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CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission's business meeting. I hope you had a wonderful Thanksgiving and happy Hanukkah. My name is Pedro Toledo and I will serve as your chair for the next series of meetings.

With that, Ravi, please take roll.

MS. SINGH: Thank you, Chair.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: (No audible response).

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Vasquez?

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Here.

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: (In Spanish) Presente.

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.
MS. SINGH: Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: (No audible response).

MS. SINGH: Commissioner Toledo.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Here.

MS. SINGH: You have a quorum, Chair.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

We will start with Director's reports and then be moving on into closed session, and then coming back out of closed session to discuss some of the other agenda items. So with that, let's start with Director's report.

Director Hernandez.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair.

I don't have a whole lot to report today. I did want to share with you that we have received a number of COI -- paper COI submissions from the incarcerated population -- California incarcerated population. I believe, we're over a 1,000 that have come in. And so
they are posted on our website. And so you'll be able to
find them if -- I'll provide you some additional
information. I don't recall the exact -- I think they're
under letters received. So there are actual letters that
have been received. We have staff that are scanning them
in and making sure that they are added into the database.

We have received some additional transcripts that
have just been posted today. So we have that going. And
that's really all, unless there are any specific
questions that you may have. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Any questions of Director Hernandez?

Seeing none, let's move on to Communications report.

Director Ceja.

DIRECTOR CEJA: Thank you, Chair.

Hello, Commissioners. Want to give you a high-level
Communications report today, so that we can get on to the
meatier, more substantial issues today.

We will be working on the December 2021 newsletter.
I believe this will be our final newsletter. So we will
make sure that we put substantial updates to go out this
week. We're at 20,336 inputs on the data page on our
website. Our ethnic media vendor held roundtables with
Black press statewide, Spanish press in San Mateo and
Redwood City, and Arab-American and Vietnamese-American
press in Orange County. So I'll send those reports when
I get them. Our social media vendor started targeting ads to counties to solicit public input in response to our draft maps. So those are starting this week.

And wanted to also throw out the idea of having a press conference the day that we certify the maps at the end of December. Hopefully, at the Capitol steps, I will follow up with the chair for that meeting, to see if we can coordinate that.

I did upload transcripts today for the May 18th, 2021 meeting; the June 9th, 2021 meeting; June 28th, 2021; August 4th, 2021; and August 30th, 2021 meetings. So those are on the website.

And as far as interviews from our last business meeting, we talked to CalMatters, L.A. Times, KTVU TV, KFBK, San -- San Francisco Chronicle, Radio Bilingue. KCRA 3 here in Sacramento, L.A. Times (sic), Fresno Bee, KION News 546, and then Southern California Public Radio. And we got two requests this morning from New York Times and from Bloomberg News. So we'll get those taken care of today.

As far as media mentions, this month -- this week, actually, there were 161 stories mentioning the CRC, the Commission and 414 stories on California redistricting. So it's still a hot issue, and it's still out in the press. And hopefully, these next few weeks it'll
increase even more.

As far as our website contacts are concerned, we have 20,202 contacts in the database. Those numbers continue to increase. We've had 300,000 views of our website and 184,000 visits to the home page alone; that has only been within the past week. So folks are logging on, clicking through our website as well. We had three e-blasts that we sent out, one regarding a public input reminder that got an open rate of twenty-four percent. But then our November 17th through the 20th meetings got a thirty-two percent open rate. And the November 22nd to the 23rd meetings reminder got another thirty-two percent open rate. So folks, like I said, are dialing in and listening to or putting out.

The social media report is posted. Just want to highlight that we are at 2,580 followers on Twitter and we finally hit the one-hundred mark on YouTube subscribers. So our numbers are increasing. And that's a good thing. That's all I have for today.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Do we have any questions for Director Ceja? Seeing none, we'll move on to our Outreach Director's report.

Ms. Kaplan.

DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Hi, good morning, Commissioners --
good afternoon. I'm going to be posting a report shortly, but I just wanted to give some recap of the -- the public input meetings that were held on the draft map feedback.

So there were six days of meetings where the Commission heard from 720 members of the public. Of those, 350 of those were individuals with appointments and 370 were the total without appointments. So there was a good chunk of no-shows through that total. So the 350 total with appointments was not all of the appointments that were made available. I just wanted to highlight that there were four speakers in Spanish that provided input. And of the reports we've retained so far on the listening lines, there were six callers who had listened in for those meetings.

I also just want to highlight that as the Commission decides -- discusses further the plans for the remaining weeks we have in December, I'll be working with the Outreach staff on how we're going to be ensuring that the public is clear on the path -- plan going forward in December, as well as staff support through this process.

So just to also provide a recap on the input meeting, staff supported with notetaking. And so the notes for the public comment from those meetings are in the Airtable database also right now. And we'll continue
to be providing that support for public input that's provided by callers through this process.

And then just to highlight what Alvaro had mentioned for the COI paper form, those are labeled as paper form in the database right now.

And staff are also continuing to provide redistricting presentations, and that'll be posted in the report also. That was it.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Director Kaplan.

Any questions for Director Kaplan?

Seeing none, we'll move on to Chief Counsel Pane.

CHIEF COUNSEL Pane: Thank you, Chair.

Good afternoon, Commission. I actually don't have any updates right now in the legal realm, but happy to entertain -- answer any questions you may have.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Any questions for Chief Counsel Pane?

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: When you have a chance, can we meet in person that new lawyer -- I'm forgetting what his title is -- just because he's been in our meetings, but we haven't --

CHIEF COUNSEL Pane: Sure. Yeah, yeah.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- met him yet. And it would be nice of --

CHIEF COUNSEL Pane: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- nice for him and for us.

CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Sure, I will definitely arrange that. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Any other questions?

Seeing none and since we went through our director reports quite efficiently and effectively, I hope the rest of our meeting is as quick as this. But we'll move into closed session to discuss litigation matters. And before that, we will take public comments. And after that, we will go into closed session to discuss litigation concerns.

Katy --

MR. MANOFF: I -- I can help you with that, Chair.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, thank you, Kristian.

MR. MANOFF: In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the Commission will be taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed. It is 839-6109-6845 for today's meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound.

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

Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream
audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your
call. Once you're 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 some raised hands. Just a moment.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Up first, we'll have caller 2448. And
after that will be caller 8117.

And Chair, would you like us to enforce a two-minute
time limit?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes, two minutes is fine. And the
issues should be pertaining to the -- to the items at
hand.

MR. MANOFF: Understood.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: All right.

Okay. Caller 2448, please follow the prompts to
unmute. Go ahead. The floor is yours.

MR. CANNON: My name is Peter Cannon, C-A-N-N-O-N.
I've called in several times before. Now that you are in the final phase of your duties, this may be the last time you hear from me about the Commission's work.

During the last year, I sincerely appreciated you listening to my thoughts and concerns. Today, I want to draw your attention to one of the essay questions you answered when you first applied to be on the Commission. The question reads,

"Please explain what it means to be impartial and describe your ability to exercise impartiality. Provide examples of times when you had to set aside your personal views in order to achieve a common goal."

I am calling to humbly request that the Commissioners take the time to reflect on your answers to this question before you start your last month of line drawing. Lines must comply with the law, but the law isn't going to tell you how to prioritize between communities.

The hardest place to maintain impartiality will be in the places each of you live. This will be a unique challenge, particularly when there is strong community-of-interest testimony from your own community. As an example of this challenge, are you willing to tell your friends and neighbors as a resident: I absolutely agree
with you, but taking care of our community would have
caused worse outcomes for others, so I had to set aside
my personal view to achieve the common goal. If you are
not to be parochial, partial local --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

MR. CANNON: -- representative, but (audio
interference) California State Commissioners, you must be
blind to and you must put aside any personal, local
interest. Take a moment to remember how you answered the
question about impartiality on your application when you
asked to do this tough, difficult, and challenging job.
It was an act of faith by the people of California to
entrust you to look inwards and act as a Commissioner for
the entire state. Please affirm your ability to make the
difficult choices that come with being.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

And next up, we've got caller 8817.
Please follow the prompts to unmute.
Caller, go ahead.

MR. GATES: Hello?

MR. MANOFF: Hello. We hear you. Go ahead.

MR. GATES: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name
is Chris Gates. I'm a resident of O.C. for around
fifteen years. And I'm calling today urging you to all
please remove Irvine from its current placement in the
district. Irvine does not have anything in common with
the beach cities. It currently is inhabiting a district
with -- and a significant, important that one (ph.).
Irvine's been kept the whole. And too, Irvine does not
belong in the coastal district. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you so much.

And again, the Commission is taking public comments
on agenda item number 4, direct -- I'm sorry -- number 2,
Directors' reports. If you have a comment on that agenda
item, please, press star-9.

Again, one more time, we are taking public comments
on agenda item number 2, directors reports. If you have
public comments on that agenda item, please press star-9.

We have caller 5420.

Please follow the prompts. Again, that's caller
5420. You can now unmute by pressing star-6, please.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is this feedback for the
visualization maps?

MR. MANOFF: No, it is not. This is for agenda item
2, Directors' reports; do you have a comment on that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, we're calling for the
visualization.

MR. MANOFF: Okay. We will have general public
comment at the end of the meeting.

And that is all our hands for that item, Chair.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

So with that, let's go to closed session.

And then just a reminder to the public that we will be accepting general public comment at the end of the meeting where we will accept a comment on any and all items. Thank you.

So with that, we will -- we will recess to closed session.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 1:18 p.m. until 4:25 p.m.)

CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission's business meeting. We are just -- came back from closed session under the pending litigation exception, and no action was taken. We will be continuing on with item number 3, which is committee and subcommittee updates. We'll start with Government Affairs, Sadhwani and Toledo, this morning.

Ms. Sadhwani -- Commissioner Sadhwani, any update?

I think she's frozen with her eyes wide open. So I'll take it. There is no update -- no substantive update at this point.

So we'll move on to Finance and Administration.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, no updates.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioners Fernandez and Fornaciari.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. No updates.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. We have no updates for Finance and Administration. We'll move on to Gantt Chart.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Nothing to report, Chair.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
Next, we'll move on to Outreach and Engagement, Commissioners Sinay and Fornaciari.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Nothing to report at this point.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Excellent.
Materials Development, Fernandez and Kennedy?
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: We have made some progress towards a draft of the report to accompany the maps. We have discussed with the legal team what their role is in this process. And given the workload that we, as Commissioners, have are exploring the option of having the lawyers do some of the editing. The subcommittee will retain ultimate control over what is presented to the full Commission as a draft. And we are hopeful that we can have a draft to the full Commission in next week.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you very much.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And then I have just a little bit more. It's a tag --
CHAIR TOLEDO: Of course.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- team effort here.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Of course, Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: There is a section in the -- in the report at section 3, I believe. And what that is, a brief description of every district that we draw. And at this point, we are hoping that our Outreach director will be able to -- her and her staff will be able to draft that language for us.

They've been doing a wonderful job of tracking all of our comments and all of our directions. So if they can also work with the line drawers in terms of some of the specific city information. So we're hoping that they can draft us with that piece. So that would be for all of the Assembly, the Senate, Congressional, and Board of Equalization districts. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

So with that, we'll move on to website committee, Kennedy and Taylor.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Nothing specific to report. I would like to remind staff that we have strongly suggested that items that are posted on the website, and particularly handouts and similar items, be tagged with date and time. We're getting down to a point where not only is there a lot of interest in what we are posting on the website, but we have seen occasions where documents have been replaced with newer versions. And yet, it's
very difficult for people to -- to see at a glance what
is the latest version or when something was posted. So I
would -- I would reiterate to staff that it would be very
helpful to have date and time posted on documents that
are going up on the website. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Data Management, Commissioners, Ahmad and Turner.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair.

We have Toni on. Yes, Toni is here on the call to
give us a walk-through. So I'll turn it over to Toni.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Excellent.

MS. ANTONOVA: Thank you, Commissioners. I wanted
to jump on the call to give a quick tutorial of The
District draft map viewer that we have on the website and
to also introduce a new feature that we have added today.
I'm going to share my screen, so everyone can follow
along. And I'll also show where we have a tutorial
posted already, so that everyone can reference that after
this call.

So if you open up the CRC web page, I'm on the home
page, you'll have to go to the data tab in the top right
corner to navigate to The District Draft Map Viewer.
You'll see map viewer in the dropdown here. This is a
widget that essentially lets you interact with the
different draft maps and also compare them to the
current-day district's. Some of you may be familiar with this already, but I'll go over a number of the features that we have here.

The very first one is just zooming in and out on the map. I just wanted to -- to show that as you zoom in the detail of the map changes. So you can actually, you know, zoom in pretty far into a city or town and see street-level detail. You can see here, if I go really far in, the names of all the streets and the highways start to appear. You'll also see things like mountains and rivers outlined. You can go back to the default view either by zooming out over here or by clicking on this little home button, and this will take you back to the default view that we started with.

Off the bat, the draft maps for the Assembly districts are loaded into the -- into the widget. This is something you can change, and this is where you want to navigate to this draft map layer feature over here. You can kind of toggle it on and off by clicking this button. So I can actually turn off the Assembly districts and maybe turn on the Congressional district draft map. You know, I can maybe zoom in, so that I see the county-level detail.

I can also turn on the current-day lines, and they'll show up in a slightly different color. So you
see here, the Congressional districts are in this grayish-brown color, and the current-day are in reddish-pink color. And you can kind of -- you can turn on and off as many of these maps as you want. They each show a label for the district shown; so sometimes, it can get a little crowded, and this is where you might want to actually turn off some of these labels.

So you know, if I zoom in here, maybe I actually want to turn off the labels for the current-day districts. I can click on these three little dots next to the map name. And here, there'll be the option to hide the labels. So the lines will still be there, but the labels for the current-day Congressional districts just went away.

Something else that you can do is actually change the transparency. And so, you know, maybe I -- I find this kind of too obtrusive, and so I can set the transparency of the current day lines to fifty, so they're just slightly shown. And this way, you can -- you can interact with more of the maps at the same time.

Something else. That you can do with the map viewer is actually see some metadata on each one of the proposed districts. So if I double click on the district itself -- oops, I think I zoomed in a little bit -- a little pop-up will come up. And this will show some
information in population statistics about that area. So I can click on the different districts and see this information here. That's only available for the -- the draft maps themselves and not the current-day districts. So this is for the Senate districts; we have some -- some metadata available, and so on.

Something else you can toggle on and off are, you know, these -- the county level layer. And this is, again, just to make it easier to interact with more than one map without having everything seem really cluttered. You can also turn on and off the incorporated places and CDPs. And again, it's just to kind of declutter the screen. The map itself has a certain level of detail that will appear as you zoom in and out that you can't change, but you will be able to declutter some of the -- the county-level and CDP lines.

It also has an address search bar. And this just makes it easier to go to a specific location. You know, maybe you want to go to West Hollywood and L.A. You can type it out as you would in Google Maps or elsewhere, and it takes you to that location. It just makes navigation a little bit easier.

The new feature that we added is actually on this button in the top right corner next to the layers button. And this is really exciting. It's -- it's just a really
easy way to view shapefiles that you have on hand. And it essentially lets you see those shapefiles with the district maps in the background, so that you can look at how the lines interact with the shapefile you're interested in.

It's a drag-and-drop feature. So if you have any shapefiles on hand, you essentially drag them into this, and the polygon will appear on the map. I'll go over an example of how you might use this with the data we currently have up on the CRC web page. So if you navigate to the data tab on the web page again and go to data and the dropdown, you'll find all of the submissions that we have received in this table. And here we have a column that has shapefiles, if they're available, or if someone has submitted them.

I'm going to actually filter to -- something happened okay. I'm actually going to filter to all of the records where that column is not empty. And you can do this in this filter feature here. So I've set shapefile to, is not empty, just so I can find what I'm looking for more easily. My internet might be a little bit slow today, which is why I am receiving that. Hopefully it won't cause anything to pause.

So now I see all of the records that have shapfiles available. And if I scroll to the right to that column...
shapefile, I can actually double-click on these links to
download the GIS file. So if I -- you know, I might be
browsing here and maybe I have a number of records that
I'd like to see the polygon in more detail, I can double-
click here, and it'll download shapefile. I'll download
a couple of them. And I'll be able to find the files in
my downloads folder.

So now if I navigate back to the map viewer with,
say, five shapefiles that I really want to look at more
in detail from our records, I can click on this button,
"Data". And I can go to the downloads folder. And I can
actually just drop these ZIP files in here, and the
polygon of the shapefile will appear. And it's super
quick and easy, which is what makes it so awesome.
There's often really no loading time. And it actually,
you know, draws the -- the polygon on top of the base
map, so you can even see where the boundaries are pretty
in detail. And if you -- if you zoom in, you'll also be
able to see that street-level of detail like you did
before. Maybe I'll add the last one in. They're --
sometimes, if the shapefile is a little bit larger, it'll
take more time, though, this one looks fairly small.

So now if I zoom all the way out by clicking on this
default button again, I'll actually be able to see the
three shapefiles highlighted that I just added. I can
also check what I've uploaded into the map by clicking on this layer button on the bottom right of the -- the widget. So I've added these three files, and I can actually remove one if I don't want it. Maybe I'll re-add it, though. Let's see. That's the big. You can see here it's loading -- loading the file, taking some time.

While it's doing that, I want to show you where these appear -- appear in this layer view. So if you go back to the layer button -- you know, we were here and now we clicked this -- you'll actually see all of the files that you uploaded up here, and you can toggle them on and off. And you can also change the, you know, the draft map that you have shown in the base layer. So let's say, I'm interested in looking at this one and maybe I want to see how it interacts with the Senate districts draft map, I can -- I can zoom in -- oh, no. Oops. Sorry about that.

Something aired out when I tried to reload that initial shapefile. That may be my internet connection as well. So we'll try again later. But for now, I'll just continue the tutorial.

So this is the second shapefile that I have here that I have uploaded, and I can actually zoom in and see where the Senate district draft map lines fall in relation to it. This is where that transparency --
transparency feature comes in hand, you know, because
it's filled in with this -- this deep color. And you
might want to make it a little bit more opaque, so that
you can actually see what's underneath it and lines that
cross it. You can also always, again, zoom in to the
street level, and this is where the transparency feature
comes in handy, too.

Yeah, thank you for listening. That was that was
the end of the tutorial. I know that was quite a bit of
information with the new feature added in, so I'm happy
to answer any questions now or later over email. Feel
free to reach out with anything that might be on mind.

There's a tutorial on how to use The District Draft
Map Viewer posted above the widget. And later today or
tomorrow, there'll be a second tutorial going over this
new feature in -- in detail. And it'll essentially be
the video describing what I just shared.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Toni. That was a very --
its great. It's nice to see the additional feature.
And thank you for the presentation and the tutorial
for --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And right before we go to
questions, still from Data --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: So we're working on Toni and her ahh game because this is absolutely amazing. And she always delivers so matter of factly. But this is her and her team have done just an amazing job. And the hope -- and, hopefully, you've picked it up from the presentation that she did -- is that for all of our shapefile files that we've received from all of California, anyone that submitted a shapefile, if we're wondering how it compares specifically without knowing an area, knowing a street, we can take the shapefile, just like she has indicated, and overlay it onto our current maps, onto our draft maps, et cetera, and see just where the variances are in the differences. And so -- and we can do that as many times as we'd -- we'd like as individuals.

So I'm just was really excited about the team and what they were able to bring forth. And so, yeah, I just wanted a little bit more excitement with this because this tool is powerful. And we're, Commissioner Isra (sic) and myself and Alvaro, we're really excited about what has been created. So I just wanted to add that in as well.

And Toni, you're funny.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you for the excitement.

And with that, we'll move on to Commissioner Sinay.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Toni, this is awesome. This whole map is really awesome. I -- I have the same issue you do where you have to just say wait a couple of times, but that just means there's just a ton of data in there. And I -- you know, I've kind of moved away from using the PDFs to using just the map. And it's been amazing.

But I have a quick question. When you have the PDFs and you have the map, the names are different from the -- the PDFs that we have online and -- and the map. And in some instance -- like in Congressional, I said it to a Director Hernandez, and I think I sent it to you as well, like the ECA district was -- Congressional district was different in this map and the PDF. And I started really freaking myself out in the middle of the evening trying to figure out which one was the right one.

But I'm guessing that the most current -- anything we're working on, we can find it on this map, on the -- on the online map versus the PDF set, that that's where we, the Commissioners, as well as the public should be going to see where -- where our thinking is at that moment in time.

MS. ANTONOVA: Yes. Yeah, the most current version of the map should always be -- it will always be in The District Map Viewer.

I will look into those -- why the PDF name might
differ from what is in here. I'm wondering -- yeah, I'm wondering if that has something to do with their data processing or, you know, maybe Paul (ph.), sometimes he creates names that are more interpretable for the public, so that that may be part of the reason why. I also --

    Thank you so much, Commissioner Turner and Sinay, for, you know, the enthusiasm. I know I can be pretty matter of fact. I also want to quickly shout out to Paul all our data analyst. He's not on the call right now, but he really is the mastermind behind all of this. I communicated an idea that Commissioner Turner had to him, and he pretty much created this in one afternoon. So it's pretty amazing, you know, what he can do with the program. And I --

    COMMISSIONER SINAY: And in --

    MS. ANTONOVA: This -- this will be the most up to date. And I will -- I will check in about why exactly those names differ.

    COMMISSIONER SINAY: In this particular tool, Toni, remind me and or correct me if not correct, is just for shapefiles, though, right? So you're not able to download PDFs. I mean, I know the name -- the name variance is something that you'll look into. But just wanting, again, say for Commissioners, this is only for shapefiles?
MS. ANTONOVA: Yes -- yes, this is only for -- for shapefiles, those GIS files. And there is -- there is a limit to the number of polygons you can upload. It's very high. It's something like 500 or 1,000. But if -- if by chance you get an error sometimes when you're uploading something, it may be that, you know, an organization has submitted a statewide shapefile that has a lot of little polygons. And then in that case, just email. And I can work with Paul to -- to get that visualized.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Any other questions for Toni while we have her? Seeing none, we'll move on.

Thank you so much, Toni.

All right. We'll move on to communities-of-interest tool. Commissioners Akutagawa and Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Nothing to report.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Next, we'll move on to discuss the subcommittee on incarcerated populations, federal facilities. Kennedy and Turner.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Nothing significant to report at this point, Chair.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

We'll move on to the lesson -- Lessons Learned
Committee. Ahmad and Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.

Commissioner Ahmad and I are discussing our next steps for the lessons-learned process. We are looking at the possibility of organizing an event in January that would be probably sometime second half of January for a week or more. I am starting to look at possible venues for that. We will have more for you at the next business meeting. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Next, we'll move on to Cyber Security. Fornaciari and Taylor.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Nothing of significance to report.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Next, we'll move on to Legal Affairs Committee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Nothing to report.

I don't know if our chief counsel wanted to update us on contracting.

MR. PANE: Yes. Thank -- thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Nothing exactly to report on that. We are trying to close one final litigation contract issue with Gibson & Dunn. We are moving forward. We are getting closer. We are not there yet, but we will get there.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I don't think we're line drawing, we are Mapping Playbook.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I think -- oh. On here, it says -- I think it's just called something else, Map and Playbook, here. It says I think it's called something else, okay?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Nothing to report, except that I did feel motivated to generate a list of California census designated places populations for you, so four pages of all the CDPs, over a 1,609.

CHAIR TOLEDO: That's a great resource. Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Let's move on to, at this point, Line Drawing -- actually, no -- Public Input Design Committee.

Fornaciari and Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I thought we sunset.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I guess not yet.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Oh, no. We were -- we were tapped --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech) the record.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: -- to design the -- yeah.

We -- the input meetings of last week. So I think looking forward, I'm not sure if we have any other tasks
on our to-do list, unless the Commission decides
otherwise.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I just think the --
we got a lot of good input. So I think -- I think that
that went well.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yeah. It was a great process. Thank
you so much.

And we will explore the possibility of sunsetting
that committee.

Line Drawing Subcommittee. Andersen and Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I think this is all being --
I believe Chair should be doing this. And then we're
doing the -- the -- the last -- the new subcommittee, I
don't recall its name. So I'd say we don't have anything
right now.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Perfect. We'll move on to the VRA
Compliance Subcommittee. Sadhwani and Yee.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: You've heard a lot from us
already.

CHAIR TOLEDO: All right. And we'll hear some more
at the -- when we get to the Finals Maps Planning
Subcommittee. All right.

So we'll move on to Litigation Contracts
Subcommittee. And I believe we just heard that update
from -- from Chief Counsel Pane. But we'll check in with
Chief Counsel Pane in regard to the litigation contract.

MR. PANÉ: Thank you, Chair.

So, yes, I would just reiterate what I had mentioned previously.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Perfect. Thank you.

And then lastly, we'll go on to the Final Map Planning Subcommittee. I know you have a proposal on the table for discussion with regard to the final maps plan and schedule, Commissioners Fornaciari and Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. So what I thought I'd start with is just a general overview of the plan and -- and what are -- the process that got us to this plan and -- and what our thinking was. So if you look at the -- the a handout that was posted on the website schedule for completing maps and delivering them to the Secretary of State. There was a little miscommunication. There was supposed to be a little more detail in this document, and we're -- I'll just talk to you that more detail that was supposed to be in that document. And then we'll -- we'll -- we'll revise this document and update it soon. I don't know when, but soon. So -- so we'll see.

So you know, we're tasked with developing a detailed plan to get us to delivering the maps to the Secretary of State on the -- by December 27th. You know, Commissioner
Sadhwani and I work very closely with Alvaro, Marcy, Fredy, both internal, external counsel, the Line Drawing team to put this -- this road map together.

We were trying to balance our -- our goals of -- you know, we have a deadline, obviously. And spending enough time on the maps to -- to do the best we can with the maps. You know, the draft maps seemed a little rushed. We had a lot of feedback that they seemed a little rushed. And we want to make sure that -- that we, you know, had enough time to -- to -- to do the best job we can, you know, given the time constraints that we have.

So I'll just offer, though, that this is a -- this is a sort of a working proposal on how we move forward. We all need to be flexible in the potentiality that we will pivot. What would be incredible is if we could move a little more quickly than this -- this schedule shows and that, you know, have more time for review and that kind of thing. But you know, in the overview of the -- of the plan, we're -- we're starting with Assembly, the 30th through the 6th. We -- we made the 5th a day off. I think we all need to have a little bit of time to sort of reenergize. And the 6th would be a Monday, when we come back to it, if we need to review or finish anything up, then go to the House the 7th to the 13th with the 12th as a day off and the 13th as a kind of revisit
and -- and -- and finalize. Then the Senate the 14th 
through the 17th, and the Board of Equalization also on 
the afternoon of the 17th is the plan.

And so in spending, you know, time with the Line 
Drawing team, we kind of developed this idea of a hybrid 
approach. And the idea would be that we would spend -- 
you know, start the day sort of, these are the CRE we're 
going to look at. Let's have a sort of big picture 
discussion and then -- and then dig in, work on our VRA 
districts, get those finalized, and then -- then work and 
manage the rest of the districts as best we can.

And then towards the end of the day, whatever we 
couldn't get to, you know, if there were some complicated 
changes that were going to take too long in live line 
drawing, we take the opportunity to give the Line Drawing 
team some specific direction that we wanted them to 
follow and -- and have a discussion about what the 
outcome and -- and consequences of that instruction would 
be. So we would have some expectation of what the 
outcome would be. And then -- then the -- for instance, 
the Southern California team would -- would spend the 
next day off-line working and tweaking our -- our 
guidance.

And so tomorrow we'll start in Southern California 
with the Assembly. Then Wednesday, that Southern
California team would work off-line. We'd be working on Northern California, and then alternate back and forth and zeroing in. So you can see there's a more detailed proposed plan for the Assembly on how we would -- we would go through it. And again, on Friday, we try to wrap everything up on Friday or on Saturday, I mean. And then the 4th, and then come back, if needed, on the 6th to wrap up details on the Assembly and then jump into the Congressional districts on the 7th.

And take a very similar approach with Congress, then again, less time with Senate, fewer districts. And you know, the thought is also that we would have -- you know, we'd spend a great deal of thought on the Assembly districts, take advantage as much nesting as -- as we could and then go forward from there.

And then with regard to -- you know, once we finish up the line drawing, then we've -- we've got a day on the 18th to review the Senate Assembly BUE (ph.) maps make any final changes and number the Senate based on deferral, the Line Drawing team felt comfortable that they could work the deferral question in that amount of time. Then on the 19th final in -- any House -- finalize any House and complete any necessary population adjustments, get that done. Then on the 20th, the plan is to approve final maps.
Just to set expectations on what that looks like, we would release -- expect to release PNG shapefile equivalency files and statistics tables. The map here will be updated that day with the final maps. The PDFs take a few days, so they wouldn't be released for a couple of days.

You know, then we have the 21st, 22nd if we need to go into those days. And you know, we need to -- if you know, we need to go into those days, but probably the 22nd would be that the absolute final day to approve maps. But our goal is -- is certainly the 20th.

We want to give the public three working days to review the maps, if we can. And then I have scheduled in here on the 23rd to review and provide feedback on the draft report. We just heard that the draft report will be out to the Commission earlier. You know, we can't talk across subcommittees. I just penciled that in. And the report team tell me, you know how you envision approving that and -- or reviewing it, and we'll revise this.

And then on the 26th, we put a brief meeting on the calendar on the 26th to certify the maps and approve the reports. And then we would deliver the report to the Secretary of State on the 27th. So I'm going to ask my partner in crime here, Commissioner Sadhwani, to add
anything I missed.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No, I think you're really thorough. I think I just want re-up this piece that I think is no longer in this document about the postings of information and the timing.

So in general, we are attempting to adjust the schedule of our meetings from 11 to 6, with the postings of -- of maps that we've worked on being posted no later than 8 a.m., maybe earlier, but no later than 8 a.m., so that we, as Commissioners, as well as the public has some -- have the time to actually review them in advance of the meetings. Right?

One of the things that we've talked about in our debrief from a couple of weeks ago was having enough time to do that homework, to do our own kind of analysis. And so -- so that is -- is most certainly one of the key components that would require a lot of behind-the-scenes work from our consultants and staff, and that we had work done with them to make sure that that would be a process that that would work well. And again, that, you know, as -- as Commissioner Fornaciari already -- already suggested that that would be loaded to the to The District Viewer, which Toni just -- just reviewed. That's the -- the piece that our data management -- the tool that our data management team created for us. And
that's really user friendly. And so we felt like that
would be a really appropriate way to be able to review
the -- the district's, largely, because those PDFs just
take such a long time. And PDFs would still come out,
but would come out later after we finish the week on
that -- on that map, in particular.

In addition, we did also talk about getting a table
of, I think we were calling them, descriptive statistics
or descriptive statistics on the districts or something
like that, that looks at, you know, things like the --
the deviations, various CVAPs, et cetera.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes. Thank you for that,
Commissioner Sadhwani, important point, right, where --
where would -- we'd send the line drawers off to -- with
specific direction to work, and then -- and then it would
be uploaded by 8:00 a.m. the day we were going to come
back to that map and work on it. It's a very good point.

And then, so we were thinking, on the 26th -- I'll
just throw this out there and see what my fellow
Commissioners think -- maybe like 11 to noon, have a
meeting from 11 to noon to certify. But we'll turn it
over for questions at this point.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. And start with questions.

And thank you very much on your -- on the very
thorough -- because I know this is -- you have -- the both of you have worked really hard on putting this plan together. And it is a very comprehensive roadmap for the last couple of days. So appreciate your work.

Commissioner Sadhwani, I think you had one other thing to say.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I just -- just wanted to note that we -- we do also want to have two separate conversations, one about this plan and separately also, you know, a debrief of the pieces that we heard from around the state as well. So I just wanted to preface that, so that we know we're leaving some time for that really important conversation about -- about both, first, the plan and then also around the -- the debrief.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Excellent. And let's start with questions on the plan, thus far. And then we'll move on to -- once we're done with questions on this plan and we're all in alignment, then we'll move on to the debrief.

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.

One question and then a quick response to Commissioner Fornaciari's question. If by some chance we managed to finish early and not require, say, Monday the 6th or Monday the 13th, does that mean that we're going
to slide everything up and get an early start on what
comes next, so that if we needed more time farther down
the line we would have it? Or does -- do those Mondays
become days off if in some imaginary world we don't need
them?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah -- yeah, the -- yeah,
this group -- yeah, we fill all the
time available and then some. My thought was there
would be days off, but I guess we could put them up --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: But at the discretion
of the Chair.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: At the discretion of the
Chair, right. I mean, I think -- you know this is --
there's two days off in the next thirty days, so it's up
to the Commission how we want to handle it.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. No. I was just
thinking if -- you know, for example, if we managed to
finish the Assembly districts early and got started on, I
guess Congressional comes next, and found that we needed
more time than the time allotted on the Congressional
maps, getting that start a day earlier might be the
difference between, you know, finishing those
Congressional maps on time, and having to bleed over into
what would be the time for the Senate maps, for example.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I think that's, that's a
great point. I think we'll --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I think when we get -- if we get there, yeah, we'll have that conversation.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I think that's a great point. I really, yeah, I think that's a great point.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. Well, I mean, you know, just from a personal perspective, there's a big difference between having one day off, which is going to mean staying in Sacramento, and having two days off which might mean that I could actually go home. So there's that motive as well.

In response to your question about the report, I just need to -- to clarify that what we're hoping to have to the Commission next week is parts 1 and 2. So part 1 is the introductory text describing the process, and so forth, that Commissioner Fernandez and I had been working on; and part 2 is kind of the legal framework which the legal team is working on.

We would not have anything, or we don't expect to have anything at that point for part three. So part three, you know, to have the full report, I mean, that that is going to plug into your schedule pretty much as you have laid it out.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, that's pretty much what I thought.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Because, I mean -- and I mean if you're going to be spending, I assume, the 21st and -- your assumption is the 21st, 22nd, to write that part of the report --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- which is not insignificant, yeah.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, I mean, the Assembly part can begin --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, yeah can begin, that's true. That's true.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- once we finish the Assembly districts, et cetera. But we don't anticipate having part three until, basically, the dates that you have in your timetable. Okay?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay, right.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, we plan on scheduling a meeting to review and provide feedback on that report on that day then.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Just a quick question for Commissioners Sadhwani and Fornaciari. When we think about -- when you came up with the schedule, I'm just
curious, if you can give a little bit of explanation to us and the public, also in terms of proportionality, we've had feedback about making sure that -- that areas across the state of California receive proportionate amount of time in our deliberations so that any one of them is left till the last moment.

So just want to make sure that that is just addressed in your conversation. I know you had conversations around this, and had deep conversations around this. So I just want to make sure that the Commission is just think -- is able to sort of hear what your thought process is as it relates to the plan.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I mean, I think you basically summed it up right there, right. I mean, we spent a lot of time thinking about the amount of details, and -- and the number of districts, and just numbers of districts, but also the number of VRA districts that we need to work through and resolve, and how much time we would expect to spend in a given set of areas.

And so you know, based on that, this is what we've come up with. We also decided to kind of keep the same approach that we've been using. We're starting with the Assembly more -- you know there's more districts that can be more complex. And we've given six -- up to six days for that.
And then with Congress, I think we have five days. It's fewer districts, but there is complexity in that, you know, we really have to meet those population targets. But we felt that once we had worked through a lot of the -- and talk through a lot of the COI questions that we have, and issues in the Assembly, it might make things go a little smoother with regard to the House.

And then, you know, as I mentioned with regard to the Senate, you know, having gone through the House -- I mean the Assembly and done all the detailed work on that that we felt like, you know, four days seem pretty reasonable, or three and a half days seemed pretty reasonable to get through that.

You know, of course, we'd like to have more time, but we don't. We also had to figure out how to fit it in within a reasonable amount of time. I thought it was important, I mean, personally, I thought it was important; I won't speak for Commissioner Sadhwani, but to put a couple off days in there so we can kind of decompress and regroup.

I mean, we could have easily just gone straight through. But everybody needs some time off, including not just us, but the support staff. And so you know, that's kind of where we got. I think Commissioner Sadhwani has some --
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. No, I think everything you said is correct, we definitely spent a lot of time talking through what map to work on first and the order, and we landed on Assembly, Congress, Senate, for all the reasons that the Commissioner Fornaciari laid out because of the Assembly being of smaller districts, there's more of them.

The COI testimony is often very similar from one map to the next, but not always. And we recognize that while there was some thought about: Should we do Assembly then Senate? I think that the key piece here for Congress is that because the deviations are so low, the issues that might arise in that map might require us to make most of those refinements and then say: Hey, line drawers, go show us, you know -- go off work and show us where can we make some of those additional refinements to get to as close to zero as possible. So we felt because of that, it was really important to do Congress second.

And then I just wanted to also put out there our other recommendation, again, not appearing on this document, but is that we would also be taking public comment daily, that it would be at the last half hour of the meeting, that it would provide the public ample opportunity to weigh in, and that we would run it very similar to how we have in the past.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And before we go on, because I see a couple of hands raised, so one last question; and that's, so I see -- let's take, for example, the 30th, tomorrow. We have three areas, Southeast Los Angeles, Orange County, San Diego, is there a thought process on how much time each one of those regions would get?

Or having done this before, we do use up all of our time, and we could be here all night, and into the next night. So just thinking about time, any thoughts on time giving -- I guess it's prioritization and having us go through those prioritization, giving us a set amount of time to work through each one of these areas, any thoughts on that; or any suggestions on that?

You know, that to this Committee, but also to the whole Commission so that we can think through just having an efficient meeting, and also being able to get the line drawers what they need so that they can turn around and get us the maps, the visualizations in a -- in an efficient manner.

So maybe we'll just think about that. And unless Commissioners Fornaciari and Sadhwani want to touch bases on that.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, we certainly -- I'll start I guess. We certainly talked about that and
thought about it. So part of the answer to that question is the rest of this meeting, and the -- the conversation that we're going to have in the rest of this meeting. What are the -- you know, what did we hear from the public input that we've got? And what are the areas that we think we need to work on? What are -- what are kind of the big issues that we need to address? What are the smaller issues that we can maybe just give direction to the line drawers to address for us, kind of thing?

And so that's part of the structure, the conversation today. I think as far as a specific amount of time, yeah, I don't think we have a specific amount of time. We need to work through VRA districts. And then, you know, work on the districts in between. But I think that -- you know, I think that you're bringing up an important point, and I think everybody needs to kind of -- sort of look at the schedule and think about, you know, the pace that we need to work through to get through it. You know, I think that's important.

So Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I would just add. I think that we as Commissioners, we need to be able to prioritize and clearly articulate what those priorities are. When we go into the discussion today, you know, Commissioner Fornaciari and I are planning to take notes,
and really try to bullet point, what is your priority in this area so that when we come back to actual line drawing, we can have a record of -- not every single priority -- but if you have three priorities, what are they?

And so that's the level of specificity we really -- we really are encouraging folks to drill down to. We can have a number of items on a wish list, but what might be some of the big priorities?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Thank you. And with that, let's go to Commissioners Andersen, Fernandez, and Turner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. I've got one really quick, easy one. We don't have any business meetings scheduled until the 26th, and that sort of alarms me a little bit. We did have one originally on the 11th, you know, I suggest we put one like on the 11th and the 13th. Just it'll be a half like, you know, you know as necessary, but you know, I'm concerned about if anything comes up, you know, if we need to have it posted somewhere, I think --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Chief Counsel Pane has a response to that.

MR. Pane: Thank you, Commissioner, for that. Sort of to that point, my understanding is Executive Director
Hernandez is going to be posting for the 13th forward to be a combo-agendized meeting. So it would have -- it would be a business meeting as well as line drawing going forward.

Is that right, Commissioner Hernandez?

MR. HERNANDEZ: That is correct.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And then the other item.

First of all, great document, there's a lot of work and way to go. The other item that I want to bring up, though, is, and I like the way you're kind of laying it out, and a lot of thought went into how we're going to do this.

The one issue I have is with the central and the coasts sort of at the end, it's like you're doing the Bay Area, and Sacramento, and stuff, and I'm concerned about when you do something in the Bay Area, particularly, I'm thinking about how we're doing in Hollister, San Jose, it's going to affect Ventura.

And the same, we do say Sacramento, the North, you know, are we -- is Inyo going to go -- you know, going to go into San Bernardino? You know, that those are the issues I'd like us to kind of do that all at the same time if possible.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh. And then one other item is, I really appreciate that your -- the thought went into the Assemblies, then Congressional, then Senate. The one issue that we sort of lost in our line drawing process is we sort of did each, each of them as sort of separate units. And like, remember there were a couple of people who said: Hey, my county is in this Assembly district, but it's with these guys, but then it's in a completely different Senate district with those guys.

And we need to make sure that Assembly districts, you know, they can really; most of them can nest, and if we -- if we sort of think along those lines, I -- I think that would go much faster. It's almost like: Should we quickly sneak the Senate in there after we've done all the work on the Assemblies, realizing that the Congressionals are an in between and will require a lot more work. But that was just a thought I want to bring up.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, can I comment?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Uh-huh. Yes.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So yeah, yeah. So we debated it a lot. And this is -- this is kind of where we wound up in the order that we wound up. I think, you know -- yeah, this is what we're proposing. With regard
to your comment about the order to go in the state, and I thought a lot about this and we can revise it, you know, however we need to do, we definitely need to work on our VRA districts in the valley sooner rather than later.

But I guess what my vision was, is we'd start at the bottom, and start at the top, and we'd meet in the middle, because we've got interface issues. I mean, I don't think there's any easy way to go. And you know, and this isn't just my idea, right? We spent a lot of time talking with the line drawers. And so I can see that Commissioner Sadhwani wants to -- has a comment too. Didn't you? Oh, you didn't have a comment. But you know, and again, this is just a proposal. We can revise it however we all see fit.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Perfect. Let's go to Commissioner Fernandez, and then Turner.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, just very quick. I just actually wanted to thank both Commissioners Sadhwani and Fornaciari for this approach, and the creativity. Because I am going to tell you, like two weeks ago I was a little bit nervous and apprehensive about how we were going to get through all this. And the proposal that you have just gives me hope. And so thank you very much. And the only other question was in the conversation that we'll have after, I mean today and this afternoon,
will we also be talking about, like we received conflicting COI? So I mean I think that would be a good opportunity, especially if we have time, so that we have that settled before we start actually line drawing.

So thank you, again, both for this. It's great.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Yes, we have lots of hope. And the plan; and we need the plan.

So let's go to Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes, thank you. I just wanted to echo the gratitude for the work that you've done, for the hope, the plan, all of it. And so I'm glad about that.

You asked a question a minute ago and it continues to come up. How are we going to actually make this work? Because we do like to use the amount of time that's available for us, and so one thought that I had is that we, this time, really focus not so much on the -- I guess the geography, or how large spaces are, and we look at population.

So with almost forty million Californians, perhaps we can apply some kind of math to it, and say if there's ten million in Los Angeles, that it gets this kind of prorated time based on the amount of time that we have available, because we always go into it saying, let's minimize -- let's make sure we minimize our comments.
Let's be, you know, we talked about being additive and not repetitive, and all of that.

But once we get into conversations, it seems like we kind of go back to kind of digging in to certain areas that we want to, and then we feel like we're rushed through it, or we didn't get it done so -- but we do have to apply something to be able to say this one area, even though it's a broad geography, if there's not that much population there, we should not be spending, I'm saying, that same amount of time in that space that we're trying to spend in other areas that have much more population.

So as we're thinking through, and move through the day, I'm hoping that we can apply something along those lines to come up with something a little bit more definitive instead of just saying, yes, we're going to do it, let's talk about how we're going to do it. And then put some kind of parameters in place that says we're going to allot this for Los Angeles that may be larger than the Central Valley, that may be larger than, you know, North, or whatever, however it shakes out. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa, then Sinay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I wanted to build on what Commissioner Turner just said. And I do also want
to thank Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner Sadhwani for this. You know, like our draft maps, it gives us all something to react to, and gives us a starting place which is, I think, important.

And as with anything, it is by no means -- you know, the comments that we're making is by no means any kind of knock on, on the work that you've done. I think we like to take things and then add to it if we can. And so I just wanted to start there.

I did have a question in terms of kind of similar to what Commissioner Turner did ask. I think Los Angeles, as an entire region, is extremely dense and has extreme complexity because of the mix of the different populations, the communities of interest are also very intermingled, and mixed, and yet also very distinct in some places.

I guess my question is -- and obviously there are several VRA districts in there as well as -- as well as in the Central Valley, but in particular with Southern California, but specifically L.A. County.

The question that I have is I see on the document, it notes particularly Southeast L.A. I am wondering how L.A., as an entirety, also falls within this, because I believe that there's going to be ripple effects depending on what is going to be decided. I guess I'm asking
because I am a bit concerned that we're also going to try
to get to Orange County and San Diego in the same day
when and where.

And then also on the next day I see that revert to
L.A., and I'm assuming that -- I guess that would be the
rest of L.A. I guess I'm just asking both for some
clarity, but also to express some concerns about -- to
Commissioner Turner's point; I would like to suggest that
we need to get L.A., you know, cleared up. And I think
the other big area, too, is Central Valley.

But I hear what you said about bringing it together,
but I think we should -- we should try to make sure that
we have enough time so that we can just get to a place
where we feel good about where L.A. is going to shake out
because of all the different communities that we have
there. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Any response from Commissioners

Sadhwani and Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. So first of all I
think, Commissioner Turner, your suggestion is great.
And I'm happy to think about how we could try to
incorporate some of that.

But I want to speak specifically to your questions,
Commissioner Akutagawa, about Los Angeles. When we were
working on the draft maps, we really didn't touch Los
Angeles in our Assembly and Congressional districts. We generally said, hmm, the basic architecture looks okay, but let's leave it. And so we specifically put Los Angeles first, and in particular, we prioritized South and East L.A. County, so that it should be read as county, largely because of the ripple effects that it will have.

It's going to have Northern ripple effects also, but specifically what we have not had a chance to look at is the interconnectedness of Los Angeles, the Southern parts of Los Angeles County, along with the Orange County border, along with on the Eastern end, along with those VRA districts that are built out in the Inland Empire, and San Bernardino, and Riverside.

And so we really wanted to focus ourselves on Los Angeles. In particular, think about those impacts going Southward, right, because there's a lot of very considerations that are happening throughout that region. That's not to say we aren't concerned or not thinking about the Northern parts, but to kind of leave that in the beginning portions, focus ourselves on some of those VRA considerations, and what that's going to do as we continue to ripple down.

We put all of those on there together because we anticipate what changes we might make in Los Angeles
could potentially have ripple effects down to the Mexico border. And which was largely why, you know, during the
draft maps, and I certainly know I was a part of it. And
many of us felt like: Ooh, let's not get too far down
the rabbit hole of making changes to Los Angeles, because
it's going to -- it's going to change -- have a larger
impact.

So that's the thought process there, is really
focusing on those key areas that we've identified and
working our way Southward, and we gave ourselves the
Southward direction because, otherwise, then we start
heading into the Central Valley, right, because we want
to kind of separate ourselves to some extent in -- in
doing so.

And we'll see how we do. It's one map at the end of
the day. So there's going to be ripples. This is why
we've gone to this hybrid approach, right. So the idea
being, if we're in a live session, say, with Jaime the
map -- you know, our fabulous mapper for Los Angeles,
who's been kind of leading the charge in Los Angeles, if
we can tell her and explore some of the key priorities
that we have.

You know, perhaps it has something to do with, you
know, Asian-American representation in the maps, or
communities of interest from historic communities, and in
various areas of Los Angeles. If we can articulate what
those priorities are, we can take a look at some of
the -- what would be the ripple effects of doing it.

We could also offer to Jaime: This is what we're
trying to achieve, tomorrow please try and make that
happen and bring it back to us the following day. That's
where we're going date -- you know, in one day Los
Angeles, the next day a different area. We'll work with
a different mapper so that Jaime, behind the scenes, can
help clean up any of the priorities that we were trying
to make, right.

That's kind of the thought process there, is that
it's -- we're not going straight back to visualizations,
but instead this hybrid approach so that we can hopefully
try to anticipate the kinds of ripples that we will have,
as we make those changes. And that the line drawers can
also have some time to work off-line, right. And my
understanding; and I don't know if Jaime is still on, I
see Karin is here, but hundreds of hours were put into
the visualizations -- just for Los Angeles County alone.

So if we try to make every single change that we
want to see in live line drawing, it might be a
challenge.

That being said, I think for the fourteen of us,
working in -- in a live session, helps us to understand
and see what the larger impact will be when we want to see a change, when we say this is a priority, sometimes I think we need to see on a map what that's going to do to all of the other districts.

I hope that makes sense. And Commissioner Fornaciari, if it didn't, please, please feel free to jump in, in terms of that thought process.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. No, I think that captures it.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'd like to -- so then just for clarification, Commissioner Sadhwani, you mentioned -- I get what you're saying, and it totally makes sense. I guess my other question then would be: Why, why L.A., Orange County, and San Diego, instead of L.A., Orange County and the Inland Empire? Because it has more of a touch point from L.A. to Orange County than it does from L.A. to San Diego. It's only through that Camp Pendleton area down South.

And so it's such a -- it's just that one area. But the Inland Empire, with all of its complexity, and also it experienced greater growth. So I think I'm just trying to understand, and that's why I'm asking these questions. So you know, I appreciate what you're explaining.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: If I may respond to that?
You know, to us there are a lot of VRA districts in the Inland Empire. There might be refinements to those, but to some extent those are -- those are a bit of an anchor. So unless -- and I think this is where the debrief should come into play, right. Unless we as a Commission feel like we have a lot of changes to make in the Inland Empire, then we should perhaps switch course.

But if we feel fairly confident that -- that we're meeting our VRA obligations in the Inland Empire, then what comes into play is working further Southward.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Thank you. I'd also add that we have two borders and an ocean in -- in San Diego and Imperial -- surrounding San Diego and Imperial, and so you know, we want to make sure that we're not districting ourselves in a corner we can't get out of.

CHAIR TOLEDO: All right. So we are going to go to a dinner break at 5:45. So we have three people waiting to -- to speak. So I just wanted to make sure that we're all aware that you're keeping us from dinner.

All right, Commissioner Andersen? Well, you're the thing between us and dinner, I should say. Yeah, some of us are hungry.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I really appreciate this. And I really like the thought involved in there. My only one issue is, I'd like us to be more flexible,
because with -- when you're going like, okay, and then we go to Inland Empire, and it turns out, it just makes perfect sense, clarity comes on. Wow, San Diego, if we do this and this, and then go up to Inland Empire, it'll work. We need to be flexible like that.

So I just want to make sure that we -- and also because there is a lot in L.A., and changing that whole VRA group is going to take a lot. I'd like us also to be a little flexible in that if we have to go, like, to another half a day to work it out, I think we should try that because of its implications, and how it'll ripple.

So I just want to kind of bring that forward.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: If I may? I see Neal smiling. I absolutely agree with you Commissioner Andersen. The ability to pivot and turn, and provide ourselves the time that we need, is the name of the game here, which is why those Mondays are kind of built in on an as-needed basis, right. We don't want to shortchange any area of the State of California. So I completely agree with that.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And -- and you'll see that there's a couple of revisits to the areas, so that we can, you know, work on it, propose what we've done, and come back in, and revisit the complex areas specifically.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fernandez?
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Just really, really quick now that I'm thinking about it, my priority would be the VRA districts, because they're going to impact everything else. And so we've got VRA districts obviously in Southern California, as well as Central Valley. So my proposal would be to let's solidify those, so that we know what the rest of the state, what we have available for the rest of the state, if that makes sense. But my priority would be the VRA districts first. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. I want to add my appreciation to this great plan. Like Alicia -- like Commissioner Fernandez, it just sets my heart at ease, just feel much more confident going forward the next several weeks. One question does need to be answered now, but I'm kind of wondering about big changes versus small changes.

So you know the thought, for instance, that we can only propose one change per Commissioner until other Commissioners have had a chance to propose changes, which I like a lot. I think it's a good rule. But then in my mind, I'm thinking, well, there are some bigger changes I'd want to propose, but there's also, you know, a handful of little changes, just things we got from COI
input, little adjustments.

You know, wouldn't necessarily want to shortchange the big changes or the little ones, so is there some way of catching those. Things that would not even affect, you know, population considerations at all. Just a couple of blocks here, a couple of blocks there, those kind of changes, how to fit those in lots, so giving attention to the bigger changes that you might want to propose.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I think that's a great point. I think that's what we're going to try to capture this evening, and before we start each day. And I think, you know, I think some of the smaller changes could probably be given as direction to line drawers to do off-line, potentially.

I think there's a -- there's a key component here, right, that indifference that we haven't talked about, that just came back to me, right?

The Commissioner, or the Chair, right, is running the show. Trena led the way, and set the -- set the tone for how we do that, how we should be doing this, right. And so there has to be -- you know, we have to get to the point where we're having some level of agreement amongst the Commission that this is the direction we want to go, and the Chair will drive that, and then the Chair will
give direction to the line drawer.

And so you know, I think that was a great model that Trena set up, and we're proposing to continue that model. But you know, when we did visualizations we were, you know, different -- there were conflicting input, and there was an agreement, right, but absolutely before we send the mappers off, or before we do live line drawing, we have to have some kind of a concurrence. And you know, when we send the mappers off to do some off-line work, we have to have concurrence.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, after listening, I just want to reiterate, because everything that was just shared to me is extremely important. I definitely agree with the VRA, and all of those of the piece parts. But I think because of the desire to still wanting to be flexible and add an additional day as we need, or additional half day, or make sure we move things and clean up little areas, all of those is where we lose time.

And I think it is extremely important. I don't know how to do it, and I don't know if Staff can help, or some of the other Commissioners. I know numbers of counties, but for the areas that we have been dealing with, they
don't necessarily fall exactly, you know, along --
however, if we can get an idea of how many people are
there, I think we're going to have to, because that will
tell us, we're going to have to use that population count
to kind of guide us in how much time we can afford to
spend.

It'll let us know early on if we have to take
another day, if we now need to work on the Sundays, and
the Mondays, or whatever else. What I don't want is for
us to feel that we have that kind of latitude and
flexibility, and get to the end, whatever the end is, and
then revert back to, we have to do it quick because we're
out of time.

And so for me, I think it's important that we go
into this knowing we do have a finite amount of time. We
can prioritize it any way we want to. We can make sure
wherever we start, I'm good with all of that. I just
think that there should be some kind of systematized way
of going into this that says: For this area, this is the
finite amount of time that we're going to spend, make it
work.

And then move on into the next area, so that at
least if someone, you know, going in this is what -- this
is our two or three days, this is our one day, you know,
based on population count, based on a fair kind of
analysis of what -- you know, what we have in front of us, and people that we're trying to work with from a population count.

And at the end of that, it just is time to move or we know we are now, intentionally, shortchanging some other area on purpose, right? And so we have to, I think, start there and be able to say we can have wiggle room anywhere we want to within these hours. But based on this population we're trying to make it map -- work for, we need to stick and be very disciplined in this time frame.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Great. Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I just wanted to be responsive to that Commissioner Turner. And what I'm wondering is, look, we're getting started tomorrow. Can we stick to the schedule in terms of the dates, right? And as we go through it, and perhaps Commissioner Fornaciari and I can take a look more closely at the population pieces. I don't know if we'll have a chance to do that before tomorrow morning, but try to allocate how much time we would actually spend for L.A., versus OC or San Diego.

But for this week, we don't go over, right. The first day at 11:30 is LAOC, San Diego, period. The next day is North State Sacramento -- or maybe we switch that
to Central Valley based on some of the responses here.
And we stick to that. We can attempt to put some time
parameters on it, in terms of hours within the day for
this week.
And let's see how that works. Would that be a
reasonable -- reasonable way to kind of move forward;
because I want us to be able to have this in place for
tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I think it's reasonable
because of, I don't have the answers, I don't have the
numbers --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- broken out that we need.
And so I wouldn't expect anyone else to have them ready.
So it's a good way to proceed -- do you have it?

MS. KAPLAN: (Audio interference) the county
populations, per county?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Based on how we have the maps.

MS. KAPLAN: Oh, oh, no. Okay sorry.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay.

MS. KAPLAN: I thought you just needed that.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. And so from that
standpoint, it's a good way to proceed. I just want
to -- yeah, I would just be repeating. Yes. That's a
good way to proceed.
(Whereupon, the court reporter interrupts for speaker ID)

CHAIR TOLEDO: It was Marcy.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes, and I'm going to throw a little bit of a twist in it. We're hoping what we come out of this today with is some sense of: We're kind of comfortable here, and we really think we need to work here, right? So I mean, if we're comfortable in an area with large population, then that kind of changes the equation. But we'll definitely work on thinking about this tomorrow.

CHAIR TOLEDO: We'll keep track of --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And I think -- you know, I think that's a fair way to look at it. So thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And we'll keep track of how much we're spending on each one of the districts so that we can monitor it as well.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, just real quick, I think we want to repeat what Commissioner Andersen did also say. I would be a little wary about boxing ourselves in. I think Commissioner Sadhwani is right. I think we -- it's a little late to be making a complete change. Let's go with what we have. Give ourselves a little bit of the flexibility that we need to see how it
works out. And then maybe next week we could figure out, you know, a little bit more of how much time we're going to need for everything.

But I would -- I would support just let's keep it with the way it is. And let's just allow ourselves a little flexibility, at least for this week and not box ourselves in too much. So thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

And with that, it's dinner time. So we will be back at 6:30. So we are on break.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 1:39 p.m. until 5:47 p.m.)

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, and good evening. We're continuing now with the Community Citizens Redistricting Commission's Business Meeting. We're continuing on with our Final Maps Committee presentation and discussion.

The next item for this Committee is discussion on -- it's actually a debrief on the feedback and the input that we've received thus far over the last fourteen days.

And I believe Commissioners Sadhwani and Fornaciari will be kicking us off. Oops, let me start my video. They will be starting us off.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right. Thank you, Chair.

Before we do, can you just walk me through the -- how much time we have?
CHAIR TOLEDO: We have about an hour.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: For discussion, and so if we start it with some of the global issues, and go around, so that each Commissioner can -- I believe we had mentioned three priorities per Commissioner, but maybe more as time allows.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I think that that would make sense. So perhaps we can do it that way. I think Commissioner Fornaciari and I went back and forth a little bit about it, on how to approach this conversation. But I think having each Commissioner identify three to five major priorities that they would have as they -- as they wanted change.

What -- what -- what he and I will be doing behind the scenes is taking the notes themselves, so that hopefully we can synthesize them into very specific priorities. And of course, this is a conversation also. So I think perhaps we can do a short round and try to limit ourselves to about two minutes each. That would take us about thirty minutes to get through everyone to list some of the top priorities.

And from there, once we've heard everyone's top priorities, perhaps we could engage in trying to better understand and synthesize some of the -- some of the
testimony that we've received, right. And we can
actually engage in and talk through.

Well, it's interesting you have this is a priority,
but you know, I might feel differently about it. So I
think if we each take about two minutes to give those top
priorities, that will take about half an hour. And then
I would leave us with half an hour to kind of engage with
one another. Does that work for everyone?

CHAIR TOLEDO: So I'm hearing top priorities. Are
you thinking three, or five, or how many, three?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I mean, I'm hoping three,
but if you -- if you absolutely --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. So what is --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Whatever you can fit into
two minutes, and we'll try to capture it.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Perfect. I like that.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: So whatever you can fit into two
minutes.

And Kristian, can you help us with monitoring the
time, because we're serious about our time?

So Commissioner Sinay, let's --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I want to be last.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, you want to be last? I thought
you had your hand raised.
So with that, let's see. Who wants to go first?

MR. BECKER: And I need you guys to be quiet, okay?

CHAIR TOLEDO: That was not for us.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. And yes, we will be quiet, thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: We will try our best.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Start to your left -- I mean, start to your right.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Any Commissioner wants to start? I want to take volunteers. Let's start with Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sure.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Two minutes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh. Okay, so number 1 priority is to get all of the VRA districts finalized because then the rest of it, I can't get to my number 2 and 3. And so just so -- I focused my review of all the comments mainly for the North area. So with that one of my priorities, and we heard during quite a bit of public comment, was the cities and unincorporated areas in Sacramento County are different from the surrounding counties, such as Placer and El Dorado.

So my priority is to keep the Sacramento County areas together, and then also build another, hopefully another district that has the suburbs of Sacramento that
are in those other counties.

And then another priority I have is, as much as possible, having Butte, Sutter, Yuba, Glenn, Colusa, and Tehama together as much as possible. They do have the AG, and as I've been told, as I'm a flatlander, so as a flatlander, they have different concerns and issues than those in the mountains. And then my --

CHAIR TOLEDO: One minute.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- my other priority is Del Norte. Initially I was okay with going with the coastal, but now I'm having second thoughts and thinking that maybe they do have more in common with Siskiyou going inward to the East. So that's probably something I would like to work on as well.

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And thank you for that thirty-second reminder, Kristian. And I think that was four, but again, I have to circle back to VRA. We really need to get that tied down. And then also the ECA coastal district --

MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- trying to figure, figure that one out.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Time. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.
CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Andersen, are you ready to go next, or do you want to -- you're next on my screen, that's why I'm asking.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sure. I'll jump in with -- I like the things which Commissioner Fernandez said, except that I also have -- you know, I like a lot of that, a couple of exceptions. But then my other priority is East Bay, the Tri-Valley, we never -- we kind of said, well, kind of threw something out there, and never really kind of revisited it. And the Cherryland, that whole area, and there's tweaks all around the South Bay, and cleaning up San Francisco a little, and Solano.

We divvied up that huge chunk out of it, and everyone said they hate it. So I'd really like to fix that. And I think that -- and then Hollister, the San Benito area. There's also then in the Valley, but I don't know if you'll be saying that.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. That was well under two minutes.

Who wants to be next? Commissioner Vazquez, thank you for volunteering.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. My priority is voting rights districts in Los Angeles County and how they -- and especially sort of the transitions, particularly into Orange County, North Orange County, and trying to figure
out also the both the South L.A. and Northeast L.A.
regions, and then also, to be specific, the West San
Gabriel Valley, particularly in the Congressional area.
Thanks.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. My
priorities align with some of the items that have already
been stated. So just to highlight, of course the
criteria that we all have to abide by, you know,
population, VRA, et cetera, but with specific emphasis on
the VRA areas that we have yet to nail down. L.A. County
is a huge priority for me just because of how densely
populated that area is, and the various VRA
considerations as well as communities of interest.

I'm also interested in focusing a little bit on that
border next to Nevada. We've heard conflicting testimony
about whether to cross over the mountains, or to keep it
in the more North-South type of district. So I'm
definitely keen on trying to explore that area more.
Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Good evening. Our priority is
the state, but you know, I guess we can highlight a few
of the -- a few of the issues again. Going with
Commissioner Vazquez, and what Commissioner Ahmad just said, just I think my mind is in the same area. Of course the VRA sets the pace. So I really think that we should concentrate on those VRA districts.

And then, you know, L.A. County -- L.A. County, the San Gabriel Valley, the border with Orange County, those are important. I think those are some hotbed issues. And you know, it'd be interesting if I go out a little further North to solving the Simi Valley, Moorpark, San Fernando issue. Of course, that would help us, that would help to drive some of the districts up North, but again, you know. And you know, I do think emphasis, or just paying respect to -- to our mandated population. Just, we have to always keep that mindful. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR TOLEDO: The time starts now.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, my, gosh.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. So top two, the split along the 10 in the Coachella Valley is a major problem, plus the fact that that split actually splits tribal lands that we were trying not to split. San Bernardino and Riverside being joined in a single district, I think is problematic. We need to look at that.
Others, you know, that I would say are priorities, and some of these we've heard, some we will hear; North County, and East County, San Diego, how to deal with Modesto. I agree with voices that have said, you know, take the Sierra region and take it farther North before coming over the mountains. So yes, I think it's going to have to come over the mountains to get population, but do it much farther North.

Dealing with Malibu area, and that Council of Government, and trying to find a better way to fit those pieces together. The West San Gabriel Valley, and the interface with the National Forest, the split in West Hollywood, putting Albany back with other Alameda County areas, and I would say --

MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- you know, we've got some work to do in North Contra Costa. So I'll leave it there.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. All right, let's see. Who's next?

Commissioner Sadhwani, are you ready?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. I was vigorously taking notes of what everyone was saying. So I don't have my own notes in front of me. So some key considerations, that's definitely nailing down the VRA
districts, particularly in the Central Valley. I think
to go along with that, we've heard loud and clear from
folks in Modesto, as well as from the Sierra folks, that
they don't want Modesto in the Sierras.

So I would agree with what's been said about --
about taking a closer look at going further North. I
think what happens in the Central Valley leaves open the
question of then Modesto further North into Sacramento.

So I think that there's going to need to be some
reconstruction there.

In Los Angeles, hmm, where to start? NELA,
definitely San Gabriel Valley with the -- the -- that 210
Corridor area, I think, particularly in the Congressional
maps need work. And I agree with everything everyone
said about the interconnection between Los Angeles and
Orange County. That is not a hard border. And we
haven't spent a lot of time actually looking at the --
the fluidity that might exist between that.

And I think we do have VRA considerations further
down that I want to make sure that we are being very
mindful of, as we begin to cross over into Orange County.
And so figuring out what happens there is, of course, of
great importance to me. And we've certainly also heard a
whole lot about San Diego and cleaning up some of the
maps in the San Diego area. So I would add that to my
list as well. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair. I love
everything everyone is saying. I'll repeat some of them.
Yeah, get Albany back into Alameda County, work on the
West San Gabriel Valley, the Congressional district, a
lot of feedback about that. The ECA, Sierra district,
yeah, go farther North, and stay out of the Valley if we
can.

Simi Valley and Santa Clarita, such conflicting
testimony, passionate, conflicting testimony, that we
need to land somewhere there, so landing somewhere there
that we'll feel good about. Our dear friends with the
Van Nuys, Sherman Oaks, the POSO line that we need to fix
in a couple of the maps. Lawndale, heard lots from
Lawndale and them wanting to be drawn into -- to be
included with the cities to the North of it.

Tri-Valley, yes, and VRA, of course, all over, but
especially in my mind, the Central Valley, and then
possibly going Westward towards the Monterey Bay. And
what possibilities there might be there, San Benito not
very happy about being included with Silicon Valley and
wanting to see what we can do there.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And so for me, I'd like to
definitely focus on L.A. County as well too, specifically those Gateway Cities, and the San Gabriel Valley, both the East as well as the West, and particularly the East San Gabriel Valley with NORTHOC. All of Orange County, I think there's different perspectives, very vehement, and very passionate requests to stay separated from L.A. County, particularly Long Beach, especially, you know, coastal -- coastal district versus no coastal district. I -- I think, you know, just there's been some conversation about that. Do they cross over into -- you know, into San Diego County? I'm also interested as well in the Simi Valley, Santa Clarita question, definitely the Sierras. We've heard loud and clear from the communities there, would like to explore that. The Central Valley, San Benito, Monterey Coast questions with its, you know, dip into the high tech areas of the Silicon Valley. Heard loud and clear that they do not want to be affiliated.

Sacramento, hearing a lot about that, that was also really important, and I think heard those as well, too. And I think others mentioned the Far North, especially the Siskiyou, and the various Native American tribes up there. And how do we honor that, as well as also the requests from the others who are in those areas, too, that wanted to keep their counties whole.
MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, great. Let's see. We have a couple more Commissioners. Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair Toledo.

Yeah, so I'd like to focus on the Klamath Tribes being kept together. I think it's the Karuk Tribe, I think we inadvertently -- I'm trying to remember the testimony -- moved it the wrong direction. So I definitely want to focus in that area.

Also, I'd like in the Bay, to work to keep Oakland with Emeryville, and with Rodeo, Hercules, Richmond together in an East Bay district. I'd like to work on decoupling Stanislaus from the Sierras. We talked about in the ECA. And then also see if we can't keep Merced whole.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Great. Let's go on to Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I'll try to be additive here. We heard a lot of -- some testimony from folks living in the Hayward area that they didn't want to be with the Tri-Valley. I looked at that. I don't know how we'll fix it, but I'd like to at least think about that a bit. We were a little haphazard in the way we split Santa Rosa. I did get a chance to take a look at
that and make something that makes more sense.

The Northstate is interesting. We've got more
testimony recently about going East-West and North-South,
but I don't know how we're going to reconcile that. I
think San Diego, you know, we just radically changed two
of those maps very quickly. And -- and we need to get
back there, and put that together in a way that makes
more sense. And that's, I guess, all I can think of off
the top of my head.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. So I'll give mine. And
I'm also -- I'm going to just keep it high level. So for
me, VRA is number 1, and focused in the Central Valley,
the Central Coast, in Los Angeles, and particularly the
NELA area, the Gateway Cities. The question around Long
Beach, and OC, and Los Angeles rises to the top. We've
received significant testimony from that area.

We've also received significant testimony from the
Central Coast, specifically from the Salinas, so Monterey
area, the San Benito area. And it's an area that
deserves attention, and that we certainly will want to
take a look at. And of course, the Central Valley, the
Central Valley needs attention as well. As does all of
California; and I think we named pretty much every part
of California through the fourteen of us.

So with that, we'll move on to the next --
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Chair?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sorry, Commissioner Le Mons?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, Commissioner Le Mons, sorry about that.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And Sinay.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And Sinay; two more.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Oh. That's okay. In the spirit of being additive, of course we want to focus on VRA, and then making sure that we can just reconcile as many of the areas that Californians have given us feedback on. That's where my -- I want my attention to be. Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. I agree with everybody's got my list, but what rises to the top is really looking at the Yuba, Butte, kind of that whole area. East Contra Costa, and making sure that we are kind of connecting all the working -- working neighborhoods, and that it's very different, you know, we're close, but we're not there.

Sacramento, I think there's a lot of questions that have been raised. The Coachella Valley, really figuring
out that conflicting testimony there, but really figuring out how to keep Coachella Valley together, and keep the VRA district strong, East -- for the ECA, really starting with Truckee and Lake Tahoe, North and South, and really starting up there and then moving down versus starting at the bottom and moving up, and then cleaning up San Diego making -- San Diego still needs some -- some architectural work that won't be that difficult. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Sadhwani, Commissioner Fornaciari, I know you've been taking notes. Anything rise to the top?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, so I mean, I'm back here just bullet pointing all of the -- the top concerns you all have just raised and the thought is, you know, between now and tomorrow I'll try to rearrange some of that so that we can see what folks top concerns were by region. Of course tomorrow we're starting in the Assembly, L.A., and working Southwards. So certainly we've heard over across many, many folks who have lifted up things like Mila, the West Sengebura Valley, Gateway Cities, Long Beach, that -- that L.A. to OC interconnection was raised numerous times, so to me that means that's where we should be spending our time and then -- and then moving further South because of the --
the potential ripples that are going to happen. I'm also hearing a lot of folks talking about the VRA districts in the Central Valley, so I might, you know, throw it out there. And I know this was a -- a -- a recommendation that had been made when we were looking at the schedule, but having Central Valley come before we -- we begin to approach the Northern California areas to -- to kind of hammer that -- that piece out. And I think from here it would be really helpful to talk through some of the key testimony that we've heard. I'd be curious if folks are having the same thoughts on some of these areas. To the extent that we can do that right now, I think our mappers are available to pull up the map for us and -- and look at some of it. Not actually start line drawing, but at least so we can have it up as a visual. If there are particular areas where folks would like to have a little bit more in depth conversation, I think we've received a whole lot of -- of testimony over the last 14 days. As many of you pointed out, conflicting testimony, and so I think here is our opportunity to talk a little bit more in detail about the conflicting -- the pieces that feel like they're conflicting throughout the state. You know, I think, if I may throw one out there, and I'm sure the conversation will -- will move from there. You know, I think the Modesto Sierra piece, I heard a lot of people
mention the Sierra district. I think it's called ECA in -- in both Assembly and Congress. It sounded like there was a lot of folks suggesting that we should definitely be creating from Inyo all the way North to, at least, Truckee and grabbing that population elsewhere. I think that would be an interesting place perhaps to start some of our conversation and the kind of testimony everyone -- everyone had. And then just to throw out there, I am absolutely going to share all of this with you, but it's kind of -- it's very notes form right now, so I'm happy to share it as I -- as I clean it up.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Great. Thank you. Commissioner Fernandez, let's start with you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, yes. And that's fine if we want to start with that. I would ask that the topography layer be added because there's actually quite a bit of the melon areas in some of these communities that they said they didn't want to be part of the mountains, but they really are part of the mountains, so I believe that's important for our discussion.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sorry, I thought she was going to go on. I thought Commissioner Fernandez was going to talk.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Am I winding or what?
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So just for clarification, Commission Sadhwani, so we're going to start here in terms of what our conflicts are or what we've heard and kind of try to hash out what we're -- we're going to try to agree upon. I think I'm just asking for clarification here?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I mean, this is an opportunity for us to talk about the comments that we've received, so I think we can really go in any direction we want to here. I was throwing out the ECA district as a potential starting point because I think we heard a lot from it. As everyone was prioritizing their comments that came up quite a lot. If you want to start off.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, thank you. Okay. I think then I'll just start it off with just maybe a general comment that I -- a theme that I've heard from all that commented on this particular region. What I heard is the mountains does create a very large, and at times, especially during the winter, impassable path to go from East to West and so anybody who lives to the East of the mountains have to go North/South and so the concerns around anything being on as they call the valley floor and besides just the identification was one of geography and just trying to cross over, and so I guess I'll just start there and just say that's -- that's a
starting place where I heard, as a way to kind of think
about the area.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you for queuing
me in, Commission Akutagawa. And I actually think we
should go -- start at Inyo and go up, but I just -- what
I thought was important that everyone should see, because
we did receive testimony from many of the counties not
wanting to be split, but if you look at the topography,
you've got Tulare, Fresno, Madera, all of those counties
have the map on there, so they may have to be split. And
that's -- that's I think what was important to me when I
was looking into this further and digging down and
getting more of that information on the mountains, that
more of the counties may need to be split in order to
keep that Sierra type district. And again, it will be
large because many of these areas are population wise are
small.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thank you. Yeah, what
I see in this area is, you know, Stanislaus said and
Commissioner Fernandez said, the flat part of Madera,
which is that area, but actually it's a little further
up, because if you remember we had testimony that talked
about the Coarsegold, I believe is sort of area where
they're talking about in Madera. That is part -- that is part of the Sierras, but the rest really isn't and that's what everyone in the Valley also says. Like what, what are we doing here? So I would like to see us almost, you know, do the reconstruction sort of around the edges so you can kind of have a really good look at, you know, how we redraw part of the areas and getting our area districts good and really solid with solid numbers, because that's really a concern. But it will definitely have to go further North and then I think actually we might end up -- I know we created another district kind of in that area, but we might shift it elsewhere to accommodate. It's just sort of what I'm thinking. I'll just stop right there for now.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Regarding the Sierras, there are two things. One is traversibility of the Sierras is one question. The other question is, you know, mountain communities versus valley communities. So you know, if we're talking about traverse ability, then we're talking mostly an issue affecting Inyo, Mono, and the counties on the Eastern side of the Sierra crest. If we're talking about mountain communities in general, then we're talking as Commissioner Fernandez said, we
need to have the terrain layer and see what is mountain
and what is valley, but we would still be faced with the
traverse ability issue. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy. And
Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I think on -- on --
just to build upon what Commissioner Fernandez and
Commissioner Kennedy just said, I'm also thinking about
not only what we've read, but Commissioner Andersen and I
had -- had the outreach liaison role to these counties,
or at least particularly some of the Eastern counties,
and -- and the understanding that I got is that the
mountain communities would prefer to stay with the valley
communities to the East. So that would include, like,
Mono and Inyo and -- and particularly because they have
some working agreements, like counsel of government type
work. I think they talked about some of that. Although,
you know, the further up it went, I -- I did read in some
of the COI testimony that they don't all see themselves
as being together, but I think due to population needs to
establish the districts to meet those deviations, we're
going to have to go further North. I think that's where
it's going to get a little trickier. I would suggest
that we -- we perhaps look at maybe some of the mountain
crests or perhaps even down from the foothill communities
as a place perhaps to what I think it was Commissioner Fernandez that suggested potentially having to split these counties. That's just food for thought that I'll just put out there. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So let's see. You know, I think the VRA districts in the valley are going to drive a lot of this. So you've got a lot of testimony from Inyo and Mono, what they would like, and I'm conflicted, you know. They are two very, very remote counties and people who lived in -- decided to live in those remote counties chose to live in a remote county and it's going to be far away for them wherever they have to go. You know, we -- we got a lot of feedback from the counties that would be on the Northern end of that district. They didn't have anything in common with Inyo and Mono and wanted, you know, a different approach. And so you know, I'm kind of conflicted here. I'd like to accommodate everybody's input, but this is -- this is going to be a tough one here because they're so small. I mean, my take is they have two -- two wishes, right?

One, they didn't want to go South, and the other one was they want to go all the way North and reach in and grab Roseville. I mean, it's like, so basically they want to drive the whole state map, you know, so I'm not
sure where to go from there.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Great points. Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you. And I guess I have a more general comment, but it sort of relates to this, especially since we're talking about the Assembly seats. And I hope I didn't miss it, or maybe it might, you know, cause a little bit more conversation, but as we march towards these final maps, is our approach as it relates to breaking up cities and counties more as it relates to communities of interest? So -- so we are going to -- our -- our consideration is that we can break up city and county lines when communities of interest seems to -- to outweigh for that particular region. In other words, the mountain region, we want to -- we are not -- mountain region, then we are overlooking or we're willing to break up those city and county lines. And I say that so we can see if we can get a consistent theme throughout the state so that we can start to see things through the -- through the same lens. So just sort of generally what are people's thoughts as -- as we go along this journey?

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner, I think, Commissioner, you have the response to that because he was working -- he and Commissioner Turner were working on the guide book -- or the play book.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Well, it's just that it's just
the six criteria. It's criteria number 4, places city
and county boundaries on the equal level with COIs or
vice-versa, so it's rather brilliant, but also it raises
many, many more possibilities for us to sort through
since we have to choose which one to favor in each
individual case, so I don't think there's any -- there's
not going to be any rule that can cover all the cases.
They're equal weight and we just have to decide which one
to use in each case.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Did the subcommittee have a
recommendation on -- on -- when you're looking at these
types of communities of interest, which include the
counties, the cities, tribal lands, et cetera?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I -- we, not as a -- not as a
subcommittee, but I do have a thought.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Earlier -- when we were
talking earlier -- oh, I just lost the thought. Oh my, I
should have said it earlier. I was going to wait until
you it out. But anyway, so we're talking about an equal
level criteria. Oh, thank you. Someone earlier talked
about the citizens Commission heavily weighing on the
citizens' testimony, so beyond it's equal, it's in that
same level of criteria, but we can establish as either a
policy or a preference that if we've had people that's
called in to tell us about the area that they live in, to
me it should take -- for sure should be heavily
considered when people have written in to tell us about
their COI area.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner -- let's
see. Commissioner Taylor, do you still you have your
hand up? I think, yes.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No, I'm going to lower it.

Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay, no worries. Commissioner
Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I -- I was actually
thinking exactly what people have been saying in that it
is communities of interest when the people in the same
county are saying the same thing, like, we would like
this to be cut up. And I think that makes it -- that
kind of makes it easier for us. And it is, you know,
communities of interest or common interests. Like in
this particular area we're talking mountains. It is the
mountains.

You know, mountains have completely different issues
than the valley and they're all saying the same thing.

So I think when we're -- when we're in an area where most
of the people are all saying the same thing, that is a
direction that I believe we should follow. I think in some of these areas it is kind of clear where other areas it is definitely not, like Simi and Santa Clarita. But in this area, I believe, you know, it's the mountain areas that they're talking about. Oh, I'm sorry, and the other one is the comment about, you know, the Mono, Inyo, and the mountain areas is federal land. That is a big issue, because they don't own their land and these counties have to then supplement their funds another way to pay for the roads, things like that. That's a common interest that they need a Congressional representative for.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I was just going to add and thank the mapper for putting on the Assembly district because, again, it's clearer than to see how we've drawn our draft maps that cut into -- down into counties and up into the mountains. So with the topography there, to me it presents a clear opportunity to split, which would split counties, but it would probably bring them in closer alignment with the community of interest testimonies for mountainous regions versus some of the inland areas and the rural areas down below.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Commissioner Sinay?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thanks. This is where there's, like, different names now for the different maps and so it gets a little confusing. According to our map on the -- the online map that we have that awesome tool. Well, never mind about what I was about to say. But ECA is higher up than the -- and the area we are right now Cala Inyo draft, but was that South -- North Tahoe, South Tahoe, Truckee are in three different counties and we've kind of just like chose which county to put them in versus join all three counties up there together. And so most of the testimony says please keep Sierra, Placer, and Eldorado together and I think that that, just for us to think a little bit about how we are joining on the East side. I think we -- we took a lot more time looking at the -- kind of down on -- on the valley, but if we can start up there and then see what makes sense down below.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, what I remember from the Mono, Inyo testimony was that fear of once again getting a representative from the valley. You know, the feeling was that if you grab population of the valley, that's almost certainly where the representative would come from.

So that in mind, you know, I think it does make
sense to split counties along the ridge line and go as far North as you need to for population. Now, the problem is, that's really far North, so you know, Inyo, Mono, Alpine, you've got about 33,000 people in the three counties all together. So you start going North and how far North you go, you actually get to Plumas before you have almost, almost the Congressional district, you know, so. And that includes all of Placer, you know, so it's just a lot of population you need to fill in somehow.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Commissioner Akutagawa and then Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I did want to address two things. One thing that I think Commissioner Andersen mentioned is that Mono and Inyo have federal lands. I also want to note that the Sierras, as you look throughout this topography I'm seeing this. There's a lot of national forests, national parks, and so it does seem to make sense to have, at least, you know, from that perspective, you know, a representative that would also be able to take that into account and perhaps stop, or start, going eastward at least either at the ridgeline or a little bit further down the foothills depending on how, I mean, depending on -- I know that some parts of it, like, Yosemite is, I believe, you know, a little bit
further down the ridgeline, I think, from what I saw on
the map. But anyway, separate from that, I think it was
either Commissioner Yee or somebody mentioned the VRA
districts in the central valley. My sense is, and please
correct me if I'm wrong, my sense is that when the
mountainous regions are sparsely -- sparsely populated
and that those who do tend to live in those areas tend
not to be quite as diverse, and I do wonder if removing
them would actually help increase the CVAPs of some of
the central valley areas, it may also mean in some cases
moving a little bit more Westward in that case, but just
wanted to just kind of point that out and to see if
that's -- that would be the case if by their removal it
would not really affect the CVAPs, especially the VRA
districts in the central valley.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I just wanted to
provide a little bit of -- of reflection on this
conversation. So we spent about 20 minutes at this point
discussing an area that's pretty low population. Just to
speak to the earlier conversation about -- about, like,
prioritizing, and I want to just try to clarify, right?
So based on everything everyone has said, we've kind of
talked in circles a little bit about the pros and cons.
There's federal lands. I would also just add to that conversation that I think we had heard also recreation areas, right? Going up through Lake Tahoe makes recreation areas as well. Are we -- where are we landing? It sounds to me like we're landing with something like what Commissioner Sinay had kind of proposed as pulling in those districts, and I think there's two of them perhaps at this point from Assembly and Congressional, and moving further up Northward to Placer and I can't see them right now, Sierra Nevada and up into that region and cutting along the ridgeline. Do we generally feel like, is that the general direction that the Commission wants to take? And I'm pushing this because I think that this is -- we need to -- we will need to focus ourselves to come to some consensus if we're going to operate based on consensus.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Turner, are you going to speak to this?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes, thank you. It's exactly the point I want to speak to. I am pushing towards that and I know that that's a rub and I guess where we need to just kind of name is that we've had some avoidance of trying to create a district that seems so long and
distant and all of that, but anytime you're talking about
sparsely populated areas, and our first criteria being
equal population, keeping in mind that we're trying to
create districts where people will have the ability to
elect a candidate of their choice, somebody that's going
to champion their shared concerns. It's going to be
long. It's going to be far, and so absolutely, that's
what I'm saying, Commissioner Sadhwani, is that I think
we should be building it in a way that makes sense for
those that can elect candidates of their choice and that
will include distance because of the sparse population.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thank you for that. I
would say in this area you can't get there if you just go
the ridgeline. You can't get there. The population
isn't big enough. You can go all the way up to Oregon,
you're not going to get there. And Inyo and Mono, most
of the things they were saying, including with people
from Mariposa Tuolumne, is Mariposa Tuolumne, Calaveras,
Amador, going into Eldorado, but again, it's the issue of
here you run into Sacramento areas going up North. But
then the other issue is, at the North, you've got to come
down to, so that's why we kind of need to look at this
all at one, which I was saying earlier. Do the North and
the edges and that'll kind of really help things, figure
out where we can and cannot go, as opposed to trying
to -- but I think we need those counties. You can't
just -- you need the foothills and those are -- that's
the gold country. That's what they're all about.
There's very little of the valley in there, except Madera
certainly has a lot of valley. Fresno has a lot of
valley. So I -- I would say going up, and I think it's
Eldorado, Placer, and Sierra Nevada always want to be
together. Placer and Eldorado always want to be
together. And then but you have the whole North area.
Tehama, where does it go? Does it go North? Does it go
with Glenn, Colusa, Yuba, et cetera? Those are the areas
that I would look at that combination and play with it a
little bit either way.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you Commissioner Andersen.
Commissioner Akutagawa, then Fernandez, Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I would -- I would
support going further North and I'm not sure who is
controlling the map. If you could just go a little bit,
I don't know, scroll down, scroll up, just closer to the
Oregon border so we can see a little bit more of the
farther North counties. Okay, thank you. So -- so yeah,
I would absolutely agree going further North. I'm also
thinking kind of along the lines of -- I think this is
where Commissioner Andersen was going. We're also
looking at, for example, Siskiyou, you know, the possibility of reconfiguring Siskiyou to keep the Klamath tribe together, so that may also kind of change things up for there. It may then be possible, looking at -- I know that Yuba, Butte, Sutter, Colusa, Glenn, Tehama wanted to stay together, maybe for population needs. That also means adding in Shasta, part of Siskiyou, or depending on far how up North we need to go for this Sierra district, you know, it could be a part of Shasta, a part of Lassen, you know, because it includes the national forest. I know that there's going to be some unhappy people about that too, but you know, just kind of maybe using that as our logic for that part.

I know that that area all feel that they have a lot in common in terms of the kind of agriculture and ranching. That's what I was hearing and reading in terms of those areas, but I'm just wondering if maybe that may be a possibility? Just like we have a very long coastal district, it just means that we'll have a very long mountainous Eastern edge district and it seems like a long of them besides, as Commissioner Sadhwani has mentioned, the recreation as a commonality, one of the things that I had heard and read, in terms of both the comments and the written comments, is having to leave the state to come back into the state, having to go into, for
example, Reno or into Nevada to get healthcare. That
also struck me as well, too, because going to the West
was not really an option. They had to go to the East and
so it seems like those are also some other kind of
common -- common, kind of, challenges that those who live
along the California/Nevada border as also grappling with
this too. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez, then Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. The
reason I was considering, or I would recommend starting
at Inyo is because if you start at the North, Placer
County has 400,000. So if you start at the North and
down, my fear was that Inyo is going to be put in with
some inland communities. So I was trying to keep Inyo
with that whole forest piece of it. So that's -- that's
why I was recommending going from Inyo, moving up, and
then once you get to the population then you start with a
new district.

So that's -- if you go the other way around, you're
going to get to your numbers fairly quick once you get to
Placer.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's go to Commissioner Fornaciari.

I -- I feel the conflict that he was feeling, but being
conflicted, so let's see if he unconflicted himself.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I know. No, I -- I didn't. I mean, we heard a lot from Placer and El Dorado and Nevada that they're East West counties, not North South counties. That they -- when we drew the district that -- that we're talking about now, we get tons of feedback from those counties that they didn't like it. You know, I'll just touch on the Siskiyou County thing. We did that and we didn't like it, and so, you know, we're -- we're talking about doing it again. We got a lot of feedback the other way. So I guess I'm just highlighting that we have a lot of conflicting coy input that -- that we're going to have to work through.

But I'll just circle back to what I said before. We've got to get those VRA districts figured out, because for instance, you know, Fresno in the Assembly, the North East side of Fresno is sort of an island out there unto itself. And where is it going to go? Right. It's got to pick up a lot of population to -- to make a district.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Yes, some of district are certainly going to impact the infrastructure of the whole state. And Commissioner Sadhwani, comment?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I completely agree that the VRA districts impact the architecture of the whole state.
So I'm looking at this just from an exercise of us discussing this area. And what I'm seeing is that we're not coming to any agreement. And it's not clear to me yet what the priority would be. Is the priority to create that North South district, or is -- is that a shared priority of the Commission? Or is it to -- to keep some of these Northern counties, Placer and El Dorado, for example, whole or moving East West? And I want to raise that, right, because I think this is the kind of mentality that we now need to have. Which one are we prioritizing, and are we going to move forward with?

I also just want to note the amount of time we've spent just on this one conversation. Right. We haven't even begun to talk about, for example, Simi Valley, Santa Clarita, or Santa Ana, or any of these places where we've had differing testimonies. And so I would very much want to just -- I know people don't like it, but in the beginning of this hour, we each took two minutes. It was hard and we had to force ourselves to rein ourselves in. But I think it's something that we should think about moving forward to have a little bit of -- of self-control there, or forced control, if you will, so that we can -- we can keep our -- our conversations moving. So I offer that as -- as something for the Commission to consider.
Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Any other reflection from the exercise? Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: One reflection is numbers. We say hey, what business in this. You know, Placer has 4 -- 401,000 people. So we start adding, and then El Dorado has 191. So too big for an Assembly district. Those kind of help resolve, you know, oop, can't do that, very quickly. And I think we should a little bit more like that, which I think was in the documents, you know, trying to bring up ideas of how we're putting this, and this and this together.

And those do create a district. And then how does it affect everything else around it, though? You can't just -- you know, everyone gave us lovely, beautiful districts in isolation, and we had to put them all together. And I think some numbers will help us do some of that. So I just thought we'd try to -- with our documents and our reference guide help ourselves with that.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Anderson.

Commissioner Sinay, Turner, then Vasquez.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. Building on that, I -- I would argue that well, my thought what I -- for me, it wasn't so much putting the whole county, but
putting a region together. You know, Tulare -- Tulare -- Truckee, South Tahoe, North Tahoe, and then building from there is what I said. And so I think sometimes I was trying to look at, hey, this is the anchor and then let's build from there. And I feel like we don't do that often enough.

We just talk about big, huge regions and -- and we're past that now. That was something we did in our first visualizations. Now, it's time to say, okay, how are we anchoring, and then move it from there. So in the valley part, if it's, you know, are we anchoring it with Tehama, you know, you know, Glenn, Butte, Colusa -- no, not that valley. The other valley. Sorry. You know, are we -- Yuba, Sutter, you know, is that our anchor, and then we add to that.

We need to start being specific about what's our anchor, and then what are we adding. Yes, the community is going to hate hearing that they're an add on, or they're not part of the anchor. But you know what? We -- that -- the -- that's what we're doing in our heads, but we're not verbalizing it and sharing it with each other.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And I think similar to what
Commissioner Sinay said. I saw it as an anchor in Inyo moving up not to have to take in the entirety of Placer, or any of the areas that were larger, but stopping with the needed population. So there would be splits, but it would allow then the mountainous communities to be whole. And I think we can get to the population if we go in Inyo, Mono, and then stop wherever we need to.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I -- I really appreciate the exercise, and Commissioner Sadhwani for you, sort of synthesizing, I think, my -- my inner dialog about this exercise. And for me, I -- we have got to spend this kind of time on the VRA districts, which we have absolutely avoided. And I think by necessity, that will -- it will force us to create these anchors in the VRA districts, which I think nearly all of us have expressed to some degree or another that like, yes, we like -- we're legally obligated to.

So let's get those right and figure those out. But they are going to require us to do these kinds of conversations, but with a purpose. And I think if we can do that, and if we can buckle down and have these conversations about the really politically contentious areas in the Central Valley, in L.A., in San Diego, in
the bay, then those are going to be our anchors.

And again, by -- by virtue of -- of just time, we're going -- I think we're going to have more productive conversations about non VRA -- non VRA regions of the state, because we'll have our anchors throughout the state in these VRA districts. And so -- we just haven't spent nearly enough time, honestly, in L.A. That -- that we really should, too, and we need to.

So I'm looking forward to this kind of conversation and -- and making commitments, hearing some proposals, and -- and getting consensus and -- and moving forward with those in our VRA districts across the state.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And that's the goal for tomorrow, Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah, just to build upon what Commissioner Sinay said, and Commissioner Vasquez said, I -- I couldn't stress enough, at least for my mind, the concept of the anchors. As -- as long as -- or as we've been presenting, I think we've all had different anchor points. We will never get to a consensus if we don't have a shared vision or a shared agreement on some sort of anchor point. We're always -- we're going to see the whole map through a different lens. And we have to get to a point where we're sharing some -- some concept. Something that -- that we all hold that that we can build
CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. So tomorrow we will be starting with Los Angeles, with -- with -- with the VRA district in Los Angeles, specified in the -- in the run of show for tomorrow, and then the schedule. So hopefully, everyone will have a chance to come with their thought process on these VRA districts in specific, but also other areas that we'll be looking at tomorrow. And be ready to have a thoughtful conversation about prioritization. The anchors that will anchor these -- these districts focused on the VRA areas, but certainly areas around it as well, so that we can move this conversation along faster.

But we have many districts to go through tomorrow. We spent about -- about an hour on -- on Inyo County up -- up North. And so we won't have -- we'll just need to figure out -- once we get used to this, and we got a hang of this, I think it'll go faster. But we do need to -- to make sure that we get through all of the areas that we need to get through. And -- and so we'll be imposing time limits as appropriate to -- to make sure that we get through the agenda, and have appropriate discussion as well.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Any other comments before we go to public comment? It's the end of the day for today, and I
know some of us still have homework to do.

Commissioner Turner, is your hand up?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: No.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I'm just imagining it. End of the day. All right, seeing no hands raised, we will go to public comment. General public comment. Please, Katie, if you could read the instruction?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Absolutely, chair. In order 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 ID provided on the livestream feed, it is 83961096845 for this meeting.

When prompted to enter a participant, ID, simply, simply press the pound key. Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press star nine. This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it is your turn to speak, you will hear a message that the host would like you to talk, and to press star six to speak. If you would like to give your name, please state and spell it for the record. You're not required to provide your name to give public comment.
Please make sure to mute your computer or live stream 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.

There may be a two-minute public comment period with a warning at thirty seconds, and fifteen seconds remaining. And we will be starting off our evening with caller 1302. And up next, after that will be caller 3241.

Caller 1302, if you will, please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

Caller 1302, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute.

Caller 1302, I do apologize, there may be some type of connectivity -- oh, no. There you go. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. I wanted to uplift the need to reach a general consensus among Commissioners before implementing the change, that all Commissioners have a chance to be heard, and each individual should be able to suggest changes before any one Commissioner makes multiple changes. Watching your November line drawing that balance was something often lacking. One Commissioner would often dominate the conversation,
usually the Commissioner from that area.

Deference to the home team may have been helpful early on, but it is time to move beyond that. I encourage you to not only embrace these policies, but the principle behind them. All 14 of you are going to have to vote for all 176 districts. All your voices have to be heard for every part of every plan.

If there is a line you support, you have to be willing to speak up for it, even if the local Commissioner opposes. If there is a line where you are from that you oppose, you have to be willing to recognize the will of the body if it is clear the rest of the Commission supports. You are Commissioners of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. Not Los Angeles, not San Joaquin, not San Diego, not Alameda, California. I thank you all for your hard work (30 seconds) on behalf of our state.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And right now, we'll have caller 3241, and up next after that will be caller 9194.

Caller 3241, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We sure can. The floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi there, I just want to say that when you redistrict the area in Orange County, like to the coastline, that you should make sure it's just from SOP to San Clemente, because it just makes sense that way. Like right now, with Dana Pointe being part of San Diego, they don't get much representation. And so their voices are drowned out by the district being mostly centered in San Diego. So they should come up and be part of an Orange County district.

And also keeping inland cities out is a good idea, too, because they have nothing in common with our area, with our coastal communities. And so -- and then also keeping it out of L.A., because L.A. and Orange County are like almost two different worlds. And so I think just an Orange County district, a coastal district will make the most sense. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And right now, we will have caller 9194. And up next after that, will be caller 5428.

Caller 9194, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute.

Okay, they hung up. We will be going to caller 5428. And up next after that will be caller 5546.

Caller 5428, if you will please follow the prompts to a to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Commissioners, I have been watching your hearings for several months, and have followed visualizations to preliminary maps. You've worked toward your population goals in less than one percent deviation in Congressional districts. When you found that you would had reached those goals, you moved on. No one ever asks, did we fix that problem? Did we create additional problems? You must be willing to go back and fix the unintended problems.

The Northern Contra Costa map is one of those Congressional districts. Albany is small. Alameda County Incorporated area is included with Richmond in Contra Costa, and Vallejo and Solano counties. 200 thousand plus people cities, both with great needs. You must be willing to go back to a previous idea that may be better. It is hard to admit you need to reconsider, but we are running out of time. The public needs to comment on any changes. There will be additional time to comment in ten years, but the final maps are just that, final.

Please consider North Contra Costa Congressional District for changes that will be better for the residents. And thank you for teaching the best postgraduate course in geography and government that I have ever taken.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: All right. And now we have caller 5546, and up next after that will be caller 3023.

Caller 5546, if you will, please follow the prompts to unmute.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Juanita Salas. I've called in several times before about empowering the Latino community in the Coachella Valley. First, I recommend you begin each day with a discussion of the Voting Rights Act for the plan and the reason being discussed that day. If that is done in closed session, it is no longer acceptable to deny the public a substantive report. Sorry about that. Back from your closed session, you should publicly report back on the VRA obligations, goals, and options you want to explore. Those three are all different. An obligation is a floor established by the VRA. There is an obligation to draw ex districts in Y region. There is not an obligation in Z region. So any majority minority districts should be drawn based on other criteria.

A goal is something you want to pursue to further the purpose of the act. While District X is compliant, we would like to boost the feedback for Group Y to maximize their opportunity to elect. An option involves tradeoffs between the VRA and other criteria. We would
like to explore -- keep exploring and keeping community X whole while still drawing VRA compliant district Y. Recognizing, if not the VRA is a -- if not, the VRA is a higher priority criterion.

That simple report will help focused Commission debate and discussion. Just wanted to make sure that you know that lawyers -- lawyers will always say don't tell anyone anything, ever. But this is not the VRA counsel redistricting Commission. This is a citizens' redistricting Commission.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: All right, now, we'll have caller 3023, and up next after that will be caller 0313.

Caller 3023, if you'll please follow the prompt to unmute by pressing star six.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, and thank you Commissioners. Good evening. Hello. I'm a resident of Yorba Linda, and I'm calling to thank the Commission for keeping our communities with Anaheim Hills, and East Orange, and East Orange in the -- in the Congressional draft maps. I think that this properly reflects our communities and our interests, because these are areas that make sense in one Congressional district. I do think, though, that we need to reconsider separating
Yorba Linda from cities like Brea and North Fullerton. We are currently placed in an inland Orange County, but we are separated right now from Brea and North Fullerton. Cities like Brea and North Fullerton have so much in common, both culturally, racially, geographically, community wise with Yorba Linda, Anaheim Hills and East Orange. So I would ask the Commission to please keep us all into one Congressional district. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And right now, we will have caller 8514, and up next after that will be caller 6638.

Caller 8514, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing the star six.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, one more time, caller 8514, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute. Oh. They hung up too. All righty. Right now, we will have caller 6638. And up next after that, will be caller 6089. Caller 6638, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

Caller 6638, I want to double-check your phone and make sure you are not on mute.

 Caller 6638, you are unmuted in the meeting, but we are not hearing you. Please double-check your phone and make sure you are not on mute.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you hear me now?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, we can. The floor is yours. Okay

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Thank you.

Commission, as you finish, I know you will continue to make sure under underrepresented voices are heard. Please do not lose track of your number one goal to draw fair lines for all Californians. I am not arguing to draw lines for the privileged minority. To the contrary, as a Central Valley Latino, I know how minority voices are often diluted. When deciding where to draw the 26,720 people living in (indiscernible) in Fresno County, so it's your priority be the 793 people who reported themselves as AAPI or the 22,064 who reported themselves as being Latino.

When deciding how to divide the City of Fresno, your main goal must be drawing strong Voting Rights Act districts for a city that is fifty-one percent Latino. Other committees should be respected, but not as extensive compliance with federal law. Look at all the trees, but not lose sight of the forest. Otherwise, you will make decisions based on those who are (indiscernible) best for the minority. This is true, not just in Fresno County, should the Punjabi community be put first in Fremont where they are twenty-seven percent
of the population, yes. Latinos make up fourteen percent
of Fremont. The AAPI community should be your priority
in the South Bay, just as Latinos should be in your
priority in the Central Valley.

In the Sacramento area, drawing Elk Grove to Placer
based on Asian Indians, who make up five percent and two
percent of the population is not respected at all. It is
getting lost in the forest. Yes, listen to testimony,
but at the end of the day that's the map.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you for your comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: All right, now we will
have caller 6089, and up next after that 0313.

Caller 6089, if you'll please follow the prompts to
unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I will be quick, as I know
you have a lot on your agenda. I just wanted to come in
and support the regional approach on your December
schedule. The draft maps division between Northern and
Southern California seems to make a lot of sense. So
alternating days between the two makes a lot of sense.
What is North should be, and what the South should be
South. Those decisions seem to be largely settled.

Meanwhile, in Southern California, it seems like
there are a lot of interaction between San Bernardino,
Orange County and Los Angeles. Particularly with San
Gabriel Valley and the Gateway cities. And those impact the ability to draw the best voting right acts districts possible in all three counties. So as looking out from Southern California, I support treating them holistically rather than separately. You want to make sure you draw strong representative districts for each, but you also need to recognize how they interact and ensure you are drawing all the opportunities for Latinos the law requires. Thank you for your hard work and good luck.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And right now, we will have caller 0313, and up next after that will be caller 8514. As a retry, which she called back.

Caller 0313, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. Thank you. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good evening, Commissioners. I wanted to speak today from Fresno County. I wanted to address some of the testimony that I know you guys have received from Kern County regarding Kern County and Fresno County not be in one district. And I know that there are multiple elected officials trying to gerrymander and sway public testimony in their favor. And I want you guys to all be aware that right now your draft maps have State Senator Andreas Borgeas, and State
Senator Shannon Grove in one district. And you have Congressman Devin Nunes and Congressman Kevin McCarthy in one district.

The attempts to separate Fresno County and Kern County in state and Congressional districts is a partisan attempt to create two separate Congressional Republican and two separate Senate Republican districts. This is not going to help our community here, because we need districts that prioritize our VRA communities, our Latino communities. And I know this can be accomplished while having Fresno and Kern in one district. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thanks for your comments.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: All right. Now, we will have a retry for caller 8514. And then up next after that, I would like to give caller 1396 an opportunity. You have not chose to raise your hand. If you would like to do so, please press star nine. But either way, I'm -- we will be giving you an opportunity. Oh, there's a hand. Perfect.

Caller 8514, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you for the redo. I am from Yolo County, and want to thank you for considering each of the three plans independently. Specifically, the Commission should reject the idea of just nesting the
Senate plan to save time for the other plans. Yolo County demonstrated why nesting is the lowest ranked criterion. There are fair arguments on both sides of where to put West Sacramento. I think it would be a good balance if West Sacramento was with Sacramento in at least one plan, and with Yolo in at least one plan. At times, smaller counties like Yolo, Solano, and Napa may have to be split. To me, splitting Yolo to put what West Sacramento with Sacramento makes them plan.

However, in your draft, the Senate plan, all three of these counties are kept whole within the same district, because you didn't nest. If you had nested, the Senate district Yola would have been split a second time, or the entire county would have been pulled into Sacramento. In general, you shouldn't nest more than the last mission did. Nesting seems to be a good idea in plenty of places, but not all. For example, just to the South of Yolo, there are an odd number of Assembly districts in the Bay Area. Nesting could unnecessarily throw together two very different Assembly districts.

Please take your time in drawing the Senate Plan. See where it lines up with your Assembly plan, make conforming changes, where appropriate, and make sure each plan can stand on its own merits. Thank you very much.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And right now, we will have 1396. If you will please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. One more time. Oh, there you go. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I've called before, and I first want to thank all of you so much for your tireless public service. I really appreciate it. I'm calling tonight about your proposed schedule, which I generally support, but have three suggested amendments. First of all, your proposed schedule emphasizes the opportunities for live line drawings, but it doesn't include time to reflect on the weeks of comments you've received.

Overall, I suggest that you build in some cushion to provide more time to review the valid feedback you've heard in the past week, and about the consequences of the map you've drawn. The proposed schedule focuses on the forward-facing process. That is, what do we draw tomorrow? But it excludes looking back, which would be are we happy with what we drew yesterday?

First, I suggest that you change your December 6th, and December 13th, meeting from, if needed, to be definite meeting dates that would allow time to make sure you are all comfortable with the lines you've drawn, and all the consequences those newly drawn lines have.
If there are places where some Commissioners are not comfortable and the fix is not quick, for example, when there is conflicting communities of interest testimony, those issues could go into your bucket list so you can discuss the differences and balance the priorities and resolve them in the last week. The length of those bucket list items will let you and the public know if you're heading towards finishing the redistricting on the 20th, the 21st, the 22nd, or the 23rd.

Second, I recommend you also add this reflective time for the Senate plan, which could occur on December 18th. Then beginning on the 19th, you could resolve those bucket list items for all three plans, reduce Congressional deviations, number the districts, handle Senate deferral. We all know the project has to be finished by end of year. This is going to be a rush to the end. But drawing the best lines possible should include reflection time rather than just live line drawings for every second until the time runs out. This means that time must be scheduled to --

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: At this time, I'd like to ask caller -- oh. Never mind. They hung up. At this time, we do not have any callers.

Chair?
CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's wait a couple of minutes to see if they call back.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Absolutely.

CHAIR TOLEDO: And then we will -- the lines will close at 8:00. If we have no further calls, we will -- we will be adjourning the meeting.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: The last caller mentioned the reflection time, and I thought we were going to do a little bit more of that. I know we did it a little bit today for just one area, but are we going -- mean, I thought that that was kind of what Commissioner Turner had -- had set us up to do this week. And then start the actual line drawing, because I feel -- I mean, I think it is critical for us to have some conversations, and not jump right into action.

We've been -- we've been reactionary. And I do feel that if we're going to get to the -- to the right place, the best place, we do need to have conversations and not just give direction.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I think that's absolutely right. I certainly had hoped that we would have a little more time today to do that. But I think, as Commissioner Vazquez kind of pointed out, you know, in
an earlier comment, like when we start tomorrow, I think it makes a lot of sense to start with some of these conversations before we start jumping into now change this line here.

Right. I -- I think, you know, and this is a part of like our homework is what is our overarching goal? What are we trying to achieve? What is one -- one -- and this is what I'm synthesizing right now from all of the notes that I took is, you know, here's all of the goals that were mentioned by various Commissioners. And do we all share those goals? Are there ones that -- that rise to the top for most of us?

And so I'm going to try and get all of that prepped and ready to go for tomorrow, and perhaps use that to start us off with that conversation. And hopefully -- hopefully, we can then dig into the maps from there. I hope that that's a reasonable way of working moving forward.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I think that's -- we'll -- we can try this approach. And I think if we try this approach and it doesn't work, we can try other approaches as we -- as we go through and find the -- what works for this Commission.

Commissioner Fernandez, Taylor, and then we'll take the callers that have come in.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, I do. I do agree with
Commissioner Sinay. But I also felt that as we go
through -- when we're looking at the maps, and working on
the VRAs, we're also going to have the conversations
there. So that's why I felt, you know, I've got my
information and when we get to that place, then that's
the time to have it. Because then it's -- it's actual,
right? It's real. We're looking at the lines. And I
thought that would be a good time to talk about it,
because then we can also see the ripple effects. And so
anyway, I think, yes, definitely talk about it, but
hopefully when we get to that point do the mess.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And just a reminder to
the public, the lines are closing at 8 o'clock.

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah, just real -- real
briefly. I strongly agree with the comments by
Commissioner Sadhwani and Commissioner Vazquez, and --
and the caller. I think we need to have those
conversations. The ground is for -- for our approach for
the day. Thank you.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I -- I definitely
agree with what the -- what the caller had suggested in
that aligned with what Commissioner Sinay, and Vazquez, and Sadhwani had said too. I do want to perhaps ask this question from a process point of view. We also had a fairly extensive conversation about, you know, time limits and other things like that. And I feel like reflection does take time. And I -- I appreciated how Commissioner Sadhwani did know just from the one district, you know, the time that it took. And that, yes, we didn't necessarily come to a -- a clear consensus.

But I -- I am -- I am just asking, are we going to reflect, or are we going to try to just try to move through as quickly and as efficiently as possible? Because I -- right now, I'm not necessarily seeing that it's going to -- I think given our style that we've established, I don't know if that's necessarily going to mean speedy. So I just want to ask.

CHAIR TOLEDO: I think it's a work in progress, and I think we're going to try to -- we're going to do the conversation, and while also being efficient and having time parameters around some of this, so that we can get through to the -- the districts that need to be. All of the districts need to be drawn, but specifically the -- the ones that we have on the agenda for tomorrow.

So let's go to call line. The queue. We have a
couple of lines --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair.

CHAIR TOLEDO: - with their hands up.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes. We have caller 5820, and then up next after that will be caller 1784. And I'd like invite caller 5566. If you do wish to give comment, please press star nine as to raise your hand indicating you wish to comment.

Caller 5820, if you'll please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, hi. I've called in the past regarding VRA districts in the Central Valley. I focused a lot of my concerns in the past on the City of Fresno, but I did want to kind of save that VRA district conversation for a little more up North into valley, specifically Stanislaus County. I know there's been a lot of callers in conversation today about Stanislaus County. And I just did want to reiterate the fact that by being able to split up Stanislaus County, that you as a Commission were able to achieve three VRA districts in the Central Valley. Which really was a huge accomplishment, and asked of the community here.

I know there is a fear from a lot of us in the Valley that some of the people calling in don't really want to maximize the number of Latino seats in the
Central Valley. So again, I just want to reiterate, you know, me and a lot of members of my community do support three VRAs seats in the Central Valley, and we do urge the Commission to keep a minimum of three seats.

If you reuniting Stanislaus as one district would have a ripple effect, that could marginalize Hispanics and Latinos, and prevent them from selecting a candidate of their choice. We know hard decisions are going to have to be made. You -- you can't make a hundred percent of people happy. But we do know that this is a priority for the Central Valley, and splitting up counties to meet Voting Rights Act regulations we believe should be the priority of the Central Valley. So thank you for your time, and your night, and you have a good day.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: All right. And right now, we will have caller 1784, and then up next after that will be caller 9194.

Caller 1784, if you'll please follow the prompt to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you, Commissioners for taking the time. I wanted to make sure I got in this. I just snuck in. I'm coaching high school girls' basketball. So it's a busy night, but I know you guys
are busy and -- and you're talking about everything. And I know there's been a lot of conversations about the Central Valley today. But I want to echo this last caller who called in. You know, I think you guys have done a great job in the Central Valley, just -- just meeting everyone's goals, and -- and listening in where I could tonight, you know, it seems clear there's another caller earlier talking about, you know, people calling in for -- for partisan reasons and -- and all this other stuff. And I just kind of want to echo his sentiment in the sense of, you know, I think you guys have done a fantastic job not caring who lives where, doing what. And -- you know, and I know you guys are working through a process, you know, reflection and all that is -- is a good thing.

But if -- you know, those of us who have been following this from front to back, you know, we want you guys to draw the lines. That's what the voters approved several years ago. And we want you guys to do it, and do it -- and do it right. We don't want the courts to draw it. We don't want the legislature to draw it. We want you guys to draw it. And so I'm just calling in to say, you know, this Assembly. I know you guys got areas of concern, but for my home area in the Central Valley, I think the three VRA seats that you guys have fought to --
to create down in the Southern part of the Central Valley is excellent.

I think you've heard the communities up North, especially the ag communities, and of course, Stockton, and then Tracy being kept whole, and then all this stuff. And I -- I just want to really encourage you guys just to continue on the path you are. I think you guys have done great work in the Central Valley, and I know there's a lot of noise. And I would imagine a lot of that noise late is partisan in nature. And I hope you guys continue to push your -- your bipartisan efforts to draw great lines. Thanks for your work. Bye-bye.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you for calling in.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And right now we will have caller 9194. And up next after that we will be caller 5566, if they would choose to talk.

Right now, we have caller 9194. Please follow the prompts to unmute by pressing star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'd like to start by saying I really like how the Commission discussions focusing on (indiscernible) to draw a map. I think that should be done in the case of Irvine and Orange County. That being said, the coast needs to be kept together from Seal Beach to San Clemente. Irvine and Costa Mesa needs to be kept
together more than -- than being with the coast. The
costal cities will lose their voice, and care for the
environment if they merge with the inland cities. The
ocean habitat of interest. The Congress person
represented both people and the environment. We need to
just stay united because of our common interests and how
much they rely on the ocean for our economy and culture.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: All right.

Now, we will go to caller 5566. If you wish to give
comment, please press star six. The floor is yours.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm speaking about city
underscore, very sunny underscore draft map in Alameda
County and Santa Clara County. Good evening, all. I'm
an active parent in the school, a basketball coach, a
student mentor, and scout leader. It deeply concerns me
about a clean environment for the kids and the community.
I support the Congressional districts, (indiscernible)
draft map, which includes Cupertino, Sunnyvale, Fremont,
Santa Clara, Milpitas.

There are two major, large industrial facilities
that create air pollution, and require local, regional
and federal oversight to protect several of the
communities as shown in the (indiscernible) map. These
facilities are the (undiscernible) planned and
unincorporated Cupertino on county land and the landfill.
Recycling and composting operations found new balance
that impacts located in South Fremont.

I have appreciated the current Congress member who
has supported the activists on this issue, written
letters to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District
and contacted the EPA. And we appreciate the Congress
member, whoever it is, and their Congressional office in
future to have a dedication to the community's concerns
with respect to these two major industrial facilities.

Commissioners, I thank you for your time, effort and
dedication to the community. We really appreciate it.
Thank you. Good night.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. And I believe, Katie,
that's the -- that's all of the calls.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: That is all of our
callers this evening, Chair.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Excellent. So with that, we will be
adjourning for the business meeting. I'm trying to
remember recess, adjournment, today is -- we're recessing
the business meeting, and we'll be coming back tomorrow.
We have a meeting to go through some of the deliberations
for the Los Angeles and Southern California region.

So we will see you when -- we're adjourning today.
No, I meant to say it. We're adjourning for today, and coming -- and we'll be meeting tomorrow at 11 a.m. Thank you so much. See you tomorrow.

(Whereupon, the Public Input Meeting adjourned at 8:07 p.m.)
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