Ad Hoc Committee to Develop Recommendations for Legislative and Other Options
Summary Report
May 7, 2021

April 14, 2021—Initial Planning/Organizing Meeting
The ad hoc committee reviewed our mandate, outlined a tentative plan for meetings, and identified issues that required clarification before proceeding. We determined that we needed to meet with counsel (1) to get clarification on timelines and timing requirements in existing legislation; (2) to understand any rules around our AHC communicating with and exchanging views with outside parties (individuals and organizations); and (3) to discuss potential scenarios and options for further investigation.

April 16, 2021—Meeting with Counsel
The ad hoc committee met with IRC counsel, Marguerite Leoni to review timelines, various scenarios and details of SB 594 and its implications for the IRC. We also received clarification on rules (Brown Act and other) for ad hoc committee to observe as it proceeded with the work outlined in the committee's mandate.

Discussion of Senate Bill 594 led to the committee deciding to recommend formally endorsing the bill, as it became clear that the bill was **the** vehicle for providing fixes to address census delays. The committee decided to draft a Resolution in support of SB 594, for IRC consideration and approval at the next IRC meeting on April 23, 2021.

The committee also set out next steps: Ken Inman to reach out to Karin MacDonald, Director, Statewide Database for detailed information on Census data availability dates; Sonia Diaz to contact Nicolas Heidorn, Senate legislative analyst to set up a meeting; Rosette Garcia to contact LA County CRC corresponding ad hoc committee to set up a meeting. Jack Russ to provide update and present Resolution to the IRC at the next meeting.

April 21, 2021—IRC Meeting Prep
The ad hoc committee met to discuss and prepare for upcoming IRC meeting, particularly the Resolution which we were proposing for IRC approval. In a phone call between Rosette and David Holtzman of the LA CRC to schedule a meeting of the two ad hoc committees, Commissioner Holtzman had requested the Resolution be withdrawn, stating his opinion that it was premature to take this action and claiming inaccuracies in the document. The committee in consultation with counsel, decided to proceed with the Resolution, confident that this was the correct approach for the IRC and a reasonable first step in the process of developing solutions to address the census delays.

April 26, 2021—Meeting with LA County CRC Ad Hoc Committee
All IRC ad hoc committee members were present. Attending from LA County CRC were David Holtzman and Daniel Mayeda; Brian Stecher was unable to attend. We discussed the positions that each Commission had taken to date: LAC CRC had approved two positions: move adoption deadline back to February 15, 2022 and shorten the public hearing period from 30 days to 10 days. The IRC had approved the Resolution endorsing SB 594. We discussed the relevance and utility of SB 594 noting that the only relief it provided was in clarifying the map adoption deadline (referendum period takes place after the deadline, not within). We conferred about extending map adoption deadlines and we referenced the letter sent from legislative leadership to CCRC, indicating a 2-4 week extension of the deadline was possible. Neither Mr. Holtzman nor Mr. Mayeda were aware of the letter; they requested we forward a copy, which we

did. We informed them that we were interested in collaborating with LACCRC, if possible, to prospectively find solutions that would serve both of Commissions. They asked us to come back when we had specific proposals. We agreed we would schedule another meeting when appropriate.

April 27, 2021—Nicolas Heidorn, Lead Staff on SB 594

Notes from our conversation:

- "Everyone agrees, we need more time"
- Author "has a desire to extend the deadline"
- "We need to hear from ROV, CSAC" etc. Everyone agrees we need more time, but no one putting forth a date.
- We discussed possible impacts to extending the deadline, i.e. in lieu filing dates, candidate nomination period. He indicated that overlap of these periods was possible.
- We expressed our priority was to preserve, as much as possible, the public comment period. He emphasized that good government groups like LWV and Common Cause were watching very closely and were concerned about any action that would constrain robust public input envisioned in the original legislation.
- He requested that we provide him with a specific date for an extended deadline.
- We asked about the possibility of being able to use data to draw draft maps prior to it being adjusted by the SWDB and switching for all subsequent and final map once official data is available. He thought it was an interesting idea.
- He suggested that we could ask for "unique fixes" that would apply only the San Diego County. He also pointed out that joint proposals could be useful, as well.
- He recommended if we get feedback from our local legislators.
- Based on his comments, we determined that it would be wise to also reach out to LWV and Common Cause to get their input.
- He asked us to provide our legislative amendments to him in the next 2-3 weeks as he expected the legislation to pass out of committee and go to the floor in early mid-June.
- Primary could be moved to June 28th. Only the Legislate can change primary date; Federal election date is "hard stop", set by U.S. Constitution

May 3, 2021—Meeting with ROV

Present at the meeting were Cynthia Paes, Interim ROV, Caroline Smith, Legislative and Strategic Affairs, Liberty O'Donnelly, IRC Co-Project Mgr, Shaun Brom, Precinct Services, Pete Arthur, Sr. GIS Analyst, Elvira, Campaign Services, all AHC members.

- ROV has no interest in changing the date of the primary
- Elections code (12262) requires them to finalize precincts 125 days before election (February 2)
- 30-35 days required for them to implement boundary changes. Although if additional staff is hired, could do in 3 weeks. Filing and precincting can overlap, thus compressing needed time
- The fewer census tracts that are split, the easier their job is.
- Working on legislative fix that will allow for minor corrections of map (will mitigate delays if clarification is needed of a boundary--Census geography completely different than ROV/precinct geography)
- Recall election also impacting their work—impacts when files can be changed or not (88 days before an election through 30 days after, so for primary: March 11-July 7)

May 6, 2021—Meeting with LWV and Common Cause

Present were Helen Hutchison, LWV and Kiyana Amensafar, Common Cause, all AHC members, except Sonia Diaz.

- Ms. Hutchison stated that CCRC was getting "inappropriate pressure" from state legislature (referring to letter from legislative leadership to CCRC). They should not be weighing in at all.
- They encouraged us to be getting public input now on COIs.
- They stated that ROV timeline could be compressed
- They expressed strong desire to push adoption deadline to end of January.
- Concerned that this year, in particular, in the first post-COVID holiday, we will not have the attention of the public to obtain meaningful robust public input.
- They informed us that the Secretary of State was gearing up to help ROVs around the state.
- They followed up with an email restating key points made in the meeting.

May 6, 2021--Meeting with Counsel, Marguerite Leoni

We debriefed counsel on all our meetings and information gathered to date (including updated information from Karin MacDonald of the SWDB). We decided to place an action item on the Agenda for the next IRC meeting on May 13, 2021. We will ask for approval to draft legislative amendments in coordination with the Chair to (1) extend the deadline up to and including January 31; (2) allow for the use of user friendly data provided by the SWDB in August (and prior to the Official SWDB dataset to become available in September) for drawing draft maps; and (3) to use the Official SWDB data for all subsequent maps once it becomes available.

May 7, 2021—Telephone Call Rosette Garcia/Caroline Smith

Reviewed all developments including agenda item and proposed motions. Caroline was supportive of our decision and actions thus far. She will work with ROV and other county legal staff to figure out how they can piggyback on our ask. Did not think the timing of our action was problematic. Agreed that we should reach out to local legislative delegation.