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CHAIR SADHWANI: Good morning, California. My name is Sara Sadhwani. I'll be chairing today's meeting along with my colleague, Pedro Toledo, who will jump in as vice chair for us today. This is day two of our meeting for the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. And we're going to pick up on our agenda where we left off yesterday, which I'll talk a little bit about in just a moment.

Before we begin, Ravi, could we take roll call?

MR. SINGH: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: (Inaudible response).

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Toledo?

VICE CHAIR TOLEDO (via Zoom): (Inaudible response).

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Vasquez?

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ (via Zoom): (Inaudible response).

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Yee?
COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Presente.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY (via Zoom): Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: (Inaudible response).

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sadhwani?

CHAIR SADHWANI: Here.

MR. SINGH: You have the court room, Chair.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you so much, Ravi.

We will be jumping into public comment in -- this morning. But just as a quick reminder of our schedule for today, our agenda is posted on our website along with a schedule that gave a lay of the land for yesterday and today. We still have agenda items number four and five to complete today including finalizing the conversation around
the mapping playbook as well as what I anticipate being a sizable conversation about the Census Timeline and how that's going to look moving forward.

And at 10:00 a.m. in particular, we will be joined by Karin Mac Donald from our line-drawing team who will be sharing with us a little bit more about what we can expect next week when we receive our first set of visualizations.

And so with that, Kristian and Katy, if we could go to public comment?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Chair, Good morning.

In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is (877) 853-5247. When prompted to enter the meeting I.D. number provided on the livestream feed, it is 88264383219 for this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant I.D., simply press the pound key. Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in the 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. Press star-six to speak. If you would like to give your name,
please state and spell it for the record. You are not
required to provide your name to give public comment.

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

  And we do have a caller in the queue. Caller
with the last four 8461. If you wish to give comment,
please press star-nine. This will raise your hand
indicating you wish to give comment and not just listen.

  And we also have another caller, Caller 7746.
Caller 8461, if you will please follow the
prompts to unmute at this time. The floor is yours.

MR. MARSH: Good morning, Commissioners. Can
everybody hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can.

MR. MARSH: Okay. Good. Okay. My name is Paul
Marsh. Spelled P-a-u-l, last name is M-a-r-s-h. I'm a
small businessman, veteran, and also the former vice
president of the Victor Valley NAACP, and I'm an over
50-year resident of San Bernardino County High Desert.

  I'm calling today because, you know, I have some
grave concerns with the commission trying to combine our
community with Antelope Valley. In my life, you know, I
have been -- you know, I've been in many districts that were based out of Antelope Valley and Los Angeles County. And, you know, I can honestly say, you know, our community was never really the main focus of those representatives, you know? And I believe, you know, this issue of equity is because Los Angeles County is so much larger and has more representatives at the State and Federal levels than the Inland Empire does. And, you know, that is one reason -- well, one major reason why we need representatives who represent us.

Besides the historical inequities of districts that combined the Antelope Valley and --

MR. MANOFF: 30 seconds.

MR. MARSH: -- Victor Valley, you know, our community --

Excuse me?

MR. MANOFF: You have 30 seconds remaining.

MR. MARSH: Oh, our community -- okay. Our community also have very different and very separated. One example is that we do not share --

MR. MANOFF: 15 seconds.

MR. MARSH: -- a major transit corridor with Antelope Valley, and our local government agencies do not coordinate on issues to benefit the public good or address issues like homelessness, housing, inequity. So, you know,
MR. MANOFF: Time.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And up next, we will have Caller 7746. If you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time?

MR. SPINNER: Hello?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, the floor is yours.

MR. SPINNER: Hi, yes, my name is Steve Spinner. I'm a resident of Atherton, California, which is in Silicon Valley. I lived here for the last six years, and before that I was right next door in Menlo Park for about 15 years.

I'm calling to give comment on stuff that I've been hearing that this area would be pushed up to be part of the Hillsborough, Burlingame area as opposed to staying as it has historically always stayed Atherton, Woodside, Portola Valley, Menlo Park with Palo Alto. I just wanted to give a -- some level of local context here. You know, Atherton, Menlo Park, these areas are one community with Palo Alto. They've been forever. People go to each other's farmer's markets. You know, I go on Saturdays to the Palo Alto market on, on Sundays go to Menlo Park market. We send -- our kids go to school here in Menlo Park, but we go to Los Altos for school -- for high school.
You know, my wife -- we live here in Menlo Park and Atherton, but my wife works in Palo Alto, and I've worked a number of opportunities over the years in Redwood City down to Palo Alto. And the communities here are all one. We are all one. And so we always -- we joke about needing dough --

MR. MANOFF: 30 seconds.

MR. SPINNER: -- and schlep up to Hillsborough and Burlingame where, you know, that community -- Hillsborough and Burlingame just south of San Francisco is very much -- the people that live there usually typically work north of there in San Francisco. Where, where I live, Woodside, Atherton, Portola Valley, we live and work here at Facebook and other tech communities down here and at worse, we go a little bit south to Sunnyvale, Cupertino.

MR. MANOFF: Time.

MR. SPINNER: So all I'm asking is just give context. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

And that was all of our callers at this time, Chair.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Thank you, Katy.

We have a little bit of time this morning before Karin Mac Donald joins us, so I wanted to just offer a couple of quick announcements to commissioners and then
perhaps jump into -- if Commissioners Yee and Turner are okay with it, jump back into the playbook discussion at least for a few minutes before she joins us. And she also might be able to add to that conversation at well.

First, just a quick announcement: We discussed in yesterday's meeting the locations for upcoming hybrid meetings. Again, these are meetings that are closed to the public due to COVID regulations. But if commissioners do plan to travel, please RSVP to staff as soon as possible.

Some emails went out this morning, so make sure that staff knows that so that they can plan accordingly and also to ensure that we are able to accommodate all of our COVID protocols.

Are there any other general announcements from commissioners before we get started this morning?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Just along that same line for the next week, we need to notify staff by Friday. The 13th, 14th, 15th.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Correct, yes. Well, for October 4th, 5th, and 6th please notify by the end of today. And for the following meetings, which I believe are 13, 14, 15 by Friday.

So with that, I'm going to hand it over -- and just pick up where we left off yesterday with Commissioners Yee and Turner to talk a little bit more -- there was one
additional document that we hadn't had a chance to review yesterday or discuss regarding the playbook. So I was hoping you could kick us off with that.

At 10:00 a.m. we'll switch gears and Karin Mac Donald will be here, but I think she'll also be able to help inform that conversation as well.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. Very good, Chair.

So just reviewing yesterday, we took a look at the main mapping playbook document, which is the one that looks like an outline, and went over that and noted various potential updates and changes that Commissioner Turner and I will take a look at.

Today let's look at the second document, which we're calling Attachment 1, and I'll go ahead and share it now.

Yes?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: We didn't quite finish the first document.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Did we not? Oh, okay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Sorry. We didn't quite finish the first document.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. We can go back to that one then.

CHAIR SADHWANI: And actually, for today, if I could ask, especially since we're now transitioning to
these hybrid meetings, wherever possible for commissioners or panelists, please do try and use the raise your hand feature in Zoom. I think that'll be the most equitable and also from my end, just help me to know where to look to find everybody when folks are raising their hands. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. Does anyone recall where we left off?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes, we didn't get to five or six.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Five or six. Okay. Five or six. Okay. I think --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I think Commissioner Sinay has a quick comment.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, what'd she say?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So sorry to do this, but I read it very carefully this morning when I was asked to do all my homework, and so I was curious to know if we can actually, you know, finish five and six but can we go back to some of the stuff at the beginning?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Sure, yeah.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. So I will follow the order of the Chair.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So five and six, actually you've seen all these previously when we looked at the
earlier draft of this document. So general principal is just trying to catch some of the general wisdom that we've heard so far, document everything, especially the reasons for decisions that we make, you know, whether or not they end up in the final report in detail, you know, keep everything documented, share the gain and pain. You know, you divide a city in one plan, maybe keep it whole in another. If the city was divided ten years ago, that's a legitimate reason to consider, you know, putting it back together this time.

Be open to resolving similar issues in different places in different ways. Those of us with high coherence needs have to struggle to bring ourselves to that, but we will do so as needed hopefully. And then the cleanest option is not always the best, right? We have so many different considerations to bring to each district, so trying to keep all those in play and not just go for the easiest or cleanest option.

So as we think about all these, number 6, just to keep in mind -- and you know all these, key differences from the 2010 process, you know, a much longer process, uncertainties about the deadline, the whole educational phase that we were able to do that we are not able to do -- they were not able to do ten years ago. The COI tool, of course, the upcoming district drawing tool, the Airtable,
magnificent Airtable, and also not having any public in-person meetings. So you're all aware of that.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, so I have a kind of reaction to 5B. It seems like a good idea potentially in the face of it. I understand that's what they did in 2010, but just a couple of observations.

You know, we've gotten feedback from, you know, a number of folks about, you know, their city or whatever being split in a bunch of different ways. And I recall looking at the maps, and I -- you know, one City's in two different Senate districts and four different Assembly districts, and I just -- you know, I'm just kind of wondering -- I don't have an answer, but I'm kind of wondering how much this notion of sharing the pain resulted in really kind of strange outcomes in drawing districts.

And so I just -- it seems like a good idea, but I just -- you know, I want to just throw my thoughts out there, I guess, is all. I don't have an answer at this time.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I think we're going to become intimately acquainted with those situations very soon.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And actually, Russell, I want to jump in --
COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- as we get ready to have
the conversation.
And just to remind all of the commissioners that
there for sure are probably 1,000 ways to approach this,
and so as a subcommittee, we needed to start someplace.
And so in the research that we've done and conversations
and what we've found from 2010, this is just our best first
effort to present to you. And so our fellow commissioners
for sure will come out with the best document, but I'd love
for us to go into this conversation with that in mind.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.
Okay. Commissioner Sinay, did you want to start
going back or should we -- okay. Why don't we -- okay. Go
ahead then, please, yeah.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm following the rules and
I'm just looking at both five and six. Building on what
Commissioner Fornaciari said, I think one of -- there are
some philosophical questions that I would like us to talk
about before we actually have the maps in front of us and
we're trying to figure it out.

And one is, what is a small city, and what is a
big city? Because there are some interesting examples from
last time, and in a lot of ways it felt like they preferred
splitting little cities over big cities. And that -- and
I'm just saying that based on the input that we've heard
and some of the things that you see. And so -- but what is a small city, and what is a big city? You know, for some of us 1,000,000 is big. Well -- okay, for all of us a 1,000,000 is big, but for some of us 55,000 is a big city, and for others of us 55,000 is a small city. And so just kind of having -- being able to get a feel from all of us where we are on that.

The other piece on this one -- I thought it was really good that it says, Document all decisions and the reasons, but I would also like to add on there and go back to the reasons -- to that documentation when we're making changes. Because I'm going to keep saying this, but I don't want the last voice in to be the one that has the loudest voice.

So if we created -- if we drew a district for a reason and then we get a lot of calls saying, Hey, we don't like that district, but we created it for a reason, I want to go back to what the reason was -- for all of us to go back to the reason we created the district the way it was, listen to the comments based -- you know, after we've put ourselves back in that kind of -- and then tweak the lines, versus just oh, they didn't like it; let's tweak the lines.

And so I do -- you know, we keep saying that all comments in are important, so I would like to add something on there that we will review before we move forward. And
And then on six, COVID's not on there, in that list. And it's -- and, you know -- and it's all inferred but, you know, in 2030 they may forget 2020 had COVID. And I think that needs to be mentioned pointblank, that there's just -- COVID was a moving target, but also that it created barriers. You know, we -- everything on here's kind of positive, and that's great, but we do need to be honest that we didn't have in-person meetings. The commissioners had their first in-person meeting 13 -- you know, some commissioners met 13-plus months into -- you know, that needs to be in here for future.

And also that we didn't travel to the regions and, therefore, we didn't get to see and we were more dependent on Google Maps, COIs, whatever it might be. And so I don't want us just to create a document that's all positive, I want us to create an accurate document for the future since I know we'll build on this one as we're creating our final report.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Excellent comments. Thank you.

To your second point, so documenting incremental reasons and not just final reasons -- prevailing reasons.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. During the process it may not need to be in the final report, but as we're moving
through the process being able to document the incremental reasons so that we can go back and remember -- because none of us are going to remember any of this. I mean, you know, do we remember exactly what we ate for dinner last night? You know -- okay, we might've, but what about lunch? You know, I'm just trying -- you know, so I'd like to have the incremental, and that might not have to go in the full report, but I do want us to be able to go back to the incremental and not just take the last person who spoke to us.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Sure. Thank you.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. I'm taking this as an opportunity to share thoughts that I wrote down a week or two ago when we were asked to put our thinking caps on, because they seem similar to the items in five and six.

So number one: You know, we're not in the incumbent protection business, but we're also not in the wrecking ball business. We're trying to make sense of this. As you said, you know, some of us have some coherence needs. I thought that was great. So, you know, we are trying to do this the best we can. At the same time, you know, and this is something I've said throughout, change is inevitable. You know, they -- the -- it would
be -- as I've said before, it would be a miracle if districts were able to remain exactly as they are. Population changes -- populations have changed at different rates throughout the state, and the minute one district changes it sets off a cascade of all districts having to change to make the puzzle whole. So, you know, change is inevitable.

Next: I think it's okay for us to have different understandings and a different focus than the 2010 commission. Social justice seems to be a greater focus for us than it was for the 2010 commission. You know, I'm not making that as a definitive statement, but that seems to be, you know, where our mindset is quite often.

Next: And this was part of the reason for bringing in our guest speaker last week, topography is important. It's not all determining, but I think it is important and we need to have a better understanding of topography than looking at all these flat maps has given us.

Next: You know, we've heard from a lot of people saying, you know, my neighbor across the street is in a different district. Well, you know, for better or for worse, it's virtually impossible for every boundary to run through zero population areas. And unfortunately, somebody is going to be across the street or road from neighbors in
another district. That's just a fact of the matter as we go through this.

We do, and this was pointed out by the CalMatters piece yesterday, we need a critical lens to discern reverse engineered districts where people are trying without saying so to ensure the reelection of incumbents. Again, you know, we're not in the incumbent protection business, but we're also not in the wrecking ball business.

I'll leave it at that. Those were some of the thoughts that I wrote down that I thought might be relevant to this discussion. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. I'll try to be somewhat concise. Definitely agree with Mr. Kennedy in terms of our focus can be different. We -- every ten years it's an independent commission, and there's 14 new people and we all think independently, which is great. I don't think Californians voted for us to do the same thing as the last commission, so I just want to keep that in the forefront.

Also building upon Commissioner Sinay in terms of some of the drawbacks, there -- we had no public input in-person meetings, and that's a huge drawback. As well as
also being able to go out into the public to maybe if there is a gathering, we can actually do some sort of advertising or even outreach or presentation, whatever the case may be.

And my other question -- or not question, concern -- or not concern, issue with 6B, longer more robust public outreach and education phase. I'm not comfortable with saying it's robust. I don't want to compare us to anyone else. But we did have a longer phase, that is accurate, but I just have an issue with using robust because that's questionable, right? Or it's anyone's -- whoever's definition that is.

And I think that's probably it in terms of my comments for now, but thank you. Thank you to you, Commissioner Yee and Commissioner Turner. Great document. It's just -- just like anything else, you have to have something in writing first for people to react, and I know a lot of time went into this, so thank you so much.

COMMISSIONER YEE: This is a great process. Yes, thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

Oh, I'm sorry, Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Yee. I don't have that many things to say.

First, I -- I apologize. I was having a little technical difficulty so if Commissioner Kennedy said some
of the things I'm about to say, I apologize.

One thing that's not in here is, that is
different from the 2010, is incarcerated population
reallocation.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: They did not do that, we
did. And also we -- they did Section 5 VRA, which required
precertification, things had to be done -- things were set
in certain counties, and that affected what you could do --
It's like you've locked some of those puzzle pieces, and
that effected what they could do particularly, I know, in
the Bay Area. So, you know, those two items need to be
added to that.

And then I also, like Commissioner Sinay, have
something to go back with, but -- and also thank you very
much for this document. I agree with Commissioner -- what
Commissioner Fernandez said. It really is wonderful to
have this in writing and then be able to talk about some
things, so thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Very good. Thank you,
Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner
Yee.

I wanted to just follow-up on what Commissioner
Sinay brought up about COVID. And I think, you know, that not only being a really major factor -- I think -- I wouldn't characterize it as incremental, the kinds of things that we had to go through as a result of it, I think it just really impacted everything and anything we did. So it feels incremental in some ways, but it's not. I mean -- and so I just wanted to be -- I guess just wanted to really state that more clearly. Yeah, because I'm thinking about just how long it took us to meet.

I want to also just, you know, play off of what Commissioner Fernandez said about the fact that we didn't have in-person meetings, and that I also believe that COVID may have impacted Californian's participation in giving us feedback -- communities of input feedback. Because I think we've talked about this, I think there's less than what we had, you know, expected. So I would agree in terms of -- you know, robust is maybe a questionable word to use, but we did have a longer public outreach and education phase.

But I do feel that people were a lot more distracted by a number of different things, and so we were competing against not only just, you know, I would just say COVID, and then later, you know, whatever your feelings are about vaccines and masking, the recall. I mean, there was a lot of things that we were competing with. The fires -- yes, the fires most definitely for the -- yeah.
I mean, we didn't have the kind of concerns that we're dealing with then in 2010 that we are now. I mean, because we -- we're pretty certain that in parts of the further north of California, there may have been people who have been, you know, unable to participate because this wasn't like really, you know, life or death like -- you know, this isn't like on Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, right? It's not like -- it's higher up on the food chain kind of thing. So I just wanted to just also note that.

And so -- I think I'll also say, and I don't know -- I don't recall exactly, but I think it did take us a little longer to get our staff on board also too. So I think that may also be something that we may want to note as well too. Speaking to the let's not all note the good stuff, but let's also note some of the other challenges. And maybe for the 2030, and I think we've talked about this as well too that, you know, getting staff on board much, much more quickly is something that I think we've noted as well too is going to be an important factor as well too, so. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

So we're at ten. Should we pause on this and then we'll come back to this later?

CHAIR SADHWANI: That sounds great. Thank you so
much, Commissioners Yee and Turner.

I see that Karin Mac Donald has joined us. There
she is.

Commissioner, do you mind to stop the share
screen?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you so much. Just so we
can see each other fully. Great. Thank you.

And so good morning, Karin. We invited Karin
this morning as a part of the line-drawing subcommittee
report to just come share with us a little bit about the --
an update in terms of how the visualizations are coming
along, and also just as a -- to have a short conversation
about what we can expect from next week. Obviously, we'll
be releasing our first visualization, so I can anticipate a
whole lot of interest. And we wanted to just make a little
bit of time and space to talk through what that might look
like and how we might need to best prepare.

So with that, I'll hand it over to you, Karin.

Just as an FYI, we were talking about the playbook. I know
that we still haven't -- one more component of that
playbook to discuss, and we might have some additional
questions for you on that as well. So with that, I'll hand
it over.

MS. MAC DONALD: That sounds good. Thank you so
much. Good morning, commissioners. It's great to see all of you.

And I am excited to report that your regional line-drawing teams are working frantically to implement all of the direction that you gave last week, so there's lots of mapping going on, lots of visualizations. And, of course, I think this is an exciting part of the process because you actually start seeing bits and pieces of the state that perhaps were in your mind before, perhaps they were just written down in a public comment or so, and they're putting that together for you.

So I think what we have in mind, and what I hope will work for you, is that, of course, as discussed we will send up the visualizations for each day. The day before it will be presented, so you should be able to see visualizations that Jaime will show. The day before, she will show them posted on your website. That's at least what we're going to try to stick to throughout this process.

And Jaime, of course, is -- has Los Angeles, and she is in communication with Dr. Gall today. I just had a conversation with Dr. Gall. As you may remember, you gave some direction that the line-drawers should be working with VRA counsel. And, you know, I think one thing to keep in mind is, is that this is definitely an iterative process.
So what we're doing next week is not a final product by any stretch of the imagination.

Dr. Gall, as you know, is also frantically working on completing her analysis. She may have some preliminary analysis that is available, but there will be more. And honestly, there will be more throughout this process, and there will be visualizations and iterations until we have a draft. And then we have a draft, then that's not a visualization anymore. And so I think from week to week, we're going to get more information from our VRA attorneys, from Dr. Gall, and also from you, and then we'll try to put that all together and try to more toward that draft plan -- and statewide plan that you feel okay about, you know, stopping and getting public input on.

And so that's essentially the first step next week, is to kind of maybe start moving towards quarter state maps. So what Jaime has been doing, and what she will continue to do up until that point is to create bits and pieces of maps. And she will be able to show those to you, she will be able for the first time show you what the population in those bits and pieces is. Like, for example, if you've said, you know, keep these two or three areas together, we'd like to see how this is going to work out, she will be able to tell you what the total population in those areas are for that particular visualization. And she
will also be able to pull up the citizen voting age
population if you'd like to see that. So those data are
now available. And remember, they're available -- they've
been available for a little over a week now. So this is
something that we can now incorporate and we can show to
you.

On -- with respect to how to look at these
visualizations, I think it's, again, very important to keep
in mind that these are not full, complete plans. Some of
them you may have said, well, is this going to be something
that could be together in one particular district? We will
be able to give you feedback on that. They will
demonstrate some tradeoffs. So if you've given direction
in one particular area that you'd like to see A, B, and C,
but then also B, C, and D you may not be able to do both.
And these visualizations will be able to illustrate those
tradeoffs for you.

The visualizations also may not be
interchangeable, and this is something you'll be able to
see, and we can discuss. You'll have access to us the
entire day, you know, just to talk about LA as long as you
need. And so essentially, we can talk in great detail
about what is there at this point. And, again, we're
hoping to have more information than we have right now on
Monday from Dr. Gall and hope that that will be
communicated to the VRA attorney so that they can then give
us feedback about, for example, at what percent perhaps
should we be drawing this and that? What should we be
looking for? What are the targets here? And then that
will inform what we can show you the week after.

There will be ongoing refinements necessary, obviously. Again, these are still ideas, these are
visualizations, some of these things may not fit together
at all.

I'm sorry, I just heard somebody. I'm sorry
about that.

And so some of the perhaps direction that you may
give once you see these visualizations starting on Monday
is whether to amend a particular visualization. Something
that you see may make perfect sense to you, and you may
just say, okay, this looks good. It's a little short of a
potential district. Could we perhaps amend this particular
visualization and add this area or that area? Some
visualizations are not going to make any sense once you see
them, and you may say, okay, that does not work. And we
know that because we've just seen perhaps some other
visualizations or just because we have additional
information now. We thought about it. Now that we see it
mapped, it really doesn't make sense. So let's put these
into a completely different bracket, and then perhaps add.
You may have some new visualizations that you would like to see in certain areas, perhaps you didn't give direction in the entire area or region that we've discussed, and you may want to add to that and say, okay, over here we didn't give a lot of direction. We didn't have a lot of information. We do have some information now, so for the next iteration please just add this or that.

And then also prioritization. So essentially, this is more important for the next version of visualizations, and this is a little bit less important, here you can have some flexibility, here is where we really want you to, you know, do certain things, and so forth. So I think this is going to be a collaboration as the entire process has been, and perhaps more of a collaboration now directly with the regional mappers in these public meetings. As I hope you will allow them to kind of walk you through these areas and then you'll have this opportunity to give feedback. And we can pause at any point, of course.

And as you're talking to the line-drawers they may say, okay, I have two or three visualizations in this particular area. Why don't we look at that section first and then perhaps get input on that particular region? And then as you give additional input, they can also say, okay,
thank you for that input. Over here based on what you just said, I want to highlight that we have a visualization. Let me just show you that visualization because it would impact the direction that you have just given.

So I know this is all sounding really extract, and it's kind of in my head and I'm trying to explain it. Once it is on a map and in front of you, I know it will make sense to you. And, of course, we will all figure out how this works for you and be able to just pivot depending on what you need. But this is kind of what I have in my head right now, and I -- and let's talk about it. So thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you so much, Karin. And I'm sure that there's going to be some questions from my colleagues. I just wanted to highlight a couple of the key pieces that I heard both for commissioners and for the public.

So visualizations are going to come out about 24 hours in advance of us reviewing them, which means if we're starting with Los Angeles County on October 4th, keep an eye out on October 3rd for that visualization to be posted.

I also want to raise -- and this isn't a you thing, Karin, but something that we've kind of discussed on the staff side and I wanted to raise for commissioners in case there's thoughts about it, holding public comment in
the beginning of the meeting. We anticipate that when the visualizations come out, we'll probably have a lot of public comment. But we want to make sure -- that public comment is extraordinarily important to all of us. However, we also need to make sure that we have time in our day given all of our breaks and requirements to do our work.

And so from -- for the public's perspective, we want to really highlight that sending in emails in advance of the meeting would be -- with your thoughts on those visualizations would be a great way to communicate your love or concerns for the visualizations that come out. We will take public comment at the end of those days, but we also want to make sure that we have enough time to actually review those visualizations. So if commissioners have thoughts or concerns, we can also discuss that as well. That isn't a final decision, but something that we've considered.

What I'm hearing also is that when we start, we'll get a review of those visualizations from the mapper -- right from -- so Jaime would start on October 4th with a review of the visualizations that have been put together based on our requests and kind of walk us through some of the considerations that we'll need to be thinking about, and then we'll have that opportunity to discuss and
amend and make changes and continue moving forward.

I wanted to raise one other issue that came up yesterday for you, Karin, and that was a request to change the order in which we review the State. I don't know if it's possible to do that at this time. I don't know if the mappers are -- would be ready in that order, but to do southern California after Los Angeles.

Would that be correct, Commissioner Sinay?

So that we can hit Orange County, San Diego, Imperial, San Bernardino, Riverside perhaps on October 5th. There's been a sense that we've had -- because they're always at the end that we've had to rush a little bit. But that -- we don't have to decide that right now, but I just wanted to make sure that that was known. And we can discuss that if that's possible for next week.

So those are some of the key things that I had heard, and I see some questions being raised.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just going along with -- you know, we want to make sure that every region gets their just amount of time. And I heard -- Karin, you just said, well, we can spend as much time as you need on Los Angeles, which would mean then we can spend as much as we need on all the other regions, which would mean that a region is going to be shortchanged just like it was when we did the
first visualizations.

And so I would like to recommend, can we -- you know, Los Angeles -- I keep saying why do we start with the hardest and then go to the easiest? I mean, I get we do it. But with the visualizations, it felt like it would've been easier to start visualizations on the easier just to get our feet wet and then jump into the deep end. But I understand why we're doing it. But I would like us to think through maybe putting time limits because if not, it's up to the Chair to really manage the time. And unfortunately, that didn't really -- you know, it's hard for the Chair to manage it, and the Chair also needs to be able to participate. And so that's the hard thing about not having a facilitator, instead having the Chair.

And so is there a way maybe that we -- Karin, if we were to put time limits on each region and then at the end if we still have time, go back to whatever regions -- you know, I would say -- you know, we keep saying Los Angeles is the most difficult, but San Bernardino, Riverside is going to be really critical to get it right as well. And, you know, there's so many different regions but can we put -- can we set like -- is there a time that we can allocate to each region so that we know, okay it's time to go on, or we say, okay, we can add half-an-hour now and we're taking it out from a pool that's at the end or
something. But create some type of agenda.

And this might not be an answer we need now, but as you're thinking about creating the agenda, create an agenda that's allowing for equal opportunity for each. And every time we finish early, maybe we put it in a bank of time that we pull out later. But we intentionally pull time out because we really did short-change Southern California last time. It was really bad in so many different ways, so I don't want to see that happening again.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Thank you so much, Commissioner Sinay. And, certainly, those details I think we can work out and see what's possible. I think the time limit idea makes a lot of sense.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. You know, remember these are the visualizations. And I don't want to say we really short-changed Southern California. We'd already given a bunch of directions, and it wasn't obvious that we'd already accounted for a lot of -- every time we say, “Don't split up citizen counties,” that applies everywhere. And I don't want us to say that some areas are, you know, more complicated. They are, but every single area deserves its time and deserves its issues. And so, you know, there're reasons why certain areas -- you
know, someone actually sort of asked, are we just going to spend all our time down south and nothing up north? And no, we're going to spend the same amount of time on every single district.

The issue is though certain districts are going to cover a lot more ground because of getting -- where the population is. When population is dense, we'll be spending more time in that geographic area, but we're not going to short-change anybody all the way through. And when you see the visualizations, you'll sort of go, oh, okay, so they do -- they all dove tail. And, you know, we can go -- there are difficult areas, quite frankly, throughout the State, which we're going to discover. But -- and I believe the natural flow of things given where we'll see visualizations, where we'll have issues will change week to week. What will happen, what we deal with first because the more visualizations we request in an area, the longer it's going to take for the line-drawers to put those altogether.

And so I really fully anticipate if we start with LA, the next week that could be the last day, and it'll shift like that. And I think, you know, the ebb and flow -- we should sort of almost let the first week happen -- and it does make sense, you know, when we're working on LA and we've just talked about how it relates to Ventura County
and San Bernardino and Riverside and down into Imperial and San Diego, you know, then we're kind of seeing that same thing. That does make -- you know, to shift into that -- but then there are other areas so, you know there is a reason to shift back and forth.

But putting a time limit on it? I don't want us to -- because if we're like we've almost resolved an area, op, times up, I don't want us to see that. You know, I understand that, you know, we don't want to spend too much time in an area, but I'd like us to think about rather than time in an area, how much time are we putting in in the number of districts. And that's -- you know, and I don't want to say, oh, the north gets short shifted because, no, the north -- and the north is not, you know, oh we're all really flexible. No, it's where these areas of districts interact.

As Karin has mentioned, district -- we get to plan maps. Like we're doing a map of a larger area, but then how those areas fit -- you know, you can almost see like -- it's kind of like well. And the play between those areas, that's where it's going to -- that's where the flexibility occurs. It's not in an entire area.

And so I just want to kind of clarify: As we get into this, it's going to be a lot more obvious. And I think everyone's -- their concerns will be addressed sort
of naturally. So I don't want us to -- you know, don't panic right now, let's get into it.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you for that.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I just want to say I think in this we need to maintain as much flexibility as possible. If we need to, you know, extend our meeting through a continuation notice, we need to extend the meeting through a continuation notice. We need to have the time that we need to do this. We had said that we are committed to doing the best job possible for the people of California. We were alerted in advance and along the way that this might take a good bit of time at certain points in the process. And so I want us to think in terms of maintaining flexibility and putting in the time necessary. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

You know, I'll just jump in and share my two cents here. You know, I think having some general guidelines in terms of timing would probably be helpful just in terms of the maintenance of the meeting and, of course, we will still have our mandatory breaks, et cetera. So I think putting some loose restraints on that -- and certainly, if we need a little bit more time, we -- you know, I think we can have that level of flexibility.
I'll also just raise: When we had that conversation a couple weeks ago about developing these visualizations, I think, one of the variabilities that I -- the variable factors that I saw was the amount of time for the presentations of the areas. And so at that point we were receiving kind of a tour of the areas in terms of the COIs that we received. We were at times getting VRA input and looking at CVAP on maps. And I felt like in different regions that took a very long time, and in other areas it didn't take quite as much time.

So I think we need to -- we might need to just think through the presentation of the visualizations will be presented and exactly how much time that actually takes. I think in the beginning, we were kind of sitting for, I think, almost two hours receiving information before we began discussing. And, of course, receiving that information is extraordinarily important, but then it also limits our ability to really engage. So thinking through the calibration of those presentations of the visualizations will also be an important factor in those time constraints that we might set.

Are there other questions, comments from commissioners?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, I kind of wanted
to piggyback on somewhat -- what Commissioner Sinay said, and I think it goes back to the -- I was going back over my notes on our September 18th meeting where we try to do seven zones, 33 counties, and for some reason somebody decided we would be able to do that. And I think part of it is we continue to think that the northern counties are going to be super easy, and that's not necessarily the case. When you have areas that deal with topography and deal with remote areas, that becomes difficult as well.

So I think we just need to be respectful of every part of California and not say that one part is going to be more difficult than the other. Because every area in California deserves the same amount of respect, and we just need to be cognoscente of that when we schedule this so that we don't try to put too much in one day and we give each area the respect it deserves. And if we get done early that day because maybe we did go through it quickly, that's great, but let's not try to rush through any area be it Southern California, Northern California, Central California. They all deserve all time. So I just wanted to throw that out there. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you so much. I appreciate that a lot.

Any other comments, questions? It looks -- seeing none. I'm very excited that we are ready to do this
next week. This is great. I'm seeing the enthusiasm.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry, I was trying to raise the button on here.

My only question is, when will we get kind of the agenda or, you know, knowing when we're looking at what? So that we can -- you know, we have to do our homework ahead of time. All of us have to do our homework ahead of time, not just the public. So do we have that -- those -- I know we don't have those dates because I made a request to kind of change things up. And when I'm saying change them up, I'm really saying change them up all the way around. I'm not just trying to advocate for Southern California, because I'm also the lead for far north. And I would say in some ways, I do think we rush far north as well. But just to -- that's why I want to give at least minimum amount of time for each region.

So when will we get kind -- the timeline of what regions we'll be talking about each day? Sorry.

CHAIR SADHWANI: No problem. The original plan was to use the same order that was used September 17th, 18th, 19th, I think those were the dates, when we discussed the initial visualizations. Given the request, I think we're going to go back and see what's possible to possibly change and then we can release that as soon as we finalize
that. One of the factors is whether or not the mappers will be ready with those visualizations because we were anticipating keeping the same schedule. So I think we just need to make sure that that would -- they would be able to accommodate that.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think building upon some of the comments and what was just asked right now. So I think -- I want to just ask this, and this is what I think I'm kind of hearing: So ideally, let's just say ideally, if it all works out -- if I'm hearing it correctly, we're going to start with LA on the 4th possibly. Is LA going to be the entire time, or are we also going to fit in another region like the remainder of Southern California? Because right now we're meeting the 4th, 5th, 6th, we have a business meeting on the 7th. So are we going to break it up by Southern California, Central California, Northern California? So the 4th, the 5th would be central, the 6th would be northern, and then we have our business meeting, or are we trying to be a little bit more flexible and are we going to use our business meeting time to also cover visualizations?

So -- and I'm asking this because I also heard LA would be one day, then the next day would be Southern California, then does that mean then if the next day is
Southern California on the 5th, then would Central California be the 6th, Northern California be the 7th? I think I'm just trying to figure this out in terms of what our time frames actually are.

CHAIR SADHWANI: So a couple of thoughts: The first -- the plan is -- for the business meeting, no, no visualizations would be discussed during the business meeting. That would simply be our business meeting agenda. I think from the perspective of the timeline, we would need to -- I think one of the key pieces we'll need to see if the number of visualizations that are coming out for each region. I think that's one of the determining factors of exactly whether or not we can cover anything else on that first day with Los Angeles.

Karin, I see you are ready to jump in here. So thank you.

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah, thank you so much, Commissioners.

So, Commissioner Fernandez, we heard you loud and clear when we were going through Northern California in particular with the Community of Interest, with the COI overview basically. And if I may offer this suggestion. Let's just use Los Angeles as an example.

So, Commissioner Sinay, I did not mean to say that Los Angeles, you know, should be treated differently
than anything else, so please -- if that came across that way, then I apologize because that was certainly not what I meant to say. I guess where -- we're just a little bit stuck on Los Angeles because we're -- you know, we're waiting for just a lot of other information to come forth. And some of the other areas we can actually map without waiting for other information, so that's really what I wanted to just make clear.

And, Commissioner Fernandez, to your point, these regions are the -- you know, basically the quarter regions are what I'm talking about right now. So Los Angeles is huge. And what I would suggest is that perhaps we don't have -- and this is obviously up to you, but what may work better is to not just look at every single visualization that Jaime has prepared on Monday, on our first day, but rather take one area of her region and then start with the visualizations there and start talking about those. And then go to another area of that region and talk about those visualizations so that it works a little bit more organically, and it's not like you're seeing this overload of information.

So basically, it's just like visualization after visualization after visualization, hopping all over the map, and then you have to go back and try to remember, okay, what did I just look at maybe an hour ago or so, you
know, and how is that relevant? So perhaps -- if you might let the regional mappers guide you through that process a little bit and then we can see how that works, then we can do that with Northern California, for example, also. You know, once Kennedy comes and works with you, she might have a suggestion about where she thinks it would make sense to start. She can let you know what her suggestion is. And if that is what you agree with, then she could start with the visualizations there, you work in that area, and then you work your way around.

So if that might work, maybe we could try that on Monday and then just talk about it and see if that might also be a good approach for Tuesday and Wednesday.

With respect to the schedule for next week, so we, you know, we also have to schedule everybody. I have not asked everybody to be there the entire three days because we have to be -- we are planning on being there in person. So for next week it might be a little bit tight because people have to -- some people have to fly in. That is not, you know, true for the Q2 team, obviously, but we have to drive up. So we have a little bit more flexibility for Q2. What we had -- the way we have people scheduled right now is that Jaime is starting on Monday, and then on Tuesday I have Tamina starting with the -- with basically Northern California coast. And then when she's done,
Kennedy could take over. So depending on how long that takes, Kennedy could take over and then start on the Northern California, Central Valley and going up, doing that area. And you go as long as you want to with Kennedy.

And then on the 6th, Kennedy can start and can finalize things with Kennedy and then John could start with Southern California and everything outside of LA. So we can be flexible and we can be there as long as you need us to.

And I think these time brackets make a lot of sense. You could perhaps say, you could perhaps set a, you know, minimal amount of time that you are going to be spending on each region most definitely, so that each region gets that particular amount of time and then you can expand from there.

Regarding schedule, I will talk to everybody and see what is possible for the week after. We heard you, Commissioner Sinay, with that request and the preliminary schedule that I'm looking at here was that, again, I would have Jaime start on the 13th, but I -- I will talk to her about that and then we were going to switch over to John on the -- on the 14th and do Southern California immediately after -- after the Los Angeles area basically and that will be on the 14th then and then we will have Kennedy, Tamina, again 14th, 15th switch off and trade off with Northern
California. So we had already planned on, based on
Commissioner Sinay's request, but again, I have to -- I
have to check with everybody and work that out. But I just
want to say for the record, we want to be responsive to you
obviously and we'll work these things out.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you for that, Karin.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just confirming. When we
start the vis -- last time when we did visualizations some
of us, you know, had ideas that -- later, right? You --
those ideas what pop up when you're driving or when you're,
you know, later on. And we said let's hold on to them
until the end that we were going to have time to go back
and we didn't even have time to really go deep into some of
the areas. Yes. I will keep saying that.

So will -- as much as some visualizations have
been created, if the visualizations that popped up in our
head before still make sense, will we have that opportunity
to share those visualizations since we're still in the
sketching phase?

MS. MAC DONALD: Yes. Absolutely. You know,
bring your ideas. And, you know, you may be able -- you
may see something that comes close to it already, and then,
you know, we may be able to grab that visualization and
then just see if we can add or subtract from that
visualization. Because again, you're going to have something on a map which just makes things a lot more concrete. The goal is to put these -- so these visualizations, they're kind of going to be like puzzle pieces from different puzzles, so they're not quite fitting together. Right? So essentially imagine you have four different puzzles of the same area and we're going to have more than four puzzles of the same area. You know? And you're trying to put them together. And then there's going to be a few puzzle pieces that are missing, but you're not really sure from which puzzle. So -- so that's essentially where we're going to be next week, and we'll try to narrow things down to a point where we can try to at least get to a version of various versions of like one puzzle, you know, for that particular area. So put some things together, because we need to move slowly but steadily toward a statewide map. And -- and so that's where we're at right now.

It's an interesting process and I -- I can't wait, honestly. I'm really excited about it.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you. I might also just add if we don't have time to go -- if we've generally finished an area for that day and we don't have time to go back to it during that week, I know, Commissioner Sinay, you're the fan of the Post-It notes, right? So it's okay
to jot them down. We're doing this week by week by week. So if we don't have time that week, you can always bring those ideas next week. Right? And we can try to incorporate them then.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: (Indiscernible).

CHAIR SADHWANI: See, I knew it. I knew you did.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I -- I am going to just keep asking the obvious questions. More -- partly because I think I just want to make sure I'm clear, but partly also because I'm also thinking about members of the public who also may have some other similar questions.

So timing-wise, I'm thinking about, Karin, what you were saying that with the line drawers you don't necessarily -- I did -- you didn't actually say you don't want to show all the visualizations but going through all the visualizations. But those are the things that I think we do need to see. And then given the time that we have, we got all these multiple maps that we have to do. I was just kind of imagining when you were just talking right now it's kind of like a backwards Jenga game. You know, like instead of taking it apart, we're trying to put it together, you know, like all those multiple pieces at the same time.

I guess if, again, going back to like how this is
all going to work out, are we -- are you going to just show
like the assembly visualizations, the Congress --
congressional district visualizations, the state -- are we
at that point yet, or are you just looking at just like big
areas of, you know, potential, you know, districts?
Because, you know, I think for me it's easier -- yesterday
I think we did this like -- we were looking at assembly
line and then all of a sudden we switched to Congress --
congressional lines and then back to assembly, and it was
just getting confusing because, you know, I was also
hearing take a picture, a visual picture of this, a mental
picture of this, and then remember. And then all of a
sudden we're on Congress -- I'm like, wait. This is
different. This doesn't make sense.
And so since we're -- we're kind of being asked
to really look at so many different puzzle pieces, I think
making sure that we stay with the like would be helpful.
Like if we're going to talk about assembly, let's just talk
about assembly. If we're going to talk about Congress,
let's talk about Congress and not mix those visualizations
up.
But I'm also just thinking, you know, just what
you were describing about the scheduling of the line
drawers, you said Jamie, and I think is she going to be
like southern California or like LA? It just sounds like
there's a lot of -- yeah. And then you said then you're going to jump up to the Nor Cal coast and then you're going to be Central Valley and then it sounds like back to Southern California. So as we move through each week, are we going back, like rinse and repeat, you know, because we make these all like little changes and then back again doing the same order kind of thing? Okay. I just wanted to make sure that I was hearing that correctly.

Okay. So I'm going to say this now. I was going to wait till later, but I think I'm going to say this now. I am kind of curious. As much as I love meeting all -- you all in person, I'm just also wondering if there would be some efficiency in holding next week as just an all-Zoom meeting, so?

CHAIR SADHWANI: Okay. Well, we can think about the Zoom meeting.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

CHAIR SADHWANI: I think the plan was for hybrid and it's up to everyone if they want to be in person or -- or not, but -- I see Alvaro has a -- has a smirk on his face on that one.

I'm going to stick to the order at this point. Commissioner Sinay, did you have another comment? Okay. No problem.

And, Commissioner Akutagawa, were you?
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. And I think I only say that because I was also hearing what Karin was saying about the scheduling of people. I'm also keeping in mind, you know, what Commissioner Kennedy said. The way I translated it is that, you know, we've been fortunate in some sense. We've had maybe one, maybe two really, really late meetings where we've had to go really long beyond our scheduled time, but what I was also hearing was that if we do need to do that, we should be planning for that. And I'm just wondering -- we could do it easily in person, but if half the group is -- or some of the group, because I think some people are not going to be available in person next week. I'm just thinking would we be able to enable better participating by having it by Zoom? We'll be together in LA the following week after that, and it seems like -- I know people want to stay together, but I'm just also thinking, you know, just from a time efficiency point of view.

Also, I want to just also throw out that if we do need the time should we be adding another day to these visualizations because I think we need to be spending the time now, not in November, which looking at the proposed calendar, we're going to be working every single day. But maybe we should also be looking at some other weekends in October, too, so that we can make sure that we're
constantly doing the iterating that we need to do. So
that's the other thought that I want to throw out there.

CHAIR SADHWANI: I don't think we'd be able to
agendize another day for next week at this --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No --

CHAIR SADHWANI: No, I think that's absolutely --
that's going to have to be part of the census timeline
conversation that we can certainly discuss.

Karin, did you want to respond at all to some of
the questions Commissioner Akutagawa had raised?

MS. MAC DONALD: Yes, thank you.

If I may, Commissioner Akutagawa, I'm very sorry
if I gave you the impression that not all of the
visualizations will be shown. They will all be shown. I
was just suggesting that we, perhaps, may not want to show
them all at the beginning and then you have to go back, but
rather just kind of show them by -- by area of -- of the
region that we're talking about because I think that might
be -- that might just facilitate a better conversation and
might be a little bit more digestible.

I also wanted to clarify that we're not yet at
the, what I call a plan, so a plan will be assembly plan,
 senate plan, congressional plan. We're not there yet.
We're moving toward that. We are -- these are really small
pieces and you can explore which pieces may fit into one of
the plans, so that's something we can discuss and then we can note that. And so basically we're steadily moving toward that, but I don't see that coming up -- that's definitely not going to happen next week.

And then on your -- again, I was actually thinking about this idea that Commissioner Sinay had earlier about, you know, if you go to like banking time, let's say, and then going back to a particular time, if -- if there is an option for the regional line drawers to -- to come back remotely on another day, then that could be -- potentially be done, because I'm -- right now I'm really just concerned about scheduling people and making sure that they can be physically present. But, you know, if we can also do some sort of a hybrid thing if we have to go back, then they're basically available remotely to do additional work, then that would obviously be easy to -- easier to facilitate on our end. But again, we can talk about that offline.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yeah, I want to bring up on the point -- and Commissioner Sinay said, you know, do we -- if we have our ideas when do we share them? You're -- I really want everyone to share them. You know, I was actually anticipating that we are doing as Karin had said, you know, like you start in LA. You start
in a section of LA. And remember, we actually said, well, okay. You could do it this way or you could do it that way. Visualizations we'll be seeing, okay, if we try to, you know, incorporate -- like I can think of a few areas that we had. Well, this city, we've had three different people say different things: like I want City A and B together, but not City C; and people said I want B and C together, but not A. And then somebody said, Well, I want A, B, and C together. So the visualizations, we'll be looking at those with population numbers in them. Do any of those work? Oh, you can't put A, B, and C together. That visualization's out.

And that's what we're kind of looking at. Now, you might be able to keep A, B, and C not in an assembly district, but it would fit in a congressional. And that's what we'd be kind of doing.

So at this point when we look at a section and we start, like say, in, you know, the northwest part of it or whatever, if you have an idea and you think, Hey, well what about that? I -- please, everybody, bring it up. Don't wait till later because time is of the essence. You know, if you have an idea, raise that old hand and say well, what if we don't put A together, but we put B, C, and D together, and that might make everything fit? So if you have an idea, don't, you know, just
kind of wait. Write it down and raise that hand because --
and, you know, that's when -- the time to do it. You know,
what we don't want to have happen is, you know, I really
didn't like putting A and B together ever but I waited
until November to say it. It's like, no, please. If you
don't have -- if you don't like an idea, bring it up now.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Thank you.

Any final questions, comments, concerns on this
topic in preparation for next week?

Okay. So we're actually up against a break.

Typically, we wouldn't take that break until 11, however,
since we're at kind of a natural pause in this
conversation, I'm going to suggest that we go ahead and
take our break now a little early. We'll have 15 minutes.
We'll come back at 11 a.m., and pick up the playbook
conversation and finish that off.

Karin, I know we didn't ask you to be available
all morning long, but I -- I know that there was some
interest. If you happen to be available and would be able
to join us back at 11, just as we finish up that playbook
conversation, you know, if you could -- if you are
available, I think it would be really helpful. That sound
good, everybody? All right. So we will see you back here
at 11.

(Off the record at 10:45 a.m.)
(Back on the record at 11:00: a.m.)

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you, and welcome back to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. We had just finished a conversation with Karin Mac Donald regarding what to expect and some guidance for preparing for next week's October 4th, 5th, and 6th's meetings to discuss our first visualizations. We're coming back now and we will head back to our conversation about the playbook. Again, this is under agenda item number 4 from subcommittee reports and the Mapping Playbook headed by Commissioners Yee and Turner.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair.

Since we have Karin with us, I'm going to suggest that we hop over to the attachment number 1 since she was the prime mover on that one, and so any questions we might have for her would be -- could begin to bring up with her present with us and then we'll go back to the main outline. I know there were a couple of questions in line for that.

So why don't we take a look at the attachment number 1 and this has to do with the question of whether or not to look at the 2011 maps, right? A question that's come up several times. And we're not required to. There's actually no statutory requirement to try to preserve the 2011 districts, but we may consider them. But there are
some good reasons to do so, nonetheless. So let's take a
look at the attachment.

And from a legal liability standpoint, the main
consideration here is as we do look at the 2011 districts,
how to do so without the appearance or even the appearance
of the appearance of trying to favor existing office-
holders or potential candidates or political parties. As
you look at existing districts, of course, they're held by
certain people now, you know. So how to consider them
without considering office-holders and candidates and
parties. So -- so you've all looked at this already, the
first second, Section A. It's a look back on the 2010
process and what they did with the districts they inherited
from 2000, and the VRA Section 5 considerations they looked
at and so forth.

In section -- well, I should pause there. Any
comments on Section A? Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um, okay. How do I do
this? Thank you for this document. I -- I did review it
all and I voiced my preference in the past that we are an
independent commission and we are redrawing lines, we're
not editing existing lines or amending existing lines. So
my preference, my overwhelming preference is to start with
a clean slate. And the -- and so this document obviously
goes opposite of what I would like to do.
And I think my concern with the document is that it's very like one-side in terms of why we should use the existing versus, I mean I saw nothing in terms of why not or I guess the pros and cons, there was only like one side of it. So I feel that it's -- I don't have the other side. And for me personally, like I've always said, I just feel that every ten years it's a new independent commission. And yes, we did receive feedback from people saying keep my district lines together, but I just view that, okay, that's their COI, their district lines. I don't -- I -- yeah, I think that's probably where I'm going to stop right now. But thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: No, that's a good thought. And as we go into the considerations, I think you'll see it's basically on an as -- we'll look at the 2011 districts on an as-needed basis. You know, we don't start there. We don't start there every time. Or we start there when -- we don't necessarily start there ever, but we do take a look on an as-needed basis. So but it perhaps would be good to add some consideration about when not to or why not to or, you know, make it clear, your concerns, Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. We've kind of gone -- we've brought up the VRA Section 5 several times
and we've been told, you know, we're not -- we don't have
to comply by it. But I think it was Commissioner
Fornaciari who, at the last meeting, said we want to make
sure that we -- that that's the bare minimum, you know,
that Section 5, even though legally the Supreme Court says
we haven't, we want to still make sure that those
communities who benefitted from Section 5, you know, but we
haven't had that conversation. So you may be saying no,
but we haven't had that conversation as a -- as a
commission on how do we insure that, you know, what -- you
know, the conversation around Section 5. We're just saying
we don't have to do it and that's it, but there were
reasons why certain counties in California were under
Section 5.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.
Karin? You have some thoughts? And perhaps you
could even address that particular question as well if you
feel comfortable doing so?

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. Thank you so much. I --
if that's okay, I would like to address Commissioner
Fernandez's comment about the way that the -- the document,
you know, came across. I just wanted to say that that was
not my intention. I -- this document wasn't really drafted
to advocate one way or another. It was really just to say,
you know, not looking at them at all might not be possible
because people are referencing the lines. And if you're looking to figure out what that input is that people are giving you, then you inevitably will probably be looking at the lines. Doesn't mean you have to keep the lines.

It's just that when people are referencing them either by saying those lines were awful or those lines were good, then essentially you inevitably will probably be taking them into consideration. So that was really the entire intent of this -- of this document was under which circumstances might you want to look at the lines? And I am not advocating that you keep them or that you don't keep them. I'm not advocating anything. It's really just -- just to say that this is a reference point and these are the situations where you may be using that particular reference. So I hope that made it a little bit more clear.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Karin.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Actually, I'm thinking since we have Fred Woocher here from our very counsel, I'm wondering if he might have a thought on Section 5 and why we would or wouldn't have any language about that in this playbook? Yeah.

MR. WOOCHER: Sure. Wrong -- wrong button. Yeah. So there's -- there's -- I guess there's two concerns here. There's a technical element about Section 5 not applying anymore, and Section 5 was, as you know, in
some ways a relic of keeping historical discrimination patterns from -- or discrimination remedies from being changed in any way that might retrogress the status of the minorities. And California does have a few areas where there, you know, are still legitimate concerns with respect to discrimination in that regard. There are some other areas, which frankly, as I say, were relics at the time this was adopted. We had certain military basis that were causing certain areas to be within Section 5 coverage, which really doesn't -- no longer exists as a -- as a concern because those places have been closed. And yet Section 5 still would apply to those areas as long as there was no attempt to get out from under them.

So there's a -- there are some practical reasons why the concerns that motivated some of the districts being drawn in conjunction with Section 5 and having to maintain those districts essentially in perpetuity over decades and decades may no longer apply. We have to see on a factual basis how that -- how that, you know, how that plays out in those areas.

And so as much as we would certainly want to commit to maintaining as much as possible the same rationale for why Section 5 was there, to not get to a situation where we're retrogressing with respect to minority progress and minority opportunities, it may impose
false constraints in some way -- in some areas that don't really make sense anymore and that the district and the minority populations in those districts would be better served by not having to maintain those prior Section 5 mandated districts and that you get a better result now under Section 2.

So it's a really a fact-based thing. And we may get, when we look at some of these visualizations, we may be able to highlight those places for you and show you why that's the case. But so as a legal matter, clearly Section 5 doesn't any longer require these districts be preserved. And as a practical, good policy matter, it may well be that you, in making your decisions, decide that you are better off drawing lines that are not constrained by Section 5. So that, I think, would be the overriding message that we would like to, you know, present as -- as what you think about as you go through the process.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Perhaps as I can float an example, you can check me to see if this would apply. So, for instance, there's a region that's 59 percent Latino and you try to apply a non-retrogression standard. That would mean you need to keep it at least 59 percent, which might constitute packing in that case. You might be "wasting" Latino votes by trying to keep them all in that district rather than spreading them to another district.
MR. WOOCHER: Yes. And as I say, we have to look at these on a case-by-case basis and a factual basis, but yeah, the populations have shifted dramatically in some of these areas over that time period and, you know, even certainly from, you know, 20 years ago when they were first created and then maintained in the last go round, but even in the last ten years. So I don't know if Karin has anything to add to that, but certainly that's -- that would be our analysis as a legal matter.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Commissioner Andersen, did you have a question? Oh, I'm off camera. Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: You actually kind of covered it. I was going to try to do an actual number similar to, you know, if you don't need the 59 percent, you're actually packing. So by not having Section 5, you can actually do the intent of the law without having to follow the letter of the law and it actually gives us more flexibility. Particularly in like you have to keep this district looking exactly the way it is. You know, that means you can't shift a little bit to actually accommodate a better representation. So I think we can actually -- so your example was great. Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. Anything else on part -- Section A? All these different sections. Section A?
Okay. Then let's move to Section B then. So a list of five situations where on an as-needed basis we might consult the 2011 maps. To the point we were just discussing, Section 5 -- regions that were covered by Section 5 in 2011 --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Yee?

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. I just had one quick comment. On Section A for the VRA Section 5, you know, number 1, do we want to put in there that anything -- because the way I read it was that we're just dismissing it and, you know, I don't want -- it doesn't read the way the explanation that was given to us, you know, that we will look -- you know, that we will be spending some time on those regions. We are going -- it's not like -- I'm hoping that the line drawers and everyone will say this used to be a former VRA, you know, a Section 5 county, but let us tell you -- let us show you what it is now. I mean I don't want us to be part of -- I want us to lead by example for other parts of the country that really do need to do this as well. So I don't want to just be ignoring that Section 5.

So if there's some way that we can put some wording in there, you know, it may not be practical, it might not -- you know, something -- I don't know.
Something that doesn't say that we're just throwing it out, but that we will, you know. I don't -- I don't know the right wording, so I'm -- I'm not saying anything out loud because I know legal will kick me under the table. So I'm staying very quiet right now because Anthony's right next to me. So can I just add -- okay --

COMMISSIONER YEE: No, I'm getting you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- I'm babbling. Let me just put it this way. Can you all please put something in there that's reflective of -- of the -- that we do have respect for Section 5?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. We would, absolutely.

Okay. Okay. I'm sorry. I lost the order. I lost my place actually.

We're on Section B now. Yeah, yeah. B -- b as in boy, and moving into the five situations where we might indeed consider the 2011 maps. So B-1, of course, when those existing districts have been mentioned in COI input, which they have been many times. People liking their districts, not liking their districts, so forth.

Numbers 2 and 3 actually go together basically using the rationale behind the current lines as data to inform our work looking at the Final Report from 2011, the rationale and description of each district, and then also using the existing districts to bridge any data gaps that
we encounter as we do our work.

Number 4, RPV analysis, of course, done on past elections, which depends on past-election districts, so we'll have to be cognizant of those districts as we digest the RPV analysis.

And then number 5, which is very subtle. This is the extra-credit one. You know, if you're in a senate district that was not up for election in the past election, and then we move the lines on you, because the senate is not elected every election, right? They're just staggered, so then we move the lines on you so you're not up in this election, then your senator might not be up for election six years running. Right? And so to be aware of areas or regions where that might be the case and to use that as one consideration for moving a line this way or that, sometimes called senate deferral, I think. Okay.

Okay. So a limited number where, on an as-needed basis, we would consider the 2011 districts and doing so without favoring or disfavoring any candidate, office holder, or party. Okay. Any discussion on those or any discussion for Karin?

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Yee. Just one thing on the -- what number is it -- I think it's in the two and three. One thing I do know in terms of
the reports of why certain districts were made certain ways, one thing to consider is which Commissioner Akutagawa and I found out in our Area G, one line was drawn because of a particular connection and they made this huge deal about, well, that -- the land, it might look like this, but actually it's all owned by someone else, and that's why the lines were drawing -- lines were drawn in a different particular area. And it's not at all obvious unless you go back and actually read the report. So there's an in -- it really is interesting to go back in the particulars of why certain districts were made certain ways, which I -- you know, this reminded me of.

And particularly because if moving a line a little bit might seem good because of a COI you just heard, but there could be other history which no one said anything about because they'd already -- the lines were already there. So as soon as you move it, you might get an enormous amount of -- of changes and calls in, which if you'd gone back and actually read the -- why certain lines were in certain places in 2011 -- in 2010, you wouldn't necessarily do that.

So sorry, everyone, we'd have a little bit more homework, but we're going to go back and have a look at the particulars on some of those areas. Some of it's just Community of Interest would shift, but some of it is like
physical landmarks or, you know, park boundaries, things like that.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you.

So I was with Commissioner Fernandez where I just kept -- even when I have people ask, you know, I actually did a presentation to Congressional District 53, and -- and so they said, Okay, what happens to us? And I am like, what do you mean? They're like, We're Congressional District 53. I'm like, Oh, okay. And so I always said, you know, so we know for the congressional districts that we start from this, but I've always been an advocate of -- of starting from clean for the same reasons that Commissioner Fernandez has.

I liked what you presented. I think this helped me understand the why. I do not like number 3, and I think number 3, for so many -- that whole bridging the data gap, let's be honest. I'm going to go back to my little diatribe from yesterday, but the 2010 Commission's number one regret was they didn't have enough data. They didn't have, you know. And as much as we may say that COI, you know, that people didn't come out, we had some really -- I'm really proud of who did come out and the people that...
came. And especially in like in San Diego when I'd tell people that, you know, we've heard from a lot of San Diego. We haven't heard from the north part of the city downtown and north. That is unheard of. Usually, they're the first ones out. So I do feel that being -- there was positives on COVID.

I don't like number 3 because we're saying they knew more than we know now and I think it's time to say, You know what? We know a heck of a lot and there's others in the community where we can get that information that know more than the 2010 Commission did. And I'm still going to stand by the fact that reports written by United Ways, community foundations, Chambers of Commerce, local universities are great resources. I mean I know when I first got -- when Commissioner Ahmad and I first got partnered, I sent her right away a report on refugees and immigrants that I had just gotten around COVID, and I'm like, Here you go. There is information out there that you're not going to get in any other way, so I don't like number 3.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay. I'm wondering if you, you know, the second line there, the contemporary record, I mean that, I think, was intended to include such things, but maybe could be more clear or maybe not.
Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Almost pressed the wrong button. I -- this is really more a question of curiosity because I found point number 5 pretty interesting and, you know, about the renumbering. And from what you, you know, in your considerations and all that, one -- what -- what are some of the thoughts that we should keep in mind to try to minimize the impact and is there a way to make it so that maybe this is one of those puzzle pieces. It's just not possible. But is it possible to avoid impacting Californians in a way that they would have to wait six years to be able to vote in their senator? That -- that was the one that really caught my interest.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa. Yes. I believe the senate has elected alternately odd and even; is that right? Yeah? And perhaps we could ask Karin to -- well, she has her hand up -- the expert to weigh in on this?

MS. MAC DONALD: Hello again. Thank you so much for that question, Commissioner Akutagawa. So I wanted to clarify that the deferral is done at the end once you've drawn your lines. So it's not really -- it doesn't really factor into where the lines go. It's once you have your lines drawn as best as possible, then you would look at the report of who used to be in an odd district, who used to be
in an even district, and then decide the numbering based on, you know, deferring the least number of people so that the most number of people are able to stick to their regular election calendar. If that wasn't clear in here, then I apologize for that.

So it's essentially this -- this is what you do at the very end and then you can make that particular decision. Please let me know if that makes sense.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It does. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Yes. I just want -- my only comment was I did want to echo what Commissioner Sinay said regarding three bridging data gaps. A lot happens in ten years and I don't think we're going to have time to validate or verify that whatever reasons 2010 had to do a certain line, I think if there's gaps, we just build it because we know once we build it, we'll receive comment. And I'd rather it be our lines than say, well that's what 2010 did. So I -- I also have an issue with number 3. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

I wanted to perhaps ask Commissioner Sinay and if
not, Fernandez, what exact wording would make this document comfortable for them short of removing this? Because the intent in the writing of the document I think the -- what I read in the document in several places is, is in consideration in certain circumstances. If there is a gap, until additional information and input has been received, so I think it's written in a way that says there are allowances, for sure, for us to use contemporary documents, new research, all of that given time. And where there is not, here are some other things that could possibly be considered and just a justification, a rationale for why we may go back and look at something. I'm a clean slater too. That's exactly what I would want to do. And then I was really grateful for this document because it helped me understand why this could be beneficial and why it would be necessary for us to reference.

And so with that said, I'm starting out at the top, How current lines could help inform. I think it's still a strong document. It could inform us, and I don't think any of these words negate what the request is, but because there is the repeated concern, it feels like there should be maybe additional lines. And maybe not even here, because this is still reasons why it could be helpful. Maybe it's back on the other document to add in as our policy. We're going to, where possible, utilize
contemporary information. We're going to -- you know, whatever that needs -- wherever that needs to be, we can add that in and it won't negate this. This still says that this could be helpful and here's reasons that we may want to consider what was done and why based on all of the testimony that was given why we have to consider the previous lines if we're going to utilize the COI testimony that was received or we're going to throw it out and say it doesn't make any sense to us because there's no lines there, right? So -- so I think it's a valid document and I would just look for kind of direction, perhaps, onto our other mapping document that says -- so that there's comfort with commissioners that we're not -- we hear what you're saying, but where should it go so that you're comfortable.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Do you want me to put this --

COMMISSIONER YEE: -- Fernandez?

Yeah, sure.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And I'm not going to speak for Commissioner Sinay, because we could be coming from completely different areas. We're going to have gaps regardless. We're not going to hear from every area. And
my opinion is let's own it from the beginning and go from there. So I think that's where I'm coming from. And I would -- and as you mentioned, maybe bridging the gaps doesn't go on this document, it goes in the other document. But yes, we're going to have gaps and let's just deal with it as 2020 on our initially, because we're going to have to deal with it at the end. But thank you very much. And yes, it's a great document and I do appreciate -- I was thinking, oh, it must have been really late last night when I missed the -- the first part of how we could use it. So I do apologize for that part. It was late when we got back, but so thank you for that. And it does kind -- it does open me a little bit for looking at 20 -- the existing map, so thank you for that information. And thank you for accepting or listening to us.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. Any more thoughts on the attachment number 1 as a whole or any part of it or any other questions for Karin?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Yee, can I speak to it as well? Patricia.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I'm sorry. Yes. Commissioner Sinay, I didn't see your hand.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. No, I read it this morning and I did read it as these may be ways to do it. I will be honest, my fear is that we will go first. I don't
want us to go first to 2010. And the way I read this and
even when you read it to me again, even though it has
contemporary, it's -- I still feel we'll go first to 2010
because contemporary are going to be harder -- contemporary
data is going to be harder to find. So I keep rereading it
and I do have a headache, so I apologize. Maybe my head's
not working well. But I can't figure out exactly how to
change it, so I don't feel like we'll use it as an ex -- I
hate to say it, but as -- that's the easiest response.
When we have a gap, we have this document and we can all
say, hey, we have this document. Let's just go to 2010,
and I don't want us to make it that easy.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I hear you. Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner
Sinay, for saying that.

I think I -- I just wanted to say that I -- I had
some of that same feeling, but then it's kind of like as I
read through the document, too, I also had the other
feeling, so I just wanted to acknowledge what you're
saying. It could be -- it could be that it's going back up
to the beginning of the document where it speaks about 2011
and it -- maybe that's where the tweaks need to be is just
acknowledging that -- you know, it's acknowledging what
they did but at the same time maybe making -- putting in
something that's a lot more explicit that -- we're just
acknowledging what they did, but we're not going to
necessarily follow or be guided by what they did. Maybe
that's what it is. Because I -- I understand what you're
saying. I -- but later on in the document I didn't get
that feeling, so I don't think it was intentional or
anything. It's --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I -- I completely agree and
I remember I did start this whole conversation by saying I
was a completely from don't look at 2010 maps because it
will bias us, and I didn't say the word "bias," but I do
think it would bias us to saying this really opened my
eyes, so thank you. Having said all that, three is still
the one -- everything else I totally got but three was
still the one that I kept going back to and going, um, no I
can't figure it out. So I'll just leave it at that.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think I had the
opposite reaction though. It was in Section A that I had
that strongest reaction and that's where maybe we just need
to put a little bit of a caveat saying, you know, we're
acknowledging this but we're not going to be necessarily
starting from this place if that helps?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. Anything else on the
playbook Attachment 1?

Okay. If not, we thank Karin Mac Donald, as
always, for her expertise and you're welcome to stay, Karin, or move onto other things if you have anything else to do today.

MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you so much. Going on vacation now.

COMMISSIONER YEE: See you when you get back.

Okay. We can return to the main outline or is there time for that?

CHAIR SADHWANI: I'm sorry. Which main outline?

COMMISSIONER YEE: The -- the playbook outline itself. We had a few more trailing questions on that, yeah.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Got it. Sure. And then I would just offer also, Commissioner Yee, if you want a motion to -- excuse me -- to approve this document as amended or if you'd like to bring this back in a future meeting to adopt? But I'll leave that to you to decide.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I don't know.

Commissioner Turner, what are you thinking? This needs quite a few edits.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I would say it's at the comfort level of the Commission. I did get all of the notes and I didn't think any of them were problematic to add it.

COMMISSIONER YEE: We are still awaiting the
third part of the playbook, which is the complete line
drawing phases plan. We've actually discussed that at
quite some length, but still not complete, so maybe we
should wait until it's all done?

    CHAIR SADHWANI: Sounds good. We can all
anticipate, perhaps, some time on October 7th to finalize
it.

    COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay.

    COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. So back to the playbook
proper and before the break, I believe Commissioner Sinay
and Fernandez had thoughts. I don't know if those thoughts
are still with us?

    COMMISSIONER SINAY: You might regret this, but I
did write them down so they are with us.

    COMMISSIONER YEE: Very good.

    COMMISSIONER SINAY: The first thing I wanted to
say is I really appreciated the map requirement document
that was drafted and I really feel that that needs to be
prominent on our website. So, you know, if there's a way
and also it would be interesting if we can do kind of a
social media, you know, just inform the public of what a
lot of those requirements were when the time is
appropriate. Not the timeline, the -- what -- what is it
called, Anthony, the one that you created? The map
requirements where it goes through all the laws and stuff?
And, you know, we had heard him several times and the
public input design committee or Commissioner Fornaciari
put it together on his own at one point just pulling out,
reading different documents. And this one was, you know,
it was really good. And I think the public would really
benefit not from having to search for it. That's the one
pain of our website is you're like I know we talked about
this and something was approved, but we don't have a place
on our website where we put documents once they're approved
so that everybody can go find them and instead of going
into the meetings.

So I did want to bring that up that I think that
we need to figure -- that needs to be something that is
really prominent wherever we are so people know where, you
know, what -- what we're working off of.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible).

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm sorry?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible).

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think the -- I think it's
called map requirements. It's one of the handouts and it
just talks about all the legal requirements. And I really
do recommend that we print it out and put it in our
handbook. That, you know, the handbook that was never
filled that was sent to us.

The other one, the -- we -- we bring up deviation
and I understand we want to be at zero percent. Are we never -- but we're not talking about -- I know that there were conversations kind of last time of zero percent is almost zero percent possible. And so, you know, I don't want us to feel like we're failing right away, and I know that they had, you know, that -- that at some -- you know, sometimes there's conversations of plus or minus one percent. And then some people are concerned with the way that the census data has been created this time that it's going to be hard to do plus or minus one percent. And I don't know all the arguments, right? I'm just saying things I've read and haven't dug into.

So I'm just wondering, are we ever going to have that conversation because I don't feel comfortable approving a document that I know we're not going to successful -- you know, successfully achieve. Why don't I just stop there and let other people and then I'll swing back in if -- if those questions aren't asked.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Mr. Woocher, I don't know. This is not a specific VRA matter, but deviation, is that something that you might comment on now?

MR. WOOCHER: Yeah. I think we've -- we had discussed this at one point before. There's two different standards that are set out in the memo there for the
congressional and the rest of the districts. Our advice has been that you not set any kind of arbitrary deviation that you are prepared to live with or not live with. The whole notion of deviation is that it is -- where there is flexibility, and there's more flexibility obviously in the state districts than in the congressional districts. Where there is flexibility, it's there because there are other factors that require a deviation from strict equality. But the objective should always be strict equality and then you might not be able to achieve that. Well, if you want to achieve, for example, compliance with the Voting Rights Act or certainly the other factors. And we think that setting any kind of arbitrary number in advance takes away from the principle that you are actually going to try to achieve zero. But it's not a failure if you don't achieve zero. It's anticipated that you're not going to achieve zero because you have all these other factors that you have to bring into play.

And, you know, we may get to a point where there are really strong reasons to have five percent deviation in some place and that doesn't apply to anywhere else. And so it just doesn't seem to make sense to us to set any objective goal prior to actually getting into the line-drawing process and seeing on a case-by-case basis what is necessary to achieve all of the factors and compliance that
you require. Does that help?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes and no. So when it comes to this document though, that's not what we're saying. And so my -- you know, I'd like to -- you know, I know we've talked about this, but we did -- but sometimes it's going to take us more than once to hear something for it to click. But also, if you have a document like this, we could put that in that document so it clicks better for us as well. And so, even -- even -- I liked what you said, we're not, you know, we -- you know, well, the arbitrary -- we don't want to set an arbitrary number because that may prevent us from getting to zero. Again, it's kind of what I said before. The easiest way out would be going to the old, you know, the 2010 maps. And kind of what we're saying is if we put a number in there, then we're -- we don't push ourselves enough to maybe get to that -- to that zero is what I interpreted.

MR. WOOCHER: No. I don't think that's what I was saying --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

MR. WOOCHER: -- not necessarily. In fact, I think the -- I mean I --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And I'm not --

MR. WOOCHER: -- I read the document saying zero ought to be your objective, but you don't have to get to
zero if there are other factors that suggest otherwise.

What I'm suggesting is, no, if you set -- it's almost the opposite of that. If you set an arbitrary number that says we are going to make it plus or minus two for every district, that is essentially constraining you, in a way, from fulfilling your other obligations to make sure that these other factors are met like Voting Rights Act compliance. Because in certain districts and certain situations you're going to want to be over two in order to satisfy these others.

So far from saying that I'm saying that you should disregard the others, it is precisely in order to give you the maximum flexibility to allow all the considerations to be taken into account that you shouldn't set yourself any kind of arbitrary range. You should keep shooting for zero and then on a case-by-case basis you can determine whether or not more -- more or less is required.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So, Mr. Woocher, we've heard in the past, you know, for the assembly districts, for instance, plus or minus five percent has been considered rule of thumb or safe harbor or other language. So that's something to keep in mind but not -- but not to hold ourselves to and so forth?

MR. WOOCHER: Exactly. Exactly. You want to have that in the back of your head, and we will be there to
remind you if we think you are straying from a deviation
that we think may be difficult to defend. But even that is
-- I mean it's a safe harbor, but it's not a strict -- if
it turns out there's a really good reason to go to a 12
percent between the highest and smallest, I mean that can
be justified perhaps. But it's so case-specific dependent
upon what -- what you see on the ground and what you see
when you draw these lines that you can't -- but, yeah.
It's a general rule of thumb you can have in the back of
your mind that notion that, you know, we don't have to
start killing ourselves to bring a deviation from three
percent down to two percent if we think this is really
where we wanted to draw the lines for other reasons.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Okay, yeah. Commissioner Fornaciari, you want to
jump the line? Is that? If that's --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible).

COMMISSIONER YEE: Sure okay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'm line jumping.

COMMISSIONER YEE: We're all about lines here,
yeah.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So all right. This is
what I want to talk about, too, but I'm wondering from a
practical standpoint as we give direction to our line-
drawing team, do we want to, I mean, initially set sort of
a wide parameter range? You know, please try to stay within this as we're drawing districts and then narrow it down or, I mean, because -- help me understand how we get to the endpoint.

MR. WOOCHER: I mean I think the line drawers will have to speak for -- to -- to this issue better than I can in terms of what constraints it puts on them and their ability to give you the information you need and to prepare lines. I -- I think they are aware, like we all are, of the objective of trying to get everything as equal as possible, but they are also aware that in -- in drawing these lines, they obviously don't want to give you something that they know is going to be problematic. And so I think from our discussions with them is they're aware of the safe harbor. They're aware of the general principles, and they're aware of the notion that there needs to be some flexibility and various to, you know.

So I don't know that they need more direction than that from you guys to say, you know, when you come at us with the first cut please make everything no more than two even if you're shooting for zero. I -- I guess that's a question, you know, better directed to them. It's a legal matter, obviously, you know, we don't have much data on that.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. I think Commissioner
Fernandez was next in line from the -- before the break.

Commissioner Andersen if we could -- if we could go in that order? Commissioner Andersen -- Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Wow. Everyone's jumping here. What's going on?

I'll just say a little bit about the standard deviation. I think yesterday Commissioner Turner, I believe, somebody said we're going to add some language to that when it says when it doesn't conflict with other criteria. So that kind of does boost it a little bit. And then also, I think it's up to all of us to watch the standard deviation, because if -- if the initial districts that we're drawing they're all under, then at some point that means at some point some district's going to have to be huge. So I think we'll probably be -- there's a lot of numbers people and statistical people in here, so I think we'll be able to figure that piece out.

But that's not really why I raised my hand.

Anyway, I -- just for the -- this document on Section 6, just some of -- some of the more, I don't want to, I guess, challenges that we had. I just want to make sure we document them all. We had Broadband issues. We're all doing -- our unemployment's high, so it's -- I really want to point out what some of the priorities for Californians
may not be redistricting right now. We've got Broadband
issues, we've got -- unemployment is high, business
closures, working from home, teaching your kids from home,
dealing with your kids at home, which is so positive,
distance learning and homelessness. I mean there's so many
issues that 2010 did not have to contend with. I mean they
had to contend with some of that, but just the mere fact of
everything being virtual and all of these other issues that
we've noted. I just want to make sure that we capture as
much as possible.

COMMISSIONER YEE: It's --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And thank you again for
putting this together.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Actually back
on the -- the deviation, basically remember when the line
drawers are showing us stuff, when they actually started,
hey, we're putting a district together, we're going to draw
this, right there in the corner it's going to say what --
what the deviations are. And they will say anytime it's
above five say, well, you know, and that's -- it's too big.
They're plan is not to show us anything over five.

Anything though -- but they're leading with other
criteria. The visualizations, like some of those, they'll
actually say we'll get the -- right away, can we keep Long Beach together. They'll be looking at, oops, here are the numbers. No, you can't or yes, you can. So I -- it's -- we don't actually have to have our slide rules out or anything like that. It will -- it will be on the visualization for us. So -- and but I wanted to actually come back to is in -- in moving down, so there's equal population, on the VRA compliance, that's -- that's fine. But in D, the Community of Interest cities and county lines, we have down here number C, Current state election districts will be considered. That is not a criteria. That's a consideration and I'd like to move that out of the criteria and put it in 5, Some General Principles. And that's -- we can refer to this document -- well, that is the document and then we can state in there about when it, you know, when there's certain conditions we will be referring to the existing lines. But it's not a criteria, so I don't want it in under, you know, criteria because that's a -- that's a consideration.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen. Let me think about that because, for instance, letter B is not a criteria either under that standard. You know, we're not -- there's no statutory requirement to consider since it's designated places but we're putting that in. So --
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Again, that, yeah.

COMMISSIONER YEE: -- yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you for that --
that also -- I'd like to stick to just the criteria here
because, again, if this goes public, we want to kind of
stick to what the criteria actually are. And if there are
explanations, maybe put it under the general principles.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Under, that's good. Under
-- thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Under D, the cities/county -- cities and county,
the exact language, local neighborhoods, local Community of
Interest and then there's parens there that says no -- that
at the below sub criteria of governmental units and
Community of Interest are not ranked within this criterion,
but to your point, that paren could be easily missed and
you're suggesting that they be moved to a general -- a
general section area?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Or maybe adding language, you
know, so letter B starts off non-statutory, maybe letter C
we just insert that kind of language as well --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER YEE: -- to make it clear?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Or -- or you just say for
considerations of this see different location? You know,
because you have sub-criteria.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. We'll give some thought
to that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. And -- but,
you know, it's a great document.

COMMISSIONER YEE: It's getting greater and
greater.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Lots of good
considerations.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Greater in spots.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thanks. I was kind of on
the same one and do -- whatever, II(D) (1)(b) that just to
make it clear and it's more for public and others. We
won't be using school districts unless a school district,
for instance, submitted a COI. Could we ask to see school
districts if we're struggling and that may make a
difference? Because, you know, having been a school board
member, I still feel that school districts are -- should
all be COIs and I wish school districts would submit them
because they do cross city lines and they are so huge in so
many different ways. Can we request it if we're like
struggling -- it's okay to request it?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Absolutely. I think that
would be covered under 2) Community of Interest letter (i).
COMMISSIONER SINAY: (2)(1)(b).

COMMISSIONER YEE: Or (i), you know --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER YEE: -- helpful to seek other info, yeah.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So community, if you're school board members or school superintendents, please thing of submitting your Community of Interests.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Please, yes.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: For II(A) -- I'm sorry. I numbered everything, but I'm trying -- so I -- I just want us to be careful because we talked about this yesterday about race and ethnicity and then if we're not using it kind of for the RPB analysis that it can be a Community of Interest, but how do, you know, we can't use just race at that point because that can get us into trouble.

But because of our historical discriminatory laws, many neighborhoods, many of the communities that are non-White were forced to live in certain places and that was set up that way and they set -- and it became cultural. They did open their stores. They did open their markets. They did open their faith-based communities. They did create the festivals and all the things that we heard about. And some people mention it and some didn't. Some people said we're predominantly like, community or we're
predominantly that. But I don't want us to throw out a COI that didn't specifically talk about their community, you know, about their using the wording "social interest" or their economic interest because to them telling us that they were 50 percent Black was telling us of their social interest. Because we know, historically, what -- what laws were in place that created some of these communities. And I, you know, and I just -- I want to put that out there and -- and maybe every time we talk about it we have to remind ourselves of that so then we're not just looking at it as race, but we're saying, look. This was a red-line district and therefore we know or whatever it is we need to say so that we're not just looking at racial context. But I don't want us to throw out COIs because they didn't -- the individual who called us did not bring up the social or economic interest.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. In fact, we -- I think that was mentioned yesterday the degree to which sometimes race and, you know, race and culture overlap are even, yeah, so.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, yesterday we were told that if we were not looking at an RPB, that we could look at it as a COI, but we don't -- we want to be careful that we're not just looking at race. And I -- what I want to push back is if someone is telling us that their community
is predominantly Latino, they're probably also telling us things that we didn't, you know, and I know we're not supposed to infer and all those things. But we didn't go deeper asking them question either, and so just to be careful.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Sure.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And then I wanted to ask on II(B), -- I'm just taking since I'm on the twos, on II(B), we're not supposed to take political, you know, candidates or parties. We got a lot of COIs that were blatant political and then we got a lot of COIs that were veiled political. But do we -- how do -- how are we, as a group, listening to those -- those COIs? Are we tossing them out if they said, hey, we're conservative and we want to stay conservative or we, you know, we're Mr. Smith's -- we're in Congressional Member Smith's and we want to stay there. Are we tossing those out or are we just listening to them still as a COI who wants to stay together?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Any thoughts? I was wondering that myself. I remember one was, you know, I'm in somebody's district. Take me out.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Trust me. As having done presentations in 53, they're like can we tell you who to take out? I'm like, no.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Commissioner Sadhwani?
CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you. I don't feel comfortable putting myself into the position to judge what constitutes a political -- political testimony and what doesn't. Even the term "political" is -- can be broadly used. A community’s desire for enhanced political power seems pretty -- pretty okay, but it's also political. So, to me, all testimony is valid. Nothing gets thrown out.

As 14 members, we are here to use our best judgment in reviewing these -- this -- this testimony as well as looking at the -- the factual data and considerations that are in front of us, weighing the multiple criteria. Right? I -- if -- I don't think throwing out COI or even engaging in thinking about what COI is better or worse necessarily behooves us. Because I think as we get into this process, we'll -- we will have to make decisions, we will have to make trade-offs. We won't -- even as much as we want to incorporate every Community of Interest that we've heard, it won't be possible.

So I think all testimony is good testimony. All testimony is valid testimony. And it's up to us to -- to make a judgment call. And I do think that's why we're here. Right? I mean I think that's why there are 14 of us, why there is variation and diversity amongst us across multiple categories is so that we can make those kinds of judgment calls as we need.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. I think we're winding down. Any further thoughts? Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. Don't ever send me to do homework again.

Noted. No, but this is what -- I ask -- I ask these questions not for us to think about it and make sure that I agree with everything Commissioner Sadhwani said, but I didn't want to be the -- you know, I want to put it out there, like you said, Commissioner, yeah, I was wondering the same thing. So let's -- I would invite us all to ask those questions that you're wondering so that we can have it out in the open versus it stays behind our head and it nags at us or we answer it ourselves versus all.

And I would be -- I would ask does anyone see it differently than Commissioner Sadhwani? You know, do -- did -- you know, does everyone feel comfortable, because this is a big question and it kind of goes back to the CAL matters.

So since you were wondering the same thing, Commissioner Yee, I'm going to ask you what were you thinking when you were wondering?

COMMISSIONER YEE: You know, I was generally thinking along the same lines as Commissioner Sadhwani, but not knowing how to navigate that really, and thinking it will probably just come up case-by-case as, you know, we're
looking at a certain part of the state and looking at the
body of COI for that, and weighing it. And with all the
different considerations including this one, you know,
we'll come to a judgment on how much weight to give the
testimony that we got, so. But it's, you know, so the
statutory language, any consideration of relationships with
political parties, incumbents, or candidates, you know,
that's a -- I know we're going to parse that very, very
closely I think in some cases. You know, what -- how
exactly to apply that exclusion.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you.

Anyone else before I go to my next question? So
can I just ask that on -- on II(C) (2) where we use a
military base as an example that we delete that because
that's not an accurate description? As someone who has
worked with military families, I will tell you that all --
all forms of all political districts affect them. They go
to our local schools, they don't live on basis anymore.
They live, you know, so all political things affect them.
It's not just congressional districts. And so that's been
a misnomer for a long time and that was why it was hard to
get some military families to participate until we were
able to write an article in -- in San Diego that targeted
military families and then we got military families who
actually came out and -- and participated. So I'd like us
to take that one out.

It is II(C) (2). I think a better example was kind of parks. You know, is it a national park? So it would be federal or is it a state park, so it's local? I thought that was a really good example that people brought to us. And I -- and I did like -- I mean that was an aha moment for me and I am going to look at things differently kind of asking that question.

On II(C) (f) where we said "scripted," I don't want us to discount people who did speak to us and it was scripted because for some people if it's the first time they're participating, they want a script. They're so scared, they're so nervous, they're so excited, you know, that someone gave them a script and they can participate. And so I think we, again, all COIs are, you know, a COI is a COI and let's try to look at it as part of one of the sketch -- one of the line -- one of the broad strokes, but not just discount it. And the way I read it, it sounded like we were kind of discounting it if it was scripted.

And I am going to stop there, because I know I saw Commissioner Andersen and I don't want to -- and now I see Commissioner Fernandez. So I'll be quiet and come back.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay. And I'm only seeing Commissioner Fernandez, so --
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: That's because I'm sitting right next to you so I'm going to -- just kidding. I did want to comment on what Commissioner Sinay just said. So it's actually, let's see Roman Numeral Number II (D) (2) (f). I don't see scripted to be any different than an organization coming forward and saying they spoke to a hundred people and this is what the feedback is. So -- and again, I just appreciate the fact that they called in. They made -- or they wrote in or they sent their COI. And if it looks exactly the same as someone else's then I would hope they understand what they submitted and they feel the same way. So I agree that because it's scripted it has the same value as one that is -- does not appear to be scripted. So thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. And, Commissioner Sadhwani?

CHAIR SADHWANI: Yeah. I mean I'm certainly in agreement that, excuse me, scripted testimony is perfectly fine. I think the purpose of this, if read in full, in cases of multiple, substantially, identical COI input submissions, I think that the issue is not about whether or not it's scripted, but potentially giving extra weight to multiple submissions that are about the same. And so I think that was -- that was kind of the concern raised is that we're not overly weighting those -- those testimonies
that are coming in. You know, for example, I don't know how many times we heard keep Long Beach together. That doesn't mean, though, that the City of Long Beach has -- should have any greater weight than any other city that wants to be kept together but only had one person call together to call in. So, to me, that was how I read that. It's not a problem of scripted testimony, but instead, giving additional weight to multiple people calling in, that targeted coordination of it.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. I'm still seeing hands up. Are those live hands or? Okay. Let's go to Commissioner Akutagawa and then back to Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Sadhwani, can I just clarify what you just said? So I thought I heard one thing and then I heard something different. Went back to the same place. So using the example of Long Beach, I would also use the example of the -- I guess it would be the Santa Clarita Valley, right, that Congressional District 25. And I feel like there was a lot -- it was very similar in the terms of the testimonies that we were hearing to what we heard from Long Beach.

So at first, it was -- it's not so much about the scripting, but it's just about the number of comments and submissions that we got advocating for Long Beach to be kept together or for Congressional District 25 to remain
the same. If I heard you correctly, even though we got a lot, it's a consideration but that doesn't mean that if, for various reasons, you know, that we're still trying to keep in mind VRA and things like that that we may not be able to accommodate, I guess, right, what -- what they're asking for is -- am I interpreting what you said correctly?

CHAIR SADHWANI: May I respond? Is it --

I mean, I think that's right and -- and for me, it's about -- it's also just about the weight that we're giving to people. Right? I -- I think it -- it's about not allowing the loudest voice to predominate. Right? I mean, in the example of the Santa Clarita Valley, I think we actually heard different kinds of testimony that I recall. Right? Some people saying Simi Valley has nothing to do with us, and others saying, yes it does. Keep it together and add Moorpark. Right? So I think to me, it's about insuring that we're hearing all of those voices and not allowing one to predominate -- you know, multiple testimonies that are the same and coordinated and allowing that to predominate the -- the discussion. Making sure that we hear the lone voice that may have called in.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. I think it's Commissioner Sinay and then Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Go ahead and go to Commissioner Andersen in case she has the same one.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm trying to be fair.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Actually, I moved down to item, you know, Roman Numeral Number III, so if yours is before that, go -- go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. I just have -- I was -- we talked a lot about Roman Number II (D) (2) (i) where it's about the data. And I don't know where we fell on that yesterday, but what I would like to recommend is that we just scratch out where it says "that parenthesis."

Though note that such data are very often unhelpful -- unhelpfully -- unhelpfully dated or and/or appro -- because that -- I read it a second time and it triggered me again.

So I just -- I don't -- I just feel bad for people who --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Sure. Sure.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So if we can just take out that parenthesis --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- and then I'll be better with it.

COMMISSIONER YEE: All good.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Just, sorry, on that. What -- I agree. Commissioner Sinay, if we took out
stuff in the parenthesis but put it would be helpful to see valid demographic instrument and other data.

Then I want to move on to item number III and I don't want us to say, okay, this is the order we're doing it, because it could actually be assembly plan, congressional plan, and then you put the senate boards together. And I -- I'd like to kind of leave that a little more flexible depending on kind of by area, quite frankly. Because if we're in one area, we're trying to look at it and, like I say, it's an area that has parks, we might say, great. Okay, for assembly this is great. But now for congressional let's do it a little differently here because this is all federal land. And it might be the appropriate time on that or we might be in this area and say, well, but okay. We've just split this but, you know, we could keep it all together in the senate. So I don't want us to say, you know, we are going to go in this order. I'd like it to be potentially, or, you know, a possible mapping sequence so if we can be a little more fluid with that?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. So I mean, of course, you know, going into sequence doesn't preclude making notes and, you know, developing intentions for the -- for the other plans. But we wouldn't start actively working on that plan until we got to it. I suppose that's the thought. But if we just leave it flexible, maybe -- maybe
just make a note here about making this our intention, our possible, or so, you know, a little softening language there. Would that be sufficient?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I -- I'd like to have that --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- because exactly. You know, if -- if we lock it in, then the line drawers --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- will do it in that order whether it makes the most sense or not.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, yeah.

Okay. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just on that one, I would really like to have that conversation with the line drawers, because my concern is kind of going back to our only example we have of visualization. We spent way too much time in some areas and it didn't give us enough time for other areas. And if we start -- and I know us now. I've been with us for a while. We will go off tangent and go into congressional and others, and we won't take the time to -- and so I would rath -- so I liked having a schedule and saying, okay, this is our goal and then taking notes and putting it away and bringing that up later. I don't want us to go down rabbit holes like we did during
visualization. Because I -- there were times we went down rabbit holes, and I know people didn't think they were rabbit holes, but we did.

COMMISSIONER YEE: And just to note, the line drawers did see this document and we actually did discuss this item with them, so.

Commissioner Akutagawa, I think, is next.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. You know, I'm also realizing that we -- and I think I heard this just in terms of what Commissioner Andersen just said. Excuse me. I guess there does need to be some measure of understanding that we reserve some measure of flexibility in what we will do. Right? Because otherwise, if we lock ourselves in too much, and I think that's what Mr. Woocher was also saying earlier about the deviations. I mean that was just one example of it, but I think we also need to remind ourselves that we're going to need a little bit of -- of flexibility because we've not done this before. So it's not like we know for sure what's going to happen. And we may think this is what should happen, but it may not turn out to be that.

That wasn't really my initial point. I know.

Commissioner Yee, I -- and, Mr. Woocher, I may ask you to jump in on this. One of the things that, as I was just kind of thinking about this document, which is fabulous, by
the way. I do really like it. One -- something that
Mr. Becker said -- I don't think it was this meeting, but
the previous meeting that just stuck in my mind was that he
said that we have the -- the six criteria that is ranked
but I remember him saying that even though there's a
ranking, in looking at all of the districts and the line
drawing, there's going to be a degree of -- I don't want to
say fluidity, but it sounded like fluidity or flexibility
where sometimes we'll start with one way but then we may --
we may need to do a little jumping around because of some
certain things. It was something to that effect.

And, Mr. Woocher, I don't know if you recall that
part?

MR. WOOCHER: I don't recall specifically but I
know one of the common themes that -- that he's been
mentioning, you know, the word "iterative" has been used
quite a bit here, and that's -- that's the notion that you
can start in a particular place and think that you have got
the perfect district for that district, and then you go a
little bit of ways and you realize that in order to comply
with maybe the higher requirement for another district,
maybe it's population, maybe it's the Voting Rights Act, it
turns out that you have to go back and make a chance in
that other district. So I think that was the thing. The
key point is we don't want you to lock yourselves in at any
point to some specific district that may seem perfect, even if it is, you know, is perfect at the time because there may be other considerations that come back. I think that may be what he was referring to. I'm not sure.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So I guess maybe what I'm asking for maybe to make it more clear or to make it more obvious is maybe something to that effect. Because I'm reading like a -- sorry, I'm going back up to the top where it says Number II, Rank Statutory Criteria and you have that sentence that says lower priority criteria only apply if they do not conflict with higher priority criteria. I think that is reflecting then what Mr. Becker is saying and what you said, Mr. Woocher. But I think on -- it took multiple reads to realize that and I think -- I think what I'm saying is just can we make some of this stuff much more obvious and simple and clear so that then even for members of the public who is looking at this, they're not going to be confused and then thinking we're trying to pull a fast one on somebody. You know, so I think to whatever effect that that can be done, you know, where it could be a little bit more clear, I think that's just what I would ask for.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. Especially says the higher ranking criteria. I mean there is a range of ways to --
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER YEE: -- fulfill each of those, so it's not as if you --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER YEE: -- you know, fulfil (C) perfectly and then everything else drops out, right? So.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Because I feel like we think we all have the best of intents. You know, we want to do what's right and what's best and what's most fair. But as it has been discussed, there is a political aspect that is being, you know, maybe brought in from outside as -- as maybe we may not -- we may try not to do because obviously we want to keep it so that political considerations are not taken into account with what we're doing. But that doesn't mean that outside people will not try to read things in that may be -- might not be there. So the more clear we are in terms of what we're doing, the more we can also point back to and remind people of what we're doing and where we're coming from.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Actually, I'm thinking of my note from yesterday that we were probably going to change the "if" there: "lower priority criteria apply if" to "lower priority criteria apply to the extent," which might help that a little bit.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Yee, if I could
just interject briefly? I'm wondering -- part of this introduction is a time check. We're up against a break at 12:30. I'm wondering -- I think what I'm hearing and I was raised about going into rabbit holes. What I'm hearing a little bit of is that there's some wordsmithing that needs to happen here that the intention of the document, the intention of most of the points on here are -- actually are reflective of our sentiment. However, perhaps a little wordsmithing needs to happen in some key areas. I think this document has gone through an incredible transformation from starting out as a commission document, having been reviewed by legal, and it's a very legalistic document at this point, and maybe needs -- maybe needs a little massaging both for us as well as for the community. And I think that's entirely fair.

And in the interest of time, I want to see if we can maybe round out some of our comments. We've spent quite a bit of time on this this morning as well as yesterday. I think this is a really important conversation that we needed to have, but I'm also wondering if some of these wordsmithing things could at least be emailed to the subcommittee. We've already committed to bringing this back next week and finalizing this document and hopefully having a motion for approval at that point in time.

And it -- I know there's a couple more hands
raised and that's fine, but I also want to just remind you, before we go to lunch at 12:30, my intention is to take public comment on agenda Item Number III.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair. So just a few more minutes for thoughts here. And so the intention will be to bring back another draft of this along with the third document, the Line Drawing Phases Plan and so that would be the whole playbook then, for consideration and hopefully approval next week.

Okay. Given that, I see Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thanks. So I was curious on when are we going -- when do we discuss packing and cracking and the percentages? Because it -- I've heard numbers thrown out, but we haven't had that discussion as a -- as a -- yes, I'm trying to bring this up before he leaves. But I -- but I'm worried because I've heard 55 percent today and stuff. But we haven't had that conversation yet about what percentage we want, you know, what looks good -- whatever the right wording is. So I do want us to be aware of that.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Mr. Woocher, do you want to comment on it?

MR. WOOCHER: I'm going to be a disembodied voice, I think, because I've had to sign out.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay.
MR. WOOCHER: It -- that's another one of these issues that you just can't do in the abstract. Sixty percent in a district where there's a heavy cross-over vote and a high turnout from the minority group, you know, may -- may almost be packing. Whereas 60 percent in a district without any cross-over for a -- for a minority group that has historically has lower voter turnout ratios, rates, you know, may not be enough. It's just so specific. That's part of some of the analysis that we're doing now and the RPB may shed some light on that. But when you're going to get to each of those ones, you're just going to have to address them as they come along. There's no --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I --

MR. WOOCHER: There's just no answer we can give you in advance on that.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I completely appreciate that and -- and I almost want a line like that in this document because it is -- it is a common and it does come up in redistricting just saying.

But I also want to talk to my fellow -- say to my fellow commissioners, be careful because I have heard people use percentages and I don't want that to come back to us. And we've just heard we don't have a percentage. We will be working on it on a case-to-case because there's a lot of other variables. So we just need to be careful on
our language sometimes. And I know I'm very guilty of it, so.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. Any last thoughts, Commissioner Turner, my fellow subcommittee member? Any thoughts?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Excellent presentation, Commissioner Yee. Thank you for carrying all of that and to all of the Commissioners for your wonderful add-ons and suggestions. And I think that we -- well, I know what we will do is to take all of your feedback, your suggestions, considerations. I do want to encourage you to email any other thoughts that you have so that we can incorporate that. And we will bring back a more -- a more excellent document at the appropriate time. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, everyone.
And thank you, Chair, for such extended discussion.

CHAIR SADHWANI: You're very welcome. I think we -- we've been waiting for this conversation. So I think it was -- it was time well spent and I really appreciate all of the work of the subcommittee to bring this forward and to continue this work as we move forward. I think it will be really helpful in guiding us throughout -- throughout this process and particularly in the next few weeks.

With that, that concludes our subcommittee
reports of agenda Item Number IV, if I missaid that earlier, I apologize. This was agenda item number IV. So with that, Christian and Katie, if we could please take public comment on Agenda Item Number IV.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I'm here, Chair. One moment.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thanks so much, Katie.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Where did my instructions go? All right. The Commission will now take public comment on agenda Item Number IV. To give comment, please call (877) 853-5247 and enter a meeting I.D. number 88264383219 for this meeting.

Once you have dialed in, please press star-nine to enter the comment queue. The phone call and instructions were read previously in the meeting and it's provided info on the livestream landing page.

And we do not have anyone in the queue, Chair, and I will let you know when the instructions are complete.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Perfect. Thank you so much.

So I think with the -- while we're waiting for those instructions to complete and see if we have any callers, I just wanted to return to our agenda. I think the only item that we have left is the line-drawing subcommittee and in particular a discussion of the census timeline -- or excuse me, the line-drawing timeline, which
stems from the Supreme Court's decision last week.

Commissioner Andersen has put together a sketch of what that looks like so this afternoon we'll be coming back to have that discussion so we encourage folks to join us in that. I think there is a general thought that we can just do lunch for 45 minutes, so from 12:30 to 1:15. So we'll plan -- in fact, it's 12:18 now, so if we -- if we don't end up having any callers, perhaps we can even come back by about one o'clock. And maybe, just maybe we could even end our day a little early.

Katie, how are we doing in the -- in the comment line? I'm not seeing any callers at this point.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We -- we do not have any callers, Chair, and the instructions are complete.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good.

So with that, we will break for lunch and be back at 1 p.m.

(Off the record at 12:18 p.m.)

(Back on the record at 1:00 p.m.)

CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Welcome back to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. I hope everyone had a great lunch. We are -- do we have a quorum? We're missing a couple members. I just want to make sure we have enough to establish a quorum if we so needed.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We have nine.
CHAIR SADHWANI: We have nine.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Inaudible).

CHAIR SADHWANI: Two three -- five, no. Linda and Jane.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Now, we have nine.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Perfect. Sorry about that.

Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that we were fully covered here.

Thank you. We are coming back and finishing our agenda for today. We're going to have a conversation about the timeline that we will hopefully eventually adopt. So the goal is not to actually take action today, but instead to review a plan that Commissioner Andersen has proposed. I know that we had heard that there are community members who also may want to weigh in. I'm sure all of you have lots of thoughts that we will discuss today. So the goal is not to necessarily take action today but instead look at a plan and hopefully be able to finalize this by our meeting next week. Okay?

So with that, Commissioner Andersen, I will -- oh, actually excuse me. I'm actually going to start off and ask Chief Counsel Pane to talk a little bit about the map requirements document that you put together. I thought that was a really helpful piece. And if we could start with that and then we'll move into the -- into the
proposaL?

MR. PANE: Okay. Thank you, Chair. Let me just pull it up real fast. That's okay. That's all right. Okay. So I just wanted to highlight some points. I briefly mentioned this yesterday during the chief counsel's report. From the Padilla case, we know now that the first preliminary maps are due November 15th. And just by the way as a summary, this is all in the Government Code 82.53, with some slight additions from the Padilla case is where all of this comes from.

Number 2, public comment shall be taken for at least 14 days from the date of the public display of first preliminary statewide maps. I'm sure Commissioner Andersen's going to go into more detail about that piece. But that's the waiting period from the first preliminary maps.

Number 3, the Commission shall not display any other map for public comment during that 14-day period. Okay? So wanted to highlight that the statute specifically refers to the first preliminary map where that is the case. It does not create that same prohibition for the subsequent maps. It is specific to the 14-day waiting period which is only referring to the first preliminary map.

Certainly the Commission could choose to further -- like not display any other maps on the subsequent maps,
but as far as a prohibition goes that is specific to only
the 14-day, which is the first preliminary map.

Number 4, public comment shall be taken for at
least seven days from the date of public display. Now, the
reason I highlighted taken is because some Commissioners
have asked, well, do we have to hold meetings during that
time. The statute doesn't require holding meetings. It
requires that public comment be taken. There are many ways
that public comment can be taken. Public comment can be
mailed in, it can be emailed in, it certainly can be taken
during a meeting. So there are many ways that public
comment could be taken. So it will be up to you how you
want public comment to be taken outside, for example, do
you want to hold meetings and maybe review some of the
comments? You could certainly do that.

Number 5, public comment shall be taken for at
least three days from the date of the public display of any
final statewide maps. So that's -- and we've mentioned
this before as well, there's a three-day waiting period
from the final maps. Once we say, the Commission says it's
final, we have to wait our three days and we take public
comment for those three days prior to certification.

Number 6, final maps must be certified by the
secretary of state by December 27th. That is the date that
the California Supreme Court gave us. Okay. Because of
number 5, final maps will need to be displayed by December 24th. So that's just an application of the three days, and it says "by the 24th." It certainly could be earlier.

Number 7, with each of the final four maps, the Commission must issue a report that explains why its decisions in achieving compliance with the various criteria listed in subdivision D, it must include definitions of the terms. And this the report that Commissioner Kennedy has referred to and Commissioner Fernandez have referred to previously.

Number 8, the four final redistricting maps must be approved by at least nine affirmative votes which must include at least three votes of members registered from each of the two largest political parties in California based on registration and three votes from members who are not registered with either of these two political parties.

So you will -- if we can just temporarily skip down to number 10, nine or more affirmative votes shall be required for any official actions. So generally we need to have nine votes. Number 8 is saying for the final maps, it has to have -- there is to be a special vote. Note that that is referring to the final maps. So that is not a requirement for the first maps or the subsequent maps. It is requiring the final maps.

Now, might the final maps be easier if all prior
votes had been of the special kind, perhaps. But as far as
what is required, the magic number needs to only be nine
without the particular make-up unless we're talking the
final maps.

So for Day on number 9, Day means a calendar day
except that if a final day of a period within which an act
is supposed to be performed is a Saturday, Sunday, or
holiday, the period is extended to the next day that is not
a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday. And I'm sure Commissioner
Andersen will discuss this as well, but it does get a
little interesting, and she correctly pointed out that
Christmas Eve is a holiday. You wouldn't think so, but if
you look it up, this year Christmas Eve is a holiday. As
such, it cannot be a "day" for purposes of when an action
is going to be taken. So we need, when we're figuring
times out, we need to account for that.

And then I had already mentioned number 10 where
any official action is nine, so we want to start with the
default where official action requires nine votes and --
and the Commission's already aware of that. But these are
sort of the broader sort of guideposts when we're thinking
of different permutations for calendar counting. And I
think most of the Commission's familiar with, but there are
some little tweaks that I think allow for different --
different ways to do the counting. The biggest, of course,
is making sure we make the 27th and we make the 15th. Those are the goals.

With that, have -- entertain any questions.

CHAIR SADHWANI: All right. Thank you so much, Chair, and I'll just say really quickly I think there's a lot of important pieces that you raised there. I see that there's some questions. One -- we are going to go into Commissioner Andersen's calendar in just a moment. I also wanted to point out your comments about public comment and the various forms that that could take. And before we leave here today, I do want to bring -- raise that piece one more time so that we can have some -- some more clear guidance of who's going to take that on and really be planning out that public comment phase. Okay?

I see Commissioner Yee with a question for you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair.

Thank you, Chief Counsel Pane. Question about number 2, the 14-day period as well as the subsequent waiting periods. So I'm imagining, you know, we have four separate maps. We don't finish them all the same day. I mean, we may approve them as draft maps the same day, I suppose, and that's when the 14 days would start. But, you know, we'd probably finish them in sequence. Right? So the 14 days would probably start at the end when we finish the fourth one and approve them all as a set, I imagine? I
mean the language doesn't require that they be issued as a set, but I imagine that's what we would do.

The second question is, okay, so let's say we've approved a set of draft maps. The 14-day clock starts, can we continue to work on maps? Can any of those maps ever appear on a public screen? Would that constitute a display or do we -- or do we not display any maps anywhere at any time for 14 days?

MR. PANE: So to your question, Commissioner Yee, the statute uses the term of a "display of a map." And I think the Commission would be well served if the vote were the display of the map, that way there's a clear communication what the display of the map is. I think in prior iterations where we've been talking about visualizations of certain parts, I think that -- those aren't what I think we're thinking of when we're saying "display of a map" because we're going to be taking official action of a display of a map. You're going to be putting and communicating to the public these are the maps as we see them. You don't have that when you're doing parts and you don't have yet a final product.

So I think the final product would be the display. We would certainly have the vote for that, and I think that's a clear communication to the public this is the display, this is when our 14 days starts, and we sort
of map -- well, I don't want to say "map it." It goes --
the timeline goes along with -- with that frame.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So we could continue to work
on maps even during the 14-day period?

MR. PANE: So when you say "work on them," I
think that's -- there's nothing wrong with working on the
maps. I don't see anything in here that says you can't
work on maps. I think the point of the 14 days is to not
confuse the public. And so I think if we're putting a
display up there and the Commission is taking public
comment, for example, and entertaining some of the -- the
thoughts that the public has, we're not confusing the
public with them. I think -- I think the hesitance or the
part of the reason why we have this, what some
Commissioners have referred to as a "freeze," is because
we're not putting up one map and then we're putting up and
displaying another map and then we're displaying another
map and the public --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right.

MR. PANE: -- has no clue -- it's difficult to
follow and difficult to participate. So if we're clear
this is our display and we have that up for the 14 days,
we're taking public comment, we're -- we're discussing what
has been displayed. It's a fixed -- they're fixed
documents essentially for that time.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. Very good. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And so basically you cannot vote on another set of maps during that period, right? So that's kind of what it comes down to?

MR.Pane: Well, it's voting and it's also, I think -- I don't think we'd want to -- certainly displaying, but --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right.

MR. Pane: -- I don't think we'd want to start another display of any kind during that because, again, that is likely to confuse the public as well.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

MR. Pane: Besides the statute telling us not to do that, yeah.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. That wasn't my question. I mean it -- it was just a follow up, but my question was number 6, it's a two-parter today. Based on December 24th being a holiday, so the final maps, we would need to display them by the 23rd then, by December 23rd, correct?

MR. Pane: That's -- well, you -- they'd have to be -- it's still the 24th that you'd, I think, if we're going to count the days. We're going to be count -- I
think Commissioner Andersen's going to go through the -- at least a permutation. They probably would need to be voted on --

-- Correct me if I'm wrong, Commissioner Andersen --

-- by the -- we would vote on the 23rd at the latest for that because we couldn't vote on the 24th because it is not a "day" as defined in the statute

CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I, unfortunately, want to go back just real quick to the display again. With the way that we're currently conducting business on Zoom, everything's on the screen, so we have a display that we've voted on that's out there, and yes, we'll take public comment. I'm just wondering, and you mentioned as you were explaining, Mr. Pane, about not confusing the public. So once we vote on a display and that's what should be displayed for seven days, for example, the other public input that we receive we'll look at it as compared to that map, but we wouldn't change anything on that map, we wouldn't show any of that. We would just take notes about it and not do anything different, because that's then where the confusion would come in.

MR. PANE: I -- I would tend to agree with that.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay.

MR. PANE: You could certainly take that comment and you might look into what changes could be made, but you wouldn't then want to put out what would be viewed as another display, a subsequent display because the statute constitutes a subsequent display having a different freeze period --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Mm-hmm. Mm-hmm.

MR. PANE: -- of a shorter time. So we wouldn't want to confuse that and say, well, are we doing that or are we still part of the 14 days.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Mm-hmm. And with that, so just no tweaking of the map period then? Once -- because to do anything different on that map, we couldn't just say this is not another display? If we start playing around with that map at all, it can cause confusion, so we should not be adjusting anything once it's displayed?

MR. PANE: I -- I think the Commission has -- so first of all, it's not defined exactly the level of tweaking you could or couldn't do. I -- I do think the Commission would be well served to be very clear on what it -- on the vote on the display at certain periods, the final, the first, the subsequent. Those are the displays. Visualizations of particular areas are -- are not the same as a display of a voted statewide map. So I think -- I
think there's a difference there. And I do think, as applied, the Commission may want to think about when they're -- when they are -- so, for example, let's say you receive public comment after a display of the first map and you all think it might be worth it for the line drawers to go back and look at a partic -- based on some public comment that was taken. They can go back and see if they could tweak something. Not a statewide map. You're talking about a particular spot on that map or a particular area, for example. You're not changing the maps that are being displayed. I wouldn't think you would go back out and having a -- vote on a new display, for example.

I don't think that means necessarily that you shut down for 14 days and all you're doing is receipt of public comment. I think you can be a little bit more active than that, but I do think we also -- that's sort of on the one end of it. I think the other end is we want to make sure we're not confusing the public and throwing up a bunch of statewide possibilities during the 14 days because I then I think you're -- you're not trying to, but I think it has the impact of confusing the public. So I think you could probably find somewhere in between on that.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Mm-hmm. And I guess the last thing I'd say on that and not directly in response again, but just a comment then. Be it possible, it all --
would almost seem that if we did any other visualization that there would be a running banner or something to be able to constantly show with that this is -- this is a visualization or whatever the wording would be so that if, through our hearings that are public on Zoom, if there's anything we're having the map -- the line drawers do during that time period that there is a banner reflecting that this is just a visualization responding to comment or something of that sort.

MR. PANÉ: I mean, to your point, Commissioner Turner, another option could be, if the Commission decides to do this much in the way I think the -- Commissioner Sinay's recommendation of posting these map requirements on the website, there could be a posting of the display of the first preliminary maps on the Commission's website. These are the display of the first preliminary maps and you call that. And that's what's being displayed for the public and there's no ambiguity over what that is and what that includes.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: You can just go ahead and pass on me right now.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Sure. No problem.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I think this is
good conversation and kind of a decision point for us on how we're going to manage it. I think that's going to be important. But I guess, you know, it seems to -- I'll just share my thought -- seems to me any visualizations that we show are going to confuse the public or could potentially confuse the public. But I think, I mean, my thought just off the top of my head is it's an opportunity to take some time and provide guidance to our mapping team to go develop new -- additional visualizations to bring back after the 14 days to kind of get a head start on our next round of mapping potentially. Just a thought.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Akutagawa, did you want to still make a comment?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thank you. I needed to gather all my thoughts together. Can I -- one, I like what Commissioner Fornaciari just said. I think -- because my understanding was that during the period in which the first draft maps would be displayed, we were not supposed to do anything other than take public input. So I would be a little concerned. I -- I had, I guess, also made an assumption that whatever maps we're going to display would be put on the website for any and all to be able to download to look at to, you know, make comment on and everything like that. And so, yeah, I mean that was my understanding from the get-go is that, you know, we just
cannot do anything that is going to confuse the public
and so that meant we could not do any work on any maps,
even the visualizations. That's why I do like what
Commissioner Fornaciari's saying. And so I wanted to just
say that because I -- I could just see that confusion is
going to ensue and I think that would just, you know, even
if it's inadvertent.

To Counsel Pane, just for clarification, and
again, this is just more -- sometimes I just have to state
the obvious but I just want to double-check. December 24th
is a Friday. So that is a working day; is that not correct
or -- or -- because it's not a holiday, technically.

December 24th is a Friday. So that is a working day; is that not correct
or -- or -- because it's not a holiday, technically.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So you get Friday in
there.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, I see. Okay.
That's how it's working. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I said I had to be
obvious about it. The whole --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'm sorry. I just said
that and my microphone was not on. Since Christmas is a
Saturday and the holiday then is on the Friday, the 24th.
That's why because I was thinking the same thing
originally, but -- and it's often if Christmas is on the
Sunday, you get the Monday off.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: That's right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So but this time it's on Saturday so Friday the 24th is the holiday.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So does that mean that the maps would actually be due on the 23rd? Because we're -- we -- I'm seeing 24th here, but technically speaking is that when we would post the final display maps or?

MR. PANE: So I think in application it would be the 2erd.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MR. PANE: But technically, if we're just looking at straight numbers, it's the -- it's because of the one wrinkle that the 24th --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Is a holiday.

MR. PANE: -- happens to be a holiday.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

MR. PANE: But if you're just counting three, it's -- it would be the 24th, but then you've got to back out for the rare exception that the 24th also happens to be a holiday, so now you're actually voting on the 23rd. Remember, this is by the 24th.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, yes.

MR. PANE: So the 24th --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: We could do it earlier.
MR. PANE: Exactly.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: But 23rd would be our latest date that we would --

MR. PANE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- okay.

MR. PANE: Correct.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: All right. Just wanted to be obvious about that. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: I just want to note that's a really good catch that the 24th is a holiday. Thank you for that.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Just a couple of things. First of all, you know, further to what Commissioner Fornaciari was saying, you know, we're going to be receiving input and I would imagine that even at that point or particularly at that point in the process we're going to be getting a lot of input. So, you know, imagining that most of our time is going to be spent receiving input, some of our time is going to be spent considering the -- the first however many pages of the final report that constitute the body rather than the explanation of the rationale for each of the 176 districts. So we will have enough to discuss with discussing the report and receiving and discussing input and then
providing instructions. So, I mean, coming up with additional maps during that 14 days seems to me is going to be overwhelmed by these other things that we're necessarily going to be doing.

I did want to ask Chief Counsel Pane if it might be useful for us to entertain a motion to define the display of maps as the result of a formal Commission vote?

Thank you.

MR. PANE: Okay. Sorry, Commissioner Kennedy.

So to your point, you're -- your question again was about a -- a vote about defining the display of the maps; is that right?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. Would it -- would it be useful for us to -- to entertain a motion to define the display of a map as the result of a formal vote of the Commission?

MR. PANE: So to answer that question, I think it would -- the Commission certainly could do that. The -- maybe corollary to that is what weight would be afforded such a vote and we do not have any statutory or regulatory authority to assist us with that interpretation. So it would be -- it would be helpful, but it may or may not carry the day whether or not the Commission's interpretation is an appropriate one. It's certainly a reasonable one given how the Commission has conducted
itself and will likely conduct itself. So it would be helpful, yes. As to what weight it carries, it doesn't -- it wouldn't necessarily carry a great deal of weight.

If, as compared the Commission -- what's -- I'm trying to think of the word. Instead of taking a vote, everybody unanimously applied it that way, it would probably -- but consistently without a vote, I think it would carry the same amount of weigh as if we had a vote. So I think it could be helpful, but it wouldn't necessarily be afforded any greater weight simply because it was a motion. But I think it would solidify to a point in time a rationale for why the Commission votes the way it did and why they interpret it the way they did. And a court would certainly look at that if it were a point of challenge.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you for that, Chief Counsel Pane.

Other additional questions regarding the map requirement document? And I do think I have hanging in the air this piece around public comment, I think there's a lot of question around what's going to happen in those 14 days. We do happen to have a couple subcommittees that could potentially take on these questions to help -- to help develop a plan for that time period of what it might look like to have public comment.

Yes, I'm looking at you, Commissioner Fornaciari.
You know, I -- we certainly do have the Public Input Design Committee. I don't know if, that's, of course, a larger committee of multiple people that would need to be agendized. I don't know if we want to go that route.

If just the chairs of that committee would want to become a -- a smaller subcommittee of two to help figure that out or if Outreach and Community Engagement -- is that what you're -- if that subcommittee would want to take it on, I'm continuing to put that on the --

I'm sorry? Oh. Got it. Fredy? Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I think Commissioner Ahmad was about to --

Were you going to say something? I mean either way, either way is fine. I guess, I mean the intent of the Public Input Design Committee is to design public input --

CHAIR SADHWANI: Public input --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- events, and so, yeah, we could certainly take that on. I think -- I don't think the whole committee though, I mean, given the requirements I would propose it would be the chairs, too, but I want to leave that. We have others on that committee so I don't know how they feel about that idea.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Fredy, did you want to jump in?

Yep.

MR. CEJA: Yes, Chair. Just a brief
announcement. I did create a new tab on the website titled Map Requirements. It's under About Us, and it includes the information prepared by Chief Counsel Pane.

CHAIR SADHWANI: You work fast. Thank you very much --

MR. CEJA: Yes.

CHAIR SADHWANI: -- for that.

I know there's several people with hands up. Commissioner Ahmad is one of those chairs, so I want to just jump to you and then we'll get back to everybody else in order.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. And I just wanted to echo Commissioner Fornaciari's sentiments as well. I know that there's other people who serve on the Public Input Design Subcommittee, so I'm more than happy to step up or step back as needed per your request.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you for that.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. One thing, and we'll be getting to this as soon as I get into the schedule here. I'm hearing a lot of things happening in those 14 days that people have talked about not just public input. So I -- I think we need to talk a little bit more about what people would like to see possible, what's realistically possible to do in those 14 days. And --
before we just say, Okay, here design public input
meetings, because I'm hearing, you know, we might want
to -- here, you know, Commissioner Kennedy is pushing like,
hey, maybe it's a good time to do work on the report.
Is -- is that going to be a couple of days for the
Commission to work on the report or is it the subcommittee
working on the report? You know, someone said, and well
we'll start giving direction to the line drawers. We have
to review the input, and so there's a -- I think we need to
-- a little bit more. I think actually we should almost
like go through this schedule and talk about other things
that also have to occur to get to the end, and then we come
back to this because I think it might be a little more
obvious about what we need to do in those 14 days.

CHAIR SADHWANI: That's fair. Let's take -- take
the additional hands that are raised though before we move
into that.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was just going to say
that I'm happy to step back and not be -- but I also do
like Commissioner Andersen's point, too, so.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Fair enough.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Happy to step back as
well.
CHAIR SADHWANI: I'm -- I'm getting a sense of the room here, so that's very helpful. Thank you. So it sounds like most likely whatever public input does happy after drafted or display, we'll ask that the chairs of that subcommittee work -- of the committee work as a subcommittee to help us define what that looks like.

Before we go into further definition of what that is, let's continue with the discussion of the calendar. There are, of course, numerous pieces here to work out. We have a very busy agenda in front of us over the next couple of months, but I think it will be great to have that -- a point per -- point people for that planning.

Commissioner Andersen, do you want to walk us through your proposed calendar?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

Okay. On -- there's a handout and it's actually -- I think it's called preliminary draft schedule or something like that. And unfortunately it -- the printout on stuff is a little confusing because everything sort of appears to be the same color. So I'm going to go ahead and share my screen here and hopefully this will help quite a bit.

CHAIR SADHWANI: (Inaudible).

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Nope. I don't have it up yet. That is not -- hang on a sec. One of the complications is share screen. I want to share a tab here.
It's not giving me that option now.

CHAIR SADHWANI:  Is it up in the --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN:  Yeah, as a tab.  Okay.

Got it.  Okay.  Okay.  Can people see that?

CHAIR SADHWANI:  Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN:  Okay.  I just wanted to -- okay.  So here we are.  This is October.  Here is today, the 29th.  Everything in blue here is already scheduled meetings.  Essentially everything on this page is already scheduled.  I'm just going to kind of quickly walk us through it.  This is the -- the first -- the three days are the visualization time we spoken with -- spoke with Karin Mac Donald about.  And then we have a business meeting on the 7th.  Again, that's the same thing's happening 13, 14, 15.  Business meeting on the 20th.

Third week is that public district map input meetings.  Those are when -- it's a different format.  The public will be reviewing maps that the public is submitting for us.  Then on the 27th, it is another business meeting, and the 28th, 29th, 30, and also the first week of November, the 3, 4, and 5, these are gathering information from -- well, the 28, 29, 30 is getting information from these public map input meetings in terms of, Hey, I saw this, can we incorporate some of those ideas, into our visualizations on this particular -- the 28, 29, 30.  And
those -- looking at those visualizations, the modifications back on the 3, 4, 5.

Moving to -- and now that was the first week of November. Now I'm going to go to the November calendar and here we have the 3, 4, 5 where we're still -- we're looking at, again, those visualizations of okay, now. Then we have the 8, 9, 10. These are days where basically it could even be the 3, 4, 5. The line drawers are going to start putting those sections of visualization we've been working on together trying to work us towards an actual draft map. We're going to start looking at basically things that look like the state and say, Yeah, I do like those visualizations. Oh, if we change that here and it affects down over here. And this is the idea here, getting these -- these three days: Veterans Day is a holiday; got to take it off, and putting out a draft -- I'm proposing put a draft map on the 12th.

Now, the 15th, and you see it down here in yellow, any of the yellows are the legal deadline for the draft map. That -- that's the legal deadlines. So I'm proposing to do it on the 12th. So if -- now, an idea was the 10th also. Either way, we have 14 days of public input when we're not supposed to be posting any maps. And we can use those for public input. We could have public input meetings. That is what I have proposed here 15, 16, 17,
you know, these five days this week, the three days the week before Thanksgiving, because again, if the 12th is a draft map, this 26th is the 14th day. Or if we do it on the 10th, that would be a little tricky because the line drawers would have to -- we'd shift that week up one day at least. It would have -- might not be enough turnaround time to work on those visualizations to get us back to coming up with a draft map, which is why I have it on the 12th.

Oh, also additionally, I'm sorry, I should say the way it works and Commissioner Yee kind of referred to this, say on the 8th we actually finish, say Hey, I like that assembly district. Then before you can display it, there's a lot of work that the -- that the line drawers have to do to put it all together, get it all out of their -- the line -- you know, their GIS system, and be able to document it and be able to post it. So basically they would start working on these -- each of these -- each of these days over Veterans Day to be able to post it on the 12th.

So again, these -- now going back to the public input meetings for these -- this time frame, that's the time frame we can work on many things. I'm putting down as public input meetings. Why not? You know, why don't we hear from that? Then we'd actually get a couple of days at
Thanksgiving. The 27th, the 28th would be our homework days. The Commission would be reviewing all of this public input. And remember, even if we have these public input meetings, we'll be getting a lot of input through the website, through the COI tool, through the redistricting tool. So it will be up to us to make sure we're reviewing all this information because then on Monday the 29th, we will be going over that public input and giving direction to the line-drawing team by plan.

So at this point they're going to be having large -- we won't be going back to little, tiny sections. We might be doing sections at a time, but we'll be looking at assembly plan, senate plan, congressional plan. Quite frankly, we'll look at Board of Equalization at the end. We'll just throw ten -- ten of them together. It's -- but anyway. Now, so that's what's starting to happen this 20 -- last -- last week of November, first couple days of December.

I'm going to go to the December calendar now. And if you'll notice, I have things in -- which this did not happen. It was not clear at all on your printout, which I apologize for. The salmon color, that lighter color, that's what the line drawers are doing. So to give you an idea, well, we have these extra days -- we actually don't because -- so while we can give direction during the
29, 30th of November, 1st, 1 and 2 of December, then the line drawers are going to go back and create those visualizations on the maps; come back on the, you know, the 6, 7, 8, and now we actually have those plans and we're saying, right. We're going to go here, we're going to go there. This is sort of our -- almost our last set of visualizations because then they're going to -- the 9, 10, they're going to put all those on and then from the 11th until we go final, we're actually live line drawing. And I don't know if anyone remembers when we actually did a little bit of this our very first line drawing workshop, and we actually said, no, could you move that district into -- I think we actually did kind of the delta area and the Stockton. We said could you -- maybe move that line over here? That's what we're actually talking about doing from the 11th all the way out.

Now, before all the way out, I'm going to actually go back -- I'm going to go reverse. I'm coming down to the 27th, which is our legal -- we must -- the maps must be certified on the 27th. And as director, well, Chief Counsel Pane said, going backwards the three days, you know, could happen on the 24th, I actually want to have three clear days, because that is -- in terms of contract when you have five days to -- for any kind of protest, from the time you say here is the document, you must have five
clear days and then you can move on.

So in case that's interpreted that way, I thought why not be careful? And it also happened that the 24th is a holiday. So that's why our legal -- I have legal deadline for declaring maps in the 23rd. But -- and Commissioner Kennedy will pay particular attention to this. While we can do the bulk of the report all the way up to this time, we cannot finish the report until after we have declared these legal -- the legal maps are declared final. Because at that point the line drawers create the appendices. The maps, the details -- details of it, one of which is also the splits: what city's been split, what county's been split and all that documentation. We need to put those into our -- each district information. So if we declare, we go all the way out and don't declare final until the 23rd, that has us finishing the reports on Christmas Eve, Christmas Day, and well, the day after, Boxing Day. I do not propose that.

I actually propose that we declare the maps final on the 20th. Then that gives us the 21, 22, 23 to finish the report, and certify on the 24th. But notice the 24th is actually a holiday. Okay. We meet on the 27th and certify them then. That's what I propose.

One thing in want to mention before this, if we declare maps final on the 20th, notice in here I have
senate deferred reports? That is what Commissioner Yee spoke about. It turns out we must finish the senate map a day before everything else because the line drawers need that full day to then do their, you know, who got deferred, who didn't get deferred, so they can actually number the senate districts. And that -- that is quite involved depending on how we draw the lines, how different they are, and the lines will be different. So that report has to be done on -- on the 19th. So basically by the 18th, we would have to have the senate map done and then finish everything else up on the 19th, declare final.

So that's what I propose. One thing you'll notice that is really missing from here and I know I think a few people have -- I've talked to this about, I was really, really in favor of a second draft. Unfortunately, with the -- giving us the 27th instead of those extra few days to actually determine if the appeal 94, I mean the legacy data was usable, we lost going to January 3rd. If we did have to January 3rd, I was going to propose that we do a draft on the 10th. It would give us the seven days. We'd have the rest of the time to finish this up, to collect -- get public input and finish the map that last week. We don't have that luxury and it takes, when we look at how long does it actually take to do a draft and then incorporate it and get back to starting work, it takes at
least ten to 12 days, because there's the seven day -- we can still work on visualizations as Chief Counsel Pane said. We can work on visualizations but you have to incorporate those in as well because you could take -- the really good public input might not come till the seventh day and then you'd have to sort of start. So I don't see it happening. And that's the proposal from -- I put it together but it was basically the line drawing subcommittee. So open to questions and comments and thoughts and everything like that.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you so much, Commissioner Andersen for your thoughtful work on this. I really appreciate it. I do see hands raised.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Mm-hmm. Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

I wanted to go back. Can you go down to where the draft map on the calendar is? Yes. Or up or generally? So as you were going through it, in my mind I thought, perhaps wrong, that the draft maps needed to be all of the maps. Yes? Okay, I thought you said something right then that -- that spoke to us adding in different districts or different parts of the maps after this date. But on the -- our first draft maps are all four maps, right?
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. Yeah, that's -- I did hear Commissioner Yee saying you can -- well, maybe if you finish one before you finish the other, I mean possibly, possibly but I wouldn't post it.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I mean I'd post all four at the same time. I mean --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I would want all four posted the same time because to post maps for public to respond to and if you're not finished yet and have to make changes to them, to me, that's problematic.

Okay. I'm not sure what I heard you say. But when you were going through those next dates, something made me think that we were still working on different maps after the first set of draft maps. And so I don't know.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That could have been right at the end when I talked about the senate map has to be done a little -- a day earlier?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: No, before --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay.


Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Great.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Two
things. One, I -- I appreciate the subcommittee's work on this and it is rather complicated with a lot of things to be considered. I'm hoping still that we can target having our draft maps out on the 10th of November rather than the 12th. I really would -- would not like to see any of that 14-day public comment period falling during the Thanksgiving weekend. Let's -- let's put the burden on us rather than taking away time from the public. That's -- that's one thing.

Second of all, I understand what elements were included in the final report in 2011, but I'm wondering what -- which of those elements are required and which are, maybe standard practice, but I'm not seeing a legal basis for -- for a requirement. In looking at the constitutional language it says the Commission shall issue with each of the four final maps a report that explains the basis on which the Commission made its decisions in achieving compliance with the criteria listed in Subdivision D and shall include definitions of the terms and standards used in drawing each final map. I'm not saying that a requirement in the legal framework that we issue a senate deferral report as part of that final report, for example. So I just -- I want us to be clear what is it that we are legally required to do and what is it that would be nice to day. Thank you.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I might jump in on that and I -- unfortunately, the line drawers aren't here. There are -- part of the criteria is, you know, the demographics are all part of that criteria. The actual details, I'm just thinking of the different appendices they put together. The senate deferral is required somewhere. I don't quite know where because that is referred to and I -- I'm going to have to get the information back from the line drawers and/or if counsel can look that up? But that didn't just come out of -- out of thin air. These are several different items. But I really appreciate the question about what exactly do we need to have in the report and where is that so fined. So we'll have to get -- get that back to you.

MR. PANE: Commissioner Kennedy [sic], I can certainly get back to -- to everyone about exactly the parts we can find. Subdivision D that I have on the map requirements is from Section 2 in Article XXI of the constitution and that has the various criteria that you all have been addressing before. And as Commissioner Andersen said, there's another piece where we're referring to this use to the senate deferral piece. So we can sort of put all the pieces that we're aware of sort of in one place if that will be helpful?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, also, I do want to go
back, you know, to the 10th. I'm sorry. I don't see -- is there any question? Because I'm looking.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Commissioner Ahmad has, but if you want to respond, that's --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Do you want to go ahead and?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Sure. Thank you. I just wanted to draw your attention to November 15th through the 24th on the proposed schedule where it states public input meetings and ask for some clarification. Are you proposing we hold public input meetings every single day of that week or is that just the window in which we could potentially hold a public input meeting?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I was sufficiently vague to see what the Commission wanted to do. And I -- I'm sorry, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah, no. That -- that was just what was I was wondering especially because it seems like everyone's stepping back so that part might fall on Commissioner Fornaciari and I.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Okay. You know, it does -- if we do the 12th, as Commissioner Kennedy said, it would be the 26th and which is why he was talking about doing the 10th. I did spin a second -- another scenario if we try to draft maps on the 10th. And what happens is --
and I'm going -- well, I can't -- I can't share both maps at the same time. Basically because it takes how long for the line drawers, we say okay, I like this map. Then they have to put it together and then they have to put it together and have to put it out. It has to move back up. So basically if we want to do draft maps on the 10th, we would need to move, you know, this section at least to on the Sunday, maybe the Saturday and I'm going to go back to the map before.

Basically what would happen is -- oh sorry. I went up too long and I am in this one. November, do, do, do, do -- oh, I guess not. Yeah. We need to move this one back and we need to -- we need to work on the Saturday. Either the Sunday or Saturday and Sunday to try to do that. It would be a very quick turnaround since this is on the 30th, it's on that Sunday. If we try to push this up, basically we're concerned about the quality of the draft is quite frankly it.

Now, we could try that and if we say, line drawers, this is what we need to do, they'll do it. We just have to -- we just have to -- and it all depends on how quickly we can make decisions, quite frankly. And, you know, that's why I'm saying from the first time you're saying, hey, what about this idea, raise your hand, bring it up because unfortunately, we have a really condensed
schedule here. You know, through no fault of our own this is really going to be tight. And I can see, as Commissioner Kennedy said he'd really like to do that on the 10th, so we have all those 14 days before Thanksgiving. It depends on what kind of input we get in this district map and how -- how this all fits together. So we -- we can rearrange things if we'd like. You know, we just have to talk a little bit more and that's the whole purpose of we're not coming to a conclusion today. We'd like to get ideas, what would people think, what would people really want to do and we'll see what the line drawers can really do for us too.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you. I -- I was kind of going along the same lines as Commissioner Ahmad regarding the 15th through the 24th. I mean if we -- if we're submitting our maps on the 12th, then I would think that anyone that's reviewing the maps may not be ready to provide any comment until the latter part of the following week. So I think we also need to maybe look at this as being a fluid calendar just based on when we actually issued the drafts versus the dates and everything. So I do remember conversations early on that suggested the 2010 Commission just had agendas for every single day not knowing which day they'd actually meet, so, you know,
because you never knew. So that was just one of my comments.

Also, if -- if our goal is to issue the final on the 20th, and I know you talked about a five-day waiting period, but realistically we could certify the maps on the 23rd. If it was December 20th --

Just wait. I know you want to say something, Commissioner Andersen.

-- and then the other piece of it was -- and we don't know. We don't want to close the door to a second draft because we actually don't know what our first draft's going to look like and we don't know what the comments are going to be. So potentially we could. But again, fluid, just the fluid process, we don't know what the first draft's going to look like, we don't know what the comments are going to look like. So it's kind of just moving back and forth.

The only comment I had on the calendar in general is I did get confused in December where you -- where you put like line drawers create visualizations on the 3rd or 4th. I assumed we were meeting as well, but thank you. You're giving me -- giving us a few days off. So -- but thank you for putting this together. It is helpful and di just won't be available for anyone that's out there including family for two months, three months. So thank
you.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: We all had the same thought when we looked at this calendar. Yeah, and I'll just add and I see other hands in the line-up. But, you know, we have very set dates of November 15th and December 27th, and I think that you're right. Fluidity is going to be important here with some targets. Right? And I think the targets are -- are -- will be our friends in this process. If we end up really needing to go to that -- to November 15th to get them -- the -- the draft out, we will have that little extra time, but I think having those targets will be helpful.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Actually, I just -- I do want to just in. On the two days, you know, if we put up on the 12th, so we might not be ready on the 15th. There will be people who are following every visualization. And the -- we will have people who are signed up for that very first day. So I, you know, I was specifically told don't worry about that. There will be people who want to give you comment, and we will be getting comment as we go, so that is another consideration. But, you know, do we -- they're 14 days. We don't necessarily have to have public meetings every single day.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Commissioner Fernandez, do you
want to respond to that?

  COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just wanted to respond. I think what I mean is if we do get it out on the 12th and if people are ready to give us comments and they can comment via email, via writing, via however they want. We don't necessarily need to have a meeting for them to provide the comment, so that's -- that's all I was saying was maybe we get a couple more days off or something? And it's not even days off because we will be reviewing the comments as well, our homework. Right? Thank you.

  CHAIR SADHAWANI: Yeah. And I think just a general reminder to all that taking care of ourselves throughout this process will be really important as well. It will be cold and flu season and, you know, we can make sure we -- we can make it all the way through.

  Commissioner Turner?

  COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to give support to what Commissioner Kennedy said earlier and I appreciate the flexibility comments but also to have goals. And I want to support our shooting actually for the 10th so that we perhaps may have to do more work up front so that the public will have those full 14 days that we will not fall during the Thanksgiving holiday. So that's number one.

  And then the second part I wanted to understand
again on the December 3rd, 4th, Commissioner Fernandez, you left it at, I think I was still reading this as days that we were participating. They're creating visualizations not in our presence, this is something they're doing outside?

Okay. I didn't get that the first go round.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. And I'm sorry.

I'm going to go to December on the calendar here and you couldn't see that on -- on the posting, which I'm really sorry about. This -- when I have the things in this salmon color that -- this time that day and this time, this one, that is just what the line drawers are doing. And that's not us. That is outside of our presence.

And actually -- well, actually, I should have -- what I should have done probably is done this portion from the 11th on in a different color because this is, you know, in here -- I'm sorry. In the -- like the 29th or 30th, we've been doing -- giving direction to the line drawers. I want this one, I want to see that, and it may be a couple of different things in the same area. Then they're going back and creating those and then coming back and giving it to us. That's what's happening in these first phases from the 11th on, no. We -- they've put everything on maps and every time we do something, it's live. But really, that's why it's live drawing with map -- with the map until we go final.
And that's a -- this is something I should say. Other -- other independent commission -- no one else does this -- not in the country. This is not done and this -- people have told the line drawers that, you know, you're crazy. You guys are crazy. I mean why would you ever do any of that stuff live? And I'm saying this for the public's benefit. This -- we are really going above and beyond as far as being transparent. But that's what we want to do and that's what -- you can ask task to do, but it takes more time. And I -- one thing I did want to say about if we did declare maps on the 20th, I really want us to have those three days clear for comment before we certify, because I'd had to have our maps kicked out for little technical issue of it said three days and you gave us two and declared and certify. That would just be, after all the work we've done.

So that's why I'm saying, you know, declare it final on the 20th. We can certify on the 24th, but actually have our last meeting on the 27th when -- when it's -- to actually do that it would have to be a -- it can't be a holiday or Saturday/Sunday. Correct, yeah. But if we certify on the 23rd, I -- I think we can get into trouble on that.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Chief Counsel
Pane, when does the three-day notice kick in?

MR. PANE: So, Commissioner Fornaciari, from our Supreme Court decision, it's the final 15 days from the preceding the finalization of the maps. So it will go -- if the finalization were declared on the 20th (audio break), we want 15 days from that and during those 15 days we would only give a three-day notice period.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. I -- for some reason I thought it had to do with the posting of our -- of our first set of drafts, so -- so that's not it. Okay.

Thank you.

MR. PANE: Normally, Bagley-Keene, excuse me, requires a ten-day notice period or 14 days for, you know, public input. And originally they -- the drafters for this -- for these statutes were thinking of the more truncated period of time, the final 15 days. And so the Supreme Court was essentially applying that standard to the new dates.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I keep forgetting. I -- you know, I wanted to go back to the target dates and I'm wondering if it would help us if we were to say this is the earliest that we hope we could hit a date and then this is the absolute latest. So that way, then as you said, you
know, if we name the dates but it's a little bit of a range, we don't have to do every single day, maybe, but at least we can agendize those dates if that's what we're able to do and knowing that we want to try to hit the earlier dates. Even -- even before the, you know, so that we can make that November 10th date possibly, even earlier. But I'm thinking just for us from a planning, but also from a mentally, like thinking about what we're going to do, like when I saw this calendar, it literally took me the last day and a half to think oh, my God, you know. But it's kind of like we got to wrap our heads around this schedule and there's a lot of fluidity we do need to continue to have. Maybe having that -- that kind of -- those targets might help us in terms of planning.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: So, Commissioner Akutagawa, am I hearing that you would be in support of a November 10th target date for those draft maps?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I would only because, you know, I'm going to be a little selfish and I think maybe most of us would be. It would be nice to have a -- you know, maybe like just that one day of Thanksgiving free where we don't have to worry about, okay. Let's just take that day off and then we'll be back to work on Friday. Right? So.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Am I getting a general
consensus that November 10th would be an optimal target date and recognizing that we do have a little extra wiggle room if we really need it, but November 10th is our -- is our target? I'm generally seeing some heads kind of nodding. Okay. That's -- that sounds great. That's the kind of -- the kind of piece that we need in order to advance this conversation. That's great.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.

I wanted to go back to Commissioner Fornaciari's question and Chief Counsel Pane's response. I'm sitting here rereading the motion or ruling from the Supreme Court in response to our request and that last part is, yes. The Commission shall provide three days' public notice for each meeting held in the 15 days before final statewide maps are approved and certified. But that -- it creates a conundrum because we don't know when they're going to be approved and certified. The one thing that we know is the deadline.

So are they, in fact, saying -- and if, -- because we go back to the language in the Constitution, it's the 15 days before the deadline. So are we -- I believe we would be safer interpreting that ruling as 15 days before the 27th of December, not 15 days before our target date, --which may or may not come to pass. Thank you.
MR. PANE: So Chief -- I agree, Commissioner Kennedy. And an even more conservative approach is to notice a bunch of meetings in advance and I believe that's what the 2010 Commission did as an even more conservative approach.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I do agree that let's target the 10th. I think that makes sense for November 10th, but I also do want to remind us to take care of each -- to take care of ourselves and to take care of each other. But this is what we signed up for and I know we've said that a lot of times. But there's noth -- at this point we can't rush things and try to say, Hey, I --

I'm going to pick on you now. I need to catch a three o'clock flight or whatever it is.

This is what we signed up for and they asked us many, many times if we could do it, and it's for ten years. And so let's all just block off our calendars and tell our employers, tell our clients, tell everybody this is what the reality is. Our families as well, but, you know, I'm the first one to say, uh, November -- I already planned something that first part of that Thanksgiving weekend. My family can still go away and they'll be happy I'm around for dog sitting. But let's just -- this is what we signed up for and let's not rush it. And anyway --
CHAIR SADHAWANI: And I think to that end I'll just note that we currently did not schedule November 1st and 2nd. It's a Monday and Tuesday, so hold that on your calendars and most likely we might have to add those dates especially if we're going to use November 10th as a target.

We might need those days for line draw.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Also the 7th.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: November?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yep. I mean if we're pushing from the 10th back, yeah.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Is it a Saturday? I don't have my calendar.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That's a Sunday.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Oh, a Sunday. Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It worked on a Sunday, so I don't know if we want to -- so it --

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Anything's open. There we go.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I was going to say just on that, yeah, I think we need to also plan on blocking out our weekends too. But I do want to say in response to what Commissioner Sinay said, I mean, I agree. I mean I think we all know what we signed up for, but at the same time, I think that's why I'm proposing that we do have a range. Like the 10th is what we ideally want to try
for, but if we know for various reasons stuff happens, that if its' going to slip to the 12th, then we don't beat ourselves up over it for that because we're still within the range. And I think just having a little grace for ourselves is going to be important because we are in this for the long haul.

The other thing, too, is I do want to caution, I think, too, what Commissioner Fernandez also said about public input can be provided in writing and in other forms. I would propose that we don't have to have a meeting every day and I only say this also, too, because I'm thinking back to the COI input meetings this summer. I was -- I was -- I mean I'll be honest. At the beginning I was thinking, yeah, we should be having more meetings. Okay. I don't think we could have done meetings like every single day. It would have been just really tough, and I think there's both the mental break and I think just that break to be able to read through things even in the in-between.

So it's not that we're not going to be working, it's just, you know, I don't know having daily public input meetings is going to be super effective for us. We'll still be receiving it and we'll still be reading it and working but I don't know if the meeting is going to make sense. Not to mention, I think I'm also very mindful of what the staff has been saying like what are they going to
be doing to constantly be putting, you know, setting up all
those and that takes a lot, too, especially if we're
talking nearly seven days in a row. So just want to be
conscious of that.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: I appreciate that, because at
the end of the day, we are only human. Yes, we signed up
to do this work and I think we will all, you know, continue
with our commitment, but at the end of the day, a body
needs to rest.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I actually
wanted to just comment along those same lines because
certainly we signed up for it. And when I got this
calendar just seeing all red and blue, I'm thinking, okay.
Let's -- let's do this between now and the end of the year.
But I also don't think that any of us need to be, you know,
modest and die on the vine behind this. So with that said,
and I'm for definitely support of the 10th and doing what
we need to. And as we plan and add in extra days, there
was a reminder earlier for us to also mark some days on our
calendar for our own internal homework to actually read
what's coming in. And I just wanted to name for the
Commission, that while we're naming additional days that we
need to spend researching, it will be an illusion to think
that there are days on the calendar that we're not working.
And so we almost need to -- it doesn't need to be agendized, but make sure we're putting that on the calendar as well, so whereas we think we have a day off here and there, we recognize it is not a day off here or there, so that we know exactly what we're up against and public knows it, we know it. And so indeed, when I see and should we be gifted with a day off, I think it should be a day off, that I'm not then expect to then turn around and read 1,000 reports. So I just think it -- we need to be real clear on where we are working and certainly willing to do the work. But I don't want us to give the illusion that we are taking days off or having days off and it really isn't -- does not exist.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: I appreciate that. And, you know, actually for my students before finals week they have two days of reading days. And so perhaps we could at least plan out a reading hour before a meeting or something like that.

Commissioner Akutagawa, did you have a hand raised again? Okay.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. I just wanted to kind of piggy-back off of what Commissioner Akutagawa said about public comment and -- because we can all recall during our initial COI meetings Community of Interest input
meetings. The first few weeks were a little bit more difficult just because they weren't full meetings. And I am thinking that if we have meetings right away, we may not have full meeting where we could actually use that time to review whatever public comment. So that's why I -- I'm kind of advocating for -- to not have the meetings like right after we display our initial maps. Let's wait and give people a chance, they can submit it multiple ways and then, you know, hopefully full, robust meetings of public input. And, yes, I understand this is what we all signed up for, but I don't think any of -- it's almost like our life has been put on hold because the census data has put our life on hold. Whether that's fair or not, I don't think any of us thought that it would be December 27th. So I get that part, but I also think we need to be healthy to do a good job. So get rest when we can.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: I agree. And so I think that this is the really great conversation that we needed to have. I'm very excited if Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner Ahmed accept the challenge to take some of this feedback and come back to us with some thoughts on what that might look like. I know Commissioner Andersen also has a lot of thoughts then and I'm sure we'll be sending you some of those -- those ideas. I am certain that that would probably also include perhaps a
conversation with our line drawing team to make sure that this is done in collaboration with what they might anticipate or the kids of experience that they have from -- from ten years ago as well.

I know we've talked now and it seems like we're coming to some consensus around November 10th as a target date for drafts. Is there any additional conversation around target date for final maps? It seemed like there was a little bit of -- of discussion perhaps to be had on that matter of what day we would actually try to cert -- have as a target for certification. Do we want to have any additional conversation on that at this point in time or do you want to hold off on that?

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I wanted to talk about something different, so --

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Sorry.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- I'll wait.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: No. I think it -- it's okay. You can go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So couple things. First of all, if you look at the calendar, 8th, 9th, 10th, you know, we're going to travel and we also have the 12th is a travel day. I guess I'm kind of wondering if we want to just make the 12th a virtual day so we're not, you know,
using up a day just away from home. And but I want to just check in with Commissioner Andersen. I mean that -- if we have to do, if we have to certify, or whatever, approve our draft maps we can do that surely as well in person. Right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, some people are going to be virtual anyway, so I -- okay, dumb question. So maybe I -- but maybe -- maybe we can just think about making the 12th a virtual meeting, I guess, is what I'm feeling out there instead of everyone being an extra day just wandering around forever --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- the mystery place we're going to be?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I might say if we're all shooting for the 10th, this will change.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And if we -- if we can -- and most people want to make it the 10th. And, you know, we did talk about there's a possibility we can do it, and so we will do our best to do that, in which case I think we can -- I don't know if we'll have a meeting on -- on the 12th. You know, because we're meeting on the 7th. And so basically what I'd like to do is kind of go back and rework this a little bit. And I also think, you know, the --
while I appreciate the 15-day -- the last 15 days and the
three-days' notice, basically what I'm proposing is once we
come up here, we say we kind of like this is we schedule
all those days and it isn't a question of oh, now we can
post the agenda. I mean the agenda for the live line
drawing would be pretty simple but it's just going to be
that same agenda for the rest of the time. So but I think
we will meet virtually -- either virtually or in person --
we still have to work that out -- all those days. So I --
I appreciate and I also did notice that I think we're
supposed to be down in Southern California I think on the
8, 9, 10 and then also on the 12th, and I thought that was
a big strange. But also, what do we do --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: There's a lot of great
Veterans Day events in Southern California. I'm sure there
are --

CHAIR SADHAWANI: I think some were looking
forward to a trip to -- that's right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So but anyway, that's
still a possibility. If we want to have a -- because we
certainly -- there'll be -- there will be needs for
business meetings, so these are -- oh, and actually -- so
and the other thing I wanted to say is the public input
meetings, I was really hoping to hear from the public,
which is why it said public input meetings to see what they
would say, what they wanted, didn't want, you know, did they want it right away rather than a few days later? That's what's -- and I expect that we should be getting some callings on that.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I was just going to comment on what you were asking about the -- the final map dates. And I think we should, I think this conversation's been important and I think we shouldn't kick it down further or kick it off to the subcommittee. I think we should just state it.

I did find what Commissioner Kennedy said was interesting and I think as Commissioner Andersen has stated earlier, it would be a shame if, by hours or by a day, we -- we miscalculated and I think we need to be very thoughtful but also very intentional and conservative about maybe adding in that extra date so that we make sure that sure that our -- whatever we need to do, make sure that the maps do get certified within the time frame that they're supposed to be in. You know, there's no question about it. And so that's what I would advocate for.

But again, you know, let's set some like our best case scenario date that we would like to, like the 20th, right, what Commissioner Andersen said. But if it slips a little bit, you know, like how far in do we -- can we slip?
Is it really the 23rd? Do we need to look at the 22nd? Do we need to look at the 21st? I'm not really 100 percent sure what everybody's appetite would be and what really is the safest most conservative date, last -- last possible date.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Did you have a target date?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I am actually comfortable with what Commissioner Andersen has -- has proposed in terms of the report writing. I -- you know, I am -- there are things that need to be done ahead of time and all that, so I -- I just wanted to appreciate the work that she's done on the scheduling and this has been really helpful to have an informed conversation. But I just wanted to just put that out there that we should look at our best case and then our absolutely like most conservative last-case date.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: So then your proposal for target date would be as -- as Commissioner Andersen proposed, December 20th for those -- to -- to finalize the maps --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I just --

CHAIR SADHAWANI: -- certification on the 23rd; is that correct?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I -- I mean I think that that would --
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Or the 24th.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I mean that would fit within what Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: The -- yes.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- Kennedy said, right?

But I -- I don't know, Commissioner Kennedy, if you want to comment on it because you mentioned the 15 days part. Like actually what day were you thinking of would actually work? I guess I'm curious.

MR. PANE: So if I could just jump in on that? So the 15 days is just the -- is just how long the Commissioner has for a three-day notice for the posting of the agendas. So that's -- we --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

MR. PANE: -- I don't know that that's -- I think that could probably be a separate issue about which days you need because we can agendize --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Everything.

MR. PANE: -- if we need to.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I was thinking -- I was thinking it was specific to the maps, but okay. Then we could just agendize every day like Commissioner Andersen suggested if we need to --

MR. PANE: Yeah. And --
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- just to give ourselves --
MR. PANDE: -- that is an option.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- some flexibility.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I just want to say, you know, the yellow dates on here which you can see on my calendar and unfortunately you can't on yours is -- those are the last legal deadlines that you can do. That's -- that is the drop dead -- if you don't certify because you have to vote on the 23rd, you can't make the 27th in which case it's all been for -- just for fun and games. We don't get to do maps, so -- which I don't think any of us want. So the 27th is the last to certify. The 23rd will be the last to declare and the November 15 is the last to do draft maps.
But as I said I don't want to do the 23rd because then we would have to be working over Christmas Eve, Christmas Day and the day after. So --
CHAIR SADHAWANI: Just -- just for clarity, so if we declare the maps on December 20th, we can't certify on the 24th though can we? I thought it was because it was a holiday.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, --
CHAIR SADHAWANI: Did I --
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- you --
CHAIR SADHAWANI: -- did I misunderstand that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: We -- we can't vote on that day. That would be the day though --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hand it into the secretary of state that day.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: But we don't have to do that until the 27th. So we -- while -- but our time frame would be we'd certify on the 24th and then that would default to the 27th because it's a holiday and it extends -- remember it extends to the last -- to the 27th.

MR. PANE: I think we're -- I think the plan is to do it on the 23rd. Right? Because the 24th is -- well, I shouldn't say. That -- that's up to the Commission, but you all would decide. But as far as we wouldn't want to count for purposes on the 24th because it is a -- it is not a "day" as defined because it is a holiday.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct.

MR. PANE: So we would have to bump it earlier than that and it's up to the Commission how earlier.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, on that one though, we would just have to have three days. I thought we worked through this.

MR. PANE: Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: We have to have three days for public comment. Well, technically we're having
five and then certify because it isn't though we must certify through -- for, you know, within the fourth day. It doesn't actually say that in the legal document. But -- but here, the other wrinkle is, okay, say we want to actually certify on the 23rd. Then to have three clear days, you'd have to declare on the 19th, but the 19th is a Sunday. So, which means, we would have to declare on the 17th, which means we'd lose one -- all those days to work on maps. You know, we would be declaring maps on the 17th. We can use those other days, which means we'd only have, you know, essentially seven days from, we say, you know, the 11th, seven days to do the final map. I think that's too short.

You know, and I know the line drawers are going to need every day we can possibly get, which is why I went to the 23rd, 20th, and then the three clear days for any public comment are 21, 22, 23, and then I -- and then ask Anthony or Chief Counsel Pane, to please verify and read through to make sure that if we declare, do we then have to certify on -- on the third day or on the fourth day or is it after? What --

MR. PANE: So see if I can answer the question. If there's -- we do have a definition of what a day is, but we also don't have a definition of what a day is. We have a definition of a day and what it's -- and what it's sort
of not. It can't be a weekend. It can't be a holiday. But we don't have a definition of a day saying it's 24 hours. So I -- I think we're going to have -- I mean my legal recommendation would be to take -- it would be to take a conservative approach on the way we're calculating a day and I think Commissioner Andersen's attempt is to -- what she's referring to is a fuller clean three days is to not say, well, we're going to do it on the -- I'm going to make this -- but the 20th and then we count the 20th as one of the three days. I think she's advocating for the 21st, 22nd, and 23rd being full clean days. The problem with that is then we would have the 24th, which would be the day to take another vote except we couldn't do that because it is an act to be performed and is also on a holiday, which is then not a day as defined in the statute. So we have -- we run into that problem.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well --

MR. PANE: So, but is it a problem at that point? Because can we do that on the 27th?

MR. PANE: Well, I'm just --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That -- that's the question --

MR. PANE: Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- because --

MR. PANE: So I think I guess what I wanted to do
is just for -- just for hypothetical purposes when we're counting, because I know there's -- there's plenty of permutations that the Commissioner could go. But what I want to make sure of and what -- what I want to make sure of and I think what Commissioner Andersen was pointing to earlier is because we don't have a defined day as saying a day is 24 hours, a conservative approach is to make sure there's always a three-day gap --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right.

MR. PANNE: -- a seven-day gap, a 14-day gap. Any time they're referring to it there "clean days" where you're not sharing it with another act, another vote, and then there's no ambiguity to worry about that that is in -- and that's a more conservative approach.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: All right. We are up against a break at 2:30, a 15-minute mandatory break. I see a whole bunch of hands, so we'll definitely come back and -- and talk through all of these comments.

The first person I'm seeing in that lineup thought is Alvaro. Alvaro, we have about four or five minutes. Do you want to make your comment at this point? Yeah. Perfect. Thanks.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Sure. It's a very short comment. I just want to suggest or recommend to the Commission for those days after the 12th that we have scheduled
continuously from the 15th through the 24th that the
Commission consider making those virtual.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Are you suggesting in the rest
of November and all of the entirety of December?

MR. HERNANDEZ: I was suggesting pre-
Thanksgiving. Thereafter, I think there's some room for
that.

And that would be part of that public comment period, so I
think -- I think that's -- we will leave that to the
subcommittee to take on that comment. I hope you're taking
notes.

Commissioner Fornaciari, would you have time in
the time before break?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I went the wrong way.
Yes. Now I forgot what I was going to say. You know, I --
I feel like the soldier in the comedy movie when
everybody's in a line and they say we need volunteers and
everyone steps back except for me and my colleague.

And anyway, so I think -- and just back to the
12th, it's not just the Commissioners, right? It's all the
staff and -- and the videographers that are going to be
traveling with us at the behest of the line drawing team.
So, you know, I mean there'd be a whole lot of people
sitting around for a couple of extra days if we don't do
the 12th virtually. So that's -- that's where I'm going at. I'm just not trying to rain on Commissioner Fernandez's parade. Thanks.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: That's fine. Yeah, I think Commissioner Ahmad had just a response to that.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Just really quick. Have you established a formal subcommittee?

CHAIR SADHAWANI: I have not but I would be happy to do so.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Would the two of you like to serve on that subcommittee and do you have a name for it?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Sure.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: No, no, no. I'm all for it. I'm just trying to think of a fun name.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: That's correct.

We are up against a break, so --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: -- I am going to give you 15 minutes to brainstorm, and then we will formalize that subcommittee.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Got it. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: When we come back, because -- why don't we pause here? I see Commissioners Fernandez, Akutagawa, and Ahmad with hands raised, so we will come
back to you in that order when we -- when we return from
break at 2:45. Thank you.

(Off the record at 2:29 p.m.)

(Back on the record at 2:45 p.m.)

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Thank you very much and welcome
back to the Citizen's Redistricting Commission. We are
continuing our discussion on the timeline moving forward.
I know there were several hands raised.

Before we get back to that conversation, for the
Commissioners, I just wanted to remind everyone that
please, by 5 p.m. send your RSVP to Alvaro and/or other
staff members. An email was sent out. Just trying to
collect who's going to be here in Sacramento next week to
make sure that staff can adequately prepare the room and
accommodations for everybody. So please, by 5 p.m., please
be sure to respond.

With that, we will get back to our conversation
about the calendar. We have solidified a target date of
November 10th for draft maps. Again, that is a target. We
acknowledge that November 15th is our final, final, final
date for those draft maps, but that we would like to try
and get those done by November 10th. We were discussing a
little bit about a potential target date for the final maps
before the break and we will pick up where we left off with
Commissioner Fernandez.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I just wanted to throw this -- Chief Counsel Pane, in terms of three days, like let's just say we declare our maps noon on the 20th, then noon on the 23rd is actually three days. Well, in my book in my life of corrections in 24-hour increments, so.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: I think there's no response on there.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I guess I was going to take a little bit more of a conservative approach and just again go back to the range and say what's our best case? You know, if we can by the 17th, because then that would give us the time frames that we need so then if we put out the draft final maps on the 17th, then using the same logic then by the 22nd, that would be the third day. The 23rd is when we vote. That would be the most conservative although I really didn't quite hear the answer as to whether or not if we vote on the 27th is that, I guess I'm going to say, safe for us? Or do we have to have voted before the 27th and then transmit on the -- before the 27th? Because I think that's the big question mark.

And then if that's the case, then, you know, maybe that the 17th is going to be the -- is the last possible time frame that we can actually submit it. And we might even have to look at an earlier date than that.
MR. PANÉ: Commissioner Akutagawa, are you -- I missed the last part of the 24th or the 27th, please.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So, okay. So Commissioner Andersen said, okay, we, let's just say, put out the draft final maps on the 20th, right? So then using the same logic that you're talking about, that's the 21st, 22nd, 23rd. We can't vote on the 24th, 25th, of 26th, so the 27th would be the next possible date that we, as a Commission, could actually vote to finalize the maps and then transmit it to the secretary of state. Is that considered still within the limits of the time frame that we could submit those maps? Do -- so in other words, if we vote on the same day that we transmit it, is that okay or is that considered late?

MR. PANÉ: So the -- the last piece of this is the waiting period from the final, which is the three days.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

MR. PANÉ: If we have that, that's -- there's no -- there's no other waiting component. So you could theoretically -- so to answer your question, yes, because you can do the certification -- there's no waiting period for the certification.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So then if we say, okay, yeah, then we put out the draft maps on the 20th and then we do the three days, which is the 21st, 22nd,
23rd, and then we vote on the 27th, which is the day the maps are due --

MR. PANE: So let me -- let me just clarify because I want to make sure I have that right. When you say vote on the 20th, are we talking about the final maps?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Well, I mean I guess no, I'm not saying we vote, but we put the draft of the final, final maps. Right? And then we have three days to do final comments --

MR. PANE: Well --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- is my understanding?

MR. PANE: So you'd vote for the final display.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MR. PANE: You'd wait three days.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Three days, yes.

MR. PANE: And then you could certify.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, on the 27th. We vote to certify on the 27th. Right?

MR. PANE: Ri -- so there's one time frame that you're describing which is you'd vote on the 20th. You're going to wait at least the three days --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MR. PANE: -- which is the minimum.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MR. PANE: Right? You can wait more --
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

MR. PANE: -- which I -- which is what's happening in your scenario where we're waiting more than the three days, which is fine.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: We're -- no, we're still meeting the minimum because it's three days, right? That'd be the 21st, 22nd, 23rd; 24th, 25th, 26th don't count for us because it's a holiday and a weekend.

MR. PANE: So -- so let me clarify that point.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

MR. PANE: So let me pull up the map requirement sheet. This is going to sound like a long-winded answer, so I apologize. But I think it's worth going through it. So the -- the -- on number 9 where it says day means a calendar day within which an act is to be performed, okay? Day means a calendar except that if a final day of a period within which an act is to be performed is one of these, then it's the next one. Right? So we have at least three days in the hypothetical that you've put out there. So we'd have the final on the 20th.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Mm-hmm.

MR. PANE: We'd have at least three days that qualify under this definition of a day.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Mm-hmm.

MR. PANE: And then we'd certify.

MR. PANE: So that's perfectly --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And that's perfectly, okay. That's what I wanted because I know Commissioner Andersen asked the same thing but I don't think we got a clear answer on that. So I mean worst-case scenario is that then we -- we vote on the final maps on the 20th but if we want to really do best case scenario perhaps the 17th is that other alternative as well, too. So like between the 17th and the 20th like that Friday the 17th is like maybe like -- if we can get it out earlier, we -- we try for the 17th, that Friday the 17th. But worst-case scenario is going to be Monday the 20th. That gives us the minimum amount of time to give the three full days, not three 24-hour days, but three full days, of -- of the time for the public comment to occur before we -- we vote to certify the maps on the 27th.

MR. PANE: So --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Maybe I'm using the wrong words, but we vote on the 27th essentially?

MR. PANE: Yeah. So I think what your count -- your hypothetical works fine because you have to have three days that satisfy the definition of how they define day --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

MR. PANE: -- after the final vote and then you'd
have the certification.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So the --

MR. PANIE: Then you'd have --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- 20th is the latest possible that we could do a vote for the final maps and still meet all of the other requirements, legal requirements for the display and everything like that?

MR. PANIE: So when -- now you've -- so you've said the latest, so I'm going to see what the latest

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Do you want to respond to that or?

CHAIR SADHAWANI: I'm going to let Commissioner Turner just respond and get -- yeah.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Just let me get it out. Because I recall us saying that certification can happen the same day. So in the scenario that Commissioner Akutagawa's given, if we were to present final maps on the 20th, the three days would be the 23rd and they can be certified on the 23rd because there's -- there's three full days.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think that was the question mark. Whether or not that really counts as the third full day.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Because if we -- we certify even say by five on the 20th or three, or whatever,
say four o'clock on the 20th, we'd have to the 21st, 22nd, 23rd at four and then if we'd still certify, still be that same day certification.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, and I think that's why I'm questioning that because is it 24 hours like Commissioner Fernandez said or is it like this other squishy three days? And I think that's why I was just proposing then, if we vote on the 27th, then we're very clear. Right? This is the most -- clearest way that we gave three -- three full days instead of --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Or Marion.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- does that make sense?

That's why --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I don't know. I think are the splitting hairs things but I think we have to be really clear about which one it is because I don't want us to be like told that you did not give enough time. And then one last comment that I'll make is I do support the idea of virtual meetings, by the way, for the public comment because if we're just taking in public comment, I don't see the need to have to be here together. I also support what Executive Director Hernandez said about the 12th. It is kind of a weird where you have to like -- are you just going to hang out on that Veterans Day? You know,
so anyways.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Very good. Thank you so much. Marion, Marion did you want to weigh in on the calendar dates?

MS. JOHNSTON: What is it -- the way the 2010 Commission interpreted it, the three-day at the end is for public comment to be received. So that even if you've voted on the final maps, if something comes in that changes your mind because of those extra three days of comment, you could still convene on the 27th to make a change.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Would you -- would you need an additional three days though if you make a change?

MS. JOHNSTON: No, because you've put them up for display for three days and then you -- after that days they'd be finalized then.

MR. PANÉ: Yeah, yeah. So I think that's -- I think Marion is -- is describing maybe the interpretation from the 2010 Commission. I don't doubt that's probably what they -- you know, how they interpreted it. I think if the 2020 Commission were to take a similar approach, I think there is at least a possibility that you run into the loop that Commissioner Fernandez highlighted a few meetings ago that you do leave yourself -- the Commission leaves itself open to the possibility of saying now we need to have -- that wasn't a final. And so we need three days
after a final and then you kind of keep having the loop of
a constant final three days.

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, if you're worried -- if
you're worried about that, you could put the public maps up
for display without taking a vote on them, but the three
days doesn't have anything to do with the vote. It's for
the display. But there's no point in having three days for
public comment unless the comment is going to be
meaningful.

MR. PANE: I would agree.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: I feel like the -- I see so
many hands raised, so I want to be respectful of everyone,
but at the same time I do think this is a -- kind of a
pertinent piece that we need to sort out.

Are the hands raised specific to this piece or on
a secondary component? Okay.

Commissioner Fornaciari on this piece?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I'm going to
open up a can of worms here, but --

It's on. I'll just look at it when I talk.

I mean the way I read day, well, I'll read day.

So day means calendar day except if the final day of the
period within which an act is performed is a Saturday,
Sunday, or holiday. So technically, the last day we could
-- we could post the maps is the 23rd, right? So we have
MR. PANE: Because you're not -- because an act is not being performed on this --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Because an act isn't being performed. So the reason we are proposing the 20th is to enable the public to have time to provide feedback not over a holiday. Okay. So I just -- just want to have that clarity there. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Commissioner Fernandez, I think you had something to bring to this point?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: As much as this pains me to say, I agree with Commissioner Fornaciari right now. I'm just kidding. No, but Commissioner Akutagawa had mentioned earlier the --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: 17th.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- the 17th. So actually, if we did display it the 17th, we could certify the 21st.

MR. PANE: Correct.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Or we could actually make an amendment or draw new maps and we would still have time to then post a final, another final and have three days. But I still agree with Commissioner Fornaciari as well. So thank you.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: So, Commissioner Fernandez, am
I hearing a push for a target date of December 17th?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Me personally, it would make sense if we're not going to have to second draft, it would make sense to push for December 17th because that does give us one more chance -- does that make sense, to try to capture -- because honestly if -- if we have three days to receive public comment and receive public comment and we don't do anything because we're down to the wire, then I don't know. The 17th or the 20th, I guess either day would work. Yeah.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Commissioner Turner, and then I saw Commissioner Kennedy, and I know Commissioner Andersen also wanted to get in on this -- this train, and then we'll go back and I know Commissioner Ahmad's been waiting on another --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Commissioner Fernandez, I understood you to say the 17th would give us to the 21st? Okay. So you're counting three days. I'd like to know the difference in the 20th than to the 23rd. It's the -- it's the same. It's three days.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So, uh, so from the 17th -- I'll answer it. From the 17th --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sorry.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: That's okay. So the difference -- well, if you went by what my definition is,
if my definition is noon on the 17th, then by noon on the 20th you could actually have another set of maps. But of course our chief counsel's asking us to be conservative, so I'm going with the 21st to insure that we provide three days because I'm very respectful of our advice. And I heard snickering, so I'm going to avoid that for now. Does that make sense?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: So you're counting weekends. And, so I can turn my mike off, I don't support the 17th.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Got it. Okay. Thank you for that.

Okay. Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I had lowered my hand, but I will take the opportunity to say that I would be happy to --

CHAIR SADHAWANI: I thought you might.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I -- I -- because Commissioner Fornaciari basically said what I was going to say, but I'll take the opportunity since you're kind of taking -- getting a sense of the Commission, I would -- I would be very happy with a target date of the 20th knowing that, you know, if we needed to stretch it out as late as the 23rd, we could. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHAWANI: Thank you for that.
Commissioner Andersen, did you still want to get in there?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you. Just a -- just a couple things. Yes. From the legal -- like because I do have my screen shared, the legal drop-dead on yellow, you know, here's the 27th for -- to certify, here's the 23rd, so -- and the 20th is the proposed -- the -- to declare maps final, voting and declaring. I do have a quick question for counsel. Do we actually vote to certify or it is -- once we vote final the time lapses and then we certify?

MR. PANÉ: So the statute doesn't (indiscernible).

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you for that.

Commissioner Andersen, did you still want to get in there?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you. Just a -- just a couple things. Yes. From the legal -- the -- which -- because I do it with my screen shared, the legal drop dead are in the yellow. You know, here's the 27th to certify; here's the 23rd. So -- and the 20th is the proposed the -- to declare maps filed voting and declaring.

I do have quick question for counsel: Do we actually vote to certify, or is it once we vote final the
time lapses and then we certify?

MR. PANE: So the statute doesn't exactly tell the Commission the process for the certification, but here's why I'd recommend we vote for a certification: because I believe the process between the waiting period and the final is in case the Commission wants to make further changes. So to simply let the clock run might have that effect, but you don't know what -- the Commission hasn't acted on any sort of -- on any public comment that's happened in the last three days. And I believe you want something concrete that you can point to to say this is a certification. And even if it is simply an adoption of the final maps that you just voted on three days' prior, that's the point in time we would point to for the secretary of state. You want something formal for a certification.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you. And then the three-day thing, I just want to do a little more clarification because I just sort of rushed through that. In contract law for -- like, say you're a state contract, you know, for construction, say, and for bidding purposes. And you have a five-day bid protest, and this is something that's well-known. People go, those five days were in violet. They cannot be part of one day on the first day and part of something on the fifth day.

You post up, you know, this is the guy who won
the bid. Great. Then the next day starts day 1. And those have to Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday. It can't be a holiday or anything like that. And only after those five days are done, gone, 5 p.m. on the last day, only then, the next day, can you do anything.

And so since that is kind of a legal standard out there, it's a conservative standard, I really want us to adhere to that because someone could say, Well, well, you have -- oh, you know, sure you can do noon on this day, and then it's three days of noon and boom, there -- it's okay. If someone says you don't have three total days separate, we can get in trouble.

So that's why I proposed the 20th, and then we certify -- you know, I have it down here as the 24th, which automatically would kick it to the 27th. But I just want to clarify that because we've talked around about it a little bit at a time. I just want to make really clear that is a standard that's out there that people know about. And again, this would be in case someone really did not like something about our map and wanted to find a place to pick us on. I don't want it to be this.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good. So the proposal here is target date November -- excuse me -- December 20th for the final maps to be displayed and certified on December 27th.
Okay. I see a number of hands, so I'm going to go back to those. Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to circle back about our subcommittee meeting, which is not going to be as interesting as I was hoping. Actually, it's interesting to me, so I would like to propose that it's called the Draft Map Feedback Subcommittee. And Commissioner Fornaciari and I would love to serve on that subcommittee.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good. Thank you. So in my capacity as Chair, I will establish the Draft Map Feedback Subcommittee. Very innovative title. Thank you very much for that, and we will include you on future agendas. And I think you have your work cut out for you. So thank you so much for taking this on.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah. And just so that I can communicate with Commissioner Fornaciari and you all can listen in, I think what we have to do is put together a short proposal of what the meeting will look like, and then potentially touch base with the line drawers to see if there's anything that we need to consider. But I'm thinking maybe it's something very similar to how our COI input meetings were held. So, we'll connect on getting something. And hopefully we can get something back by next week. Yes? Next business meeting.
CHAIR SADHWANI: That sounds incredible. I so appreciate you taking on that. And it looks like Marcy is very excited about that as well. I am sure she will be a great partner in helping advancing this work as well. Sounds like Fredy wants to get in on this, too. I don't know. I'm just offering that up there.

(Laughing)

CHAIR SADHWANI: What was that?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I think we should just keep moving.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: You're shooting for the 7th. Very good. Very good. So we will look forward to having that update for the 7th.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair.

A question for counsel about the certification:

Could we take a vote on it -- if this all goes well, could we take a vote on the 20th on the set of maps to display, the final maps, and then also vote to certify them if there are no further changes? That way, we would not have to meet on the 27th.

MR. PANE: So, Commissioner Yee, to your point, it sounds like what you're -- maybe you're hypothetically proposing is like an alternative? Sort of like a one-vote
assuming no changes?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. Just -- yeah.

MR. Pane: The, the hesitancy against that is it -- I think there's an argument that could be made that you -- that the Commission is not thoughtfully considering the public comment period that -- for those three days, it's almost as if we're not really paying attention to it. So I can appreciate the fact that we'd all have to come back around again to formalize it.

One point that I would want to highlight: It is going to be important for purposes of enactment and effective dates to really be able to point to an exact certification date and time. So I think that is something we probably don't want to open ourselves up to any skirting of any sort of vote on that. Even if we could do it in sort of the alternative, I think we want to take Commissioner Andersen's earlier point. I think we want to make sure that it's not all -- we wouldn't want to risk all for naught, at least towards the end.


CHAIR SADHWANI: Maybe we can have some sort of incentive for the 27th when we come to certify. I have heard that Commissioner Fernandez makes excellent holiday tamales.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Oh. Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: More than happy.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'll make a note.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No. You have to super, super, super majority for that.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: All right. I know it feels like we're beating a dead horse here, and I shouldn't even say that, probably. But I just want to -- I still want to just come back to these dates.

So first off, I guess, Chief Counsel Pane, I have a question for you. On your map requirements document, number 6 says, Final maps will need to be displayed by December 24th. Taking into account the public comment period of three days. Right?

The 27th -- you know, given what we've been talking about, it seems like a little squishy there, too. Which is, I just wanted to point that out that it -- it -- I guess my question is, yeah, to what Commissioner Andersen had said, it should probably be to the 23rd, I assume. And then also, that was where I was asking, I was also, now I'm confused because what Commissioner Andersen said about, like, you know, the
holidays and the weekends don't count in this case.

Then according to this, then it can't be the 24th or even the 23rd because technically the 24th, 25th, 26th don't count. Is that correct?

MR. PANE: So, Commissioner Akutagawa,
on -- remind me if I don't answer all of the parts. I'll try to get to the first part, which is the 24th, on number 6. So it says it will need to be displayed by December 24th, and that's still technically accurate. The 23rd would be by the 24th. It's just -- the 24th isn't a possibility on the day of.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

MR. PANE: That's all. So we -- I certainly could change that to the 23rd. The difference is it's a technical versus effective. I mean, I think the effective application is by the 24th. Because the 24th is not a possibility, because it's a holiday, it effectively means the 23rd. But, technical, by the 24th is also another way of putting it.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I get it. Yeah. The technically. Right?

MR. PANE: Right. Right. So I absolutely can change that to the 23rd if we wanted to.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It might be clearer for everybody who might be reading it in the public. But then
that also means, then, that -- that technically, then, in this case from a public comment period, the weekends do count. Is that true?

MR. PANE: Thank you. So that -- so that other point, if we look to number 9, and Commissioner Fornaciari had mentioned that previously, the date -- we count the days. We just don't count them if it's a day in which an act is to be performed. So the holiday, the 24th, counts as a day --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: For public comment. But it's not one in which we could actually take a vote.

MR. PANE: Exactly. So --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And -- and that's what I wanted to just be clear about because I think the public comment period time is important. And I heard what you said, I think it was in response to Commissioner Yee, that we will take a vote up to a certain point, but we also do so knowing that we will listen to -- and if there is something compelling in the public comment that we all as a body decide we need to really listen to and take into account and make an adjustment before we finalize or certify the maps, no later than the 27th. Then that's something that -- what we're doing is leaving ourselves open to that period.

I want to just go back to -- and I heard what,
Commissioner Turner, you said about not supporting the 17th. I think I would -- in the vein of let's aspire, maybe, that we could do that. Because I do like the kind of the framing that Commissioner Fernandez said about if we do the 17th through the 20th or 21st, right, that gives us the three days, that's kind of like a little bit of a way to get that second draft squeezed in there without it really being a second draft. I don't want to call it that because that's not really what it is, but it is an opportunity where if in that three-day period we get public comment that we do need to make adjustments, then we have that additional time to make further -- but if we can't -- I mean, that's just aspirational. I guess I'll just say that.

But that worst case scenario, we go for the 20th. That it seems like most people are comfortable with, which I would be fine with, but aspirationally, if we could -- I know that it's going to be challenging, but if aspirationally maybe we could go with the 17th, it would give us that additional opportunity to perhaps hear some additional feedback and make some additional adjustments without being so up against a timeline that we're just going to, you know. I just don't want us to get sloppy, either, because we're rushing. So that's my -- I guess, my thought about that range. So thank you.
CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you for that.

Commissioner Sinay?

CHAIR SADHWANI: Oh. No problem.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Yeah. Just wanting to respond to that. I think we're -- it feels to me like we're still doing a lot of guessing or supposing. I don't feel like -- because we keep wanting to put subsequent dates just in case, which says that even though we keep getting a response from counsel, we're not settled in that date. Because it seems -- feels to me like we're still making allowances for "if it's not this," "If it's by contract," "if it's by the end of the day," etc. And in so doing, we're cutting out time just in case.

And I think this is -- we have a boatload of work to do. We know that we didn't get the extension we wanted. We are looking for public comment. And I do feel that we're rushing and short-changing the other end because we're not -- have a conclusive response or a definite kind of feel of what the end part is and so our answer is let's cut more days out.

And I just -- I'm not supportive of that. I feel that if indeed we had a definitive this has to be done by the 17th because is how the dates are going to be counted and this is when we -- that's one thing, is what I'm
hearing -- is what it's feeling like to me, which is why I'm not supportive of the 17th. Because what I thought I heard last is that we were confident that the 20th would give us the days that's required, and we would be able to certify by the 27th. And I think those extra days will help us be more concrete and feel good and solid about whatever we're presenting, and we would have had plenty of public comment. There's always time for more, but I don't want to lose the extra days on that end for -- in hopes that we're being careful and cautious for something on the back end.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you. I want to just insert myself here. I'm sorry, Commissioner Fernandez. I just saw you raised a hand there.

But I would agree with you on that, Commissioner Turner. My sense is the 20th -- there's a real reason for it, right, given all of the dates: the holidays, the weekend, etc. That means -- if we set the 17th, we're cutting out the opportunity to work on the 18th and 19th, which we might -- we might need those days. Right? I mean, those might be all-nighters, in fact. We won't look at staff when we say that. But it might be -- those might be very long days.

And my sense is -- and I've never gone through this process, but my sense is once we get -- none of have,
but -- once we are getting close to final maps, slight changes in one area might throw off a whole lot of things. So better to take that time to get it right. Of course, we're going to allow those three days. Unless there's something glaringly concerning that we have missed, I don't actually see us making major changes after those three display days because, you know, changing a matter of two or three census blocks could throw off the entirety of the -- of a state map. And I -- you know, I think I would support the December 20th target date.

Commissioner Andersen, did you want to jump in on that real quick?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I just realized, the three days usually nothing happens, but sometimes what happens is -- yeah, I know. Second time.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's only happened once.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. That's true. But what -- what -- I remember now a discussion. I'm not exactly sure what -- it was with the line drawers, exactly whom the conversation was with -- but, it's -- say like you do post the maps, but for some reason, one of them, like the line bled into the other line. Like that kind of thing. That's the only reason when you might actually -- you have to make this little change before you certify. It's not a consequential change, but it could be
a little change. And that's -- that was the three days. I remember that that was kind of thinking as someone was walking me through what the thinking was for those three days.

CHAIR SADHWANI: So it's almost more clerical errors.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Exactly. A clerical error.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm fine with the 12/20 day, but I also -- I mentioned it earlier. It's a calendar and it's a fluid calendar. We don't know how swiftly we're going to go through it -- and there's no laughing by Director Kaplan at this point. And it might take us a long time. It may not take us a long time. But I also -- if there's a possibility at some point to maybe display the maps earlier, then I would -- I would suggest that we do that instead of saying, oh, we've got a couple days off. Right? So I just want to be open to that. But yes. Definitely the 20th. That's kind of like our target. We need to get it in by that date. I agree. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good. I think that we have some conclusions, then, here. Target date for draft to maps being November 10th. Target date for final maps
December 20th. And of course, we can always
(indiscernible—simultaneous speaking.)

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'm also hearing add the
particular homework days on the calendar. So the couple of
days that we don't have homework, they're actually -- you
know, we actually can relax. So I appreciate that. Those
are the couple things I heard. And I'm going to try to do
my best to get this calendar a little more legible for, you
know, these are line drawer activities, Commission
activities. So I thought that --

CHAIR SADHWANI: I think that sounds great.
Yeah. Thank you so much, Commissioner Andersen for your
work on this, and for that -- for the follow up that I know
that you're going to do.

I'm very excited, also, for our new subcommittee
to take on the -- take the charge of the public comment
component, as well.

Commissioner Andersen, do we have anything more
on the Line Drawing Subcommittee at this point?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Just one little
thing was the -- you know, the phase document. As the Line
Drawing Subcommittee, you know, putting the schedule
together was the highest priority. So that's what we've
been sort of working on, and then we'll get back to the
actual how's of what things are happening, which we'll
probably bring back on the 7th because we'll be jumping
into -- and as we see how the 4, 5, and 6 go, it'll be a
lot more -- it'll be more concrete. And I think that
document is going to actually make a lot more sense. So I
just wanted to mention that as the other item.

And -- and we'll also try to make sure as of this
day, this is what for the Commission, for also for the
public, in terms of what areas of maps we're going to try
to work on and what days. Because I know the public gave
us feedback about that. They really appreciated it, and
we'll get better participation, I think, if we can get that
done, too.

CHAIR SADHWANI: The only other thing I wanted to
add in terms of the -- from the Line Drawing Subcommittee
report for next week -- I did raise this earlier, but I
just wanted to flag it in case there was any comment. The
intention that we have discussed thus far is that we
open -- these are not business meetings. These are line
drawing sessions. The visualizations will be posted 24
hours in advance of discussing them, which means the L.A.
visualization will be posted on the 23rd -- excuse me, on
the 3rd of October. The dates are all kind of squishing
around here in my brain -- on the 3rd of October.

We will discuss it on the 4th, but when we open,
the intention is not to take public comment until the end
of the third day. And the through process there was that what we don't want to have happen is a COI input meeting during out line drawing sessions. We value input. We want to get public input, but what we don't want is four hours of public input like we had in our COI input sessions because it would limit our opportunity to actually do the work.

I just wanted to make sure that we were all on the same page with that. It is not trying to, you know, limit the public from weighing in on the visualizations. And instead, I think the message certainly should be Take a look at the visualizations. Send us e-mails. We will be reading them. And, you know, Fredy from the communications team, just making sure that those communications that are written to use are being posted so that everyone is aware of whatever might be coming in at that point in time.

Is there a general agreement that that is an approved way to proceed?

The other piece on that is waiting until the very third day. We contemplated, also, after each section. So for example, we cover Los Angeles and take public comment on it. That's going to open a whole another can of worms. We're going to want to go back to Los Angeles, fix it in a million different ways. Instead, if we're waiting until the third day, keep it in your mind, bring it back next
week, right, the following week when we come back to do our
second set of visualizations. So that was kind of the
thought process there. So I just wanted to lay that out
for folks and make sure we're all kind of comfortable with
that approach.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. It's just for
clarification again. So I -- I'm fine with the 20th. I
like that. So then should there be public comment -- this
is going to be kind of within those three days. That's
going to kind of serve as that second round of comments,
especially. And then if we have to make changes, is that
then when we're going to put out revised maps, on the 24th,
to be voted upon on the 27th?

CHAIR SADHWANI: Oh. I think we're -- I think
maybe -- the public comment piece is still next week.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No, no. I'm sorry. I'm
going back to -- yeah.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Oh. You're going back to --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'm going back to
just -- yeah.

CHAIR SADHWANI: December 20th?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. You moved on
before I could comment. Yeah.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Oh. I'm so sorry.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

CHAIR SADHWANI: So remind me of your question one more time about December 20th.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It's about the dates. December 20th. So I'm fine with that, but if people make comment -- if we get comment that is substantive and we decide we're going to make changes. So then we revise the maps, and then we have to redisplay them again no later than the 23rd. Right? Because the 24th is technically a holiday.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Andersen, did you want to respond to that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Remember, they -- the public can give public comment all the way through the process. And we'll be doing live line drawing. So for them to all of a sudden say -- I expect we will get comments in. That it be substantive, it's like, Where have you been? I mean -- and it would have to be -- no, I shouldn't say that.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: But remember, this is only -- I mean, but we've only done draft of the map. And what if there is something that people are like, you know, people are like, You got it wrong. You weren't listening to us. You got it wrong?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I definitely want to do a
second-draft map, and the time to do that isn't really there. You know, unless -- you know, if I can share again -- actually, I might just do that just really quickly because this is going to come up.

CHAIR SADHWANI: As you're finding those, I just want to also note there are going to be people that don't like the maps that we come up with. And my sense is, though, throughout the next two months, we're going to have a sense of what those trade-offs are. And at least amongst the 14 of us, we're going to have to come to terms with some of the trade-offs. Right? We each might not get our own areas as we wanted to see them, but my hope is that by our target date, you know, we'll have some peace with the trade-offs that we've made.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, and it's not -- and I don't think I'm talking about those trade-offs. I mean, I understand that that's what's going to happen, but if for -- I'm just thinking hypothetically, like, we just get somebody that just says, There is a glaring mistake. And what if we just didn't see it until that last -- you know, until we put it out on the 20th? What are we going to do? How do you want to do this? That's what I'm asking, because I think we need to be prepared for that, too. Or are we just going to say, You know what? Look. This is the compromise. This is the
trade-off. This is it. Too bad.

MR. PANE: Commissioner Akutagawa, are you asking more of a policy question on that, or --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think it's a combination of both, probably. And I don't know if right -- I mean, I think that's why, I think, I'm just trying to understand these dates. Like, it's great that we have these dates, but now we're down to a final time. We don't have any more space. And so given that we don't have any more space and this is it, then these -- I don't know if the time is now. And maybe this is also for our new subcommittee to talk about? I don't know if that really falls within them or it's a line drawer question about what happens in that time frame. That for whatever reason, we have our blind spots, and we just didn't see something and somebody just says, You really got it wrong. And they compellingly, you know, say, I've been trying to say this. You haven't listened, but this is something. And then we finally see it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. I might jump in here. This could happen if we put out a second-draft map the way that you're spinning it.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: No. I understand that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: In which case, you know, we can look at what can we do. In three days, could
you -- it would have to -- I mean, theoretically, could you
work and basically redo all the maps, 176 of them? You
know. I don't want to speak for the line drawers on that
because we'd have to give them direction. That would be
very, very hard, very, very hard, which is why you try to
get the public input all the way along. And, you know,
even if we -- because we did look at, say, if you try, I've
shared by calendar.

You know, I originally was hoping to do one on
the 10th, and then we'd get public input for the seven days
of the 17th. You know, I think I just quickly went through
that. If -- assuming we had this week to finish. Because
basically, to do -- to incorporate, you have to have the
public input of the seven days, right, if you do a draft
map. And then you try to incorporate anything you've got
to review at all, and incorporate it, which means we have
to give the line drawing directions. And it's hard when
you say, Okay. I really like this. How do we
incorporate --

I'm just not quite sure what --

(Audio feedback and technical discussion.)

Okay. Basically, to try to incorporate the
information, give the instruction to the line drawers, Now,
let's redo this and come out with a different scenario,

once we've done a full-draft map and then try to second-
draft map, and then incorporating the changes requires a lot because at that point you're -- imagine a puzzle piece because it's the easiest thing to imagine. And you're taking out two puzzle pieces and you want to put them in of a different size. You can imagine what you have to do with the rest of the puzzle. You kind of have to -- and so you it isn’t as -- it isn't as easy as it is in our visualization process. And so we sort of run out of time.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I know. I think that’s why I wanted to just ask the question. And better that we address, at least think about it now. Because I know we’re not going to be able to make everybody happy, and I understand that. But I think we -- I do believe that it does at least warrant some kind of conversation.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Actually, Commissioner Akutagawa, I appreciate you bringing this up. From the whole commissioners, I want all of the commissioners to think about this. I want the public to think about this. We want the public participation now, along this way. If you have an idea that you like, that you don't like, speak up. Please send it to the Commission. You know, go to www.wedrawthelines.org. Please submit these ideas because we want to hear them now, because we want to incorporate them now. We want to address the pros and cons early.
And so I really appreciate you bringing this up because this is a -- this would be a huge concern. Please don't wait and think, Oh. I'll wait to the end. Please jump in now. And I appreciate you bringing that up.

CHAIR SADHWANI: All right. I see a number of hands. We'll go to Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair. Two things: One, quickly, just to note that Commissioner Andersen mentioned earlier the line drawing phase is planned. Just to note that that's what we're calling Attachment Number 2 to the mapping playbook. So when it comes out, you'll know where that fits.

Concerning the three-day period, I'm thinking of it as serving two purposes. One is to offer a real and legitimate opportunity for any final comments that could possibly and remotely alter the maps. So if at that point somebody offered something compelling that really undoes a puzzle that we'd all been struggling with and never really were totally happy with, and now we see it in a flash of inspiration, you know, that it would be theoretically possible to change that and make everyone happier. Fairly unlikely. Let's hope all the good work that goes up to that point, but it could be possible. And a real possibility. We don't want to even imply that that's not a real possibility.
The more likely, I think -- you know, it's the last chance for people to have their say. And even people who know there's basically no chance that we'll draw the maps in a certain way to be below opposition, to have your say, that's important in a democracy. Right? And even if there's zero chance that you're going to change the maps, to be able to go on record -- you know, I want to hear those comments, and this is the chance for us to hear them. So that's more likely, and I think that's what the three days will serve.

But if the first one does happen, then the 20th does give us, you know, a legitimate, legally defensible opportunity to make those changes and still make the 27th.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you.

Director Kaplan?

DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Thank you. I just wanted to highlight the comment about at the end of the three-day series will be time for public comment that we make sure to include that in an updated description or calendar that you're going to be creating, and even provide a narrative to this document so that that's clear on the website. Everyone knows each week what's happening, how we're doing the zones, if possible, when is the time for input, what is that input that we want so that you can get, and the outreach team can really push this message of here's how to
participate now early and here's what's happening. And I think even with that comment at the end of the third day, we can also highlight, "Here's the recording. On Monday we talked about Zone A if you want to go back and listen to it." On Thursday is when we're going to taking comments on this so that we can be pushing that message also. So as clear as this can be in a final version. And we can work with you on that, too.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Got it. And I think we're going to finalize that plan on Friday, and then we'll send it over to you and post it on the website as well.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. I think I just wanted to say I'm really anxious to start drawing lines. I think for sure that work -- and this conversation drives all of us to be very much so in tune, focused, ensuring that we're recalling all of the testimony that we've received.

I appreciate Commissioner Andersen's call and reminder out to the public to make sure you're commenting now because after -- and I appreciated the analogy that she used about puzzle piece and all of those piece parts because once we get down to the three days, I think it's very unlikely that there will be a lot of changes at that moment.

And so I wanted to just say that again, and it's
the unspoken piece of the work. And so we've worked on
this, not just now, all along, to ensure that we're doing
what we can to include all Californians and hear everyone's
voice and include all of the piece parts. We've built in
some more things today to talk about the research that
we'll get that Commissioner Sinay has done that other
people don't have access to.

So on every front we've talked about how do we
include every piece that we need to. And we're going to do
all of that. And I think by the time we put draft maps out
and allow people to respond to it, I think that
will -- that there will be already a crunch period of
trying to incorporate that and make that happen. And by the
time we get down to those last three days, I think it
really will be a matter of hearing from people and not
necessarily a whole lot of changes that's going to go one.
And that just is the given timeline.

Hindsight is always 20/20. When we finish on the
27th, when we come back from holiday after the New Year,
we're going to be like, "Oh, man. In ten years from now,
we can do something different." Yeah. The time for all of
that is now and we all want to do the best for everyone.

But I think we all need to come to the
understanding that everyone is not going to be happy, much
to our dismay. We want everyone to be happy, but we're
going to set a date, set a line, follow what we have to, whether we think it makes sense or not in these three days in public comment and can't do much with it. It is how everything is outlined. Three days we'll hear the public comment. There can't be a whole lot of change after that time period or the whole thing will be for naught still, and we will have to move forward. And so I just wanted to name that and thank everyone that this is going to encourage them now to give more public comment. Wonderful. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So I'm not sure if we need to do public comment on this one before we go on to something else or if we're just going to do public comment on everything at the end. Because I'm going to a different topic. I'm leaving the map -- the calendar.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Is it a topic that we're agendized for?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, yeah. It's not a big topic.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Is it line drawing related? We are currently still on the Line Drawing Subcommittee.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. It is line drawing.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good. Go ahead.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can we be clear on what's our homework for our next meeting besides -- We know when we're going to put out the visualizations, but should we be re-reading all the COIs to match with those visualizations, and if so -- you know, can we just be -- because I feel a lot of times we're not that clear on how -- on -- yeah. So can we just be clear on our homework between now and next week.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Would you to add that as a homework for our commissioners for next week?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, I would think that if we were -- I mean, that was my main thing --

CHAIR SADHWANI: Sure.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- but I wasn't -- I didn't know if I was right or not right. But my thought would be that we should be re-reading the COIs and looking at the new COIs that have come in. And then when we see the visualizations, we'll be better informed.

I guess, I'm new at this, and so I was just questioning --

CHAIR SADHWANI: We all are.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So that's what I was questioning. I'm like, is that the right homework or am I off?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No. I think that's
entirely appropriate. Right? And so as soon as possible we will get out that finalized schedule of what days we'll be taking on which zones and areas of the state. Certainly, we know Los Angeles is going to go first on October 4, so you can start getting prepped for that, and we will let you know the other days. Again, we're going to coordinate that with the mapping team and make sure everybody -- it fits for everybody in terms of their preparedness.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. One thing I would say is -- actually, thank you for that specific comment to make sure we know exactly what the homework is. The one thing that we should pay attention to is all the new things that do come in because that won't necessarily -- in public comment, as well as public input because those won't have a chance to get into the aired -- into our database. So look at that. Make sure, even, like, you know, the Monday, you know, right before the meeting starts, sort of. And then a review of the COIs, but all input, too. Because remember, soon we'll start getting in not just COI, but we'll be getting in, I want you to do the maps this way. So, I don't know -- Oh. And I don't have a date. We will -- as soon as we get the date for the, you know, the redistricting tool, we'll make sure everyone knows that. So. And thanks for bringing that up. And that's -- we'll
do that specifically for each time frame.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And my second point is: Can we go back to creating the redistricting cheat sheet that we talked about way back in the beginning because there was a lot of new language for us all, and have it online? Because I feel like some of you have spent more time with the VRA lawyers and the line drawers and stuff and used certain language, and I think I know what you mean, but I'm not sure. And I'm sure if I'm feeling that way, the public is feeling it. So if we could -- if we could spend some time -- even silly things like "point contiguously."

Contig -- I was like I think I know that. It's thrown out a lot, but have we ever defined it? And so, you know, just a cheat sheet for everybody. And there might be already one created on someone else's website, and we steal it and create a link to it, but just so that we go back to our promise of that.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Does the Mapping Playbook maybe want to maybe include that as a -- I think some of those are actually -- because there a bunch of terms defined in the Mapping Playbook. I'm wondering if that's maybe Attachment Number 3 that could have a couple additional definitions.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Indeed. I already have half
of what you're describing drafted up.

CHAIR SADHWANI: I kind of had a feeling that you might. Yeah. Perfect. I think that would be great. That would be great. Yeah. And so maybe if you -- if it's possible for you all to bring that next week. I know you're bringing back the rest of the playbook. We're going to finalize that. If it's possible to have that ready by next week, and we can take a look.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And actually, if any of the commissioners have particular words that they are, like, you know, I've always wanted to have that included, please forward to -- well, I don't know. I don't know if we can -- we have to forward it to Alvaro -- forward it to somebody. But, yeah, because I think that's a really good idea.

CHAIR SADHWANI: So from that regard, Anthony helps out with the Mapping Playbook, just to ensure that the definitions are legally sound and appropriate. So if you have specific terminology that you'd like to see defined for the mapping playbook or redistricting cheat sheet as we might want to refer to it, send it to Anthony. He can coordinate it with the subcommittee.

That's all we've got for Line Drawing Subcommittee, and we are at the end of our agenda. So with that -- oh, no. I see. Okay. Commissioner Fernandez,
whatcha got?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: At last week's meeting we had the presentation by Megan Gall. And there were some of us that had questions. We still had our hands up and you said, Oh, can it wait until next week? And it's next week, and then we never got to it. So I did have a few comments on that, and I was hoping that -- I'm not sure when to discuss it, but maybe if information can get sent back to Megan. Can we talk about it now, or do we need to move on, or should I just go home?

CHAIR SADHWANI: Well, did you want to describe our comments or do want to send them via e-mail and get responses? Do you feel like there --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No. It's kind of simple. I don't want to say it's a simple comment. So obviously Megan Gall really knows her stuff, which is great. But I am not an aesthetician and I think -- I think what my -- I don't want to say issue, but concern or whatever you want to say with the presentation is that there were many times that I had to Google some of the words because as most of you know, English is my second language. And although I have a Bachelor's and a Master's degree, and all of us here have a Bachelor's degree and most of have beyond a Bachelor's degree, there's -- what did I Google this morning? Thirty-four percent of those
over 25 have a Bachelor's degree.

What I didn't Google was how many Californians English is a second language. So what I'm trying to get to was her presentation. And as we move into line drawing, I don't want to lose our Californians in terms of the words that we use. And I know early on we made a conscious effort and we're intentional to try to use language as simple as possible, so "ecological regression," "ecological inference," that's what I was Googling. And I thought I had a really good handle on this racially polarized voting, and I came away a little bit more confused than when I went in. So I just want to make sure that we remind ourselves that very few Californians are familiar with a lot of these really technical terms.

And the second piece of it is Megan also mentioned, I may use acronyms for him. Please don't use acronyms for him because that's even worse. I'm going to be like, What was ER? What was EI? What was EI-RxC or whatever? So I was -- I just wanted to bring this back to reminding ourselves that we want to be careful in the words that we use because not very many people are as familiar with his process and with the language that we use in this process and we don't want to exclude people based on the language that we're using. I hope that makes sense. So thank you.
CHAIR SADHWANI: Yeah. That makes a lot of sense, and thank you for raising that.

And, you know, I'm certainly not going to speak for Dr. Gall, but yes, certainly we can get additional clarity on ecological regression and ecological inference. They are two very similar processes. But at the same time, I know we struggled, actually, in talking about that training, about just what level of depth to go into. There was a concern to not -- to not have to go too far down into the rabbit hole of describing Bayesian statistics and statistical modeling. And so I think it was a challenge to figure out how to be comprehensive and yet still be accessible. So I can certainly raise those three terms. If there are other specific terms in particular, I'm happy to pass them on.

And perhaps, you know, she could elaborate on those slides that she had and we could post that to our website as an ongoing reminder or training for folks. I think we do have a training tab on the website, and perhaps we could have that live there so that when we need a reminder about the differences between these terms, these statistical terms, we could have it as a hand reference. Would that be a --?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I appreciate -- that's fine. That's fine. I did go do my own research
afterwards, so I'm okay. I mean, I understand it. I was just more concerned for reaching Californians. And I don't want to discourage them. Right? Like, I don't -- like, I'm just thinking if my mom was listening to this, she would have turned it off after about two minutes. But again, I was also thinking of when we had our public input meetings, Now how are Margarita and Johanna going to explain ecological regression if they had to interpret this?

So I think I was trying to get to like a very basic level. And nothing against Megan because she's absolutely wonderful and I'm so glad that she understands this and is so excited about it, but I just kind of wanted to set that out as a reminder to all of us.

CHAIR SADHWANI: I think that's great.

And Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thanks. I still kind of see that as it was an overview and not a training, and I think we're still using words incorrectly. Because the bottom line was at the end of it I didn't know if it was VRA or not, and I had to ask again. Like, I didn't care so much about the different ways she was interpreting it, and I didn't think that was as important for us to go -- I mean, it was important that there's three different ways. And I thought -- I was waiting for the punch line, which was
— I thought it was going to be if you use this regression, it is a VRA; if you use this one it's not. You know, and there was no punchline. And I was sitting there -- and that's why it took me a while to figure out -- wait; so is it or is it not? And I had to write it down and have a question later.

And so I think we still need to be -- when we agendize things, say, if it's a presentation or a training. And if it is a training, can we switch it so we are actually doing something. Like, they give us the data and we all play with it, and we come back and say, Hey, based on this, that will, you know, even if we're wrong, but at least we're playing with it, versus talking at us. We've talked at a lot, and I think that's why we're getting confused as well. And so -- and again, it's nothing against her.

I think it's just right now we're getting to the beginning. You know, we're going to start line drawing, and we don't always want to depend on others because then we're not doing it.

CHAIR SADHWANI: I think that's really helpful. And I think the good news is I don't think we have any more trainings. Not that I know of.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: That might be the bad news since we're still saying we're not sure what is and what
isn't. So I hate to say that, but it might not be a good news.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, just real quick to add into that, I do think that that will be helpful, and good or bad, I think that's something that maybe even for lessons learned that we'll pay attention to more so going forward. We'll catch as we can this time and ask more questions to ensure that we are at least operating in some expertise based on responses to questions.

And then coupled with that is something that, I think I got pulled away the day that we focused a lot on lessons learned, but along those same lines, I think what we tended to do was to put people with expertise on subcommittees and I in retrospect think that that is a mistake. I think there should be a person with expertise and someone that has farthest away from expertise on the subcommittees so that as conversations are being held, it does us no good if two lawyers are in a subcommittee or people that have law backgrounds are in a subcommittee to determine who to move forward in something that's legal because no one present then has a good clue on how to interpret that information for someone without that expertise. And so I think going forward it's better suited to have someone that has expertise on VRA on a subcommittee
and some that has no clue so that even as the subcommittee is deciding what should be presented and what its training, etc., you'll be able to give kind of a balanced approach so that the entire room and audience will be able to access the information that's being trained. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you for that. Seeing no other comments at this time, we will go to general public comment. Can we -- Chief Counsel Pane put together public comment for this agenda item, as well as general public comment to close out the meeting for the day.

MR. PANE: Yes. Yes, Chair.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Thanks so much. Katie, I see you there.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Here I am. The Commission will now take general public comments for items not on the agenda and for the item number 5, Line Drawing Subcommittee. Correct?

CHAIR SADHWANI: Yes. That's correct.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: To give comment, please call (877) 853-5247, and enter the meeting I.D. number 88264383219 for this meeting. Once you have dialed in, please press star-nine to enter the comment queue. For full call-in instructions are read at the beginning of the meeting and are provided in full on the livestream landing page.
We do not have anyone in the queue at this time, and we will let you know when the instructions are complete.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you very much, Katie.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And we do have a caller in the queue. One moment.

Caller 3818, I do see your hand. If you'll please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star-six, and the floor is yours.

MS. GARNER: Hi, Commissioners. Good afternoon. This is Grace Garner calling from the Black Census and Redistricting Hub. It's good to be with you all today again. I just wanted to find out if you can give us a better sense of what the Commission will be releasing and discussing in open session versus what will be discussed in closed session regarding the racially polarized voting analysis.

And we recognize that the legal counsel is recommending closed sessions because there might be significant exposure to litigation, and of course there's a need to protect attorney work products. However, there's also the competing values of transparency and the public's need for this information to help draw and comment on Section 2 districts. For example, the Black Hub is preparing a number of majority minority districts for its...
submissions last night and that RPV data would be very helpful in our work, as well as our comments on visualizations on district lines. The 2012 Commission did not release all of the VRA expert analyses, but there was a lengthy legal memo, and a 52-page set of attachments that were released and discussed in open session in its mid-July meetings.

We hope that the current Commission would also provide these types of materials and have open discussions to better inform the public. If you can clarify what the Commission intends to release and discuss publicly and when any materials might be released, that would be very helpful. Thank you so much.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you so much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Up next, we have caller with the last four 2829. If you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time, the floor is yours.

MS. WESTA-LUSK: Yes. I have three questions. This is Renee Westa-Lusk. My first question is about the public map input sessions for October 21st through the 23rd. Are those appointments for group presentations or individuals, or both? That's my first question.

My second question has to do with the VRA former district under Section 5. I don't understand why the Commission can't look at those as a starting point to help
them draw the VRA districts that qualify under Section 2. I don't know why that can't be done. And then, the third question I have is if there's not a majority of one minority in an area, and it's made up of three different ethnic minorities, but neither one has a majority, then does that automatically qualify for VRA Section 2, or -- I just wanted to know if that would be considered a Section 2 qualification VRA district. Those are my questions. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you so much for your questions, Ms. Westa-Lusk.

In terms of your first question, those are appointments per submission, so it could be an individual. It could be a group. Whoever wants to make such an appointment can do so and is welcome to do so. And that appointment system is still open, and there are still some appointments available.

We don't have our VRA counsel with us at this point in time, so I don't want to speak without the precision of their legal view. My understanding, however, is under Section 5, those were previously covered counties, including counties such as Kings, Yuba, and Monterey. I believe Merced as well. They are no longer covered, and so Section 2 just simply takes on a different task of thinking about the dilution of the minority vote.
Section 2 existed in the 2010/2011 redistricting process just as it continues to do so here. So those are two separate activities. Those covered counties required preclearance by the Justice Department, which no longer applies in this instance. So our obligations under Section 2 continue to -- you know, we continue to have those obligations. But I'll certainly punt this question to our VRA counsel when they are present to provide a more precise answer.

In terms of your third question, again, I would ask for our VRA counsel's response on this, but in general, this is the purpose of the racially polarized analyses, is to understand what our obligations for Section 2 districts would be, and to see when and where -- if in those instances where you suggest where there may be more than one group that might be covered under the VRA historically excluded minority racial groups to see to what extent they are voting together when they have the same candidate of choice. And that's what the racially polarized voting analysis would help to tell us. But again, I want to leave those for our VRA counsel to weigh in on, and they will certainly be with us in future meetings again. I hope that helps.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We have no other callers at this time, Chair.
CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good. Thank you so much.

And with that, if there's not any final comments
from Commissioners, we will adjourn our meeting.

(Meeting adjourned 4:00 p.m.)
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