1	CALIFORNIA PRIVACY PROTECTION AGENCY
2	
3	TRANSCRIPTION OF RECORDED BOARD MEETING
4	
5	SEPTEMBER 7, 2021
6	SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
7	
8	Present: JENNIFER M. URBAN, Chair
9	LYDIA DE LA TORRE, Board Member
10	VINHCENT LE, Board Member
11	ANGELA SIERRA, Board Member
12	JOHN CHRISTOPHER THOMPSON, Board Member
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	Transcribed by: Melinda Friedland,
23	eScribers, LLC
24	Phoenix, Arizona
25	000

TRANSCRIBED RECORDED BOARD MEETING

2.0

2.3

September 7, 2021

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Good morning. My name is Jennifer Urban, and I am the chairperson of the California Privacy Protection Agency Board. You see the other members of the board on your screen. Welcome to our September meeting.

I would first like to acknowledge that today is Rosh Hashanah, an important holiday in the Jewish calendar. I regret that we were unable to switch the days of this meeting so that the closed session discussion fell mainly today and the public discussion fell tomorrow. We are recording the meeting, and I'll say a little more about that later in the meeting. For now, I would like to wish everyone who is celebrating Rosh Hashanah/Shana Tovah a good and sweet year to all.

Before we started with the substance of the meeting, I have some logistical announcements. First, I'd like to ask everyone please check that your microphone is muted when you are not speaking. Today's meeting will be run according to the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, as required by law. Additionally, as I mentioned, this meeting is being recorded.

After each agenda item, there will be an opportunity for questions and discussion by the board members. We

have a designated time on the agenda for public comment, and I will also ask for public comment on each agenda item. Each speaker will be limited to three minutes per agenda item. If you wish to speak on an item, please use the raise your hand function, which is in the reaction feature at the bottom of your Zoom screen.

2.0

2.3

Our moderator will request that you unmute yourself for comment. When your comment is completed, the moderator will mute you. It is helpful if you identify yourself, but I want to stress that this is entirely voluntary, and you can input a pseudonym when you log into the meeting.

I would like to remind all speakers to please stay on topic and keep your minutes to -- keep your comments to three minutes or less. We do have a tight schedule today.

Relatedly, I would like to remind everyone of the rules of the road under Bagley-Keene. Both board members and members of the public may discuss agenda items only. Items not on the agenda can be suggested for discussion at future meetings when the board takes up the agenda item designated for that purpose. It's number 8 on today's agenda.

The board welcomes public comment on any item on the agenda, and it is the board's intent to ask for public

comment prior to the board voting on any agenda item. If for some reason I forget to ask for public comment on an agenda item, and you wish to speak, please use the raise your hand function so our moderator can recognize you.

2.0

For those joining later in the meeting, the moderator would usually admit people between agenda items, but with the webinar people may be coming and going as the meeting proceeds, and that is just fine.

We will take a break around mid-day for lunch, depending on where we are in the agenda, and shorter breaks as needed.

I'm just delighted to be with you this morning for this meeting of the California Privacy Protection Agency Board. We have a full schedule over the next two days. And I would like to thank the board members for their service. These meetings also require a lot of work behind the scenes.

I would like to thank Ms. Debra Castanon for taking minutes; Mr. Chris Phillips for serving as meeting counsel; and Mr. Edwin Joseph Panero (ph.) for moderating and managing the Zoom conferencing system.

I would also like to thank Deputy Secretary Lila

Mirrashidi for obtaining staffing and resources behind

the scenes, and the team at the Department of Consumer

Affairs for managing our communications list and website.

1 I would also like to generally thank the staff of Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency, (indiscernible), the Department of Consumer Affairs, the 3 4 Department of General Services, the Office of the 5 Attorney General, and other agencies who have continued to loan time behind the scenes. 6 7 I would now like to call the meeting to order and 8 ask our moderator, Mr. Joseph Panero, to please conduct 9 the roll call. 10 MR. PANERO: Thank you, Chairperson. 11 So to call for roll, Board Member Lydia de le Torre. 12 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Present. 13 MR. PANERO: Board Member Vinhcent Le. 14 BOARD MEMBER LE: (Indiscernible). 15 MR. PANERO: Board Member Angela Sierra. 16 BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: 17 MR. PANERO: Board Member Chris Thompson. 18 BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Here. 19 MR. PANERO: And Board Chairperson, Jennifer Urban. 2.0 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Present. 21 Thank you. We do have a quorum. MR. PANERO: 22 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Joseph Panero. 2.3 The board has established a quorum. I would like to 24 let the board members know that we'll take a roll call

vote on any action items today.

25

And with that, we will now proceed to Agenda Item

Number 2, which is Approval of the June 14th, 2021

Meeting Minutes. I would like to offer my sincere thanks

to Mr. Phillips for taking such thorough minutes. He is

our meeting counsel today, and he's responsible for the

minutes from the last meeting.

2.0

Do board members wish to make any additions or corrections the June 14 meeting minutes? Please raise your hand, and I'll recognize you.

Ms. de le Torre, followed by Ms. Sierra.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you. There are just a few things that I will request to be revised for accuracy. In pages 4 and 7 of discussion, that effects the conversation we had on leadership positions, but it is my recollection that the agreement that we reached was that all leadership positions will be CEA roles, or we will try to make them CEA roles. I understand there's separate process for that. I will appreciate if the names could be corrected to reflect that agreement.

I also notice on page 6, there's a reference to a statement that I made, and it is not accurate. The minutes reflect that I have concerns related to making the chief deputy position a CEA position and that is not my position. I actually believe that the leadership position should be CEA. So I ask that that be corrected

as well.

On page 6 as well, we have a conversation about this (indiscernible) position, but it is unclear to me that the (indiscernible) -- the agreement that we had, which was that positions should be posted immediately when possible, and that we should not wait to try to stagger the position. So I request that that be also made clear in the minutes.

I think I have one more thing. Yes. Give me a second. Yes. On page 17 where it talks about future meetings, I specifically recall that the board agree on having meetings monthly. I don't have a clear understanding of what the minutes say; they seem to say that we agree on having the staff propose meetings. I'm not — it is not clear to me from the language, so if it could be revised to make it clear that we agreed on June 14th to have monthly meetings, I will appreciate that.

I don't have any other corrections. There's a small incorrection in the future agenda items, but I don't think it's significant enough to bother to correct it.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: I'm going to collect these, and then Mr. Phillips and I might ask some clarifying questions.

Ms. Sierra.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Yes. Good morning. I just have one -- just a technical point on page 15 in the first paragraph when it talks about objections to the committee assignments; I believe it's just missing a "no". There are no objections to the committee assignments.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you.

2.3

Okay. Any other comments or suggested edits to the meeting minutes? Great.

Mr. Phillips, let's maybe proceed in reverse order.

Is there a "no" missing? I know you listened to the recording to check. I don't remember. We can go back and check and --

MR. PHILLIPS: We did. So I took contemporaneous notes at the last meeting, and then I went back and reviewed the tape -- or the video. I believe that is correct, the technical issue with leaving out "no".

There were no objections to what Ms. Sierra pointed out.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Okay.

And then with regards to the final agenda item, Ms. de la Torre, is the correction the mention of staff? The monthly meetings is not a correction, correct? The correction is the mention of staff?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I can pull up the -CHAIRMAN URBAN: I can share the screen if you'd

like.

2.0

2.3

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Right. So that is on page 17. And I think it is not clear that we agree on hosting -- or having monthly meetings. I saw that both have been called on that, but it seems that it was not. But I do recollect very clearly that we agree that we will have monthly meetings.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Yes, I believe these minutes are accurate. We did not vote, but we had a consensus, and the meetings record that every person agrees.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: But what are we agreeing on, on having the staff schedule or on having meetings?

CHAIRMAN URBAN: I guess I'm unsure of the distinction.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Right. So it isn't clear to me whether we are agreeing to host meetings or we're agreeing on asking the staff to propose meetings. My recollection is that we agreed on having meetings. Is that your recollection as well?

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Between the -- whether it was staff to set a schedule or to have monthly meetings, I'm unsure.

Mr. Phillips, are -- do you recall? Again, we can double-check this. I think the main point is that everybody agreed in principle and was in favor of having

monthly meetings.

2.3

MR. PHILLIPS: Yeah, I can't recall exactly without reviewing what the phrase was in that discussion, but the bottom line is the schedule is for monthly -- the agreement was for monthly meetings, whether that's staff who sets it or whether it's Chairperson Urban who sets it. I don't think that that's -- that there's a distinction there.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: All right. Do you have an edit to propose Ms. de la Torre?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Chairperson Urban proposed to have monthly -- meetings in monthly intervals due to the large amount of work to get done. That will make it clear.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: All right. Well, I suspect that what is here is what actually what was said, but I think the substance is the same, so. Thank you.

And then on the CEA and chief deputy positions, I do recall, Ms. de la Torre, the portion of the minutes with your comment. Could you remind me what page it is again?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: The portion with my comment is on page 6. And again, I do not have any concerns with making that position a CEA position. I think I made it clear through the meeting that I will prefer all positions that are leadership positions to be

CEA positions.

2.0

2.3

CHAIRMAN URBAN: All right. So we will double-check on this to the -- as to what was said in the meeting, but I think we, as you will here in future parts of the meeting, I -- again, the substance of the understanding seems to be fine because that's how we've been going.

All right. So I have several corrections proposed.

One is there are no objections to the subcommittee
assignments instead of objections. One is to edit the
sentence on page 17, as Ms. de la Torre and I just
discussed, in order to remove the reference to staff,
which I do think is accurate, but this reflects the
substance of our discussion.

And then Ms. de la Torre, do you want edits to this part, or do you -- are you suggesting edits, or is it just important that we all understand that you support the CEA positions?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: So long as we have an understanding, it is okay, but I will appreciate if that could be noted somewhere if not in the minutes.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: They will be in the minutes of this meeting.

Mr. Phillips, is it --

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Perfect.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: -- appropriate to put a note in

this meetings, or should we just keep the minutes of this meeting?

MR. PHILLIPS: You can handle it either way. You can make an official edit to last meeting's minutes right now and vote on that, or you can let this meeting's minutes reflect the understanding --

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Okay.

2.0

MR. PHILLIPS: -- in a more clear way.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Whatever is more expeditious works on my side.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Okay. Thank you, Ms. de la Torre.

I propose that we make sure this is reflected in the minutes here because I think that's most efficient.

And then the last was with regard to the staggering -- the natural staggering of the positions given the process to hire. Did you have a proposed edit to these minutes, Ms. de la Torre? Or again, would you like the understanding to be reflected either in the minutes today or in a -- in an addendum note to the minutes from June 14th?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: No, it is perfect to reflect it in the minutes today. I think that what I want to make clear is that we agree that the positions will be posted as soon as possible and that they will not

1 | be staggered.

2.0

2.3

CHAIRMAN URBAN: All right. Thank you. We will reflect that in the minutes for today. And those were -- that's the list that I had.

Mr. Thompson.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Thank you, Chairperson Urban. Very minor edit on page 15.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Sorry, I'll share my screen again.

Go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Under Agenda Item 6 -- thank you -- the notation where I talked about kind of the culture of an organization working remotely as an existing organization or new --

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Um-hum.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: -- and then the duty station. My recollect -- those are two separate ideas; the way it's drafted they flow together to be one. So I mean it's a very minor edit. But we were talking about working -- I was talking about working remotely and how that works in a new organization versus one with an existing culture, and then the topic was the duty station listed on the job spec.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: So --

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: So look at the second sentence: He believes the board should be sensitive to

1 that fact. I would just put a period after "brand new entity". And then new sentence: "Having a duty 3 station" -- new sentence, new paragraph -- "Having a duty 4 station is a necessary piece of information for" -- there 5 you go. CHAIRMAN URBAN: How is that? 6 7 BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Perfect. Thank you. 8 CHAIRMAN URBAN: All right. Of course. You're very 9 welcome. 10 Any more addenda or edits to the minutes? 11 Thank you all very much for your attention to Wonderful. 12 the minutes and the careful read. 13 Are there any comments from members of the public? 14 MR. PANERO: Thank you, Chairperson. 15 So as a reminder, if anyone from the public would 16 like to make a comment, please press the raised hand icon on your screen. If you're joined by telephone only, you 17 18 may press star nine to indicate that you'd like to 19 comment. As a reminder, you'll be called on and have up 2.0 to three minutes maximum to make your comment.

So give just about ten seconds or so to see if any hands come up. It looks like we have one comment, so let me -- it looks like the name is Barry Weber (ph.).

You're able to unmute yourself and talk.

21

22

2.3

24

25

MR. WEBER: Yes, thank you. This is Barry Weber. I

1 was just wondering -- I thought I had recollected from the previous meeting also there were going to be monthly 3 meetings. So I've just got this general question of what 4 happened to meetings in July and August? 5 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you for the comment, Mr. Weber. We'll be taking up the meeting schedule in the 6 7 next -- probably in more than one agenda item. Mr. 8 Phillips will guide us as to what we can discuss. 9 MR. PANERO: And I'm not seeing any more public comments at this time. 10 11 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you. 12 Thank you, Mr. Weber; and thank you to the board. 13 May I have a motion to approve the minutes as 14 corrected per our discussion and/or as reflected in the 15 minutes for today? Is someone on the board ready to make 16 a motion? 17 BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: So moved. 18 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Thompson. 19 May I have a second? 2.0 BOARD MEMBER LE: I'll second that. 21 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le. 22 The board will now vote whether to approve the June 23 14th, 2021 board meeting minutes as amended in this discussion. 24

Mr. Joseph Panero, will you please perform the roll

25

1 call vote? 2 MR. PANERO: Certainly. Thank you. 3 Ms. de la Torre. 4 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I approve. 5 MR. PANERO: Ms. de la Torre approves. Mr. Le. 6 7 BOARD MEMBER LE: I approve. 8 MR. PANERO: Mr. Le, yes. 9 Ms. Sierra. 10 BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: I approve. 11 MR. PANERO: Ms. Sierra, yes. 12 Mr. Thompson. 13 BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes. 14 MR. PANERO: Mr. Thompson, yes. 15 And Chairperson Urban. 16 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Yes. 17 Thank you. We have a vote of 5-0. MR. PANERO: 18 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Joseph Panero. 19 The motion carries, and the finalized amended 20 minutes will be posted to the CPPA website as soon as we 21 can get them corrected and remediated so that they are 22 accessible for people with disabilities. 2.3 All right. Thanks, everyone. With that, we will 24 move on to Agenda Item Number 3, which is the

Chairperson's Update; this is something of a stand-in.

25

Once we have an executive director, hopefully quite soon, then that person will be updating the board on activities between the meetings.

2.0

2.3

I'm going to share some slides to facilitate our discussion, and I am going to walk through this relatively quickly. I've tried to strike the right balance -- I don't know if it is -- between sort of detail -- too much detail and sufficient information for everyone to understand what I have to report, and then we will have discussion. So give me one moment to bring up the slides.

All right. So this is the Chairperson's Update for the September 7th and 8th, 2021 board meeting. I'm going to talk a little bit briefly about the big picture, and then move through several points which are drawn from priorities the board identified in our June 14th meeting.

I wanted to say a little bit just about the big -what I'm calling "the big picture" here. As we know from
the previous meeting, and as everyone who is following
this, and the public, and of course the board members
know, we have two parallel efforts underway, each of
which is very substantial. One is substantial
substantive work on a tight timeline, and the other is
creating an agency.

When I talk to my clinic students, one of the

analogies that I use is from a fellow clinical professor that, in a situation like this, rather than flying the plane, you're jumping off the cliff and building the plane on the way down. So we are in the midst of building this plane so that we can fly it to regulations to give certainty and protection to the public and eventually enforcement. That means that there's a lot of things that are happening in parallel and things that depend — one thing depends on another that is sort of in some ways unavoidable. So I'm going to explain kind of how we've been approaching it thus far so that we can discuss.

The focus has been on the infrastructure of the new agency, both abstract, by which I mean kind of figuring out the basic things that we can about how it will operate in the absence of the executive director, and concrete: contracts, buildings, that kind of thing.

We are a state governmental agency. That means that multiagency collaboration is required for most decisions and actions. This is very important to safeguard taxpayer money and to provide structure and transparency. There are numerous controls around almost any activity, whether it is hiring, signing a contract, or choosing a location as we discussed in the last board meeting. So it's very important for everyone to have the picture in

their mind that this is a governmental agency, and that we are working in collaboration with our control agencies and others in order to build things out.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

There's a lot of hard work behind the scenes, and I would like, again, to thank all of the people at the DCA, the Department of General Services, BCSH, the attorney general, and others who are providing support.

I wanted to bring up some -- the points of focus, which are from the last board meeting -- what we discussed. Ms. Tiffany Garcia discussed beginnings of contracted services -- this is in my infrastructure bucket -- and that of course is important and has continued. We had, as we alluded to in the last conversation, a discussion about how important it is to develop staffing and personnel resources; it's just absolutely critical. And the delegations that were made at the last meeting were for some leadership positions, especially the executive director, the chief deputy director of administration; we added the general counsel in the meeting, and there are additional staff and services that are required to do anything from holding this meeting to being able to actually interface with the control agencies to hire others, et cetera.

We also talked about location and premises. We discussed some board policies and a handbook. My

understanding of that discussion was that we agree to work on this over time, given the critical need space in the agency. And I'm happy, of course, to read this if that -- if we need to. And of course, we split into subcommittees to do a fair amount of work. So one of the things about this update is that I will be referring to subcommittee updates that are coming imminently because a fair amount of the information is likely to be in those.

2.3

To start with, contracted services and infrastructure. These are the services that are required to basically function and do things as an agency. We've done most of this, for the moment, through what are called "interagency agreements". Ms. Garcia mentioned these in the last meeting; she got several started, and I completed some over the last few weeks. Some of them are still in progress, but they are -- they're essentially in place; we just have to finish the contract.

The first is an IAA with the Office of the Attorney General. They were providing, for example, human resources support through June 30th. At which point, we move to the Department of General Services, which I'll mention in a moment.

The Department of Consumer Affairs is providing information technology services for us; that includes email addresses, the website; they built a list so that

people could sign up for our announcements; that they're building a repository so we can accept comment from the public and that kind of thing. It has an asterisk because I expect the contract from them very soon, but they have been providing the work already.

2.0

2.3

The Department of General Services is as it sounds; it is an agency that provides services to other agencies. We have several contracts with the Department of General Services. The first is human resources services. We transitioned to the Department of General Services on July 1st. They have a series of teams who help us with all of the various steps that are required to hire different kinds of positions. There will be more detail about that in the Start-up and Administration Subcommittee update.

DGS is also -- we are working on contracted financial services and budget and planning. These are services to do finance, budget, and accounting. This is not the person who is actually able to write the budget, but these are the people who are able to interface with the various control agencies and keep records for us.

In addition, we have agreements with the Department of General Services for procurement services. We are not able to buy anything without procurement authority. DGS has recently started providing the service to a few

agencies, and they agreed to provide it to us -- real estate services, which we will talk about at the Start-up and Administration Subcommittee in more detail. And most importantly, and very happy news, we have an IAA with DGS as a loan part -- a half-loan -- half-time -- excuse me -- loan of a high-level staff person as our interim deputy director of the administration. I will introduce her shortly.

2.0

2.3

We also have in place now legal services from the Office of the Attorney General. For this, I mean they're a -- excuse me -- the Attorney General provides legal advice and services to other agencies in the state pursuant to a standard relationship and arrangement. This is services that we can use to ask about various governmental issues and other legal questions that come up for the agency.

And then there are some other services that are less general. The interim deputy director of administration is working hard on a transcription service for recordings so we're able to make recordings accessible. We are working through with procurement to get subscriptions to -- for our future job postings, and some other things like that.

The second and related point of focus is staffing and personnel resources; this is critically important.

Again, a lot of this update will be in the Start-up and Administration subcommittee report, but I did want to say a few words about the executive director because that is something that happened before we began working on the rest of the positions. Excuse me. Just a moment.

2.0

But before we talk about that, I would like to very warmly welcome and introduce the interim chief deputy director of administration, whom I mentioned, her name is Debra Castanon, and she is part of the webinar panel today. She is the chief privacy officer for DGS, and she has — and they have graciously agreed to give us fifty percent of her time to work on administrative matters while we are working to hire an executive director and other positions.

She was previously the chief privacy officer for the California Department of Motor Vehicles, and she was one of the top two people in the California Office of Privacy Protection. For those of you who are part of the Privacy community, you know that was a beloved office, and Ms. Castanon has deep experience and expertise and commitment to the work of the agency. We are very grateful to have her. She is currently our only staff member. And again, we will be talking about where we are in efforts to increase staff in the Start-up and Administration subcommittee report.

So the executive director position. I was very grateful to all the members of the board for the robust discussion and the approval to move ahead with this to delegate the authority to me to sign the paperwork and move ahead with this. I agreed with and -- I heard and I absolutely agreed with the urgency. I thought, because we had had an initial approval from CalHR -- the human resources team -- that I would be able to post it probably that week. I was incorrect. And I just wanted to share why I was incorrect with the board because this -- and for the public, this is not something we can kind of talk about offline; Bagley-Keene requires us to talk about it in public. So I apologize if it is sort of boring, but I thought it was important to understand that sort of the collaboration that is required -- and necessarily required -- to safeguard public money in order to make a move like this.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

So there was a exempt pay request, which went -which is a several-page document with a justification and
essay; that went in to CalHR two days after the board
meeting. A staff person at the Attorney General's Office
who is helping us with HR followed up every week,
sometimes more than once a week. We transitioned to the
DGS HR team on July 1st, but the person at Attorney
General's Office, and I thank her -- I don't want to name

her because I haven't asked permission, but I'm very grateful to her -- continued to shepherd the package. We received the approval, which is called "an exempt pay letter", on July 7th.

At that point, we needed to do other things. We needed to establish the position number and generate what's called a "607" in order to request Department of Finance approval. All of that work was done, and Department of Finance approval was requested on July 14th. That usually takes thirty days. Department of Finance expedited this for us quite substantially, and in the interim, we also made some other requests. We needed a code from the State Controller's Office and some other things.

And we finally got all of the approvals required on July 27th and 28th, and had to be established in the CalCareer system because we didn't exist yet, and the job was posted on July 28th. There's a thirty-day posting period, which was — that was a choice that I made in order to give people sufficient time to apply. Other kinds of positions have some requirements, but we could choose different things for this position. I chose the thirty-day posting period, which closed on August 29th. The applications arrived last Monday, and they are currently under review. So thank you for indulging this.

I just had the sense, and I know that people must have been curious about the steps, and so I hope this is somewhat helpful. It it is not all of the -- it's not all of it, but it's a little bit more detail than just you noticing that we needed approvals. And then there's been quite a lot of activity on the CEA positions and working towards civil service positions, which, again, we will talk about in the Start-up and Administration Subcommittee.

2.3

Location and premises was another point of focus for our meeting on June 14th; that, again, we will bring up in the start-up administration subcommittee. And the polices and handbook again; my understanding was we were going to work on that over time. But I certainly welcome other priorities from board members in discussion. And finally, subcommittee work, which, I understand has been ongoing.

I have a few additional updates. The conflict of interest policy we voted on last time is out for public comment; it's a forty-five-day period, which ends

September 20th. So I will be finding out if we need to vote on it again, and we will vote on it in the next board meeting if we do.

I would like to acknowledge and recognize that Mr. Le mentioned strategic planning in the last board

meeting; that is still on the list. The notice to the attorney general for us to take authority -- to accept authority to begin rulemaking is not on the agenda for today. We do have a busy agenda, and we have a little bit of time to do that, but it is very much a priority and is on the list.

Communications; I mentioned a distribution list. We are working to get recordings of the meetings onto the website. I am hoping that this will happen now very quickly. And I apologize if you have been looking for the recording; they do need to be transcribed, and we are working on that.

And we have dates set for the next two board meetings, Monday, October 18th and Monday, November 15th, but I have put in brackets the fact that we may need additional mostly-closed sessions for hiring. Mr.

Thompson made this very good point in the last meeting and asked if that -- if it was possible to do this. It is. Every meeting is notice -- public meeting, then we can go into closed session if we need to discuss candidates who don't have other agenda items for the day and come back out of closed session. So those are in brackets because I anticipate that we may need those.

And subcommittee reports, again, will have further information and advice. The subcommittees that I am on,

I know we have some advice that will certainly involve additional public events and meetings.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

The priorities in my view are three; the first is people. Ms. Castanon is -- been a -- is a real boon to the agency. We have to hire staff. I know the board knows this, and we talked about it in the last meeting. That is a big priority. We've come up with some various strategies for temporary options, and we will talk about those in the Start-up and Administration Subcommittee meeting.

The second is systems. Unlike a business, there is no Secretary of State for a new agency. There's no sort of checkbox or services, so building the systems that allow us to operate is crucial. And of course substance; making progress on the substance. My view is that all of this we need to get as far as we can and set the stage for the executive director. I've been trying to avoid making decisions that the executive director should make, but we are on such a tight time line, and the time frames for creating the systems and hiring people are such that I think naturally the best that we can do, and the right thing to do, is to set everything up so the executive director is able to walk in and finish the processes. And if we get some of these processes done before the executive director arrives, that is all to -- better.

So our current challenges are that we do have these parallel activities that have to happen in -- they have to happen in parallel, and that are on a very tight time line. And we are working hard to develop staffing, but we are very limited in staff.

So with this, I would like to return to Mr. Weber's comment, and we can talk about this more in the discussion. There are two reasons why we didn't have a meeting in July or in August. The first was simply that a fundamental reason for the next meeting was to discuss the executive director, and this is the absolute earliest that we can do that. However, the other reason is that we are borrowing staff for every meeting. And I have secured staff for the next two meetings, and we are developing a plan for further staffing. We are working to be able to have a steady plan, but there have been some challenges.

And so the final issue that I'd like to discuss is what everybody can do to help. For the public, we would like you to continue to be engaged. We very much appreciate that. When we begin our preliminary activities, we very much want to -- for rulemaking we very much want to hear from you, hear what your views are on what the regulations should say, that would be -- it's always valuable; it will be particularly valuable in the

current situation.

2.0

2.3

For board members, I know that you have been giving a lot in a volunteer position -- a lot of time, a lot of resources, and I will continue to ask you to do that for what I hope is a relatively limited period of time. And again, I just want to give very big thanks to all of the staff people who've sort of loaned their time to us in order to make these initial things happen so that we can move forward on our own footing. Thank you.

And with that, I'm going to stop sharing my screen and open it up for discussion. In order to frame the discussion, I would like to note again that we do have two more -- or three -- we have three more subcommittee presentations coming, and there may be a fuller picture of sort of resources and activities by the end of that, so I may suggest that we recall the item in order to come back to it if that makes sense. But in any case, would the board like to comment, ask questions? Please raise your hand.

Ms. de la Torre.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I just want to start by thanking you for all of the commitment that you have made to the agency; it is something that I think goes under appreciated in many ways. So obviously, all of the stuff that you mentioned as well, but thank you, Mrs. Urban,

for the commitment that you have made.

I just lost -- can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Yes, I'm sorry. I lost my video.

I'm --

wanted to start by thanking you. I also wanted to mention that the slide that you prepared on the process for the executive director was very, very helpful to give us a visual of all of the steps, which are not intuitive to me, and I imagine they are not intuitive to the public necessarily, so that we can better understand the challenge that we are facing.

I also want to mention that I appreciate that we have set a certain time for the meetings in October and November. I remain concerned about our ability to sufficiently meet. I understand that that might not be something that we want to discuss at this point. But I think it will be helpful for the board to talk about it so that we can collaborate in supporting you and supporting the staff in finding solutions so that we can meet our deadlines.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. de la Torre. That is much appreciated. I do think that it would probably be helpful to work through all the subcommittee reports so that we understand everything that's on the table,

1 both in terms of resources that we are developing and the needs that we have. And then I would propose that we 3 recall this agenda item in order to talk about planning 4 and resources in the sort of near and medium term. 5 And I would like to ask Mr. Phillips if that is acceptable -- if that would be an acceptable process to 6 7 follow. MR. PHILLIPS: Could you repeat the -- so I'm clear 8 9 on what you're asking? 10 CHAIRMAN URBAN: So I understood that Ms. de la 11 Torre was asking to have a deeper discussion about 12 resources for meetings and scheduling meetings. 13 I apologize, Ms. de Torre, I know that -- de la 14 Torre -- I know that I'm paraphrasing you, and please 15 correct me if I'm wrong. 16 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: That is perfect. It's 17 better than --18 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Okay. 19 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: -- what --20 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Okay. 21 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you so much. 22 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Okay. And I was wondering if the 23 appropriate approach would be to go -- we talk about all 24 of the subcommittee work, which we'll flesh this out

25

to discuss it under another item. I regret that in the last meeting I had a specific agenda item for meeting schedule, and I neglected to add it to this one. But of course, I -- meeting schedules are a topic of this presentation, and so it seemed to me that we could recall this, but if there's another point that would be better, we would be grateful to know.

2.0

MR. PHILLIPS: Yeah, I think based on the agenda, this would probably be the most appropriate agenda item to discuss -- to have that discussion under.

Future agenda items would also kind of work, but I think because this question was raised here, recalling it after the more substantive subcommittee agenda items is probably your most-appropriate approach.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Phillips. That gives me an idea as well that maybe we would like to recall it after future agenda items so that we have a full picture, and then we can recall it, but I assume that would be just as appropriate. And we can sort of see where we are after we hear from the subcommittees.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes. And you certainly have the latitude to jump around in the agenda as long it's for good purposes and not to try and stifle public comment or participation in any way.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Right. Of course. Yeah. And in

order to make it as easy as possible for the public to participate, I think it would be helpful to follow the order as much as we can.

And I am now letting everybody know that we will recall this item later in the day after we have more information so that everyone in the public is aware of where the discussion is going and can plan accordingly.

Thank you, Mr. Phillips.

MR. PHILLIPS: Welcome.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Further comments or questions from the board?

Thank you, Ms. de la Torre.

Is there public comment from anybody in the audience?

MR. PANERO: Thank you, Chairperson.

As a reminder, if anyone would like to make a public comment, please press the raised hand on your screen, or if you're connected by telephone only, you can press star nine. And it looks like we do have one comment, initially: Barry Weber.

You have three minutes.

MR. WEBER: I'll only take a couple of seconds. I just wanted to thank all of you for what you're doing. I think this is an incredibly difficult situation, and it's clear that you are doing an admirable job at navigating

all sorts of things that are happening in different directions and limitations of the public open meetings and so forth. I just want to commend you on what you're doing and look forward to future (indiscernible) for the organization. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Weber.

Mr. Joseph Panero, is there further public comment?

MR. PANERO: I see no additional public comments.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you very much.

Thank you, Ms. de la Torre, and the rest of the members of the board. We will recall this item in order to have a discussion about resources and meetings and other public events, I think, later in the day.

With that, I would like to move to Agenda Item

Number 4, which is an update and a recommendation from

the Start-up and Administration Subcommittee. As a brief

reminder, our last board meeting we formed three advisory

subcommittees, which we'll be reporting today. Bagley
Keene for subleads -- excuse me -- the Bagley-Keene Open

Meeting Act allows for subcommittees of two people for a

board of our size to act in an advisory capacity for the

board, and the Start-up and Administration Subcommittee

is made up of Ms. Angela Sierra and myself.

We have a brief presentation in order to provide an update, and then we will engage in discussion, and we

have one action item that we have proposed.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

Ms. Sierra, if with -- if you agree, I will go ahead and pull up the presentation.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Great. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: All right. Is this the Start-up and Administration Subcommittee update? Is that what everyone sees?

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Great. Thank you.

Again, Angela Sierra and I are the members of the administration and -- excuse me -- Start-up and Administration Subcommittee. The roadmap for our discussion today is that we'll first do an update of our activities -- generally very brief -- and discuss the office space and location work that we've been doing. will then talk about continuing hiring strategy positions and time lines. This is the further information and detail that I mentioned under the last agenda item. we will finally discuss selected board and agency policies and practices. We have one policy to consider as a board, and we would like to have some discussion about prioritizing -- how to prioritize work for policies for the board while we are undertaking all of these various activities.

With that, the Start-up and Administration

Subcommittee has been operating since the end of the last meeting. We have taken as our priorities the same list that I mentioned in my Chairperson's Update, covering whatever is within the remit of the Start-up and Administration Subcommittee. We have focused largely on hiring, on space, and on selecting policies, and we of course welcome additional priorities from the board.

2.0

2.3

With that, I will turn it over to Ms. Sierra for the first of our updates, which is on office space and location.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Okay. Thank you so much, Chair Urban.

And good morning, everyone. So I'm going to give a kind of high-level overview of the work that the Start-up and Administration Subcommittee has been doing with respect to the issue of office space and geographic location. So as Chair Urban noted, one of our subcommittee priorities has been to explore and obtain options for our agency to obtain office space -- at least initial office space -- as we are moving forward for employees that will be soon hopefully joining our agency.

To pursue this, we have done a number of things.

One is we've been in consultation with various agencies.

For example, we have been working now very closely on seeking advice and services from the Department of

General Services, DGS. As Chair Urban noted earlier, DGS has a unit within it that focuses on real estate and facilities, services, and support for state agencies such as ours. And they've been doing this for a long time and they've been able to give us a lot of guidance and support.

We've also been consulting with our Business,

Consumer Services and Housing Agency in that they are the

umbrella agency for many state agencies or departments,

and are aware of potential space that is available now or

may be available in the near future.

Also, in doing the work on this topic, we have been working with these agencies and working among ourselves to do and prepare and develop estimates of what our potential office needs are. And we are working on these estimates with a view that we're going to need lots of flexibility. We want to think both in the short-term and long-term, but we're trying to devise a plan in which once we have an executive director on board, they will have the flexibility to kind of refine these estimates and plans. But we needed some initial ideas about approximately -- like, over the next six, nine, twelve months, approximately how many offices we would need, for example. Would we need conference rooms? Would we need cubicles, generally? Would we need an area, for example,

for some support staff or for a -- an entryway or security for our building or for our office?

2.0

2.3

So the folks at Department of General Services, they've been really terrific in talking through this with them, and based on our conversation at the last board meeting, it was our view that we should start with one geographic area first. And from our conversations at last board meeting, there seemed to be a general consensus that we would, at a minimum, have a footprint and have some office space — or should have some office space — in Sacramento, being that was a center of state government. There would be — if we had staff there, they would be close to the legislature, to the governor's office, to one of our main offices at the Office of the Attorney General, et cetera, and it made sense in working with DGS to focus on one geographic area at a time.

And so they have been working with us to explore what may be available in terms of state-owned facilities. It was their advice, and we agreed with it, that if we were able to find some office space in a state-owned building, that would provide us more flexibility and would likely be less costly than if we were to look for and obtain space in a privately-owned building. If we cannot find sufficient -- or a satisfactory office space in a state-owned facility, then they will work with us in

looking for space in a private facility.

We are in somewhat parallel tracks looking for both a short-term home that, perhaps, typically in state government for state agencies, that might be, like, a home — a core office for approximately six to twelve months, and then at the same time doing some work and looking at what may be available for a longer-term home. Again, just in terms of options for our executive director. So working on those two tracks, the focus primarily on what could be a short-term home for our agency.

I wanted just to let you know the factors that we as a subcommittee are really focusing on and will be incorporating when we are providing these options to the executive director. We want to make sure we have a sufficient space, that the floorplan makes sense for the activities that our agency will be engaged in. Of course, we're going to be looking and comparing cost; that will be not only the rent, but will we have to do any remodeling to the space? Some state agencies have space available that they've left that may available that are already furnished; some are not. They will be taking that into account as to part of the cost; looking at the precise location, looking at whether parking will be available. And most importantly, particularly with this

short-term home, is what are the terms of the agreement that we can negotiate. What will be the length? And very importantly, will we have flexibility to end the agreement when we determine as an agency that we're ready to move on to a different location.

2.0

And another thing I just wanted to note is that while we're focusing on Sacramento, that will not exclude us from down the road looking for property in other locations. But we were told that, with respect to metropolitan areas, facility space in Sacramento will likely be less expensive than other metropolitan areas in California, just as a generality.

Okay. So next steps, and where we're at. Three potential facilities have been identified that are available currently, and so -- and that look like they may meet the needs that we feel are appropriate at this time. It would give us some office space for the executives in our office; we would have cubicles, for example, for other staff; it would provide a conference room for our agency, et cetera. There's going to be a walk-through of two of the potential Sacramento facilities in -- later this month, in mid-September. At that walk-through, it will be representatives of DGS. Again, they are the ones who have identified these facilities and provided us with the floorplans and some

information about them. And then along with them will be Debra Castanon, our interim deputy director for administration, and then she'll be able to come back and report to our subcommittee as to what she found with these walk-throughs and her thoughts on this.

2.0

And then there's also going to be an evaluation of some petitional -- additional office space that had been currently used or had been used recently by the Department of Consumer Affairs or maybe other state agencies that may be available. We'll be able to follow-up on as well.

So as a -- after this exploration and these walkthroughs and when options solidify, there will be a
report to our executive director if we have one on board
at that point. If not, we will bring a report to this
board. If we do have an executive director at that
point, we anticipate that the executive director will be
reporting to our board just to get our input and comments
about this. And then ultimately, when a decision is
made, we will be entering into -- it will be called
either a "space allocation agreement" or an "interagency
agreement", assuming that we are -- that they have found
appropriate stace -- space in a state-owned facility.

So that is the end of my report. And again, I just wanted to just kind of give you kind of an overview of

what we're -- what we have been doing and where we are at on this issue, but.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. Sierra.

2.0

2.3

I would just add that to give the board and the public sort of a general sense. The prices are not one hundred percent clear yet, but they've been somewhere between, like, \$1.50 and \$3 a square foot. The spaces that have been suggested so far -- identified so far -- as potentials have furniture. It's not exactly what we need, so there may be some additional need to move things around or change things a bit. But that's kind of -- the DGS real estate team is looking for "plug-and-play" is what they called it, that can be used until a longer-term solution is found.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. Sierra.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: You know, and I just want to add one thing, and I just -- I think I -- I'm not sure if I emphasized this. The staff at the Department of General Services have been -- they really understand our need for flexibility and are providing a lot of guidance on how an agency deals with this as they're going to be growing over time. So that has been really appreciated.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you.

All right. So my hope is that we will give all of

our updates and then have discussion. If you have a burning question, though, please, board members, do raise your hand. I'm sharing my screen so I can't see all raised hands at once, but I will keep scanning and hope that I don't miss anyone.

The second update is the critical hiring and personnel resources update. I talked a little bit in the Chairperson's report about the executive director, and this is the work that we've been doing at all of the other positions.

Mr. Thompson, I see your hand.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Sorry. You had asked that we go through the whole presentation and then ask questions? Okay.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Yes, I think that's most efficient, but --

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: -- if -- we can also pause after topics if you fear you might lose your question or point, for example.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Thank you. I fear that my short attention span is going to inhibit my ability to hold -- I'm making notes, but. I don't know if we lose the flow of each topic, because there's a lot in this topic.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Do you have a comment or question on the real estate topic?

2.0

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: I have a couple. But I don't know if others want to go topic by topic and have the discussion, or if that's okay with you, Chairperson.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Sure. Why don't we just adjust and try to have relatively efficient conversation to make sure no one loses anything, and we can always circle back as well. So please go ahead, Mr. Thompson.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: One question -- and apologies if it was mentioned and I didn't catch it -- as far as the government-owned space or lease space, if one is faster to occupancy, or if it's case by case? So obviously, speed is essential here.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Yes. My understanding is that the government-owned space is much faster to occupancy for a couple of reasons. One is privately-leased space usually requires a significant amount of customization. But secondly, there's the leasing and contracting process. The third issue, which is not one you brought up, Mr. Thompson, but which has animated mine and Ms. Sierra's approach thus far is that commercial leases usually lock you in for quite a while, and the state options, there is the possibility of agreeing in advance that this could be a short-term solution so that we could move on as we

grow.

2.0

2.3

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Those are the -- that was the advice that we got from DGS residential -- RESD, and we did think that it was good advice.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Sounds good. My only thought was that given the -- it seems like, at least in L.A. where I am, there's a high vacancy rate in commercial space right now because of COVID, and I didn't know if we could get additional flexibility either on price or accommodation for our needs from a commercial landlord at this point because they would want the stability of our business. But as you said, we need some flexibility as well.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Thompson.

That's a very good point. There's also more availability in state-owned space than there has been previously for similar reasons. There's more remote work so space is opening up. Of course, that applies to commercial real estate as well. And it's not -- it's certainly an option that is open. For the short-term, we were focusing on the state-owned option, but we certainly will continue to ask them about that. And my assumption is the executive director we hire will have -- will report to us with sort of a vision and the plan for the longer term.

Mr. Le.

2.0

BOARD MEMBER LE: Yeah, I had a quick question.

What's the approximate square footage or the number of people that you're trying to accommodate in looking for these spaces? And then my other question is you gave a dollar price for square footage, but what is kind of like the anticipated budget for, like, a twelve-month spot?

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le.

Ms. Sierra, we do have those numbers and --

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Yeah. Well, I have at least -- I have the square footage for two of the spaces that we'll be looking at in mid-September, and one is approximately 4,300 square feet, and the other is much larger, it's 10,000 square feet. It's probably more than we may need early on in our evaluation at this point, but that part -- that space may be able to be broken out.

And in terms of short-term amounts of offices right now, again, we're only looking for office space for employees, not board members, but we are hoping to have, like, a conference room or an office that board members could use on occasion if they wish to. But right now, just for initial purposes, we're looking at three or four actual offices with then maybe six or so or more cubicles in the area, or a conference room, because we are -- imagine the meetings may be happening, and we'll also

need space for interviews. We were looking for space for receptionist and also a space -- office or just a allocated space for IT services that we are going to have, and equipment, things of that nature.

BOARD MEMBER LE: Thank you.

that as --

CHAIRMAN URBAN: I would say, Mr. Le, I would hesitate on the dollar numbers just because we have kind -- we've gotten some sort of basic information, but without having seen what the offer is, I don't want to misspeak. There may be other charges that we don't know about, but depending on the size, back of the envelope, it's around 12,000 dollars a month and up, depending if it's bigger space.

BOARD MEMBER LE: Okay. Appreciate that.

15 | CHAIRMAN URBAN: If you promise not to take

BOARD MEMBER LE: I won't hold you to it, yeah.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you.

Mr. Thompson. You're on mute, Mr. Thompson.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Thank you. And thanks for the time. My other question was the bullet about next steps report to the executive director and/or board one option solidify. Is there a thinking that we would delegate the decision on the office to the executive director, assuming they're on board, or is this going

to -- is -- will there be an opportunity for the board to weigh in on this decision? My preference would be that the board have the opportunity to weigh in on the --

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you. My view is that that is up to the board. We could delegate this on the executive director. I thank you for your view. My own view is that for temporary space, I would ask the executive director to make the best decision within some range of price. But I absolutely understand your point of view, Mr. Thompson, and I think it's really a question for the board collectively. We won't sign any leases without talking to the board, unless you tell us to.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Thank you. I guess it'd also -- it depends on the duration, so you raise a good point about the temporary nature.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Yeah.

2.0

All right. If there's nothing else at the moment on this topic -- and we can circle back if something occurs to you -- I will move on to the second chunk of our updates, which is the crucial hiring and personnel resources update -- well, it's a crucial issue. We've been working on a number of different fronts simultaneously in order to try to provide some basic staffing and/or the sort of already teed up package for the executive director to make decisions between people

on -- as we -- over the last couple of months.

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

So as an overall update and illumination of the strategy we've been following, we've had two concurrent goals. One is to establish leadership positions, which we discussed in the board meeting last time. second is to find a way to establish sufficient staffing to accomplish immediate needs. That includes hiring, actually. We do not have a human resources analyst, the person who prepares the duty statements and the packages that then can go to DGS HR for processing, for obtaining approvals, and that sort of thing. Right now, I have been preparing those. Ms. Sierra has been preparing some, and she's been an incredible help. I should have started this entire presentation with my deep gratitude to Ms. Sierra for all the work that she's been doing. So but that would be an example of a staff position that would be really helpful to have right away.

Rulemaking, of course, and I will defer some of that discussion to the Regulations Subcommittee discussion because the Regulations Subcommittee has been considering that closely, and underlying functions: the website, IT, being able to hold meetings, getting legal advice, which is why we put in place the relationship with the Attorney General's Office, being able to produce a budget and keep track of our finances, all of these things. A lot of

those we have the processing services in place from DGS, and they've been incredibly wonderful and been holding our hand, but having a professional staff who know how this works would help a lot and is critical in the short to medium term.

2.0

2.3

Along with that, we have tried to balance maintaining some flexibility for future leadership. In the last board meeting we discussed that at least for some positions it will be important for leadership to know that they can work with the people who are staff while meeting immediate needs. And what we found is the hiring process naturally dictates this because of the way the process — the steps of the process it tends to stagger things sufficiently that I think most of the time leadership will be able to have some say.

So I'll walk through the various option sets for the board's elimination and then explain how we've tried to take advantage of each one. The first of course are exempt positions. For us we have the executive director and a chief privacy auditor; those positions aren't in statute so we can hire as an exempt position. These positions are at will; they serve at the pleasure of the board.

There is quite a lot of flexibility for the position characteristics. It's somewhat less complicated process

to hire; despite the steps that I showed you, it's somewhat less complicated. There are a fair number of approvals that are required, and there are some basic steps that have to happen. We have to have the position administratively established; salary range has to be justified; et cetera. That's the first batch, and we have two.

2.0

The second batch are the career executive assignment positions that Ms. Garcia mentioned in our last board meeting, and Ms. de la Torre mentioned under the last agenda item. We are currently pursuing two: the chief deputy director of administration and the general counsel. These positions are at will. They are reserved for leadership positions with policy responsibility.

I've put that in quotes because that generally means policy within the organization. They're the ones who set the course of a division or that sort of thing, but it can also mean exterior policy responsibility.

It is a more complicated process. We have a choice of three classifications. There's a -- something called a "concept package" that has to be prepared and submitted to Calhr for approval; it's about twenty-five to thirty pages long, and it includes a lot of explanation for why this position is justified. Simultaneously, it's required to seek Department of Finance approval for the

salary. There's a review by CalR -- CalHR; they often will have questions. Eventually, when they approve it, it gets posted for public comment for thirty days. After thirty days, CalHR reviews again. If it approves, then an exam can be created and the job posted.

These jobs require what's called an "exam". In California state government it's usually answering a series of questions or meeting a series of required experience characteristics. There's an exam team at DGS HR that is helping us with that. And then once the candidate is selected, there's a list of further approvals before an offer is made, but it's a shorter list.

The third is permanent position -- a third permanent position option set -- excuse me -- are civil service positions. This will be most of our positions. Each position has to be administratively established. Overall budget approval is required. We will not need individual budget approval for all positions. Unlike the CEAs and the exempt positions, it depends on the salary.

There are a set of available classifications and the job classification must be chosen from that set. It is possible to request a new job classification; it is a lengthy process. There's a wide range of classifications available across the state government. Sometimes an

agency will sort of have ownership over a series of classifications, and you need to request permission to use that classification or make a new classification.

But in any case, a -- an appropriate classification must be found. And then when that -- once that happens for existing classifications, there's already a standard exam for that position. I'll say a little bit more about that -- about this in a moment, but that's sort of basic for the civil service positions.

2.3

Then there are temporary staffing positions. We've discussed this in the last board meeting what the options might be. The first is the interagency agreement that Ms. Castanon comes to us under; that's the loan of a staff from one department agency to another. There is process, of course, in developing a contract and it requires various services to be in play, but it is the most sufficient option that we've discovered. The major limiting factor we run into is the profound lack of available staff to borrow from other agencies. Agencies are currently very thinly staffed, and it's been very difficult to find people to work for us under an interagency agreement.

There's also retired -- the retired annuitants classification. State retirees can return part-time up to fifty percent in a fiscal year on a time-limited

contract. Ms. Sierra and I think that this is a -- has high potential for us to be able to get help from experienced staff; it doesn't require posting the position; you can. But there's a database called "Boomerang" where state retirees who are interested in positions post, and you can review and reach out to them. It also requires a concept in justification and paperwork; it's somewhat different process, and usually an internal approval rather than the series of approvals.

2.3

Finally, there is the option of contractors; it also requires justification and approval, usually an open bidding process and procurement. After exploring it to some degree, we are not pursuing this option right now. We will happily take feedback. It is a relatively lengthy process, again, but we will if it's viable for a particular position or need. So those are the sort of the panoply of options as we understand them.

The state of our current efforts is of course the interim chief deputy director of administration was onboarded through an IAA on August 1st. She's with us for fifty percent time through October 31st; we may be able to extend her time. Be nice to her, please. If you run into her boss at DGS, be nice to her boss at DGS.

Currently, the contract is through October 31st.

The chief deputy director of administration, the

concept -- DA concept -- was prepared and submitted in July -- mid-July -- I'm sorry, I didn't put the exact dates on this one -- again, balancing how much information. But where we are is we got the initial approval; it was posted for thirty-day comment. The thirty-day period ended last week, August 30th. You then wait for another approval. CalHR was really quick with it. Everybody is trying to help us as much as they can, and they approved on August 30th.

DOF really outdid itself in a -- that's -- excuse me -- the Department of Finance -- and approved it on September 3rd. And so we are currently awaiting to take control or approval, reviewing delegation agreements, which I need to review with counsel, working to create the exam, prepare what's called a "job control report" from which the posting is created, and create the posting.

The general counsel, this is also -- it's a little bit behind the chief deputy director of administration. The steps up to the posting for public comments have been completed. It is currently in its thirty-day public comment period, which expires September 22nd. The chief privacy auditor is something that we would like to have forward discussion about. We would like to prepare this package and send it -- get it in for approval as soon as

possible, but we were hoping to get board input on the characteristics of this position, and we have room for that a little bit later in the discussion.

2.3

For temporary positions, we are looking out for interagency agreement options. I didn't put that on there. As I said, it's been hard to find, but we have our ear to the ground. Retired annuitants, we have several experienced attorneys we are looking to hire on a temporary part-time basis; they each have experience with rulemaking or other things that are relevant to our work. We are currently working on HR packages and approvals. Sometimes a position will not quite work out because we can't get the classifications to match or something like that, but we are hoping to have several retired annuitant staff quite soon.

Ms. Sierra, I confess, I -- I've lost track of exactly how many.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Okay. Oh, good. I'm unmuted.

Yes, we are -- sorry about that -- right now in

conversations and working on potential approvals for

approximately five.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Okay. And these are attorneys.

Ms. Castanon is also reviewing administrative

professionals for high-level positions to help with the administrative work currently.

Finally, are the general -- the civil service positions. Again, this is a new process. We are a little in earlier stages of this, but we've met with the appropriate team at DGS last week and gotten the sort of training. We do have some very draft duty statements. They are looking out for other duty statements that we can repurpose. They're going to review comparable agencies and advise us on an initial position set. we have identified a few high-need initial classifications, like the hiring liaison I mentioned; a budget analyst is going to be important soon. there's a position called an "AGPA" that hopefully -that Ms. Sierra knows from being -- working in state government. That sound like an almost magical position to me, just very experienced, effective people, basically.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: You --

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

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Yes, and I'll just note that in my experience, there is a broad range of different types of work, and AGPA can do, in my experience, as the -- Chair Urban noted, can be really critical and helpful to a team, whether it's policy work, paralegal work, other just support work that can be done, so. I'd be very much in support of pursuing that option down the

road.

2.3

CHAIRMAN URBAN: And can you help me with the initialism?

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Oh, boy.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: I know career --

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Assistant governmental -- I will come back to you on that --

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: -- because I am so used to (indiscernible) AGPAs.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: So the next steps that we advise that we continue are to continue the efforts with the retired annuitants and keep our ear to the ground for interagency agreement opportunities to keep pushing through the process for the CEA positions and to pursue initial civil service positions.

There's also -- the Office of the Attorney General is providing regular legal services to us. We've transitioned from their HR department to DGS, as I mentioned, for sort of the more medium-term solution.

And there is further news on that, which I think will be discussed in the Regulations Subcommittee. But our goal has been to establish the processes, establish the agency, and the various systems in the state, and to make significant progress for the executive director.

In sum, we're trying to move as quickly as we can while making sure that we are following all the processes that are required, and giving room to the executive director to hire staff.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: And I'll just note that Board Member Vinhcent Le -- thank you -- he has, for the acronym, is the associate governmental program analyst.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le.

I don't know why I -- I just -- they just --

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Well, no, I should know that, but I had a brain freeze. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Sierra and Mr. Le.

So on the chief privacy auditor position, the Proposition 24, now part of the California Privacy Protection Act, says that -- excuse me -- the California Consumer Privacy Act -- it says that the California Privacy Protection Agency shall appoint a chief privacy auditor to conduct audits at businesses to ensure compliance with its title pursuant to regulations adopted by the agency. It's in the statute that this is an exempt position. We have been working on a duty statement for CalHR with the goal of post the position as soon as possible.

This is not -- as I understand the sort of purpose behind the chief privacy auditor, the thoughts that the drafters of the law had was that the chief privacy auditor would be the head of enforcement. We don't necessarily have to set it up that way, the executive director doesn't need to set it up that way, but it is an exempt position. So it is a high-level position with a lot of responsibility for conducting audits and investigations, developing the processes for these, and overseeing them.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

This is a position that is unusual in the United States. There aren't a lot of examples that are very close. It is more common in European countries, and so we've been looking in that direction. What I was hoping was that we could have a board discussion about the sort of general parameters of this position and desired qualifications that board members had for this position. So I wanted to be sure that I wasn't missing something fundamental in my research. If the board is willing, I would move ahead based on that. If the board wants more input, I could bring a duty statement to the next meeting based on our discussion, as we did in the June 14th meeting. It isn't required for the process; it's a question of whether the board wants to maximize its input into the position or maximize the speed at which we put

the request into the process.

2.0

2.3

So with that, I -- our next item is policies and practices and has an action item, so I do suggest that we pause here in order to discuss anything to do with hiring and personnel, as well as the chief privacy auditor position.

Yes, Ms. de la Torre.

that's a bit (indiscernible) but I wanted to mention is that I have not had an opportunity to see this presentation before this moment. It would have been really helpful to me we would have had that conversation about the chief privacy auditor to have known in advance so that I could have conducted a little bit of research myself and been more prepared for the conversation. So where possible, I will encourage this subcommittee, and really all subcommittees, to prepare this material, provide them to the other board members so that we can be more prepared.

And as to the more substantive questions, I have two. For the civil servant (sic) positions, I believe the slide said that we had not taken any action on that until last week, where we met with DGS. Did I misread that or?

CHAIRMAN URBAN: I elided some detail. We started

working on some duty statements for sort of line attorneys some weeks ago -- I didn't catch exactly when that was, and we were working with DGS to find out how we can post civil service positions. They connected us with the team two weeks ago, I guess, Angela, and we met with the team -- we did meet with the team last week that -- but it wasn't -- that wasn't the first that we were working on the civil service positions.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: And --

2.0

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: My second --

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: I was just going to add with respect to attorney positions, much of the work that we're doing with the potential retired annuitant positions will -- is work that we will be able to use for those civil service classifications. A lot of that work will be very useful for that, and you know, preparing duty statements and the work-up that we need for those packages.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: I mean, I think if I'm understanding Ms. de la Torre's -- what is underlying Ms. de la Torre's question -- it did take us a little while to figure out what advice we needed to get for the civil service positions, how they fit together with the other positions, and to make time along with the various other

processes we're following to make significant progress on that. So it has taken us some time.

CHAIRMAN URBAN:

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: And I was going to say -and I should have started with just thanking both of you
for all of the efforts. It is very complex. The
percentage is really helpful; it really outlines
possibilities that I -- they were not in my radar. So
thank you for all of the efforts.

On that, I was also a little unclear because I -- if I recall correctly, the delegation that was provided to the chair will enable the chair basically to unilaterally, without bringing this into a subcommittee, engage in hiring all of the staff positions for potentially in a more expeditious way. I don't know if that's case, but I was going to inquire as to whether that's the case. And if that's the case, why was the decision-making to do this through subcommittee as opposed to just in a more executive manner by the chair?

question. That is my understanding of the delegation.

The subcommittees themselves can act in an advisory

fashion. My understanding is that the delegation stands.

So for example, I can sign documents, and somebody needs

to sign documents, so I've been doing that.

Thank you. That's a very good

Ms. Sierra, my understanding was that the

subcommittee did have these items as part of its sort of research and work scope, and Ms. Sierra has simply just been really, really generous. We would not be where we are if I were having to do all of these myself -- beginning every -- starting and ending all of it myself. Without an HR liaison or an HR analyst, every single package has to be prepared by us, and so it's honestly just been an issue of person power, and Ms. Sierra's been incredibly generous with her time.

2.0

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you for that update. I would like to just encourage the chair to be as expeditious as possible if it is through the subcommittee that this is better addressed. I support that. But I also believe that for these kinds of positions, the chair should feel in power to go through this process, do the interviews, hire as soon as possible, and not necessarily wait for feedback from the board, where that could delay the process, because I think it's of the essence to get some of this done sooner rather than later.

And understanding the importance of the leadership positions, I think that because of the challenges that we're facing that you just very well summarized, meaning we don't have manpower to get some of these things done, hiring at a lower level, even entry-level positions, even

fellowships, will alleviate that challenge that we're facing. So I just wanted to reiterate that I support the chair being taking decisions independently from input from the board and trying to expedite the process for these kinds of hirings.

The other thing that I had in mind to discuss is the chief privacy auditor, but maybe we should leave that for the end and address all of the questions that other members might have, and then kind of reserve a chunk of time for all of us to talk about that piece.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. de la Torre.

Other comments and questions?

Mr. Thompson.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Thank you for all of it.

This is -- the two of you have done an immense amount of work, and I can appreciate how much -- the roles that you've taken on have an incredible amount of importance for getting us up and running. So thank you.

A question -- and I didn't know if it was embedded in the presentation -- we had talked at the last meeting about getting an understanding of how the attorney general had staffed the rulemaking process, how many people they had in what functions. I'm trying to get kind of clear in my own head how we meet the deadlines and how many people we're going to need in order to do

that. Obviously the focus on hiring leaders is incredibly important and perhaps the -- those leadership positions will help us to flush that out. But I don't know if we're talking five, twenty, fifty people that are needed to draft that set of regulations. Do you all -- do you know if we have any insight into how the attorney general has staffed that function?

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Thompson. I do recall you bringing that up at the last meeting, which is a very good point. We have explored it with the Attorney General's Office, and that will be part of the update from the Regulations Subcommittee.

I do confess, and I apologize for the oversight,
that I don't have the detail with me today, but I do have
a -- I have the general -- you know, the difference
between five and twenty people, and essentially have a
staff that -- and that has very much been in my mind as
we've been pursuing in parallel leadership positions and
attorneys who can help us with the rulemaking proceeding.

I also wanted to say I thank you for the kind words. I really want to thank Ms. Castanon, who is with us half-time, and who has been just doing a tremendous amount of work in helping with all of this. She knows the processes, and she knows the people, and she's just been an incredible asset.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Ms. de la Torre, did you have further comment?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: No, unless we want to talk about the chief privacy auditor feedback that you'd requested.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Yes. Your hand is up, which is why our --

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Oh, sorry.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: That's okay. And I knew you wanted to return to the chief privacy auditor, so that's fair enough.

If there's not further comment on the board from -about the sort of general hiring situation, then let's turn to the chief privacy auditor position.

Ms. de la Torre.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Sure. Like I said, I wish I have had more time to prepare, but I can confirm that this -- my understanding is that this position was designed into proposition -- into the proposition as the chief -- the head of enforcement for the agency, and I think that it should be drafted when we -- drafted with the statement to reflect that. And so I envision it as a direct report to the executive director, and this person will be responsible for all of the enforcement activities and the enforcement strategies that the agency puts together. I'm uncertain as to what should be the size of the organization that should report to him, or the positions. I really wish I had the time to do more research. But I definitely can confirm that in my recollection, this was envisioned as the head of enforcement.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. de la Torre. And I do appreciate that. It was my hope to have a drafted statement to all of you and there simply wasn't time. So I do appreciate that. Thank you. And I do apologize that we are -- we're having the discussion a little bit cold.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: No reason to apologize.

Like I said initially, there is -- the commitment that
you have made to this agency, I think it goes unnoticed.

This is not a paid position, and I am fairly sure that
you're putting more hours than you would put in a regular
job, so thank you for your commitment and for your
service.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you.

Other comments and thoughts either on the position itself or the process for moving forward?

Mr. Le.

BOARD MEMBER LE: Yeah, well I -- quick question to go back to the other section. Was there any attempt -- I know you said it's really hard to get IAA staff --

borrowed staff -- for kind of the attorney positions, so is that -- was that something you explored at all to get the rulemaking at least? Like, getting the questions together for public comment, was there any possibility of that from the AG borrowings and attorneys? And then I can get to the chief privacy auditor after that.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Great. Thank you. There will be an update on the path of working with the Attorney

General's Office in the Regulations Subcommittee --

BOARD MEMBER LE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: -- update. We discovered the -- well, I discovered -- Ms. Sierra knew already having already worked as a retired annuitant -- but I discovered the retired annuitant option, and we decided that it was important to work with that option as well, so we've been working sort of in parallel.

BOARD MEMBER LE: And then, yeah, so for the chief privacy auditor, yeah, I think it's something that it was based off -- the little I know off the top of my head -- you know, I know it is a lot more common in the EU, where there is -- the data protection impact assessments, so I think familiarity with those impact assessments would be a good requirement. I think, in this case, someone who works -- who has experience with those private industry internal audits, as well as external ones, is important

because there's always a -- I'm going to make sure that you know how compliance works within these businesses, and then how they can adapt and -- to make sure that when we develop these audits and we do enforcement that these impact assessments actually are substantive, and that they know what levers to push within business to make sure there's good compliance.

2.3

And then part of the -- Proposition 24 -- the CPRA -- was there was going to be a risk assessment regarding profiling by algorithmic systems. So I would like to see in a chief privacy auditor kind of good understanding of automated profiling, disparate impact, those types of risks of -- and that come up when you do profiling that may not happen on the basis of race or gender, but can have disparate impacts on the other end of that, so making sure that as they develop audits, that those types of risks are assessed.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le. That's extremely helpful. Do you mind if I follow-up with a -- do you have -- and you may not, which is fine -- do you have a sense in your mind as to the role of technical expertise -- the role technical expertise should play --

BOARD MEMBER LE: Yeah. Yeah, so definitely, I
think -- well, I think the future of risk assessment is
having AI audit AI. So I do think there is some sort of

technical expertise that does need to be there, thinking through how we can make these audits kind of on a larger scale, right? We do need the investigations, and we need companies that disclose on paper how they're doing their data protection. But eventually, I would like to see more automated auditing that at least alerts the agency to whether there is potential discrepancies between what's a company's stated data protection controls are and what's actually happening. So I do think technical expertise understanding of algorithmic audits is a key, yeah, job qualification.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le.

Ms. de la Torre.

2.0

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I just wanted to mention we haven't really talked about this as a board before, but in my mind, one of the positions that is likely to be required -- I think is required -- is a chief technology officer --

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Um-hum.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: -- who -- and this doesn't need to be a leadership position, but more an office that supports the different efforts that will be underway. I think that we will need that to support the rulemaking process because there's some aspects of the rulemaking process that are very technical. And I think

that same office -- the chief technology officer -- and the people who have worked with a chief technology officer could efficiently assist the head of enforcement and the enforcement unit in questions that are more technically driven.

Without undermining what Board Member Le said about the benefits of having a chief privacy auditor that also has some technical expertise, I also think that independently we need a group of people within the agency that are just technologists because a lot of these -- the way data moves these days, it's really driven by technology.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. de la Torre. Are you thinking of something like the group -- and I apologize, I'm blank on the exact name -- the DFTC (ph.)?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Yes, absolutely. I think

that's an excellent model to consider.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. de la Torre.

Further comments on the chief privacy auditor?

In that case, I would like to make a process

point -- or ask a process question, I suppose. Within

the delegation of authority under which I'm operating to

accomplish various things, my understanding is I could go

ahead, take this information, add it to what I know, work

with Ms. Sierra, if she has time or not, to put all of

this together. Of course, the board would have to finally appoint the chief privacy auditor. So that's one path that we could take.

2.3

Ms. de la Torre made -- of course, made a very good point that the board might need more time to consider, so I am willing to either kind of go as fast as I can or to bring a fuller package to the next board meeting for consideration. I'm happy to give my own opinion, but that's --

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Yeah, in my view, if we will -- if we're going to have our next meeting on October 18th, which, I understand is in the schedule, I will favor just making good use of that delegation that we have put in place and enabling you and this upcoming team to act as expeditious as possible. I don't see necessarily the need for us to discuss the specific language of the job posting as a board. I think it -- on October 18 when we get an update, if there are questions either as comments, either -- there are areas where there might be policy decisions, they could be built into the slides in the presentation, and we can discuss them at that level. I think that would be more efficient.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. de la Torre.

Mr. Le, did you --

BOARD MEMBER LE: Yeah. I think it can go either

way on this, right? I think the chief privacy auditor might have a lot of good input on the regulations, right, and that -- and the rulemakings that get developed that enable them to do their job. So I would kind of support the more expeditious solution, right, and then we would have the final say in making sure whoever we hire can do that.

And I just wanted to add, as a qualification forward-thinking in terms of privacy compliance and audits because this industry moves so fast --

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Um-hum.

BOARD MEMBER LE: -- and kind of understanding where the future is going to be and what's going to happen.

And I also think that we're going to have a lot of other agencies coming to the CPPA to help out with kind of maybe their enforcement of, say, Fair Housing, or you know, inking, and other types of regulations. So I think that kind of knowledgebase -- and I mentioned that other way, the disparate impact -- those are the areas that are key. So yeah, just forward-thinking in that kind of sense.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le. That's very helpful.

Ms. Sierra.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Yes, I just wanted to note

that I also agree the moving with this path that we're proposing is just to move ahead, and as a member of the Start-up and Administration Committee (sic), I'd be very happy to work with the chair on this, and I have time to do that, so. But I'm in favor. And then what would -- the next step, the board would have a lot of input in the selection of the individual.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. Sierra.

Mr. Thompson.

2.0

2.3

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: I agree with a lot of what has been said. Just wanted to -- I -- it's a close call to me, but I'm comfortable with moving forward and being expeditious. I agree with Ms. de la Torre, I feel a little -- I feel like I was caught a little flat-footed with a request for input on the qualifications. So I don't know if there's a mechanism for us to leave the record open if we have any thoughts in the next couple days -- if that works, but I wouldn't want our weighing in to slow the process. I think Ms. Sierra makes -- and others -- made a good point, we'll have the opportunity to weigh in in the future.

And I would want us to keep our focus on the roles that are critical to the rulemaking. And so if Mr. Le is correct that this position could have some helpful input and influence on the rulemaking process, then it's

something we need to move on quickly. I'm kind of on the fence, but I would err on the side of quick, so. I think let's move forward, but to the extent that we'll -- we will be asked to opine on things in a meeting, having a little bit of time to think about it ahead of opining would be great.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Thompson. And again, I do apologize.

As far as mechanisms, we do have a fairly lengthy closed session, and I believe -- and we will be in open session, go to closed session, come back to open session, so if there is something that occurs to you, I think there will be an opportunity to air it. And I will check with Mr. Phillips during a break or something to be sure I'm not misspeaking.

Thank you all very much for putting your heads to this issue, even though I recognize I did ask you to think about it a bit on the spot. Again, I do apologize for that. My juggling has been as successful as it's been, so thank you all for very much for that.

My understanding --

2.0

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: You referred to the potential of an upcoming break, which I didn't know if that could be --

-77-

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Yes.

1 BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: -- sooner rather than later. 2 That would be --CHAIRMAN URBAN: Yes. I also could use a break. 3 4 So we have for this section -- excuse me -- agenda 5 item, we have one more section: discuss the per diem policy, and we will be also taking public comment. 6 7 don't anticipate that would be a terribly long 8 conversation, but we should of course leave the 9 possibility for robust -- we should be sure that we understand that there could be a robust conversation. 10 So 11 if you would like a break, I would suggest that we take a 12 ten-minute break. 13 And Mr. Phillips, we can recess and just recall the 14 issue when we come back; is that correct? 15 MR. PHILLIPS: Yes, of course. 16 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Phillips. And thank 17 you for indulging me as I'm still -- I want to be sure 18 that I am using the correct process. 19 MR. PHILLIPS: No problem. 2.0 CHAIRMAN URBAN: So with that, let's take a ten-21 minute break and return at 11:11. I will see you all 22 back here then, and we will recall this agenda item. 2.3 Thank you very much for all of your input. 24 (Whereupon, a recess was held)

Welcome back, everyone.

We are

25

CHAIRMAN URBAN:

back in session from a break, continuing with Agenda Item 4 of the California Privacy Protection Agency board meeting for September 7th and 8th, 2021.

We were currently wrapping up at least the initial conversation about the need to hire a chief privacy auditor and the approach to doing that. It is my sense of the conversation that we are balancing being expeditious with the board's input, and we are generally in agreement to take an expeditious path so that I will take all of the input that I have received in this meeting and start the process for getting approval for the position.

That said, other thoughts may occur to members of the board over the course of the meeting, in which case, we can recall the item for some further discussion and to give the board a little bit more time to think because they haven't had a lot of notice. If there is any different view, please raise your hand. Otherwise, we will move on.

Wonderful. Thank you all very much for your input and your thoughts. And we will continue with the next portion of the Start-up and Administration Subcommittee's report.

In this section, we do have the recommendation for the board, and I would draw the board's attention to the

short memo that the Start-up and Administration

Subcommittee prepared for you and the form that goes with

it if you would like. And I will turn it over to Ms.

Sierra to present this portion of our agenda item.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Great. Thank you, Chair Urban.

And before I kick this off, and I'm going to try to be fairly brief, but I want to thank the chair and others for their kind words. And I would be remiss if I did not thank our chair. Chair Urban has been working on the subcommittee with me, from what I can see, working around the clock, and that's only on one subcommittee, so I'm just so grateful for your time commitment, your overall commitment, and your leadership. So I really appreciate it. So thank you.

So now I will turn to the policies. I know that we have a very full agenda today, so I will try to be fairly swift with this. Because as you have seen in your board materials, we have provided a memo outlining a policy — a per diem policy — that we are proposing in a form with the form that we would submitting as board members. So in general, based on our discussions from our June board meeting, our subcommittee decided to prioritize the policies that we thought were of most immediate need. And the first policy we thought that should be

prioritized was this per diem policy because it is set forth in statute that the CPRA does provide for a per diem, a hundred-dollar compensation, to board members for each day on which they engage in official duties. But in order to implement that statutory compensation, we do need to have, as a board, a policy in place to process and compensate board members.

2.0

2.3

After I talk about the per diem policy, I will briefly talk about what we're -- what we are proposing is our next priority would be to working on an incapability activity statements, then potentially after that, communications policy. But I will get to those after we have fully discussed the per diem policy.

So an overview of this issue, as all the board members know, the nature of our appointments is that we are volunteers. These are public service positions in which we are not receiving a salary. However, our underlying statute does provide for what is called a "per diem", which is essentially an honorarium. It is a rate of a hundred dollars for each day -- this is -- I'm just quoting the statute -- for each day on which board members engage in official duties. And we have on this slide the actual language of that statute.

In order to develop a proposed policy for our board, our subcommittee conducted research. We have seen a

number of per diem policies and learned of a number of per diem policies that other state boards have implemented. This type of provision many -- apply to many state boards, and often the underlying statute has language that's almost identical to ours, so looking at other policies was very helpful to us. We consulted with counsel, and we also attended a webinar -- brown lunch -- that was focused on per diem policies as well as travel reimbursement that was hosted by the California

Department of Consumer Affairs. They actually have a board and bureau relations unit, so they had a brown bag webinar that was very helpful to us.

2.0

And what we found as a subcommittee is that state boards that have per diem statutes like ours have flexibility on the policy that they adopt to implement that statute, and there are a wide range of policies that have been adopted. There is not a one size fits all. Each board is going to be looking at the proposed policy or the actual policy they adopt based on the nature of their activities and the time commitment from board members, et cetera.

On one end of the spectrum, we see -- we saw policies in which a board only provided for a per diem for attendance of a board meeting, for example. Others were providing per diem compensations for a wider range

of activities that were directly related to board matters. We saw some policies in which a board member would receive a full per diem payment for any time spent that day, others that would break it out by the hour, and then others that would be, depending if the board member worked four, six, or more hours, would be compensated for that amount of time for a one-day per diem.

2.0

2.3

So after reviewing all that, we have come to a decision to recommend a middle path for our board. We are recommending a policy in which our board members would receive this per diem -- one hundred dollars -- honorarium for every six hours engaged in official duties. We are recommending that the policy can allow for the per diem for categories of duties that are directly related to board business -- not only board meetings, but work, for example, on subcommittee matters and preparing for those matters, and preparing for those meetings as well. And we have a slide, and this was also in your materials, that list what we are recommending official duties include. You'll see the right-hand of the slide, and that was in your materials as well.

And we also are proposing that a six-block amount -six-hour-block amount of time for the per diem
compensation could be spread over multiple days because
the majority of our board members have full-time jobs,

are working in this board -- board work in the evenings, weekends, other available time, so we thought it would be appropriate for this board, and particularly since we're doing so much substantive work right now, to allow for six-block periods of time to be spread over multiple days. And we have seen that example in other policies as well.

And finally, because we want to ensure we have good recordkeeping, we have transparency, and we're tracking our agency's expenses in a timely manner, we are proposing that all board members will submit a per diem form each month. It would be submitted the 15th of the month following the month in which you are requesting your per diem and you're noting your hours. You would submit the form even if you are not claiming any per diem for that month. And the form that we have provided to you, we have actually modeled that form on the form that's used by the California Medical Board, so there were — it looks very similar in structure, and we pulled many of the components from their form.

And assuming that we adopt a policy today, our proposal also is that for all work done until the policy was adopted, all board members would have until October 15th to submit a form for each month prior to now in which they have been engaging in official duties as we

have outlined on this slide so that we can process the per diem payments for board members for all the time that they have contributed until we actually had our formal policy.

2.0

2.3

So we do have an action item for this matter, and we're -- again, we're recommending that we adopt the policy on the proposed policy that we have provided to the board and I've just outlined at today's meeting, and that before any vote, we also invite board discussion and questions.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. Sierra.

As a process point, two things. First of all, we will have a board discussion now. We will finish the last small point in the subcommittee's presentation, and then go to public comment, and then return to the action item so that we have the benefit of public comment before doing the action item.

The second process point is that I wanted to let members of the public who are following along know that we are looking at part two of the meeting materials in case you weren't sure which document we were looking at.

So thank you, Ms. Sierra and Ms. de la Torre.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you. So I appreciate the work that has been done in terms of putting together the per diem policy. However, I do not

believe that the first paragraph of the proposed per diem policy is a paragraph that aligns with the literature of the law. I think it's excessively burdensome, and I think it's unnecessary; and let me go through all of those three things.

First of all, if we approve this policy, what we're going to be basically doing is instead of paying per day, we're going to pay per hour or per fraction of an hour. That means that today, for example, where we will likely meet for over six hours, we will pay ourselves more than one hundred dollars, and that, in my mind, is opposite to the language of the law.

Our chair, who I am sure has worked more than six hours a day for quite some time, will be also in that situation where she will be paid over one hundred dollars. And let me make sure that I think she deserves much more than one hundred dollars for the work that she has done, but again, the statute doesn't say so. The statute says that for each day, the maximum that we can pay ourselves is one hundred dollars.

I think it will also -- will show the situations where individuals -- individual members who have done substantial work in a day will not be paid a full per diem of one hundred dollars because maybe they did two hours or three hours of work. So in my mind, that is

misaligned with literature of the statute.

2.0

I think it's also burdensome. I'm an attorney; I charge my clients per hour. I'm used to the discipline of tracking my time in six-minutes (sic) increments; it is burdensome. And I also have to say that I actually — I have the records; I can go back to May and tell the board how many hours I have worked each day because I have basically been tracking my time the same way I track the time for clients. But I will assume that some other members are going to be really having a hard time trying to figure out how many hours or how many minutes they worked — or they conducted board business on, you know, September 20th. So I think it's burdensome, and it will result in denying per diem to those of us who might not have been tracking to this kind of specificity.

And then the last thing is I just fundamentally think it's unneeded. The statute says per day. A day is a day. We don't have to redefine what is a day and divide it into six hours that can be put together through different times working different days.

Everything else in the policy seems reasonable to me. I will be happy to approve the rest of the policy. But that first paragraph where it says the board shall be paid as per diem allocated of one hundred dollars for each six hours of engage -- engage in official duties, I

disagree with. And I will suggest that we edit that,
that we just take the language of the law: per day means
per day. So with that, I will vote against this policy
if it's put forward to approval today, and I will
encourage other members to do the same.

2.3

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. de la Torre.
So I've highlighted the right part, correct?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Yes, that's correct. If we eliminate that and we just say what the law says, which is per day, I will be happy to approve this policy today.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: So let me -- if -- let me see if I can -- I heard more than one point in there, so let me see if I can summarize. The first is the lack of a maximum for a day. So that six hours, we could, in theory, with the way this is written, end up with two per diems because we would have more than six hours -- well, we could have twelve hours -- it would be twelve hours, and that is not a one-day per diem.

That, Ms. Sierra, I think is that -- I'm surprised that counsel didn't notice that, and we didn't notice that. That makes absolute sense to me.

The second is that having to track the number of hours is burdensome. And I know you had a third point in there about hours sort of versus days, which we can also

talk about.

2.0

2.3

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: That isn't needed. My last point is that it isn't needed. The statute says the agency -- where is it -- for each day on which they engage in official duties. "Day" is a very common term. It doesn't need to be redefined. It has a meaning in the dictionary. Everybody knows what's a "day". A day is a day; it's not six hours. So we should just leave it be, and say for each day of which they engage in official duties, and then define "official duties", which you have done, I think, really well.

I mean, we want to set some threshold where we say a simple exchange of emails for five minutes is not -that's not constituted official duties, or whatever
language we feel is appropriate to avoid a situation
where a member can claim per diem in situations where are
not appropriate, I'm all -- I will support that.
Although, I think that members are responsible enough to
understand that that will not qualify for per diem, and
we can leave them to their discretion. But the first
paragraph, in my opinion, should be edited.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you.

To give a little bit of background on the hours, when we did the research, what we found was that there is, by a lot of boards, a -- there is the decision to

define a day -- which is, you're right, it's not defined in the statute. Ms. Sierra has the deepest knowledge on this, but my understanding is there was everything from one second on a given day up to eight hours being defined as a day. In addition, the Fair Political Practices

Commission has an hourly amount. We didn't go there in part because we were thinking of the flavor of the point that you were making, Ms. de la Torre, that this was really for a day.

2.0

2.3

The second sort of thematic item is that these are honoraria. They're not intended to be pay; they're not intended to be salary. And we were trying to balance the fact that this is a volunteer position and these our honoraria with the reality that we understand that there is a substantial amount of commitment that board members are making. So those were the things that sort of went into the hopper with our recommendation.

I just give this background to help flesh out why per diem is actually defined and sort of what the ranges we saw were. The board could -- we were advised choose essentially any definition that makes sense to the board. So I give the background; I ask everyone to hold Ms. de la Torre's thoughts and -- in their minds.

And then, Mr. Thompson, if you would like to be recognized.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Thank you, Chairperson

Urban. I appreciate what I think the goal here was,

which was to be good stewards of public money and apply

some thresholds. I had a similar reaction that Ms. de la

Torre did, which is a plain reading of the statute is

pretty clear that the people enacted the proposition and

it reads for each day, and that has a very plain meaning.

I think that if we want to give guidance to members that they're -- you should use your discretion that de minimis amounts of time shouldn't be counted -- you know, the example given that if I responded to an email for five minutes, I'm not going to claim a per diem for that -- but it is -- we're effectively making the per diem \$16.66 per hour rather than \$100 per day, which is clearly laid out in the valid measure. So I would agree with Ms. de la Torre's reading that it's clear.

I also think for myself I would apply some threshold level of time for myself to not -- like, I don't mean to repeat myself -- some minimal amount of time, I -- you know, I'm not going to claim that. But I do think we should go with that the clear meaning of the statute is, and it appears to be very clear to me. And I say that with recognition and appreciation for the desire to be protective of public funds.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Thompson.

Ms. Sierra.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Yes. So what I see as a challenge here as the more working on it and looking at a policy is that if we were to make modifications to this -- like, for example, like, let's say, either completely not -- you'd have it just anytime during the day with no de minimis claims or set amount of threshold of time and have, though, maybe a ceiling of no more than eight hours per day.

But the struggle I have with this is that when it says for every day, I think the reality of the work that we're doing is that many board members may be doing, like, one or two hours a day, you know, in the evenings. And I think it would be really, in my view, important to have uniformity on this, and so we all have an understanding because I think there's a lot of subjectivity here of is that enough. Do we want board members to claim for two hours for the hundred dollars or is that de minimis?

And so I think having some of this detailed in a policy, in my view, is very helpful -- would be helpful to me as a board member and for the public to understand what we are considering to be substantial service in order to receive the per diem because some could argue, well, a day is eight hours, typically.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. Sierra.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: I agree. I think a working day is eight hours.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: (Indiscernible), Mr. Thompson.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Sorry for interjecting.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Go ahead.

what's being applied here, and I think the math is relevant. If each of us claimed per diem every single day of the year, we would come out spending \$182,500 for all five of us every single day for each year, which I think is -- that's the cap on what board compensation would be. And I would -- I just think the statute's pretty clear. I think we're changing something that is pretty clearly laid out.

Sorry for -- I didn't mean to interject, Chairperson Urban.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Thompson.

I will wait for other hands. I would like to offer some of my own views while I wait. For me, it is of utmost importance that we are transparent with the public about exactly what we mean when we are claiming per diems. It is also, I think, useful to allude to practice by other boards, and it is very common practice among other boards to define a per diem as a number of hours.

I absolutely thank Ms. de la Torre for catching the spread over multiple days issue and the fact that that creates no stop, but in my personal view, the board should decide what it means by a day. And if the board would like a day to be any amount worked in a day, that's the board's prerogative. We chose six hours because we thought it was a reasonable amount with the issue of the sort of backstop. I would recommend that we revise this to something more like four hours, which is also quite common and -- or that we do that -- and/or -- that we make clear that there is no more than one amount to be paid per day. In my view, that is the best balance between transparency and careful stewardship of public funds and recognition that this is an honorarium and recognizing the board's work.

2.0

2.3

That said, I really do recognize the fact that the board -- this board -- has been operating at a level of commitment that most boards do not, and I think that is also important. So I am certainly happy to hear more viewpoints, but my view would be that we would define this.

Are there further comments?

Mr. Thompson.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: I have a question as far as the benchmarking of other boards and the authority under

which their per diem policies were established. If their per diem policies were subject to -- were established with -- you mentioned with similar statutory language as ours, where they say for each day. Is that right that the ones that you benchmarked had near -- similar or near identical statutory authority? That's one question.

2.0

And then if there was a number -- it sounded like the range was anything -- any work on a day was one bookend, and the other was only for attendance at board meetings was the other end of the range, right, and then they fell in the middle? Because I'm struggling. I agree with what Ms. de la Torre said. I mean, I think the wording is super clear, so I'm reluctant for us to adopt a policy other than the one that is consistent with the language that was enacted, but I'm trying to get my head around why we should do that.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you. I apologize, there's a very loud truck, but I think I understood the last thing that you said, Mr. Thompson. Yes, most boards -- at least that we've researched, but I think it is most boards -- operate under the Business and Professions Code, which does have quite similar language. We are unique in that -- we're unique in that we have our own implementing statute with our own provision. I believe that is also true of the Fair Political Practices

Commission, but I do apologize in advance if I misspeak on that.

As far as defining the per diem, we could define it as any time in a day. I will ask Ms. Sierra. I don't think that we came across any examples that didn't say anything about how it would be calculated because for the very reason that the statutes say per diem and don't -- their statute -- it's statutory, so they don't go into a tremendous amount of detail.

Mr. Le.

2.0

2.3

And then I think it's -- the number of hours, I can understand that some folks have defined it differently. I think the -- you mentioned there was four hours; maybe we can just do -- I do think there's some agreement needed on, like, what's a substantive amount of work in a day? So maybe split the difference, have it just -- the amount be two hours or three hours, and then have a cap that -- with a cap that you can't claim more than six hours in a day -- or more than a hundred dollars in a day. So that would be my suggestion, but I can see both sides on this one.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le.

So one option, if I'm understanding correctly, would be to choose a different chunk to define per diem --

maybe two or three hours, and make clear that in any calendar day one per diem only is available.

BOARD MEMBER LE: That's right.

2.0

2.3

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I disagree with the idea of how to track hours. I don't know if all the board members track hours, but it is not easy to track our hours with accuracy. I mean, how do you add it -- I mean, I do it every day, and if it's to be done accuracy -- accurately -- it's burdensome. So I think it's much better to say a day. And then if we want to agree that any day we're -- there's less than an hour, cannot be claimed, that's fine, but leave it as a day. Because if we're going to have to -- say I worked 3.3 hours on this day and 4.6 hours on another day, we're imposing on ourselves a burden, and I -- I am going to -- we have to sign these statements confident that those hours that we're tracking are accurate.

And to me, that's an additional lot of work that I would much prefer not to impose on myself because as it has been mentioned before, the commitment to this board, I think, by board members is that -- a significant level already. And I don't -- if we decide that for every day that we engage in one hour of work we will receive a per diem, I want to remind everybody that this is a one-hundred-dollar per diem. You're not claiming a one-

thousand-dollar per diem. I think Mr. Thompson did the math and that gives you a pretty good reference, right?

So again, I would much prefer not to track hours.

2.0

2.3

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Okay. So Ms. de la Torre -
Mr. Le, I will call on you in a moment. I'd just
like to follow-up with Ms. de la Torre to be sure I
understand.

So Ms. de la Torre, would you support some kind of definition -- however many hours that is -- without the need to track hours? I'm looking at the form that we suggested, which does have hours and activity code, but it could just have a checkmark for a day.

check mark the day. And we can agree minimal activity should not be counted, but I do believe that when we engage in one hour, an hour and a half, two hours of work that we take away from our families, and we're talking a per diem of one hundred dollars, we shouldn't be concerned about claiming a per diem or allowing a member to claim a per diem in that situation. I think it's perfectly fair.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. de la Torre.
Mr. Le.

BOARD MEMBER LE: Yeah, I kind of agree with that approach as a good compromise. Maybe we just have some

guidance that, yeah, we don't have to track hours exactly because that is a huge burden, and just having some guidance for us -- or for board members, and they're like, all right, so not substantive; anything, like, less than an hour, just don't count that day, as a guidance, and we don't actually have to track the exact number of hours.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le.

2.0

I would certainly support changing the reporting form so that it's a matter of reporting a day. And then the question is, would the policy either has guidance or requirements for what a day constitutes? We could say one -- anything less than X is not significant enough to count. We could have it just be guidance. I think there are a number of ways that we could accomplish this.

I would like to turn to public comment now. I think public comment is particularly important on this issue. Well, it's important on any issue, but if people in the public have comments, I would very much like to hear them.

MR. PANERO: Thank you, Chairperson.

Looks like we have one comment to start here from Barry Weber.

MR. WEBER: Personally, I hope I'm not the only person in the audience, but I certainly appreciate the

incredible, intelligent work that you people are doing.

I'm going to avoid for now -- I'd like to go back to the topic of hiring because there wasn't an open period for comments there. I think you're doing a fine job and probably taking way too much time on this issue of per diem because you're -- I know you're all credible and you'll figure something out, and anything that's simple is going to make sense.

2.3

I think Mr. Le had an incredibly valuable comment with respect to using technical support in the staff to support rulemaking as well as to focus on difficult things such as dealing with auditing of automated decision-making. I would extend that to say that there -- you can have a significant impact on privacy in California if you even extended that to use automated -- automated support to evaluate privacy notices for dark patterns and for completeness. That would be just such a massive improvement to the beginning of enforcement. So I think there's lots of opportunity for leveraging technology and building it into enforcement, and I think you're going down the right path. I just want to support that.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Weber.

And we very much thank you for your engagement. I'm sure someone else will speak up eventually.

MR. PANERO: And as a reminder, if there is anyone else who'd like to make a public comment, please press the raised hand icon on your screen, or if you're connected by telephone only, you may press star nine. Looks like we have a comment from Gary Wright (ph.).

Gary, you have three minutes.

MR. WRIGHT: Thank you. I've been listening intently, taking notes, and I've already sent a email to some recommended comments, but the last discussion on per diem, I'd like to agree with the what I think is a consensus that the CPRA was enacted by the voters and there was very specific definitions in there, and I don't think that changing the definition of the per diem would probably be prudent if that was the basis of some of the suggestions. That's number one comment.

And again, going back, I really enjoy hearing the dialog and the direction that you're moving, but there's -- in regards to an earlier --

(End of recording)

2.3

24

25

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

This is to certify that I transcribed the foregoing pages 1 to 101 to the best of my ability from an audio recording provided to me.

I have subscribed this certificate at Phoenix, Arizona, this 16th day of May, 2022.

Melinda Friedland

eScribers, LLC

--000--