle that?

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: I have it. Yeah, thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you so much.

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Thank you for flagging that. Thank you.

CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you. Good morning everyone. I can’t say I don’t smile whenever I hear resources are in L.A. County.

So, I know, Kimberly, Marcy said specifically Kimberly was going to be an L.A. County lead. And I hard Sulma had some roots in L.A. County. Is she in L.A. County as well or is she taking on other regions? I just didn’t catch that.
OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: So, Sulma is based in L.A. But as the Outreach Coordinator, she’ll be working with the Field Leads statewide, and so she’ll also be focusing on statewide. But because she’s from L.A. and has relationships, I will definitely be working with her on how to leverage that. And just her, you know, experience and background in certain communities as well have definitely -- even though she’s not focused on L.A., she will have some additional, you know, suggestions and recommendations of communities to engage with as well.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Got it, thank you. I know, so it doesn’t matter so --

CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Yee?

VICE CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Chair, and thank you Director Kaplan, and welcome to our new staff.

I had a question about the input meetings. And so, I assume June 10th is going to be virtual. I’m wondering what your current thinking is going forward from there? How aggressively to try to start having in-person input meetings?

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Yes. And Alvaro and I were talking last week about connecting this week to start that research and planning. I think he could discuss more on the timeline. But that is definitely a big role that the Field Staff and Outreach Coordinator will help to
ensure identifying locations and logistics.

CHAIR AHMAD: Go ahead, Alvaro.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to mention that as we move forward, and we’re still waiting for word from the Governor’s Office as to when and how. And as I mentioned before, each county may be a little bit different. But the goal would be to start looking at sites and locations, and prepping for that transition to the in-person input meetings. So, that’s kind of what we’re doing right now.

But the fact that Kimberley, and Jose, and Sulma have contacts in those particular areas, we’re going to leverage what they bring to the Commission and use that to start at least looking at sites and understanding where we might go within those specific areas or regions.

CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: On that note, it might be helpful if you all can create kind of a one-pager on what the requirements are for those regions, since also Commissioners know the regions really well and can maybe help identify sites, and contacts, and things like that.

CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Sinay, just clarifying, is that a direct request of staff to take action on the item at this point or is that to have further discussion on that item?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: It’s up to the Chair.
That’s the Chair’s prerogative. But I would encourage
action just so that we can help out.

CHAIR AHMAD: Okay. I think we can bring that
forward. If you don’t mind, can you please bring that up
again during the Public Input Design report out, because I
believe we’re going to have a lengthy conversation about
that first meeting and every meeting following. So, I
think that’s an important point to raise moving forward.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And I’m hoping I know
the answer to this, Director Kaplan, but seeing that there
currently is not a lead for Northern California and there
are going to be COI input meetings in Northern California
would I have a correct assumption that the Leads you have
now, plus the Coordinator, will assist with that northern
-- the northern site-specific COI input meetings?

CHAIR AHMAD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you.

Any other questions for Marcy at this time?

All right, I know we’re going to have a great
conversation once we get to Item 11, with that dry run and
all of the items that the team has put together for us to
review. So, we’ll have a more in-depth conversation at
that time.

So, moving right along, our Chief Counsel’s Report.

CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR AHMAD: Marcy?

CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Oh.

CHAIR AHMAD: Sorry, I just saw Marcy’s hand up.

CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Oh, go ahead. Go ahead, Marcy.

CHAIR AHMAD: No. Okay.

CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Good morning everyone. Just two items I wanted to inform and brief you all on. Please be on the lookout on June 9th, as part of the Chief Counsel’s Report I plan on providing a Bagley-Keene Open Meetings Act refresher for everyone. Again, it will be part of the Chief Counsel’s Report.

And second, I just want to let you know that Marian and I are working very collaboratively, and we were working to sort of iron out division of labor for the Legal Affairs Division. And so, plan on getting you more information as we sort of iron out those details. But we are looking at that right now.

And with that, if anyone has any questions?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Just to inquire if the
Legal Team has anything to update us on as far as
litigation surrounding the Census and other states.
Specifically, I guess the Ohio case and what’s happening
with the Alabama case. Thank you.

CHIEF COUNSELPane: Sure. So, I don’t have
anything at this moment, but I’m happy to report back to
you for that.

CHAIR AHMAD: Any other questions for our Chief
Counsel and/or Legal Team? Great. Great, moving along.
Thank you, Anthony, for that.

Moving along to subcommittee updates. So, I had
a request come in to start with Item 9-J. So, if it’s
okay, I would like to honor that request and start with 9-
J, and then we can jump back to 9-A and continue through
that list. Aside from that time certain report out that we
have on the agenda.

So, with that, Commissioners Akutagawa and Le
Mons.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, thank you. And I’m
going to go ahead and I’m going to start this off, and then
just so that you all know I’ve also asked Director
Hernandez to also give -- to give an update. And then,
that will be followed by Commissioner Le Mons, who is going
to walk us through the meat of the RFP.

So, I do want to just acknowledge the
conversation that we had at the last meeting. We did have a lot of input from everybody and definitely point taken. I also want to just say that at that time we were just waiting for the final approval from the Office of Legal Services. And so, shortly after that we did get the okay to move forward, as I had mentioned that there were some specific kinds of things that we needed to ensure that the way in which we would move forward with this funding mechanism would be done using the RFP. And that it would be also open to any entity or any qualified bidder in the State of California.

So, what you have seen -- and I just want to just say thank you and kudos to both Director Hernandez and Director Kaplan. We have been working, and they specifically have been working tirelessly since we started talking about all of the different options.

I know that last week we talked about, again, the what ifs. I do want to just say that the Committee, working together with Director Hernandez and Director Kaplan, looked at every single possible iteration or possibility that we can consider, in anticipation of the kind of questions that came up last week.

But ultimately, again within the confines of what is allowable within the statute of what the Commission can do, this is the route that we can best follow.
I just want to also acknowledge that Director Kaplan, with the help of Director Hernandez, really turned this, you know, revision to the RFP to reflect the changes that the Office of Legal Services was requiring. They turned it around quickly and we’re pleased that we were able to then have something that we could submit to the public, and also to the entire Commission for everyone to review prior to today’s meeting. And so, I do want to just acknowledge them.

I know that there were some what if questions that came up last week specific to personal services contracts, and also about being able to perhaps utilize some of the funds to then share with some state agencies, specifically libraries, so that they can also help us with outreach.

I want to turn to Director Hernandez to speak to those particular points because there are some answers that he was able to get. So, Director Hernandez.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yes, thank you. In regard to the personal service contracts, those are very limited in what they can do. And for the purposes that we’re looking at, they don’t apply in this particular instance to do the personal service contracts for the work that we’re outlining.

As far as the interagency agreements, if the goal
is to speed up the process that is not going to speed up the process, one.

Secondly, the interagency agreements, although you don’t have to do a bidding process, they still have to follow contracting protocols and state guidelines. So that, again, doesn’t speed up the process either.

So, the interagency agreements, although, you know, are a good idea and you avoid the RFP posting and all that part of it, you still are required to follow the contracting guidelines.

So, you know, working with another state agency, if you’re giving away -- trying to distance yourself from having to make a decision on awarding that doesn’t work because the Commission ultimately has to approve and decide on who the award goes to. So, it doesn’t remove that or distance you, as we had originally thought from that part of it. You know, as far as making a decision, it still is required.

And ultimately, I think the Commission would want to have responsibility and oversight of how those funds are being used, and directing how they should be used. So, in that sense we’re limited on what we can do, and definitely within the time frames in which we can do them.

COMMISSIONER AKUTFAGAWA: Thank you very much, Director Hernandez. And I also want to just note that in
terms of distancing ourselves from awarding, I think, I believe that we’re all capable of being as impartial and as objective as we can. It would be no different than what we did in terms of any of the other contracts that we’ve awarded. For example, to the line drawers, or also to our counsels. So, I have no doubt in the 14 of us bringing in all of our different lenses to ensure equal balance.

So, with that said, I’m so happy and really proud to be able to say that we have something to submit to all of you. I’m going to turn to Commissioner Le Mons to speak about, really, the scope of work and the RFP, and what we’re proposing for the RFP. Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

And I, too, want to echo the gratitude to Directors Kaplan and Hernandez, and all of the support staff behind the scenes that have been working tirelessly on this process. My hope is that most of the questions and brainstorm from the last meeting, which unfortunately an emergency prevented me from attending, that we’re at a place where we believe that we turned the stones that needed to be turned, and really looked for every possible pathway to try to meet the original vision that was outlined very, very early in this process.

I know I’m very excited that we have a viable
path and I hope every Commissioner at this point has had an
opportunity to review the document, which I also want to
say is pretty clear and concise, which I think is
fantastic. There’s not a lot of ambiguity. There’s not a
lot of gray areas here. And that was one of the things
that was really important as well. So, I think that that
supports us in being able to feel very confident in our
outcome that we select. Contractors to represent the
outreach work that we are looking to have done, that we’ve
laid this out as the way that gives us a path to those
outcomes that we can feel very comfortable with.

So, you know, we talked about how to approach
this. I don’t know if everyone -- I’m not one who likes to
read stuff to people in general, especially not adults.
So, my question becomes there’s a way to tackle this, we
really wanted to focus on the activities and make sure that
the things that we are asking from the proposers have been
captured here.

So, we might want to start with the objectives
and feel -- sort of we feel comfortable that these are the
objectives. We also want to, I’d say, make sure that --
there’s not a lot of room for a lot of substantive change
in the structure of this, et cetera. So, I just want to
caution that we keep our discussion focused because we have
gone back and forth with OLS for quite a few weeks now, and
this has been looked at by any number of eyes, and making sure within the statutory authority if we lack or, you know, who can do what. This is the framework.

So, I think at this point it’s a question of are there outliers here in that we feel there’s a gap in what it is that we wanted to accomplished or that there are things that are an over-reach that might need to be dialed back. So, I think if we can look at it through that lens, and that’s not the exclusive lens to look at it, but if we can look at through that lens, I think we’ll be able to have a pretty focused discussion about it.

So, if that’s okay with the group, and I’m open to suggestions on how to approach it as well, so that’s just my thoughts.

Chair, I don’t know if you have any specific direction on how you’d like us to go about it?

CHAIR AHMAD: No, I believe you all have the floor. So, however you want to frame that conversation, you can just jump in.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay. So, why don’t we start with Item B, the statement of work, which outlines the objectives of what this RFP is all about. And just ask, I guess, is there any questions from any of the Commissioners? The contractor in each of the regions will collaborate and work with community-based organizations,
local government agencies like counties, cities, schools and local businesses to inform the general public of the importance of participating in the redistricting process, and activating and to participating in the redistrict through the Commission’s Community of Interest tool, and other avenues the Commission has made available to the public. For those to avoid duplication of efforts within a region, identify outreach gaps and fill them accordingly, and implement outreach to encourage full participation by the public.

Is the Commission comfortable with that objective? Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, everybody, for the amazing work that was done to this. There is a lot of work. And I’m sure we’ll be getting calls from the community when we have, you know, public comments.

And having created a lot of RFPs in my lifetime, you know, no process is ever going to be perfect. And I think we need to just trust -- we need to trust the work that was done. And I want to thank you all.

Just one point, just on this. My understanding is that this is a -- that, you know, the purpose and the outcomes are twofold, but then there’s four bullets underneath that, A, B, C and D. And what I’m hearing is that it’s twofold about education and activating. And I
think with a lot of emphasis on the activating.

And then, the C and D ones are types of activities that can take place. And so, we just might want to make that -- you know, just make that match what’s twofold and what are the bullets underneath it.

And I would go back to saying we really want proposals that are going to get us communities of interest submissions, or whichever way. So, whatever we can do to really emphasize that part.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay, thank you.

Does anyone else have any feedback on the objective? Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Well, thank you. I think I’d be more comfortable if there was a focus on nonpartisan. If the proposers were nonpartisan in nature. So, if they weren’t -- if we highlight that we are seeking organizations that don’t lobby. And this might be in the qualification statement on this type of work. But potentially there could be a statement that we don’t -- that because that we’re an impartial organization that’s seeking nonpartisan groups to help in this effort, that way we can highlight the impartiality aspect of the work.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you.

Any other comments on the objective?
Commissioner Fernandez?

Commissioner Fernandez: Yes, I just want to echo the thanks. I was reading this last night and I was, oh, my goodness there’s so much information in here, which is really good information. So, thank you for capturing everything that we need.

Just on that one — I know this is a little bit of minutia, but 1-C, when it says to — towards the end it says: And where possible to their counties and cities. I would like to also add “and communities” because sometimes, you know, their community doesn’t encompass the whole city, obviously, it encompasses a community. So, that was my only comment in that area. Thank you so much for capturing everything else, though. Great job.

Commissioner Le Mons: You’re welcome.

And I see Director Kaplan, you’re taking notes, right? Okay. I noticed you keep moving each time there’s a comment. I just wanted to make sure that someone was capturing it. I know we’re reporting this, but thank you for that.

Any other questions or feedback on the objectives?

Commissioner Turner: Chair, I had my hand raised.

Commissioner Le Mons: Okay, I’m sorry. I hear
Commissioner Turner, I recognize that voice. But why don’t I see you? Anyway, Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Just a point of clarification. Under the objectives -- and thank you for this work. You all have had quite the ride on this. The objectives statement of work starts out: The contractors for each region will, and then it ends with the goal to avoid duplication of efforts with a region, to identify outreach gaps and fill them.

I just wanted a point of clarification. Are we looking for those that we ultimately select to identify those gaps or is that’s something that’s internally to be done? Are they expected to identify gaps and do the work?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I think that’s a really good question, Commissioner Turner. I would imagine it will be both, actually. So, any information that -- of course, we’ve been doing work, meaning the Commission. And I think that our Outreach Team, whatever could be provided that identifies, and we could see what mechanism we could actually use for that, where we know of gaps already. And where we might incorporate that information.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Uh-hum.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Because I think that would drive potential bidders -- I mean, excuse me, proposers’ scope of work. So, that’s just sort of my thought, off the
top of my head. But, yeah, it’s just a thought off the top of my head. I think that’s a really important question as to who has the responsibility to identify those gaps. I think it sounds like -- it looks like Commissioner Sinay might have a response to that. Go ahead, Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, what I liked about how this is written and I know it’s further along, but we are making a contract where part of the contract is working directly with our field staff.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And so, the field staff will have that information and, you know, as we’re receiving COIs and we have the maps, we will be able to identify those spaces and the field staff will be able to go back, you know, and work with the different contractors.

So, it’s not a blind partnership, but it’s really working hand in hand.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Great point, Commissioner Sinay.

Does that answer your question, Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: It does. And the way I understood the response is that basically the field staff will be predominantly watching out for gaps. It was only a
flag for me and point of clarification because receiving a grant for an area that you know that you’re able to work in is different than lifting your head and looking out to see what’s missing. And so, I think to have the field staff be predominantly responsible for that will ensure that it happens and we are covering areas that we expect to. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: You’re welcome.

Commissioner Andersen? I’m sorry, Commissioner Akutagawa, were you going to speak to that point?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I just also wanted to just point out, Commissioner Turner, and to everybody else, if you look later in the RFP it does specifically state that each of the successful bidders will be working directly with an assigned field staff person as well, too. So, yeah, we’re not going to let them out on their own.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I also agree with the -- thank you very much for a great detailed document. And I also liked the approach of going through certain chunks of the sections at a time. I think that’s very organized.

I have a very small comment on this section. And it’s under 2-B. To activate Californians how to provide public input. I would prefer if you switch the bullets using -- using the draw the lines community tool to be
first, then send the emails, writing. I mean, since we are trying to emphasize because that -- by using the my community, it’s already processed into our line drawing efforts, and our whole system. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you for that, Commissioner Andersen.

Any other questions or comments on the objectives? Okay, seeing none let’s move on to the next category, which would be the contractor responsibilities.

Now, their whole section between -- before I jump there, we have what -- you know, as we talked about objectives I know we focused on the broader bullets. And then, of course, there’s those Sections C and D. We didn’t get any feedback on that, so I’m assuming people are comfortable with that at this point. And if that’s accurate, then I’d like to just move to Section 3, which are the contractor responsibilities.

Okay, Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Did you want comments on that now?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Sure. Yes, yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Just a quick thing on the task 3, on page 7.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Uh-hum.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: The third bullet, and it
was a few times throughout the RFP language, it has state, because it says: May be provided to the contractor by the state. I think it’s supposed to be by the Commission, correct? And there’s a few times throughout the RFP that it mentions state versus the Commission.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I think we should ask Executive Director Hernandez on that clarification.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. And the only other question I had was when we’re asking for like feedback -- not feedback -- for the reporting I’m hoping, I think it’s in here, but I’m hoping that part of the reporting will note like how many Californians they actually reached, and if they actually have information on how many actually submitted communities of interest input that would be great information for us to have as well so that --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: So, when you -- to that point, Commissioner Fernandez, when we look at -- because the reporting is broken out. There’s the monthly reporting, there’s the initial status report and then final report. Do you feel like the point that you just made is reflected in the bullets there?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I wasn’t sure if it was. I wasn’t sure if it’s something that once you, you know, start working out the details and once, you know, our
outreach area starts working with the contractor maybe that will be like the -- that will be additional information that’s given to them. But I didn’t feel that it was specifically spelled out, but I didn’t know if it needs to be spelled out. I didn’t know if it was something that Director Kaplan would then, you know, work out with the contractor.

But for me, I just think that would be good information for us to see the touch points of the counting. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Director Kaplan, do you have any feedback to Commissioner Fernandez’s question?

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Yeah, I think that’s helpful to clarify. It’s in there clearly in the reporting, particularly around final reporting. It may not be so -- I think for -- depending on the type of activity that’s done they may be able to track, you know, if they’re holding a workshop that has a component that then gets people to submit a COI that’s easier to track sometimes. It’s also looking at perhaps total impressions. There’s other ways to do that measurement, so depending on the types of activities. But I think looking at some of that wording to make sure that’s in there as well. Thank you for finding that.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: So, I think monthly -- yeah, this is going to be you get the money and you run. Groups aren’t going to really have, you know, the time that we would really like. You know groups, let’s say you get money and you’d like to be able to have a lot of time to plan, and do all that. And so, it is going to be adjusting as you go.

And I was looking at task number 2, the monthly report seemed a little cumbersome, especially for, you know, the amount of work that we’re doing. And, you know, who’s going to review budgets every month and all that. I would encourage, unless we have to do that, that we really look at a sit-down meeting with the regional directors and, you know, they talk about what the gaps are, what’s happening. So, that was one.

Two, on what COIs are actually being submitted, with the Community of Interest tool the Statewide Database did tell some of the groups that they could have like a tag line, or something. I can’t remember what it was, but it was some type of tag that people could submit and they would know, you know, their outreach resulted in this number or this tag.

And so, what I would recommend is that we just figure out if that can be done, that we just do that for each contractor and we pull up that. You know, whatever we
can take -- you know, take on in the big pictures, just
because this is going to be a really tough contract to
manage with such a short timeline.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you. We do need to
have those. But I think rather than either/or, it could be
an and in that. That might be a mechanism by which to help
the contractor gather the data. But they do need to be
able to provide that data to support fulfilling.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And this may be minutia, so
I apologize. Maybe we can just create a Google form that
they fill out every month and they just have to put a few
details in that and that’s how we get the monthly report.
But however we can simplify it, the better.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Absolutely.

Director Kaplan?

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Yes, we’ve discussed
the streamlining of the reporting, but I think the key
thing to emphasize with this multiple award or a fee is
that we are distributing funds based on work performed.
And so, the Commission needs to ensure that we are doing
due diligence to identify the work that has been done for
the month, the funds that were used in order to do that
reimbursement. So, there are ways that we can help with
streamlining and having, you know, the expectation set up
front on what that reporting will look like, but it will
need to be a written report that can also be complimented
by a phone conversation that’s in here, as well, but
ensuring that due diligence.

   COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?
Commissioner Turner, I see you.

   COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I just realized, just
for clarification then, Director Kaplan, does that mean,
for the sake of all of us, too, so does that mean that each
month we will be, also the Commission, not just the staff,
the Commissioner will be reviewing each of the monthly
reports and then we will be -- because it’s a disbursement
of funds we will need to vote each month to disburse the
money, the funds to each of the contractors?

   COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Fernandez?

   COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, I don’t believe we
do. I believe it’s a -- I would call it a deliverable.
And it would be similar to any other sort of invoice
processing that’s done internally, where the invoice would
go to the specific area, which I think would go to Director
Kaplan’s area. And then, she would be responsible for
determining whether or not they had met that milestone for
the payment. And then, she could report back to the
Commission. But I don’t believe it would be the
responsibility of the Commission to approve that. But I
could be wrong. I have been wrong a few times.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons. I wanted to support Commissioner Sinay, some of her comments. I’m really grateful for the report template that it looks like that will be provided, and the attempts to streamline that. And in understanding that this particular -- this will be paid out in -- I guess in arrears, as opposed to up front. So, I guess maybe that’s why the monthly. I wanted to go back to I think monthly reporting is particularly cumbersome, even with a report -- a template that’s provided.

But then, if it’s going to be based on actual work, I’m wondering is there already a formula set up, payment per widget, or is it just a division of the total grant amount and then you receive those funds at the end of the month if the report looks satisfactory?

I’m trying to figure out what does that look like to pay them because I don’t see any costs, you know, per activity, or is there a dollar amount assigned per meeting, per training, per COI? What does monthly payments look like based on a report without a financial structure tied to it, I guess is what I’m trying to wonder about?

Because if there’s a way to -- particularly because there’s monthly meetings going on as well. But it
seems to me that if we’ve accepted someone as a viable candidate to receive funds, and have confidence in their ability, if they’re meeting on a monthly basis there probably could be some funds released up front, and then paid out on a monthly basis if that’s satisfactory.

Now, the reporting, if it’s going to be based on actual work, do we have that already determined what’s that going to look like? Payment per what type of work?

I mean yes, Director Kaplan.

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: So this would be part of the timeline and budget that they would submit that Commissioner Le Mons will go into, in a further section, and that will have the breakdown of activities and cost associated.

I know we had explored utilizing a potential template with that budget, so that it’s the timeline is associated with the dollar. So, this would be an entity in their application identifying these are the activities they’re going to be implemented and the costs associated. And so, with that monthly reporting would then -- you know, this would be the proposed and then they would report on the actual. And so, that would be part of the overseeing of these reports would ensure that, you know, those activities actually occurred and that those working relationships with the field lead that would be overseeing,
as well as, you know, that costing being realistic in terms of, you know, what they’re charging to do particular activities.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Yee?

VICE CHAIR YEE: Thank you. I had a question about number of contracts. So, it looks like it’s set out for six contract, you know, divided regionally. So, is that absolutely set? Like if a smaller firm wanted to be in on one of the regions would that be possible? Or, is it really all or nothing for each of these regions and each of the six contracts?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Well, the way it’s structured is there’s an assumption that subcontracting may be necessary to reach the scopes and objectives, so that would be on the lead proposer to determine what would be needed to accomplish the activities for the region.

VICE CHAIR YEE: I see, thanks.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy, then Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. Looking under reports, I’m reading the description of the initial status report and it’s saying that it provides the first month’s update regarding the status of the key milestones. I’m wondering if it would be possible to perhaps rephrase that a bit, have something called a baseline report and have the
baseline report be a deliverable that could be paid
against. And that baseline report could be submitted, you
know, much closer to the start of the contracts. You know,
one week after the start of the contract there’s a baseline
report. The baseline report gets reviewed and a payment is
made against that baseline report, rather than waiting for
a full month. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I guess that’s something
that we would have to -- go ahead, Director Kaplan.

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: So, this is --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Fernandez --
I’m sorry, Director Kaplan, I just wanted to check in with
Commissioner Fernandez. Is it okay if Director Kaplan
answers? Okay, thank you.

Director Kaplan.

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: This was in some of
the feedback from OLS that it has to be on work performed.
And so, we had originally framed it as like a finalized
strategic plan, but it really has to be the work
implemented and so that’s why it’s going to the monthly.
Not just the proposed of how the work would be implemented,
even though that is work to create the strategy of the
implementation of it.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: And you seem -- you don’t
-- you seem perplexed on that, Commissioner Kennedy.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah, I mean a baseline report involves work that is done. That’s why I’m saying it’s not going to be something that’s submitted, you know, the day that the contract is signed. It’s going to take, you know, a week or so. But, you know, it is work and it is something that could be paid against.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez, then Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I just wanted to caution a little bit -- caution the Commission about trying to transfer any of these responsibilities to our staff. I mean, one, our staff’s going to be busy. They’re already behind. I mean right? I’m sure if I ask Director Kaplan she would be like so overwhelmed, so glad that she has staff.

But at the end of the day for any sort of RFP or any type of invoicing, it needs to be the contractor that’s providing their information. I can’t be -- it should not be the Commission providing numbers, and anything else to support why they should get paid. Because at the end of the day all of this information, you know, is discoverable. If somebody wants to audit it or review it after the fact, we need to make sure that it’s the contractor that is submitting this information and it’s their data.

And it is -- you’ve done a wonderful job of
outlining all of the responsibilities. So, it’s not like if somebody submits a bid they’re not unaware of what their responsibilities are. So, I appreciate you lining that out. And that is how state contracting is, it’s paid after the fact and that’s, unfortunately, how it is. We don’t do the ten percent, give you a ten percent up front so you can get started. Unfortunately, that’s how it works. And I know that Commissioners Le Mons and Akutagawa have probably been researching this more than we will ever know. But those that are familiar or have contracted with the state are familiar with this requirement. And again, it is detailed out in the document so that prospective bidders can decide whether or not they want to do it.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I just wanted to just reiterate what Director Kaplan said. This part about the baseline report, I understand what, you know, your intent is Commissioner Kennedy, and I know what you say about, you know, work is being done. Yes, there is a degree of work that is being done. However, as Commissioner Fernandez just also said, too, there is very, very specific rules and regulations that we do have to follow that we’ve learned in this process. And the intent of what is going to be done is not considered a work product.
And so, therefore, even just to say a baseline report, you know, we did this work because we’re going to tell you how we’re going to do our work is essentially not going to be an acceptable kind of actionable work product. And so, that was made very clear to us at the very, very beginning, when we started asking all these questions.

We had hoped that we would be able to disburse some funds, even just on the basis of the plan, but we were told very clearly that that’s not going to be something that is going to be allowable within the state contracting rules. So, we just want to just say that, you know, that is something that was considered.

And as Commissioner Fernandez also just said, I think we also realized that this does make things -- it changes who will probably be able to apply. Commissioner Yee, you know, any smaller organization can, but they really have to have the capabilities of doing it.

Subcontracting is an option and so this is going to be up to, you know, entities to perhaps partner with others.

And again, as Commissioner Fernandez says, people will know what they’re getting into because the requirements are very clearly laid out in terms of what they are going to be asking to be done, and what they are going to be applying to do.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner
Akutagawa. And I’ll just echo that. And having been a recipient of state contracts, to Commissioner Fernandez’s point when you contract with the state, if you have experienced contracting with the state you absolutely understand what you have to do and what’s required of you.

Hopefully, those organizations who apply are committed to our objectives in the broadest of sense, and will be creative at their level in being able to partner with and ensure that certain things happen. And we didn’t go so far as to make partnership requirements, like some contracts do. Some RFPs do, they force you to contract in certain ways. But I think what we -- we’re going to probably have very passionate people who want to get this job done and, hopefully, they’ll work within the confines of the contract to reach the objective.

Are there any more -- I think I got everyone who had their hand up. Is there any more comments on this particular section, the reporting? Okay, thank you.

So, jumping down to the -- let’s see here, minimum requirements -- it should be minimum qualifications for proposers. Any feedback on that area?

Commissioner Vazquez, then Commissioner Sinay, then Andersen.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I think actually this is helpful to know, to understand that the vision for
this work is one where subcontracting takes place. Because
in just overall looking at the qualifications and then the
requirements in the later section seems -- it seems pretty
challenging for most grassroots organizations to be able to
meet. So, I guess that was my overall feedback. But being
educated on sort of the framing for this contract, I think
that is helpful.

I would say maybe then my overall feedback, if
there is some -- I’m not sure how much more this ties our
hands, so maybe it’s just us communicating sort of through
our meetings like this that the vision is that there will
be subcontracting, without requiring subcontracting,
necessarily, I think would -- would be helpful for folks
who maybe aren’t watching these meetings, but get this in
their inbox. Someone says, hey, you guys could absolutely
do this, apply for it. So, we have to also be able to feel
like this whole document could go to a grassroots
organization and have it be clear that they could -- that
they could enhance their application through partnerships.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Very good point.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So, the one question I have,
since we’ve done a lot of statewide outreach, I know that
some statewide organizations were waiting for our RFP to
come out. The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, or the United
Ways and, you know, United Way of California, Boys and Girls Club. And so, how would they -- is this open for a statewide group to submit a proposal to be very -- you know, be very specific they’re going to be working across the whole state with their members, because I think that will come up as one of the questions.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Sure. Also, that I think we can apply, and I think you can apply for a maximum of three regions. So, there’s an opportunity to -- you do have to put forward, though, three separate applications. So, it isn’t you put forward one application to cover three regions. For each of the six that are identified you can submit, but the maximum is three. That would be an opportunity to have a broader swath of the state, if you will.

Commissioner Sinay, did you want to have a follow up?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I know you said this and it came in and it came out of my head, so I apologize. Are we planning to do just one grant per region, or it may be multiple grants up to the amount that we put in the box?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: The six that have been identified, they’re one per plan.

Director Kaplan, then Commissioner Andersen and Commissioner Kennedy.
OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Just one note to just reframe, make sure that we’re reframing to contracts.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Oh, right. Yeah, these aren’t plans, that’s right. Contracts, yes. I was coached on that prior to this. Thank you, Director Kaplan.

Commissioner Andersen, then Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. This is very interesting, there’s a lot of -- I have a few, a couple -- an answer to a question, and then a couple of redlines, and then another request.

So, the first, it’s very obvious in the qualifications and experience that these are -- subcontractors are essentially required because it says you have to have five years or more experience in managing and tracking budgets for three or more subcontractors. So, that’s very explicit. Once they start looking at, you know, what are the minimum requirements.

That does mean this is for bigger groups to subcontract to those grassroots, is the way I’m interpreting this.

This is a couple of redlines. In Table 3, the strategic outreach plan, the narrative response should be -- it’s including sub-requirements. It should just be 1 through 12. There are no section 1.1. It’s just section 1 through 12, not 1.1 through 1.2.
And then a similar redline comment is on page 16. That is still under Item 4, actually D, strategic partners. That’s also one of the subcategories, the strategic partners should be underlined. I would make two different changes to make it a little bit more clear, the difference between 4 and 5, but that’s a personal preference.

Then, going back to the subcontracting, I would like to put a line in specifically on Northern California 2 and then Central California 2 areas to distinguish. Northern California 2 is basically our Zone A, B and D. And I would like to make sure that A, B has consideration, as well as D, because that’s all too easy to put the Sacramento area in and skip over A and B.

And similar, I would like on Central California 2, a distinction between F and G, with making sure that -- and in terms of the amount of budget that would obviously -- you know, very easy to distinguish based on population, but I don’t want A, and B, and G to get missed just because of the amount of contracting. So, I’d like to put that in, in terms of our -- because I was looking for a place to put that in, which I haven’t found that exactly yet. So, I will come up and propose that as soon as do find a good, nice easy spot to put that in. thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay, thank you.

Director Kaplan?
OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: With the comment on the table, can you just tell me the page? I have a printout and my stapler is broken, so my papers are very --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, it’s Table 3 and that is on page 11. It’s under -- it’s the Section 3.A.2, Table 3.

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Oh, okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It should be numbered 1, 2, 3, it’s just they go through the whole document.

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: On page 11.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I just wanted to point out under the six regions, we are missing four counties. So, we’re missing Lassen, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, and Santa Cruz.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you for that.

Director Kaplan?

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Commissioner Fornaciari had emailed me, also. So, thank you, I’m flagging that. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay. Did I miss any
Commissioners who had -- oh, Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I want to start by thanking the subcommittee and the staff for all your hard work on this. This has been a real, real, big, big amount of work and thank you so much.

I just had a question about the Table 1, about the distribution of funding. Is that proportionate to the population? Is that how you came to those numbers? Or proportional.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: And I could add, and then Commissioner Ahmad, Chair Ahmad, and then Commissioner Toledo.

When the proposal -- I mean I think that part of how a proposal gets evaluated is going to be some of those points that you raised, Commissioner Andersen as well, is that that organization really having an understanding of how to reach the counties that are within that particular region. Meaning these, not the A, the lettering formation, but how it’s outlined here. And for the reviewers to really be looking to make sure that that kind of coverage is being identified in the activities and plans.

So, you know, we would caution submitters that, you know, don’t submit for a region and only focus on
Sacramento. It’s not going to get very far in terms of getting approved. So, I just wanted to make that comment.

Chair Ahmad?

CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons. And we are at break. So, we will come back at 11:15 and continue this conversation, thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: We’ll pick up with Commissioner Toledo.

(Off the record at 11:00 a.m.)

(On the record at 11:14 a.m.)

CHAIR AHMAD: Welcome back from break. Let’s continue the conversation where we left off and I will hand it back to Commissioner Akutagawa and Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you, Chair. I believe we left off with Commissioner Toledo wanting to give comment.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Well, thank you. Thank you Commissioner Le Mons and Akutagawa.

I’m curious if the outreach and education contracts would be similar to the legal affairs contract, where the individuals working under the contract would each need to be approved by the Commission or if these contracts are different? I’m just curious in terms of process, and just vetting. And so, I’m not sure if that question is for the committee or for our legal team, but I’m just curious
to see if we have any requirements that we would have to
meet in terms of just vetting and approving the staff
working under these contracts. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Does staff have a response
to that question? Director Hernandez?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: We’re going to
have to look into that. I don’t know at this point. Good
question though, thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: And Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It is in the page 16 it
actually says: The top bidders are required to identify all
subcontractors utilized in the contract. And then under
independents conflict of interest, which is on page 17, it
does say, 7-B: Bidders must disclose -- a continuous duty
to disclose any financial business or other relationship
with the contractor/subcontractor, or individual employee.
So, that is intended to cover these issues.

And then C says: The Commission shall have the
right to disqualify or terminate if they believe the
interests are disqualified. So, I think it does indeed
cover it.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Do you feel like that gets
to your question, Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No, I understand about the
subcontractor versus contractor. I think it’s the
individual people doing work under these contracts whether they have to be approved, which is a slightly different question. Although, related because if we are having to approve each person under this contract then, of course, there’s conflict of interest disclosure requirements for each person under each contract and potentially other --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right, individuals.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- requirements as stated by Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sorry, it does also say, I would continue, under 7-B, on page 17 it also says: Other relation to the contractor, subcontractor, or individual employee. So, they have to require -- they do have to disclose that.

And then, under C: The Commission has the right to terminate them.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah, thanks. I would also point out that on page 9, under minimum qualifications, it talks about bidder and the personnel proposed to perform professional services must have qualifications and experience identified below.

So, there is a requirement and this is going to -- I mean if they’re required to have this, then somebody obviously has to review the proposal to make sure that they
have it.

The one thing that I would suggest is that there may be a possibility of breaking out the qualifications and experience required from the bidding firm or organization versus qualifications and experience for the personnel proposed. It might be useful to split those two out. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Do you want to stick to this section or -- no, because I have a question -- I’ve found that I missed one question earlier, but I can send that later, so I’m just --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: No. No, go ahead. What’s your question?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. So, on this question, since we’re in this section and I don’t want to confuse -- for Marcy having to go back and forth. So, I have found that it’s really important when creating these large contracts and you have subcontractors to actually ask for the contact information of the subcontractors. Because I’ll be honest, a lot of times big groups will put in names of smaller groups without asking them or them knowing. And I have also been known, when I was creating contracts, to send the contracts to the subcontractor so they could see it as well, and they would call me and say, oh, I didn’t
even know we were in that proposal.

And so, whatever we can do to make sure that the subcontractors are an authentic partner and will be getting some funding for the work they’re doing, you know, and some recognition. Not just that they give -- you know, it gives the contractor points. If that makes any sense? So, that was the one piece on this one I just wanted to make sure.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you for that, Commissioner Sinay.

Any other comments on this section? Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Not on this section. I’m being --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: On the previous section. What was your comment on the previous section, seriously?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, we kind of jumped the whole budget and went straight over to kind of the subcontractors and that, unless it’s in more than one place. So, can I just clarify where we are?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Sure. Well, we did because one of our Commissioners asked the question about an area that we hadn’t gotten to. So, you know, we just jumped around. But it’s okay, go ahead and ask your question.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. So, a couple things.
And please tell me which of these comments I can just email to Director Kaplan because they’re minutiae and they just need to be --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Use your discretion.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We say COI Tool, training on the COI Tool, and what we talked about in the Public Input Design Subcommittee was that it’s really community mapping. So, the bigger picture, understanding how to talk about communities and stuff, and not just use the tool.

And so, in one of the activities we kind of talk about just the tool. So, if we can just pull back a little and say either communities of interest -- I always say communities of interest/community mapping so people understand the bigger picture and not just the tool.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Could you point us to where you’re referring?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I’ll find that exactly where I found it.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And get it to Director Kaplan.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: All right.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: The other one, on the contract I like that we looked at this as, you know, a way to look at it is equal, but not equitable was to look at
the population. But the one piece that’s in -- that
wasn’t, I think, taken into account is that there has been
$3 million that has been awarded to certain areas already,
very specific areas. And so, and those tend to be the
areas that we are also giving a lot of larger grants to.
And there are some areas that have been completely not
received any funding yet for redistricting. And I just
wanted to lift that up because I think it’s important for
us not to say that this was the most equitable way to do
it, it was a more equal way of doing. And if anybody had
thoughts on that equity question.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, since Commissioner
Fornaciari and Sinay brought up the budget issue, I’ll just
bring up the one concern that I have with Northern
California. It’s 22 counties that are included in that
county and I realize -- I mean, I guess the easiest way to
divide the funds is by population, but also there’s some
challenges with, you know, a third of the state, trying to
reach out to that area. It’s more -- the people are more
disbursed, there’s more area to cover. They may not have
as many community-based organizations. So, I just need to
continue to try to push for more resources for those areas
because they are remote and just as some other areas in
California. but disbursing funds out by population
sometimes may not be the best for every Californian. So, I just wanted to make sure I stated that. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah, we did give a lot of thought to that, by the way, and there’s any number of formulas that could be used. But this is a population-based project. Actually, what we’re doing is based on population. So, we actually felt like with all of the myriad of ways you could go about dividing the money, but then also being able to legitimately substantiate these issues requires a lot of research, a lot of support documentation so it couldn’t just be theoretical that this particular area doesn’t have, or this. You really get into a much more intricate process to support that kind of thinking. So, the subcommittee landed on the population-based, not just out of ease, but also I think primarily because that is what this whole -- what we’re doing is about population. So, if we made sure that the resources were put into -- throughout California based on population, then the onus are really going to be on our -- those that submit to really be aware of the zones that they are focusing on and how to maximize those resources that are available to get the best outcome for that zone, or for that region. So, that was the thinking, just to go on record as to what the thinking was.

Other Commissioners? Okay, if there’s no --
well, are there other comments on the section that we were
on, which was the contractor responsibilities?

   So, now we’re going to move to Commissioner
responses. I’m sorry, we had done Commissioner responses,
and we did talk about the reporting. And then, the minimum
qualification per proposal is where we are, I apologize.

   And so, now we’re down at the proposal
requirement and information. Does anyone have any specific
feedback on this particular section? That’s Item 3,
proposal requirement and information?

   Commissioner Sinay?

   COMMISSIONER SINAY: I’m just saying to create an
authentic collaborative it takes -- some of them already
exist and they’ve been working on redistricting, and
talking about it, and this will help them gel which is
really exciting.

   But for others it’s going to be tough to do it in
two weeks. And I understand. So, I just wanted to allow
you all the space to explain to the public why we’re doing
it so quickly.

   COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Director Kaplan?

   OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: We did do three weeks
for the proposal, not two weeks.

   COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?

   COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Commissioner
Sinay, I just want to acknowledge what you’re saying and we are very conscious of it. But we’re also as much trying to balance that with the urgency of where we are right now. And I am just happy that we do not have to go to a plan B, to be honest, that it is still within the time frame that we could still get these funds out via contract to do some of this work. And we do realize -- I mean, there’s a lot of things that, you know, we would have wanted differently and when we first started out on this process we had different kinds of hopes. We had hopes that this would be able to go to much, much smaller organizations. That we would be able to grant for, at the time, I’m using the word intentionally, grant funds to, you know, many different organizations so that we can get deeper into some of the areas that -- you know, I want to acknowledge what Commissioner Fernandez also said, too. We were very, very conscious of that and we were aware of that.

But having to move to this more of a contracting process, you know, it’s not the perfect way in which we would have wanted it to have been, but it is the way in which given the speed by which we do want to get funds out there this is what we’ve had to weight. And that any further delay would, I think, create more challenges than create. And so, I just wanted to say that, that these are the considerations that we took part in.
COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you for that. And now, I want to look at the back side of this, on the back end part. We don’t know how many RFPs -- I mean, how many proposals, or whatever the right, contract, request, whatever the right word is we’ll be receiving. Three days to review all of it and check references, and budgets, and all that really seems tight. And, unfortunately, that could give us space to make mistakes.

So, I just wanted to check if we really thought that was realistic?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy, you have a separate point? Okay. Do you might if we get a response to Commissioner Sinay’s question?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I do want to note that the timeline was one that was provided to us by the staff. And I trust that this is something that they took into account. And I want to, you know, give them the benefit that this is something that they feel is doable. We do, I think, understand and they’re also very conscious of the timeline that we’re under. But I would invite, you know, either Director Kaplan or Director Hernandez to speak otherwise. But I do want to just say that this is part of what I appreciate what the staff is doing, too.
COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Director Hernandez?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I believe we should be able to meet that time frame. I don’t anticipate all of the proposals coming in at the end, so they’ll be staggered. So, we’ll be, you know, kind of looking at them as they come in and taking them into account.

Now, you know, if there’s over a hundred that we don’t anticipate, then that will be a challenge. But both Marcy and I have been working long hours, so this is par for the course.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy and then Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. Thank you, I’m just wondering if there’s something about conflict between the language on page 1, saying that the term of the contracts will be one year, with an estimated start date of July 18th, and the language I think on page 11, in the calendar that says contracts will run until 30 days after the submission of the final maps. Might it make sense to have the language on page 1 say six months given that we reserve the option to extend the term of the contract under the same terms and conditions.

So if there were a need to extend it beyond six months, we have that ability. But that would put it more in line with the timing that’s set out in the table.
COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thanks for that, Commissioner Kennedy.

Commissioner Taylor, then Sinay.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes, thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy just caught the same thing that I was concerned about. And then, secondly, do we have, even though it can’t be placed, do we have a rough idea of how long it would take the Department of Legal Services to approve this for the implementation, or is that another 30 days before they would actually be able to get to work? Do we have an idea, a guesstimate?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Director Hernandez?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Given that they’ve already seen this iteration, with the minor edits that we’re going to make to it, it should flow rather quickly. I’d say two weeks, not 30 days.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to go back to the evaluation period and ask staff to consider making the evaluation period June 29th through July 2nd, with a posting on July 5th just in case you need extra time, and that three-day weekend that you have. Because I’d rather you all not need it and get to celebrate Fourth of July and be excited, than do a quick run.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you.
Commissioner Andersen? Excuse me, before you go
Commissioner Andersen, Commissioner Turner did you have
your hand up? Okay, Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Actually, the
opening proposal is set at a particular time, so it really
is you can’t open them as they come in. You must wait and
open them all at the same time.

So, the only issue with the changing of the
notice of intent to award, you need to have that full
period in case someone protests the bid, which they can do.
And that’s -- so, those are -- basically, that’s a week,
five days -- and it’s actually five calendar days. Those
are -- not just calendar days, those are business days.
So, that’s going to affect if you change that date in
there.

But then, also, in terms of the staff evaluating,
in previous RFPs some Commissioners have also been
involved, who are on the appropriate subcommittee. So, I
would recommend that we also add some Commissioners in
there, understanding that this is for conflict of interest
information. So, it’s not -- it doesn’t have to do with
impartiality. It isn’t like another issue of impartiality.
It’s looking at helping to look particularly through the
conflicts of interest. I would make that recommendation.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy?
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. If the proposals are due at 9:00 a.m. on the 25th, could they be opened at 10:00 a.m. on the 25th?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: That’s a good question. Director Kaplan, is there a specific reason why there’s a three-day gap there?

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: No, I can note that to follow up with.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, it’s the weekend. Oh, I just jumped in. Yeah, it’s the weekend. And usually these --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: They can’t be opened on the weekend?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No, you have to do that in public.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Ah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It has to be done in public.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: At 10:00 a.m. on Friday, an hour after they’re due. I mean I don’t see the point in sitting on them.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: The reason is it’s usually -- you say it’s due at this time, and but most people consider it’s the end of the day. And if you say 9:00 a.m., then there have been issues of it didn’t arrive
in time, it was delayed, that sort of thing. So, there’s usually just a just-in-case on that. But we could, indeed, do it that way. But that’s why it’s usually done like that.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I mean if you’re going to wait until Monday, I would make the deadline 5:00 p.m. on Friday, and then open them at 10:00 on Monday.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah. I don’t know about that comment, Commissioner Andersen. I know any state proposal that I -- if it’s due at 5:00 o’clock, or 10:00 o’clock, at 10:01 you’re late, period. And there’s no -- you know how many people who have sweated months putting together proposals and had that dreaded moment. I have never heard of that leniency, but I could be wrong.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I concur with your comment, Commissioner Le Mons. Also with the -- when we went through the videographer, we actually did it that way where it was due like at 5:00 o’clock that Friday and we moved it to like noon so that we could open it up that afternoon. For that specific reason of gaining -- granted it’s Friday and you’ve got the weekend, but that’s still two extra days that you can potentially be doing your reference checks and evaluations.

So, if it’s due at noon, it has to be in the
office by noon. It doesn’t matter what was postmarked, it needs to be in the office, or e-mail, or however it’s going to be accepted.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you. Other comments on this?

Okay, I think that, Director Kaplan you got all of the -- oh, excuse me, Director Hernandez?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: I just want to circle back. I just checked with Raul, just to make sure that we can adjust those time frames that we have listed there. And you are correct that we have to open all the proposals at the same time, so we can’t stagger them as they come in. Just wanted to clarify that, thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you. So, it sounds like -- I’ll let the Chair address whether we move today, or however we go about making that decision. That sounds like a decision that needs to be made that’s a little bit different than some of the minor edits to language, et cetera. So, Chair, I’ll just put that on your radar.

So, moving to the -- any other questions on the proposal requirements, and information, and the key dates?

Okay, required proposal forms and exhibits.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sorry, before we jump -- leave that section, I did want to put in regarding the --
making sure Zone A, B and G get notified under -- on page 12, under our outreach approach, I thought we could add in, just under the third bulletin, where it says: Targeted population identified within the region. And you do examples. But we should also add in as an example geographic diversity, which is one of our criteria previously, but just to emphasize it in that location.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So, sorry, and then continue to the next section. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: You’re welcome.

So, questions on the next section? Comments?

Okay, so moving to strategic outreach plan requirements section, are there questions or comments on this section? We’re on page 11, by the way, Item 4.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, this actually extends into the components, if you’re ready for feedback for the components.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I’m again still getting my brain to understand that this is sort of one contract per region and the idea is that theoretically partners will be brought in under subcontracts. I still feel like many of the pieces, particularly around language and communication
access plan, and social media plan feel still somewhat onerous to me for a community organization, even theoretically large, regionally-based community organizations who will then subcontract with partners to achieve some of these goals.

So, I’m wondering particularly like there’s a component in the communications access plan, identification of the top six non-English languages spoken. Could it be something like up to the top six? Again, I’m not sure how much capacity even large organizations have to be able to do that kind of landscape analysis in three weeks. If it’s not already -- I feel like there are two sort of sets of groups, either they already have a finger on the pulse of all of the language in that region or they work with a very specific subpopulation in that community and may -- again, within three weeks may not have the resources to do that kind of landscape analysis.

And then, again some of these feel like things that I think the Commission should have more of a hand in. So, things like could the social media and non traditional communications methods portion be optional? I’m guessing how much of this can be optional and how much of this needs to be a requirement. And sort of if you put pieces in that are optional, obviously that like elevates your application to the top of the pile. But I’m concerned by requiring all
of these, and detail within all of these we are -- we're
going to get a smaller pool of potential applicants who may
not be overall the best fit to lead outreach in that
region. I mean, we're basically identifying organizations
who are going to be leading the outreach in these regions
and like do they need to be leading social media outreach
in that region? Maybe that region is not -- again,
thinking in Northern California, is that going to be the
best use of our contractor's time to be developing a social
media campaign? I don't know.

So, that's my overall feedback. To the extent
that -- again, I don't know what's allowed and what's not,
but to the extent the plan may include -- may include as
opposed to shall include for me makes more sense for some
of these components.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I think -- thank
you, Commissioner Vazquez for that. I think on some of
these points, particularly like I guess the language
access, and even the social media part I don't think we're
looking necessarily -- I think this is when it comes to
evaluating. I think, you know, we want to know that
whoever is going to be bidding on this is going to have
some understanding of all of this. We may -- you know, I
think what's being worked out is like how much are we going
to weigh, you know, social media, some kind social media, like ability or communication use, but we want to know are they even thinking about that, too.

I think on the language part, I guess I -- this is for me personally, so I just want to make that clear this is just my thoughts. My thought is that since whoever is going to successfully win this bid is going to have to be able to cover a broad swath of a region. It’s got to be someone who’s going to at least have a broad general pulse of some of the languages in that region. So, therefore, if someone is very specifically working with just one community, you know they may be great if they also have very, you know, existing relationships with potential subcontractors who can cover the other languages. And they should already know that, I think, if they’re already working with other partners.

If there are ones that are broad and they’re going to bring in other partners, I expect that they’ll probably have a broad general sense of, you know, some of the top languages in their areas.

I do agree that it could be up to because there may be just some very, you know, particularly dominant languages in certain areas and it may not be six. But I do expect that they’re going to have a real good pulse of the non-English languages and the needs in the areas. And I
think that’s what’s reflected in the RFP here.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: And I would just add that they can explain why they’re not addressing a particular thing. And so, for example on the up to six, if that’s not pertinent for that area that also will give you some insight into their knowledge of the area, or any of the other categories. If this is a non-tech-wire environment you would say, you know, social media doesn’t make sense in this environment because the infrastructure isn’t there, et cetera, but this is how we approach whatever the case may be.

Commissioner Kennedy and I’ll come back to you, Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. I just wanted to share that I did attend the Statewide VAC, Voting Accessibility Advisory Committee meeting last week. And one of the takeaways from that meeting was that we need to be putting more emphasis on producing plain language material.

And I can share some examples of plain language explanation of election-related issues. But I did take the point and I wanted to share that. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I think it could be
made much more clear in, then, these qualifications that there is an opportunity to explain why you’re not addressing certain portions of the plan components. Because definitely, in every single component bidder shall describe, bidder shall describe, and then it lays into detail what they shall describe. And if you don’t -- if you’re not going to do said thing, it’s not clear that that is also an acceptable response to your outreach plan component. So, I think that needs to be made more clear.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

Any other comments on this section?

Okay, moving along to -- I think background is pretty straight forward. Are there any comments on that section?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Background was on language access and I think the next section is on the project budget.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you. Did we fix that? Let’s see here. So, we have language access and communications, and then we have the project budget. I mean I’m not quite sure why that part’s bold, but I won’t worry about it.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think the bold kind of
throws it off, yes.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I took a moment to look at that too, yes.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay. Project budget.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I saw Director Kaplan raise her hand and I don’t know if she wanted to address something first.

I’m sorry, can you just flag the bolding, the question about the bolding so I can circle --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: The word “background”.

It’s under A.

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Oh, okay.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah.

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: On the project budget it says, the fourth bullet down says: At least 10 percent of the funds should be specified for local community-based organizations and small businesses to provide accessibility tools. And then, below are examples of unallowable costs and it says: Equipment, including computers. And that seems to contradict each other.

And I would also -- so that seems to contradict
each other. And then, my second question would be why
would we say no equipment, since technology and equipment
are so critical in this whole process? And, you know, it
seems not to make sense. It doesn’t make sense to me that
we would say no equipment.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: So, the distinction
between those two one said access to, which is not the same
thing as computers. So, the 10 percent that you’re
referring to is not saying you can purchase computers, it’s
to facilitate access.

And the other is not capital purchases,
basically, is really what no computers are. So, do we --
is that what we really want is for these resources to be
spent to purchase equipment? No. Especially not a short-
term project like this. Because the computers would belong
to the state. So, I mean that’s a whole ‘nother -- that’s
just sort of my reaction to that but -- Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So, I guess I need clarity
on would they belong to the state. And second I know --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Uh-hum.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay, so they would belong
to the state. So, they could go that they’re donated to
libraries and such that are state libraries.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Is that what we want to do
with the resources is facilitate libraries getting
computers?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, what I wanted to just bring up is that in my conversations that there are certain technology pieces like, you know, in talking to libraries some of them have projectors and are able to show the communities -- you know, our meetings, and others wouldn’t, and that would be one expense that they would have. Others, you know, we heard from Statewide Database that if someone were going to be at a spot, you know, that some places do need a special computer for the COI.

So, I just, I guess I would feel better, and this is just me, if we said no more than X could be spent on equipment. Because it could be i-Pads are being bought to be able to do the -- tablets are being bought to do stuff, if they’re thinking creatively.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez, then Andersen.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I want to echo these sentiments. I’m thinking if you’re hiring organizers, even part-time, temporary, six-month staff organizers, you know, you may be needing to equip them with cell phones to do phone banking. Again, if you’re thinking creatively, you get organizers to take an i-Pad door to door and walk someone through the COI Tool, because that is the way to
reach them. And you help them submit a map right there on the doorstep.

Like I think there’s -- I think technology, we have seen in this pandemic that access to technology is a huge, huge gap for underserved communities. And we don’t -- for us to not empower our subcontractors to meet this need, which is a technology need clearly across the state, I think -- I think we haven’t thought about how technology access gaps are going to limit participation in our process. So, I feel the same as Commissioner Sinay that I think we need to think critically about how to achieve this, given the constraints of the state.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. This is an issue, absolutely. But I think there are other requirements. Remember, the Legislature is actually tasked with providing access for the public to the Commission, to provide input in mapping. And that’s part of what the Statewide Database was, I believe, getting -- being asked to provide public access areas and centers, which could indeed house a lot of this information.

I understand there is the issue of, you know, that quick, like Commissioner Vazquez was just mentioned, you know, the -- which was used in the Census, was the i-Pad getting access. That was very successful with the
I’m just wondering if there are rules about equipment in the money that was actually targeted for these granting purposes that may allow for a portion of that or may actually restrict it, which I think we need to look into that before we can actually -- although, we understand there’s a need for it, we may be restricted about that.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah, I’d like to offer a comment there, too. I don’t disagree with Commissioner Sinay or Vazquez. However, I feel like these resources should not be utilized for equipment. I think what we’ve talked about a lot, month over month, has been technology analog really being one of the biggest differentiators. That technology -- we’ve moved to a technology-based communication in the last year. And lots of resources have been deployed throughout the state to address this by school districts, and others, to make sure that communities who have suffered in the technology gap -- I’m not saying they’ve reached a hundred percent saturation. They have not. But there has been resources deployed because we moved to having to do school online, and all kinds of things online that communities have not been able to do prior to 2020.

And at the same time, what we’ve argued here repeatedly is everyone’s focused on technology and the
areas that we really want to reach are areas oftentimes who have no access to technology at all. And so, investing in technology from a capital stand point seems contrary to that.

And then, finally, I think the reality is that where we are in this process and the timing, this is going to -- these are not going to be people who apply for this project who aren’t ready. This is just the topic and the subject matter alone, the ones who are going to have to lead this are going to have to have a certain degree of readiness. And I think even in their partnerships they’re going to choose organizations that they’ve been working with, that they know are ready to deploy. There’s not a huge learning curve or long runway for these resources. That’s just the reality.

So, I think if we’re looking at this through the lens of organizations that are ready, if you have to build infrastructure, if you’re -- that’s just, to me, not ready. And every opportunity everyone’s not ready for, and that’s okay, too. But we’ll move another group closer to readiness the next time.

So, we’re not going to solve every problem with this small amount of money when we need to get the word out. So, that’s just what I wanted to add to that conversation, as well.
Commissioner Kennedy and Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. Yeah, I’m moved at least to some extent by Commissioner Vazquez’s earlier comment. I’m wondering if we could just move the consideration of equipment purpose to the evaluation process and look at it through a value-for-money lens. You know, if we had two proposals and, you know, the main different was one wanted to spend money on equipment and one wanted to spend money on, you know, other ways of generating outreach we could still look at, you know, which one was going to give us better value for money. And make that decision there, giving some more leeway to the groups, rather than just from the get go saying, no, you can’t buy computer equipment. So, you know, I’m thinking maybe there’s another option here.

And second of all, in that line once we receive these proposals are we able to negotiate, as we have with some of our other contracts? Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez, then Turner.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I just -- I don’t think the state has made nearly enough technology inroads that one would think, or certainly hope. And again, especially for we’re talking about hard-to-reach communities. This is where shoe leather and old-fashioned
organizing really, really matters. And again, that door-to-door, that in-person -- that physically distanced, but still in-person connection and communication that people have, that organizers have with these hard-to-reach communities can be, I believe -- I think a proposal could absolutely be enhanced by the use of equipment.

They have traditionally -- the shoe leather is to activate and get people to go, to leave their homes and go vote, or go submit their ballot, you know, mail in their ballot. And the outcome that we want to see is for people to either show up at a meeting and/or submit their maps.

And I don’t think the sort of access that is currently being planned on for the community -- for the mapping tool via libraries is sufficient in a country where we’re still emerging from a pandemic. And I think that we have to acknowledge that people are going to be restricted in their movements and, therefore, then this technology piece has to be, I think, part of the in-person organizing strategy.

And so, yes, agree that there’s going to be a certain level of readiness for some organizations and, at the same time, many of these organizations have been doing this sort of door knocking, physically distanced, in-person engagement without -- with an ask that is not directly tied to technology. And if our ask is submit a map, for me
hard-to-reach communities, if you have organizers, again, armed with i-Pads, or what have you, to be able to walk each household through a community mapping exercise in 20, 30 minutes for me that feels like -- I would like to hear that proposal because that -- again, I could also envision a proposal where they’re then only realistically able to like reach X number of households in this region, and that might not -- like that might not work. But I want to hear about those proposals where they’re -- if given X amount of money, and the ability to like purchase, you know, 20 i-Pads for 20 organizers, we could actually move the needle in this particular community, I’d like to hear that proposal.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I almost want to just stand down and say yes to exactly what Commissioner Vazquez said. I want to add, though, as -- because I think it’s so -- I’m wondering if there are opportunities still to lease tablets and utilize them, if the purchase is what the sticky point is, number one.

But as far as being able to lease tablets, being able to purchase hot spots and things, I think it’s really important that there is the opportunity for people to engage at that level.

And then, Commissioner Kennedy, when you talked
about being able to weigh at the end, again I would love
the opportunity for the proposals to be submitted so that
we can see if, indeed, trying to balance out language
access if -- into some of these areas we are able to go,
and utilize, spend money for tablets would allow us to
reach certain languages that could not be or was not
submitted in a different proposal might have us ultimately
make a different decision if it means we’re going to reach
a particular segment of our community that we would not
reach without, you know, achieving their feedback as a
result of spending the money on tablets.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah, I’d just add to that
that I don’t disagree that tablets can facilitate a
particular process. I guess my lens still remains more
from a readiness stand point. The groups on the ground,
shoe leather, these people do this work, they’ve been doing
it, and they have the tools they need, usually, to do it.

And so, to assume that they aren’t able to do
their work because they don’t have a tablet, or they can’t
distribute tablets to whomever it is they want to
distribute tablets to I think is a broad assumption in many
ways. Because the individuals who are ready to do this
work do it. Like they’re doing it currently. And I don’t
think whether it goes done or doesn’t get done is whether
we pay for tablets and cells phones.
Commissioner Akutagawa and Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Two things. One, I’d like to ask, perhaps Director Hernandez, if there is -- and I think this might have been asked earlier, but I don’t know if we need to find out if we are disallowed or not allowed from including equipment purchases? I think, you know, this may clarify whether or not this is a conversation that we need to continue to entertain. I think that’s going to tell us one way or the other.

The other thing, too, I do want to just note, Commissioner Vazquez, I’m with Commissioner Le Mons. I agree with everything that you’re saying in terms of technology access. But I also want to note, you know, having been part of the Zone G conversations with Commissioner Andersen, there’s some things that I think technology is not going to solve. There are people in certain hard-to-reach regions of California that do not want to be contacted by technology, do not want somebody to come knocking at their door. And in fact, you’re probably putting yourself in danger if you do, do that. They’re out in certain regions for a very distinct reason and they do not want to engage.

However, I think those are then the kind of, you know, things that we also need to understand that, yes, broadband access in certain, and in a number of areas is
restricted, as well as access to technology is restricted. But I’m a little hesitant to just say, well, you know, if we just arm people with i-Pads and, you know, put them out into, you know, the streets and walk between regions or between, you know, homes to homes, I don’t know if that’s going to be the sole purpose.

What I’m understanding, though, from what you’re saying is that you’d like to see at least the proposal for those that may want to use technology, and I think that’s why I think it would just be helpful for us to know whether or not that’s even allowable. Because I know that there’s some very distinct rules, I think, around contracting and use of state funds. And so that’s why, you know, I would just propose that perhaps we just table this part of the conversation and allow the staff to find out whether or not that’s something that we can even do, because it could end up becoming a moot point.

But I do also want to just remind people that in certain regions, yeah, shoe leather may work, but in other cases there may have to be other ways in which we want to ensure that people are reached. And it may not only be through technology, and again through face-to-face contact. So, just want to acknowledge that, too. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen?

Oh, I thought I saw your hand a few moments ago. Anyone
else with comments on this particular aspect of the conversation? Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I’d just -- not on this, but I mean I don’t know if --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I still feel, you know, I still would like to see some money going to technology, but I understand both sides. And I like that -- I appreciate -- I don’t like. But I appreciate that we are saying, hey, we’re going to fund organizations that are already ready, and are larger and stuff, and that is a bias. And I think it’s important to acknowledge that we didn’t go in with that idea, but because of the urgency to get the funding out that’s where we are. And we all -- we’ll take some time, I hate to this, but to mourn kind of the project we had in our mind to what the reality is now.

And so, Commissioner Akutagawa, and Commissioner Le Mons, and staff I know you’ve gone through the hard process of mourning -- you know, just it getting cut, and cut, and cut, and you’ve been able to mourn it through the last few months. While for a lot of us it’s still fresh. And so, thank you for giving us that space to be able to discuss our frustrations, thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: I wanted us to stay on other examples of unallowable costs, the third one where it says: Expenses or staff time related to policy advocacy. I think what we mean there, policy can be exactly what we’re doing. And so, I’m think that what was meant by policy advocates, because we are asking people to advocate and advocacy is okay for nonprofits. Lobbying is not.

I just wanted clarify if what was meant by policy advocacy was things outside of redistricting, and if we just wanted to be more clear in that way?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Chair?

CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons. I just wanted to circle back to see where we are with this conversation and what else the subcommittee needs. Do you all have intentions of bringing this back with recommended edits, or would you like to have a motion on the floor to make those edits and continue to move forward with the contract? So, I think we just need clarity on what those next steps look like for you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I think there’s a couple of them in my mind that do require a very specific motion. That I think there was a couple germane points. And then, we haven’t had a chance to really talk about it, Commissioner Akutagawa, to know what your thoughts are.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I would say it’s
more the latter so that we could keep this moving. Our hope is that, as Commissioner Le Mons said at the very, very beginning, major substantive changes is going to require another review by OLS and that means that we’re looking at a further delay.

I think, you know, we definitely heard the feedback from everybody and I think the smaller edits will be easier to move forward on. But to Commissioner Le Mons’ point I think getting clarity on the couple points that he mentioned, so --

It looks like Commissioner Toledo has his hand up.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I just had a question for -- I think it’s for legal at this point. You know, our constitutional provisions and statutes state pretty clearly that Commissioners and staff of the Commission are not able to accept -- are not able to communicate on redistricting matters, line drawing out side of public meetings. And so, I’m just curious how that impacts our outreach and education because what I’ve been hearing is Commissioners talking about these outreach staff of the Commission, or outreach workers, I’ll just say that, helping individuals submit their COI data, helping them through the process. So, I’m just curious in terms of the distinction between receiving and accepting that information, talking about
that as opposed to facilitating just the submission
process, and how we make it clear that these individuals
wouldn’t be having conversation about redistricting matters
outside of a public -- a public meeting. Thank you.

CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Commissioner, is that
something you’d like me to opine on? Is that about the --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes, yes. I was wondering
if you or Marian can opine on this issue in terms of these
-- whether these individuals are employees of the
Commission and whether they’re submit to the requirements.
And as such, whether -- how do we modify the scope of work,
if we need to, to ensure compliance with those
constitutional provisions and state statutes pertaining to
this matter. Thank you.

CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: So, my initial thoughts, and
I’m happy to let Marian also jump in, but I would want to
make sure that we’re satisfying 8253 for this -- with this
contract. And so, to the extent we need to make sure we
have the right disclaimers or provisions for any of these
communications, they all have to be allowable
communications as provided under the law.

So, if we have to -- this entire contract is
centered around making sure that we’re adhering to the
legal requirements, so we would be doing that as applied.

For example, if we have to have a -- if, for
example, we have a public hearing for a particular outreach regarding redistricting matters, then we would pursue that, we would have that, and we would make sure that any communications that are made from these consultants or the contractors are still -- don’t violate -- don’t violate our Commission statutes.

It looks like Marian has her hand up, as well.

LEGAL COUNSEL JOHNSTON: If I could just add one point, contractors are not employees. So, contractors who assist people in, for instance, filling out the COI Tool, the COI Tool submission becomes public when it is transferred to the Commission. Any other documents submitted by email, or regular mail, or however is also made public. So, the fact that a contractor is assisting a member of the public with doing that I don’t think violates your statutes in any way.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you both. That addresses my concern, thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I’ll pass, thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Chair, how would you like us to proceed?

CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you for this very robust conversation. A lot of moving pieces, you all put a lot of
work into this contract. I think at this point it would be helpful if we can get some motions on the floor for those changes that you heard for that -- for the RFP. And then, also looking at the timeline that you all had drafted within the draft, having June 4th as the date the RFP goes live puts us in a little bit of bind of getting this RFP contract language approved by the Commission to move forward. Being that we have today and tomorrow, and then we have an as-needed meeting scheduled for next Wednesday. And we can certainly meet on that day if we need to, but that would be a day and a half prior to the launch of the RFP.

So, what does the subcommittee need in order to move this forward at this point?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: So, I think we need, at the bare minimum, a motion to consider the feedback that was given, vet -- some feedback still needs to be vetted with the OLS, to vet those items with OLS to adjust according -- this isn’t this motion. This is not eloquent at all. But to adjust accordingly and move forward, keeping with respect to the timeline that we currently have.

Unless Commissioners have any -- let me back up. I think I would do a round robin with Commissioners to see if they have -- which items they feel are germane at this
point. Because I think that there are some that certain
Commissioners are really passionate about. And then, I
think those would be the ones that would probably need to
maybe make a motion as to how we move forward, if we’re
split.

So, if you’re okay with that, Chair, that’s what
I would recommend. And then that way I don’t have to try
to do it from my memory, nor do we have to comb through all
the notes that Director Kaplan has taken throughout the
day. So, does that work for you?

CHAIR AHMAD: Yeah, that works for me. Go ahead
and start your round robin, I guess.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay, I just literally
will go through and go. Commissioner Yee, are there items
that are germane that you think we need to make sure are
included, beyond the -- you know, beyond the minor edits?

VICE CHAIR YEE: Nothing that hasn’t already been
mentioned.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think the two that I just
want to make sure that gets looked at is if we can change
the posting date to July 5th so staff has more time to
review. And if there’s a way to put some money for
technology, maybe a limited amount.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you. Commissioner
Akutagawa -- I mean, no. Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Just a couple of items to make sure they get addressed is we discussed the idea of when the proposals are due versus when they’re opened, however we want to resolve that.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Also, the word “state” is used multiple places in the documents where it should be Commission. I want to make sure that that gets caught all the way through the documents.

And then, Commissioner Sinay -- oh, actually, the item that Commissioner Sinay just brought up, additionally I want to make sure, and this is actually for legal and staff to go through, make sure that our attachments, which are not in this, also correspond directly to specifically our conflict of interests. Make sure that they are consistent with this RFP portion that we’ve looked at.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think as much as possible if we can highlight the use of the word “nonpartisan” throughout the contract, just to make that clear. I’m still concerned a little bit about impartiality, although I think the scope of work has addressed some of those
concerns and I appreciate for all of your hard work on this to the Commission. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I’m good. I believe I’ve already voiced a few things and then I’ve just got a few minor changes that I’m going to forward to Marcy, so I’m good to go.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay, Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes. I just want to agree with Commissioner Toledo, nonpartisan should be stressed throughout the verbiage of the RFP. I agree with maybe limited funding for technology. And I just think having the applications due and open on the same day is just terribly efficient. So incredibly efficient. So, that’s it, thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Not to duplicate anything that’s already been said, I’ll just reiterate the takeaway from last week’s VAC meeting the importance of producing plain language materials. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Director Kaplan, were you going to ask a question?
OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Is that a note as a direction for the contractors to include language like that, the materials that are developed during -- using plain language?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right. That would go under language and communication access, the bullet: Provide redistricting information to persons with disabilities by using braille, American Sign Language, captioning, plain language, and any other tools that would increase accessibility.

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Can you just remind me the page? I’m just noting on something else. It’s in the --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: That is on page 14.

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I have nothing additional to ask.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: With the limited funding for technology, I’m good.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Fornaciari?
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, next.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I will say thank you to everyone for this really robust conversation and appreciate all of the feedback that we received.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay, Chair?

CHAIR AHMAD: I have nothing additional to add.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay. So, with that, then I recommend that we make a motion to make the edits to the document as noted by Director Kaplan, getting clarity from and making an adjustment to a portion, a percentage of budget being able to be assigned to equipment within the confines of OLS. And moving the -- excuse me, changing the open time to day of, which I believe is January 25th -- excuse me, June 25th, not January. June 25th at 10:00 a.m. versus the 9:00 a.m. time that we have currently.

That would be the motion that I would put forward. I think that covered all of the key points.

Anybody second?

CHAIR AHMAD: I see Commissioner Fernandez as the second.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay.

CHAIR AHMAD: So, the motion on the floor is to incorporate the recommended changes by the Commission, as
noted by Director Kaplan, follow up with OLS regarding the
inclusion of technology funding, and releasing fundings for
technology, and change the date of opening the RFP to the
same date of the due date by 10:00 a.m., I believe it was.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

CHAIR AHMAD: From memory. And the motion was
made by Commissioner Le Mons, seconded by Commissioner
Fernandez. Do we have any discussion on this item at this
time, on the motion specifically on the floor?

Okay, can we move to public comment on the motion
that is on the floor.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. In order
to maximize transparency and public participation in our
process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment by
phone. To call in, dial the telephone number provided on
the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted,
enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream
feed. It is 92638886526 for this meeting. When prompted
to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound key.

Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a
queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press *9.
This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it is
your turn to speak, you will hear a message that says the
host would like you to talk and to press *6 to speak. If
you would like to give your name, please state and spell it
for the record. You are not required to provide your name
to give public comment.

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.

And the Commission is taking public comment on
the motion that is on the floor at this time.

We do have a caller in the queue, with their hand
raised. Go ahead, the floor is yours.

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

I wanted just to echo our comments regarding
kudos for the robustness of the discussion that you’ve been
having on the grant program. When I heard the motion, I
just did want to clarify an issue that had been discussed a
little earlier. We don’t think it will be helpful to put
in a explicit restriction on funding going to organizations
which also lobby. Lobbying has a very distinctive meaning
under the Internal Revenue Code. And if you are a
nonpartisan, nonprofit organization and you’re a 501(c)(3)
you are allowed to do very, very limited lobbying. So, we
would not want the money restricted, kept from groups that
do lobbying. We recommend that if there is a prohibition it be that none of the money, none of the grant money can be used for lobbying as set forth in the Internal Revenue Code.

And, you know, I think there’s lots of examples from grant letters from foundations as to what that language would look like, again saying that none of the money can be used for lobbying. You know, some organizations do have partner 501(c)(4)’s that do their lobbying, so they don’t do it through their (c)(3)’s.

AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 30 seconds.

MS. GOLD: But you can do very limited lobbying through your (c)(3)’s and we wouldn’t want to keep those organizations from getting the money, as long as they don’t use the money for lobbying. And thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And thank you. And I would like to remind those calling in to press *9 to raise their hand if they wish to make a comment on the motion that is on the floor.

And there is a raised hand. I did see Ms. Kaplan’s hand go up.

CHAIR AHMAD: Marcy, do you want -- do you have something to address us?

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: I just want to clarify the language in the RFP, the examples of unallowable costs
are costs for the contract, so that’s where the expense are staff related. Policy, or advocacy, or lobbying is related to the expenses of the contract, not limiting an organizations that does lobbying.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Okay and we will move on to our next caller. Go ahead, the floor is yours.

MS. WEST-LUSK: Hello. This is Renee Westa-Lusk. I just don’t understand how this outreach effort, going through I guess groups that apply for the grant money, includes going door to door with technological equipment that is supplied by the CRC. I mean you talk about hard to reach, but there are so many rural parts of the state that are extremely hard to reach and they would probably love to have someone come to their door and help them with -- you know, figure out the COI Tool, and print a map, or whatever, do a community of interest map. And I just don’t see how just giving certain parts of California this equipment advantage, and extra training, and all that, and the door-to-door service is really fair to the other areas that won’t qualify for any of this help.

That’s my comment. Thank you for listening.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. And that is all our public comment at this time.

CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Katy. Alvaro, are you ready to call roll for the vote?
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Just about. I want to make sure I have the motion correct. It was very lengthy. One second, let me share the screen.

CHAIR AHMAD: While you do that, I see Commissioner Akutagawa’s hand up.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I think I -- I just wanted to clarify just what the last commenter was asking about. Just for clarification, if I’m understanding it correctly, it sounds like she’s not understanding, you know, about I guess going door to door sounding like it may be limited to certain parts of California. I don’t believe that that’s what we were discussing. It was more specifically about whether or not, you know, technology, the purchase of technology for the purposes of door-to-door outreach should be allowable under the contracts or the provisions of the contracts which would disburse the funds. If and how, you know, each successful bidder would go about taking part in outreach and reaching hard-to-reach populations, which does include rural communities, that’s going to be based on, hopefully, the expertise of each of the bidders who are going to successfully win each contract. Whether they choose to use technology or do it in other ways, that’s going to be, again, up to each of the successful bidders.

I also want to just note that what I said about
Jungee (phonetic), which is a rural community in Eastern California, we have been told that, yes, some people would love to see people go door to door, but there are also as many people who would prefer not to have somebody come to their door and knock on their door.

So, I just wanted to note that there is -- as there is in California all across the state, there is quite a bit of diversity where it comes to rural communities as well, too. So, just making that note about that. So, thank you.

CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you. We are ready for the vote, Alvaro.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Okay, so I’ll read the motion once again. The motion to the edits to the outreach RFP as noted by Director Kaplan. Follow up with OLS for releasing funds for technology equipment and changing the opening of proposal time of day of June 25th -- or to June 25th at 10:00 a.m. Is that correct?

CHAIR AHMAD: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Okay.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Chair, there was one distinction, as I’m reading this. It isn’t just the follow up with OLS, but it’s follow up and incorporate. So, yeah, follow up with OLS and incorporate releasing funds for technology, if permitted.
CHAIR AHMAD: Great, thank you for that clarification.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Okay, we’ll begin the vote.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Alvaro, can you just -- I’m sorry, the last part of your motion, can you move today to June -- just remove today. Oh, thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Also, could you fix that the way Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: The follow-up part?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, the follow-up part that Commissioner Le Mons said. It’s follow up with OLS and incorporate, you know, for releasing funds and incorporate -- not incorporating with OLS.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: We need to delete “for”.

Incorporate releasing funds. So, it should not be “incorporating for”, it should just be incorporate releasing funds.

And since we’re on that can I just note that equipment, there should not be that extra “e” after “p”. And opening should be one “n”. Thank you.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I’m
definitely exposing my weakness here.

Okay, once again I’ll read off the motion. Motion to make the edits to the outreach RFP as noted by Director Kaplan, follow up with OLS and incorporate releasing funds for technology equipment and changing the opening of proposal time to June 25th, at 10:00 a.m.

Okay, we’ll begin the vote. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fornaciari?

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 Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Abstain.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Abstain.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Yee?

VICE CHAIR YEE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Ahmad?

CHAIR AHMAD: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: This is a special vote.

CHAIR AHMAD: Anthony, I’m forgetting my training already, is this a special vote?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: It is a special
vote.

CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: It is because it’s for the
decision for contracting decisions.

CHAIR AHMAD: Got it.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: So, the motion
fails.

CHAIR AHMAD: All right. I am not sure where to
move from here. Perhaps -- we have about -- yikes, we have
lunch at 12:45. So, we can either continue this
conversation to see where our sticking points are and where
we can come to a compromise, or we can table this and jump
into the next item and come back to this item at a later
point in our meeting. Do we have recommendations?

Yes, Commissioner Yee?

VICE CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Sadhwani expects to
be back after 3:00, if that makes a difference.

CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Well, I guess maybe we
should talk to Commissioner Turner and Vazquez to find out
what the sticking point is from their perspective.

CHAIR AHMAD: I see Commissioner Vazquez, you
have your hand up.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I think I need more
clarity about if there’s a timeline, a quick timeline, even
a 24-hour timeline in terms of just checking with the
powers that be about what language can actually be included in this type of contract related to technology, and what those parameters would be specifically. Because then, I feel like I could have like a real discussion as to whether or not we include that in this RFP.

My problem is that I don’t -- we’re having two different -- I felt like we were having two different conversations. One, do we include this or not, which is I think the more important conversation. And we were also having a conversation about can we do this or not. And so, I feel like we should just text to see if we can in terms of like what those -- like I would like to know exactly what those parameters are and then I feel like we could have an actual discussion about whether or not we should include it in the RFP. Then I don’t feel like we are having two distinct discussions.

CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Le Mons and then Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Well, my understanding was that we were determining if we could, and if we could we were incorporating it. That’s what we voted to do. So, that wasn’t an outstanding item.

CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: That was my understanding as well.
CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Did we talk about a percentage? If we’re allowed, you know, what portion?

CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you for the invitation, Commissioner Le Mons. I don’t have a sticking point. I appreciate all of the discussion and will continue to abstain.

CHAIR AHMAD: Yes Marcy?

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: I do want to highlight that the way the RFP written it does allow for 10 percent of funds on technology. Then, just clarity around the equipment purchases versus other ways to utilize equipment. So, whether it is through leasing, as was discussed or --

CHAIR AHMAD: I see Commissioner Vazquez and then Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, thank you for the clarity. I guess it was not clear to me that it would for sure be included. My understanding of the motion was that we were going -- we would check and then some decision would be made at the subcommittee level, and/or with staff, as to what and how to include around technology, and that did not seem sufficient to me.

So, if we go back and hear, yes, we can include this piece with these parameters and we’ll include it, I
mean personally I would like to actually see what that language looks like before approving the RFP, but I also trust my fellow Commissioners in that if they don’t feel like they need to review that particular language before approving the RFP, then I could approve this motion with that in mind.

CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Le Mons and then Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Well, I was just curious on the vote because we have one absent Democrat, we have two abstaining. How many do we need to pass. This is a clarity question on actual votes. Three?

LEGAL COUNSEL JOHNSTON: Three from each group.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: And if Commissioner Turner is not going to vote, then we’re -- this is just sort of a moot point.

CHAIR AHMAD: Three total.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Three total. Who are --

CHAIR AHMAD: Three total Democrats would need to vote yes.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Ah, three. Okay, so we could seriously have two, but it’s not -- I mean it’s kind of unfair to Commissioner Sadhwani who was not here for any of the discussion like -- I don’t know. Yeah, I’m really frustrated I guess at this point. Maybe we shouldn’t have
proceeded with the discussion without having Commissioner Sadhwani present. And I thought part of what we -- why we moved J to the beginning was so that we were allowing for presence because of this potential issue. So, anyway.

CHAIR AHMAD: So, we are right up against our mandatory required break, which is lunch. So, I have noted down Commissioner Fernandez, Kennedy, and then Andersen, but we will be taking a break right now and meeting back up here at 1:45. I would like to remind folks that we do have a time-certain presentation today at 2:00 p.m., so we have 15 minutes when we get back to continue this conversation and, hopefully, come to a resolution on this item.

See you all at 1:45.

(Off the record at 12:45 p.m.)

(On the record at 1:45 p.m.)

CHAIR AHMAD: All right, welcome back from lunch. I just have a few administrative updates for everyone before we jump back in. We will actually be going into closed session today at 3:30 to address data and cybersecurity issues. Ahead of that we have our 2:00 p.m. presentation by the Statewide Database.

So, we have about 15 minutes to continue that conversation regarding Item 9-J, the grant -- the contract RFP language. And I had Commissioner Fernandez, Kennedy, and Andersen in the queue.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. Let’s see, is Commissioner Vazquez on? But it was my understanding that if we reworded the motion, I believe she would be in favor of it. She just wanted to make sure that it explicitly stated that if we did find out that we could -- I guess if the contract could include equipment that we would therefore change the RFP to reflect that.

So, I’m thinking that what we would do is if we could -- if it could include computers, that we would just get rid of that last bullet on page 15, under examples of unallowable costs, we would just remove equipment purchases including computers. But Commissioner Vazquez is not on right now.

CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Kennedy and then Andersen.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. My recollection is that Commissioner Vazquez wanted to know pretty much exactly what language could go in there. So, my proposal would be to table the motion, tomorrow to reconsider. So, a motion to reconsider, tabled tomorrow, would both give us an opportunity to have an answer regarding the technology purchases question, as well as give Commissioner Sadhwani time to review the video of the discussion. So, that’s my proposed way forward. Thank you.
CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner -- I see Marian’s hand up, and then Andersen and Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I just, Commissioner Sadhwani said she would be absent tomorrow or a large portion of tomorrow also.

CHAIR AHMAD: She -- Commissioner Sadhwani did say she would be back by 3:00 p.m. tomorrow, so if we push this to the later half of tomorrow we could potentially have enough folks for the vote.

Commissioner Andersen and then Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I’m not going to speak for Commissioner Vasquez, although it was my understanding as long as it had the right words -- she thought it was precluded. And what Ms. Kaplan has said, at least 10 percent of the funds being, you know, access to computer and internet that could indeed be part of the money. And if that is indeed what we found out from counsel that that is indeed allowable, I would certainly be okay with that amount being about 10 percent.

I don’t believe that you can scratch equipment purchases, including computers. You might just have to say eliminate including computers, because I believe there is a contract requirement about that. But that is what I’d like to get from counsel. Thank you.

CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner --
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And I like -- sorry, I like Commissioner Kennedy’s idea, if we have to. Although, I do believe, you know, there are five Democrats, five Republicans, and we have one abstain and one absent so --

CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Akutagawa and then we shall wrap up this conversation for now.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I do want to just let you all know that I did have a conversation with Director Hernandez and Chair Ahmad that I think is -- I don’t know if this would just -- if we could just continue on this, I know that we have scheduled a presentation or discussion time, but I do want to tell you, or maybe perhaps Director Hernandez could speak to the questions that are open, and have generated the most conversations. That way, then we know. And while the conversation’s still fresh, I feel like we can at least address those right now.

CHAIR AHMAD: Sure, just want to uplift that we won’t be able to take a vote now or right -- or, actually, we do have enough people to vote. Sorry about that.

Go ahead, Alvaro.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: So, we did some additional checking and Raul confirmed that the contract does allow for purchasing of technology equipment, PCs. Just wanted to uplift that it may not be the best use of time or of our resources, state resources, purchasing of
PCs. But that would mean the question, the answer is, yes, they can purchase equipment.

We also have laptops available here that we could, you know, loan out, so there may be some work-arounds as well, but that question answered.

In regards to the timing and the time frame, depending on when we have it approved, this project was based on approval of the RFP on June 2nd. So, if it were to be approved prior to that, then obviously we’ll be able to adjust those time frames accordingly.

CHAIR AHMAD: Great, thank you. So, for right now I would like to put a pause on this specific item and come back to it tomorrow. That way, we can give some of our colleagues a little bit more time to catch up on this, and then we can take the vote up again on the RFP. But as of right now, just to be very clear, the vote did not pass, therefore there’s no direction given to staff right now in terms of moving this item forward.

So, with that we have about eight minutes. I’m going to be optimistic here and check in with Agenda Item 9-A, the Government Affairs Subcommittee, if you all have your report out ready.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I can be quick. I’m not sure if we can do it in eight minutes, given that we have two policies to review.
CHAIR AHMAD: Okay. Is it okay --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I’m happy to give the overview and if -- I just don’t know if we’d have enough time for conversation, if there is any.

CHAIR AHMAD: Sure. Sure. And if it’s okay, Commissioner Toledo, can I skip over to a subcommittee that may be able to report out within the time?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Certainly. Certainly, thank you.

CHAIR AHMAD: Okay, great. Finance and Administration, do you all have something short?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: We have an item to vote on, too.

CHAIR AHMAD: Great. GANTT Chart?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: No further work has been done on the GANTT Chart at this point.

CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you for your report out.

VRA compliance?

VICE CHAIR YEE: Nothing new at this time.

CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you. Outreach and Engagement, do you all have a quick report out or do you all have something substantial?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: We have a motion.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We have a motion.

CHAIR AHMAD: Okay. And then, Language Access, I
know you all are tied into the meeting schedule calendar,
if I’m --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, not really. We
could discuss it. I don’t know if Commissioner Akutagawa
-- I think we can discuss whatever changes we have, which
we didn’t have any changes for language access. It was
more of moving some of the dates around. But I believe we
were going to discuss that during either Agenda Item 11, or
14, because that’s more of a scheduling, not a language
access.

CHAIR AHMAD: Okay, so does --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But we don’t have
anything else for Language Access.

CHAIR AHMAD: Great. I’m crossing that off.

Materials Development, that’s Commissioner
Fernandez and Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: We have the paper-based
Communities of Interest Tool form that has been distributed
as a handout.

CHAIR AHMAD: You all have it?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. And at this
point I think what we were thinking is we’re going to hand
it off to I believe the Communications. Right,
Commissioner Kennedy? Because we’re pretty much done with
it, we’re getting ready for public input meeting, we need
to start sending those out and getting them translated.

    COMMISSIONER KENNEDY:  Right.

    COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ:  So, kind of more of an
FYI for everyone.

    CHAIR AHMAD:  And is that to -- you said is to the Communications Team, so Fredy and team?

    COMMISSIONER KENNEDY:  Right.

    CHAIR AHMAD:  Okay. And you all don’t need a vote or a motion on any item at this point?

    COMMISSIONER KENNEDY:  I don’t believe we would.

    CHAIR AHMAD:  Okay. Great.

Website Subcommittee, Commissioners Kennedy and Taylor.

    COMMISSIONER KENNEDY:  Well, this I guess can tie into the communities of interest form. One of the questions that we have at this point, and Commissioner Taylor and I have exchanged some thoughts on the website, and one question that we have is are we making our recommendations to the Commission or are we making our recommendations to the staff?

    And Marian has said that if the Commission has delegated authority over the website to the staff, then our recommendations will be directed to staff rather than to the Commission. If I understood it correctly, Marian?

    LEGAL COUNSEL JOHNSTON:  Right. And I don’t know
if that decision has been made by the Commission.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right.

CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Kennedy, is that a decision that you would like to bring forward at this time for the Commission to consider.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay.

CHAIR AHMAD: Do you have a recommendation on the direction we should take?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: My recommendation would be that the Commission delegate authority over the website to staff and that, therefore, the Website Subcommittee’s recommendations would be directed to staff.

CHAIR AHMAD: My gut says that this a motion that is required. But given that there’s three minutes, we won’t be able to take in public comment and do all the things we need to do prior to our guests arriving at 2:00 p.m.

So, from here shall we come back to the Website Subcommittee? Okay, I’ve made a note that you all foresee coming.

Data Management. Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair, we don’t have anything just yet to report out on.

CHAIR AHMAD: Two minutes, we have.

Cybersecurity Subcommittee, Commissioners Fornaciari and
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: We don’t have anything substantial to report out at this time.

CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you. Incarcerated Population Subcommittee, that’s Commissioners Fernandez and Sinay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: We do not have anything at this point.

CHAIR AHMAD: The second Incarcerated Population Subcommittee focused on Federal Facilities, Commissioners Kennedy and Turner?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Nothing to report, other than the letter has reached Senator Padilla’s Office.

CHAIR AHMAD: Great. Lessons Learned Subcommittee, Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Our standard refrain, please keep them coming, the log continues to grow.

CHAIR AHMAD: And then, IT Recruitment Subcommittee, Commissioners Andersen and Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No, nothing.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes, nothing at this point.

CHAIR AHMAD: We just went through 11 subcommittees, woohoo. I have made a note on our list of Government Affairs we will return to for a policy review and potential action. Finance and Administrative is
expecting a motion. Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee is also expecting a motion. Website Subcommittee is also expecting a motion.

And then, now, we will turn it over to our Communities of Interest Tool Subcommittee, Commissioners Akutagawa and Kennedy for their report out.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: All right, great. I know that we will or have -- yes, thank you, we have been joined by our contacts at the Statewide Database. Before I introduce them to discuss the access centers, redistricting access centers, I do want to give an additional, an additional very quick, brief update from a Communities of Interest Tool perspective.

One is around the Communities of Interest Tool, specifically around requests for help. We have noticed that there were a couple comments centered around the Communities of Interest Tool and the need for help, live help specifically. I know that at least one comment said that they had tried to request help and had some problems. We did share that -- actually, I take that back. We had two comments around the need for help and we did share that with the Statewide Database folks. And they have noted that they have addressed those. There was one that was also sent back to us in the comment letters.

I do just want to just generally say to anybody
looking to use the Statewide Database, the Communities of
Interest Tool, if at all possible we find that the
Statewide Database is very responsive, and that we want to
encourage you to access them for live help. And they have
both -- they have help both during the day, but also into
the late evening as well, too. So, if you are using the
tool after work, and after dinner, and after you get your
kids settled it is possible to get some help there as well, too.

We also believe that they are best positioned to
provide the help. However, we do recognize that, you know,
maybe there is some difficulty in reaching them. And that
if you do need to, you can utilize us, the Commission, as a
secondary or backup point. And what we’ll do is we’ll make
sure, then, that we forward the requests or the need for
assistance to the Statewide Database.

The other thing that I want to also just note on
the Communities of Interest Tool is that we’ve been
receiving now weekly updates on the use of the tool. And
we are happy to report that we are seeing that the
Communities of Interest Tool is growing. We saw it was
first -- from the time we started receiving updates about
roughly a month ago, first it was like 10 increases from
the previous week, and then it became 15, and then 20. And
based on the last update, we’ve had an increase of 30 new
users to the Communities of Interest Tool. So, the good news is that the trend is going up, people are using it. And we want to encourage folks to please, please keep using that Communities of Interest Tool. It’s something that we think is a unique tool that will enable us, the Commission, to be able to get input directly from you. And you can always go back in and edit it, if you feel like there is something that needed to be edited.

So, with that I want to just also next introduce -- or, actually, maybe before I do that, if I can, Commissioner Kennedy is there anything that you want to add to what I just shared, before I introduce our speakers?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: No, thank you for taking care of that.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: All right, great. I would like to introduce Karin MacDonald and Jaime Clark. They are here to speak with us about questions related to the redistricting access centers.

I know that in a meeting, I think it was maybe two, or maybe three meetings ago we did have, you know, a number of questions about the role of the redistricting access centers. And we did also ask both Karin and Jaime to come and join us so that we can all hear directly from them around the questions related to the purpose, and how the hiring is going to go, how the staff that would be
hired for that is going to be utilized, and how we can also
use it to complement the efforts of our Commission field
staff as well, too.

So, with that I’m going to turn this over to
Karin and to Jaime. Thank you for meeting us and joining
us here.

MS. MACDONALD: Thank you so much, Commissioner
Akutagawa. And hello members of the Commission. Thank you
for inviting us to be here.

Jaime has a PowerPoint that she will share that
we’re both going to use. So, that’s okay, Jaime. And if
Kristian will let you, then maybe we can share that.

Great, thank you so much.

So, this is a little bit of a bigger update,
actually, not just about the centers, the redistricting
access sites, but also about redistricting software.

And, essentially, what we would like to talk to
you about is the entire approach of providing access to
redistricting software and redistricting data that we have
worked on. And again, let me just start by saying we
really appreciate your collaboration. And thank you so
much for everything you just said about the COI Tool,
Commissioner Akutagawa. I think, you know, working
together this is going to be a really successful project.

So, okay, Jaime let’s go. Thank you. So, the
way that we have approached the access to software for redistricting has really been multifaceted. As you can see on this slide, and as you know, our first tool that you’re very familiar with is, of course, the Community of Interest Tool. It was the first Community of Interest Tool anywhere in the United States. It was, of course, not available ten years ago. And, you know, ten years ago not a lot of people thought about making, creating a tool for communities to figure out, you know, where their boundaries and let anyone know what their interests are. So, we’re pretty proud of that tool. I think it’s pretty successful at this point, as you’ve noted. And, of course, we have it available in so many languages, which is wonderful. And definitely, there is nothing even remotely similar to this tool out there.

So, the second part to this multi-pronged approach to redistricting access or software access, redistricting software access is the redistricting access centers or redistricting access sites. And this is, of course, something that came out of the last redistricting and we’ll talk about this in a little bit more detail on the next slide.

And then, also, we would like to talk to you about two additional levels of line drawing software and access to line drawing software. And I know that this is
something that many of you have been very interested in finding out about, like what were we going to do, and we’re now at the point where we would love to talk to you about it.

So, there is one, the first level, which is a desktop line drawing software that we’d like to talk to you about and show you. It is at this point called Draw My CA. And then, there is an online line drawing software piece, and we’re calling that Draw My CA Districts.

So, you see that we’re working on a theme here, Draw My CA Community, Draw My CA, and Draw My CA Districts. And these tools are very different from each other, but they also have a lot in common. And they are designed to basically provide users and participants with a pretty seamless transition and seamless experience when they want to perhaps move from the so to speak entry level of drawing their community of interest, and then they get more interested, and then they want to draw a district, actually. So, there’s a little bit of a seamless transition to that.

But let’s talk about the redistricting access centers, first. So, actually we’re talking about the Community of Interest Tool first, so sorry. So, the Community of Interest Tool of course is drawmycacommunity.org. The official launch was March 2nd,
2021. And we now have 16 languages, which is pretty incredible.

There are ongoing updates of support features, which you know. We are still actively working on the tool. It’s working very well. But you also know that somebody just recently found a little bug in there and we’re always very appreciative to anybody who let’s us know that there’s anything that’s not working. And that is, of course, what we have always done and how we also run the Statewide Database. So, this is not -- you know, us being available and open to input is nothing new to anybody who has ever worked with us.

We also, of course, set up this seamless data transmission with the -- or we are setting up the data transmission with the Commission and that is in progress right now. And as you are bringing your Data Management Team online, and you’re hiring your Data Manager, all of this will be integrated.

As of May 20, as Commissioner Akutagawa just mentioned, we have had 286 individual registered users. And we had 240 completed submissions. And there are, of course, also submissions in the pipeline that are not yet completed.

The target audience of the Community of Interest Tool is, as you know, absolutely everybody. Everybody in
the State of California. That’s why we have so many languages, we’re really trying to reach anyone who wants to participate and we’re trying to make it very easy.

And again, one more time, if you have any problems, please reach out. We have chat support and we’re very happy to help. We are trying to get as much feedback as possible from as many Californians as possible, and that is regardless of their knowledge or interest in redistricting. Anybody can participate and just say, hey, this is where my neighborhood is, let me just draw it for you.

So, this is a relatively simple task. You define your community of interest. It’s a pretty low barrier of entry. And, of course, this is all relative. Sometimes when I say it’s a low barrier of entry there’s, of course, some people that, you know, are just not familiar with computers. They have never really used line drawing software in any way. And, you know, I’m not going to sit here and say that it’s easy for everybody. There are obviously different user groups and for some people it’s going to be a little bit more difficult than for others.

And we’re really hoping that this help system that we have in the background will assist in capturing people that may, you know, not be as familiar with computers but that do want to participate, and that they
can walk them through step by step.

So, next slide please, Jaime. Thank you so much.
Now, we’re at the redistricting access centers. So, to
remind you, because I know you’ve heard about them, in 2011
we had redistricting access sites funded by foundations.
It was the James Irving Foundation. I’d written a grant to
them and we’d worked on it, and they funded six centers.
They were not fully funded, so they were actually only
staffed part time. But we did what we could with the
budget that was available. And of course, as you know, in
2011 it was a recession, the state wasn’t doing very well.
So, you know, funds for these kinds of efforts were pretty
hard to come by. So, we’re very, very grateful that the
Irvine Foundation at the time took a chance on us and
actually implemented this.

And the centers were very well received. They,
you know, had technical staff and quite a few people took
advantage of them, and also quite a few like local
organizations, neighborhood organizations, and so forth
used the centers pretty regularly and frequently.

In 2021, the state stepped in and said, hey, this
worked well. We have some money, let’s do it again. And
we had hoped to expand to more locations than the six
largest urban centers, which is where we landed last time.
And, you know, there was a little complex algorithm,
actually, that went in to figuring out where they should be. Back in the day we looked at, you know, how long do people have to drive. But I think we all know that, you know, six redistricting access sites for the entire State of California, I mean California’s just so large it’s just not going to do it.

And that’s actually, exactly the reason for why we went to this like multi-pronged system, and system of access. So, basically not just have the centers, but also have like different levels of software that people can use. And I’ll talk about this a little bit more in a second.

So, again, we had hoped to at least meet the level of service that we had last time. We were -- I mean that’s what we’re hoping now, that’s what we are doing. But we had hoped to expand to other locations, but then COVID happened.

And when COVID happened, of course everything was just thrown up in the air and we were trying to figure out what to now do. And so, we started to shift to figure out a very robust remote support system for the other tools that we were providing because we didn’t know whether we were going to open at all. And so, we didn’t know. Nobody knew. So, that’s kind of where we detoured a little bit.

But we’re still at the same level of access that we had last time with respect to the centers and we are in
roughly the same areas, also. So, we wanted to make sure
that there would not be a reduction in services if health
policies allowed and we could open.

So we have, as Commissioner Akutagawa mentioned
earlier, we have already hired some of the managers for
these sites. And the way we did that because, you know, UC
Berkeley -- and, I mean, you’re going through the same kind
of hiring issues, things just take a really long time. So,
we ended up having to hire, just to be ready to open we
have to start the hiring process pretty early. And had to,
you know, get jobs approved in the middle of a hiring
freeze, and so forth.

So, you know, we are essentially now at the point
where the managers that we have hired, they are the ones
that are providing that online support. And then, as soon
as they can they will be moving into these centers to help
people in person.

So, just to point out access versus outreach,
because I know that this has come up, these are not really
outreach centers, they are access centers. So, the primary
purpose is to provide a place to use the tools that we’re
making available. And, of course, in collaboration with
you, you are undertaking a much broader effort. You’re
doing all of this outreach and we basically are the place
where people can come and then just use the tools, and sit
down, and spend some time, think through these things and create their input no matter what that might look like.

So, we’re hoping also that we can collaborate with you moving forward, as we have been, just to let people know that these resources are available, that these centers will be open, where they are, and what’s available there and so forth.

The resources that are available in each center are essentially the same that we had last time, but with a little bonus. So, we have staff trained on redistricting processes and criteria. We have public computers that will be available there. And then, the COI Tool of course is available at the redistricting access sites. And then, we will also have line drawing software available at the sites. And, of course, we now have two different levels of line drawing software and we did not have that last time.

So, last time what we had was no COI Tool and just a desktop system. So, there were, you know, I think we had two or three computers that people could use in each site and they had desktop systems. And the level of access is just much different this time.

So, the next slide please, Jaime. So, for line drawing software, just to talk about that and kind of get away from the COI Tool and the access centers, so this is like the third level of access, really. It is a different
target audience than when you’re talking to people about the COI Tool. While it is obviously available to all Californians, I think the people that are going to take us up on actually using the line drawing software, it will be just a different, a different population that may have a little bit more knowledge about redistricting in general or more interest in redistricting. So, and there’s also people that may have a little bit more time, to be frank. You know, not everybody has the time to draw an entire district or an entire district plan.

They definitely need to know what a district is. They have to know how to draw a legally-compliant district in a perfect world and, of course, we’ll have supporting materials available to make it as easily understandable as possible. But it definitely still is a different target audience.

The scale of submissions is also going to be different. And this is just some stats, rough stats from last time just to give an idea of the takers here. So, in 2011 we had about 22,000 written submissions, so essentially no COI input and so forth. But we only had about 50 or less than 50 plans that were submitted. So, they were either partial or complete plans. And some plans, so when we say plans we basically mean a map that’s not a COI map. So, it’s a map that was generated with data
like, you know, Census data and so forth. So, that’s the different in scale. And that leads us basically to that conclusion that this is definitely a different target audience even though we’re making it easier, and a lot less expensive this time, obviously, to participate.

So, what we’re trying to do here is we try to fill the access gap. The COI Tool is basically for those that are providing, you know, neighborhoods, communities of interest, and so forth. Those are little building blocks that you can use to put your district together.

And then, there are two options for people that want to try to put those building blocks together and also use redistricting data. And please remember that in the COI Tool we’re not providing data. The COI Tool basically collects data. We’re collecting data from people about what’s going on, on the ground.

So, California, you know California has some pretty unique needs in data. Obviously, you know, we have the incarcerated folks that need to be adjusted, and we have a nonpartisan approach. And, you know, providing this software and actually making it available, having the software designed in a way that allows for these unique needs and the unique data to be provided is very important, we think.

So, it’s not a replacement, really, for private
software that’s used by redistricting professionals. So, you know, there’s not the kinds of reporting functionality, and so forth that you might look for when you’re a redistricting professional when you have, you know, multiple reports already programmed and so forth. So, this is a different level, most certainly, of software. So, this is really for everybody across the board, but not really for professionals who presumably can afford their own software.

So, go ahead Jaime. Thank you. And then there’s -- so, there’s the desktop software. So, this is our first level of line drawing software. And this again available to all, but it’s not an ideal solution for everybody because it’s a little bit more difficult.

So, the desktop software is a QGIS plug-in. QGIS is an open source software that anybody can download, and this is a plug-in that we designed specifically for California. It’s desktop software. It’s not online software. You need a -- you know, you need to have a moderate level of, you know, technology sophistication to install it. Even though we’re working on a very good and, you know, very clear user guides which, you know, I want to just say thank you to everybody who is beta testing all of our stuff. And I’m sure that perhaps some of you will also volunteer to do that, so thank you again.
There are some large data files that you have to download. So, once you have it on your computer, then you have to download data files. And, you know, just to remind you all, California has a lot of geography. We have 530,000 something Census blocks. And so, when you're downloading data it takes a minute. And it takes another minute if you have a slow internet connection. So, then you have to set it all up. And this one is not something that you just probably -- that you probably don’t do on the fly, just when you have an hour. I think this is ideal for more fixed locations like the access centers, libraries, so library computers. A college, for example, you know, community college GIS labs and so forth.

So, this is kind of an ideal package. It’s free to use. It is open source. It is designed for California and, you know, what more can you ask for? I’m starting to feel like I’m doing an infomercial, but it is pretty cool.

So, the next slide, please, Jaime. So, the features are, so again it’s called Draw My CA. It’s designed to facilitate access to California statewide redistricting process. Free to use, built on open source GIS software. You don’t need a license. You can keep it on your computer as long as you want to and no salesperson’s going to ask you to renew it. And, you know, members of the public can download it to their PC and then
use at home.

And it allows people to submit their district plans directly to you, again. So, there’s this seamless transfer that we see with the COI Tool also, where things don’t go sideways. They’re not going to go to somebody else. They basically just go to you. So that there’s no confusion and nobody, hopefully, will be standing there ever and saying I submitted something and now you don’t have it, what happened. Because there’s no third party involved. You know, it just goes to you.

So, the plug-in is available in Spanish and English. And as far as we know, this is the only software that we have found that actually has language capabilities. And again, this is a different user group. We are anticipating fewer users but hopefully, many, many, many more than we had last time and, hopefully, many, many more maps.

And I think, Jaime, with the next slide I think you’re taking over. Is that correct?

MS. CLARK: Yes.

MS. MACDONALD: Okay, I will move it over to Jaime. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Thank you, Karin. And just one moment, I’m like rearranging my screen. I’m there now.

So, we are going to provide sort of an overview
of how to use the Draw My CA tool. And also, we have a
video demonstration of the tool, itself. I’m going to sort
of jump into that now.

This slide details the overall user flow for Draw
My CA. So, users log in with the same credentials that
they use to log into the COI Tool, for example. From there
users can connect to the server or work offline. And we’ll
go into what that exactly means in an upcoming slide.

And then, users create a district plan by type.
So, you know, users say I want to create my Congressional
District, I want to create an Assembly District, or a State
Senate plan for the entire State of California.

Through the tool, of course, users create and
edit their districts. Users will be able to write comments
about their districts. And then, again, submit their data
to the Commission.

So, when users sort of log in and connect to the
server, the reason we have a log in, and for this tool
unlike the COI Tool, users will need to log in. And that
is so that users can only see their own projects that
they’re working on, whether or not they’re working at home
or on a public computer.

And additionally, users can connect offline and
connect to the server later. So, working offline would
look like, okay, I’m going to create my plan. I’m just
going to work offline and then when I’m home, or when I’m at an internet connection I can connect to the server and submit once I’m somewhere where there is an internet connection.

And additionally, when users connect to the server they can create a plan on one computer, save their work and then keep working on that plan from a different computer. So, once scenario that this could work in is if somebody goes into one of the redistricting access centers, learns how to use the program, and then maybe even gets help installing it on their laptop that maybe they have with them. Then they can, you know, work from the access site, save their work, upload it to the server, and then go home and keep working on that exact same plan from their personal computer that they have at home, should they wish to.

And I’m going to hide this. Okay. So, this is sort of a screen. You lot on or decide to work offline. And the next step in the process of creating your plan is choosing the area that you want to work with. So, you either can choose geography from their just one individual county, or they could choose a group of counties, neighboring counties, or they can work on a plan with the entire state.

The next step is based on the type of district
the user would like to work with, the ideal population is automatically calculated by the plug-in. So, users will have everything that they need to be able to draw districts that comply with the equal population criterion.

And users will either start with a blank map or with the 2011 statewide districts. So, that means, you know, starting fresh or if users want to load up the current plans, the current districts pardon me, and sort of have a really in-depth sense of okay, here’s the 2011 districts, with the 2020 data loaded into the plan. And can really see like, oh, okay, now ten years later this district is too small in terms of population and it needs to grow. Or, this district is too big in population and it needs to, you know, shed some population. So, a user can start with whatever option they prefer.

Users will have access to block level Census data. And block level geography is going to be the exact same database that the Commission is working with. So again, access to California’s official redistricting database and this table. The image this year, on the right side of the screen. The red area that’s highlighted is one Census block. And users can see all of the information, all of the Census data that is associated with that one Census block.

Again, users will be able to export and submit to
the Commission from inside the tool. Users who are
connected to the server, this is one thing you do need to
be connected to the server for, users can submit just one
district, or full district plans to the Commissioners. And
users will be able to export to their local computer that
they’re working on, their own equivalency files, and shape
files, and PDFs. This is an example of a PDF. It just
shows, you know, one district, some of the statistics
associated with the district, their district comments. And
all of this will review in the demonstration video that we
have coming up shortly. Yeah, you know, district comments
and again, just sort of an image of the district itself.

And with that, I’m going to quit sharing my
screen and hand it over to Kristian, who has a copy of our
video.

AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: All right, let me
just wait a moment and we’ll bring that up.

(Video is played)

MS. MACDONALD: Thank you, Kristian for showing
this video. And Jaime’s going to pull up the PowerPoint
again. And I just wanted to give a shout out to our
colleague, Sarah, who expertly narrated this video. And
she’s also the redistricting access center manager for
Sacramento. So, I hope all of you at some point will get
to meet Sarah in person. So, anyway, pretty excited about
this.

So, now we’re going to move on to the next level of access. So, our next redistricting access tool, number three in the lineup is Draw My CA Districts. It’s the online tool. And Sarah spells Sarah exactly like that in the chat. Sorry.

So, let me talk about the online tool just a little bit and then I’ll pass it back over to Jaime. I just wanted to remind everybody that there are some pretty unique challenges when you’re talking about redistricting access, redistricting software in California. And that is really because we’re a really big state and we have a lot of people. We have a lot of Census geography.

So, any software product has to support an incredible amount of data. And that data for an online tool, of course, has to be sent over the web. So, also to remember that we’re drawing lines using block level geography. So again, 530,000 of these. So, when you are doing something that’s strictly online, let’s say you’re drawing an entire district and you’re just adding one block, the system computes all of the 530,000 blocks to add that one or take one out. So that, of course, brings up issues of bandwidth, and we have those anyway because, obviously, there are quite a few people that don’t have access to the internet or don’t’ have access to high speed
internet. Or, you know, maybe have to pay for certain levels of use and start -- you know, not everybody has unlimited access to high speed internet, obviously.

And the other issue that this of course raises for any really online tool that anybody’s looking at is how long does this take? How long does it take for the little wheel to be spinning for everything to be computed? And some of that, you know, has to do with bandwidth, you know, just the amount of bandwidth that you have available. But, you know, it just has to do with the geographies and so forth.

And then the other issue, of course, is the number of potential users. Now, online redistricting software is still pretty new and redistricting doesn’t happen often enough that anybody can actually say that they really know what the use is going to be.

I spent quite some time throughout the decade looking at jurisdictions that were using online tools and I have to say the number of participants has always been negligible. I mean there has just not been a lot of takers.

And when you talk to people a lot of times what they tell you is that it’s just too difficult. It’s just really -- it’s a pretty high level, you know, of entry. I mean, the barrier of entry is pretty high.
And so, what we were trying to do with this online tool, with Draw My CA District, is to seamlessly go from the COI Tool to this particular tool and provide something that is already familiar to people. In fact, this tool draws a lot of its design and its functionality from the COI Tool. And it also draws in from the QGIS plug-in. So, essentially, you can think about it as the two bookends. There is the COI Tool on one end and the QGIS Tool is on the other end. So, you know, the least technical knowledge needed for the COI Tool, and then the most technical knowledge really needed for the QGIS Tool. And then, this one is nicely in the middle.

And Jaime’s going to show you a little bit about it. So, take it away Jaime. Thank you.

MS. CLARK: Sure. Thank you, Karin.

So, again Draw My CA Districts, our online redistricting tool is designed to facilitate public access to California’s statewide redistricting process. Again, just like the COI Tool it’s free to use. You don’t need a license or anything like that to be able to use this tool. We are making it as user-friendly as possible and accessible. It is, you know, as we are building out the tool it’s undergoing, you know, constant accessibility audits.

Users can submit their district plans to the
Commission from inside the tool. So, again, no need to
download and email files, or any of your testimony to the
Commission.

Just like the COI Tool, online help will be
available through the chat function in this tool. The tool
will be available in Spanish and English.

And again, as Karin mentioned, it’s going to be a
really familiar interface for users of Draw My CA
Community. So, it’s not like learning a totally brand-new
tool, there is a lot of overlap. The look and feel is
really the same and the overall functionality is similar.
With, definitely, more functionality built into this tool.

So, the user flow for this tool, Draw My CA
Districts, users can log in with, again, the same
credentials across all of the tools. Or, users can use the
tool as a guest. The difference, of course, is being able
to save your district plans in Draw My -- yeah, save the
districts plans in Draw My CA Districts, where there’s not
an opportunity to save your work and come back to it later
if you’re using it as a guest.

Just like the QGIS plug-in, users create a
district plan by type. Through the tool users can create
districts and edit their districts they’re working with.
And again at the end, when the user is happy with their
work, they can submit directly to the Redistricting
Commission.

So, and we have some animated slides here so you can see some of the functionality inside the tool. Users create districts based on the Census geography. The drawing functionality is pretty similar to that of Draw My CA Communities. The main difference is that users select the area and then commit the change, just like in the QGIS Tool.

And similar again to QGIS, in that plug-in we have a statistics table that shows each district population, voting age population and citizen voting age population breakdowns by race and ethnicity.

Again, just like in the QGIS plug-in, the data that’s associated with each of the districts is available through the statistics table. And also, users can use the statistics table to, you know, consider whether or not they’ll make certain changes. Like, okay, what if I add this area or this Census place to my district? Oh, I can see that that’s too many people, so I’m going to need to sort of reframe how I’m working with this.

And again, this data is going to be -- is going to be the official redistricting database for the State of California, the same data that the Commission will be using in its line drawing process.

Users will be able to provide written
descriptions of each of the districts that they’re working on, on a district-by-district basis. So, here’s my first district. District A I’m calling it. And my comments are I’m creating this district to keep this area and this area together, and that’s plus around that.

There’s also a section for written testimony, where users can include overall commentary on their entire redistricting plan. So, I created these Senate -- this is my Senate plan and I created my Senate districts to keep rural areas and metropolitan areas as separate as possible where I could.

And users will be able to export and submit, really similar to the COI Tool. Users can create single districts or full redistricting plans through the tool and submit that to the Commission, from inside the tool. File types available for export to the user’s local computer are the same as the COI Tool. It’s the equivalency file, which is a Census block assignment file, a shape file which is a GIS layer, and a PDF. It could be a PDF of their single district, if they’re doing one district, or a PDF of each district in their redistricting plan.

I’m going to hand it back to Karin for this one.

MS. MACDONALD: Thank you, Jaime. Thank you.

So, again just to summarize, the approach here is that there are multiple options for access. There are centers
that are offering in-person and remote support. Not all of
our remote people are going to be located in the centers.
We also have remote/remote people. So, we’re still hiring,
we’re still in the process of hiring and adding people to
the team. We’re pretty happy with where we’re at right
now.

And then, you know, QGIS can be used by people
where, you know, getting to a center might be impractical.
It’s just too far away. Or, you know, people just don’t
have time when the centers are open. So, if there is, you
know, a PC available, they have a PC, they can download
this and then they can just create their districts on their
own time. Again, the support is available irrespective of
whether you’re in the redistricting access center or not.

And then, the online tool is available anywhere
people can go online. And that may be in the center, that
may be on their computer, or for people that just want to
do a little bit more extensive work, they would probably be
using the QGIS.

The timeline. Of course, the COI Tool was, you
know, released March 2nd, 2021. The centers are going to
open depending on public health directives. But, you know,
there is obviously light at the end of the tunnel, it
appears. And then, the line drawing software, right now we
are working towards a release date at the same as the
redistricting data, the official redistricting database comes out. So, we would load it in and then release the line drawing software at the same time.

We will be using -- we will be looking for beta testers, so please let us know if you’re up for beta testing. We would really appreciate your input.

The Statewide Database’s role, as you know, is really the same as with the COI Tool. We will transfer and then just transmit the data securely to you. And we will be providing user support through our team.

And analysis and application is, of course, your job. And we will just send you the files over so you can do that job.

For future discussion there are probably a lot of things that we’ll need to talk about and we’re looking forward to it. Like things like are partial plans accepted? And, you know, what do we do about support materials for your outreach. You know, can we collaborate on that? What would you like to see from us? Is there any other way that we can help you? And what else should we talk about? I’m sure -- I mean, this was a pretty dense presentation here, so I’m sure you have a lot of thoughts and we’re happy to come back. You know where we live. And we, you know, look forward to this ongoing collaboration.

So, thank you very much. And with that, I think,
Jaime, we are on to questions. Thanks for your time. And thanks, Kristian for showing this video. And also, one more shout out to our colleague, Marinella, who helped us with the animated sides, and was the UX designer on these tools. And just wanted to say thank you to Marinella, also.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay, wow. Thank you for that. That was great to have that expanded presentation. And I want to see if any of the Commissioners have any questions, comments?

Karin, I’m hoping that you’ll also be sharing the presentation. I feel like, I know for me I feel like I need to take it and just kind of relook at it and digest it as well, too.

Okay, Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Uh-hum, Jaime and Karin, thank you for the presentation. Very interesting and exciting, I think.

You may have said this, but wondering in a couple of the applications where you’re actually supposed to log in and save, you said that we can then print out and use the information. Are you able to see what others have submitted and download -- okay, I see no. That’s what I thought. Okay, thank you.

MS. MACDONALD: Commissioner Turner, you can -- I
think that’s on your end how you want to make that
available. Statewide Database and we’re not going to make
that available. We feel like that is up to you what you
make available and how you make that available. But we’re,
of course, happy to work with you.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, and just to add to that a
little bit. Thanks Karin, and thank you Commissioner
Turner for that question.

So, for example, should the Commission make all
of the shape files available that are submitted through the
COI Tool, then a member of the public could download those
and then import all of those into their plan in QGIS. So,
QGIS is a full GIS software. And our plug-in was built
sort of with the framework of that software. But, you
know, QGIS itself is really the backbone of the software,
or of the plug-in, rather. It’s like the foundation upon
which the plug-in is resting. And because it has full GIS
capabilities users could definitely -- or members of the
public should download the shape files, should the
Commission make those publicly available, and then import
those into QGIS and use the plug-in, use those when they’re
creating their districts through the plug-in.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

CHAIR AHMAD: Oh, Commissioner Yee?

VICE CHAIR YEE: Thank you. Thank you, Jaime and
Karin. Wow, what an amazing array of tools. I have two questions, basically.

One is, you know, it’s so much functionality, wow. I mean, as we sit here and think about it, it all makes sense. But I could see how the public would be pretty overwhelmed. I mean just explaining the COI Tool, let alone these other two tools.

I’m wondering what our expectation is, optimistically, but realistically, on how these will actually get used, you know? You know, plus the access centers. You know, and as the Legislature funded these efforts, you know, what were their expectations on how much they’ll be used and in what form, and in what fashion. So, that was the first question.

The question is, well, how about us, then, as Commissioners, you know? As we get into the drafting phase and so on I mean are these tools that we should be good at, you know, and really learn for ourselves? Are there other tools you expect us to be using at that point or is it really option for us as Commissioners because you guys will be doing the line drawing, you know? What would be a good expectation for ourselves in regards to these tools?

MS. MACDONALD: Yeah, thank you for those questions and maybe I’ll take the second question first, if that’s okay. So, just to be clear, Statewide Database will
not be line drawing. And I think that with respect to what you should be learning or what do you want to learn, I think perhaps a conversation with our counsel might be in order on that, you know.

But these are public tools and that’s the way they’ve been designed. And really, I’m just going to pitch this one more time, if anybody here in this group would like to beta test that will be fantastic. We would love your collaboration and see your -- you know, get your feedback.

With respect to the first question, it is definitely not for everybody. And, you know, GIS software is not the easiest. I mean, you know, even just thinking about Jaime and I were formatting the PowerPoint earlier, you know, and there were a couple of page numbers missing. I mean, I think we’ve all been there. You know, software and doing anything with any kind of sophisticated software, it takes a little time to come up to speed.

But having said that, Jaime and I have spent over two years looking at software packages that are out there. And looked at line drawing software. We looked at just anything that we could get our hands on and tried to figure out what’s easy and what’s not.

And, of course, everybody says that it’s easy, but it isn’t. And let’s not fool ourselves. I mean it
isn’t easy. But what we found is that most of the redistricting software, in particular that’s out there, is very much geared to the most frequent users, which are people that are, you know, drawing political districts. So, that goes again toward that whole like California is unique because we have different criteria. We do things differently than most people, right.

So, that was one thing that was like why are all these functionalities in there? Why are we constantly looking at, what is it, donkeys and -- was it donkeys and elephants? Anyway, various, various animals on there. And, you know, while that’s kind of cute, it’s just not how we draw lines.

So, we looked at why are there all these bells and whistles if they’re not applicable to California? Why are there, you know, all these compactness measures in there if the California -- when the California Constitution is very specific about what compactness measure -- what the compactness measure is for California. And that compactness measure is not in there.

So, what we set out to do, once we started with the COI Tool, was essentially to make things as easy as possible by not adding things that people don’t need. So, there is not as much functionality in there as you will see with other software. And that is specifically geared or
designed that way because we don’t want to confuse people. We feel like if we provide the essentials and we provide those essentials well, we will be able to get more people to use these tools and get more people to participate.

With respect to the level, you know, like the user -- like how many users are going to be using the -- or utilizing the redistricting access site, I don’t know that there was a specific expectation. I think our expectation -- our expectations, at Statewide Database, was that we would be able to meet the same level of access. So, we looked more at it from the access perspective to just make it possible for people to participate, if they want to.

And, you know, the Legislature was incredibly open to our suggestions. And in fact, you know, when the funds were transferred to Statewide Database it was before COVID so we had, you know, higher expectations of perhaps more sites. And, you know, we basically just said, hey, if we get a good Commission and we get people that really do, you know, help us, and collaborate with us, and do outreach, then we will get more people to go to these sites.

And then, of course, with COVID and so forth it just turned into a little bit of a broader project by saying, okay, well, if we never are able to open these sites then, you know, how do we catch people? What do we
do?

And, you know, the online tool versus the QGIS tool came in at that point where we said, okay, the online tool is going to be the easiest, quote/unquote, to use while still not super easy because it’s still GIS software and it has to be learned. But QGIS is for more sophisticated users that perhaps want to spend more time, have more time, and want to do more complicated things and perhaps submit more than one district, more than one plan.

So, I’m sorry, Commissioner Yee, I don’t really have any numbers for you of expectations. I think my expectation would be to make it as easy as possible in this very complicated field to open the door to anybody who wants to participate and to have a robust, you know, support network in place that will help people that get stuck somewhere along the line.

So, I hope that answers our questions.

VICE CHAIR YEE: That’s fine.

MS. MACDONALD: And I’m very happy to be talking about this.

VICE CHAIR YEE: It does, thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. And I see Commissioner Sinay and then Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa. Thank you, Karin and Jamie for the
presentation. As Commissioner Akutagawa says, it’s going
to take a little bit of time to soak in all the different
pieces.

But as I was watching the presentation and this
is the same question I’ve had with the COI Tool, and these
may be questions for 2030, but how do we -- how do other
redistricting efforts, how are these tools -- how can these
tools be used by other redistricting efforts in California?
You know, the cities, and county efforts, and school boards
they don’t -- they’re not putting is as much resources, but
the community does want to be able to use some of that.

So, what thoughts do you all have about how the
community can use this for, you know, the local
redistricting efforts?

MS. CLARK: Thank you for your question. The
answer is definitely not as simple as with the COI Tool,
where you can export your files and then email them to the
appropriate place. These tools really were geared towards
the statewide process. There’s not going to be a way to
say, you know, here’s my ideal -- here’s my ideal
population per district. I’m going to plug that in and
then magic is going to happen where, you know, it’s
certainly not quite that simple. I suppose that an
enterprising person could say, okay, I know what my ideal
population is. I know what my geography is. And I’m going
to do my best with these tools to make districts that meet
that ideal population, and export my files, and send those
in that way. But, you know, it’s certainly not as simple
as with the COI Tool.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thanks Commissioner. I
think it was Commissioner Turner that was next, and then
Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes, thank you. I wanted
to just ask how are you, as the Statewide Database, how are
you marketing these tools so the communities even know that
they do exist, all of the different components?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Well, so far -- thank you
for that question, Commissioner Turner. So far, we haven’t
marketed them at all. You are the first people to find out
about them. You know, aside from our beta testers who have
been working behind the scenes on them. So, this is our,
you know, public reveal so to speak.

And we will put notifications onto the Statewide
Database website. Of course, we’re hoping again to talk,
to collaborate with the various groups that were
collaborating with us when we first came out with the COI
Tool. And, of course, with you.

So, you know, we’ll tell everybody we talk to
about these tools. In particular, you know, as we move
forward with developing them, and they’re set, and people
have tested them, and we will do what we can. But we’ll 
heavily rely on you and your, you know, outreach 
mechanisms, and we will support you as much as we can. But 
then, also, through the access sites of course. You know, 
there will definitely be something there, also.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And yeah, Karin, I’d love 
to beta test.

MS. MACDONALD: Oh, great. We will be in touch.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I know that Commissioner 
is next, followed by Director Kaplan. I also want to just 
note that we are going to be due for a break in ten 
minutes.

Also, Karin, before Commissioner Andersen speaks 
can I just mention, I thought I saw something about the 
tool will go live at the end of September or late 
September. Is that true?

MS. MACDONALD: Yeah, so that’s our development 
deadline right now. Because, remember that these tools 
they rely on data, right. So, and since we have to use 
official redistricting data, essentially we need to load 
something in and right now there’s nothing there. So, our 
-- you know, our focus has been on making sure the COI Tool 
is in really good shape, then move on to the QGIS Tool and 
then, you know, use the code from both of these to do the 
online tool. So, that’s just basically our development
timeline. And happy to continue to update you on how that’s going and, you know, talk about these things.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I just wanted to ask because Commissioner Turner’s question about marketing is not something that you can market just yet, then, because you’re still developing it.

MS. MACDONALD: Right, so I do -- I do feel like, you know, Commissioner Turner’s point is really well taken because just letting people know that this is coming is going to be very important. Because otherwise people get stressed out. They’re like is there going to be anything? You know, how am I going to be able to participate? And just letting them know it’s there and perhaps just provide updates to you on a regular basis might be a really good thing because you’re getting more coverage, also, as people are starting to check into the redistricting process. So, I think that’s going to be very important.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, and my thought is that the people who will most likely be interested will be the ones who are watching us.

Let me go to Commissioner Andersen, then Director Kaplan, then back to Commissioner Turner, and then I think we will be at break.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you for a very
interesting presentation, much more than I was expecting. I was expecting this to be about the centers, the access, and the COI Tool. Had no idea that this redistricting tool is being presented today. So, there’s a lot of issues to be discussed with that one. Coordination, criteria, training. Let’s start on the easy stuff and I won’t even get into some of it.

The centers. Do we have any idea of how many and where they are. And then, yeah, you know, on the staffing and when are those going to be open?

MS. CLARK: Yeah, thank you for your question. There are going to be six centers and they will be located in Sacramento, Oakland, Fresno, Long Beach, San Diego, and San Bernardino. And we will be opening them, you know, as possible based on public health guidelines. We have, you know, active -- we’re calling our old site managers and just in general our redistricting access support team. We have, you know, a number of people already hired and we are continuing to hire for these roles.

As Karin mentioned, you know, it’s not quite as easy as if we were a private organization and could immediately put out a job description and hire. There are a lot of steps. We are in a hiring freeze and we’re having to get exemptions for every single hire. And then, there are a lot of official processes that we follow.
And, you know, we have a number of people hired. We are also in the process of interviewing others. We have some really great candidates. And also, everybody that we’ve hired so far is amazing.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Great. And just a -- then the COI Tool, obviously we’re -- this is going to be supported at these access centers, and that information has been greatly coordinated with the Commission. We understand how we’re handling all this stuff.

Coordinating a redistricting tool, though, are you already envisioning what committee or is this also going through the COI Tool? Do you want us to create a new -- a subcommittee to deal specifically with the mapping input? You know, obviously we need -- there’s a line drawing component, there’s a data management component.

So, how soon can we start coordinating with you on this?

MS. MACDONALD: I think any time, it’s up to you. Again, we’re in development on both of the tools. So, you know, as you organize ourselves, whatever works for you is going to work for us.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Great, just want to make sure that we’re on track for our break.

Director Kaplan, and then Commissioner Turner, and it looks like Commissioner Fornaciari.
OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Thank you. I’ll just be quick. Thank you again for the presentation. And just to echo some of the comments that have been discussed, and the offer that you made about communications materials, you know, I think staff will want to work with you on, and with the Commissioners on how we can message this and provide, you know, as much information to the field staff, also, as they’re out in the field that they’re communicating these resources and directing folks.

Also, I had more like a longer general question, I think for the Commission, and for Karin and Jamie. For when the Commission comes out with draft maps is it this Draw My CA Districts Tool would then be what people would utilized to provide feedback on draft maps, or maybe this is for another discussion. But I think it’s helpful. I know we’re now just in the COI input phase, and thinking a little bit further along on this I think is helpful.

MS. MACDONALD: Yeah, and thank you for that question. I think once the draft maps come out we can move them as a geography into the tool, so people can see what the draft maps look like. And then, they can either -- you know, they can evaluate them for themselves, they can make changes, and then submit a map with their changes, and then also with their comments in both tools. So, that can be done over either one of them.
And I just kind of wanted to say something about the comments section. That’s actually a really important one because you may get a -- somebody, you know, gives you a couple of districts and they’re very well-drawn districts, and you don’t really know what they were trying to accomplish. So, you’re looking at these districts that somebody spent a lot of time and you can’t perhaps use the exact districts, but you might be able to accomplish something that is very close to what the submittor wanted to do. So, if they put into the -- it into the comments, I’m submitting these districts because they’re keeping XY&Z communities together. But then, I also have to equally populate these districts, so I just added this and this and this, then you know why it was drawn that way. And you might be able to just accomplish the essence of the district in your district. So, that’s why that piece is also important.

And I just thought I’ll flag that because you asked, you know, how do people provide feedback and I think that’s the way to do it. So, I hope that made sense.

OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay, thank you very much. Commissioner Turner said she will pass. And let’s go to Commissioner Fornaciari and then we will be turning it back over to Chair Ahmad for a break.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Just in consideration of our break, I’ll just quickly volunteer to test and we can talk about my other questions then, thanks.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Not seeing any other comments, Chair Ahmad turning it back over to you. Thank you. You’re on mute.

CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Jaime and Karin for this presentation and to the COI Tool Subcommittee for putting this together for us.

As we heard this is, you know, very early in the process so we have lots of time to provide our feedback and to get organized around utilizing these tools.

But as of right now we do have a break until 3:30, and we will be joining in Closed Session at 3:30. And you all should have gotten that link. So, see you all at 3:30.

(Off the record at 3:16 p.m.)

(Closed Session at 3:30 p.m.)

/Public Session resumed at 4:21 p.m.)

CHAIR AHMAD: Welcome back everyone. We just popped out of a Closed Session. And I would like to report that we met in Closes Session regarding data and cybersecurity issues and no action was taken.

With that, we have about 9 minutes left with our team, so I just wanted to do a quick overview of the agenda
for tomorrow. Tomorrow is going to be motion Tuesday, because we have quite a few items on our agenda that require some motions. So, I will review them now.

So, Item 9-A, the Government Affairs Subcommittee. Item 9-B, Finance and Administration. Item 9-E, Outreach and Engagement. Item 9-H, the Website Subcommittee. Item 9-J, the Grant/Contracting Subcommittee.

And then, we still have to hear from the item under Item 10, which is the Legal Affairs Subcommittee. Item 12, which is the Line Drawer Updates Subcommittee.

And I would also like to emphasize that we do have a presentation, a COI input -- a Communities of Interest input dry run starting at 1:30 tomorrow. There are quite a few number of items to make motions on and approve for that session. And I would prioritize that before going out to the subcommittees because of the fact that we have to post the agenda very quickly.

So, I’m hoping we can get through all of those items tomorrow. But before we close is there any other items that I’m missing that m colleagues would like to raise at this time?

Yes, Commissioner Fernandez and then Andersen.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I was just alerted that we may need to take a motion on the paper COI in terms
of having it translated into all the languages. But I’m not sure if we can have -- hopefully, a quick discussion on that tomorrow.

CHAIR AHMAD: And that’s for Materials Development, correct. Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, 9-G, sorry.

CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I was just wondering, you know, in terms of the -- we have copies of virtually everything except for on 9-E. What are we -- a motion? Is there a document, a handout that should be -- that goes to that item? 9-E was just Outreach and Engagement.

CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Sinay and/or Fornaciari, do you all have --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, there wasn’t a document. We were just going to talk about the --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Anything else the public education and going into phase 2, and so it’s just a quick and easy one, really.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

CHAIR AHMAD: Yes, Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: On the COI paper tool, are we going to discuss it? Because there is a second half of
it that we haven’t had a conversation on.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: We can discuss it, but we really need to try to finalize that and move forward. But yeah, of course. There’s a handout, so if everyone can take a look at that tonight that would be great. Thank you.

CHAIR AHMAD: Great. And then, just another reminder tomorrow’s meeting starts at 1:00 p.m., not the usual 9:30 a.m.

With that --

LEGAL COUNSEL JOHNSTON: Public comment.

CHAIR AHMAD: Yes, public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: All right, we end our day. 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 ID number provided on the livestream feed. It is 9263886526 for this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound key.

Once you have dialed in you’ll be placed in a queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press *9. This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it is your turn to speak you will hear a message that says the
host would like you to talk, and to press *6 to speak. If you would like to give your name, please state and spell it for the record. You are not required to provide your name to give public comment.

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

And we do not have anyone in the queue at this time.

CHAIR AHMAD: We can budget a couple minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And we do have someone in the queue with their hand raised. And go ahead, the floor is yours.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Good afternoon, this is Lori, L-O-R-I, Shellenberger, S-H-E-L-L-E-N-B-E-R-G-E-R. I’m the Redistricting Consultant for Common Cause. Good afternoon Chair Ahmad and Commissioner.

I’m calling regard the draft policies on your subcommittees and third-party communications. First, I’d like to acknowledge that some of the hot water you got into was from an information sharing meeting that Common Cause did participate in. And looking back, and given Common Cause is a champion of transparency, we probably could have
brainstormed an approach with you that would have furthered your information on an urgent matter and then consistent with your subcommittee and third-party communication policies, but that would have avoided the blow back that resulted.

So, on that note we’d like to put forth an idea we think would maximize transparency and minimize the likelihood of after-the-fact allegations about third-party communications.

But first, I’d like to commend you on the radically inclusive approach you’ve used to inform your planning and implementation of your unique 2021 redistricting process. We echo the legal and voter support for the policies that have facilitated that, which you adopted after thoughtful discussion and consultation with your counsel.

Even more importantly, we appreciate the way in which you’ve followed those policies and diligently reported out the content of the subcommittee work and the information gathering you’ve done.

As a party to some of those communications, I feel they were reported out thoroughly and accurately. However, even though those conversations don’t involve district lines, talking about other subjects behind closed doors still gives some members of the public pause.
And their concern is genuine and it’s fair. Setting aside, you know, the conspiracy theories and nefarious intent and bad faith accusations others, including former Commissioners, and independent Commission proponents are raising concerns that details of nonpublic conversations could be unintentionally left out, or subtle dynamics could somehow influence a Commissioner.

So, we’re recommending that you adhere to your policies, but consider recording and posting all conversations within third parties within a certain time period, 24, 48 hours. I’m not sure what works for your staff, of course, and the logistics there.

But we, and those who have followed your work closely over the last several months know that you are 100 percent aboveboard, and we’re incredibly grateful to see a Commission so committed to the broad outreach and inclusion that you’ve pursued so far.

But by taking -- but if you take these extra steps of recording and posting third-party conversations, then anyone would be able to watch, provide public comments --

AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 15 seconds.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: -- related to the conversations, or offer up their expertise, or ask for their own meeting. We hope you’ll consider incorporating
this into your policies and that you regularly explain those policies to the public --

AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF:  2 minutes.

MS. SHELLNBERGER:  -- just to avoid future criticism. Thank you for your time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR:  And thank you. And we do have one other caller. Please go ahead.

MS. WESTA-LUSK:  Hello, this is Renee Westa-Lusk. I just had some questions because I haven’t been able to watch the meeting, all the meeting. Will the public -- my first question is will the public input meetings after June 14th be in person or will they be in -- well, in virtual form? I know you said the two statewide public input meetings would both be virtual, I assume. But what happens about the ones when you’re in the different regions?

And then, the second question I have, do persons wanting to give public input at the statewide public meetings, or the other regional meetings, will they have to make appointments in order to get a slot to speak? And those are my questions. thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR:  Thank you. And those are all our callers at this time.

CHAIR AHMAD:  Thank you.

LEGAL COUNSEL JOHNSTON:  Let me answer the first question, which is the answer is we’re waiting for a
direction from the Governor. And he’s supposed to make an announcement before June 15th as to what the post-COVID rules are going to be. And until we get that information, we don’t know what the Commission will be allowed to do as far as actual public meetings.

CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you. And with that, we don’t have any more public callers at this time. We will go into recess until tomorrow at 1:00 p.m. Thank you, everyone.

(Thereupon, the Citizens Redistricting Commission meeting recessed at 4:32 p.m.)
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