

BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA BUREAU OF STATE AUDITS (BSA)

In the matter of

Citizens Redistricting Commission (CRC)
Applicant Review Panel (ARP) Public Meeting

555 Capitol Mall, 5th Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 30, 2010
9:30 A.M.

Reported by:
Peter Petty

APPEARANCES

Members Present

Mary Camacho, Meeting Chair
Nasir Ahmadi
Kerri Spano

Staff Present

Stephanie Ramirez-Ridgeway, Panel Counsel
Diane Hamel, Executive Secretary

Also Present

Public Comment

Joan Matthews, Applicant
Trudy Schafer, League of Women Voters of California
Jim Wright, Voter
Kathay Feng, California Common Cause
Malka Kopell, California Forward
Sam Walton, NAACP
Gustavo Cubias, California Common Cause
David Pacheco, AARP

I N D E X

	Page
Proceedings	4
ITEM 1. Approval of minutes from June 11, 2010, Panel Meeting	4
ITEM 2. Announcements	5
ITEM 3. Staff Report - Steven B. Russo, Bureau of State Audits, Chief of Investigations - Report on the bureau's activities in support of the panel, including forwarding application materials, confirming applicant eligibility, and gathering information concerning applicants	15
ITEM 4. Panel Counsel's Report	19
ITEM 5. Public Comment about Applicants	29
ITEM 6. Applicant Selection and Reduction of Applicant Pool	30
ITEM 7. Discussion relating to panelists' assessments about applicants, further assessment and review of remaining applicants, requests for additional information from or about remaining applicants, and remaining applicant selection phases, including, but not limited to, applicant interviews	58
ITEM 8. Public Comment on Items not on the Agenda	82
Adjournment	83
Certificate of Reporter	84

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

JUNE 30, 2010 9:32 A.M.

CHAIR CAMACHO: The hour being 9:30, and a quorum being present. I now call to order the June 30th, 2010, Meeting of the Applicant Review Panel to order. Secretary, would you please call the roll?

MS. HAMEL: Mr. Ahmadi - Here; Ms. Camacho - Here; Ms. Spano - Here.

ITEM 1. Approval of minutes from June 11th, 2010, Panel Meeting.

CHAIR CAMACHO: The first item of business is the approval of the minutes from our meeting of June 11th. Copies of the Draft Minutes have been available in the back. Did everyone get a copy? Okay. Is there any public comment on the Draft Minutes from our last meeting? No? Has each member had a chance to review the Draft Minutes from our prior meeting?

MR. AHMADI: I have.

MS. SPANO: Yes.

CHAIR CAMACHO: Do you have any comments?

MS. SPANO: No, I think it actually reflects the record.

MR. AHMADI: Yes.

CHAIR CAMACHO: Okay, so then I move that we adopt as final the Draft Minutes for the June 11th, 2010 meeting,

1 as prepared by staff. Is there a second?

2 MS. SPANO: I second.

3 CHAIR CAMACHO: All in favor, say "aye."

4 (Ayes.) All opposed? There being none, the motion
5 is carried.

6 **ITEM 2. Announcements.**

7 CHAIR CAMACHO: Our next item of business is the
8 announcements. What I have done is I have kind of put some
9 notes here and I will probably look down because I want to
10 make sure I say this correctly.

11 As we begin our work today, I think it would be very
12 helpful to step back just a bit and talk about the Applicant
13 process. First, I want to express my appreciation for the
14 enthusiasm and the talent that those of you who have applied
15 to serve on California's first ever Citizens Redistricting
16 Commission have shown. Can everyone hear me? Okay. I know
17 we have said this before, but it is worth repeating, the
18 vast majority of Applicants were outstanding. We have been
19 so impressed with the caliber of Applicants who applied to
20 serve on the Commission. In all honesty, most of the 4,546
21 Applicants humbled us in terms of what they have
22 accomplished in their lives. Even looking at them and
23 comparing them to what I have done, I am just so impressed,
24 and I look back at what I have done and I am just awed at
25 what most of these Applicants were able to accomplish in

1 their lives, even the length of the time, or even the short
2 time.

3 Also, I wanted to state that I was so impressed with
4 the history and what some of these Applicants participated,
5 they participated in historical events that I just wanted to
6 say that I was so impressed with these Applicants.

7 MR. AHMADI: I agree.

8 CHAIR CAMACHO: So, for those of you who have been
9 eliminated, please understand that being eliminated is not a
10 reflection of your talent, skills, abilities, or commitment.
11 These were difficult decisions, I wish we could have told
12 Applicants exactly why they were eliminated from the pool,
13 but because we were doing such a thorough job reviewing
14 applications, we just did not have the time to go into more
15 detail on the reports. But I hope that everyone understands
16 that being eliminated does not mean you are not a great
17 Applicant, it just means that, compared to 623 other
18 Applicants, your talents and abilities were less evident on
19 the application materials. Secondly, I want to assure all
20 of you, Applicants and interested members of the public,
21 that the work that we as Panel members have done to review
22 applications and to make these hard decisions has been
23 guided by fairness, openness, and most importantly, by the
24 requirements of the Voters First Act.

25 One of the most important things that we as Panel

1 members have done is to carefully review each and every
2 application and to assess the information provided in those
3 applications against the requirements of the Voters First
4 Act and the regulations. I assure that each of us read all
5 of the applications before we made the hard decision to
6 eliminate Applicants at our last meeting.

7 After the last meeting, I went back to the video and
8 transcript to make sure I really understood some of the
9 things Kerri and Nasir said about our Applicants, that we
10 discussed, and as I was reviewing the video and transcript,
11 I realized that some of my comments in the last meeting may
12 have suggested that I had not read every essay submitted by
13 the Applicants, that is not correct. So I want to clarify
14 for the record that I did read each essay; similarly, with
15 the Letters of Recommendation, I read the Applicant
16 materials, I spent the most time reviewing the Application
17 materials for those Applicants who appeared to me to be the
18 most competitive, but I did read the application materials
19 sometimes two or more times. To be honest, I am not very
20 comfortable or used to speaking in a public setting; the
21 cameras make me nervous, and you couple that with working
22 80-90 hours a week for months, and I end up being not good
23 at something I am not familiar with. So, I am sorry if I
24 have confused anyone and I sure hope the public will
25 understand why I may not always articulate clearly what is

1 on my mind. I also think it is important to understand
2 that, although we focused our initial review on the essays
3 provided by Applicants, this does not mean that we did not
4 look at the other application materials, it simply means we
5 may have focused our attention somewhat more on the essay
6 responses. The law requires that Applicants demonstrate
7 that they have the relevant qualifications; the best place
8 for Applicants to show us they could do the job was in their
9 essay responses. So, that is where we focused the most time
10 in making the initial assessments.

11 I also want everyone to know that, although each of
12 us had staff which was fully dedicated to assisting us in
13 reviewing applications, each of us read the application
14 materials and we, not our staff, made decisions about how we
15 would vote in the last meeting. You may have heard us refer
16 to our "silos," a term we use to describe the staff that
17 each of us had assigned to assist us. Our staff was
18 tremendously helpful in reviewing the materials and
19 highlighting certain information, but each of us thoroughly
20 reviewed Applicant materials and made our own decisions. We
21 read the materials, we made the decisions, and we spent
22 whatever amount of time was necessary to determine whether
23 an Applicant should or should not remain in the pool. That
24 meant, and has meant, working numerous hours every week
25 since April 19th. I hope the public understands the great

1 deal of care we are taking to select the Commission, and how
2 seriously we take adhering to the law.

3 MS. SPANO: You made a great point, Mary, and I just
4 want to reemphasize that, though we were clear in what we
5 did, I think the public has some questions and I want to
6 explain a little bit more about what we did. First and
7 foremost, everything we did was consistent with the law. We
8 gave every application a fair, thorough, and impartial
9 review. We looked at everything we needed to do to get an
10 idea and a good picture of each Applicant. Yes, we had some
11 help from designated staff, but they individually worked at
12 our direction. We trained them with the help of legal
13 counsel to teach them the law, to get them focused on the
14 law, and they were not allowed to talk to any of the other
15 Silos that worked with the other Panelists. They reviewed
16 application materials, like Mary said, the summaries, and
17 highlighted the materials, tried to direct our focus. We
18 looked at the Applicant materials and the recommendations,
19 and we made the decisions. So there should not be any doubt
20 that any of the ARP Panelists, any three of us, reviewed
21 every application and made our own decisions.

22 MR. AHMADI: All that is true and I just wanted to
23 add a few words, myself. And just echoing on what was just
24 spoken by Mary and Kerri, and I think in the last meeting we
25 talked about it, but I think we really need to emphasize on

1 this, as Kerri and Mary said, the decisions that were being
2 made were our decisions. I, personally, made the decisions,
3 and I personally reviewed every Applicant's material, and
4 those decisions, as I stated, in the last meeting were not
5 easy all the time. They were very very difficult,
6 especially that we have a lot of talent and there was a lot
7 of back and forth and reviews that I did before I made the
8 decisions.

9 As I said in the last meeting, and also in April, I
10 believe, our initial review was more focused on minimum
11 qualifications to identify the most qualified Applicants,
12 and the analytical skills and other talents the Applicants
13 demonstrated on their applications were used to make those
14 judgments, initially. And after we made the decision about
15 who is the most qualified Applicant, I went back and looked
16 at diversity, as well, because the law requires us to look
17 at diversity, being racial, ethnicity, and also economic
18 status, gender, and geography. So, looking back at the
19 diversity, I was very pleased to see that the decisions I
20 had made based on analytical skills and ability to do the
21 work, whether or not the person who would be able to
22 successfully achieve the objectives of the law, I was
23 pleased to see that not only had I selected the most
24 qualified, but I also had a good diverse group in my group
25 of Applicants.

1 And as we saw in the last meeting, the reports that
2 the staff provided, I am also glad that we have diversity in
3 the pool that we retained. And looking back at the
4 decisions that were made, we eliminated over 3,900
5 Applicants, unanimously. I think that is indicative of the
6 fact that we are following a process that is very rigorous,
7 very thorough, and very effective. It is not easy to
8 compare an A+ with an A, or an A+ with an A+, but we are
9 doing our best to make sure that not only are we in
10 compliance with the law, but also to do it efficiently. So
11 I just wanted to emphasize the fact that the reviews that we
12 did, the staff that helped us, were aimed towards the common
13 goal of achieving efficiency, without losing or compromising
14 the effectiveness of the process and the quality of the
15 reviews. I guess I just wanted to make sure that the public
16 understands that I made the decisions myself, based on my
17 reviews, and I reviewed every application. In going
18 forward, I think we will follow the same process to make
19 sure that we have a fair and thorough review process in
20 place, and that we are in compliance with all of the
21 applicable laws. So, thank you.

22 CHAIR CAMACHO: With that in mind, let's move
23 forward. What I want to do is kind of just give you a sense
24 of how this meeting is going to progress. We are going to
25 first have a staff report from Steven Russo, then the

1 Counsel will provide us with one or more written reports
2 that are going to reflect the individual's assessment, so
3 the individual's Panel's assessment of each Applicant. We
4 have not seen this report yet, so we are not really sure
5 what we are going to see, we are not sure about the
6 demographics, but, however, copies are going to be provided
7 at the back of the room after Counsel has provided her
8 information. So, for those who are viewing this meeting
9 over the Internet, Counsel is disseminating the report to
10 us, Bureau staff will attempt to upload onto our website,
11 and that is the WeDrawTheLines.ca.gov website, and we hope
12 that it will be available shortly after we receive it, so
13 that you will be able to follow along.

14 Secondly, I would like to have you know that the
15 Bureau has made all Applicant materials public, so what we
16 have received is what has been put on the website, so you
17 are seeing exactly what we are seeing, nothing more.

18 What we have done, as you can see in the back of the
19 room, there are a couple of laptops, instead of making
20 copies of Applicant materials because it can be very
21 voluminous, some of the Applications could be 40 pages, and
22 then you have public comments, and then you have your
23 Letters of Recommendation, that is just a lot of documents.
24 So, to be a little bit more green, and also due to fiscal
25 concerns, we have provided those laptops in the back, and so

1 you can view Applicant materials in the back of the room.

2 We do not know how long this meeting is going to
3 last. It is scheduled to last until July 2nd, however, it is
4 possible that we will complete our business before that. If
5 we do, we will adjourn. We will also take periodic breaks
6 because this could be a long meeting, so just to let you
7 know that we will be taking breaks. Also, depending on how
8 many members of the public wish to comment on items, we may
9 need to limit the maximum amount of time individuals may
10 speak, or limit the amount of time on Applicants for public
11 comments on a matter, we will assess this as we proceed
12 through the agenda items.

13 I want to remind everyone of our ground rules on
14 public speaking. Once we call for public comment, please
15 line up at the podium. After I recognize you, state your
16 full name for the record, make your comment, and return to
17 your seat. Once the meeting begins, what is going to happen
18 is the website will reflect these changes. So, any of the
19 Applicants that have been removed will be taken off the
20 website. This will be performed as quickly as possible, and
21 so it will reflect the smaller pool. So, this could be
22 whenever the meeting adjourns, that is when it will be. So,
23 if you are unable to watch the whole meeting or stay in this
24 meeting, you can go to our website and see who is still
25 remaining in the pool. Also, I want to remind everybody who

1 has submitted a Form 700, we have not received the Form
2 700s, so if per chance the Applicants that have submitted
3 Form 700 have been removed from the pool, those Forms 700
4 will be destroyed, unless the Applicant requests for the
5 Form 700 to be submitted back to them. Once we receive the
6 listing, we will receive the Form 700s for the remaining
7 Applicants. I would like to remind all of the Applicants
8 that are still remaining in the pool that they must submit
9 their Form 700s by April 12th - oh, sorry -

10 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: You are tired.

11 CHAIR CAMACHO: I am still thinking it is April
12 19th. So please submit your applications by July 12th, so
13 this means that the applications have to be in the Bureau's
14 office - did I say it again?

15 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Form 700s, they are received
16 by the Bureau.

17 CHAIR CAMACHO: Okay, thank you - by July 12th, by
18 close of business. So if you have any questions or any
19 comment or concerns about the Form 700, please contact the
20 Bureau now so that they can answer any of those questions
21 because, obviously, as it gets closer to the deadline, those
22 questions might not be able to be answered if you call April
23 12th - July 12th, I am just so tired - July 12th, okay? Do
24 any of the other Panel members have any announcements that
25 they would like to make before we move on to the next agenda

1 item?

2 MR. AHMADI: I think you covered it very well.

3 MS. SPANO: Actually, I do. I just want to say to
4 the public that, as I was reviewing the finite details of
5 the applications, I realized that there was one Applicant by
6 the name of Kenneth MacPherson, that could be someone that
7 my husband may work with, and so I asked him if he knew this
8 person, and he confirmed that he did. I do not know this
9 Applicant, personally, and I have never met or spoken to
10 this Applicant, nor do I ever discuss ARP matters with my
11 husband. But, in the interest of transparency, I just
12 wanted the public to know how remote this connection.

13 **ITEM 3. Staff Report - Steven B. Russo, Bureau of State**
14 **Audits, Chief of Investigations - Report on the Bureau's**
15 **activities in support of the panel, including forwarding**
16 **application materials, confirming applicant eligibility, and**
17 **gathering information concerning applicants.**

18 CHAIR CAMACHO: Our next item on the agenda is a
19 staff report from Steven Russo, who is the Bureau of State
20 Audits Chief of Investigation. This report is the Bureau's
21 activity in support of the Panel, including forwarding
22 application materials, confirming Applicant eligibility, and
23 gathering information concerning Applicants. However,
24 Steven was not able to be at this meeting because there was
25 some urgent business, so he is not in the office. However,

1 my understanding is that Steven provided his comments to our
2 Counsel. Is that correct?

3 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: That is correct.

4 CHAIR CAMACHO: Okay. Can you please read those
5 comments?

6 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Yes. Mr. Russo actually
7 provided me with some comments and, for the sake of not
8 botching them, I will go ahead and read them into the
9 record, and that way you will almost have the benefit of Mr.
10 Russo's report. He writes:

11 "Since the last meeting of the Applicant Review
12 Panel on June 11th, 2010, Bureau staff is continuing to
13 provide support to the Panelists described in this report at
14 that meeting. More specifically, Bureau staff has been
15 continuing to consult with the Secretary of State's Office
16 and County Election Departments to confirm that Applicants
17 satisfy the eligibility requirements set forth in the
18 California Constitution for serving as members of the
19 Citizens Redistricting Commission. Bureau staff has also
20 been searching public records to identify any Applicants
21 having a disqualifying conflict of interest, as defined by
22 the Voters First Act. In addition, Bureau staff has been
23 researching and responding to questions from members of the
24 Panel concerning statements made by Applicants in their
25 application materials that suggested potential ineligibility

1 conflicts of interest, or untruthfulness. All reports to
2 the Panel have been posted on the Bureau's Redistricting
3 website with the Applicants' application materials. As an
4 additional matter, after the Panel's meeting on June 11th,
5 2010, Bureau staff placed a previously excluded Applicant
6 into the Supplemental Applicant Pool in a response to a
7 Request for Reconsideration. The circumstances for the
8 addition of Applicant A'lyce Baldarelli to the Supplemental
9 Applicant pool are as follows: Ms. Baldarelli successfully
10 submitted an initial Application for Selection to the
11 Commission on January 31, 2010 and, based upon her
12 submission, was included in the initial Applicant pool
13 established by the Bureau on February 17th. Ms. Baldarelli
14 therefore was invited to submit a Supplemental Application
15 with three Letters of Recommendation by the extended
16 deadline of April 19th, however, while the Bureau received
17 three Letters of Recommendation from Ms. Baldarelli by the
18 filing deadline, it did not receive a Supplemental
19 Application from her. Accordingly, the Bureau excluded Ms.
20 Baldarelli from the Supplemental Applicant pool for failing
21 to comply with the procedural requirement of the Application
22 process, specifically for failing to submit a completed
23 Supplemental Application packet by the application deadline.
24 The Bureau informed Ms. Baldarelli of her exclusion on April
25 29th, 2010, and within 10 days of being given that notice,

1 Ms. Baldarelli requested reconsideration of her exclusion on
2 the basis that an inadvertent computer error had caused her
3 application not to be received. Unfortunately, while Ms.
4 Baldarelli's Request for Reconsideration was timely and
5 properly received, and she stated grounds for
6 reconsideration that served as the basis for other
7 Applicants being granted reconsideration of their exclusion
8 from the Supplemental Applicant pool, her request was
9 misfiled. The circumstances of this misfiling appear quite
10 unique, and so far as we can determine at this time, it is
11 the only Request for Reconsideration that was misfiled, but,
12 as a result, no action was taken on her request. Then, on
13 June 2nd, Ms. Baldarelli contacted the Bureau to inquire
14 about the status of her reconsideration request. In
15 response to this inquiry, staff searched the Bureau's files
16 and determined that the Request for Reconsideration had, in
17 fact, been misfiled, that a request would have been granted
18 had it not been misfiled, and advised her that the Bureau
19 would correct its error at its first opportunity, which
20 would not be until after the Panel's June 11th meeting, as
21 the Agenda had already been published for that meeting and
22 the Applicant names were listed on the Agenda. So, at its
23 June 11th, 2010 meeting, the Panel reduced the Supplemental
24 pool of Applicants from 4,546 Applicants to 622 Applicants.
25 Thereafter, the Bureau granted Ms. Baldarelli's request for

1 reconsideration of her exclusion from the Supplemental
2 Applicant pool and included her in the pool, increasing the
3 Applicant pool to 623 Applicants. Ms. Baldarelli's
4 application materials were simultaneously posted on the
5 Bureau's website, along with the documents related to her
6 Request for Reconsideration." And that concludes Mr.
7 Russo's report.

8 CHAIR CAMACHO: Thank you. And thank you, Mr.
9 Russo and his staff for performing such an outstanding job.

10 **ITEM 4. Panel Counsel's Report.**

11 CHAIR CAMACHO: Next on our agenda is the Panel
12 Counsel's Report. Counsel, please provide your report.

13 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I
14 have two items to report today. The first item is really
15 just administrative. I wanted to explain why we modified
16 the room set-up a bit, and I think that this was something
17 that we had considered, but it was also suggested by Mr.
18 Wright last time. We added the tables and set it at angles
19 for you to facilitate better discussions, while minimizing
20 neck strain.

21 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

22 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: But we also provided - you
23 are welcome - but we also provided you with room so that you
24 could spread out your materials a little bit. Additionally,
25 as we get to a place where we start talking about applicants

1 individually, you may want your assistants to join you at
2 the tables and help you stay organized with your materials
3 and track decisions and discussions, so there is now room
4 for that to happen if you decide that you need it.

5 The second item that I have to report is that,
6 once again, we have generated some reports for your
7 consideration. You completed your work on Sunday, January
8 27th, and on Monday morning, I had staff generate reports for
9 me, which Diane will soon disseminate. Just like last time,
10 this will be the first time, as you indicated, that you have
11 seen the reports because the only people who have seen them
12 are people within the Bureau who I needed to assist me in
13 preparing them, and they have been kept in the strictest
14 confidence. Just like last time, we have generated a list,
15 this time, of 309 Applicants who, after the second round of
16 Panelist reviews, did not receive a single favorable
17 recommendation from any Panelist. We also have a list of
18 314 who received one or more favorable recommendations from
19 the Panelists. And we have further broken that down so that
20 you can see the demographics of the 162 Applicants who
21 received only one favorable recommendation, similarly, the
22 demographics of the 80 Applicants who received two favorable
23 recommendations, and also the demographics of the 72
24 Applicants who received three favorable recommendations.
25 And we also have a report that shows the demographic totals

1 for the 314 Applicants who received one or more favorable
2 recommendations.

3 In addition, though, I actually asked staff to run
4 some new reports for you. As you know, the first
5 assessments were based really on, as Mr. Ahmadi indicated,
6 identifying those core minimum qualifications of Applicants,
7 so, in other words, you went through the 4,546 applications
8 to identify a smaller pool of Applicants who compare to all
9 other Applicants without regard to party affiliation, were
10 the most qualified. After that assessment was completed,
11 you identified 622 Applicants who you felt were the most
12 qualified and, at that point, there was not a need to
13 balance the numbers in terms of party affiliation because
14 that was not your focus, although I know each of you were
15 careful to assess your most qualified to verify that you had
16 sufficient political, racial, ethnic, gender, economic, and
17 geographic diversity. But now the focus has changed. The
18 law requires you to identify 40 Democrats, 40 Republicans,
19 and 40 Applicants who are not affiliated with either major
20 party, so that you may interview 120 of those individuals.
21 So, now the focus has to be on party affiliation, as well as
22 other types of diversity, and the law is very specific, that
23 you have to have equal political diversity. So, recognizing
24 that it is now time to compare Democrats to Democrats and
25 Republicans to Republicans, and non-affiliated with non-

1 affiliated Applicants, we have provided some additional
2 reports to show you the 115 Democrats who received one or
3 more favorable recommendations, and you will see that, on
4 that report, we have listed the Democrats by name. We have
5 reflected that each Democrat's individual demographic
6 information and also how each of you assessed the Applicant.
7 As a companion to that report, we have also prepared some
8 totals on those 115 Democrats in terms of where they come
9 from and their economic status, and so forth. We ran
10 similar reports for the 113 Republicans who have now
11 received one or more favorable recommendations, and also for
12 the 86 Applicants who are not affiliated with either the
13 Democratic Party, or the Republican Party, that received one
14 or more favorable recommendation.

15 I know it is a lot of data, but I wanted you to
16 have all the information that you think might be necessary,
17 and I wanted to slice it a couple of different ways for you;
18 again, it comes from the computer, so you do not have to
19 rely on my math skills. That concludes my report. Diane,
20 if you would be kind enough to distribute those reports to
21 the Panel, and also make some available in the back of the
22 room, and at this time, Bureau IT staff will attempt to
23 upload the reports onto the website so that those folks who
24 are following via live stream can view them, and hopefully
25 that will be successful.

1 MR. AHMADI: Thank you, Stephanie.

2 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: You are welcome.

3 CHAIR CAMACHO: I would like to thank the Counsel
4 for that report. Also, Nasir and Kerri, do you have any
5 questions or comments that you would like to ask of
6 Stephanie?

7 MS. SPANO: No -

8 MR. AHMADI: Not without looking at the reports, I
9 guess. Once I have a chance to look at -

10 CHAIR CAMACHO: Members of the public, do you have
11 any questions or comments?

12 MS. MATTHEWS: My name is Joan Matthews. I am an
13 Applicant from Tracy, California. I noticed that you
14 outlined the Applicants in terms of ethnic background, and
15 the demographic, the whole demographic, but I did not hear
16 anything about age. Was there any age discrimination? And
17 did you evaluate age in there as an issue?

18 MR. AHMADI: I -

19 MS. MATTHEWS: Do you have a top age that you
20 said, you know -

21 MS. SPANO: No.

22 MS. MATTHEWS: No.

23 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Age is actually not one of
24 the types of diversity that the pool is required to have,
25 and so we have not tracked that data.

1 MS. MATTHEWS: Thank you very much. Being aged,
2 it is important to me. But I do want to thank the Panel and
3 the Committee again for the hard work. I think it is
4 incredible that you did what you did. When you lead a new
5 way to do things, it is time-consuming, it is exhausting,
6 and you have done a really fine job of keeping us informed,
7 so I want to personally thank you all.

8 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

9 MS. SPANO: Thank you.

10 CHAIR CAMACHO: Thank you so much, Mrs. Matthews.

11 MR. AHMADI: We have another comment.

12 CHAIR CAMACHO: Oh, great, thank you.

13 MS. SCHAFER: Hello, I am Trudy Schafer
14 representing the League of Women Voters of California, and I
15 am not certain this is the appropriate time for these
16 comments, but I thought I should ask you if it is. They
17 really are just a couple of comments about aspects of the
18 work that you are doing today, and as you do the discussion
19 and selection of the Applicants. I will just continue and
20 see if this seems appropriate. My first comments are about
21 the goal of selecting a diverse Commission and -

22 CHAIR CAMACHO: We are going to get into that, but
23 a little bit later. I think it is our Agenda Item 7.

24 MS. SCHAFER: All right, these are things to just
25 reinforce that you will be considering as you go through

1 your deliberations. Is that number 7 still the best place
2 for that?

3 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: There will be an
4 opportunity to comment on the Applicant pool. I think you
5 have a Panel that might be dying to see the results.

6 MS. SCHAFER: Yes, I am sure you are. I will wait
7 until -

8 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: If it is not convenient,
9 then, by all means, now if you have another place to be, but
10 if you can wait and you are planning to stick around -

11 MS. SCHAFER: All right, thank you.

12 CHAIR CAMACHO: Yeah, because there is going to be
13 a couple more - probably after most of the agenda items, we
14 will have public comment, so if you see in the agenda - and
15 hopefully you can stay?

16 MS. SCHAFER: Yes, I will stay for at least
17 through the morning. I just wanted - these are so general
18 that I did not want them to be - and the League is not
19 making comments on any individual Applicants, and so I just
20 wanted to put that in the right place.

21 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Whatever you are
22 comfortable with.

23 CHAIR CAMACHO: Yeah, since you are only going to
24 be here in the morning, to make sure that we receive your
25 comments, please do.

1 MS. SCHAFFER: All right, thank you. As I said, my
2 first comment was about the goal of selecting a diverse
3 Commission which, of course, you know, is mandated by the
4 Constitutional provision that the selection process is
5 designed to produce a Commission that is independent from
6 Legislative influence, and reasonably representative of the
7 State's diversity. We were very pleased that the
8 regulations implementing Prop. 11 recognized the need that,
9 if you are going to ensure a diverse final pool in step with
10 the final part of Prop. 11 that requires that, in selecting
11 the final six Commissioners, the six Appointees shall be
12 chosen to ensure the Commission reflects the State's
13 diversity, including, but not limited to, racial, ethnic,
14 geographic, and gender diversity, so two of the sections of
15 the Regulations, 60848F and 60850E, apply as you narrow the
16 pool, first to the 120 to be interviewed, as you are doing
17 today, and to the pool of 60. And they require that you -
18 and I am quoting - "also consider whether the composition of
19 the pool of Applicants to participate in [that, whichever
20 phase we are talking about] of the application process is
21 reflective of State diversity." We feel that this is
22 extremely important that you keep in mind the Commission
23 that reflects the diversity of California's population, that
24 is such an important ingredient to a fair and effective
25 redistricting that we just appreciate the opportunity to

1 remind you how strongly we feel that you should be following
2 these requirements and giving due consideration as you carry
3 out your tasks. And then, my second point is that we
4 believe you should give weight to having at least some
5 Commissioners who possess personal knowledge and experience
6 with past redistricting. Proposition 11 laid out
7 redistricting criteria that the Commission must follow in
8 drawing district lines, and the interplay between those
9 criteria, and the need to follow their relative ranking is
10 extremely important. And, in addition, the Commission is
11 required to issue reports about the basis on which decisions
12 were made, to achieve compliance with those criteria. And
13 those reports will be subject, as we are sure, to
14 considerable public and possible court scrutiny. So, it is
15 crucial, we think, that the Commissioners are able to
16 perform those tasks without being overly reliant on staff,
17 or susceptible to irrelevant outside pressure, and that
18 means it is very important that the Commissioners have the
19 relevant skills. Regulation 60827 clearly details relevant
20 analytical skills that Commissioners will need, and I
21 apologize for repeating regulations to you, but I think it
22 is important for you to know how important we consider all
23 of this. Specific skills might include, but are not limited
24 to, an understanding of sociology, demographics, the
25 application of legal terminology and requirements, or Voting

1 Rights Act, or Civil Rights Law background or familiarity.
2 And, in more general terms, because there is a short
3 timeframe available for the Commission to accomplish its
4 work, that is, to involve the public in a meaningful way, to
5 draw fair District lines for the entire State, this requires
6 that the appointees be able to hit the ground running, so we
7 feel it is extremely important that the pools you select
8 today and later contain a large number of people who are
9 impartial, highly qualified, diverse, and/or who have
10 relevant open meeting experience to carry out the duties of
11 the Commissioners. So, thank you for your consideration.

12 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

13 CHAIR CAMACHO: Thank you for your comments, Ms.
14 Schafer. Since there are no other public comments at this
15 time, and looking at this vast information that Counsel has
16 provided us, what do you guys think of maybe taking some
17 time to take a look at this information?

18 MS. SPANO: Yes, please.

19 MR. AHMADI: I think it is very beneficial, at
20 least to me, to spend a little bit of time on these reports
21 before we further discuss these, so I would appreciate if we
22 can take a few minutes, at least, to look at these?

23 MS. SPANO: Yes, we have received a lot of
24 material now, and I would prefer we take about 20-30 minutes
25 to review it before we proceed further.

1 CHAIR CAMACHO: What do you think? Twenty to 30
2 minutes?

3 MR. AHMADI: Thirty minutes is fine, I guess.

4 CHAIR CAMACHO: So, it sounds like we kind of
5 agree on taking a little bit of time to review these
6 documents. Since it is 10:08, we will reconvene at 10:30 to
7 go on to our next agenda item.

8 MR. AHMADI: How about 10:45? I just want to make
9 sure I have enough time to look at this detail.

10 MS. SPANO: That is fine.

11 CHAIR CAMACHO: 10:45, okay.

12 MR. AHMADI: I appreciate it.

13 CHAIR CAMACHO: Okay, so we will reconvene at
14 10:45. That will also give the public time to take a look
15 at these documents. Okay, so 10:45.

16 (Off the record at 10:09 a.m.)

17 (Back on the record at 10:48 a.m.)

18 **ITEM 5. Public Comment on Applicants.**

19 CHAIR CAMACHO: It is 10:48, so let's go ahead and
20 get started. Next, on our agenda is public comment about
21 Applicants. We have on the agenda an opportunity for
22 members of the public to comment on Applicants if they wish
23 to do so, please. Does anyone have comments about the
24 Applicants they would like to make? Please bear in mind
25 that we will likely move directly into discussion of our

1 votes, and make some decisions about who to retain and who
2 to eliminate, so this may be your chance to speak about
3 individual Applicants before that happens. Okay, since
4 there is no public comment at this time, we will move on to
5 our next agenda item.

6 **ITEM 6. Applicant selection and reduction of Applicant pool**
7 **(see Attachment 1 for list of Applicants being considered).**

8 **The panel will identify the most qualified Applicants,**
9 **examine the demographics of the pool of most qualified**
10 **Applicants for purposes of assessing its political, racial,**
11 **ethnic, gender, economic, and geographic diversity, and vote**
12 **to retain the most qualified Applicants in the Applicant**
13 **pool and eliminate all other Applicants from further**
14 **consideration.**

15 CHAIR CAMACHO: Our next item of business is a
16 discussion and identification of Applicants to be retained
17 or removed from the Applicant pool, and an examination of
18 the demographics of the pool of remaining Applicants for
19 purposes of assessing its political, racial, ethnic, gender,
20 economic, and geographic diversity, and vote to reduce the
21 Applicant pool by removing one or more Applicants from
22 further consideration.

23 After looking at these reports that we have
24 received from our Counsel, I am suggesting a couple of
25 different options on this matter. We have a very diverse

1 Applicant pool at the 314, and I do not feel at this time
2 that I would really like to discuss these individually,
3 however, we could reduce this pool even further by
4 discussing each Applicant, individually. What are your
5 opinions?

6 MR. AHMADI: Thanks, Mary. First of all, if we
7 could back up a little bit here, just to share my thoughts
8 about, you know, this is the first time we saw the list, the
9 combined list, of our assessments, the list that reflects
10 our assessments, in a combined spreadsheet. I am really
11 impressed with the results of our reviews at this point in
12 time, and the reason I say that is that, if we look at the
13 list of 162 Applicants who received at least one favorable
14 vote, we have coverage for every single diversity element
15 that is in the law, so that is a positive thing, I think,
16 and I appreciate that we can say that. Looking at the other
17 two lists, the Applicants that have received two favorable
18 recommendations, again, I can see that we have at least a
19 single coverage for each element of that diversity. So I am
20 happy about that. And same thing, when I look at the three
21 favorable votes or recommendations, we have good coverage
22 for party affiliation, for race and ethnicity, for gender,
23 and for the Counties in the State, at least we have one for
24 every single county, and then we have the regions well
25 covered, at least we have one for some regions where we had

1 a limited number of applications in those sub-pools. And
2 the same thing with the economic status, actually economic
3 status is pretty well bell-shaped curve, which I am happy to
4 see that.

5 Now, combining all of these applications into one
6 report, we see that with at least a single favorable
7 recommendation, I can even see that the diversity is getting
8 even better. So, for example, looking at the party
9 affiliation, as I am sure that you are aware, not all
10 parties have equal participation in this process. For
11 example, we had a vast majority of Applicants who were
12 either Democratic or Republican Party members, so that is
13 reflected in the demographics here because the sub-pools for
14 those parties were bigger compared to the other ones. And
15 looking at ethnicity and race, again, the White Applicants
16 made up the vast majority of the applications that we had to
17 review. So, again, the data here is reflective of that
18 diversity in the race and ethnicity. Likewise, when I look
19 at the demographic data for geographic by County, and you
20 will probably see that there is a direct correlation between
21 the numbers that are reflected here on these reports, as
22 compared with the Pool of Applicants from those different
23 regions within the State. And then, looking back at the
24 regions, for example, outside of California, we have two Bay
25 Area compared to Southern Coastal, I believe, again, we have

1 good coverage and reflective of the pools of Applicants that
2 we had to review. And lastly, economic status, I think,
3 again, we have a good bell-shaped, almost bell-shaped curve,
4 reflective of the diversity of the application pool that we
5 have received.

6 So those were kind of like my impression or
7 initial impressions. Of course, we have to go back to these
8 lists and look back at the detail and see in more detail who
9 each and every one of these individuals are, and apply the
10 same rigorous criteria or review criteria that we have to
11 apply.

12 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Excuse me, Mr. Ahmadi?

13 MR. AHMADI: Yes.

14 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: There will be an opportunity
15 for public comment later on this Agenda item, thank you.

16 MR. AHMADI: Sorry, I did not see that. Now, I can
17 also see that the data also suggests that there are
18 challenges ahead of us. As I am sure that you are aware,
19 our selection of these applications is somewhat limited in
20 terms of who are in these pools. Depending on how many
21 diverse and qualified, or most-qualified Applicants that we
22 have in the pool, I again want to assure you that I
23 understand the challenge of comparing these almost equally
24 qualified individuals with each other, with the emphasis
25 from this point on that the law requires us to have the

1 diversity, and we will look at diversity once again to make
2 sure that we have equal coverage for all those elements that
3 are in the law. So, understanding the challenge, and I
4 believe that we need to spend some time on this, I think it
5 would be a little hasty to move on and make a decision at
6 this point in time. That is my own personal opinion. We
7 need to look back at the applications and we need to check
8 their qualifications again, and the diversity again, and
9 compare Applicants; as I mentioned this morning, we are
10 comparing As to As or maybe A+s to A+s, so it is a difficult
11 -- it is a very difficult decision-making process and we
12 have to take the time to make sure that we are fair, and we
13 are thorough, and that we have a rigorous process in place
14 to make sure that the decisions are well supported by the
15 facts that are in the application material. So, with that,
16 those are kind of like my thoughts about, if I have an
17 option, I think I agree with you, Mary, that we need to
18 spend a little more time on these and reconvene in a few
19 days, maybe in the next meeting, to try to reduce the pool
20 again to maybe a smaller pool that is manageable for a
21 discussion, one by one, of the Applicants, or a one-on-one
22 discussion of the Applicants in the pool, because if we - I
23 know the agenda is planned to have a three-day meeting, and
24 I believe that was the purpose of making the meeting three
25 days, but even for three days, I think to discuss 300 plus

1 Applicants is very time-consuming, not only for the ARP
2 members, but also for the public to be involved in that
3 process, and we want to encourage participation from the
4 public. And, as Mary suggested, if you have any comments,
5 any suggestions, we are more than welcoming of that and we
6 want to make sure that we consider that, as well.

7 CHAIR CAMACHO: Kerri?

8 MS. SPANO: Yeah. I would just like to - I agree
9 with Nasir on how we did pretty well at trying to achieve
10 diversity the best that we can at this phase of the review.
11 I am impressed that two or more of the votes that were
12 favorable were 152, I think that says something about how we
13 are agreeing on the candidates and their qualifications. I
14 think there was a natural progression and rise of these most
15 qualified candidates. I think that we could maybe do a
16 little bit better in diversity, and as we take a closer look
17 at the remaining 314 Applicants -

18 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Well, currently there are 623
19 in the pool you have not made any decisions to narrow the
20 pool yet.

21 MS. SPANO: Three hundred and fourteen that are
22 favorable, with favorable - excuse me - favorable
23 recommendations by our Panel. As we most likely look
24 further into this, it will require more of a rigorous review
25 and the decisions we make will become tougher. At this

1 point, I think we made significant progress to identify the
2 most qualified at this time, but the results show that it is
3 going to be very difficult to determine the 120 most
4 qualified to interview. We have a lot of Form 700s to
5 review and those will be coming in fairly soon, I believe we
6 have not received a lot at this point, so before we make
7 further cuts, I am afraid at this point we do not have
8 enough Applicants who have submitted Form 700s, and if we
9 make further cuts at this point on an individual basis, by
10 talking about these Applicants' qualifications in an open
11 meeting, I believe that we would risk cutting the wrong half
12 out. I do not want to make a hasty decision right now, I
13 think that is still another component that is critical in
14 the application review. We do not know what these Form 700s
15 are going to reveal, they could point out any
16 inconsistencies that could create a conflict and remove an
17 applicant that can hurt any one of the five diversity
18 characteristics that the law requires us to consider. So I
19 really hesitate to go lower at this point. I want to just
20 go back, as Nasir mentioned, to our offices and do a
21 thorough review, and as we await for all the Form 700s to
22 arrive, and I believe it is going to be very difficult for
23 us to maintain diversity, but I believe, I am confident, we
24 will be able to achieve that. These Applicants are, by far,
25 so stellar, it has been very difficult as we compare one to

1 another, as it gets tougher and tougher to wind down the
2 pool. So those are my thoughts.

3 MR. AHMADI: So - oh, sorry, as I hear you saying
4 Kerri, and I think I wanted to mention this, but I probably
5 have not made it clear, I think that we can discuss and make
6 a decision about the 309 Applicants who did not receive any
7 favorable vote at this point in time.

8 CHAIR CAMACHO: Before we do that, I would like to
9 get some public comment.

10 MR. AHMADI: Sure.

11 CHAIR CAMACHO: Did you have something else to say?

12 MR. AHMADI: I just wanted to add something, that we
13 will get to that point where we have to make a decision
14 about the 309 who did not receive any favorable vote, but I
15 think what I was trying to say, and I think that is
16 reflected in your comments, as well, is that the remainder
17 of the applicants, the 314 who have received at least a
18 single favorable vote, I believe, provide sufficient -
19 sufficient in terms of our ability to make sure that we are
20 in compliance with the law, to make sure that we have a
21 diverse pool at the end. So, in other words, I think the
22 314 - that is my thought - will provide us for that. So,
23 thank you.

24 CHAIR CAMACHO: Yeah, I agree with both my
25 colleagues in the sense of, I hate to go on and discuss each

1 of these Applicants that have received one or more favorable
2 responses, individually, because with the Form 700s still
3 coming in, I want to ensure that we have a diverse pool, and
4 I would hate to see where somebody has been removed and then
5 the other individuals that are maybe in a particular region,
6 or a particular economic status, does not provide their Form
7 700. So I agree with you on that.

8 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

9 CHAIR CAMACHO: Is there any other comments? If
10 not, I will go to public comment, please.

11 MS. FENG: My name is Kathay Feng and I am with
12 California Common Cause. I do not want to speak to any
13 specific Applicant, I actually am just trying to understand
14 where we are in the process. When last I was watching the
15 televised discussions, the ARP had reduced the pool to 622.
16 And so, I think I missed a step where there was a discussion
17 to recommend an additional reduction to 314, and I just
18 would like to ask for an explanation of the list that we are
19 looking at and help us understand that step. Maybe some
20 other folks have caught it, I just missed it and I was very
21 confused.

22 MR. AHMADI: Sure. May I explain that? Or do you
23 want to explain it?

24 CHAIR CAMACHO: That is -- go ahead.

25 MR. AHMADI: The list - you are referring to the

1 list of 622?

2 MS. FENG: Yes.

3 MR. AHMADI: Yes, this is a list of Applicants that
4 received at least one favorable vote by any Panel member the
5 last time we met, so, in other words -

6 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: You mean it was - maybe I
7 should take this just to -

8 MR. AHMADI: Sure, I am sorry. Go ahead.

9 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: It was not reflective of your
10 vote. Your vote is what takes place during the meeting.
11 The 622 individuals were from the last meeting, where,
12 coming into that meeting, we had identified those 622
13 individuals who had received a favorable assessment by the
14 individual Panel members in the individual Panel members'
15 offices. So at the last meeting, they voted to reduce the
16 pool to those 622 individuals and, as I explained on behalf
17 of Mr. Russo, we had one further individual who was added to
18 the pool, so we now have 623. The Panel has not yet acted
19 to further reduce the pool. I think what I am hearing, if I
20 am clear, is that there seems to be some concern that, while
21 they may reduce the pool by the 309 individuals who no
22 longer have a favorable assessment by the individual Panel
23 members, I think I am hearing you say that you are concerned
24 that, if you further reduce beyond the 314 who would be
25 remaining, you fear individuals may not submit their Form

1 700s and that you may lose some of the diversity so integral
2 to the process, and not be able to go back and pick up
3 individuals because you have eliminated from the pool. I
4 think that is what I am hearing you say.

5 MR. AHMADI: And that is correct.

6 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I know you are tired.

7 MR. AHMADI: Yes, that is correct. That is what I
8 meant to say.

9 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Does that clarify your
10 question?

11 MS. FENG: So on the website chart that is made
12 available, it had 622 names and it indicated who had - I
13 believe it was who had voted for candidates.

14 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Correct, and those are the
15 individuals who are in the pool today.

16 MS. FENG: Right. And then today we received hand-
17 outs which I think, when you add the 115 Democrats, 113
18 Republicans, and 86 not-affiliated with either major party,
19 it adds up to 314 Applicants -

20 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: And there should be another
21 list back there that indicates -

22 MS. FENG: Oh, 309.

23 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: -- 309 individuals who do not
24 have, at this point, do not have a favorable recommendation
25 by any Panelist as a result of the secondary level of review

1 that took place between June 11th and today.

2 MS. FENG: Thank you, okay. So there was a
3 secondary review looking at the 622 Applicants who had
4 received at least one vote -

5 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Correct.

6 MS. FENG: -- and this additional reduction - or, it
7 is not a reduction yet, but there was an additional review
8 and there is now a list that is shorter. And could I just
9 ask what the Panelists, at that time when you were thinking
10 about recommendations, were you looking at - what factors
11 were you looking at?

12 CHAIR CAMACHO: What we looked at for those 623
13 Applicants was their complete package, so we re-reviewed all
14 the essay questions, we looked at the Letters of
15 Recommendation, we looked at all the public comments, and we
16 did keep receiving public comments, I think I was up until
17 Sunday?

18 MR. AHMADI: Yes.

19 CHAIR CAMACHO: Up until Sunday, so we reviewed all
20 of those. We also looked at their financial contributions,
21 the family information, so we looked at all that
22 information. We also, as Steven Russo's report - we also
23 had additional comments and questions that we did submit to
24 his team to look at. So, we looked at the complete package
25 for those 623 Applicants.

1 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I think it is also my
2 understanding that each of you started comparing Democrats
3 to Democrats, Republicans to Republicans?

4 MR. AHMADI: Yes, if I can - thank you, Mary, I know
5 you did this, but I think we are a little nervous here.
6 But, anyway, let me explain to you what I did. When I went
7 back to my desk after we made the decision about the 622, to
8 retain in the pool, I focused on - I printed all the
9 applications that I had from the system, including all the
10 public comments and all the letters of recommendation, and I
11 organized those applications, those paper applications, in
12 two boxes, and, in fact, I have it upstairs and I was ready
13 to bring it in here, I have all those nine boxes that I have
14 counted, so I printed those applications on paper and I
15 organized them by sub-pools, by party, so I have four boxes
16 of Democrats, and then I have two and a half boxes of
17 Republicans, and then I have about three boxes of other.
18 Some applications were, in terms of number of pages, in each
19 application a difference, some were 40 pages or 50 pages,
20 and some were 27 or 25 pages. So you add that up to paper
21 print-outs of the letters of recommendation and public
22 comments. My office was full of paper. And then, what I
23 did, I looked at each single package, I had my staff look at
24 it first, and point out to me if they saw anything, both
25 positive, or towards a potential for consideration for me,

1 but I did review every single package. And if you look at
2 those packages, I should have brought a sample here, you
3 will see my signature on the cover page of each single one
4 of them, and I am using a blue pen, that is my color code
5 for my team, and I am using blue paper so that we do not get
6 it mixed up with the other teams that we have here.

7 CHAIR CAMACHO: Yeah, this was a huge process. I
8 mean, each of us individually looked at each application
9 again, so we looked at them thoroughly. Just like Nasir
10 did, I grouped my individuals by political affiliation, so I
11 looked at them per the political affiliations.

12 MS. SPANO: I did something similar to that. But,
13 just to summarize what I did, is I separated in samples
14 also, but I also ensured diversity and every step of the
15 way. I want to assure the public that I did comply with the
16 law, I considered it for every single application that I
17 reviewed, that was the first thing I looked at. I also, in
18 comparing the best to the best, so it makes it more
19 difficult to make these decisions; there are different
20 aspects of diversity, you have these characteristics of
21 diversity and political diversity, as well, these are
22 additional elements in the decision-making that makes it
23 even more difficult. We have several candidates that are
24 very qualified, they have redistricting experience, they may
25 have communities of interest that represent certain - the

1 Agricultural community, they have expertise in Voting Rights
2 Acts, and Voting Rights Acts or legal experience in that
3 area, too. So you have many Applicants with Commission and
4 Board experience, and so it really makes it difficult when
5 you are comparing each Applicant because each Applicant has
6 unique abilities and experience to bring to the Commission.
7 So, as we wind down the pool and we look at all these
8 applications, right now, I think as we await the Form 700s,
9 these decisions are going to be very difficult, and I do not
10 think anybody should feel wrong that we did not select them
11 because you have a lot of tough competition out there. So
12 it is - the diversity compliant, impartiality, analytical
13 skills, are all important every step of the way, we never
14 disregard it, and consider it always. So I think that is
15 why it probably behooves us to discuss - look further into
16 these applications in our offices before we further discuss
17 it in open view.

18 MR. AHMADI: Thank you, Kerri. And just to make
19 sure that we answer your question completely, one other
20 thing that I wanted to add is, once I divided my pool into
21 the different parties, then I subdivided them into different
22 ethnic and geographic diversity, and I looked at all of
23 those elements. Just to give you an example, only last
24 week, I had 97 hours on my timesheet, and that does not
25 include the time that I had dreams about the process, dreams

1 about the decisions, believe me, I was even thinking about
2 the application process, and Applicants, and qualifications,
3 and diversity, and all that, even on the dinner table. So,
4 believe me, I did my best, and I am sure the Panel members
5 have done their best to take maximum advantage of the time
6 and resources that we had available to us to do nothing but
7 the best.

8 CHAIR CAMACHO: Is there any - please.

9 MS. KOPELL: Good morning. I am Malka Kopell and I
10 am from California Forward. And I would like to begin by
11 thanking the Panel for your dedication to this extremely
12 complicated and challenging process and for the
13 thoughtfulness with which you are approaching it. We would
14 also like to speak to the issue of diversity of the
15 Applicant pool, in particular, to respectfully urge you to,
16 as you consider further reductions of the pool, to begin to
17 place some more significant emphasis on diversity, and we
18 know that you have been considering many important criteria
19 to date, but as you move from the current pool of applicants
20 to formulate the pool of 120, we do encourage you to place
21 more emphasis on diversity, and I know you are going to be
22 talking about that in a few minutes. California Forward
23 supported Proposition 11 because we believe that a
24 Redistricting Commission would help engender the trust of
25 the California public in a process and at a time where an

1 atmosphere of mistrust dominates the relationship between
2 public and government. To that end, the Voters First Act,
3 as you know, as specified by Section 60848 and 60850
4 Regulations promulgated by the BSA, requires that the Panel
5 consider that the composition of the pools of 120 and 60
6 applicants be reflective of the State's diversity, that is,
7 the State's diversity, not necessarily reflective of the
8 diversity of the Applicant pool, of the original Applicant
9 pool. So, it is important to the credibility of the
10 Commission that the public consider it to be reasonably
11 representative of the population of California, and that
12 perception could significantly influence levels of
13 participation in the public comment period, as well as trust
14 and competence in the final maps. The diversity of the
15 Commission may also affect the qualities of the Commission's
16 analysis and decision-making. We join many other
17 organizations in seeking a robust conversation on the
18 Commission, and we know you feel the same way, in which
19 Commissioners can bring their different experiences and
20 knowledge to bear on their collective tasks, so a diverse
21 group of Commissioners with a wide range of informed
22 perspectives will be prepared to create maps that satisfy
23 the challenges in a state as diverse as this. We believe
24 that the best way to produce a diverse Commission, given the
25 constraints on Commission selection established by

1 Proposition 11 is to start with diverse partisan subgroups,
2 and we understand that the demographics of some of the
3 partisan subgroups will make this more challenging in some
4 subgroups than others. Nonetheless, we do believe that
5 striving for the greatest diversity possible will provide
6 the Panel with the greatest possible flexibility in creating
7 a final Commission that is both well-qualified and
8 reflective of California's diversity, and we do believe that
9 the time to focus on that is now. So we want to thank you
10 for the opportunity to comment.

11 MR. AHMADI: Thank you, ma'am.

12 CHAIR CAMACHO: Thank you.

13 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I just want to let everyone
14 know that we did actually do the sound check during the
15 break, I am not certain of the source of the issue, but we
16 will try to get it resolved quickly.

17 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

18 CHAIR CAMACHO: Is there any - Mr. Walton?

19 MR. WALTON: Hi, I am Sam Walton. I am here on
20 behalf of NAACP, and I would like to start by, you know,
21 expressing that we are very impressed with the level of
22 sensitivity to recognizing diversity as you have gone
23 through the process thus far, and believe that, if you are
24 able to hold with those kinds of principals, we are all
25 going to have a Commission that California is going to

1 benefit from. To hear the discussion of breaking it down by
2 party, and then going with it, I think that is outstanding.
3 We would also - I think I heard you say, and we want to
4 support you - that, as you go to reducing each group, each
5 party down to 40, that you will continue to push for
6 diversity within that group, and then, as you push to the 20
7 for each of those groups, you will continue to make
8 diversity a priority. And I believe, if you are able to
9 hold to that diversity, when you are down to the 20, the
10 three groups, the 60, I think the luck of the draw is going
11 to be the luck of the draw when we get to the pool, but I
12 think you will have done an excellent job. So I want to
13 commend you for what you have done so far, and we are please
14 with your progress.

15 MR. AHMADI: Thank you so much.

16 CHAIR CAMACHO: Thank you.

17 MR. CUBIAS: Good morning. Gustavo Cubias,
18 California Common Cause. We helped draft the letter that I
19 believe you all received earlier in the week. So, first of
20 all, I want to thank you all again for having us here this
21 morning, but we want to commend the BSA and the Applicant
22 Review Panel for adopting the Regulations that recognize the
23 duty to create a diverse Applicant pool. With that said,
24 you know, I know that you have already all expressed with
25 how exactly a meticulous process has been - you have all

1 been very thorough with abiding by the regulations that have
2 been posed by the Act, and that are being posed by the BSA,
3 itself, but, as one of the organizations that helped to
4 write the California Voters First Act, we agree that the
5 BSA's recognition to a diverse Commission is a fundamental
6 purpose of the Act, as has been clearly stated beforehand,
7 and it is one that is supported by various parts of the
8 selection process, and has been repeatedly raised by the
9 public. With that said, we would like to point out how,
10 before, in Memorandum 5 from the BSA, relating to diversity,
11 it was mentioned that the only way that Applicants - and I
12 quote this - "The only way that Applicants can be chosen
13 from the pool of 60 to ensure the Commission reflects
14 California's diversity is if that pool is a diverse pool."
15 And I know that you have all up until this point of time
16 have been trying very hard to make sure that this does
17 follow through, I would just like to reiterate, the Panel
18 does have some duty in addition to selecting the Applicants
19 for a pool based on their qualifications, to select
20 Applicants with an eye towards diversity again, and that,
21 seeing as how the paring of the Applicant pool down to 60
22 will most definitely be one of the most critical processes
23 of the selection, and another important step that, as Mr.
24 Sam Walton reiterated, that may depend on the luck of the
25 draw, but we hope that, more than that, it will be a careful

1 and meticulous scrutinizing review process. And with that
2 said, we hope it is stage that you will begin exercising
3 this mandate that was imposed by the Act and by the BSA,
4 itself, in order for the 60 finalists to be diverse in
5 gender, race, ethnicity, and geography. Thank you.

6 CHAIR CAMACHO: Thank you.

7 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

8 MS. FENG: My name is Kathay Feng and I am the
9 Executive Director of California Common Cause. I want to
10 echo everybody's expression of gratitude and thanks to the
11 three members of the ARP. When I hear that you have worked
12 92 hours and then have been dreaming about -

13 MR. AHMADI: Ninety-seven.

14 MS. FENG: -- 97 hours this week and have been
15 dreaming about the panelists and the whole process, I know
16 that this has invaded your lives in a way that you probably
17 did not expect, and maybe or hopeful it will be over very
18 soon. But I also want to echo what Sam Walton from NAACP
19 said, which is icing because we observe in the various
20 rounds of review that a lot of care and a lot of time and
21 attention has been paid to thinking about each of the
22 various mandates of the Voters First Act, and so I have no
23 doubt that you are putting a lot of sincere effort into
24 making sure that this process is carried out to everybody's
25 expectations, including the public that voted for this

1 initiative. I, without reviewing or repeating everything
2 that everyone else have said, I just wanted to set a little
3 bit of political context. In your 90 plus hours, I am not
4 sure if you heard on Thursday that there were two
5 initiatives that have qualified for the November ballot,
6 that perhaps puts even more pressure on you than before, one
7 that threatens to dismantle Proposition 11, and the other
8 that would change the role of the Commission potentially to
9 expand it to cover not only drawing of the State Legislative
10 Districts, but also drawing Congressional Districts and that
11 might change the deadline that the maps have to be drawn and
12 approved from September 15th to August 15th. And so, what
13 that means is that, as you think about who the Commissioners
14 are going to be, not that you did not have already a great
15 deal of pressure on you, and dedicated responsibility to it,
16 but it does mean that, depending on how the election goes,
17 all eyes are on what the ARP is going to be doing. On the
18 one side, looking at potential critiques of the pool, to
19 say, "It's not diverse enough," "it's not representative
20 enough," da da da da, I think you all have in the forefront
21 of your mind the need to be responsive to the mandates of
22 the Act, including the diversity issue. I think, on the
23 other side, because potentially the scope of the Commission
24 could be expanded and the timeline for them to draw the maps
25 could be decreased, from nine months to eight months, it is

1 also important to look for people who can hit the ground
2 running, as Trudy said. And, as I look at the pool, we wrote
3 some recommendations for folks, but what I am pleased about
4 is that, as I see both the 622 pool, but also the
5 potentially smaller pool that you are looking at, of 314,
6 that there are individuals who have very specific
7 experience, that is very relevant, that could help them hit
8 the ground running, and make sure that they can withstand
9 the public scrutiny, that they know how to balance the
10 Redistricting criteria, that they bring some very specific
11 Voting Rights Act experience, that they have public hearings
12 experience. And all of that, while I know that the
13 Secretary of State will be planning trainings for the
14 Commissioners, all of that, to the extent that they bring
15 some experience to the table, will make their jobs so much
16 easier when they are managing the eight and a half months,
17 or nine and a half months to bring this baby to birth. Now,
18 in that pool of 622, as well as 614, there are some people
19 who are demographers, social scientists, lawyers, nonprofit
20 directors, actually a lot of us are quite excited to see
21 some of our colleagues throwing their names in, who bring
22 this very specific Voting Rights, Civil Rights, voice to the
23 table, and political scientists, small business people, city
24 and county elected staff, and I think that you are going to
25 have a very difficult job to continue narrowing, but I do

1 think that, as you think about this, without commenting on
2 the 314 that you are looking at right now, I do think that
3 it is important to continue to put diversity at the
4 forefront, and continue to think about people who can hit
5 the ground running with that specific Voting Rights, or
6 Redistricting experience in their background. Thank you.

7 CHAIR CAMACHO: Thank you.

8 MR. AHMADI: Thank you so much.

9 MR. PACHECO: Good morning. My name is David
10 Pacheco. I am with the other AARP, not to be confused with
11 the ARP. We represent three million members here in
12 California, previously called American Association of
13 Retired People, we are now a 50 plus organization. We have
14 been with this issue since there was a ballot initiative and
15 we have worked closely with the previous speakers to make
16 sure that this process remains fair and open, and I applaud
17 your efforts, in my 30 years of working in the State House,
18 as well as in academia, I have not seen a public process
19 with this kind of transparency and clarity, and I wish you
20 all good sleep sometime soon. But speaking a little bit to
21 the Applicant pool, we are delighted to see the number of
22 retirees that are in the pool, as well as persons of color
23 and diversity. In terms of retirees, we consider ourselves
24 chronologically gifted, and we think we have a lot of
25 experience to offer. Looking at your pool as it remains

1 now, diversity looks strong. We are excited about the
2 number of Voting Rights, Civil Rights, activists that are
3 included in that pool. At the same time, and my colleagues
4 will know my manta on this in terms of, I think it is real
5 important that, as the Citizens Redistricting Commission,
6 you look at individuals who are local activists, or
7 civically engaged in a number of different ways, that they
8 balance, in turn, with the larger well known activists and
9 proponents of a fair Redistricting process. We are a firm
10 believer that ordinary people can do extraordinary things
11 and in your selection to date, from what I have seen, it
12 looks like you are doing that kind of balance. Activists,
13 God bless them, I am an activist, they deserve their place
14 in this selection process, but, as well, there are folks
15 that are in their parent-teacher community, there are folks
16 that are retired, State or Federal workers, there are a lot
17 of folks that, with the proper staffing, get it; they will
18 be able to handle this process. I do not want to take
19 anything away, I do not want to diminish anything from what
20 Kathay or others have said about having people that know
21 Redistricting, they will be part of the balance, as well.
22 But remember, I do not want to use the BP term to Small
23 People, but remember, just ordinary folks can make a major
24 difference in this process. And, again, AARP applauds your
25 efforts and hope you continue and get some rest.

1 CHAIR CAMACHO: Thank you.

2 MR. AHMADI: Thank you, sir. Thank you so much.

3 MR. WRIGHT: I am Jim Wright, a voter from San Jose.
4 I am hearing what I think is a disturbing thread in some of
5 the discussion that has been going on. I get the impression
6 that the survivors of this process might be people who -
7 only people - who have been involved with demographics, with
8 redistricting, with something involved with the process of
9 voting. When we had one of the earliest meetings in setting
10 up the Regulations, the thought ran through my mind that the
11 ideal Commission would include a student, a college student,
12 would include "Joe Plumber," an individual who is
13 independent, really has not paid much attention to things,
14 but he is "Joe Average," an independent business man, a
15 small business man, maybe someone from large business, maybe
16 a lawyer, maybe somebody who is really skilled at
17 Redistricting, but a balance of their specific skills and
18 place in the community. And I do not hear this happening.
19 I am sure you have got a lot on your plate, I know you do,
20 and a lot of things to consider, but "Joe Average" needs to
21 be represented, not just people that have been actively
22 involved in their community, who have been doing a lot of
23 things political and apolitical. Please consider that.
24 Thank you.

25 MR. AHMADI: Sure, thank you.

1 CHAIR CAMACHO: Thank you. Just like these comments
2 have been saying, I think that they are even strengthening
3 our point in the sense of we should, you know, look at the
4 314, move them forward, and then wait until we receive those
5 Form 700s, and people on - the Applicants, please submit
6 your Form 700s prior to April 12th - July 12th, I am sorry,
7 see, I am trying to push the project back a little bit.

8 MR. AHMADI: Nice try.

9 CHAIR CAMACHO: So I am thinking that I would like
10 to move that we eliminate from the Applicant pool all
11 Applicants who did not receive a single favorable
12 recommendation from any Panelist, as reflected in the list
13 provided by Council entitled "309 Applicants Who Did Not
14 Receive a Favorable Recommendation From Any Panelist."
15 Applicants who did not - okay, so there we go.

16 MR. AHMADI: I second that.

17 MS. SPANO: Second -

18 MR. AHMADI: Sorry, Kerri.

19 MS. SPANO: That is okay.

20 CHAIR CAMACHO: All in favor, say "aye."

21 (Ayes.) All opposed? Seeing there is none, it
22 passes.

23 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I think this is a perfect
24 time for me to add that I have been advised twice that they
25 cannot resolve the microphone or sound system issue unless

1 we take a break. So let's take a 10-minute break. I
2 suggest you take a 10-minute break to get folks in here so
3 we can stop inadvertently censoring people.

4 CHAIR CAMACHO: Well, since we - how about if I make
5 another suggestion? Since we only have a couple items on
6 the list, we can either take a short 10-minute break, or a
7 30-minute break for lunch.

8 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I think all we need is 10.

9 MR. AHMADI: I think 10 is good.

10 CHAIR CAMACHO: Okay, then we will reconvene at
11 11:40. Does that - nine minutes, or do you think 11:45
12 would be better for them?

13 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: We might as well go with
14 11:45.

15 CHAIR CAMACHO: Okay, we will reconvene at 11:45.

16 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

17 (Off the record at 11:32 a.m.)

18 (Back on the record at 11:47 a.m.)

19 CHAIR CAMACHO: We just want to let you know that
20 the microphone system can be affected because there is some
21 construction being performed within the building, so this
22 could be affecting our system. And I am really sorry about
23 that. Oh, am I not loud enough? Okay, is there any other
24 comments that -

25 MS. SPANO: Actually, I just want to point something

1 out. I just want to say how pleased I am that we did not
2 unanimously agree to retain 314 applicants until we received
3 the Form 700s. I was really worried that if certain groups,
4 geographic, ethnic, economic, racial, gender, diversity, did
5 not - if they did not turn in their Form 700, we would lose
6 the chance to create a diverse 120 of the most qualified
7 candidate pool, so it is critical that everybody gets their
8 Forms 700 in, preferably before the deadline, and ensure
9 that the Bureau receives all that information so that we can
10 fairly evaluate these Applicants further.

11 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: "Everyone" being the 314 who
12 are left in the pool after your last vote, correct?

13 MS. SPANO: Correct.

14 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Because if you have
15 eliminated from the pool at this point, there is certainly
16 no reason to submit that Form 700; furthermore, as we
17 indicated earlier, if you have been eliminated, your Form
18 700 will be destroyed unless you immediately contact the
19 Bureau and let us know that you would like it returned to
20 you.

21 **ITEM 7. Discussion relating to panelists' initial**
22 **assessments about applicants, further assessment and**
23 **review of all remaining applicants, requests for additional**
24 **information from remaining applicants, and remaining**
25 **applicant selection phases.**

1 CHAIR CAMACHO: Our next item on the agenda is
2 discussion relating to panelists' assessments about
3 applicants, further assessment and review of remaining
4 applicants, requests for additional information from or
5 about remaining applicants, and remaining applicant
6 selection phases, including, but not limited to, applicant
7 interviews. How I think we should kind of group this in is
8 kind of discuss how we are going to assess these 314
9 remaining Applicants, kind of what we are going to look at.
10 Do you kind of agree?

11 MR. AHMADI: Sure.

12 MS. SPANO: Sure.

13 CHAIR CAMACHO: I just kind of put down some notes,
14 what I was thinking on this next phase. What I was planning
15 on doing is, currently, I have my Applicants, all 622,
16 currently, in binders by political affiliation. What I am
17 going to do is keep them in the political affiliation, by
18 political affiliation, look at them in groups by the
19 diversity, so to make sure that we have a diverse group, so
20 when we get down to our 40/40/40, because that is 40
21 Democrats, 40 Republicans, and 40 Others, that we have, as
22 much as we can, a diverse group within each of those. So,
23 when we do receive the Form 700s, what I was thinking is
24 that the Form 700 is going to be kind of used as a
25 verification phase, that we could verify that there are no

1 conflicts of interest, so individuals that might have some
2 stock that would possibly show that they have some
3 impartiality issues. Also, if there is some funds that they
4 are giving and receiving, that may affect their
5 impartiality. And then also, determine how forthcoming the
6 Applicants really were in their Supplemental Application. I
7 know that those Supplemental Applications ask for economic
8 status, and that is as of a particular time, and that kind
9 of concerns me because there could be an individual that
10 said that they made under \$35,000, but, yet, when you look
11 at their Form 700, they are really not reflective of those
12 individuals that really are earning under \$35,000, so those
13 single moms, maybe, or those maybe unemployed individuals,
14 and you look at their assets, and they could have these
15 astronomical assets, so, I mean, that to me is also another
16 consideration I would like to take a look at.

17 MR. AHMADI: Sure, so what I am hearing you say,
18 Mary, is that the Form 700 has an important role in this
19 next phase of our review. For one, it is a requirement by
20 law for each Applicant, in order for them to move forward,
21 to have a completed Form 700 to us by July 12th, so the
22 sooner we have those, of course, I know we emphasized on
23 that, but I want to reiterate one more time, to please
24 submit your Form 700 as soon as you can because that is a
25 major part of our focus at this phase. And the second part

1 of what I heard you say, Mary, is there is certain
2 information on Form 700 that can help us in our evaluation
3 of the facts on the applications, or facts included in the
4 application package, and you provided some good examples,
5 one of them is financial information relevant to the
6 information on the application. And not only in terms of
7 supporting what is in the application, but also in terms of
8 helping us assess any concerns that you may have, or any
9 concerns that may surface in terms of impartiality. So I
10 think I heard you correctly to say that, and I agree with
11 that, that you should use the information from the Form 700
12 as much as we can, just to tie it back to the legal
13 requirements being not only minimum qualifications, but also
14 impartiality. And I think our emphasis should also be on
15 the issue of diversity. As I heard from public comments, we
16 all heard that, and I am sure you agree with me that,
17 starting with the last phase of the review, that we employed
18 our focus more on diversity, and we will continue to do
19 that. I agree with you that we will keep our party
20 divisions separate and we will do our best to achieve the
21 maximum level of diversity possible, given the pool of
22 applicants that we have retained at this point in time, to
23 make sure that we have as much diversity as possible, not
24 only in terms of those just male, female, or party
25 affiliation, but also geographic, and coverage for the

1 State, and also the other elements of the diversity. I
2 think at this point, as we move forward, I can see that it
3 is getting harder and harder in terms of our approach and
4 our evaluation of the facts, so I am glad that we have a
5 smaller pool, so that we can devote all our resources to the
6 smaller pool, to make sure that we not only look at
7 individuals, but look at who they are, actually. And I
8 think the best approach for me would be to try to get an
9 understanding of would this individual be able to do their
10 job in accordance with the requirements of the law. And
11 sometimes that is difficult to get because we are trying to
12 read into the information that is in the application, to try
13 to gauge how successful this individual might be once they
14 are accepted as a Commissioner for the Citizens
15 Redistricting. So, not only that part is challenging, but
16 also looking back at diversity on top of that, to make sure
17 that we have individuals - I heard public comment saying, or
18 touching on, individuals who have some experience with the
19 Redistricting process, definitely, my goal is to make sure
20 that, if we can, if we have qualified Applicants who are
21 most qualified within these smaller pools, my goal is to
22 make sure that, if we can have at least one individual who
23 is familiar with the process, at least, that would be ideal.
24 But, of course, we have to consider all the other facts and
25 requirements before we can make that decision. So that was

1 a few thoughts that I wanted to share.

2 MS. SPANO: I just wanted to say that I am probably
3 going to continue reviewing the applications and assessing
4 them by pool, digging deeper into the diversity elements
5 even further, although I have been already. But being
6 mindful that any further information we receive could change
7 my decision, depending on the Form 700, and I am also going
8 to be looking at inconsistencies related to, say, perhaps a
9 family member being identified on a Form 700 that was not
10 identified on the application. I am looking for the
11 truthfulness of the application as you receive it. So, as
12 we receive additional information pertaining to any
13 Applicant that is inconsistent, I may question the
14 truthfulness and the integrity of this Applicant's
15 responses. A Commissioner has to have integrity and
16 impartiality, among all the other qualifications, so it just
17 adds another element for me to determine whether this
18 Applicant is the most qualified to be recommended as among
19 the most qualified Applicants in the pool or, for that
20 matter, to be interviewed. But, I think that I am looking
21 for Commissioners that are going to complement each other,
22 so diversity is first and foremost important with me in how
23 I review the Applicants, but that is always going to be in
24 the forefront of my mind as I make these decisions. And I
25 think that all the Applicant Review Panel feels the same

1 way, so I think that we have a hard decision to make and, as
2 we progress further, we are going to be able to come the
3 next time and meet and feel confident that we have a diverse
4 pool, and be able to have meaningful discussions when we get
5 that pool further down.

6 CHAIR CAMACHO: I agree with Kerri in the sense of
7 Commissioners that complement each other, and definitely
8 because, you know, when I was kind of going through the
9 Supplemental Applications and the qualifications that we
10 were seeing within the Applicants, I was just so impressed,
11 we did see quite a few - it really surprised me -
12 individuals that have had prior Redistricting experience.
13 This might not have been at the State level, but we saw it
14 at the local level in quite a few instances, so that really
15 impressed me. Also, it really impressed me where I saw
16 individuals that had facilitation-type of skills or
17 consensus building because I think that is going to be a
18 very important element to make sure those 14 individuals can
19 come to some sort of agreement, and to be able to work with
20 each other. And then, having prior Board experience, I
21 think that might help out because then they are going to
22 know the process that they are going to have to follow. You
23 know, this Board experience, I am not thinking that they
24 have to be an elected individual like on a Council, but
25 having some sort of ability to be able to work with a group

1 and to have those discussions, and to be able to listen, so
2 the give and take. And as our training that we have
3 received has kind of shown that individuals with maybe some
4 high functioning computer and/or math skills would be very
5 helpful, and I am thinking that they might have -- a
6 consultant comes in and they provide some statistics or some
7 information to these Commissioners, it would be nice to be
8 able to have somebody that can think right then and there to
9 say, "Whoa, well, wait a minute, this doesn't look right."
10 And I am thinking that that would be kind of beneficial.
11 And I am not saying that everyone has to have this because I
12 agree with Kerri in the sense of complementing, having these
13 complementing qualities. And also, in the sense of having a
14 background in successfully listening or receiving public
15 hearings, so the sense of give and take, communication
16 skills, as you can tell, even with us, we are trying to
17 develop our communication skills, and I kind of agree that
18 they are going to have to hit the ground running, so
19 individuals that have this communication already there and
20 able to talk to people and feel that they can talk to people
21 in getting solicitation from the public, and able to get the
22 communities of interest, to give them the information that
23 they need, I am thinking that is another element that I am
24 looking for in the sense of this global.

25 MR. AHMADI: Mary, if I can stop you for just a

1 second, just to make sure that I understood.

2 CHAIR CAMACHO: No, go ahead.

3 MR. AHMADI: So, I am sure that you will be trying
4 to maintain Applicants within each one of your sub-pools by
5 party, to the extent possible. And when you say you would
6 like to see a Commission - you would like to see
7 Commissioners who complement each other, I think my
8 understanding of that statement is that, if a sub-pool does
9 not offer all the qualities that you are looking for, then
10 it is okay to have that quality covered from another sub-
11 pool, because sometimes, as I am sure you know, our choices
12 are limited in terms of having a complete 100 percent
13 satisfactory diversity within each of these sub-pools. And
14 I agree with you that, to the extent possible, we do our
15 best to have each of these at least 40/40/40 sub-pools
16 contain or reflect the various diversity and qualitative
17 kind of elements reflected. But for that reason, I think
18 when we meet again in a few days, I do not know when we are
19 going to meet again, in about two weeks, I believe it is, I
20 think from this point on, it has been challenging, of
21 course, all along the way, but from this point on, it is
22 even more challenging because everybody in the pool of 314
23 right now are equally qualified in terms of minimum
24 qualifications and their abilities, at least in our
25 assessment, these are all fabulous, talented individuals.

1 When you compare two talented individuals, considering
2 diversity and all that, I would not be surprised if we meet
3 back in about two weeks and still have differences in our
4 assessments because, to a large degree, the assessments from
5 now on will be more subjective. And to the extent that our
6 judgments, because we are individuals and we do not meet and
7 talk about these, so my hope is that, when we meet the next
8 time, hopefully we will have maybe about 200 or so that we
9 have at least set one favorable vote for them. And it
10 sounds to me that we will be discussing the remainder in
11 order for us to reduce the pool down to about -- up to 120
12 Applicants, one-by-one. So, part of the reason that I made
13 this comment is also to make sure that we have good notes,
14 as I am sure we do have right now, but once you reduce your
15 pool to your favorite favorable Applicants, then have as
16 much detailed notes as we need to have to be able to share
17 with each other when we meet in public. And I think there
18 is also the benefit of - and, you know, for reasons of
19 transparency for the public, to see why we differ, differ in
20 our judgments on those Applicants. Because, as I said, they
21 are all good, they all meet the qualifications, and assuming
22 that they also submit their Form 700s, I am looking forward
23 to having another long meeting maybe a few days meeting to
24 discuss each one of those Applicants for which we have at
25 least one vote, or for which we do not have today unanimous

1 favorable votes. So, having clear notes, and supportive
2 detail to enable us to discuss would be very helpful, and I
3 will do that, as well.

4 CHAIR CAMACHO: Okay, so - go ahead.

5 MS. SPANO: No, I was just going to - I will make a
6 side comment here about diversity. I realize and it is
7 obvious that the 14 members of the Commission are not going
8 to represent every single County in the State of California,
9 so, when I look at geographic diversity, I look at it at the
10 County level, but I also seriously consider the Regional
11 diversity, as Counties get eliminated. And it is critical
12 that, when I envision the Commission and these regional and
13 representatives of the Commission representing the under-
14 represented areas of the Counties that were eliminated, and
15 in doing that, I am looking at, you know, counties and
16 regions that are similar, that may have similar communities
17 of interest to ensure that each member could understand and
18 hear and listen to all communities of interest in the State
19 of California. And so it is really tough when you are
20 eliminating maybe a certain race, a certain ethnicity, a
21 certain economic group, a certain geographic area, and so,
22 in doing so, I try to make up for any areas that I think
23 could be covered in a different diversity characteristic.

24 MR. AHMADI: That is a good point, Kerri.

25 CHAIR CAMACHO: I also agree with that in the sense

1 of making sure we have that diversity and also, you know,
2 understanding that, when we get down to the 60 and the 14,
3 each county is obviously not going to be represented, but we
4 definitely have that diversity in there. Another thing that
5 I am looking at is to ensure that these Applicants
6 understand the commitment that they are making to be this
7 Commissioner, you know, some of the individuals that I read
8 in the Supplemental Applications, there are individuals that
9 have said, "I can work on weekends and after work," that
10 might not be an option. So I am looking at, you know, that
11 they might have to work 24/7, so they have to understand
12 that, and understand that they have to do their full
13 commitment.

14 MS. SPANO: I think they would be working the hours
15 that Nasir has mentioned.

16 CHAIR CAMACHO: Yes.

17 MR. AHMADI: They have a much more difficult job
18 than us.

19 CHAIR CAMACHO: Definitely.

20 MS. SPANO: Definitely.

21 MR. AHMADI: No, I agree with all that. It is going
22 to be challenging and difficult, but at the same time, I am
23 glad that we have a smaller pool so we can focus all of our
24 resources to that. And one other thing that I would like to
25 mention is, we will be focusing also on additional

1 information that we may need to get from the Bureau staff,
2 in terms of research requests. I know we have been focusing
3 a lot lately - in the past, we have been focusing more on,
4 initially, on the minimum qualifications, and then bringing
5 diversity, and now, as we move forward with this new smaller
6 pool, I think when we focus more on the details of
7 relationships, for example, or the individual's affiliation
8 with different community movements or activities, we may ask
9 more information from the Bureau staff to help us with
10 additional information with that, as well - all with the
11 same purpose of identifying the most qualified, of course,
12 and who is best suited to serve.

13 CHAIR CAMACHO: I definitely agree with that in the
14 sense or - that we will probably be asking the Bureau staff
15 to look up on a few more additional items, and that they
16 might be even providing us additional information on these
17 remaining 314 individuals, and even maybe the 120 that are
18 remaining, when we get down to that pool.

19 Is there any other discussions about our next phase
20 and to assure that we can have as much commonality in our
21 next - or do we know what each of us are looking at, and
22 focusing in on? Yes.

23 MS. SPANO: Yes, I am sure I have a fair
24 understanding of how you both are assessing the Applicants
25 from here on out. I hope you do, as well, as I do.

1 MR. AHMADI: Yes.

2 MS. SPANO: You mentioned earlier interviews?
3 Talking about interviews?

4 CHAIR CAMACHO: Yes, yes. Another of our items that
5 I would like to discuss, or discuss because we have not
6 discussed these things, is we are going to have another
7 phase, and it is going to be coming up on us pretty quickly,
8 it is the interview phase where we are going to be
9 interviewing up to 120 Applicants. What I was thinking is,
10 we need to discuss how long those interviews should be. You
11 know, we could have them two hours for each Applicant, we
12 can have them a half hour. I was kind of thinking maybe
13 that we could have between an hour and 15 minutes to an hour
14 and 45 minutes to get the information we need. And, in
15 addition to these interviews, we have got to take into
16 consideration that Counsel can ask questions, each Panel
17 member can ask questions of the Applicant, and even our
18 assistants, so that each Panel member's assistants can ask
19 questions of the Applicant. So I was trying to put out on
20 the floor here for you, kind of discussing how much time do
21 you think we should give each applicant? Or just - we are
22 not voting on this, this is just kind of to get an
23 understanding so we can maybe get a schedule set up.

24 MS. SPANO: Sure. I would give it some thought
25 about how long the interviews should go. I was thinking

1 maybe four interviews a day, every day in August, and maybe
2 the first two weeks of September, and to give the Applicant
3 maybe one and a half hours to two hours, at most, because I
4 know we are going to think about maybe developing some
5 questions, five or six, for the Applicants to actually
6 prepare for in advance, in addition to any questions that we
7 may ask during the interview. So as you said, Mary, Counsel
8 would have an opportunity to ask questions, so it could go
9 long, or it could go short, I will want to hear whatever the
10 Applicant has to say. We may have follow-up questions
11 during an interview to clarify certain things, either as
12 stated in the application, or doing their interviews, so I
13 thought that would be a reasonable timeframe. I do not
14 know, there could be some people that actually will decline
15 to interview because it is going to be - they are in the hot
16 seat once they come here, and a lot of people can attend and
17 a lot of people can watch, so it will be interesting to see
18 how much turnout we get with the interviews. But I thought
19 maybe one and a half to two hours would be good. What do
20 you think, Nasir?

21 MR. AHMADI: Thank you. I think, if I had an
22 option, I would probably go with as much as it takes for the
23 Applicants to share their thoughts, and their qualities, and
24 their participation in this process. But, as I am sure you
25 know, we have limited time, and the deadline is in the law,

1 which is by September 30th, we have to have the list of the
2 60 of the most qualified Applicants. And we are taking
3 maximum advantage of the time that we have to allow a month
4 and a half, I believe, that is the maximum that we can allot
5 for interviews, given that we start the first week of
6 August, for example, I think if you divide the amount of
7 time that is available by the number of Applicants that we
8 have to interview, which is up to 120, we do not have much
9 choice other than limiting the time limit for each
10 individual, but, of course, once we set up the maximum limit
11 of time for each individual, that does not mean that they
12 have to stay that long with us, depending on how much time
13 they need to share their thoughts and their qualifications
14 with us. I think I will be, to the extent possible,
15 flexible. We may have a situation where the Applicant who
16 is scheduled to be seen next may not show up, and we can
17 take advantage of that time.

18 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Actually, you cannot. The
19 Regulations require that each Applicant can have a maximum
20 amount of time to speak, so whatever you agree on is the
21 most time that a person, however long-winded, will have.
22 And at the one and a half hour or two-hour mark, we will
23 have to cut them off out of fairness to all other
24 Applicants.

25 MR. AHMADI: Thank you for that clarification. So,

1 yeah, you are right, we have to set the maximum time for
2 each Applicant, and then, as you mentioned, maybe two hours
3 is the maximum we can do because, if you have six
4 applications in a day, or five applications in a day, it is
5 going to be a little demanding, I guess, not only for the
6 Applicants, themselves, but also for the Panel members
7 because we have to take notes and digest the information,
8 and make sure that we are ready because, at the end of the
9 interviews, we have to meet again and discuss the
10 performance of those interviewees.

11 CHAIR CAMACHO: I am thinking two hours might be
12 quite a bit. You know, there are some people that are going
13 to - would like to have two hours, but I am thinking, in the
14 sense of us sitting there and listening to them, and also
15 being able to fit in as many Applicants in the short amount
16 of time that we have, I am thinking maybe we should go with
17 an hour and a half, just suggesting, and see what they come
18 up with, a schedule, and that way we can see if possibly
19 they could expand it out to two hours an Applicant.

20 MR. AHMADI: There is a benefit in setting a limited
21 time like an hour and a half, and that is, knowing that I
22 have only one - I am just talking about Applicants - knowing
23 that I have only one hour and a half, then I would be more
24 prepared to concisely share the information, and just answer
25 the questions, I think an hour and a half makes sense in

1 that regard.

2 CHAIR CAMACHO: You know, we are not committing to
3 anything right now, but we are just -

4 MS. SPANO: It sounds reasonable. I envision these
5 interviews being very intense, and I would like to collect
6 my thoughts at each interview before I start with the next
7 interview, and that is going to maybe a few minutes just to
8 break and get prepared for the next Applicant. I know we
9 are going to have, in addition to five standard questions,
10 five or six standard questions, maybe certain questions are
11 unique to each Applicant, so I just want to get my head
12 around that and really be prepared to do that. So maybe two
13 hours is a little aggressive, I mean, that is a very tight
14 timeframe with us not eating, and no breaking. So, one and
15 a half hours seems reasonable. And maybe go in the next
16 meeting and see, with that in mind.

17 CHAIR CAMACHO: Would staff be able to provide at
18 the next meeting a schedule that reflects an hour and a half
19 interview timeframe for each Applicant?

20 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: Absolutely. We will mock it
21 up for you and you can make decisions.

22 CHAIR CAMACHO: Thank you very much. I know it is
23 12:16, we do not have a lot more on our agenda. I was
24 thinking that we progress and get through with this. I am
25 thinking we might have at least maybe an hour at the max,

1 depending on how much public comment that we receive. Do
2 you guys feel that is -

3 MS. SPANO: I could move forward.

4 CHAIR CAMACHO: Forego the lunch break?

5 MR. AHMADI: Yeah, let's move along.

6 **ITEM 7. Discussion relating to panelists' initial**
7 **assessments about applicants, further assessment and**
8 **review of all remaining applicants, requests for additional**
9 **information from remaining applicants, and remaining**
10 **applicant selection phases.**

11 CHAIR CAMACHO: Okay, our next item, it is just kind
12 of like what Kerri was thinking, in the sense that we are
13 going to be asking questions of each Applicant, and
14 Applicants are going to receive prior to their interview a
15 list of standardized questions that we are going to be
16 asking each and every Applicant. What I would like to do at
17 our next meeting is to prepare some standardized questions
18 that we could bring to our next meeting. I want the
19 Applicants to also understand that, just like what Kerri
20 says, is that we may have additional questions that are
21 geared towards each Applicant, so those obviously will not
22 be provided beforehand to the Applicants, but these
23 standardized ones would be. Okay?

24 MR. AHMADI: And that is up to five questions? Or
25 the decision will be to come up with five questions, if we

1 could come with as many questions as we think of.

2 CHAIR CAMACHO: Exactly, and then what we can do is
3 narrow them down and determine how many questions that we
4 possibly can have in a certain timeframe.

5 MR. AHMADI: Sounds good.

6 CHAIR CAMACHO: Okay? Like Kerri has been saying,
7 Nasir, and I, I just want to reiterate that those Form 700s,
8 please fill those out and get those in prior to the July 12th
9 deadline. We definitely want to have a diverse group. We
10 have such a stellar group, it has been so hard on us getting
11 this far and, so, we really would appreciate all Applicants
12 that are in this 314 group, to submit their Form 700s. What
13 I am thinking is, in the sense of the remaining selection
14 process, that we are going to go back to our offices and we
15 are going to reassess these 314 Applicants, and we are going
16 to take a hard look at the Applicant materials, this is also
17 going to include the Form 700s, and I am thinking that we
18 might be able to receive some next week for the ones that
19 have been already submitted, but I am thinking that we are
20 probably going to get a bombardment on the 12th. I am
21 thinking that we will probably be scheduling another meeting
22 around July 19th to discuss the remaining Applicants, so if
23 an Applicant does not submit their Form 700, one of these
24 remaining Applicants does not submit their Form 700, they
25 will be eliminated because this is part of their

1 application. Also, as Nasir stated, we are going to be
2 taking a look at these again, these 314 Applicants, and we
3 are going to go back to our office and say we favorably
4 recommend this Applicant, or we do not favorably recommend
5 this Applicant, so we may come back to this meeting with 200
6 at least "one yes votes" or hopefully 120 at least "one yes
7 votes."

8 MR. AHMADI: Or maybe 300.

9 CHAIR CAMACHO: Yes. So there could be an
10 elimination process within that, that might help reduce our
11 Applicant pool, depending on the diversity, we are also
12 going to have to take a look at that. So our goal is to
13 come to this next meeting with 40 diverse Applicants from
14 each pool. So this is going to be a very hard process
15 because, as you can tell, when we get through this, there
16 are such stellar individuals that it is going to be hard to
17 assess, like Nasir said, an A+ to an A+, but we have to get
18 down to those 40 individuals from each political
19 affiliation. We also need to ensure that we keep in mind
20 those diversities, so it is the political affiliation, has
21 to have 40 individuals, and has to ensure that they have a
22 diverse race, ethnic, geographic -

23 MR. AHMADI: And economics.

24 CHAIR CAMACHO: Economics, and the last one is
25 gender. So we have got to keep those in mind. I am

1 thinking that we will probably begin the interviews between
2 August 2nd and August 9th, that kind of depends on our meeting
3 to narrow down the Applicant pool to 120. I am thinking we
4 are going to start probably around July 19th, and we will go
5 day to day and talk about these individuals, one at a time,
6 to get down to that 120 pool. And it is 40, as diverse as
7 we can, for each political party.

8 MR. AHMADI: Excuse me, Mary, just to make sure that
9 I got that clear. There is a possibility that we have
10 individuals who did not receive any favorable vote from any
11 of us, so it sounds like, in the next meeting, we may be
12 able to reduce the pool further down to an even smaller
13 size, that number could be 300 or it could be 380, or it
14 could be 200, I do not know, but since we are going back and
15 reviewing all these applications, everybody has an equal
16 chance to be considered and included, and is included, in
17 the pool. So, your comment about discussing each single
18 Applicant was limited to those who received at least a
19 single favorable vote. Am I correct?

20 CHAIR CAMACHO: Yes, depending on what we vote on
21 for those remaining Applicants, these remaining 314
22 Applicants, at the time.

23 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

24 CHAIR CAMACHO: And that also takes into
25 consideration, you know, if the Applicant is eliminated

1 because they have to submit their Form 700, because then, if
2 they do not submit their Form 700 by July 12th, they will be
3 eliminated because that is not the complete application.

4 MR. AHMADI: Correct.

5 CHAIR CAMACHO: Are there any other comments?

6 MR. AHMADI: One thing that I wanted to mention is
7 something that you have already said in the past, in terms
8 of diversity, I do not think there is a lot of concern about
9 diversity. We definitely will focus on diversity and make
10 sure that we have a fair share of each element within the
11 pools; however, I just wanted to re-emphasize on the fact
12 that the law prohibits us from any quotas or ratios, or any
13 percentages, for example. When we say, for example, "gender
14 diversity," it does not mean that we have 50 female and 50
15 male, and likewise, when we say, for example, "economic
16 diversity," it does not mean that we take some kind of
17 ratios off all those different economic classes. So, as
18 long as each member of the Commission is represented to the
19 maximum possible way, a portion of California, and not only
20 that, as long as each member of the Commission is
21 appreciative of diversity within the State, I think that
22 would be serving the goal of this process.

23 CHAIR CAMACHO: I agree with that.

24 MS. SPANO: I agree. I am looking for well balanced
25 sub-pools, and pools that complement each other.

1 CHAIR CAMACHO: At this time, I would like to ask if
2 there is any public comment regarding this agenda item.

3 MR. WRIGHT: Jim Wright again, voter from San Jose.
4 Stephanie, I submitted last time a request that the Panel
5 consider how they go about doing the interviews with the
6 candidates. Has that been considered in any way?

7 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: We are taking all public
8 comments regarding the interview process under advisement.

9 MR. WRIGHT: Okay, so discussion might be held at
10 the next meeting?

11 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I do not know whether the
12 Panel will make a decision about the formation of the
13 tables, that might be a decision that I make myself, based
14 upon the ability to mic everyone, and that sort of thing.
15 But I am taking your comments under consideration.

16 MR. WRIGHT: So I will reinforce my suggestion.

17 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: I got it.

18 MR. WRIGHT: Another suggestion for the discussion
19 the next time around, eliminating anyone from the pool that
20 has no recommendation from any of the three of you seems to
21 be a very efficient way of reducing the size of the pool,
22 so, you know, some number of people do not need to be
23 discussed at all. And as you proceed to discuss the
24 individual people, perhaps you start with the ones that only
25 have a single recommendation, and one-by-one, eliminating

1 them. You probably do not have to discuss the people that
2 have three recommendations because they are very strong in
3 all of your minds, so maybe that will shorten the process if
4 you were to follow that strategy. Third item, would it be
5 reasonable at this point to send an e-mail to each of the
6 remaining Applicants basically saying, "Are you still
7 interested," seeking a positive response from them? "Are
8 you committed to this process?" Are they really committing
9 themselves to the process?

10 MS. RAMIREZ-RIDGEWAY: We assume that, when we send
11 a reminder asking for their Form 700, by submitting their
12 Form 700, they are indicating that they are still
13 interested.

14 MR. WRIGHT: That is a good answer. Thank you very
15 much, Stephanie. Thank you, again. You are doing a great
16 job.

17 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

18 MS. SPANO: Thank you.

19 CHAIR CAMACHO: Thank you, Mr. Wright. Is there any
20 other public comment regarding this item? Seeing that we
21 have exhausted our discussion here, the next item of
22 business is just general public comment.

23 **Item 8. Public Comment on Items not on the Agenda.**

24 CHAIR CAMACHO: Is there any general public
25 comment that we have today? Wow. This is a first. What I

1 would like to do is let everyone know that has been removed
2 from the application pool that, personally, and I know my
3 colleagues can agree with this, that we have been so
4 impressed with the caliber and the activities that these
5 Applicants have shown, and that it does not mean anything
6 against the Applicants that have been eliminated on their
7 qualifications or their commitment, they are stellar
8 candidates, but we are having to narrow down the pool to get
9 the most qualified and diverse Applicant pool, so I just
10 wanted to reiterate that it has been a very hard process to
11 get down to this number. Since there is no further
12 business, I would like to adjourn this meeting.

13 MR. AHMADI: Thank you.

14 [Adjourned at 12:30 P.M.]

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25