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PROCEEDINGS

Friday, May 14, 2021 9:32 o'clock a.m.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ (via Zoom): Good morning, and welcome once again to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission Meeting, Friday, May 14th, action packed, full day. Glad you could join us.

And we will take roll call. Is that you, Executive Director Hernandez?

MR. HERNANDEZ (via Zoom): Yes, that is correct.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA (via Zoom): Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN (via Zoom): Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fernandez?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fornaciari? I saw him. Okay, we'll move on.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY (via Zoom): Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS (via Zoom): Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI (via Zoom): Here.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay?
COMMISSIONER SINAY (via Zoom): Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Taylor?
Commissioner Toledo?
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO (via Zoom): Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner?
COMMISSIONER TURNER (via Zoom): Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Vazquez?
COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ (via Zoom): Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Yee?
COMMISSIONER YEE (via Zoom): Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Ahmad?
VICE CHAIR AHMAD (via Zoom): Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: You have a quorum, Chair.
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Great. Thank you.
Can we go through public comment, Katy, please?
And just a reminder that public comment is limited to two minutes per individual speaker.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR (via Zoom): Yes, Chair, good morning.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Good morning.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone.
To call in, dial the telephone number provided on
the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed. It is 93330293366 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 star-nine. This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it is your turn to speak you will hear a message that says, “the host would like you to talk,” and to press star-six to speak.

If you would like to give you 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 again, I’d also like to remind those that call in to please press star-nine to raise their hand indicating that they wish to comment.

We do have a caller but they have not chosen to raise their hand as of yet. And there it is.

Go ahead, the floor is yours.

MS. MARKS (telephonic): Hi. Good morning. My
name is Julia Marks. I’m calling from Asian Americans Advancing Justice Asian Law Caucus. I just wanted to start out by saying we really appreciate your thoughtful document and discussion so far on the Language Access Plan for the public input design -- or public input meeting. And we appreciate the attention that you’ve giving language access.

We do hope that you won’t take final action on this item today. I’m not quite sure what the next step is after your discussion this morning. But we hope there can be more discussion and consideration.

We appreciate a lot of parts of the plan laid out, but we think there are a couple of areas that could use some tweaking. And so I’ll talk to a couple of those quickly.

It would also be helpful to have more information on some of the budgetary and logistical reasons for the approach you’re taking. We understand you’re balancing a lot, but want to make sure that there’s robust language access.

So, first the procedural requirements could be challenging to some community members, and we’d support (indiscernible). The timeline for signing up with the request needing to be 10 business days in advance is just not going to be workable for quite a few community members.
And we strongly recommend you go back to five business days in advance at most, and we’d love to work with you to figure out a fair way to make that happen, such as getting contractors set up in advance, even if they aren’t ultimately needed.

One concern is that folks are busy and just might not think three weeks ahead of a public meeting to sign up for a slot to speak. And if folks are working (indiscernible) --

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thirty seconds.

MS. MARKS: -- community, they’ll need more notice to make sure that they can get in the queue.

So, one additional recommendation is to make sure the appointment system is in the top 12 languages, and to make sure --

MR. HERNANDEZ: Fifteen seconds.

MS. MARKS: -- that the opening presentation that the Commission gives is also being translated into the languages being requested.

And then, finally, I would like -- a couple of concerns from Spanish speaking community members about the scope of coverage.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Two minutes.

MS. MARKS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ms. Marks.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you, and we’ll move on to our next caller. And I would also like to remind those calling in to press star-nine, raising their hand, indicating they wish to comment. We do have a raised hand currently.

And go ahead, the floor is yours.

MS. HUTCHISON (telephonic): Good morning, Commissioners. This is Helen Hutchison with the League of Women Voters of California. I wanted to start just by saying, thank you for bumping the item 9A to this morning. We really do appreciate your flexibility.

Two things I wanted to talk about this morning. The first is that there’s a -- you’ve had a number of questions being raised about the Commission’s two-person subcommittee meetings.

I know from watching your meetings that after robust discussion, you all agreed that subcommittees would be allowed to explore issues, do information gathering in order to facilitate your work. And that, additionally, subcommittees would not make any decisions and would report back to the full Commission on all of your meetings and discussions.

I also know that that policy was based directly on the Bagley-Keene Act, and that you followed that policy. People who didn’t see the meeting where you established
this policy might not understand all this. It would be really helpful to explain your policy on a regular basis, and to post it on your website.

The second item I wanted to raise is going back to the handout on 9A. I dropped off the call yesterday while you were responding. I apologize for that. And I do have a follow-up question.

If there was no legal analysis done, then why is the risk associated with just one scenario? You know, where does that come from, and would it be better --

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thirty seconds.

MS. HUTCHISON: -- clearer to leave everything blank until you actually do your own internal legal analysis? Thanks very much.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ms. Hutchison. And we will be discussing that later this morning. Thank you so much.

MS. HUTCHISON: Okay. Thanks.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I would like to offer the next -- the last caller in the queue to press star-nine to raise their hand, indicating they wish to comment. Again, that is star-nine would raise your hand.

I believe that’s all our public comment at this time.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Great. Thank you, Katy.
We will be moving on. Just a roadmap for today, the open agenda items that we have still.

We have 9A, which is our Government Affairs/Census subcommittee.

We have our 9B, Finance and Administration. It’s a motion that was placed on hold yesterday to move forward with the hiring of outreach staff.

We also have 9K, which is Communities of Interest. We have a statistic update from Commission Kennedy.

9J is Grants. Our subcommittee has -- is still going to present some information on that.

And we have 9F and 11 are combined, the Language Access and Public Input Design Committee. And then last but definitely not least, is our Labor Panel at 1:30.

And so I’m thinking what might be best, since we ended yesterday with the Public Input Design Committee and Language Access, that we continue with that discussion. Are there any concerns with that?

Okay. We will continue with that. I did want to update everyone with that information. Commissioner Akutagawa and I, as well as Director Kaplan, we have been communicating back and forth and we’ve heard some of the concerns. And we’ve agreed to amend our recommendations to five business days prior to, in terms of requesting
interpretation services. So we will be -- excuse me, we
will be amending that.

And then the other item -- and I just want to
reemphasize that although it shows there’s only four or
five Public Input meetings that show Spanish, and there’s
some that show other languages as well, I want -- we want
to make it clear that those aren’t the only days that
limited to Spanish or the different languages there are,
Chinese or Japanese.

If there is a request, then we will -- if it’s
made within five business days, we will make an attempt.
If it’s in the top 12, we’ll find an interpreter. If it’s
beyond the 12, we will make our best attempts to contract
for them.

However, we did decide to include some additional
Spanish, zone-specific dates. And what we will do is we’ll
go back and see some of the higher concentration zones,
such as there’s K, J, E, and possibly D, in terms of higher
numbers of Spanish. So we’ll go back and one of those --
we’ll add in Spanish for each of those zones.

Okay. And I can’t remember where we finished
off, Commissioner Fornaciari, yesterday. It was a lot of
information. Commissioner Sinay, and then Commissioner
Andersen.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We were discussing at the
end, you know, how are we going to make sure that we know how to listen. And that might -- I don’t know how to put it correctly, you know, what the right wording is. But I’m going to go back to a recommendation I made back in October or September. Because I thought about it last night, and I still think this is the best approach.

Is why don’t we invite some of the redistricting experts who are out there, both on the -- the Democrats and the Republican experts to tell us what they advise us. You know, how -- you know, what should we be listening to? Why don’t we just invite them, open up and bring them here, so we can ask them questions and learn from them?

I mean, we’ve done that with other areas where we’re looking for learning, and, you know, we’ve had Paul here, you know, to talk about the LGBT and other issues, but not necessarily talk about his expertise in that, or Matt Rexroad, and there’s others, too. But let’s open up the door.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Mine was actually the language access -- sorry. Could you -- you said very quickly which groups you are adding. Was I -- you’re adding another meeting or you were adding Spanish to --

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: No.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- existing ones?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. I --

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yeah. It’s not adding another meeting.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I’m not adding another meeting.

We will add Spanish to one of the meetings designated for those zones.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And which were those zones? You went through those very, very quickly.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I knew you were going to ask me that.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: We haven’t fully talked through all of those. So, that’s still pending. So we’ll come back to everybody on the for-sure recommendations I think later on.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. So you’ll actually then do like an update to this, to this document?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Great. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I have Commissioner Sadhwani and then Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Commissioner Turner was
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner, worry about that.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: As you’re going through the list, thank you, Chair. I wanted to suggest that you look again at the Central Valley that has a heavy Latino presence, which would be Zone F.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. I think we already have Zone F. We already have Spanish for one of -- we do have -- one of the sessions in Zone F is Spanish, but thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, thanks. You know, I was thinking about this a lot yesterday. And I really, I so appreciate all of the work that the subcommittee has done. And I really appreciate the attention to, you know, like regions that have greater populations that are Spanish speaking, and other languages as well.

I agree with the comment that came in this morning from Ms. Marks though. That procedurally, I think that this is going to end up creating some gaps in our ability to meet all Californians, which we’ve said, you know, over and over again.

And so I wanted to just ask, and I know that the subcommittee has looked at this previously, but I wanted to give it a little bit of a different spin on it. I’m
actually very supportive -- and I think Commissioner
Kennedy has mentioned this yesterday. But can we go and
look at, what does it cost to just run all of our meetings
and have Spanish interpretation, right. And have the whole
meeting interpreted in Spanish.

And have the availability -- maybe it’s even
hiring someone on staff to be our Spanish language
interpreter. To take questions or take comments when they
come and interpret them for, you know, dummies like me
whose Spanish isn’t very good.

And I -- a part of this, I was thinking about it
yesterday, and I had a chance to talk with Alvaro about it
a little bit. We have asked, we’ve put in a request to
increase our budget for VRA council, because we anticipate
that that’s going to be a very real need for us.

When we’re thinking about VRA in the State of
California, it covers many different historically excluded
groups, but, in particular, it covers Latinos, right, and
ensuring Latino representation in our process. And that we
are thinking about the application of the Voting Rights
Act, particularly for Latinos, because California has so
many Latino communities across the State.

And so I feel like we’re putting all of this
investment in terms of legal, in terms of quantification,
in terms of analysis of the numbers, but we’ve also
continuously said, and I completely support that this is an art form, and that we need to hear from folks on the ground.

And so I just kind of feel like if we’re willing to do all -- if we’re going to -- if we’re committed to being in compliance with the Voting Rights Act, and we’re putting the resources into the quantitative analysis, I think we also have to put the resources in to make sure we get qualitative analysis as well.

Because we can run, you know -- I think Commissioner Vazquez was talking about this yesterday, right. We could just have some computer-generated maps, but that’s not going to be responsive to folks on the ground. And so I see this as a really important piece.

As it relates to other communities, I love the attention to all of the other languages, and I think that’s so important and necessary. I do also wonder though, that if the procedure, like if I were limited English proficient, and had to know I have to request five days in advance and I didn’t do that, so then I feel like I can’t participate.

I’m wondering if we can just set up a separate system? I know we had talked about this early on, right. In the very beginning of this process we had talked about -- I think it was Commissioner Sinay, talking about -- what
is the term for it? Civic technologies and things like that. I’m wondering, can folks submit videos, right. We’re taking three-minute testimonials.

Could we ask people to -- like could we create some system, also, where folks could submit their -- a three-minute video to us? I mean, we’re living in the age of Tik Tok and YouTube and all of this stuff, right. Like if someone -- in particular, I think for limited English proficient folks, right, like those videos could then be -- we could send out to have, you know, interpretation put down at the bottom, right, so that everyone could read them and see them. And it wouldn’t be so much of a time crunch as the live and in person.

I don’t think it’s an either/or, I think it’s an and/and both, right. I don’t know from a budget standpoint if we can do all of those things, but I am concerned that we could do more to really meet the needs of Californians.

Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Comissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you, Chair Fernandez. I would agree with Commissioner Sadhwani and Commissioner Kennedy and the others who both (indiscernible) show that, of just trying to get more interpretation for the Spanish
speaking, and actually offering them.

But one -- the issue that I actually wanted to raise was just that of the on-line scheduling system or the scheduling system. I mean, the -- it just reminds me of the COVID vaccine scheduling system. And what we learned from that is that language minorities really had difficulty with it. Not just because of the technology, but also, you know, the rules associated.

There were so many rules to get a -- you know, you have to know how to be able to use the system and to navigate that. But -- and certainly that’s -- I know that you’ve worked -- that we diligently to come up with a system that works. But, of course, we don’t want to inadvertently end up with a system that creates more barriers for people.

The 10-day waiting period of -- or a 10-day window to have -- to interpret, to ask for interpretation, that might be -- if there’s a way to reduce that to maybe five days, as Commissioner Kennedy has proposed, that might be a way to giving people more time.

As many of the individuals are, you know, working two, three jobs. And just have, you know, difficult lives, challenging lives. Especially with the pandemic, taking care of their kids and other situations. Just making sure that we are taking into consideration and then share what
we have. And saying if there’s a refinement we can get to
reduce barriers as much as possible. And thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

And we did say that we are going to reduce it
from 10 days to five days. So we’ve taken care of that
one.

You’ve all brought up some good points, so it’s a
probably a good time to discuss it, to see if we need to
move forward to look into some of these concerns or
suggestions.

So, Commissioner Toledo, you talked about the
sign-up appointment. I’m trying to think of a way. Maybe
we allow like -- I don’t know, the first hour or the third
hour, whatever’s connected with that language, maybe we
leave it open for those that didn’t have the opportunity to
use the sign-up system, but still need interpretation
services. I’m just trying to brainstorm. And what we’ll
do is we’ll take this information back and -- with the
Language Access. So I’m just trying to think of different
ways to address that.

And the video, I think it was Commissioner
Sadhwani talked about the three-minute videos. I think
that’s great. Can I hand that off to Communications
Director Ceja, so you can look into that to see if that
would possible?
Because, again, what we’ve said is, if somebody comes to our meetings, our public input meetings, and they don’t have an interpreter, we don’t have an interpreter, they can actually give their public input in their language, whatever language they’re comfortable with, and then later on we would translate it.

So, I don’t see that being any different than them being able to submit a video. So, I’m going to punt that to Communications Director Ceja to look into.

In terms of cost to run the meetings, I’m assuming we’re talking about the public input meetings and beyond, not necessarily the business meetings. So we will look into the cost of that, to translate the entire meeting, all of the public input meetings and beyond. The Language Access with assistance from Outreach Director Kaplan.

And then in terms of inviting the Democrats and Republicans, I’m actually not sure how to really address that. I keep thinking we’re not supposed to, but then again, who says we’re not supposed to? Because, again, we need to, we need to hear from everyone, right? So I would welcome -- okay. We have lots of people that want to say something.

I have Commissioner Akutagawa, Commissioner Sinay, and then Commissioner Ahmad.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So I’d like to address the language access portions actually. So I guess I do have a question in terms of, you know, all the balancing acts that we are trying to meet. And I hear what you’re all saying in terms of, you know, the additions to interpretation.

I think I’m particularly thinking about the appointment system, and I think that’s something that we had also, you know, touched upon and talked about in our committee meeting when we were just trying to imagine everything.

I think we’re also trying to imagine also -- we’re running into a crunch time, also, in terms of trying to get these kinds of translations. I mean, look at how long it just took just to get the materials in. It took literally like two to three months to do it.

And we don’t have two to three months to translate an appointment system into the various languages. Get it up and running. We’re going to be done by the time that gets up and running. So that was a concern that -- you know, I guess I’m just kind of trying to think, are there easier ways to be able to do all of that?

I think with that said, you know -- I hear what you’re saying, Commissioner Toledo. I guess the other question I have is then, is the alternative to not have
appointments, you know what I mean, so that we don’t exclude anybody. But then we have this other kind of issue that we’re trying to also avoid, where people who do need a little bit more certainty around what time they would be able to, be able to testify, would need that because the kinds of jobs that they have, they can’t just wait all day for their turn.

And so I think -- you know, is it the solution that maybe, you know, Commissioner Fernandez says, I think those are things that, you know, we’ll definitely from our Language Access part, I think we’ll need to consider. But I’m also concerned that even if we just say, we’re going to set aside, whether it’s the first hour, the middle hour or the last hour, for those with no appointments who need interpretation, you know, I’m also just trying to think about the what ifs.

So, if we’re talking about six minutes per person, you know, that’s less than 10 people in that hour. And if we get lots of people, I think we’re going to run into other issues.

And so this is the challenge that I would put out to everybody else, too, because I think this is what, you know, I’ve also been saying is, we may need to then just add more days to the schedule if this is what we’re going to need to do.
Because when you break it down, we’re not talking about a lot of slots, a lot of time, and if have hundreds of people that want to testify, we’re either going to be looking at very long meetings, or we’ll just have to really think intentionally about adding extra days. And I don’t know, you know, those definitely are all things that it’s not just a financial cost, but it’s a cost of, is this what you want to do?

And I know that -- you know, I’ve heard I think a couple Commissioners say, well, this is what we signed up for. But at the same time, I’m sure that, you know, is it really that this is the expectation? Are we going to take up -- I mean, I’m okay. I think we just need to know what it is that we want to do.

And I think we can add a few more meetings, but do you really want to do that? And if that’s the case, if that’s the balance, then I think we also need to hear that from you as well, too, because the impact is not just on the individuals who come to testify, but it’s also on us.

And I’m not trying to be selfish about it, I’m just trying to balance all of these things that we’ve been trying to -- that we are talking about as well too in our subcommittees. And by the way, I do love the idea of the video, because that would actually make it so that the translation versus the interpretation costs is a lot less
than the interpretation.

So, somebody, you know, may feel more comfortable, because, you know, it’s nerve-racking getting up in front of somebody, even if it’s on Zoom, to give testimony. You might get a better quality testimony for some people if that’s their preference.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. And thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa. I have Commissioner Sinay, Ahmad, Turner and Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think there’s a lot of fixes for some of the stuff that we’re talking about, and some of it has come up in the past. And so it’s good to -- you know, we -- you know, as Sara said, civic technology was kind of my passion at the very beginning of this, and it -- one of the subcommittees said that they would take it on, and so I backed off.

But there are really easy solutions to some of the stuff we’re talking about. Tik Tok and, you know, and all -- social media platforms already exist, so we don’t need to create things. And, yes, people all over the world are using these, and so it is a simple platform. It’s -- there aren’t the barriers that some may think.

And we -- you know, I’ve asked a long time ago, can we have a hashtag that’s ours. That we’re looking at during meetings, that we’re looking at other times, and
that’s a way to collect comments. That’s another -- you know, if we use Tik Tok or we use Instagram and people use the hashtag, we sweep those all into our public comments as well, and then we, when we review our public comments, that would come -- public inputs, sorry, would also come up.

We’re going to have a field team. The field team can actually take these calls and set up the appointments that people having a hard time with our technology. I mean, the field team should be our liaison with the community and really help reduce barriers.

And the -- you know, we said from the beginning, they need to be able to do a little bit of everything. And we’re going to find out new barriers that we haven’t thought about. And we need to be able -- the outreach and comms team and all staff need to be able to just adapt and lower those barriers.

And so I think we need the appointments for some, because we’ve been asked about that, and we don’t want people waiting forever, but we need to make sure the appointment system isn’t just, that’s it, and we forget -- you know, we need to learn from the vaccination appointment system and others. And there’s a lot of best practices. And so let’s go out there and learn from them.

I think I would encourage us to do the videos, as I said, and it doesn’t need to be -- you know, submittal of
videos is really hard. Ask most of your kids who have actually had to do it for school, it takes a long time to upload and all that, a three-minute video. But if we were to create a hashtag, and people could @ us or whatever on social platforms, it’s very easy on the social platforms. They’ve got it down.

So I just want us to keep thinking creatively on how we make this an inclusive process, versus going back to hearings and how we did things in the past. It’s really important that -- you know, I know we could think, we might be able to go back to doing face-to-face meetings. I’m going to go back to what Commissioner Vazquez said. No, we’re always going to have to have a hybrid system. We need to think creatively.

And that’s part of what the outreach subcommittee’s been doing, is talking to folks to see where can we have viewing parties for a lot of our hearings, so people -- you know, it’s about equity right now, and we need to think creatively as we’re thinking about equity, and what already exists out there.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Ahmad.

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to circle back on this video idea and slow us down a little bit. And I know you’ve given clear direction to
Fredy, so I don’t want to confuse Fredy.

Right now, Fredy, I’m talking to my colleagues, so I don’t want you to get confused with anything on this part.

But I -- my ears perked up because of the data management perspective. Where do we store these videos? How do they come in? There’s so many questions that I have about this process. And I know sometimes, you know, I forget, too. I just click on a link to join this meeting and that’s all I do for my planning purposes.

But we will hold that expectation for staff to be able to deliver all of the public inputs received, whether it’s to video or some other means. So just throwing that out there as a caution of before we get too deep into that, how we would manage that.

The other point I wanted to directly respond to, Commissioner Sinay, about hashtag and social media. Do not underestimate the meme culture. I am part of the meme culture, and all it takes is one influencer, one comedic influencer to overtake a hashtag, to overtake a sign-up system, to overtake anything that is on the internet.

So, I’ve seen it happen. Even it crossed over into the political world, if you all know what I’m referencing, from some time in the presidential campaign season.
I would not be comfortable allowing that type of floodgate to open when we don’t have the infrastructure to support and/or clean that process from our end. So, as much as I love the meme culture, hashtag all the way, but for this purpose I just wouldn’t know how to manage that data coming in, if it was coming in such a fluid way.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.
Commissioner Turner, then Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Uh-huh. Yup, that’s my data manager subcommittee partner.

In regards to the videos, I won’t repeat, yes, exactly what Commissioner Ahmad said. And then I also was wondering about the personal, identifiable information on videos that are sent. How are we then able to manage that portion of it?

So, really just more, throwing out more questions about that. I love creativity and thinking of different ways, but it caused more concerns then about how do we navigate those spaces?

And the other thing I wanted to say was just a plus one to Commissioner Sadhwani. As far as looking into hiring someone that is Spanish speaking interpreter, then we don’t have to necessarily relegate any days specific to Spanish. At least we’ll have one on staff moving forward for all of the sessions. So, if we can look into what that
cost would be, as opposed to retaining interpreters.

And I’m not clear yet, even with the block hours that we have for Spanish, so we know people can arrange interpreters for, you know, with five days advance notice, which would include Spanish at this point. And then we have blocked times, and then we have full days, but they could still call other days.

I think it -- we still have to work out what that will look like for all languages, but for the high population that we have for Latinos, I think it makes sense to look into having interpretation for that language, much as what Commissioner Kennedy’s and other have -- Kennedy and others have suggested before. So I didn’t want that part to get lost either. Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Sadhwani, and then Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. So, you know, I’m very pro-video, but -- so just to speak to Commissioner Ahmad and Turner’s concerns. I mean, my thought is that at this point, I think a part of it could be based on what kind of system we use to receive those videos.

If we’re anticipating that some of those are coming in in different languages, and that we’re going to have to send them out interpretation in any case, then that
means we’re going to get a transcript along with them. And there’s a lot of systems actually. I mean, even if you think about like -- I don’t know, I’m an iPhone user. So if someone leaves me a voice mail message, you can see the transcript. It’s not always perfect, but you can get a, you know, a written transcript that goes along with it.

And I think just like as we, the -- you know, the data management system and Airtable that we cite yesterday, you know, we would be inputting written e-mails, letters that we receive, the napkin map and scanning it, right.

I think, similarly, we could pull a transcript from it, recognize there might be a couple little errors in there, and that’s okay because we’ll link it back to wherever that video is stored. But that transcript could be ultimately what’s input into Airtable in some way, shape or form, for our analysis purposes. I’ll leave it to Fredy to figure out how to do that. But that was initially my thought.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And then maybe we could also go back. Maybe if the -- my gosh, the data management subcommittee can go back to see if that’s possible, where you just get some --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Well, can I respond then?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Sure.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Because certainly it would
be possible, but the reason -- those other concerns I left it before and was right in link -- on track with what Commissioner Ahmad was saying, is because I’m thinking it has to be some sort of technology that allows people to put it on a different platform.

To send a video through for three minutes is almost an impossibility for most people. It’s -- it takes a lot to send a three-minute video. And we’re doing this in a -- but really to accommodate people that may/can’t navigate other technology issues or what have you. Three minute -- and unless -- and even being an iPhone user, yeah, it’s not easy.

So now, if we were to get the video, if they’re going to send them, talking about where we’re going to store them and all of that, yes, we could get them. Yes, we can send it out. It’s the, how do they just send, a regular person, a three-minute video?

I do work with that a lot just in the church realm and stuff, trying to send through videos, and most people can’t navigate it and figure out how send anything more than a few seconds’ video, let alone a three-minute video. So, I guess I’m still trying to figure that part out.

If it’s them sending it to me, I see problems. If it’s them creating it somewhere that we’re going to
access it, how will we get it, where will we store it, those kind -- and then we have the personal information. But if some kind of way they can actually send us a video, certainly we could then redact what we need to, and do the interpretation and all of that.

I’m just, again, wondering, how do we get all of the Californians that would want to utilize this process the ability to send a long video?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: And can I add to that, Chair Fernandez?

I would just ask then what’s the difference between a video and someone calling in and leaving a voice message? Because from my understanding, all of the information is going into one database, and I can be absent from every single public input meeting over the summer, and still should be able to have all of the information from the public to study for our big, final exam.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

I have Commissioner Toledo, Commissioner Vazquez and Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I just wanted to just recognize and appreciate Chair Fernandez and the Commissioner Akutagawa. I think that in drawing, in putting the puzzle together, it was really done with an
equity lens. And you can -- I mean, we’ve seen that, right? We see her as, you’re allocating slots, you’re putting them up upon chair making. It’s almost minority is first in the one-up process in that. For that I think that’s wonderful, and I appreciate your work on this. And I know this is a difficult topic. And so I just wanted to send my appreciation for your hard work on trying to create an equitable process to get people’s comments through. And so, thank you for that.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

I have Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. I am -- in a sense, I appreciate this discussion about sort of like opening, opening up basically public comment to different forums, and trying to leverage social media to that end. And at the same time trying to think about also what social media now is used for.

And I think it could be, to Commissioner Ahmad’s point, things would get, things could get out of hand quickly, and at the same time, I’m not so sure it’s anything that we couldn’t sort of be alerted to fairly quickly and, you know, shut it down. Let’s push pause. I think we could be somewhat responsive in real time if things start to get out of hand on-line.

That being said, another consideration is that,
you know, do we want -- if we, let’s say we created a
hashtag, I think we’d have to create a public policy about
sort of like how we are, how we are reviewing things
submitted via social media.

So, let’s say I’m a community member and I decide
that I’m going to digitally organize my neighbors, because
we want to be -- you know, we want our community of
interest to be this thing, right. And so, I create a bunch
of tweets, sent them out to my neighbors and said, hey, at
the public comment meeting we’re not going to go, but we’re
going to be like tweeting up a storm.

What counts as like official public comment and
what counts as like someone just popping off on Twitter?
Because, you know, I use Twitter for both.

So, I -- you know, can -- we have to make a
distinction sort of about like, this is just someone
sending things out into the universe, and this is someone’s
like official public comment. And do we make the
distinction, and to what extent can we make that
distinction?

So, and the last thing I’ll say is that to
Commissioner Ahmad’s point, in terms of what’s the
difference between sending a voice mail and sending a
video. I do think there is some difference. I’m not sure
it’s a super meaningful difference when it’s all said and
done. But like, again, just thinking about someone my age. I’m definitely not calling and leaving a voice mail for public comment, but I could like film like a one-minute video and e-mail it to publiccomment@wedrawthelines or whatever. But that -- or post it and put a hashtag on it on my Instagram.

So, again, I’m not sure how many people we will lose if we say, only this way. Again, some of these things may not be meaningful differences in the end, but just other considerations.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez. So I have Commissioner Sinay and Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I forgot. Just going back, I wanted just to -- for clarity sake. When we were talking about inviting the redistricting consultants, they’re not legislature. So I just wanted to make sure that, that clarity. And there might be others that I don’t know about, you know, other firms, that that -- I just wanted to clarify that. (Indiscernible.) I apologize.

What’s the difference between hearing and seeing? A lot. We really need video and we need to -- it would be great if we could figure out how to see people when they give their public comments, even in our meetings. Because
seeing we get the body language, we get the connection, we
get to see what they’re showing, we get to see all those
pieces. And we have been told that over and over again by,
you know -- so I think that piece is really, really
important for many reasons.

Yes, you can have biases as well when you see
people, and maybe you kind of erase it when you hear it,
and there’s studies on that as well. So, there’s both
sides. But I do think that you do get other information.

And people do feel comfortable. I mean, the
number of videos I get from my family around the world, I
am always laughing because they won’t send me voicemails or
type something, they’ll just do a quick video and send it
to me.

But, you know, I think video would be number one,
but number two, voicemails would be great as well. But on
-- I think a lot of us are saying is just, we need to try
to figure out how to be inclusive and look at equity in all
different ways. And that’s the only piece.

I’m not that concerned about too much information
or, you know, I think, yes, things get abused on the
internet and whatnot, and you can go through it. But, you
know, I am a believer, as James Worley says, about the
wisdom of crowd, and the more input we get eventually
patterns come up that are better than less input.
And so, again, we need to figure out how to screen from that -- screen for that, and I think that part of the lessons, you know, kind of what we need to prepare ourselves for in the next, in the next round. We may not know it today, but maybe we think about, okay, who do we bring in to help us think some of this through, and what conversations do we need to have. Thank you, everybody.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Yes, thank you. And I have Commissioner Akutagawa. And then after that, we need to keep moving and make some decisions on how to move forward, so we can move to our next area.

So, yes, Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. This has been a great conversation, and I’m so glad that Commissioner Ahmad and Vazquez brought up the points about social media. I think that was one of my initial thoughts about social media.

I think the obvious ones are going to be easy to make decisions on. You know, the obvious ones that are clearly public comment, and the obvious ones that are clearly just someone trolling. I think where it becomes very slippery and I think this is what Commissioner Vazquez was talking about, is the ones that kind of fall in that gray area, and where do you draw the line is the problem on that. But where do you draw the line on what is really not
legitimate public comment is what kind of like borderline just trolling.

And I think the challenge that I can see is that that’s going to take us into another place where we may not be well-prepared, nor would we have the adequate time to really think through and make those decisions. And then could subject us to additional litigation that may or may not be productive in this case.

On the videos, I hear what everyone’s saying. You know, I think the way I would look at this is, it’s actually not any different than us offering the paper COI Tool, the Communities of Interest Tool. I don’t think everybody is going to use the videos.

I think what it does is it’s looking at it as offering another option, in addition to sending us an e-mail with their public comment and the map that they’ve drawn by whatever means, by leaving us the voicemail, by, you know, submitting through the COI Tool, or coming in person.

I think we should look at the video is for those who want to or those who have the, let’s just say the skill sets to do whatever they need to do, to upload and get it to us. I think it’s just another option to offer, versus an either/or. I think someone said it’s an “and.” It’s an and, and another and, and another and. There’s just these
various options.

I just would, you know, encourage caution against
the social media hashtags, and also taking comment from
social media. I do have some serious concerns about where
that could take us. I think we just need to have our more
very clear-cut, official channels for receiving that
information. So, thanks.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
Akutagawa.

So, moving forward, I’m -- a few things have been
brought up that we want to make sure we don’t lose. One is
the potential of hiring a Spanish interpreter instead of
contracting each time.

So, Executive Director Hernandez, can you please
look into that? Or maybe we already have one on -- we
already have an interpreter on staff. I’m not sure. Just,
you know, throwing that out there in case, double duty.

Also, with the videos, in terms of looking into
that, I was thinking of trying to hand it off to my data
management subcommittee to work with Communications
Directors Ceja, and also with Cecy (phonetic), to maybe get
more information on that and look into it. Is that
something that you would be willing to do, Commissioner
Ahmad and Turner?

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Yeah. And certainly I’m
willing to, you know, spend the time to look into it, but I think we just need a little bit more clear direction in terms of what the Commission is looking for from that research.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I believe right now what the direction would be is, what would be involved in, one, receiving the videos. Maybe different mechanisms in terms of the ability to get those videos to the Commission, maybe some of the security issues. And you brought up the great point of data management, what are we going to do with them, the videos, right?

Commissioner Turner, and then Director Kaplan.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I think what would be helpful with that clarification is, is right now without deciding that someone could send a video. And on the timeline or the kind of chart that we have, it would stop with the data manager and its team, to have it translated, to have it then transcribed, and then it would go into the system.

So, I’m not sure what else you’d want the data manager team -- we could take it on, but how are you thinking about this? This is where I’m seeing it up front.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. I was thinking more of like the security concerns. And I don’t know, maybe it’s the cybersecurity, I don’t know. I’m just trying to figure
out how we can come up with process to be able to accept videos.

And I’m going to admit, I’m not the social media as -- person as Fredy knows. So, I have Director Kaplan, and then I believe Commissioner -- no, nothing more? Commissioner Sinay and Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, I think my -- I was just going to clarify is, I think the big question is, how can people easily submit videos to us? And I think Fredy may have some ideas on that.

So it’s looking at what systems exist, kind of like we’re looking at the scheduling system, and then checking in on, you know, do they work with systems that we have. And, you know, just bring -- and do they work with security. So, again, it’s just, are there systems that -- are there civic technology that we can use that will help us with that?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Fredy, are you good looking into that as well? Okay. So you’re off. Data Management no longer on it. We’ve got Fredy looking at it.

And Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Actually, I was just going to say, I agree with what Commissioner Turner was saying. I don’t think we necessarily need to work out what
systems. I think anybody who is going to choose to use the videos is going to know how to use it. They’re going to choose what they’re going to do, and they’ll just figure out themselves or they’ll ask somebody to help them figure out how to get it uploaded to the appropriate site.

I think that’s the one place, is just seeing where do they send it to? Do they just e-mail a link? Do they e-mail, you know, the actual video file? I think maybe that’s more of the specifics, or the specificity that maybe the data management could deal with is that do you want to link or do you want the specific file or do you want both, and then where do they send it to.

I think -- you know, we don’t need to tell them what platform to use or how to create a video. I think that that’s going to be up to the person. Social media is not going to be on it, it’s just the place where you send it to, to share it with people. I don’t think social media has anything to do with the videos.

The security piece, I think the security piece is going to be something that’s not just going to be limited to the videos. I think that is a piece that’s for all of the inputs that we’re getting in. So whatever would be applying to everything else would apply to the videos as well, too. So that’s just kind of my perspective on that.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.
Director Ceja.

MR. CEJA (via Zoom): Yes. We can certainly explore various ways to capture video. If we’re just going videos in e-mail, I can upload those as public comment to our website, but it’s going to take the additional step of uploading it to YouTube and then linking it on our website, so that we can clear any security issues.

The other thing, too, is, I remember when we did the Granicus demo. This was actually one of the features for that agenda-building software. Not only did it create an easy way to create an agenda and post it on-line and for Commissioners to follow along as we’re describing -- or discussing the issues, but it did allow a portal for individuals to drop their public comments, so it’d be attached to that, to that meeting date. And it would be in written form and video form.

And so folks can at their own leisure provide public comment and public input, and just leave it there for the Commissioners to review at their -- at whatever time they have available.

So I will look at different ways to do this, but I know like Granicus definitely did it. So I’ll look at other platforms that do the same.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. I appreciate you looking into that, and then coming back with some options and
recommendations. That’d be great.

I think I had Commissioner Akutagawa, and then
Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was just going to ask
if people could upload the videos to YouTube directly and
send the link, or is that a security issue?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Are you responding to that,
Commissioner Turner or --

MR. CEJA: Yeah, people can definitely do that.
Just send us a link as public comment.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Well -- okay.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. I thought there was
a concern with links and our ability to store and keep the
information. So, I can -- we can certainly take it off-
line, but I’m still trying to think through redacting
certain information, and our ability to store when you
receive links, as opposed to actual video. But that’s all.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I was just going
to uplift what Fredy was saying. I don’t remember a demo
of Granicus. I don’t -- maybe I wasn’t there for that.
But I do remember we had previously, like several months
ago, been talking about agenda systems, right, and some
sort of civic something or other that, you know, I think a lot of city councils and school boards use. So I don’t know if this is that system, but it sounds super exciting, and I would love to see it, if there’s others.

You know, I certainly have no sense of what that cost for something like that would be, but recognizing that we’re moving into a phase where we’re anticipating a whole lot of public input, I think if such a system could be useful to us, it would be, it would be great.

I mean, we do also of course have all these other systems that we’re ramping up as well, right, in terms an appointment system, the data management system, the COI Tool. So my only concern would be making sure that they can all speak to each other and work together.

But I think if there are things that can make our lives easier in terms of the agenda, I know we were talking about that a while ago, so I would definitely be interested in that as well. So I look forward to hearing more about it.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Great. Thank you.

I am going to -- okay. I was going to turn it back to you, Commissioner Fornaciari, to see where we wanted to go with this. Because I know we had some recommendations from the Public Input Design, and then we also have some recommendations from the Language Access
that we’re going to be amending. That piece of it we’ll be amending and bringing back.

So how did -- is that what you were going to respond to?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI (via Zoom): Yeah, I’ll do that, but first I want to talk --

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- I want to respond to the Granicus thing. You know, we looked into that. It’s pretty pricey to get it up and running. We’d only use it for a year. And all the information is stored on their system. And it was just unclear how we would manage getting all of that information back at the end of the year. So we ultimately recommended against going with Granicus, because just the complexity of dealing with the data.

And like Commissioner Sadhwani said, it’s just a whole other system to learn and get up and running. And by the time we got, you know, we’d figure out, it just didn’t seem like it’d be worth the overhead, too. So, we recommended against it, and -- but I’m sure there are other platforms that Fredy can find for managing the data input, hopefully, so.

Yeah, so let’s come back to where we were. I think -- I mean, if I can kind of summarize where we were
at with the Language Access, we had a lot of, a lot of good feedback on that. And the Language Access Committee will take that feedback back, and they’ve already arise some of their suggestions, and work and consider some of the other suggestions. And we’ll bring it back to the Public Input Design Committee, and then bring it back to the entire Commission next time around.

So, the June 10th meeting, you know, again, just circling back to the initial recommendations. The meetings are -- it seems like we kind of have consensus on three minutes for public input. The meeting’s already scheduled. I know we had a suggestion to make the meetings go over to allow for more input.

So this first meeting it’s already scheduled. The time is scheduled. So I just propose that we go with the duration that we have for this first meeting, and we can revisit it.

We’ve got the team putting together -- looking -- putting together a proposal for a scheduling system. I think there was uniform support for that.

I don’t know if we need to vote on these recommendations or if can just kind of get a consensus. Is it -- do we just-- is that okay?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Marian?

MS. JOHNSTON: You should have a vote.
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: We should have a vote. Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Ahmad.

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Just to piggyback off what Neal has been -- or Commissioner Fornaciari. Sorry, wearing the wrong commission subcommittee hat. When we were having these discussions and putting together this recommendation, I think what we ultimately wanted the full group to see was a dry run, right? A full end-to-end dry run of what a COI input meeting would look like.

Because, you know, the previous conversation that we had, like how do we accept certain types of input? What if it comes through like various different mechanisms, who is going to be taking that input down and noting it and putting it into the data management system? What is the role of the line drawer at these meetings?

We had a really robust conversation with Karin and Andrew at our subcommittee meeting about what role they played in 2010, which was very different than now because we have that COI Tool. How are we going to advertise the COI Tool during these live input meetings, to draw folks to use that mechanism to submit their input? So, the last item on that document that you all received for recommendations is along those lines.

In terms of voting on this, Marian, I hear you,
you said we should vote on this. But at this point, I’m seeing it more as an administrative thing. As more of planning purposes to give our team some guidance in how to organize and plan for just that June 10th meeting.

I personally am -- don’t feel strongly about having this concrete set in stone because it might change, right. We might learn that three minutes is not enough, or three minutes is way too much time. Or we might learn we need to shorten these meetings or lengthen these meetings.

Or we might learn certain regions people have used the COI Tool already, and they’re just not going to call in. So are we still going to sit there for six or seven hours?

So, I personally am just kind of wary on putting anything into stone because we still have that dry run coming up, hopefully next full Commission meeting. And then a few subcommittee meetings and a full Commission meeting in between that first June 10th meeting, so that we can refine and edit all of these recommendations before launching something for that first COI meeting.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Marian.

MS. JOHNSTON: My only point in suggesting a vote would be to have that as your -- to say that the June 10th is a trial. That it’s not set in stone, but this is how the -- you’re acting on the recommendation to do this as
your first Public Input Design meeting to see how it goes, and it will be revisited.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Another option, too, Commissioner Ahmad, is we could wait until the dry run, and then -- how about if we do that? Why don’t we wait until the dry run --?

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Yeah. No, that’s exactly what I was going to say --

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay.

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: -- is if we vote today and we learn next week that something doesn’t work, then what happens. So, yeah --

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Right. And, again, if we take a vote and we -- something does get approved, we can always amend that with a future vote as well. And that’s probably what Marian was going to say.

MS. JOHNSTON: Right.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Great.

MS. JOHNSTON: That would be fine.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. So, thank you everyone for your input. I think we have homework to do. And with that, we’re going to move on to -- let me get my list. Agenda item 9A. We’ll go ahead and start. We will have to take a break at 11:00, but at least that will give us a start.
And I will hand that off to Commission Sadhwani and Toledo.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Perfect. Well, thank you so much. I think we have a number of things to discuss today, including an update on that letter that we sent to the Governor’s Office, the timeline scenarios document, which I understand there are many -- some adjustments that need to be made to it. We’ve heard from a couple of folks already about that.

But I wanted to start off a little bit by talking about the letter that we received from Mr. Munger, and just, again, reiterate -- and I thank Ms. Hutchinson very much for calling in today and recognizing the provisions of Bagley-Keene, and the policies that we’ve taken thus far.

I’ll reiterate, as it was said at our last meeting, also, where this issue was questioned, that the Commission has, you know, is -- that two-person subcommittees are not subject to Bagley-Keene opening meeting requirements, and this Commission has selected to operate under those subcommittee provisions.

Bagley-Keene allows two members to communicate with external stakeholders, to plan meetings, logistics and conduct research. All of the CRC subcommittees are purely advisory in nature, as we just saw, right? The Language Access subcommittee went forth, you know, talked with a
number of stakeholders. You developed a set of recommendations, you brought them to the Commission, and we’re reviewing them and discussing them. It is not to suggest that we’re going to take every recommendation from a two-person subcommittee.

The 2010 Commission, to my understanding, referred to these as “ad hoc committees.” So the meeting referenced in the letter from Mr. Munger was such a subcommittee meeting. It was to discuss the impact of the Census delay.

Both Commissioner Toledo and I, as well as Alvaro, our Executive Director, and our counsel, Ms. Johnston, were all a part of that meeting. We reported it back to the full Commission, as is our policy of the Commission. No details regarding actual line drawing were discussed at that meeting, and, you know, and it was simply to collect information, and try to better create our response to the Census delay.

A reminder, also, that all of our agendas are posted 14 days in advance. So when someone wants to, you know, send us information, that’s wonderful, and we’re always here and ready to receive public input from any Californian who wants to submit information to the Commission, but it’s not necessarily going to be reflected in our agenda right away. Because, in compliance with
Bagley-Keene, we’re posting our agendas 14 days in advance.

I understand, also, that Mr. Munger had raised some concerns about our counsel. Commissioner Toledo is going to discuss that as well.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes, certainly. And I would just add to the point that you brought up, Commissioner Sadhwani. That we are -- while we are an independent Commission, we’re also a state agency. So we were set up as a state agency and operating under state rules, and we are following those rules as we’ve advised by counsel.

So -- but in terms of the VRA counsel, the issues raised were the potential conflict of interest with regards to our counsel. And I just want to remind the public and Commissioners that we did conduct a fair and open, transparent recruitment and hiring process for our VRA counsel in compliance with all state contracting guidelines.

VRA -- the RFI was posted publicly back in December actually. It’s been -- it was a while ago. All applications were posted on our website. They were thoroughly vetted. We received substantial public input, as well as we discussed it at various committee meetings. And during that process we did explore conflict of interest, and we found no disqualifying conflicts of
interest. Conflicts of interest, the conflicts of interest that were, were certainly disclosed, and the committee and Commission did not find any disqualifying conflicts of interest. And all of the interviews were conducted in public session, and they were voted. This body voted unanimously to move forward with the contracting process for the VRA counsel.

We do have the legal affair -- litigation counsel contract that are moving forward at this time, and those involve Gibson Dunn and Strumwasser Woocher. And those will be reviewed at the next legal affairs committee, and then hopefully coming to the full board at the end of the month.

And certainly we take conflicts of interest very seriously. We -- the legal affairs committee did a full vetting of both firms, and we anticipate to come back with a recommendation later in the month with litigation counsel.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Perfect.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sorry. And I think, you know, just to reiterate, all of us, right, as a whole Commission, we all have a deep commitment to transparency, and to having an open and fair process. And I think that that has absolutely been the case from the get-go. And so
we appreciate, you know, all Californians who want to weigh in. You know, we certainly welcome them to do so.

Moving on, just a very quick update to the letter to the Governor’s Office was received. Chair Fernandez did sign that letter, and it was sent off. Ravie (phonetic) in the office very kindly made sure that it was received, and we followed up actually with the staff contacts from the Governor’s Office. They said that they do have it. They don’t have a response yet, so I don’t have any additional update than that it was received. But certainly if there’s any questions about that or any additional advocacy that folks want to do, please do let us know. Seeing none, I’ll continue.

So we’ve also posted a document that we were creating. One of the things from our last meeting in discussing the Census delay, was to start thinking a little bit about what are some potential scenarios. And, you know, the Gantt chart committee and Commissioner Kennedy have definitely, you know, started us off in that realm, and so we just wanted to expand upon that a little bit.

We prepared a document simply for discussion today, and I know Ms. Hutchinson had referenced that. I think at our last meeting we were asked to put this document -- such a document together, and this was our attempt to do so, largely in advance of our new chief
counsel coming in.

As we’ve discussed, the Census delay and the possibility that when we deliver our maps has legal implications, right. I think in our last meeting there was -- we had a long conversation about that, and I believe we were all on the same page. That there is -- this is, at a minimum, a legal question.

And as we try to develop a response to what our timeline will be, we recognize that we have an incoming new chief counsel. We have incoming counsel, outside counsel as well. Litigation counsel is forthcoming. And so we wanted to be prepared for when they come onboard to share with them what some of the conversations have been thus far, as well as some of the opportunities.

So I tried to put together here an overview of the general dates in which we should be -- that we would ordinarily be held to. I have -- we have -- I think through Marian we had received comment from Angelo Ancheta. I don’t know, was that ever posted, or if that was meant to be a full public comment or not.

But I think we’ve also received feedback from Karin MacDonald about the timelines that we used. Because in the very first column I said, “used by the 2010 Commission,” and apparently these are not the exact dates that were used by the Commission. They held themselves to
these dates, and then they were -- this timeline was then codified into line 2012 is my understanding. So we can most certainly work on an update. This is why we posted these documents, right, from one Commission to another. There’s some information that can be lost, and so this is why we post them, to get this information. So I welcome, you know, public input on this, and you can feel free to tell me how I have it wrong.

What we’ve done here though in the first column is lay out what our process would have been, right. What are some of those milestone dates, had we received the Census data on April 1st, what our agenda would look like.

I want to also note that we were able to share this with Commissioner Kennedy and the Gantt chart committee, and he was able to provide some input as well. Commissioner Kennedy is really excellent at the dates and calendaring in detail, so I want to acknowledge that, and thank you very much for that input.

There are -- you know, I guess I hadn’t thought about, and Commissioner Kennedy was, you know, alerted me to the fact that, you know, sometimes if you’re starting the count of 14 days on the first day versus the second day, it matters, right. So Commissioner Kennedy was very helpful in this.

The key piece that we wanted to really point out
here, however, if that in our -- in the, what we’re calling kind of the usual process, our COI input meetings, the Commission of Interest input meetings typically would occur after the Census data has been delivered to the Commission. That was certainly the case, and I understand I might have the dates somewhat wrong, but that was the case for the 2010 Commission in general, right. So the Census data was there, and that’s when the COI meetings began.

We recognize that we -- you know, the date is uncertain in terms of the legacy data. We recognize there’s potentially legal issues regarding the legacy data versus the P.L. 94 official Census release on September 31st. And so we wanted to just think about the fact that these timelines are different.

And what I’d really like to point you to here is scenario one and two, in which one possibility is using that legacy data. I think that -- you know, and we can go back to the discussion, we had at last time, but we can certainly review it again if need be, that the legacy data is the same as the P.L. 94 data.

Marian I know was tracking, you know, some litigation on this nationally, and some of the conversation on it. I think we will have a pretty hard time saying that we shouldn’t use the legacy data, as we have discussed previously. But that’s still certainly something that we
can explore.

The key piece here that you should see that’s different, however, is when we begin line drawing, right, or when we could begin line drawing. So, we will be engaging with the community in June, July and August, prior to the release of Census data, before we have it. We have planned out over 30, I believe, or exactly 30 COI sessions to collect communities of -- community of input -- of interest input.

I think the real question then is, once we receive this legacy data in a usable format, does the Commission want to begin line drawing, or do we feel like we still need to go out and do additional, in addition to those 30-some-odd meetings that we’re doing, do we feel like we still need additional time to do more input?

Scenario two here using the legacy data, which we’re calling an innovative timeline, we could have called it whatever we wanted to but, suggests that in this, in this scenario, as soon as we have that, the legacy data in a usable format, we would begin line drawing in public. And that that would occur on September 21st, potentially, assuming by September 20th the statewide database gets it. Maybe it’s the 22nd or 21st or something like that.

In that scenario we would be able to move up all of the other requirements that we have to post draft maps,
to have a waiting period of those draft maps, to finalize those maps. And if we did it under scenario two, we could have this whole process done prior to the Christmas holiday at least, which I know was certainly a key consideration that community groups raised.

I think one of the things that’s -- you know, we haven’t built in here as, you know, which I think is, my sense is what the community groups are concerned about is, having that timeframe in which community groups themselves, who want to draw district maps and submit them to us, when that would be, right. It may not be on September 21st or before we begin our first draft of maps, but it could potentially be after we do our -- as we’re working on our final maps, right.

And I think one of the things that I want to just uplift here is that our first draft maps probably won’t get it right. The 2010 Commission certainly didn’t. They got a lot of heat for the initial maps that they put out. And I think we need to be prepared for that.

You know, I think even as the -- as we’ve seen, as the -- we’ve learned, that there will be one less congressional seat than we currently have, you know, tempers rise, and people care about this and are going to weigh in and tell us that we have it wrong.

And what we’ve attempted to do here is really
make sure that taking the recommendations of the 2010 Commission, making sure that we have extended time periods to go back out into the community and do additional public hearings after the draft maps have been formulated.

Certainly scenario one and scenario two are not our only options in front of us, and certainly not, you know, the four or five scenarios that we’ve placed here are not the only ones either. I’m sure we can come up with some others, but these are some of the ones that have been -- we’ve been discussing at length.

Scenario three, wait for the P.L. 94 data is another potential option. I’ve put on here, lawsuit risk high. I know Ms. Hutchinson was asking how we formulated that. You know, I can’t say that we used a particularly scientific form of analysis in creating that. However, in the discussions with our counsel one of the things that we’ve said regularly, is that if we’re waiting for the P.L. 94 data, it would leave us open to potentially having the courts relinquish our power and take it.

We certainly leave these all as open questions, as we assemble a larger legal team. And I think we can work together to develop that analysis in and of itself.

Scenario four -- you know, I wanted to also just report back. Alvaro and I were able to do a meeting with a member from the San Diego Commission, and this contact had
come through to Commissioner Sinay. The San Diego Commission requested to meet with someone to learn more about the Census process that we are using.

As it seems, the San Diego Commission, you know, has been -- I believe that they are meeting yesterday and today as well. And they were going to discuss the possibility of going to the legislature and asking -- they have a bill number already, I believe. I believe it was Senate Bill 594. I don’t have it in my notes in front of me but I can look for that.

Their hope is that they can get the legislature to identify the “trigger date” for their start of their process to be when the statewide database releases a usable data file. What they are anticipating is that that would be sometime in August, likely August 23rd, but ultimately August 23rd is assumed if it’s an August 16th drop of the legacy data.

And so, even that’s a little bit uncertain, but my understanding is, that was the direction that the Commission was going in, or at least going to be a recommendation from some of the Commissioners, and that the full subcommittee was going to take a look at that as a possibility.

They were also going to advocate to their full Commission setting a January 31st deadline for their maps.
It’s unclear to me whether or not such legislation would move forward. It’s unclear to me if the San Diego Commission sets a January 31st date, what impact that would have on us, because ultimately we would still fall under the Padilla ruling of the California Supreme Court.

But I wanted to put that out there as a possible alternative as well, and just share, you know, that we had had that meeting, also.

Commissioner Toledo, I’m sure I’ve missed something. Anything else you want to add? And I recognize we’re up against a break.

Thank you, Chair Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No, I think you did a great job of covering the timeline.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I think how -- should we take a break now and then go through questions?

What do you think Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I’m fine with whatever you’d like to do. I see Commissioner Andersen --

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Right. She’s very anxious.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Very -- yes, anxious to weigh in.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: If I could, just very short. There are two issues I see that we have to consider before we really jump into this. One is, both these
consider the draft and then a final. You know, and weren’t we going to talk about two drafts? And the other is, what is the actual process of the VRA, the analysis, how we look at it. And how does that fit with how much is done before the Census data gets here, and how much of it after, because that affects things, too, you know, in terms of, you know, when you start -- so that -- those are two.

I’d like when we get back if you kind of walk through the VRA process, so we know how that affects our timeline. And then we can kind of get a -- we can really sort of delve into it.

And then the idea of two drafts and a final, slightly modified. You know, that’s another thing to be considering. And then that’s it. That’s -- I think we should go to break. But those are things you need to consider, if anything.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

And with that cliff hanger -- hanger, we’ll go to break and come back at 11:15. Thank you.

(Off the record at 10:58 a.m.)

(Back on the record at 11:15 a.m.)

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Welcome back. So were on -- we are on Agenda Item 9A, and Commissioner Sadhwani and Toledo have gone through the different scenarios. And
so thank you very much. It’s actually very helpful to, you
know, see the dates and see what’s involved. So I really
appreciate that.

And we did have comments from Commissioner
Andersen. Did anyone else have any questions or comments
regarding the scenarios?

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Do you want me to go
now? I thought we were going to talk to Commissioner
Andersen’s comments. But, first of all, thank you for this
awesome, a lot of good thinking and thoughts going into
this. You know, Commissioner Andersen asked about the VRA
and what the approach is going to be for the VRA. And it
just -- I guess I just really have a comment.

It would be good if sometime soon, whenever we
can do it, just look at the full schedule and actually put
it on the Gantt chart and pull up the Gantt chart, and kind
of get an understanding of what all the upfront work is on
the VRA, and then in these different scenarios and what
they might look like, too, if that makes sense.

That’s all. But thank you all for your hard work
on this. It’s really helpful.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I’m happy to respond to
any and all of these comments. I wasn’t sure if there were
more that we want to kind of collect.
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: It’s up to you, however you want to do it.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. So, I mean, in terms of VRA, a lot of that work I think can be done prior to Census data, right. A lot of it will be CVAP data, which is already released.

So, my -- but I’m hesitant to chart out what that looks like, because we’re bringing in counsel, we just don’t have them onboard yet, right. Like we’ve approved the contract. It’s still sitting at the Office of Legal Services.

We can’t -- we haven’t been able to really have a detailed conversation with them yet about what their -- what approach they would want to take. So, I mean, I might have in my mind how we should do it, but we’re hiring these folks who are experts, so we should probably rely on that.

So, I do think that the first order of business once that contract is finalized, is to have -- and what we’ve kind of talked about in very vague terms, is having a strategy session, and really asking them to turn out for us, like in one or two pages, what’s their -- what do they anticipate their approach looking like, right.

What do they want to do in terms of racially polarized voting analysis? What do they want to do in terms of assessing, you know, where current VRA districts
lie, and to what extent we will continue to need them in
those similar locations moving forward? I think there’s a
lot that we’ll have to think about in terms of regions
where we’re not -- you know, California is super unique
because we’re not just dealing with one community that’s
covered by the VRA, we’re talking about multiple
communities, often times that live together.

And so I don’t have a clear sense, but I think a
lot of that work can be done at the -- especially in terms
of the data analysis this summer, and hopefully once -- as
soon as that Census data is released as well. But I don’t
have a clear answer for you yet, and I don’t want to give a
clear answer because I feel like that’s the role of our
counsel. If not, then you could pay me, and then -- and we
don’t even need them, right. But I think that that’s not
the purpose, right. It’s that we’re drawing on their
expertise.

You know, in terms of -- but I do think that it
can be done relatively early, and I think that’s why I also
pushed back on like making sure that we’re getting the
community input in multiple languages, and making sure that
the process is really set to do that, to have both sides of
it, the quantitative side as well as the qualitative from
communities on the ground.

In terms of two drafts, I think that’s a
Commission thing. I mean, I know, Commissioner Andersen, we had certainly talked about that in the line drawing subcommittee. I’m still open to that. I think we would need to really think about what that might look like.

In the scenario two, it does only include one set of drafts, but it does actually have quite a bit of time to go back to public hearings after -- you know, in the beginning of November, which is when that would kind of be scheduled out. My sense is that that’s also probably when we would request, if there are community groups who want to submit district map proposals to us, that it would be in that November time period.

So after we’ve already put together our first, our first cut at these maps, that’s different from how 2010 did it. We also don’t have -- I don’t believe we have any requirement to receive such district maps. We do so because we think it’s important to do so.

So, you know, I think if we want to go two rounds of draft maps, then that’s something we should certainly discuss as a Commission and figure out how we would do that.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I would just add to that.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: In terms of the VRA process, I appreciate Commission Andersen and Commissioner
Fornaciari’s comments. I do think that as we plan this forward, we will need to think about our own training, right, our VRA training, so that we can ask the right questions, and so that we can for the -- so that we’re the ones really determining the strategy around VRA, because that is our mandate.

And we need to be able to have sufficient training, I know we received some, but we’ll need more, as we develop the strategic plan around, around the VRA. So, that all requires time and meetings, and so we need to work through figuring out how to schedule those trainings, how to schedule those strategic sessions, planning sessions, and while also conducting the rest of the business.

And once chief counsel is onboard and we have all the litigation -- VRA counsel, I think, as Commissioner Sadhwani pointed out, we’ll have -- be able to chart this out a little bit better. And bring it back so that we get, can get more input from the full Commission on how to move forward and to make the timeline more realistic, and incorporate all of the elements that we’ll need to get all of the work done that needs to get done.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I would just add, I think that’s absolutely right. I think we’ve definitely talked about additional VRA trainings once counsel is onboard, once we have a better sense of, you know, even
their direction that they might advise us, in terms of the RPV analysis and such things. So I think that’s absolutely right.

And, also, just as a reminder, like this subcommittee is not asking the Commission to take action on any of these scenarios today. It’s simply for, something for us to think about and to continue to get legal advice as our full, you know, legal team is coming onboard.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

Any comments? I do have a comment. Regarding the -- I mean, it would be great if we could do two maps, but I feel that it’s almost like a wait and see. Are we going to be able to do it? Would we -- I don’t want to tie us to two draft maps, you know, early on, in case when we get closer to that point, maybe we want to have more public input in terms of on our draft maps, instead of releasing again and then you can’t do anything with it for seven more days.

So, I mean, I’m kind of like a wait and see type person. I mean, it’d be great to be able to do it, but there’s also a shorter timeframe from when you release the draft maps to when you have to finalize, you know, submit your finals. That’s my only comment on that, but of course we can still talk about that in the future.

And as Commissioner Sadhwani said, it’s not --
we’re not making decisions today. I really appreciate the options that you have put out there. It’s really good for me in terms to visually see the dates and, you know, calendaring it in my head, not finalizing it, but thank you.

Any other comments?

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I’m sure that there are some people that are wondering, and I apologize if I just didn’t hear it.

What -- is there a point where you anticipate that a decision will need to be made about what of the -- what options that’s going to be in around? I mean, and is it possible to give a kind of a sense or an idea of when that time -- when that could be, when we’ll have to make that decision?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And if you think back to our last meeting in the memo that had -- the infamous memo that we put out. You know, we -- our recommendation to the Commission was to develop a, quote, “wait-and-see posture,” right. Because there are potential legal implications for whatever scenario we choose, and we also know and can confirm that we have all of these legal resources coming onboard, and whatever choice we make I think we do need to have -- you know, just having our ducks in a row, if you
will, right.

And so my sense is -- or my recommendation I suppose, is that we continue to wait until, you know, those folks are onboard. They’re brought up to speed with where we’re at, and can work collaboratively, right, with Marian, with the full Commission, to help us really understand the litigation risks. I think there’s potentially risks in any of these scenarios, right. We’ve never even heard of legacy data before a couple of months ago.

You know, one of the things that we heard when we were interviewing litigation firms, we asked every, every -- in every interview, what do you see as the potential risks? And there were a whole host of them, and one of them was most certainly process.

And I think this is a process kind of question, right. Ultimately, whichever scenario we choose, someone in California might not be happy about it, and I think we’ll have to just make sure that we’re prepared.

So, you know, I don’t have a specific date in mind, but I think once we have those folks up -- and I see Marian has some thoughts on that as well.

MS. JOHNSTON: I just wanted to add that even the exact date that the legacy data is going to be released is somewhat of a question. It’s not before August 16th, but maybe it won’t be August 16th. So, certainly that at least
until the legacy data is released to decide how you want do proceed.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Any other -- Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: This is all very, very good, and very, you know, great info and what we need to work on. I think the only thing that we might have to really say, okay, what are we going to try is -- and again, as everyone just said, we don’t know. As Marian just said, these dates are vague still. I mean, they -- you know, even these dates say September 20\textsuperscript{th} or -- those are vague. We don’t know now.

You know, a week, four weeks. So, is it three and -- three weeks and six days? I mean, the dates we don’t know, and we won’t know. But it seems to me that -- and this is based again on as we find stuff out. But the Ohio case, the Census data, the Census Board is basically saying, the legacy is the P.L. 94, except it’s not user-friendly.

So, the idea of going to the California Supreme Court to make sure that it’s not until it hits the statewide database -- it’s not until it comes -- it’s already made user-friendly by the statewide database, should we ever consider that as it’s being delivered.

I think that is a very valid thing. If we need
to get onboard on that, I think we should do that as soon as. That’s the only -- that’s the first decision as I see you would actually need to make, and I think it’s very important. But it’s still, then it’s like, on week? We don’t know. So, whatever that -- you know, it would have to be (indiscernible). You know, when the clock starts, once it becomes user-friendly. And then in terms of when we can actually start on it, it depends on how long it takes to do prisoner reallocation.

And I would throw into our scenarios, in terms of looking at when we could actually start working on maps, I would throw at least a week in for the -- after we get the Census data. It arrives to us from -- it’s been prisoner reallocated, to go, okay, now where did all the population go in terms of VRA? Even though -- no matter how what our process is and how we look at it, I’d throw at least a week in, and only then could we think about actually starting to draw lines.

Because the first step, one is population. Boom, those numbers are easy. We know what those numbers are right now for each -- you know, what’s the number for how many in all the different districts? But where those people are we don’t know. And so, once the Census data gets here, and we look at it with the VRA information, essentially looked at in relationship to where the
(indiscernible) people are, only then can we start working on it. So, I’d throw another week in before we could ever start drawing any lines.

And then it goes from there. But again, we can all go vague dates. So the only thing I see is that we really kind of need make a decision on is, where’s the -- when does our clock start? So, that’s what I have to say.

And then the two map -- the two drafts, I think it is going to be sort of early. I do think we’re saying, we essentially are, even though we’re talking about, there’s only a draft and a final, we’re still talking about, we can make little changes to that final before it goes final.

So I’m saying like, don’t even think of it that way. It’s a second draft, and then the final is final. So that’s why I’m saying, but there might be a little bit of time in there. And then I don’t recall -- if we do a second draft, it does not have the same, we can’t touch it, or does it?

MS. JOHNSTON: It has seven days.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It does have seven.

Okay. Thank you.

So I think, depending on how this all shakes down, that we -- I still think we’d have time. But if we get good COI in right away, that first draft is going to be
a pretty good map.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I mean the way I’ve been thinking about this thing, you know, many of us have, as well as -- in looking at these timelines, do we have sufficient time to ensure that the communities being engaged, that we have public input, that we’re going to end up with maps that are fair and representative for the State of California by the end of these time periods, right?

And, yes, there’s uncertainty on certain -- on when we’re going to get the Census data on -- there’s lots of uncertainty all over that, all over the timeline, but we need to do our best. Look at the data as best as we can, which is what we’re doing.

And if we need to -- if we feel like we need additional time, which we may or may not after we look at all of these things and incorporate the -- how long it’s going to take us to do the VRA, and strategically, I mean, the training and all of the other elements we need to do.

Then we -- if we do need additional time, we need to strategize around -- any additional time left would go to the State Legislature, for example, would be the San Diego example. If we wanted to pursue that type of option where it would, where it’s actually a bill that we need to get passed, that takes time. And we would need to start
creating that sooner rather than later.

    If it’s going to the Supreme Court, that takes time as well. And so, we wouldn’t of course have to add an argument that would justify that. But we -- in order to justify that, we’d have to base it on some kind of, some kind of real need. Whether it’s us not being able to fulfill our constitutional duty, or the timeframe, which is probably be a stronger one. But we would need an argument, so we would need -- based on our timeline and our ability to do our work in any of these scenarios.

    So -- but I agree with Marian, that we’d probably have until, until the legacy data is released, or right before the legacy data is released. But we probably should have a decision sooner rather than later if it involves any type of, any type of, type of bill or legal changes, or going to the State Supreme Court. Thank you.

    CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

    Any other questions?

    Commissioner Akutagawa.

    COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I think Commissioner Toledo, I think he answered my question, but I think I’m going to ask it still anyways, more for just to say it out loud as a non-lawyer.

    And I guess my question is, let’s just say that there is the possibility that we may need to go the Supreme
Court for potential extension, knowing that it will take some time. Is it possible for us to kind of do some early groundwork with them, so that they know that we may be doing this? I don’t know. I think that’s why I’m asking, and there may be others who are listening in that may be thinking the same thing. So, just to try to shorten the time on the back end, so.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Marian.

MS. JOHNSTON: When they went in on the Padilla case, they did ask for expedited ruling from the court. And in fact the 2010 Commission got a request from the court about -- within a week after the petition was filed, that they wanted the 2010 Commission to weigh in. And I think the final decision was issued within about six weeks. So the court understood the urgency of the matter, and I’m sure that would be the same understanding this time around, if necessary.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

Right. But I would agree with Commissioner Toledo that -- I mean, if six weeks is a best-scenario, so we would definitely need to make a decision prior to that, prior to receiving the data I would think, so that we would know what our timelines are when we’re drawing the maps.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: One of my questions for my
colleague is kind of -- my colleagues, sorry, is what, what we were asked last time, and I still -- you know, obviously we’re all new to this. This is a new -- but how much time do we need? I mean, it was -- you know, when we’re looking at these scenarios, where are we feeling comfortable? You know, we keep talking about, do we need to change, you know, go to the Supreme Court, but we still haven’t talked about how much time do we need to look at this.

And I think Commissioner Kennedy gave us a good -- yeah, he did the math on, and it helped us. But I feel like we still haven’t had that conversation.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Just wanted to repeat part of my statement from the last meeting, which is to me the most significant difference between using the legacy data and the newer format data is the additional time, whether it’s one week or two required to make the legacy data usable, and that’s what we should be discussing, how to recover that time. Because that, as I understand it, that is time that was not factored into the Supreme Court’s decision and, therefore, that would be time that we would have -- will have lost relative to the 2010 Commission.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen, and then Commissioner Sinay.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I totally agree with Commissioner Kennedy. With the possible addition of, our scenario does go over this -- which is a slight difference from, again, the 2010 -- well, the Padilla ruling, is should it go beyond December 15, we would have two holidays in there, official legal holidays. And fortunately, it’s only two.

So, those are also days that we should, we could easily say, we should have those back, too. But I agree that in terms of, you know, you go, you ask for, you ask for what you want and then what’s totally defendable, or things that are different from the four-and-a-half-months’ scenario that was put originally into our whole charter.

And we’d have to really come up with something hard to say there’s something different with what everyone was thinking all along for four-and-a-half months, to modify that, except for things that are extenuating beyond what was the norm.

And these, as Commissioner Kennedy just said, the legacy data, until it’s put in the same format that is user-friendly, that’s time that was not considered. And the extra holidays are also time that was not considered. You know, because it -- I looked at the -- of actual holidays in the original scenario, and if you throw -- that’s already considered because there’s Thanksgiving in
this group, so they considered those. But then should it
go beyond if there are a couple more holidays? So -- which
would be Christmas and New Year’s. That’s, you know, in
terms of what the holidays would be. So, I think you could
ask for those as well.

Anything else we’d actually have to have, that’s
a little bit -- the 2010 didn’t do it well, or there’d have
to be another justification to modify that timeframe. And
with a six-week scenario, I believe we’d have that ruling
before it hits, before the legacy data is out.

Because otherwise, our clock is started, has
started ticking. You know, we need to have that. I mean,
so -- which puts the six weeks would be, you know, August
-- what is it, August 15th, say, so we’re talking July 1.
And then to get that ready, we’re talking June 1. We’d do
all the prep work, blah, blah, blah to get it to the
Supreme Court, which means I think we should be going on
this now.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay, I think I saw your hand up.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I don’t know. Another legal
holiday that hasn’t been brought up, but I think everybody
gets it off, is, statewide is Veteran’s Day, falls in here.
But it’s -- but I just -- I want to go back to something
that Commissioner Sadhwani reminded us of, is last time it
was collecting the COI’s at the same time as they were line
drawing. This time we’re spending all of that time on the
front end this summer.

And so, I’m -- I just need to understand how we
would justify needing more time than they did last time,
when we’re doing a lot of the work earlier on, and we’re
really going into the line drawing. So I -- that’s kind of
where I’m kind of stuck right now.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. And I just want to
remind everyone that our chief counsel starts on Tuesday,
and I think that this would be something that he could look
into. Because it’s, as we know, it’s not going to be
something simple, and he would have to look into the
argument, weigh the pros and cons, what’s the best use of
our resource, staff resources and time and money.

And, again, we don’t know how long it’s going to
take us to draw maps, so we’re going to have to take all
this, put it in a basket, and have him bring it back and
give us the information that he’s found, and then we can
make a decision from there.

Any other -- Commissioner Vazquez, and the
Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: To Commissioner Sinay’s
question. For me, you know, it’s up the lawyers to make
the legal argument, but we’ve discussed here before that
our charge and what we, the 2020 Commission have taken up as our charge, is orders of magnitude greater than what the 2010 Commission had in terms of its (indiscernible). The bottom line for them was that they had -- they didn’t have an outreach component at all. And for a lot of reasons had not -- the way I interpret it, is that their scope was much smaller than what ours has been able to be, given that we were seated earlier, and I think we’ve also made statements that we actually need more, more time to really lean into this outreach, right. But the 2030 Commission, you know, our general recommendation would be to seat them much sooner.

So, again, I would leave it to the lawyers to figure this out in terms of how to argue it, but our mandate requires us to do so much more, and we are leaning into those pieces of the mandate to make sure that we have included everyone, and everyone’s input into this process, and that just requires more time.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. Thank you. I really appreciate the dialogue and the scenarios that has been lifted. I just need it to say, and not because I have a definitive kind of path forward and set choice that I’d like to make, but I do think there is a difference.
Commissioner Kennedy and others can think so much more analytical, but thinking of the significant difference is just the one week or two, and holidays considered, all of that, I keep thinking that we go to such extent and extremes to ensure -- and I was trying to write out my thoughts to make sure I had it -- that we were cautious to be inclusive of, you know, language access and disability access and all those other piece parts. To me I feel like if we get around, we choose something to get around to the holiday time period, there is the cultural aspect that just is real for, for sure Black Americans.

I can speak from my own personal experience that holidays are huge, and it’s not just the day, it is family, it is the time. We are coming out of a pandemic when last year people could not travel. It will be a huge competition factor for people to focus during this time period.

And I don’t know that that was considered when we were just looking at days, counting them as apples to apples. I don’t think it’s the same thing. I think that it should be at least considered and included in the conversation as we’re talking about how easy it will be for people to participate, for organizations to get people to weigh in.

And I know a lot of the scenarios we’ve even
talked about having them earlier, which I think that would be great. I just wanted to state again that if we get around those holiday time periods, I don’t feel it’s as cut and dry as we’re making it as far as just a calendar count. I think that we need to take -- and then as far as what do we need, how much time? I’m hoping and looking forward to the additional training that we’re still going to have, the VRA conversations, all of that. I don’t know exactly what we need and how long. I’m glad to be able to sit through that discussion as well.

But for this comment, I just wanted to say that I’m concerned that we are not giving enough weight and consideration to a cultural obstacle or difficulty that I believe is real when we get to the holiday periods. Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. This is great. I’ve been writing down what everybody’s been -- like arguments. So, we’ll definitely forward that to our chief counsel when he arrives, and he can start looking into that.

Are there any other questions or comments before we move on?

Commissioner Sadhwani and Toledo, do we have anything else for Government Affairs?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Not for Government Affairs,
but just, you know, touching on Commissioner Turner’s point. I, you know, I think certainly that’s an important issue. I think it’s certainly an important issue for farmworkers who often times go back to -- are gone from California. They go back to their home countries for the holidays. And many of the Latino communities across the State, and other communities who have (indiscernible). I know the holidays are just an important cultural, a cultural -- are important for every community probably.

But it’s, you know, for some communities it will be harder for them to engage during the month of December, and that’s just something we have to balance as we look through all of these issues and try to figure out how best to ensure that we have meaningful participation in -- through the process.

And so I just wanted to uplift that comment, knowing that it’s a difficult situation and we are under very tight time constraints. But that we need to consider that issue as well, and balance it against all of our other legal and time constraint issues. Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you for that. I didn’t think of that, and as soon you brought it up, we would be gone for six weeks during that timeframe. We go back to Mexico for six weeks. The schools didn’t like it very much, but it was great that we were able to do that.
It’s a great cultural experience and connection. And you’re absolutely right, it’s so much so in this community that they have a three-week Christmas break, not a two week, because so many of the community members do go back to their home country. So, thank you.

Any other discussions?

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I’m very glad of this uplift, because it is, it really is. There’s no -- I mean, and it’s -- this is a good thing. This is a wonderful thing. That people in our country of all different backgrounds really do, you know, these holidays. That’s why it’s called the holiday time, and it is really very, very important.

What we kind of, I believe, is the Commission needs to kind of try to grapple with is, how much time should we think if we’re considering this? How much time would we consider? And I think that’s something we should really kind of contemplate and come back, because our chief counsel is going to go, well, based on what?

And we’d have to kind of come up with, you know, is it just, is it just a week? Is it a -- is it around from this time to that time? I mean, you know, based on what would we -- you know, and how long?

So I think that’s something we should, you know,
consider, and then come back to, you know, when -- because we’ll obviously talk about this on, in our next meeting with the chief counsel. And this will be talked about again. But I think it’s very -- you know, I’m thinking my personal, yeah, you know, you’ve got to get there. You’ve got to -- you know, you’ve got that week. You know you have that -- so, you know, I’m thinking of my scenario, but what are other people’s scenarios? I mean, what are other considerations? So I think we should consider that, and then bring that also back.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I think that’s right, right, and I think that that’s the piece. So, I don’t -- what my concern about our conversation thus far is like, we recognize the scenarios and a little bit we’re punting, too, I mean, chief counsel, which puts in a bit of an awkward situation.

I do think if the notion of the Commission is that we’re going to need more time, how much, right. Like, you know, the date being floated by many of the community groups has been January 31st. Do we need that much time, right? Do we need all of January as well?

I don’t have any skin in the game on that, I just feel like we -- like is that the notion of the Commission, right? Is it not January 31st? Is it January 15th? I have
no idea what day of the week any of those fall on. I don’t have that in front of me. Is it sometime before that? Is it somewhere in the middle? You know, I think that that -- you know, one of the things with counsel, I think, and I’m not a lawyer, but we do need to understand what is the will of the Commission and then ask them to go figure out how to make it happen, right. Like what’s the legal argument behind it? How are we going to do it? What will the strategy be? Do we have to go back to the Supreme Court? But I think this is actually a really helpful conversation, and I really appreciate Commissioner Turner and Toledo and Chair Fernandez raising this cultural component, because if we want more time, how much? And then we can kind of tell the lawyers, like this is what we want. Try -- see if you can make it happen, right, from that legal perspective.

So I don’t want -- you know, I am cautious to like say, well, we can figure out all of this once the attorneys come on, because at some level, as a Commission, we need to know what we want.

And I think that’s why these scenarios lay out a couple different options, but there could be others, I don’t know. And that doesn’t mean that any of those scenarios are defensible in court, right. That doesn’t mean that we’re going to get them, but we can say what we
want, right, and have it --

(Recording inaudible.)

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes. Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I guess not -- I really appreciate the conversation about the kind of the cultural nuances, too. I’m just wondering, like I’m thinking about just the way COVID has really changed life in a lot of communities. And I don’t want to assume that life is going to be completely back to what we might have known it before, both in terms of our cultural practices and just, you know, our willingness to, you know, continue on in the ways that we used to live life.

So, I feel like some of the assumptions that we’re making I think, you know, may need to be tested, or at least questioned, only because are there new things that have been created in the -- given that we might still have communities that don’t feel comfortable traveling and other things like that.

And it could be that if we’re going to be completely virtual even through the end of the year in terms of the input that we’re going to be asking, if they’re away they could still participate via Zoom, but I think where it becomes more complicated is, how do you organize them so that they do know to call in. That there’s going to be something going on.
I think that’s the role that I think some of the, you know, the community-based organizations play, is to make sure that the community members know about it, and get on to, you know, whatever method that they would be asked to participate. So I just want to also just encourage us to keep that in mind as well, too.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thanks. I was recalling a caller mentioning the importance of public outreach to encourage this broad participation that we want. And so I want to encourage our outreach staff to be thinking, okay, if we end up being, you know, stuck between a rock and a hard place and we don’t have a way out, and we have some of this happening over the holidays, we’re going to need a robust outreach effort to motivate people to participate at a time when they might prefer to be doing something else.

And, you know, I would like everybody to participate. And so we may have to, you know, reserve some funding for additional outreach work at that point in time. But we also need plans. We need to be creative, to motivate people when it’s going to be hard to motivate them. Thanks.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Thank you. And I do hear you, also, Commissioner Sadhwani, in terms of, you
know, we’re the ones driving this. Absolutely right.

So, with that, I don’t want to say I want a challenge, but how about homework, so that everyone -- you know, go back and think of the different factors that may be different, in terms of this process versus 2010 and how -- and, you know, why we think -- how we think we could justify going forward.

And step two is, how long do we think we’re going to need? I mean, that’s the more difficult question, because like you don’t know. But at the end of the day, if you have more time than you need, that’s great, right, because you can always finish early if you -- you know, before the deadline. But how many times have any of us had projects and we’re like, I wish had an extra week, right.

So, that’s kind of -- so let’s think about this and come back next time and just really delve into this. We are right now, but we can continue to delve into it.

I have Commissioners Turner and Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Chair, can we finish early if we submit a timeline telling the public what we’re going to do and how long we’re accepting -- would we actually be able to finish early, or would we then need to stick to whatever timeline? I’m just referring, I’m thinking about what you just stated.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Marian.
MS. JOHNSTON: Nothing would preclude you from doing it earlier than your statutory limits.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. And what I’m saying is, is that if we, if we announce this is the timeframe that we’re working with. This is when we expect to draw drafts, finals. This is when we’re -- if we’re setting that and stating it, and we --

MS. JOHNSTON: You wouldn’t be bound by that if you find you need more time. You’re only bound by what the maximum time is.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I think what Commissioner Turner is leading to is, if we give a timeline and then we cut it off early, how fair is that, right?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: It seems like that would be problematic if we set --

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Right.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- a timeline and then determine, we got what we need.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Akutagawa, and then Toledo.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I guess that that -- and maybe I’m oversimplifying things, but at the same time I guess I’ll just say it out loud. I think we work to the amount of time that we’re given. And I think to Commissioner Sadhwani’s point, you know, I think we should
really realistically determine like how much time do we really need, and then use that maximum time in the most efficient and most productive way that we as a 14-person body can, trying to move like an aircraft carrier, you know, around, you know, something like that, it’s not going to go fast.

So, I do also just want to say with that in mind, then that way I think if we set a time that we will submit that part at such-and-such time, I think we have to honor that. I mean, we could be done earlier, but I think that’s where if we think really -- think through really just the amount of time that we need, we won’t be worried about doing -- you know, are we going to finish early. We’ll be really like working up, probably up to that deadline, because we’ll be using every minute of the time that we have.

And instead of just kind of like, well, we could do this and we could do that, and I feel like, you know, I think just human nature, we’re going to -- there’s going to -- I don’t want there’s going to be procrastination, it’s just that we’re going to think about all the other things that we need, things that we could do, and then intend to do. And then when crunch time comes, we’re just going to start to, you know, say, okay, what is it that we absolutely have to do?
So, I think I just want to just throw that out there for our consideration, so that we could, you know, really be honest about our time, too.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I would concur with Commissioner Akutagawa. I think, you know, we’re preventing worst -- we’re doing scenario play and (indiscernible) we’re attempting to do.

And there’s certainly the worst-case scenario and the best-case scenario. And what we need to come up with is really figure what -- how much time we actually need to do meaningful outreach to get us to fair and representative maps within the worst-case scenario.

And if we have additional time, how could we -- you know, how might that benefit us in terms of, potentially, the second draft that Commissioner Andersen has brought up or -- and how would that fit in, et cetera, et cetera.

But I do think, going back to Commissioner Turner’s point, I guess the question becomes, could we be challenged if we -- could there be legal challenges if we said we’re going to be done on such-and-such date and we ended up -- ended earlier.

And so that’s, I think, the -- would that pose a
risk to our maps if for some reason we were to do that? 
And I don’t know the answer to that. Maybe Marian can
weigh in on that.

MS. JOHNSTON: I think just what Commissioner
Turner was suggesting, that if you have expectations, that
people think they’re still going to have more time to
comment, that that might be unfair. It’s up to the
Commission.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Any other comments?

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I do believe we
wanted to try these as realistic as possible, knowing full
well that we’ll use whatever time we have. But also if we
arbitrarily sort of set something, well, okay, we know that
that’s -- you know, we probably won’t even all that time.

You know, we’re not working in a vacuum. I mean,
if like we say, you know, we’re going on February 15,
period, and we maybe know that we don’t really need to go
out that way, all the election people do have to stick with
whatever date, the final outside date that we say.

So we have affected a ton of other people, unless
you need to, you know, we have to be, we do have to be
considerate. Now that doesn’t mean whatever time we need,
that’s what we need. But to arbitrarily go, well, we’ll
just take extra time, that’s -- you know, then we’re not
being good citizens, you know, or, you know, good
Californians I should say, because that doesn’t have
anything to do -- well, it is -- anyway.

   It’s -- the point is, is we really want to be
careful with how much time do we really need, and to do our
outreach, to do the maps, and then that’s what we should be
asking.

   CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Any other comments? Okay.
Again, we will bring this up -- I’m not sure if the next
Chair, Commissioner Ahmad, would bring it up, or actually
give -- it can be brought up during the subcommittees.
Yeah. So think about how much time we’re going to need.

   My opinion personally is, what would be defendable
would be how much time do they have -- did the -- were we
given to do it, and then see if the -- see if we have
justification to try to extend that date out based on, you
know, having to make the Census data workable, and meeting
potentially holidays. That’s just my own personal opinion
in terms of how far we can justify moving the date out.

   So with that we’re going to move on. I’m going
to try to break for lunch at 12:30 because we have a panel,
the Labor Panel is at 1:00 -- 1:30. Actually I’ll try and
break at 12:25, to give us an hour.

   I’m going to go quickly to 9B, that’s Finance and
Administration. We had a motion yesterday to move forward
with the four outreach positions, three field leads and the outreach coordinator. And so -- I think, do we have a quorum? Do we have enough for that right now? I want to make sure. We didn’t have enough yesterday. It looks like we do.

Commissioner Le Mons, are you listening in?

Commissioner Ahmad?

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Just a quick clarifying question on that. Will the motion be repeated? Was it to hire or to --

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes, it was to hire --

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Okay.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: -- to hire and move forward. So the motion was -- let me go back to my tab. The motion was to move forward with the four hires in the outreach area. There were three leads, two Southern, one Central California, and then the outreach coordinator. So it was move forward and hire.

Yes, Marian?

MS. JOHNSTON: It is a motion for hiring, so you need three, three and three at least.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Right.

MS. JOHNSTON: So, if we don’t --

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I know. I was trying to figure out if we had it.
MS. JOHNSTON: We don’t have Commissioner Akutagawa, and we don’t have --

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: She’s here. She’s here.

MS. JOHNSTON: She is back. I’m sorry. So we do have, we have enough people.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. But we need to go to public comment first, right?

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Katy, can we go to public comment, and it has to do with 9F, the hiring of four staff.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: That’s right. So it’s the same motion as yesterday, correct?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Okay. Thank you. Wonderful.

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 93330293366 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 star-nine. This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it is your turn to speak you will hear a message that says, “the host would like you to talk,” and to press star-six to speak.

If you would like to give you 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 the Commissioners are taking public comment in relation to Item Number 9B, it says here, the hiring of four outreach positions.

At this time we do not have anybody in the queue with their hand up. Again, I will remind those in the queue that star-nine raises your hand indicating that they wish to comment.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. While I wait just a minute, after this, what I have left, and please correct me if I’m wrong or I’ve missed something. I have 9K, which is the COI, Communities of Interest statistics, 9J is Grants, and then 14 is our label -- Labor Panel.

Is there anything else that I’ve forgotten that
we’re still -- okay. That’s great.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And the instructions are complete on this stream, Chair.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, Katy.

Okay. Executive Director Hernandez.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you. So this is a motion to move forward -- I’m going to spell that correctly. Move forward to hire three field staff and the outreach coordinator. The motion was made yesterday at 2:36 p.m. The motion made by Commissioner Fernandez, seconded by Commissioner Taylor.

We will begin the vote here.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commission Sinay?

Commissioner Taylor?

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner?
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Sorry. Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Ahmad?

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen?

Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fernandez?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes.

MR. HERNANDEZ: The motion passes.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Great. Thank you.

MR. HERNANDEZ: And I will stop sharing here.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thanks.

And, Commissioner Kennedy, you had mentioned yesterday that you had some statistics for us for Item Number 9K, with the Communities of Interest?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes. We have updated statistics on the Communities of Interest input tool. As of last week there were 237 users. Now there are 256. As of last week there was 188 submissions, now there are 206. None of the new communities of interest have been submitted
in non-English languages.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Great. Thank you.

Any questions on that before we move forward?

Okay. So the next item is 9J, which is Grants. And that is Commissioners Akutagawa and Commissioner Le Mons.

I’m just going to -- we’re going break at about 12:25, and then we will break for lunch, have the Labor Panel, and then if there’s further discussion needed, we can discuss it then. Unless you want to just wait until after the Labor Panel. I will leave it up to you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think it should be fairly quick. It’s just a brief update.

So, what I want to say is, due to statutory authority what we’ve done is we’ve pivoted to a contracting method for the grants. And where we are right now is that we’ve been following the state contracting process and procedures, and we’ve been working with the staff to submit a draft RFP for prereview to the DGS, Department of General Services, Office of Legal Services.

So we’re still waiting for an update. We were hoping to have an update today, but we are still waiting for the update. So we expect that we’ll hear something shortly. And so, that is our report for right now. And if anybody has any questions, we’re -- I’m happy to take any questions.
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Just, I just want to think pragmatically about this, and I still appreciate -- this is such a tough one. It’s always been a tough one, right, because can the state agencies’ commissions rebranch? I don’t know. Like I think this is the ongoing question. But I’m also really recognizing that we’re move into a period of collecting the communities of interest input.

And so I just wanted to ask like in realistic terms, like we’re still waiting to figure out this, you know, are we legally allowed to do this or not, and what might that look like?

I mean, what do we think are the -- what do we anticipate is the likelihood that something like this can actually -- even if we are allowed to do so, I mean, can we get this off the ground within the -- I mean, we were thinking through all of these scenarios, and I mean regardless of which direction we choose, we’re going to be done sometime in December or January.

You know, just having received grants in the past, I mean, it’s a long process. So, I guess I’m just trying to wonder, do we have backup plan? I’d just love to hear a little bit more of the thoughts on the practicalities of moving this forward at this point in
time. And that is not meant at all as any kind of slight
to the subcommittee. You know, I think this is something
we’ve all been, you know, thinking about and grappling
with, you know, for many months. And, you know, we all see
community input as -- an engagement as being of upmost
importance.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. And thank you so
much for asking that question. I think that that is
grappling part that has been going on after we made our
initial report in, I think it was in February, and we were
so hopeful that we had finally come to a place where we can
move.

And I think to that point, we believe that the
RFP contracting process is the way in which we can legally
go, but we just want to make sure that we cross the t’s and
dot the i’s, and we’ll then be able to present something.

If anything goes as we hope it will, then in
working out a timeline we believe that we will be able to
take on the shortest possible times, and that -- and,
Marcy, I’m going to ask you to weigh in on this part,
because you know the actual timelines best. But we believe
that we would be actually getting money out or regranting
funds sometime towards the end of June -- although am I
wrong on that? Was it more July? I’m going to -- maybe
Marcy could weigh in now.
MS. KAPLAN: Yes. So just with the proposed scenario that we have looked at, which was a little bit -- I think we were hoping we’d be able to have review. And so within -- I think the soonest in terms of contract award and execution was middle of June.

So that’s not getting the dollars out, that’s just the contract execution. And that was on a timeframe if we had actually been able to have approval from the full Commission of the RFP this week. And so I think that pushes us a little bit on that timeframe.

So that would be the contract execution was not when the dollars would come out. And as with contracting it’s different than with a grant. So, I just, I think we want to also just shift that language.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So I -- and I apologize. We -- this -- the timeline that I was thinking about, now that I think about it, time was flown by fast. And this was at the end of April that we were looking at this timeline.

And we were hoping that we would be able to present something to the full Commission for approval by around this time, but we’re still waiting for, you know, the official opinion/approval that this is definitely the way we can go, so.

And a plan B is probably something that we will
be shortly talking about next, because the further out we go, the further -- the less likely that this is going to be the best --

(Music playing in background.)

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: And so do we have an estimate as to when we’ll find out if this is the right mode? And then -- so it’s a two-part question. And then let’s say the RFP is the way to go, is the RFP already written, the language already written, so it’s ready to go? Okay.

MS. KAPLAN: Well, I’ll -- I don’t know if Alvaro wanted to --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Maybe Alvaro could --

MS. KAPLAN: Yeah.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you. The RFP is written in a draft form. We wanted to make sure that we hit all the elements. Because in the previous method that we were thinking of for grants, it was very different. And so we’re not able to do it that way.

So now we are going to proceed looking at it from a contract perspective. And as you know and you’ve experienced through the line drawer, the videographer, and also the VRA contracts, they are different, and they must follow specific guidelines that all state agencies must follow.
So, we’re trying to ensure that we’re on the right path as far as the language and the information that is required of the RFP, and also looking at the funding part of it, how the money is awarded out and so forth. So all those elements is what OLS is looking at, to make sure that we are on the right path.

Should they come back and say, no, we can’t do it this way, then we have to adjust that request and that information, so that they could take a look at it and make sure that, okay, that is doable, and then we’ll bring it back to the Commission for the full review. That’s the intent.

But I do want to mirror what Marcy said. We have to shift our verbiage from grants to awarding of a contract. Because we cannot issue grants, and that’s what Commissioner Akutagawa was referencing in regards to the statutory, statutory authority part of it that doesn’t allow us to do so.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. So, am I understanding it correctly, that we would be doing direct contracting with entities for -- the proposal at this point would be -- or what we’re exploring is potentially doing direct contracting with agencies, instead of doing a
granting process?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, that’s correct.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And I think when we thought about this a couple months back, and this was a while ago, I think the concern we have around that is -- was impartiality and the, and the need to ensure that we’re -- were -- you know, that we are impartial as the Commission. So -- and I’m sure that the committee has looked at this issue and has a plan to address it and -- but that certainly would be the, a concern that still would arise with this issue, I mean, because we won’t have the protection of having it with a third party. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. And you’re right, we -- this was -- I’ll be honest, I don’t think that this was our preferred direction for all of the reasons that you’ve mentioned. And as we had discussed, you know, I think it was back in end of January, beginning of February, you know, there were a lot of different reasons.

Obviously a contracting process is also going to be potentially more challenging for some of the smaller organizations that we really wanted to make sure that we would be able to get funds to who are doing the direct work.

But going to a contracting process we’re probably going to be seeing more larger agencies being able to apply
and, therefore, you know, being the ones to perhaps help move money out into the communities so that it’s reaching, you know, the hard-to-reach communities that we want to make sure are being covered. So, yeah, this is -- and so I see that Commissioner Le Mons has joined us.

So, Commissioner Le Mons, if you want to weigh in on this part, too.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah, I’ve been listening. I’m sorry I wasn’t able to speak earlier. But I echo everything you’ve already presented. I just wanted to say that from a process point of view, what we’re really anxious to get in front of the Commission is the scope, because that I think, we’re going to have to use that as our mechanism to address the concerns that Commissioner Toledo just raised and others, that we are all -- Commissioner Akutagawa and myself are intimately aware of.

This has been painful. It’s very incredibly painful. However, we’re trying, you know, we’re of course working within the parameters that we have and really trying to hold the line on the integrity of the vision. And we think that the scope is going to be our best chance at that.

So, that’s where we’re really going to lean on all of you to really scrutinize that scope, and it’s just not released yet because we’re still in the step that
Commissioner Akutagawa has already described. So, that will be forthcoming, and the invitation is for every Commissioner to look at it through that lens of what our vision is.

You know, at this point, you know, as much as we’re all fighters and we’re 2020 and we’re not anybody else and all of that, we found ourselves in a situation where we’re restrained in a way that we’re having to really work with. So, we’re going to make it work and get as close to the original vision as possible.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And the other piece, too, when you initially presented the two options of, I think it was if we picked option one -- I forget which one it was, we would need an outreach position to manage all those grants. And because we picked option B, we decided we didn’t need that position. So I’m just a little -- it’s outreach -- I guess it’s more towards Director Kaplan, knowing that now we’re going to have to manage multiple grants in terms of what that’s going to look like, and the ability to manage that extra workload.

Marcy, I saw your hand up, and then Commissioner --

(Recording inaudible.)

MS. KAPLAN: If Commissioner Le Mons wants to start and then --
COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah. I think this kind of is to Marcy and Alvaro’s point. That whole grant model is not the model anymore. So what was presented back then is very different actually as we’re moving forward with this RFP and doing a contracting. So it’s going to be a small number. It’s not like we’re going to be managing multiple grants. So we’re not going to need a workforce to do that, at least that’s my understanding.

Marcy, correct me if I’m wrong on that.

MS. KAPLAN: I think what the avenue that the Commission’s exploring was a multiple-awards schedule RFP, which is not necessarily -- which breaks it down by region, which was what they were advised as an approach to look at as a potential for an RFP, which would not be then as many -- like Commissioner Le Mons noted, splitting up the decision that was presented before, versus one entity, versus numerous grantees. It’s not. I think you can’t look at that approach.

And so, there would be staffing that would be needed to oversee this RFP and contracts that would be executed, however, it would not be to the extent of numerous -- the amount of contracts would be smaller than what was discussed in terms of the grants, the grants process before. That’s clearer.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes. Because before it was the
scenario, there would be quite a few grants and you’d have
to manage those. So, you have justified a position.

We’re running up against a time -- Commissioner
Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I was just going to
offer, I am very excited to see where this all goes.
Having been a part of the line drawer RFP and the counsel
RFI’s, the contracting I find horrifying. So, I’m so glad
it’s you all and not me. But what I might just offer is,
you know, I think I’m going to -- counsel is going to have
a lot on his plate, I think Marian has a lot on her plate.

But I know one of the things you had talked about
before is the potential need for additional retired
annuitants in the legal area. And I’m wondering if
potentially finding someone with that contracting
experience might be helpful, if this is ultimately the way
that we move forward. Because the contracts -- you know,
there was a lot involved in that.

So I, you know, I think having someone with a lot
of contracting experience, which our new chief counsel has,
but someone who could just focus in on this piece of it in
a, you know, maybe in a part-time capacity, might be a
beneficial way of using our resources to get it done.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

Any other comments? Okay. So with that, we’re
going to go ahead and break for lunch. If you can be back at 1:25, we have the Panel starting at 1:30. I just want to make sure we’re all back. Thank you so much. Have a good lunch.

(Off the record at 12:28 p.m.)

(Back on the record at 1:30 p.m.)

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Welcome back, everyone. Hopefully everyone had a good lunch.

We are moving to Agenda Item 14, which is our Labor Panel. I’m very, I’m looking forward to this Panel. I look forward to all the panels, but I’m really looking forward to this one. And I am going to pass this off to Commissioners Sinay and Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair.

So, this will probably be the last of our outreach education panel. And we’ve, you know, we’ve had folks come and speak to us about language access, Native Americans, immigrant refugees, environment infrastructure. We did the business panel, and now we’re excited to have the Labor Panel. We’ve been working on this for a while, and we’re excited that it’s finally here.

I really want to thank Bryan, Dylan and Dolores for their time today, and for coming to speak to us. They -- Bryan had -- yeah, Bryan, you had slides that we have put up. And just so, I just want to make sure that they
have screen-sharing privileges.

MR. MANOFF: They do.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Kristian.

And I’ll let each of them as they speak introduce themselves and tell you a little bit about their background. And we will start with Bryan, who will give us the big -- yes?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I just want to make sure that they’re aware, hour and a half we’ll take a break, and then they can continue on.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Uh-huh.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We’ll be -- we should be done in an hour and a half.

But we’ll start with Bryan, and he’ll give an overview of kind of the labor movement in California. And then we’ll -- Dylan will give us a little bit of a feel of labor movements in urban settings and cities and such. And Dolores Huerta, who is, you know, the founder of the labor movement in kind of the rural areas.

So, it’s a privilege to have all three of you here today, and we look forward to learning from all of you.

MR. BLUM (via Zoom): Thank you. I think I’m first. I am Bryan, my name is Bryan Blum. I’m the
Political Director for the California Labor Federation.
And what the California Labor Federation is, is in effect, the umbrella organization for labor unions in the State of California. And I’m going to go ahead and share a screen if I can.

Okay. Is -- can everyone see the screen with -- okay. Great.

So, yeah, the California Labor Federation is the umbrella organization for labor unions across California. We are not any individual union. Again, we’re the federation of unions. There are about a little over 1,200 individual, local unions all across California. And we are the voice, the unified voice for the labor movement in California. And I’ll get a little more into that structure a little bit in a couple of the other slides.

Let me just start off with the basics. Of course, labor unions are simply a way for workers to have more of a voice at their worksite. And each one of those over 1,200 unions that I talked about, the structure and the leadership all democratically elected by the membership of those unions, and a very democratic process through those elections on setting policy and direction for those individual unions.

And so when you look at broadly the labor movement with all those different unions and union members,
it all adds up to about 2.7 million members, union members, active union members in California, actively employed at the worksite. However, they’re not -- those members aren’t sole entities, they also have about 4.1 million family members in their households with them. So, between the union members and their family members in their household, it’s about 6.8 million Californians who live in union households.

And I cite the household and the family members that live with them because we have found with research we’ve done, that a lot of the same attitudes that our members have are shared by the members of their household. And the values that they share, and the common interests.

Of course, it makes sense, but -- so I just wanted though to point that out and show that the reach of -- and we often think about the union movement as not just the members, but also their family that they represent.

So, the labor movement, very diverse in all kinds of ways. Labor members are in unions in a wide variety of jobs. Things like the building trades, those are the construction industries, traditionally thought of as sort of blue collar jobs. They are though just one part.

Some folks may have sort of the building trades or the construction members as sort of the mental image of the labor movement, and they are a big, important part of
the labor movement, but a very diverse workforce.

Also, public sector employees, both blue collar
and white collar workers represented there. Things from,
you know, whether it’s people who work at -- in schools and
education, which is both professors and teachers, but
that’s also like the classified employees, the cafeteria
workers, the bus drivers.

And, of course, also in public sector, all types
of people who work for state and local government, you
know, whether it’s fire fighters or people at the city
hall, all of those are different types of jobs and
employment in the public sector. So even within the public
sector a wide variety of jobs and professions covered.

And then, also, of course other private, private
sector jobs. Things like at the grocery stores, the United
Food and Commercial Workers, the people who are at the
checkout stands and work at the grocery stores. Or things
like -- or teamsters, truck drivers. People who work in
healthcare, nurses, other folks that help make the
healthcare industry run.

Those are just a couple of examples, but I just
wanted to cite a few of those to really sort of show that
labor being very diverse in the type of work that and
industries that our members work in, and that they’re
families have -- how, you know, how their employed in and
get, you know, the jobs that help put food on the table.

A wide variety of jobs, it’s not just one sector, not just one type of job. It’s not just white collar, it’s not just blue collar. It really is a cross, basically the whole gambit of the type of jobs workers in California do.

You know, how are we organized? So, I talked about this a little bit at the top. Over 1,200 local unions. Those are really sort of the structures that -- the basic building blocks for labor and for the unions. So they can range anywhere from our labor union, you know, with, you know, a few dozen employees at a worksite, you know, to large employers that, you know, we have locals that may have, you know, tens of thousands of members in some of these locals.

So, again, not one size fits all with what our labor union is like, and how big it is. A wide variety of different shapes, sizes and how our local unions are structured.

And within the labor movement there are probably in California over 40 to 50 different types, I want to sort of say, international unions, you know, folks make a part of the name teamsters, or the United Food and Commercial Workers that I just talked about, or SEIU. We’re going to hear from SEIU, or the farmworkers, United Farm Workers Union.
So you’ll have these different type unions. There’s about 40 to 50 of them. And then within those unions are going to be all the different locals, and those are usually broken down regionally.

And in addition to all these 1,200 local unions being part of the California Labor Federation and organized through us at the statewide level, to be a voice at the statewide level for the labor movement, that also happens at the local level. And I really want to stress this in I think a way that the labor movement could be a resource for the Commission is in outreach to the 23 central labor councils.

And when I talk about the California Labor Federation being the umbrella organization for labor statewide, that’s replicated at the local level through the central labor councils where you will have, again, public sector, private sector, building trades, in a particular geographic area coming together, and all given voice by these things we call, “central labor councils.” Those are the umbrella organizations for labor unions at the local level.

There are 23 of those in California. All the lead counties in California are covered by jurisdiction of a central labor council. Some are just one county, like the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, or the Alameda
Labor Council.

But there are some labor councils that are structured that represent multiple counties. For example, the Fresno-Madera-Tulare-Kings Labor Council represents four counties of -- in the coverage for the union workers that they represent.

But I do want to stress that every county has a central labor council that represents the workers, the union workers in that area. And they really are the way to -- that labor gets worked on at the local level, and can really help and provide a resource to the Commission.

If you have a particular interest in a geographic area, and that I do know that our unions will have a particular interest on a geographic level of giving their input when we get to the point of communities of interest and line drawing in certain areas. There will really be often cases the labor councils that will be the folks coming and wanting to provide you information and talk to you.

I’ve talked about sort of the breadth of the labor movement all across California and the diversity. And also to stress that, that we are in every part of California, we’re just not in the big cities, you know, where labor is just concentrated.

Certainly Southern California is so huge, that is
where a large part of the population of California is. So that is where the plurality or the largest chunk of where our members and family are in the counties of Southern California, 3.8 million. You can see in the counties outlined there. But we’re in the Central Valley, almost a million union members and family residing in the Central Valley, and I think you’ll hear Dolores talking a lot more about that, and in some of our rural areas.

Of course, we’re in the Bay Area. One-and-a-half-million members and family for our unions in the Bay Area. You know -- excuse me, I went backwards.

And then, you know, in Northern California, you know, a place that folks sort of think is rural, and then also maybe even a bit more conservative, but, you know, 600,000 union members working in those counties in the rural northern part of the State.

So the labor movement really is broad, diverse, different types of industries, different types of workers all across the State. And, you know, not to talk about this in partisan terms, but just to make this point that we don’t want unions to be, unions are just one -- think one way or the other or a political party. You know, our membership in terms of their voter registration are fairly close to being a representative sample of the State of California. The plurality are democrats. It’s about 47-
percent Democratic. But we have 22-percent of our members are Republican, which are -- is not that far off from what the statewide numbers are as well.

So, don’t think that labor unions are necessarily a monolith with one, with one particular political party they represent. We are going to have a diversity of opinion, we’re going to have a diversity of interests based on geography, based on sector.

And they really are an important voice to be taken into consideration in the sense that, you know, I talked about, it’s not just the union members, it’s their family as well that have stakes in the political process.

Also to say that our union members don’t wear just their union member hat, they’re also members of churches, they’re active in their local community, they’re active in local community groups. So they bring a wide variety of perspectives to the table as well when they engage in the political process.

And one last thing also to say about union members and the importance of engaging them in this process, is that our research also shows that they are very engaged in the political process. That our union members and their family on average turn out and vote in elections at a higher rate than the general public. They are engaged in voting and very actively civically engaged.
The last presidential election in California, union members turned out four points at a higher percentage than the general public. And we’ve seen in past elections, particularly in gubernatorial years that our turnout’s even higher above the general population. And that we have seen a turnout among union members on average be five to seven points higher than the general public.

So just to that point, that our union members are -- very much care about civic participation, and very much care about the political process and engaging in the political process, and have stakes in the political process.

When I talked about the different workforces that our members represented, you know, I talked about fire fighters, I talked about people at grocery stores, I talked about nurses, frontline responders. Talking about essential workers, people who are -- had to go out there day to day in a pandemic and do their jobs, and, you know, have the rules and regulations on how they work, you know, being set by our elected officials.

And so that’s just one example, a most recent example, again, of how stakes matter for labor union members and their family. In the process, the essential workers in the pandemic being maybe the most striking in recent sample, but it’s true all the time that union
members and their families are going to have a stake in the political process, and they have shown that by their turnout and their engagement in the process.

So, I know we have a lot of great presentations to come from Dylan. He’s going to be getting more in depth in sort of parts of this, and Dolores digging more in depth.

But I did want to give this broad overview of the labor movement, so that folks could have that sense, and, you know, really encourage again, as the work of the Commission goes forward, we want to be a resource, and also to provide the labor councils at the local level to be resources as you’re seeking input from our communities. And I will stop there and turn it back to you all.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thanks, Bryan. If you can unshare your screen.


COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you so much. That was really, really helpful, and a great overview.

And from there we will go to Dylan. And after Dylan and Dolores, then we’ll open it up for questions.

MR. JOHNSON (via Zoom): Got you. Thanks. Okay. I also, I, too, have a presentation, so let me just get my little share screen going here.

All right. Well, first and foremost, my name is
Dylan Johnson. I am a political coordinator with SEIU California. So, first and foremost, of course I would like to thank the Commission for inviting us to be a part of this panel. I’d like to thank my fellow panelists for engaging in this, and, you know, also thank the public for jumping on an engaging in this. We think this is a really, really, really important process, and so we’re thrilled to be here and thrilled to be a part of this discussion.

So, I just want to say at the top, SEIU California to that point is committed to assisting this body’s goal of drawing equitable lines. And we are eager to assist in outreach efforts to ensure that all Californians have input on this process.

So, just to give a little roadmap of what I wanted to talk about in this presentation. I wanted to start off with just kind of an overview of SEIU California’s membership, just to give an idea of who we are.

And then from there, I’ll get into, I wanted to get into a bit of why I think we’re kind of uniquely qualified to help participate in this effort, give some examples of past efforts our organization has done in concert with other labor organizations that might, you know, inform why we’d be particularly well positioned to be a resource in this process.
And then question and answer, which I will take at the end of the panel, so I have some time there, but we’ll just take that when we’re all through with the presentations.

All right. Great. So, just to give a quick snapshot, this is kind of a 10,000 foot level of our membership. So we have 700,000-plus members across the State of California, as well as 200,000-plus represented workers. So that brings us to roughly 1,000,000 workers, representatives here in California, that’s just SEIU California here in the State.

So, when we talk about the tally of our numbers, and Bryan touched on this a bit, you know, that doesn’t really capture the whole rest of the region -- our union. So when we dig into the data of our membership, what we find is that our members on average live in households with three to four adults in the household, right. So, these are multi-generational households that our members are living in.

So when you talk about the reach of SEIU California, the number that we’re looking at, it’s closer to 2.7 million across the State when you take into account the fact that our members are living in these households.

And so those family members are also receiving the information that we are doing with our outreach to our
members that are part of these larger households. And so we really like to emphasize that, because it gives a clearer idea of kind of the reach and the scope of the -- all right.

So just to jump into a bit of the demographics. Our union is a very, very diverse group. SEIU California is a very diverse union. We -- our members speak over 31 languages. And I think this is a particularly, you know, salient point to raise, because so often, unfortunately, language can be a barrier to outreach and to organizing. And so, I think it’s really important to highlight this, because SEIU California does have experience with facing those types of challenges, and communicating in a way that’s really inclusive, right.

So when we’re thinking about doing this outreach, you know, something like language can be a barrier for folks to do this type of outreach. And so we just really like to highlight, that is something that is constantly at the top of mind for us, because we have just a diverse membership, and that goes to language as well.

So in terms of ethnicity, this is a breakdown of ethnicity for SEIU California. So, again, we are a very diverse union. As you can see here, we are majority-minority union. One thing I do always like to highlight when we talk about these numbers, the African American
numbers are likely underrepresented. African Americans are often underrepresented in this type of data. That’s due to a host of reasons, many of them systemically -- you know, systemic racism in, you know, just our systems, and the way that last names work. And, you know, that’s a whole other presentation, but I do like to always note that when we talk about ethnicity, is African Americans are usually largely underrepresented in this data.

That said, we do have a larger percentage of African Americans as part of our union than California as a whole, but we do look like California. We are a very diverse union. And so when we dig into the numbers or the ethnicity, I think it speaks to that.

All right. Next slide.

In terms of gender, our membership tends to be more females, so seven in 10 of our members are women. And 60-percent of our members are women of color. So our union is a majority women of color.

In terms of age, so we look at the breakdown of our membership by age. We are pretty well represented across age groups of working folks. So as you can see here, our largest age block is 45 to 54, but that’s very closely followed by 55 to 64 and 35 to 44. It’s a pretty even spread, so kind of among that, that working age population, we’re pretty well represented across the board.
Voting registration. So, 70-percent of our members are registered to vote. And that does extend out to our represented workers as well. So, when you break it down by numbers, our union represents roughly 625,000 registered voters in the State of California. So that’s the voter registration piece.

So who we are, and I think this is really important. I’m going to get more into depth on this later on in the presentation when I’m talking about kind of how we think we can be a particularly -- a great resource for this Commission. But this is a little bit of a breakdown of who our members are, right.

And so we talk about our members, you know, and it’s inherent in our name, we are the Service Employees International Union, right. And so our members, their professions, it’s folks that are in the communities. So we’re talking about childcare workers, we’re talking about nurses and healthcare workers, social workers that are -- the janitors.

So we’re talking about folks that really are in these communities, right, and not only are respected members of the community, and they’re engaging with the community at nearly every level. I mean, it’s just, it’s in, it’s in the DNA of who we are, right. Our jobs are service industry jobs. And so we do have -- our members
are very active in their communities. And so I think that’s really important to point out. And, again, I’ll get to that a little bit more in depth later, but I just really like to highlight that point of what the types of workers we represent are and what they’re doing in their communities as part of their work.

In terms of geography, and so here is where I want to get -- as you can see, we have membership in every single zone as defined by the Commission. So we thought this would be a helpful thing to bring out. But as Patricia said, just in terms of speaking to the urban piece of this, if you look at these numbers, you know, our greatest concentration of folks are in the metro areas in Los Angeles County and in the Bay Area.

So that does -- that is where the largest kind of hot most concentrated -- excuse me (clearing throat), area of our membership is. So obviously we do have a depth of knowledge organizing and reaching out and working with members in the urban areas, in the urban centers of the State.

But I think it is worth pointing out, you know, SEIU California is in every community across the State, and so we do have experience organizing, and we have a presence in all the communities. We’re all over California, so -- but just thought this would be helpful for the Commission
when they’re trying to picture kind of where our folks are at. So we’re across the State, but, again, that kind of Bay Area, Los Angeles County is where we’re concentrated.

So with that, now that I’ve given kind of an overview, given a sense of who we are, what our membership looks like, I wanted to get into a little bit of a case study, the types of organizing efforts we’ve done, and how that might relate to the work that’s being done in the Commission, and how we might be able to serve as a resource moving forward.

And so one of the case studies we wanted to highlight, it’s an effort that we’re still currently engaged in. So, SEIU California is spearheading in coordination with other labor groups, as well as many community organizations, a vaccine program. This is a massive statewide fuel program to get folks vaccinated across the State.

So, labor was chosen by the State to run this effort because of our background in organizing, right, and because we have deep roots in the community. And we are a trusted -- we have a trusted ability to provide culturally competent resources, right. So when we’re talking about equity, and particularly around the vaccine work, that’s been a big part of the conversation.

And so to that point, this program has focused on
what they’re calling HPI zip codes. And so these zip codes are in the hardest to reach communities, as well as the communities with the largest health disparities. And so that’s where they wanted to focus this work. This work is to, you know, get folks signed up for vaccines, get shots in arms. That’s like the goal of this effort.

I think it’s also worth pointing out that we look at our membership. More than half of our membership lives in these HPI zip codes. So these are the zip codes that are hardest to reach and have the largest health disparities, which I -- again, just goes to, we have experience reaching out to these folks that are kind of the hardest, hardest to reach.

But we’ve seen, you know, great success (indiscernible). Part of the work we’ve been doing has been up in the field for about five weeks now. This has been door to door, phone, knocking, text messaging.

I think the latest tally since we went up with the program in early April, we’ve already had 160,000 conversations, full conversations with folks across the State about getting vaccinated. And already had over 11,000 appointments made and shots in arms. So we’re really proud of that work.

And I think that just, again, really speaks to the fact that, you know, there’s this infrastructure there
that we can quickly tap into to do these kinds of mass
statewide, you know, it’s about information, it’s about
organizing, and it’s about action, right. And so I think
this just kind of speaks to the fact that because we have
such deep roots in these communities, we can really
activate that in a way that brings folks in and allows them
to participate in these really important efforts.

So further, just to kind of wrap up today’s
presentation, I just wanted to kind of reiterate how we
think SEIU California is, you know, uniquely qualified to
assist the Commission in this redistricting process. So,
you know, as I hope this presentation illustrated, our
membership is extremely diverse, and we think really
represents and reflects California as a whole.

And know that our members work in sectors, and
again, I said I was going to circle back to this, and just
really do think this is such an important point to make.
Is that our members are working in sectors that impact
Californians everyday lives, right, so we are the nurses,
the home healthcare workers, the educators, the childcare
professionals, and the public sector workers.

So our members are really part of the lifeblood
of these communities, and our members have a great deal of
respect in their communities. And know that they have
experience organizing, right, they’re union folks. They
have experience organizing in their neighborhood. That is what they do. And so, they have experience, and not just organizing, but organizing around complex issues.

And so this redistricting stuff it can get complicated and it can get in the weeds, and our folks have experience kind of breaking that down and making that acceptable to folks in their communities that are all too often left behind in these types of conversations and in these types of efforts.

And so, you know, we’re really, really looking forward to the opportunity to be able to engage our membership, and by proxy, engage their communities around conversations of how important this redistricting process is, and how important it is that folks make their voices heard as we move through this process of defining communities of interest, and in getting to a point where we’re getting these lines down.

And so, you know, when all that’s said, we at SEIU California really hope you will continue to use us as a resource. We look forward to continue engaging in this process, to kind of tap into that grassroots power, and ensure that these lines are drawn in an equitable way, and in a way that best serves the communities that they’re going to define for the next decade.

So, with that, I will turn it over to the next
folks. And again, I just want to thank the Commission so much for having us, and we look forward to continuing this work.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thanks, Dylan.

I lost all of you for a second. Thanks, Dylan.

That was really helpful and in thinking it through.

Dolores with -- are you ready?

MS. HUERTA (via Zoom): Thank you very much, Commissioners, for allowing us to give you the picture of what life is like in the San Joaquin Valley. And I do like to refer to it as the San Joaquin Valley.

You know, the San Joaquin Valley kind of gets left out because people think of California as Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Jose, and then there’s something in the middle of all of that, and that is the San Joaquin Valley, which of course does include Sacramento. But of course this is a very special place because this is where all of the food is grown.

San Joaquin Valley is one of, I think four or five areas on the whole planet where we have a Mediterranean climate that can -- we can do all this wonderful food production that we do. And even though this is a very special place in the world for the agricultural industry, unfortunately it’s not special for the people that work in the agricultural industry, because they are
left behind.

We of course have the highest child poverty rate in the whole United States of America, and that of course is stunning when we think of the richness of our State of California and the wealth that we have here in the San Joaquin Valley with agriculture.

So, when you think of the San Joaquin Valley, you have to compare it to the south. We’re kind of more like Montgomery, like Selma/Montgomery, than we are say like, again, San Jose or San Francisco. And the type of course of representation that we have had over the past -- let me go back a little bit though to the Census.

The Dolores Huerta Foundation, we were very active in the last Census 10 years ago, and we are very active in this Census, also. We went door to door. We did phone banking. We went to the different flea markets to get people to sign up for the Census.

I have to say that people were terrorized. They were not afraid, they were terrorized because of what the Trump Administration came out with is attacks on undocumented people. And the Census followed a huge wave of deportations that had happened just before the Census happened. And so we know that many, many undocumented people did not sign up for the Census.

And that also affected other people who are legal
immigrants, even citizens, because of the public charge
issues that they put out there. That if anybody had
somebody that got any type of public assistance, that that
would affect them if they tried to immigrate somebody from
their family in the future. So that was very, very
devastating.

And I don’t know how that is going to be
adjusted, to make sure that a lot of the people that were
not able to be counted, they can factor in or do some kind
of, some kind of algorithms or whatever, to make sure that
some of those people are included in the Census.

Our foundation, we work in four different
counties, Kern, Tulare and Fresno County, and also in the
high desert in the Antelope Valley. We have chapters in
all of these different areas that do all of this work
currently.

We are doing canvassing on COVID-19, getting
people to sign up to get their vaccine shots. We sign them
up right then and there, make their appointments for them.
We’re also this weekend we’re doing nine different food
banks throughout the Central Valley, to provide people
there with fresh food that they could have access to. So
we are very, very busy.

We’re also active in about 20 different school
districts, organizing the parents and the students so they
can go to their school boards and make recommendations. The discrimination against Latinos specifically, and African Americans, is very, very fierce here in the San Joaquin Valley. We had to file a lawsuit against our local Kern High School District because they expelled, expelled 2,100 students of color, Black and Brown students in one year, one single year.

We won that lawsuit, and from 2,100 expulsions it went down to 21. And we’re still having issues because they put their students in -- they call it, “alternative schools,” and the graduation rates especially for the Black students, is very, very dismal. So that is a fight that we still have going on.

And it was really interesting when we talked about redistricting. When we started our fight with the Kern High School District here -- by the way, the Kern High School District has 40,000 students. And of those students, 65-percent of them are ethnic students, students of color. But when we looked at that school board they had -- of the four of the five trustees on the Kern High School Board lived within five miles of each other in the most affluent district of Bakersfield, in the richest district of Bakersfield.

Now we did put pressure on them and we forced them to redistrict. And so the complexion of that school
board has now changed, where we have actually teachers that are on the school board, and two people, two Latinos on the school board now at that Kern High School District. But -- and when we look again at whole Central Valley, 40-percent of the highest expulsion rates are in the school districts in the Central Valley.

So the discrimination, as I said before, fierce and it really does affect -- and of course we have to also add the prisons. I think we have something like 22 prisons, starting from Bakersfield, Auburn, California, all the way to Sacramento. And during that period of time that they had built all of these prisons, there has only been one university that has been built, the University of Merced. So, this is, as you can see, not a very nice picture for the people that live here.

And as I mentioned before, we have seen that the type of representation that we have had is not, it is not -- it does not represent the people that live here. We have of course farmworkers. We have the largest number of farmworkers I think in the United States of America that live in the San Joaquin Valley.

And people always think of farmworkers as just being migrant workers. No, they live here. The live in these communities. We were able to get unemployment insurance for farmworkers back in 1975 when Jerry Brown got
his first election. So the farmworkers when the crop season ends, they are able to stay in their communities and collect unemployment insurance.

The other thing is that the way that agriculture works is, when you have one season that is ending, you have the beginning of the other season for the -- for instance, the citrus is in the wintertime. And when the citrus ends, then you start going into your grape season. So the farmworkers are able to work pretty much continuously throughout the entire year.

So, again, people think farmworkers are always just migrant workers, and they’re not. Some of them do migrate up north to Washington and places like that, but for the most part, they live in the community, and we have to just remember that, as if they are -- they live here and they are the residents here, but of course they’re not always represented there.

And it’s rather interesting that over the years in terms of the congressional representation that we have had from the San Joaquin Valley, all of them -- the minority/majority are Latinos, we have never had a Latino Congressperson to represent the San Joaquin Valley.

We have had some people with Latino last names, but they are of European descent, and they do not represent the majority of the people in the San Joaquin Valley, who
are Mexican or come from Guatemala or come from El Salvador. So that is very definitely lacking in terms of the kind of representation that we need.

And as you all know, that Kevin McCarthy is the -- who is the leader of the representing -- of the Republican of the House of Representatives, he is the -- of course represents the area here of Bakersfield, California.

So, the other thing is that we do have voter suppression in our area. We have had people that have been purged from the voting roles. So after every election we have to do this big campaign to cure the ballots. We have to send people out there to find people, because their ballots have been discarded and they have been thrown out.

And people that we registered to vote, when they go to vote all of the sudden their names are not there, or their signatures they say do not match. People do not receive their absentee ballots.

So voting is always a big struggle here. We are hoping and we are of course fighting to correct that. And now we have a new (indiscernible) or safe, and I think we’re going to continue with, to do that, but -- so, as I said, when we think of the politics of this area and the power structure, compare the San Joaquin Valley pretty much to the south of the United States of America. And so this is pretty much what we’re up against. So, redistricting is
very, very important to us, because we do need representation.

Another example I want to give you, in that we know that the Boards of Supervisors are also very powerful entities. And recently, because of the money that came from the State, our organization, the Dolores Huerta Foundation -- and we of course, we have alliances with many other nonprofit organizations. When we were working, we were working with the local public health office here to do outreach on COVID, and the money was coming from the State.

We -- all of our, our nonprofit organizations that we had, which are on the ground, which are a trusted organization who have the experience of canvassing and doing outreach, we were denied the contract because one of the young women that belongs to one of the organizations had made a public statement about defunding the police.

The local supervisor that represented the area of South Kern where a large majority of the farmworkers live, didn’t even bother to go to the meeting, (indiscernible), he’s the -- and we were denied that contract. And instead it was given to the Chamber of Commerce instead of to the nonprofit organizations that have the experience.

So, the one thing that we are asking you to do, is to please give us enough time to be able to reach these communities. There are hundreds, literally hundreds of
communities throughout the San Joaquin Valley where farmworkers live, where Latinos and people of color live.

Be sure and give us enough time so we are -- belong to another organization. We have many allied groups. Everybody is willing to go out there and help you, to give you the information that you need to make the maps that we need, to make sure that we can finally have some fair redistricting and fair representation. So we do want to ask you for that.

And I don’t know exactly what’s going to happen in terms of the times of the election that they’re going to be having, whether the Census data you’ll be able to have that before the districts are drawn. But, again, we would -- and I don’t know whether you have any influence on that or not, but if you do, we would like to have the primaries postponed to the end of June, to make sure that we have enough time so that you can have the information that you need to do a good job.

And I want to thank all of you, because even with all of these complaints, I know that we in California are so much better off than they are in the other states. And that we want to thank you for giving your time to making sure that we have fair redistricting in the State of California.

I know that we’re ahead of the game, but, again,
we can do a lot better than what we’ve done in the past.
So, again, I want to thank you very much, and we’ll -- and we’re here to work with you and do whatever we can to help you do your job. Si se puede, yes, we can. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Gracias, Dolores.

And with that, before we turn it over to everyone for questions and comments and thoughts, I did want to acknowledge that Commission Vazquez and Director Kaplan were really helpful in connecting us to be able to put this panel together. So, thank you.

And I wanted to take the liberty of asking the first question, because you all have said that you work diverse -- you know, your membership’s very diverse, and the communities you work with is very diverse. And if you had to answer this -- the question that we keep trying to answer, how do you answer it.

How do you tell your membership when it’s a diverse membership as the ones that you all have, why is redistricting important to you?

MS. HUERTA: Well, they actually know it on a very personal basis. I can give you another example. We have a school district up in a California city, which is actually part of Kern County, but it’s up there in the high desert. There eight out of 10 of the African American students were being suspended and expelled from school in
elementary school and in high school.

Well, needless to say, they had no representation whatever on the school board. The city council, even though that city, California city, the population is 40-percent Latino, 30-percent African American, they don’t have any representation whatsoever on the city council. And so, people suffer when they don’t have representation. The lack of resources, the lack of policies that can help them.

And so, this is part of the work that we do with the Dolores Huerta Foundation, is in educating our communities about why it’s important for them to get involved. And we are having many, many seminars about the redistricting. We’re doing these in both languages, English and Spanish, and also we have members of our group, our allies, that also they speak Hindi, the Punjab language.

And so we’re reaching out to as many people as we can. And we’re doing this with our organizers. We have 45 staff people in the Dolores Huerta Foundation, full-time staff, and we 70 canvassers that are just going out door to door. So we are making an all-out effort to make sure we can get as many people involved in the redistricting effort as possible. And of course working with our allies, also, in the labor movement, who are making a big effort.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Dolores.

MS. HUERTA: You’re welcome.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Dylan.

MR. JOHNSON: Yeah. I would say, you know, similarly, I think particularly our membership understand the importance of building power, right. That’s -- and building power within communities and within -- interest is really important in order to advance justice and to advance, you know, the interests of their communities.

So I think our members kind of really understand that at a cellular level. And so I think that’s really important. And I think that extends out, right, like particularly minority -- you know, minorities and folks understand that in order to progress their interests, there’s a necessity of building power within communities.

So I think that’s one.

And I think particularly as it comes to the redistricting process, you know, I think it’s about informing our members and informing the populations what this really means. I think a lot of folks do kind of understand, but, again, you know, explaining how this is going to be, define the lines for the next 10 years, what this means for communities, how this impacts folks, I think it’s really important.

You know, some folks will understand it, but
there is an educational piece that I think is so important. And so I think that just goes to, as we’re moving through this work and continuing in this process, to really outreaching to these populations as much as we can, getting this information in front of them, and getting it in front of them from folks that they know, from folks that they trust, and in ways that are, you know, that are digestible and, you know, that they can -- that they understand and makes for them and their work.

And so it relates to them, right, because folks want to see how, like how does this relate to me? So making sure that we do the work on the backend to ensure that the information that we bring them, it’s like, you know, we put some thought into that in how we present it. So, that’s kind of the way I think about it, and what I tried to hit in the presentation.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Hang on, Dylan.

MS. HUERTA: There’s one other issue I forgot to mention. Is when we get people from the community elected to the different boards, they actually are discovering there’s a lot of corruption going on.

One of our members got herself elected to the Water Board, and she asked for a review of the bank records. Found out there was $250,000 missing from this little water district. And so she had the grand jury come
in to do an investigation.

Another one of our members got herself elected to the school board. It turned out that the superintendent was using the school funding as this own little piggy bank, okay.

And so we are finding that because they are not, they are not currently sitting on so many of these city councils, water districts, et cetera, that there’s a lot of corruption going on, because they just assume that the people who are out there, they’re farmworkers, many of them are not English speakers, that they can just look at these public funds as their funds.

And so we know that there are hundreds of districts throughout the San Joaquin Valley where people do not have their own representation. And of course this is one of the things that we’re working on, so that we can have the people take control and make sure that they can be the guardians of the tax dollars that are being paid for to bring the services to their communities.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thanks, Dolores.

Bryan, do you have any -- what’s your thoughts about this?

MR. BLUM: It’s all very similar to what was said. Again, you know, I’ll go back to sort of, union members understand the point of coming together and voicing
their opinions and concerns. And that’s why they’re in a union in the first place, to raise their voice at the worksite, and this is about raising their voice in the civic engagement process.

You know, I cited those figures, that our members get it in that regard, that they vote at a higher rate than the general public, they’re more engaged civically than the general public. And it really is just this sense of, you know, there’s a saying, if you’re not at the, if you’re not at the table you’re probably on the menu.

So our folks know that here’s a chance for them to have a voice, express their concerns, their community of interest. And again, with labor members expressing that both in the sense of their union interests, but again, they also bring a wealth of experience in the other facets of their life, and can overlap with a lot of the different parts of their community as well.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Great. Thank you.

I’m going to head it over the Chair, because I know she wanted first dibs.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I wanted first dibs?

Okay. Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, you wanted to tell a story.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes. I was going to -- but you
know what, I won’t -- I actually have Dolores’ e-mail, so
I’m just going to e-mail her. I’ll e-mail her my story,
but thank you so much.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Uh-huh. Yes. Thank you.
And I’d like to say thank you to our panelists, Bryan,
Dylan and Dolores. Just so grateful for your presentation.
The question I’m wondering if you could address,
and speak to the Commission, we -- and if you had
opportunity to follow our hearings, we are in the process
now of trying to discern where -- what we’d like to
suggest, and how we’d like to move forward as it relates to
the timing. Dolores puts the -- and you asked, indeed that
we push out primaries until -- or at least request that
they be pushed out until a bit later.

Can you give us a sense, with all of your
membership that you have, can you give us a sense of what
the complexity will be in trying to get participation,
reach out to your membership during the holiday timeframes,
if indeed some of that area falls towards the end of
December, can you talk to us?

Our sense -- my sense is that that might be
difficult, but with the number of people that you
represent, if you could speak to -- if that would still be
an easy thing, you have processes set up whereby you’d
still be able to get that feedback, or if indeed that would present a challenge to you.

MS. HUERTA: Yeah, it definitely would present a challenge if we do it during the holidays. We have a lot of families that leave and they go to Mexico during that period of time. It’s kind of like an exodus.

We actually don’t even have any of our chapter meetings during that period of time because so many people are gone. And we do have a lot of people, as you know, that they’re immigrants from Mexico or from Guatemala, El Salvador, that they do go back during the holidays to visit their families.

And so, if we can do the hearings not during the holidays, it will make it more difficult for us to get people there. We would appreciate that very much, so.

MR. JOHNSON: I know -- I’m happy to add to that and jump in. So, I think in terms of thinking about that, definitely, you know, holidays, it’s going to make it tough. I think we’re put in here right now in May, so certainly like on our end, that we want to already start to have those conversations.

So, like we really want to start building credibility and start getting input from folks starting like now, right. And I think we’re already doing that.

The Commission has already been doing that.
So I think if we’re thinking about just doing that outreach in December, like that’s obviously, that’s too late. But I think we have the time now to really be building that credibility in these communities, having these conversations, and doing some of that educational piece ahead of that, like we have the time. And so I think that we really should be engaged in that.

I know we at SEIU California are definitely going to be engaged in that, and I think there is some, you know, consideration with the holidays. I think the Commission can, you know, look at what those dates look like, try to plan around as best as they can of just what the reality of the calendar is going to be. You know, we have, you know, gone on record, SEIU California really do have some concern around like during the primary, and what that will mean for disadvantaged communities, and how disruptive that can be. So, there is some concern around that. So, I think that, from our point of view, it’s, yes, that is --

MS. HUERTA:  (Indiscernible.)

MR. JOHNSON:  -- it’s more difficult to that organizing work and reach out to folks when they’re kind of checked out for the holidays. But we have this time. I had a (indiscernible) to start having those conversations, start building up. The Commission’s already doing a terrific job doing outreach, and we were having panels like
this here in May.

So, I mean, I think that that’s really what we need to be doing and focusing on, is like how can we maximize this time ahead of -- I know like the numbers, and given some of that data has been backed up, but I think there’s still a lot of quality, quality work we can be doing and is being done ahead of that. So I think that’s important to keep in mind.

MR. BLUM: If I could, I would just echo what Dylan said and sort of agree with that, that, you know, this is important. We want to -- and have structures to do outreach as early as possible, and very committed to engaging with the Commission as early as possible.

Of course, doing anything during the holidays is going to be problematic for anyone, but I do want to stress, you know, the more that we can do earlier, labor’s committed to helping in that end.

And in the sense of, you know, we have some concerns as well about changing the primary date. Not ideal. Ideally, this all could work that we don’t have to -- that it can work. And I realize this is easier said than done. Having to do work during the holidays, if there’s some way to avoid that, but also continue to keep the continuity of the primary date, that would be the ideal outcome. I realize that’s easier said than done. But
we’re committed to try and, as Dylan said, you know, helping and getting engagement as early as possible.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

MS. HUERTA: Yeah. One of the things, one of the things, too, when you think of the San Joaquin Valley, you could put several states -- you could take many of those states in the northeastern part of the United States and put all of those states in the San Joaquin Valley. You know, that’s how big it is, you know, the -- when you think of how big the San Joaquin Valley is. So just remember that, that it represents a really, a whole amount of acreage.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Alvaro, I saw you raising your hand.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you. I have a question with regards to technology and the use of technology. One of the things that we have available, this Redistricting Commission has available is the COI Tool, the Community of Interest Tool. We also have internet access where people can send in their information or their input to an e-mail address. We also have social media as well. So I wanted to get your perspectives on the use of those tools that are now available, that weren’t previously available, and how it impacts this particular
community in the Central Valley.

MS. HUERTA: Well, we know that those platforms are very important, and we are actually right now, in addition to doing our food bank, like I mentioned, we’re having nine food banks this weekend in these different areas that I mentioned. And we are going to be doing community of interest surveys at the same time that we’re doing the food banks. But, yes, we will definitely take advantage of the social platforms, also. So, thank you for mentioning that.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Dylan, Bryan, do you want to add anything to that?

MR. BLUM: I don’t think I have anything to add on that one.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

MR. JOHNSON: Yeah. No, we’re thrilled that, you know, more -- any technology that makes this more accessible I think is great. And, yeah, we’re excited.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Great.

Alicia -- I mean, sorry, Commissioner Fernandez.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: That’s okay. Either way is fine.

Dolores, I just wanted to follow-up on Director Hernandez’ comment. I think what I would be more interested in is the availability or lack of technology in
the San Joaquin. So, I think that’s what I would -- would
concern me the most. I mean, we have this Community of
Interest Tool that’s on-line, but I also live in a rural
area, and I know many of the students unfortunately don’t
have access to internet. They don’t -- I mean, even if
they had a computer, there’s no signal. So I think that
would be the, one of the major concerns.

I am a daughter of an immigrant, so I know the
challenges that we have. So, maybe, can you address it
that way?

MS. HUERTA: Yes. Thank you for that. Yes, of
course, you know, we have many parts of, and again, the San
Joaquin Valley, there is no broadband availability at all.
Our children were of course really set back in terms their
academics, because they had to sometimes drive trucks with
hotspots so that they could even get on the computers to be
able to engage in their classes.

And this is a really, really, really big issue
for us here in the San Joaquin Valley. All of these
different communities, these under (indiscernible)
communities that do not have broadband access, and they
don’t have computer access. I mean they have computers,
but they don’t have the internet access. So it is, it’s a
very big problem. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Kennedy.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you.

Dylan, you mentioned SEIU members speaking 31 languages. You know, we’re dealing with the language issue as well, but I just wondered if you could share with us some of your lessons learned on what works best for, you know, getting messages out to such a diverse group of people. I mean, how do you prioritize? Do you put everything out in all 31 languages, or, you know, what works best? Thanks.

MR. JOHNSON: All right. Yeah, of course. And thank you for the question. So, for us, you know, just given we’re very, we’re intimately familiar with our membership, who they are and where they are, right. And we look to our locals for that as well.

And so, we, you know, we’re going into a community, we’re in a certain community, that’s always one of the tops things, which languages are we going to need to be able to communicate in. And that’s always like at the top. And this is with anything that we do, right, so anytime we’re going into kind of a campaign, if we’re doing any type of event, that’s always at top of mind for us.

And so it’s about we, how we prepare for that. And so whether that’s getting translators, ensuring that we have translators available, ensuring that we have all of our marketing materials translated into the languages that
we need. And having folks that are conversive in those languages and able to communicate that to our members and to our folks in these languages.

And so, I think it is about -- you know, it’s not necessarily every single language, every single time on every single thing, but it is just knowing the communities that we’re going into, keeping that top of mind, communicating with folks on the ground. That’s a question we ask, will you need translation? Are there going to be any other languages we need to have this translated into?

And so I think really just making that just a part of every single time we’re going into an event or communication, making that a part of the discussion of what resources do we need to make be made available, and then ensuring that we do that, right. And so, get that, get those materials translated. Make sure that we have an interpreter ready for these different languages.

And so, that’s kind of an overtime, honestly, because we’re doing this so often. We need to really have an idea of, okay, we’re going to be in this community with this local. This is the language we’re likely going to have to think about and then confirming that.

So, that’s kind of how we approach it, and so similarly, if we were doing outreach on something like this, and we have already started to do that, making sure
we have materials translated as we’re going into those communities and talking with those members.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Angela -- I mean, Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I’m Angela. Thank you so much to our panelists for being here. Great presentation.

I’m curious, going back a question and thinking about digital access and on-line organizing, thinking over -- I’m curious if our panelists could think over the last year. You know, we have had to necessarily use new tools for not just organizing purposes, but for like activation and engagement on issues, right. So, councils and boards have been meeting on-line.

You know, so I imagine that your folks on the ground, your organizers, have been using digital tools for their organizing, and then also having to navigate sort of government digital tools, or lack thereof, to give input and participate in these political practices.

As we move, you know, as we head sort of out of the depths of the pandemic, we’re likely going to see a lot of hybrid spaces. And so we at the Commission are trying to think about how, how we preserve digital access to our processes, while also acknowledging that like in person is where a lot of the action happens, right.
So if any of you listened to any of our conversation yesterday, we had a lot of conversation about, you know, wanting to drive people to the digital tool, which is, Draw My CA Community, right, and also creating enough in-person space and time to get people’s stories and narratives, and get people to show up, right.

So, I would just be curious for your reflection on how you see organizing, shifting in the coming year digitally and then sort of in person. How do you see that, and if you have any recommendations for how we integrate this new hybrid model of digital and in person, that would be great. I hope that was clear.

MS. HUERTA: On our end it’s been very difficult because so many of the people don’t have the devices that they need. And even if they have their cell phones, they’re not able to have wi-fi on their phones. And so, it’s been very, very difficult.

We have, we have had our canvassers going out there even during the height of the pandemic, during the Census, but they had their shields and they had their masks, but of course it made it a little more difficult to be able to communicate with people.

Now that we have, have received the good news that people can start -- if people are vaccinated, that they can start having meetings, et cetera, that will
definitely help us. But I do agree with you, that I think
going forward, I think not only in your work, but I
think in our lives, it’s going to be a hybrid of both
personal and work on social media, you know, on the
interest. I think that’s just the new world that we’re all
going to be living in.

MR. JOHNSON: Yeah. And I think this is a great
question. It’s something that we think about in a lot of
the different spaces that we’re entering into. What comes
to mind, and just because I gave some information on this
during the presentation was around this vaccine work that
we’re doing, to get folks signed up and to get them
vaccinated.

So we had been in the planning process from this
-- again, we started about five weeks ago, but the planning
started much earlier than that, before vaccine was kind of
widespread and widely available.

And so, in thinking about that, we knew that we
were going into these communities that are some of the
hardest, the hardest to reach, and have been the most
impacted by health disparities.

And so a lot of that, and there’s a lot of
discussion around, you know, this, the My Turn California
and the access to technology. And, you know, like the
other folks who were very computer literate were able to
sign up and get these appointments, and other folks that weren’t as technology literate were being left behind in this. And so that was something that we were really thinking about.

And so I think this just goes to -- and like just the fact that you’re having these conversations now and looking into what we’re going to need to do down the line, is really about that planning.

So we’re looking, okay, so we’re going to really be going into the field in April, so by that time we should have a high level of folks that are vaccinated. So what does that mean, right?

So, okay, that means maybe we can do some door-to-door signing up with folks, because we’re going to be able to find organizers who are vaccinated and can go into these communities, obviously with all the public protections, but do some of that more in-person work, right, that’s going to be necessary to reach some of these harder to reach communities, and get them signed up and get shots in arms.

And so it’s about like that type of thinking and planning, which is like, again, what we’re doing here on like how we can best do that. And so that’s -- and that’s proved really successful, right. So we’ve been able to have 160,000 conversations, and we have folks that are out
on the doors, you know, knocking and getting folks signed up, and we’ve got those like 11,000 shots in arms.

And so, it’s just, it’s understanding that, you know, we’re not going to be able to necessarily like make -- potentially be full-fledged as we would like to be, like in person having big, massive events. But like where can we do that strategically to ensure that, you know, for folks that don’t have access to some of these on-line tools, how can they engage in kind of the more analog, in-person way that’s still safe? And just kind of thinking ahead.

And, again, it’s like this is why it’s great that we have this time to start thinking about this and having these conversations. So it’s just like that planning process and trying make -- and imagining what’s possible and what we can do to augment what we already have. So, yeah, that’s just what comes to mind for me.

MR. BLUM: Sorry. I was just, just say, yeah, something similar. I do think you’ve raised a very good question (indiscernible), and I have no magic bullet for this, but it is I think the hybrid in presenting as many options as possible. There are barriers if it’s all digital. There are, there are also of course barriers for some folks if it’s all in person, and, you know, unfair to ask someone that doesn’t have digital access to do this all
digital on-line. They’re disenfranchised. But also, how
do you get more engagement if, you know, if -- particularly
for working people?

For (indiscernible) if you worked and nurses
worked an eight-hour shift, you’re in the suburbs, do you
want to have to drive an hour, hour and a half, to go to an
in-person meeting to make your voice heard? So I think
having a variety of options for people to make their voice
heard is the key.

MS. HUERTA: I --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes, go ahead.

MS. HUERTA: -- I just want to mention one other
point. When I was talking about the sort of the economy of
the San Joaquin Valley, and I did mention that we have, of
course, the present conflicts that is very strong here with
the 22 prisons I believe.

But, also, when you think of agriculture, I think
of agri-business. This is not a place where we have small
farmers. These are plantations. So, a small farmer in our
area will be somebody that has 1,000 workers. And so,
again, you know, just again to have that concept of what
you’re dealing with when you talk about the San Joaquin
Valley, in some ways we’re a little bit like the dark ages,
okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you.
Anybody else? Okay. Linda -- I mean, Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I mean, actually, I don’t know who this should be directed to. It’s either probably Bryan or Dylan in particular, I mean, given the organizations that you’re presenting.

I want to come back to that question about language and language access. And I’m curious as to -- and you may have said this earlier, and I apologize if you did, but I’m curious as to, you know, who -- what are the languages that your members predominantly speak?

You know, which are the communities that you may be -- especially, you know, like if you had to think about, what are your top languages that you’re trying to provide service in?

And part of the reason why I’m asking is because I’m always curious, because, you know, this is what we have to do now, too, and I’m hyperconscious of it. I did go on to your websites to check and see like what kind of language assistance you’re providing in terms of access through your websites.

And I’m just curious as to whether or not, you know, there’s other means through which somebody who may not speak English well, how they would be able to access your services.
MS. HUERTA: Well, at the Dolores Huerta Foundation we focus primarily on the Spanish speaking community, but the allies that we have, that we work with, we do have some of the groups that work -- the Jakara Movement, they work with the Punjab community. And so that they’re able to communicate with them.

Up in the Fresno area where we have a lot of Cambodians and Hmong there, that are there, then we have people that we work with, especially with our youth group, that work with people in the those languages, also.

So, we kind of, kind of depend on the allies. That we all work together to reach the goals of the communities that you mentioned, that have different language skills.

The Filipino community, which also is a very large community in the valley, most of them are English speaking. I don’t think -- I can’t think of any of them that don’t speak English, because I think that that is taught to them even in the Philippines.

MR. BLUM: I’ll defer to Dylan, next to me. He had sort of talked about the slides with the 31, with 31 languages.

MR. JOHNSON: Yeah. So, I can get you -- and I can follow-up with you, Commissioner, with kind of a breakdown. We have that data just in terms of what the
breakdown of the language speaking and where it predominantly is.

Spanish speaking is obviously a large one. The Chinese Cantonese, Korean, you know, Russian. We’re often -- and Russian, Vietnamese, four API languages as well.

But, again, I can follow-up with you and give you like the actual breakdown of what our languages is in our membership, because I think that gives a pretty good sense, and I know we have that data. I was trying to pull it quickly. I don’t have it at the top of my -- at the top here, but I can definitely follow-up with you and send that over for sure.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I mean, part of the reason why I’m actually curious as to what and who you’re serving, is because obviously to me, you know, you have a membership in who you’re able to also communicate to and how you engage them in the redistricting process is of interest, you know, I would think to all of us.

Because then that will also help us to understand, you know, how you can help mobilize your members to help also provide, you know, input to us, and we’re, we have at least our -- whether it’s use of technology, Communities of Interest Tool, or even in any language, you know, we’re intending to translate and/or depending on where we’ll be providing interpretation.
But I also see that you also play a role as well, too, in terms of ensuring that communication is also happening from us to your members, you know, in the languages that they’re most comfortable speaking as well, too.

So that’s why I was curious as to, you know, who you serve and how -- and what languages especially -- you know, you can have 31 languages but, you know, how do you really serve them in 31 languages is what I’m trying to understand.

MR. JOHNSON: Yeah.

MR. BLUM: And if I could just jump -- or, sorry. On that point, just so I’m talk -- you know, as, you know, 31 languages, absolutely, and sort of, you know -- of course it also makes sense that, you know, I think Dolores sort of referenced the Hmong community in a certain part of the State. And, you know, we’re going to see sort of, you know, Vietnamese speakers, you know, perhaps maybe more in Santa Clara County, and then some parts of Orange County.

So, the value that I think, you know, the labor movement also can bring is, particularly as we’re organized locally, the 23 labor councils that are in depth in their community, and our 1,200 unions, their reflections of their community.

And so they are the experts of -- you know, it’s
not one union that’s an expert in speaking and reaching out
to Hmong workers or reaching out to Cambodian workers, it’s
the union in that community, because they look like their
communities.

And it is the structure of that, I think of the
labor movement, because we’re in every community, because
they talk to their workers, they have to talk to their
workers and their membership on a daily basis, I think
there are, you know, a major part of the State, there’s
going to be 1,200 -- with our 1,200 unions, there’s a 12 --
probably 1,200 different answers on how they reach out to
the members.

I would just say, that’s the value the labor
movement brings because we have -- they have had to figure
it out, because they have to speak to their members on a
daily basis. And it’s almost a specific region-by-region
and union-by-union answer.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes, Commissioner Turner.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes, thank you. Thank you.
Very, very helpful. I wonder if I can have you think
through something else with me, with us.

So, getting back to just outreach into the
communities, and getting our Californians to participate.
And so maybe some around broadband access, but maybe not.
I’m thinking in terms of those that typically we go out --
and, Dolores, I know how we typically do it in the Central Valley. And we go out and do canvassing or phone banking, and, you know, we reach out different ways.

Redistricting is not as accessible, not as easily embraced and understood as some of the typical matters and issues when you go out, regardless if we’re trying to get people to, yes, be vaccinated through COVID, or participating in the Census, or what we want them to do on a ballot, or get involved, et cetera.

I’m wondering how are you thinking about canvassing in the same manner or phone banking or getting into the rural areas with such a complex message. Have you had conversations about where there would be differences? And because it matters as far as how many people we think we’re able to actually reach that will be able to respond in a manner that will be useful for this Commission.

MS. HUERTA: We have actually had some webinars, and we have had as many as 50 people that have attended them. And we’ve already had probably about three or four in English and in Spanish, so that people can understand.

And we do have some really good examples. I mentioned our -- when we got the Kern High School District to redistrict. And we have these beautiful maps that we showed where these five trustee -- four of the five trustees, like I said, live within five miles of each other
in this affluent district.

And one of the districts was like a rainbow, because it went from one side of Bakersfield all the way to the other side. We had another community that was just cut in half, so that they could make themselves a little district there.

So we have some really great examples that we can show, and so people understand it. And as I said, because they are -- you might say the victim, when they don’t have representation, it’s something that they very easily understand.

And now that we are able to -- the announcement that we had from the disease control, that we can now take off our masks and have these small meetings, then we intend to have many, many meetings. So, our organizers are really going to go out there into the communities.

And we have organizers that will -- so, we don’t have one organizer per town, so to speak, we have to have one organizer (indiscernible) four or five different towns, where they can have these meetings to explain to people about redistricting. And getting them to engage, so that they can participate and they can show up and give their presentations and their ideas.

So -- and, also, you know, we’re part of a larger group. We have several of the nonprofit organizations that
we’re all working together. And so we can take care of the issues of language, and making sure that everybody has knowledge and that they’re accessible to these meetings, so they all know what’s going on.

This is a big deal for all of us. We know how important this is. We know that the decisions that are made on redistricting, this is going to govern us for the next 10 years. And so -- and by the way, we started working on redistricting when we were doing the Census, because we wanted people to understand that when they signed up for the Census, that meant about who was going to representing them, how many resources that are going to be coming into their community. And the people of course that are elected are the ones that make those decisions.

So, we’re not starting from day one here. We’ve actually been working on redistricting since we started our work on the Census, which was, you know, over a year ago. So, I think people are in tune, and now we just have to bring them to the table and bring them to the meetings. But we’re very confident that we’ll be able to do that. And we’re, by the way, trying to get additional resources, so some of the other organizations can also be resources, so that they can help on this effort.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Dylan or Bryan, did you want to add anything?
Go ahead. Dylan, did you want to add something?

MR. JOHNSON: I think I just want to -- yeah, I think it’s about this -- I mean, I’ll piggyback on a lot of what Dolores said, right. So having these types of broader meetings where we can bring a lot of folks together, both digital and inclusively in person to disseminate this information, and just really continue to stay engaged in a real way around this. And it’s, yeah, it’s going to be really important. So I think a lot of what Dolores has really got to (indiscernible), right. I think (indiscernible).

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Great.

MS. HUERTA: Excuse me. Yeah. We will be using the press. In fact, I’m doing a press event next week about the redistricting. And, you know, again, when we were doing the Census, we did a lot, a lot of press around the Census. And we will be using our social media, also, to get the word out to people.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Bryan, you were going to say something?

MR. BLUM: Yeah. Just to say that I also do think, you know, as we have been having these conversations with our affiliate unions and our labor councils, taking advantage of structures that already exist. Again, we have, you know, monthly membership meetings for our unions,
monthly, you know, monthly meetings for our labor councils.

So, piggybacking off of structures that already exist, and putting time for redistricting on those already occurring meetings, I think is going to be a helpful way, as well as, again, finding different special occasions, specialized meetings to bring folks together as well.

So I do think, you know, part of this is us getting our influence to focus as this (indiscernible), understanding then how do we make this time of regular occurring times when we already have our members coming together.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, all.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, we’re getting close to break, and I just wanted to check in to see if anybody had any additional questions or -- okay. Commission Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Quick question for Ms. Huerta. You had spoken the -- your support for and encouragement of potentially moving the primary date further. I’m just wondering, I -- we’ve heard some, from I believe SEIU and others, some just concern about the tension -- some concern that individuals might not be -- and by moving the primary, it might just, it might result in fear of people participating in the primary potentially.

I’m just curious about your thoughts on those issues, and whether that’s something that concerns you as
well, or what your thinking is around that.

MS. HUERTA: I think if the primary is held in
June, people kind of associate voting with June. And even
if it’s not on the regular first Tuesday of June, I think
as long as the primary is held in June, that that would be
important.

And I know that there’s some tension because some
of the candidates are concerned about, you know, what it’s
going to look like. But, again, if we can, if we can have
the primary held towards the end of June, instead of the
beginning of June, I think that might give you all more
time so that you can see what the Census data looks like.

Because we, again, we know we’re going to be at a
disadvantage because so many people did not get counted.
And that some of these districts are going to have been
redrawn. And, of course, we’re all really concerned
because we all know, and as we said before, the decisions
that are going to be made are going to affect us 10 years
from today. So it’s really, really important.

I think -- you know, we just do it as carefully
as possible, and have as much input as possible that we
can. And with all of the limitations that you are faced
with, that you can do the best job possible, and have as
many participants as possible. I hope that answers your
question.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

MS. HUERTA: You’re welcome.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes, Commissioner Andersen.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: We need to take a break.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: So our -- Bryan and Dolores, Bryan and Dylan, are you able to stick around for another -- let’s take a 15-minute break. Can you stick around?

MS. HUERTA: Sure.

MR. BLUM: Until when?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: So we’ll take a break until about 3:10.

MR. BLUM: Okay.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: And then we’ll come back.

MR. BLUM: Okay.

MS. HUERTA: Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay? Okay, great. Thank you.

(Off the record at 2:56 p.m.)

(Back on the record at 3:10 p.m.)

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay, great. Thank you so much, and welcome back everyone. We are continuing our discussion on Agenda Item Number 14, Labor Panel, we did have -- we’re in the midst of asking questions to the wonderful presentations that were done by our panel members.
So, I believe Dylan, you were very anxious to provide some more information.

MR. JOHNSON: Jumping the gun here. So, yeah, so I just wanted to make sure that I was able to circle back to Commissioner Toledo’s point around the primary. So I just wanted to add in like our real concern with that is around voter confusion, and by extension, you know, voter disenfranchisement. And so we’re really worried about that with the moving of primary, and do see that kind of as a last resort.

I know you were talking about, you know, ensuring that we have enough funds and for outreach around the holiday. And so, we just really encourage the Commission to even ask for more funds to just do some of that outreach and to frontload some of that work, like you’ve been doing. Because really, you know, at that point, once it’s moved, that’s -- you’ll have to communicate any move to 22,000,000 voters across California, who are used to having that primary the first week of June, right.

And so, the cost and the outreach, and the voter information that will need to be done, that’s 22, you know, with those 22,000,000 voters that’s just of concern to us. And so that’s our real worry with that. And so I think as much as we can kind of frontload some of this work, and do some of this outreach around the Commission, the
Commission’s work and around redistricting, you know, I think that’s where the focus should be. And then kind of the moving this as a last resort, just because that is. Voter confusion is a real concern, because it’s always been, it’s been the first week of June since, what, the 40’s? There’s only been like one time where it wasn’t. So, that our, that’s our real concern around that. So I just wanted to make sure that that was clear, and that’s where our concern lies.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Dylan.

And I think Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Thank all of you for participating and giving us your discussions and your knowledge about your groups. And for really bringing forward the outreach. Outreach is so -- the first step is outreach, and then you can get into participation. And we need that so we can, (indiscernible) lag time.

And then so it dovetails right into your, the frontloading. Because our -- we’re doing things a little differently. We’re able to do things differently this time around than 2010. Because 2010 it all sort of happened, all participation essentially started happening as soon as the Census data got there, which is participation and line drawing all at the same time. And that leads to confusion, and what are we talking about, and what’s going on.
And so, the previous Commission really worked at that and came up with ideas. And so we do have what’s -- we’re talking about this Community of Interest Tool, and we are doing, we’re actually having community of interest meetings, input meetings, and right -- you know, before. All of this is before the Census data.

So -- and we want to make sure that your groups, as you have so eloquently brought forward, there’s a lag time between how the harder the group is, that the fewer that they’ve been able to participate, often harder is to reach out to them, and harder to get them to participate. And the idea of, how can we -- we’re coming up with hybrid models, we’re coming up with on-line models, we’re actually having paper forms of this COI Tool. How can we help you get your groups who you are the trusted messengers with, be able to participate and participate now? You know, they don’t have to wait until, you know, we’re out there standing in your community.

Now for some that is by far the best, but others, particularly ones who are, you know, doing multiple shifts of work, and, you know, your hours are all strange, it’s a lot easier if you could do something on your own time, and either mail it in or access to -- you know, e-mail it if you can do that. Go on-line if you can do that, but that’s not available for everybody.
So, how can we help you reach your groups even, and how can we reach your groups then through you?

MS. HUERTA: I think if you have materials that could be provided, and be specific about the kind of information that you need, we see some of that now with the community surveys that we’re already starting to do the community surveys. We’re already doing some of this. Some of it in person, some of it on-line. I think that will help us.

So, any type of materials that could be provided to our organizations, I think that would be very helpful. And any kind of educational materials, also, that would -- that could also help us a lot.

So, you know, like I said, we were talking about redistricting since we started working on the Census. So, it’s not a new thing, but we do have all of these hundreds of communities that we have to reach out to. So -- and I don’t know that the Commissioners have any type, a kind of resources, but -- resources. And if you could help us, especially with some of our allied organizations, we have these coalitions of other groups, but a lot of them are smaller groups, and they also lack resources.

So, any, any word to funders out there to say, look, give some of these CPO’s, these nonprofit organizations, help them get some of the resources so they
could staff up, and we can reach out to some of these communities. So, the -- so we don’t leave anybody behind. So we can get that full participation that you need and that we want.

MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, I agree the materials are super helpful. So, materials the Commission can provide to us, that we can then get to our groups. The Commission has done a great job in their offer to meet with our folks and give an overview of redistricting, which I think has been like so great and so helpful.

So I think it’s in those types of outreach efforts where folks are -- you know, where the Commission is engaged with us. And then also just being -- creating what the most effective way for us to kind of communicate. You know, to bring what we’re getting, because we’re bottom-up organizations, right.

And so we’re collecting folks from our members across the State, and so what’s the most -- what’s the best way for us to communicate that to the Commission, which I think you’re already setting up some of these great tools and some of these hybrid options.

And so just being really clear with us about like this, it would be really helpful if you communicated in this way, any of those types of tips, so we can start to plan in terms of like funneling that information over to
you all to be the most helpful, I think would also be great. But, yeah, just continuing to engage materials are always super helpful. And, I mean, you guys are obviously doing a great job in these type of forums. And so, I mean, I just really commend the Commission on all that. But, yeah, the more the merrier.

MR. BLUM: You know, I’m also thinking -- I’ll also just throw up on us, what is -- what are more that we can do that sort of gets you good input and good product to deal with? And I -- you know, we have talked about the COI Tool. I do think that, you know, maybe doing some more outreach with our folks about sort of the utilization of the COI Tool and how it’s going to, how it’s going to help the Commission do their job. And a little bit more understanding of the COI Tool, I think that could be helpful with us getting you good inputs.

MS. HUERTA: Also, I think any kind of major media, if, again, if major media could be put out there. And not only just on television, but also radio. Because so many of the people are workers, and they do listen to radio. I have to tell you this. Spanish radio is extremely, extremely popular. So, having things on Spanish radio, things on Spanish television.

Also, I know in the valley there is one T.V. channel that is a Punjabi channel. And I think on the
public radio stations, that could be Linguay (phonetic),
they also have different programs, the different Asian
languages, also.

    So I think a lot of that media would be -- radio
media, television media could also be very helpful to let
people know, Commissioners are reaching out to you. They
want you to participate. This is going to affect your
community. Redistricting is going to, you know, kind of
govern your life for the next 10 years, so we want you all
to come in and participate.

    MR. BLUM: Can I ask just -- and I realize it’s a
question. But I really do want to also just echo that
point again also, about local in-language media. I’m just
sort of citing that as a (indiscernible), I’ve sort of seen
that from the lens of political campaigns, and also just
that we’d better talk to our members.

    And we did a research project on past governors’
races. And particularly with -- this was with some of the
Asian-Pacific Islander communities, and there was great --
they had great levels of information about what was
happening in sort of, you know, the country from which they
or their parents came from. Great levels of knowledge of
that. Great levels of what was happening in their local
community, but there was sort of this donut hole -- and
some knowledge of what was happening.
I was like, there’s this donut hole of knowledge about California politics, and it was because so many, a lot of folks in these communities got their information from in-language local media that covered, you know, news from back home, or would cover, you know, big, important national news, and, of course, cover the local news, but it doesn’t cover California politics.

They don’t -- these entities don’t have California Bureau or Sacramento Bee as a (indiscernible). So there’s a, there was just in our sense that there was just California-specific politics, state-level-politics language. There’s this donut hole, that these communities that we’re talking about, they rely on in-language, local media, whether it’s T.V., radio or newspapers. So -- and now digital.

I would strongly just also stress that as a way to really get to some of these underserved communities that may not be reached otherwise. Just completely agree with what Dolores meant about that point. But I just, a light went off in my head with some of this research we had done in the past couple years on this issue.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you so much. This has been an amazing panel, and just really informative and so helpful. So, thank you all so much for sharing your
time and being here, as well as for subcommittee for
bringing this together.

You know, so many thoughts kind of jumping
through my mind here. First, Bryan, I would love to see
that research. I actually have some projects looking at
home-country politics, so I’d love to see the results from
your studies.

Second, I think, you know, I think it’s really
interesting, and I just really appreciate (recording
inaudible) conversation around the timeline. And I think
just hearing the different perspectives here, you know,
just reflects so much on our own conversations, because I
think that we’re torn in terms of which direction to move
this in. And, clearly, it sounds like there’s some split
here as well about how to proceed.

I’ve actually been really interested, also -- you
know, what I haven’t heard thus far is the impact because
we run on top two primary. Often the primaries are where a
lot of the action happens, and very decisive in terms of
the long-term outcome of elections. So I think that’s also
an interesting piece to think about when potentially
considering moving the primary.

What I really wanted to ask, however, is, you
know, we’ve heard from some community-based organizations
and other groups on the ground, that they are planning to
submit to us their own district maps for our consideration.

I was really curious if your groups are planning to do that? If your infrastructure supports that? I certainly hear the involvement of mobilizing your members to submit the communities of interest information. But I was curious if that’s something that was on your radar or agenda as we move forward, also, that certainly plays into some of our considerations around the timeline as well.

MS. HUERTA: Well, on behalf of the Dolores Huerta Foundation and some of our allied groups, yeah, we are going to be presenting maps, also.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Great. Thank you so much.

And Cal Labor Fed and SEIU, is that a part of your plans as well?

MR. BLUM: I would say that it -- it’s not sort of proactively guaranteed that we will be submitting plans. I do think it’s a possibility. And I would say more sort of figuring out with some of the labor councils and some of our unions, I -- for now I don’t know that we’re going to -- I would not say that we had plans to have a California labor map presented, but I reserved my right to change our mind as more info comes.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, similarly. And I know we have -- a lot of our discussion so far has focused on those
communities of interest, like you said. And so I think that’s going to be a big part in really defining what those look like for us, and thinking about that creatively and how that impacts our communities.

That may result in, you know what I mean, in some (indiscernible) maps, but I’m not sure. And I can follow-up with some of our other folks that have also been engaged in this work and get back to you with some of their additional thoughts, too. But -- so that may result in that. But I know for a fact -- like communities of interest obviously, we’re really trying to think about that in creative and important ways, and to be able to communicate for sure, for sure. So, yeah, that may come out.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you.

And I know, Commissioner Turner, you had a question?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I did. I wanted to follow-up on, for our panels that also asked what can they do? And I just wanted quite simply to ask that you ensure that you follow us on Twitter, like us on Facebook, connect us to your network for each of your -- for labor, SEIU, for Dolores Huerta Foundation.

I think that we have an amazing video that is available, that has the redistricting basics presentation.
that you’ll be able to share at your leisure to any of your groups in anyplace that -- so I think that would be wonderful.

Some of the materials that you’re asking for, to some extent, is in -- on our website. Now we are constantly looking for additional pieces that we can develop. And so I just would love to have you go to that www.wedrawthe -- wait a minute. I’m mixing it up now, Fredy. I’m trying to do a plug for you and mixing it up. Wedrawthelines -- where does CA go? WedrawthelinesCA.org. And -- but go on to those websites. But also, if you would then push it out in material that you’re providing and encourage your members as well to follow. Because as things change, as articles come up, we do have some of us -- Commissioners have done radio spots as well. You can kind of pull those down and play them as well for whatever the meetings, whatever the gatherings that you’re having.

So I loved, Bryan, earlier when you talked about your meetings, regular meetings and sessions that you’ve having. I think the more you’re talking about it -- Dolores Huerta, of course I’m very familiar with the maps that you all did, kind of even in parking lots and stuff, getting people to participate. The more that can happen, the better.

I just, again, want to state that redistricting
is something that can be approached once. It needs to continue to be talked about. And I wanted to just kind of agree. I know that DHF has been a rabbit out front, you know, way earlier on, back to 2010, et cetera. A lot of our -- the other organizations are coming along now.

So whereas there is the experience of those that have the deep-seeded knowledge, all of what you’re doing now will also make it accessible for those that’s just waking to the importance and the critical nature of redistricting. So, tag us, like us, follow us, and connect us to your network as well.

MS. HUERTA: Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Turner.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just to say on that note that I did present to the California Labor Federation this week. We had a major technology glitch. I disappeared within five minutes I think into the presentation, and it took about 10 to get back on. But I do thank you very much for allowing that opportunity.

And I want to remind everyone, you know, what Bryan said about there are California -- you know, there are Federation groups at our local levels, and that’s a good place to reach out.

I will send you all as part of your thank-you e-mail links to everything that Commissioner Turner brought up. We -- Fabio (phonetic), the linguist, did do a really
good piece, half-an-hour piece in Spanish on redistricting, and that would be great if you can share it with your Spanish speaking, because I -- not because they interviewed me, but really the reporter was really, really good, and she really went in depth and did a really good explanation about it all.

And Commissioner Kennedy is shaking his head, so it’s not just because it was me.

And I see Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. I just wanted to flag for our panelists and -- that we do, we have a social media tool kit on our website that our communications team has been putting together.

And definitely, you know, as we ramp up our engagement and activation efforts, those tool kits will probably be, you know, easiest to send out far and wide to your members and to folks on the ground. So I just wanted to flag that for you.

And also for folks who are listening at home, a reminder that if you have network out there that you are trying to get involved in this process, that social media tool kit is the place to sort of monitor for those, for those details on how to do digital outreach.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Great. Well I know we have, we’ve got a packed agenda, so if there’s no additional
questions, I’d like to thank you all for joining us today, and really continuing our learning and our engagement with the greater community.

And we thank you so much for everything you do to help the community know about redistricting and helping us really create fair and representative maps. So, thank you so much for your time today.

MS. HUERTA: Thank you very much.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

MS. HUERTA: And I just want to mention one more thing. Is that of course in addition to agriculture here in the southern part of the San Joaquin Valley, we have oil. So, we have a large population that works in the oil industry, and of course there’s some political tension going on.

Kern County, in addition to being the largest oil -- petroleum producer, but we are also number one in terms of clean energy, okay. So just to let people know a little bit more to add to the complexion of the area that you’re dealing with.

So, again, thank you very much for allowing us to be able to share out information with you. Thank you so much. And good luck, Commissioners. Good luck.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you so much. Thank you.
CHAIR FERNANDEZ: It’s a great panel. Really appreciated that.

Thank you, Commissioner Sinay and Fornaciari for bringing that panel. It’s a good way to end out the panels, so thank you so much.

So with that, we actually are kind of done. So, the only -- I think we’ve gone over everything. The only thing we have, and I don’t, I don’t really believe there’s a discussion right now, Agenda Item 16 is discussion of future meeting dates and agenda items.

And we actually have already put together the schedule for the next few months. So unless there’s any changes to that, we can move forward with it.

I did mention earlier, I want to make sure that everyone catches that the initial schedule that was posted inadvertently had a Zone J on August 7th, 2021. That was not correct, so we removed that.

And then also the initial one that was posted the week of August 20th, some of those dates were, were not correct. So, the correct schedule is now posted on-line. So please refer to the on-line version. And I think that was it for the dates.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: On the dates, in terms of the -- you know, there were a couple of versions of the
full, everything date -- calendar. And is it, is the latest correct one dated 5-dot-11, 2021?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: No. The latest one, unfortunately it does have a different -- it has an earlier date. But if you go on the website, on our website under the handouts, it will be on there. It actually says right now, version --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: 5-dot-six.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: 5-6. Uh-huh, 5-6.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And that’s the current one?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes, that’s the current one. The one that is currently posted is the current version.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: All right. Thank you.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: An accurate version. So thank you so much for confirming that.

And we do have a meeting scheduled for this coming Tuesday, May 18th. Right now I’m keeping the meeting. There’s a few things that we might have --

If Commissioner Akutagawa and Director Kaplan and I can get together, we may bring back the language access recommendations at that point. And the reason for trying to do that is, the sooner we get the information to our staff, the sooner they can start planning for everything.
So that’s one thing to consider.

Another thing, Commissioner Andersen is checking with our line drawers to see if they might be available on the 18th to try to do a dry run of reviewing all the public input we have received to date. So just kind of go through that to see what that would look like.

And it is the first day of our chief counsel, and I know that our Legal Affairs Committee has a meeting right before our meeting. So, regardless, there will be a meeting with the Legal Affairs, and I will let everyone know as soon as I can in terms of whether there will be a full Commission meeting as well.

Is there -- Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Also, I’m hoping that we’ll also hear -- have heard back from the Office of Legal Services by next week. So if we could, can we also plan to make sure that we’ll be coming forward with a report from the grant subcommittee, too.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Great. Thank you for (indiscernible) that to us as well.

Is there any else?

Commissioner Ahmad.

VICE CHAIR AHMAD: Yes. If I can ask folks, if they haven’t done so already, to provide a time estimate for your agenda items, subcommittee report outs for the
meeting of the 24th and the 25th, that would be greatly appreciated.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

Anything else? Okay. So the time is 3:34, and we will -- 3:35, it just flipped, so we will -- Commissioner Turner, are you saying good-bye or you want something? Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Do we -- public comment.

Do we have public comment?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: That’s right. Thank you so much. Thank you. Public comment.

Katy. Sorry --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: That’s okay.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: -- I think I was a little anxious, a bit anxious.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: It’s Friday afternoon, you know.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay.

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 93330293366 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 star-nine. This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it is your turn to speak you will hear a message that says, “the host would like you to talk,” and to press star-six to speak.

If you would like to give you 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 -- and this is end of day, end of meeting public comment, and we do have a caller here with their hand raised.

And go ahead. The floor is yours.

MS. HUTCHINSON: Thank you very much. This is Helen Hutchinson with the League of Women Voters of California.

And I wanted to thank the Commissioners for your very quick response about your policy on subcommittees. It’s a really clear and helpful statement. I hope that it
will be posted on your website.

One small nuance that still needs to be addressed is your definition of redistricting matters. Because your definition differs from that of the 2010 Commission, people may be confused. You adopted your more narrow definition after a lot of discussion, and it is based on the advice of counsel. And I -- so hope you can highlight that either as an update or an addendum to the statement or something else. Thank you very much.

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Ms. Hutchinson.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And we do have one more caller with their hand raised.

Go ahead. The floor is yours.

MR. CONNOLY (telephonic): Yes, hello. My name is Kevin Connoly, and I’ve been following redistricting nationally on places like the Gerrymandering Project on Facebook. Redistricting partners’ e-mails and Hani Lo Wang’s Twitter account.

Regarding Twitter -- regarding timelines, when disputes happen temperatures can run high, but just some perspective.

The Utah legislature gutted their voter-approved Commission and replaced with a watered down legislative version.

After a year of forming, the New York Commission
didn’t even have a website because the legislature hadn’t approved their budget.

Colorado’s legislature pushed their Commission to draw up preliminary maps using survey estimate data, not even the Census.

Compare this to California. A blog reported that the legislature doubled the budget from 10 years ago, and more is on the way. California’s 2020 lawsuit is the first case I can find of someone going to court to get a deadline extension.

On Facebook other states are definitely jealous of our COI Tool developed for you. People would have been just as grumpy if the legacy data wasn’t being processed, and your Commission had to wait an extra month after everyone else to get started.

This isn’t a threat to independent redistricting. Check out other states to see what that looks like. It’s just figuring out what the court said before. Is there now a need to ask for something else, and if so, what is reasonable?

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you so much for comment.

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

CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

Anything else from anyone? Okay.
It is now 3:39, so we will adjourn. And thank you all very much. Have a good weekend.

(Session recessed until May 18, 2021.)
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