1	CALIFO:	RNIA 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:	Cynthia Piett,
23		eScribers, LLC
24		Phoenix, Arizona
25		000

TRANSCRIBED RECORDED BOARD MEETING

September 7, 2021

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- section on hiring and -- and staffing, it seemed like there is a concentration to maybe hire several attorneys. And as an alternate suggestion, has -- have you considered reaching out to the Attorney General's Office and using their already staffed attorneys to advise technical staff and staff that you're going to hire to -- to work on the policies, provisions of auditing, and all of the nuts and bolts and -- and things that -- that need to be done? Because I agree with Mr. Le that, you know, technical staff and privacy professionals that had been working with GDPR, CCPA, PITA, the numerous privacy laws throughout the world are probably in a better position to provide better technical advice at implementing this -this consumer-based law that was approved by the voters.

And that's one of the last stresses that I wanted to convey is I hope the focus of your agency is on the consumer. When you were talking about real estate, I would think that since this is a -- a -- you know, supposed to be the benefit of the consumer, a more -- a location that is better suited to the consumer to be able to come in, once we have that capability post-COVID, would be better suited rather than a state building --

MR. PANERO: Caller, you have fifteen seconds remaining.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: -- where they may not be
free to come in and express a concern about their
particular privacy concerns. So that's some of the
synopsis of the comments that I already sent to you via
email. Thank you.

MR. PANERO: Thank you for your comment.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Right (ph.), for your comment.

Mr. Joseph Panero, is there further public comment?

MR. PANERO: I'm seeing no additional comments at

this time.

2.0

2.3

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Joseph Panero.

I propose that we have two options here. One would be for the Board to approve a per diem policy with amendments that we decide in the meeting. And Ms. Sierra and I will make those amendments.

The second would be for Ms. Sierra and I to make amendments and bring them back to the next board meeting. I am agnostic on which option to take, but I understand the amendments to be, number 1, to remove any requirement or apparent requirement to report actual hours, and instead only record days worked, and number 2, to replace the six-hour definition with either a requirement or

guidance.

2.3

Again, I agnostic that a per diem -- per diem -- to claim a per diem, one should do substantial work, and that is not X. I -- we could -- we could -- we could move forward in either -- either fashion. I am fine with either.

Ms. de la Torre.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: So my suggestion is that we approve it now with the understanding that those changes are going to be made. I think it's the more expeditious way. And then maybe we can discuss the guidance, what would be the minimum that should -- we should consider in -- in a future meeting or -- or I guess in a meeting. I -- I guess there's no other way to discuss it.

But just -- just make it a guidance, that can be a paragraph -- that is provided to -- to the members as, you know, do not report these or do report based in these particular situations. It just seems to me that's more expeditious. If I'm wrong about that and the other option is faster, then I'm -- I'm flexible.

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

I support that.

Mr. Phillips, is that an appropriate form of motion?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes. I think that would work.

1 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Okay. Thank you very much. Then I will ask the Board if I could have a motion to approve the -- a form of the per diem policy that the 3 4 Start-Up and Administration Subcommittee recommends with 5 the following changes. 6 The first is that there is no requirement or 7 apparent requirement to report hours, that members will 8 only report days. And secondly, that the six-hour 9 definition of a per diem be struck and be replaced by guidance to board members as to what counts sufficiently 10 11 set -- excuse me, sufficiently substantial work on one 12 day to claim a per diem. 13 May I have a motion? 14 BOARD MEMBER LE: I -- I so move. 15 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le. 16 May I have --17 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Aye. 18 Thank you, Ms. de la Torre. CHAIRMAN URBAN: 19 thought you were seconding, but I couldn't quite tell. 2.0 Mr. Joseph Panero, could we please have the roll call vote? 21 22 MR. PANERO: Certainly. Thank you, Chairperson. 2.3 So Ms. de la Torre? 24 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE:

25

1

Mr. Le?

2

BOARD MEMBER LE: Aye.

3

MR. PANERO: Mr. Le, aye.

4

Ms. Sierra?

5

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Aye.

6

MR. PANERO: Ms. Sierra, aye.

7

Mr. Thompson?

to what we have agreed.

meeting and the next meeting.

8

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON:

9

MR. PANERO: Mr. Thompson, yes.

10

And Chairperson Urban?

11

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Yes.

12

Yes. The vote is 5-0. MR. PANERO:

13

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Joseph Panero.

14

The motion carries. And we will proceed according

We do have one final item from the Start-Up and

Administration Subcommittee, which is simply the board's

request for the board's sense of whether our plan for

prioritizing board-level policies is the same as the

board's and/or if the board would prefer us to -- to

revise our approach and do something else between this

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

So as we mentioned, at the top is meeting. We have been prioritizing what we think we need to get done right away, with the understanding that we do have a fair

number of policies we will need to be considering. We recommend, first of all, that we continue that approach rather than trying to flesh out all the policies that are in the handbook and any others we might need.

2.0

2.3

Secondly, we recommend for the next priority, the development of an incompatible activity statement. And I will turn it over to Ms. Sierra if -- for any detail that she would like to offer on that.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Okay. Thank you. So just briefly, the reason that we are recommending that this be the next policy that our committee work on this -- what is called the Incompatibility Statement. It is something that is required by state law under the government code. It requires all state agencies to adopt one. These are basically policies that notify employees that certain types of activities and outside employment may be incompatible with their duties as state employees.

And, you know, examples from the statute -- the statute itself lays out a number of provisions that must be included. For example, what would be prohibited would include misuse of prestige and influence of your office.

We'd be prohibited to misuse state time and resources.

But that list is not exclusive. Agencies can add additional items based on the mission of their agency in our subject matter area.

For example, we, in developing a proposed policy through for your consideration, may want to identify certain types of outside employment that the board would determine is incompatible for an individual who's employed by our agency to also be doing, for example, part-time. There is a process that an agency must pursue in adopting this type of statement. And what it involves is a public -- a thirty-day publication and comment period. And then the policy needs to be approved by the California Department of Human Resources. All employees upon starting with our agency would need to review and sign once we have a finally -- final and approved policy.

2.0

But before we did any publication and started that process, we would come to the board with the proposed policy. You know, our aim is to present it to you at our next board meeting. And we'd also want to be exploring with you whether we should be extending some or all of these provisions to us as board members. That would be through a conflict of interest policy, because the incompatibility statement only pertains to the actual employees.

So that is our proposal with respect to the next policy for us to work on and to present to you.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. Sierra.

I would add that we have sought advice from the

California Attorney General's Office, and they are providing example policy to get us started and background information that we can provide to the Board when we are ready.

2.0

2.3

Is there a comment on this as the next priority, whether we should have additional or other priorities?

Ms. de la Torre?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I just want to agree with that priority. I think that you should go ahead and -- and prepare that. My initial feedback on the idea of having that policy applied to board members is that it doesn't quite make a lot of sense to me, but I haven't really taken the time to think it through. The reason why is because the study itself sets a number of limitations on us that we have to consider on (indiscernible) not necessary have to consider.

And also I do believe that there is already a conflict of interest policy that we approve prior to now, and it's -- it's going through public comment. So -- I -- I'm assuming that that would be like a separate check, but please, go ahead with the work that you're suggesting.

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

I would also note that Mr. Thompson and I have signed an incompatibility activity statement as part of

1 our -- we were appointed by the governor, and that's something that is part of that process, so we would have to be sure that everything is compatible. 3 4 Any further comment? 5 Thank you, Ms. de la Torre, for the thoughts. Is there any public comment? 6 7 MR. PANERO: Thank you, Chairperson. As a reminder, if anyone would like to make a public 8 9 comment, this would be the time to raise your hand in 10 your meeting window or press *9 on your telephone. 11 And I am not seeing any public comments at this 12 time. 13 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Joseph Panero. 14 For completeness, I was just going to share the last 15 slide, which is the end of presentation. I thank all of the board members for their time and attention. 16 17 Mr. Thompson, do you have a final thought? 18 BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Sorry. I didn't know Yeah. 19 if -- if your request for Board member comments was about 20 the Incompatible Activity Statement or -- or future 21 priorities of the subcommittee. So I -- I haven't --22 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I'm sorry to interrupt, 23 but I just wanted to bring to the attention of the board

this (indiscernible) screen. She's probably not

24

25

intending to do that.

1 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Oh, I'm sorry. What was I showing? 2 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Yes. 3 CHAIRMAN URBAN: What -- what was I showing? 4 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I don't know. They were 5 documents. I didn't --6 BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: It was several different 7 documents. Oh, my goodness. I do apologize. 8 CHAIRMAN URBAN: 9 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: (Indiscernible). 10 CHAIRMAN URBAN: No. My intention was to show the 11 slide. 12 **BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON:** Good. 13 CHAIRMAN URBAN: That better? 14 BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: There you go. 15 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Okay. 16 BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: I think the incompatible activities policy makes -- makes sense for the 17 18 subcommittee to work on. I didn't know how we're going 19 to start to flesh out what -- how we are thinking of the 20 operating model of the -- of the agency, kind of what the 21 concept of our operations, our -- our goals and the 22 capabilities that we need to achieve those goals and -and what structure. 2.3 24 Obviously, some of those things will be within the

purview of the executive leadership of the agency when it

25

comes on board. But these strike me as things we might want to get a head start on, utilizing the capabilities of the -- of the subcommittee. And they will be things I think the board probably as an opinion on. So I didn't know if that -- how we were planning on -- on addressing those bigger-picture questions.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Thompson. Are you referring to something like a plan that Mr. Le brought up last time, something like an organizational chart, both?

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: I -- I think they -- they work together.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Okay.

2.0

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: A strategic plan for what we need to achieve will spell out long-term and -- and medium-term goals. And then we need to start to identify what capabilities we will need as an organization and then what structure we want to put those capabilities into. That seemed like a fair amount of work that will take a while. And we'll -- it'll need the implinton (sic) assistance of folks other than -- than probably the two subcommittee members and -- and the staff we have on board. No knock on the -- on the immense and amazing capabilities of our two subcommittee members, but I -- I want to make sure we're -- we're heeping our eye on the longer-term development of the agency as -- as

well, both the short-term and the longer-term needs.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Thompson.

The subcommittee will take that under advisement.

And the -- I will say from my part that one hope that I have is that we will be able to hire an executive director soon and we can all work together on -- on these vision -- the vision of the structure of the agency and where it's going. But your point is very well taken, that, you know, this isn't something we can put off, of course.

Any further comments?

2.0

2.3

Thank you very much. That concludes agenda item 4. I propose that we take a thirty-minute lunch break at this point and come back with agenda item 5. We -- we do have still a fair amount of work to get through, and we will need to go into closed session sort of mid-afternoon if we can. So I do apologize. It's a relatively short break. That is my thinking.

Ms. de la Torre.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I -- I will suggest, if everybody agrees, that we make the break shorter, even fifteen minutes, if -- if everybody agrees. Because like you mentioned, we have a fair amount to cover.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: That is perfectly fine with me.

Sometimes people need to do things, to eat, or whatever.

1 It's all right with me. Do other board members have opinions? BOARD MEMBER LE: I -- I'd like at least twenty 3 4 minutes for a break. 5 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Okay. Ms. Sierra? 6 BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Either is fine. I don't need 7 much time. CHAIRMAN URBAN: Okay. All right. So shall we say 8 9 twenty minutes? 10 Wonderful. Thank you all very much. We are in 11 recess at 12:05 p.m. We will return 12:25 p.m. 12 Thanks to everyone on -- from the public for 13 listening and engaging with us. 14 And thank you to the board members. I will see you 15 in twenty minutes. 16 (Whereupon, a recess was held) 17 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Good afternoon. Thank you to 18 everyone for returning. It's 12:25. And we will return 19 from recess now and reopen the meeting. We will proceed 2.0 with agenda item number 5, which is an update from the 21 regulation subcommittee. The regulation subcommittee, as 22 a reminder, was formed to advise the board -- the 2.3 agency's, excuse me, upcoming rulemaking and is comprised 24 of Ms. de la Torre and myself.

So I will be sharing our presentation. For those of

25

you in the public, just check the website.

2.3

BOARD MEMBER LE: The materials are available.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Yes, I know. They're numbered. I was -- I was going to direct people to the correct numbers.

This is starting with part 3, and our presentation is part 5.

Is the Regulation Subcommittee presentation up on the screen?

Great. Thank you, Ms. de la Torre.

So Ms. de la Torre and I comprise the Regulation

Subcommittee. We're going to give a very brief update on

our activities and recommended an initial course of

action to the board.

So to begin, I'm going to do a very brief overview of the rulemaking process just to orient the discussion. We had a longer training on this in our June 14th meeting. The important thing to recognize is that there are two main components to rulemaking. The first is preliminary activities. Agencies are able to conduct preliminary information gathering, activities to gather information in whatever way is most productive.

So that might be requesting comments from the public, written comments on the public; it might be informational workshops or hearings, and there's a wide

range of activities an agency can undertake in order to gather information in this preliminary fashion.

2.0

2.3

Second, there is the formal rulemaking process. The formal rulemaking record is opened with the publication of the agency's initial version of regulations with a notice of proposed rulemaking and what's called an initial statement of reasons. The -- that process then follows a strict timeline that includes, again, collecting public comments, holding hearings, and responding to comments. So this is sort of the basic, basic overview just to orient the discussion.

I will also give a brief status update. The regulation subcommittee has reviewed statutory requirements, timelines, available resources, and process options. Based on this information,, we've come up with an advised initial course of action. We've secured certain resources for example, some technical support for accepting public comments. We are working toward a personnel resources. This is — within our subcommittee, we've been focused on one stream because we have to maintain our separation between subcommittees under Bagley-Keene.

So I will first refer to back to the Chairperson's update and the Start-Up and Administration Subcommittee to remind everyone that staffing support, attorney

support from retired annuitants, and also any civil service positions we could fill or inter-agency agreements we can make is very much on the table and being pursued.

2.0

2.3

In addition, this subcommittee has followed up on the -- on the requirement in the statute for the office of the Attorney General to provide support. I formally requested staffing support from the office of the Attorney General for rulemaking activities, including staff and resources for informational hearings.

The Attorney General's Office and we -- the

Regulation Subcommittee have a meeting coming up soon to

discuss this further with the office of the Attorney

General. And we will, of course, report what we are able

to work out with them in -- in the next meeting.

I will now hand the presentation over to Ms. de la Torre, who will outline our findings and the initial course of action that we are advising the board take.

You're on mute, Ms. --

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Apologies. I was mute. So you might want to move to the next person -- next slide. So before we go into the details on the slide, I also wanted to remind the board of the conversations we had and how we interpreted those conversations in terms of the goals that we set for ourselves while preparing

this proposal.

2.0

2.3

So our goals -- and I -- we understand those were the priorities outlined by the board on June 14th -- were to, first of all, accelerate the rulemaking process while ensuring transparency, accountability, and compliance with our requirements, which include Bagley-Keene. We aim at structuring the work so that all members of the board were able to participate in the rulemaking process in a meaningful way.

We aim at aligning the assignments of work with what we understand to be the skills and expertise that each one of us brings to the board. We also try to distribute the work as evenly as possible. This was very challenging because, given the requirements that apply to us, they — the subcommittees that we are proposing have to really work independently, meaning they cannot communicate with each other.

So that mean -- that meant to us we distributed the work -- that the piece of work assigned to each subcommittee had to be basically independent or sufficiently isolated from the other kinds of work assigned to different committees to enable that compliance with Bagley-Keene. And I think that there's one subcommittee that actually has possibly a -- a -- a higher burden in terms of the assignment, but we just

couldn't find a way to -- to avoid that.

2.3

We also wanted to ensure that we were able to solicit broad public participation immediately, to gather input from the public as soon as possible, before even starting to draft our initial version of the rules. In order to enable the public to provide meaningful and impactful comments, we aim at identifying the different areas where feedback was most needed and provide tools and teach to help the public file these comments in an effective way.

The high-level approach that we followed to that idea of soliciting public comments that were more needed was to highlight for the public those topics that are completely new because they don't exist under CCPA or those areas of CCPA that have been substantially changed. There's a substantial record already in place that was generated by the Attorney General when they went through the CCPA rulemaking process. And we can benefit from that public record in terms of understanding the feedback of the public.

So we felt that the new areas were more important in terms of us understanding what are the preferences of the -- the public. Finally, we wanted to ensure that subcommittees were able to gather information they needed and call on experts or interested parties during public

informational gathering meetings before we draft initial version of the rules.

2.0

2.3

This will give us more flexibility and enable to the kinds of conversations that we might want to engage in so that we are well-informed before we put together the first drafting of the rules. In terms of challenges on strategy, so one big challenge was ensuring compliance with Bagley-Keene, because that required us to create subcommittees that could function independently without sharing information.

To address this challenge, what we have done is we separated the work of the subcommittees into new rulemaking, update of existing rules, and then a subcommittee that is essential that deals with the process of rulemaking. And we will talk a little bit more in detail about this, and we're happy to also answer any questions that the members of the board might have.

One of the challenges is that when we review the rulemaking -- the -- the sections of the statute that talk about rulemaking -- and there's several sections.

Some of them are not necessarily where you will expect it to be, but when we review those sections, we identify that there were areas where there's a mandate to issue rules, but there are also areas where we're enabled to issues rules, and we have to account for conversations

within the board to consider those areas and determine which ones of those areas that are allowable, we want to engage in, and versus which are the ones where maybe it's not the right time to start a rulemaking process.

2.3

The other challenges -- challenge that we face is the volume of work ahead. I think this was highlighted in the prior meeting, but it is expected that the current rules are basically one third of the final rules that we will have. So we are going to increase the volume of what are already substantial rules of potentially by two thirds. That's a lot of work. We look for ways to maximize efficiency to deal with this volume of work.

One of the strategies that we use for this is, for example, thinking about using existing records of public comments and responses gathered as opposed to generating necessarily a new record on the same -- on the same topics; it -- it was not needed. So basically, what I'm saying, in -- in a nutshell, is we want to maximize the great work that the AG put together and benefit from that as much as possible.

In terms of work distribution, we did ensure that after -- you know, if our proposal is approved, that all members of the board will be serving in two different subcommittees. And I think that in a way that will even itself out. Some subcommittees, I think, are going to

maybe have a heavier load, particularly at the beginning of the rulemaking process. But like I said, it was really difficult to -- to avoid that.

2.3

In terms of public participation, we tried to tackle that challenge. And -- and I'm looking forward to the presentation of the third subcommittee because, you know, with the limitations that we're having in meetings and gatherings, and this situation with COVID is -- is really difficult to -- to think about different venues to enable this public participation.

But one thing that we did is we tried to, in our request for -- for comments, first of all, we don't -- not use legalese and outline of topics in -- in logical manner, in as clear language as we could, you know, move all of those citations to footnotes so that, you know, regular people can read them and understand and decide whether the topics that are most interest to them and if the document can be accessible.

We also decided that it might be helpful to create a (indiscernible) tips document for the members of the public to -- to understand how they can best draft effective comments.

So the proposed action first is -- is right here.

Summarize it. The first thing is we will ask the board to authorize the immediate commencement of pre-rulemaking

activities. This means that we will like to issue an invitation for comments, and we will also like to start working in identifying topics for informational hearings.

We -- we have another slide that talks about suggested topics.

2.0

2.3

The second main point is that we are asking the board to approve the creation of three additional subcommittees. The first subcommittee will take over adopting and basically redlining the existing CCPA rules to align them with CPRA requirements.

The second subcommittee will take over creating, basically, rules from scratch. These are for topics that are not addressed currently in CCPA and therefore they are not in the CCPA rules. This committee basically doesn't have a record to refer back to because these going to be dealing with new items.

The third subcommittee is the rulemaking process subcommittee. And that subcommittee will be responsible for helping us get through the rulemaking process. One of the initial things that we anticipate we will be doing, if the proposal is approved, is to start informational hearings. The rulemaking process subcommittee will take the input from the other subcommittees in terms of the topics and then will work independently to enable us to put together a good -- a --

a -- panels that include the expertise that is desire or require in order to provide the feedback that the CCPA rule and the subcommittee and the new CPRA rule subcommittee deem necessary.

2.3

As a note, we also proposed that the current Regulation Subcommittee will dissolve September 17. I will Jennifer very much because I get to talk with her every day. But we need a little extra time. The reason we don't want to dissolve it immediately is because, like Jennifer mentioned, we have a conversation already scheduled that needs to take place, and also -- I don't think it's mentioned on the slides, but both us have signed up for rulemaking school, which is a three-day commitment.

And typically, you know, we have a general counsel, the general counsel should go to a school, but since we don't, we -- we're going to put ourselves through school so that we better understand the process better and are able to -- to -- to guide the subcommittees and ensure that we comply with it.

In terms of hiring a staff, we have the -- the bullet point there, but I really would like to refer you to the discussion that we already had. And we are hoping that -- at least, my personal hope is that the conversation with the AG will result in some form of

media support for the subcommittees, maybe an attorney part-time, but we cannot promise that a conversation is -- is still to be had. But we're -- we're aiming at having one person as lay support each one of the subcommittees, even if it is on part-time basis.

2.3

Do we move to the next slide? Jennifer, is there something else?

Okay. So in terms of the proposed subdivision of work, I want to say that -- no, I -- I actually, I love being an attorney. I love reading laws. And I am good at past laws. But this was -- this looks so easy, but it was so difficult. And I will really encourage the -- the -- the members of the board to look at the supplementary materials, because those are the ones that actually -- for each one of these subcommittees identified as subsection of the law and the topic and a summary of the topics assigned to which subcommittee.

But at a high level, we're talking about is that the new CCPA subcommittee will deal with cyber security, all the risk assessments, all the decision-making, and then the agency or they prefer these are things that are not in the current CCPA rule.

We are proposing that member Le and myself will serve in that subcommittee but obviously, we're open to feedback from the other members of the board. I can

mention initially, we tried to align the expertise of the different members of the board with the assignments the best that we -- the best that we could.

2.0

The second subcommittee will be the update of CCPA rules subcommittee. And that is a really short list. I mean, the -- the list is really long in reality when you look at the -- at the supplemental materials. So everything that has to do with just changing the system rules, including the up tile (ph.) requirements and the preference signal accessibility -- there's a new right, which is the right to correct. That -- that was something that the update of CCPA rules subcommittee will handle as well. We are proposing that Chair Urban and Member Sierra will serve in that subcommittee.

The last subcommittee, which is an essential subcommittee, will actually help coordinate it to be prerulemaking and rulemaking activities. This means the
informational hearings, collection of documents, et
cetera. It also has to make recommendations on the topic
of whether we need to issue rules in regards to insurance
companies. There's a section of CPRA that states that we
need to look into how insurance companies are regulated
currently and see if there is like a -- between data
relation and what CPRA provides.

And if there is a gap, we need to issue rules. But

that starts with the process of just obtaining a legal opinion. So the rulemaking process subcommittee will help us with that. And you can see their other tasks. I will serve in that committee, if the proposal is approved, together with member Tom Chung (ph.).

We want to move to the next slide? Right.

2.3

So the invitation for comments is actually drafted. We -- it has been provided, I think, a week ago for the members to -- to take a look at. It aligns with what I was just mentioning where we're really highlighting in the same order the new things and the things that have substantially changed. We're trying to use accessible language.

In terms of informational hearings -- we might want to move to the next slide, Jennifer.

In terms of informational hearings, we have here a list of suggested topics. This is just things that we came up with. They're -- you know, in the same -- in the same mind frame that we just mentioned. They're either things that are new or things that are substantially changing, but our expectation is that if our proposal is approved, the subcommittees start meeting, and they will come to the next board meeting prepared to give us a -- a list of what are the topics that they deem more important in terms of conducting these informational hearings.

We wouldn't have time for infinite number of
informational hearings, but being realistic, I think that
we might be able to do three or four, so we're going to
have to be very strategic in terms of selecting the

topics that are more -- more needed.

2.0

2.3

Other than this, anything more -- is there anything more, Jennifer, that I'm missing?

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. de la Torre. Thank you for the thorough description.

I would only add that with regard to the -- the invitation for comments, we -- the subcommittee has secured resources to issue that and to accept comments. Things are still being built, but they're very close. And we would like to issue that as soon as possible in order to give the public time to absorb it and respond to the comments. We propose a forty-five-day comment period after some research, and we mainly would like to be able to go to public and start to receive information from them.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Perhaps we can move to the next slide, which is just a summary with this graphic representation of the rulemaking process. I find a graphic recommendations very helpful. And then --

CHAIRMAN URBAN: (Indiscernible).

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Right. And then maybe we

can open it for comments by either members of the board and feedback.

2.0

2.3

CHAIRMAN URBAN: All right. So this is a summary of recommendations. We have some draft timelines in here, understanding that the subcommittees are going to be reporting, and, of course, the process subcommittee will have a critical responsibility here, but we were trying to count back and figure out sort of what some rough timelines are. That is the end of the presentation. I will stop sharing it, but we can bring it back up again should anybody like. And --

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: One thing that I was going to mention, Jennifer -- I know member Thomas asked for a overview of what the AG had needed in terms of resources. And I actually found my notes on that, so I'm happy to read from those if -- if that is helpful.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: I think a -- a -- a rough estimate would be appropriate. We don't have an -- we don't have detailed information.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Right. Right. We don't have details. And to be honest, I think that we will need more resources than the AG for two reasons. Number one is we have more rules. But number two is our process is more complex because we created subcommittee, so everything's going to have to come, while they didn't

even -- don't even have to through those steps.

But one thing that I can share from what the AG shared with us is that it is clear to us that they -that the -- the need for resources increased over time,
meaning the preliminary activities might need just one
full-time person and some support, versus at the end when
you're talking assembling the final rulemaking package
and updating approval, we might, if we are in apposition
to do so, have several attorneys who are legally trained
staff engage in helping us do that.

And the initial drafting and the creation of the nopah (ph.), that also will also be a point where we will start needing more staff. We were advised to look for, perhaps, software solutions to help us track comments.

We are -- apparently, there is, like, no off-the-shelf package that we -- that we can buy to do these, but it is really, really, involved because every comment that is filed, we're going to have to identify which pieces go to which rules and answer each comment, not -- if we have the same comment made by multiple people, we don't have answer it multiple times.

Literally, that -- that just requires a lot of very detailed work, reviewing and creating this -- this package. And the last thing that I want to remind everybody, which the AG also reminded us, is that we are

not the only agency that is involved in the rulemaking process. We cannot necessarily anticipate the time that other agencies that will need to provide approvals or participate in the process may need, so we are hoping to have the public understand that that's -- that's the case, that we -- we don't fully control the timeline here.

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

Comments and questions from board members on our proposed course of action for any of the documents?

Mr. Le?

2.0

2.3

all have done on this. You know, I -- I think the recommendation is to do a -- a rulemaking pretty quickly, but I think -- and -- and part of it is -- I believe it says that we would have the text of regulations ready by -- by winter. I -- I just don't think that's that feasible. We can have some -- in -- in my -- in my opinion, what -- what wakes -- makes more sense is kind of what the CPCU does, right. There's that initial scoping memo that talks about all of the issues that need to be talked about. You know, and then there's preliminary thoughts in that scoping memo that you get comment on.

So there's actually a specific list of questions.

So for example, I'm assigned to the Cyber Security Audit
Committee. The initial regulation -- or the initial
comment period would talk about, okay, what should be in
the scope of an audit and what are the processes in which
to ensure that the audit is thorough and independent.
Staff, a -- or the subcommittee would put some ideas out
there, but we wouldn't have actual language of the
regulation yet because that would have us creating from
whole cloth at least for our -- the new rules just brand
new rules that we don't actually have anybody's thoughts
on.

2.0

2.3

And then after we get those comments, you know, they're all arranged by question, then staff comes in, they — they draft proposed rules. And then there's a proposed decision that comes out and then you get comments on that exact — on the exact language of the — the proposed regulations, and then there's a final decision. So I think there has to be at least two — two rulemakings, at least for the new rules subcommittee, so that we have some material to work with in — in creating these new regulations.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le.

So would you advise that the subcommittees prepare scoping information for each of their topics? And -- and forgive me, we -- we are going to rule school next week,

but is the CPUC process -- I mean, I like this -- I like the substance of the idea. Is the CPUC process a formalized process, like the final rules, or is it something that falls under the guise of preliminary activities?

and -- and Chris, you may have some thoughts on this.

Yeah, it's a pretty well-defined process. It's all in the rules of practice and procedure for the CPUC.

Thirty-day comment period. Fifteen-day reply period -- or ten-day, I believe. And then there's administrative law judges. So it's a pretty -- it's a pretty -- I don't want -- I don't think we got to adopt the whole thing, but I think the -- the idea of having these phased comment periods to create the record, to create the regulations makes a lot of sense.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le.

Ms. -- Ms. de la Torre?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I was going to mention that one thing that comes to mind is that we might want -- I mean, the idea that Jennifer and I really had was to leave some of these details to be defined by the subcommittees independently. The -- the process -- we -- we have a process that we have to follow because it's -- it's mandated by statute. We -- we're going to have to

follow that for all of the rules. But the idea, for example, of generating a memo on getting that initial feedback might be really, really helpful for the new rules subcommittee but might have less impact in terms of the work of the CCPA update subcommittee.

2.3

So I -- my suggestion is that whatever the decision is taken in terms of the things that are not mandatory should be left to the subcommittees to -- to design so that the process is designed in a way that better serves their needs.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: I would add that we very much recognize how aggressive the schedule is. It is -- was -- the draft -- I mean, the sort of rough timeline, it was produced by counting back from our statutory deadline. And we can certainly explore options for managing that, but that's -- that's where -- that's where the sort of rough timeline came from. There's a process with the Office of Administrative Law that takes a certain amount of time, and there are all the required parts of the formal rulemaking process.

We also have to give our notice that we will be taking on authority to pass the rules to the Attorney General, but we don't have to do that quite yet. We will just have to consider it pretty quickly.

Other comments and thoughts from the board members?

Yes, Mr. Le?

BOARD MEMBER LE: Yeah. I'd hate to ask this, but, you know, is there any way to push back that pretty concrete-sounding deadline of July 1st, 2022? Yeah, because it makes sense, counting back, having two forty-five-day rulemakings is going to be tough, and just without staff to draft the regulations this is -- is going to be really difficult.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le. There -- there are options. One option would be to request that the legislature revise the deadline. Anything the legislature does would have to comport with the purposes of the statute, essentially, to protect Californians' privacy. I know you know this Mr. Le; I'm just finishing the whole thought all the way through. There is another option, which is the legislature does designate some regulations as what are called emergency regulations.

Emergency regulations follow a slightly different timeline. They go to the Office of Administrative Law on a very short timeline and then go into effect. And when -- then -- they go into effect provisionally. And then the formalized process continues. So they're sort of temporary regulations. There's -- there -- it's also completely allowed to do all of the preliminary information gathering in order to have high -- you know,

high-quality regulations, but it changes the timeline to some degree.

2.0

2.3

There are obviously tradeoffs. There's -- there's the -- the -- there's the question of what it would mean to have this sort of emergency temporary regulations. We could address that, of course, to some degree by making sure that we really have input in advance. There are also other timelines in the statute or other deadlines, for example, when the regulations take effect and consumers and businesses need to follow them, and enforcement. And so all of that would have to be taken into account. But those are two potential options in addition to what Ms. de la Torre and I are proposing to meet the existing deadline.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I -- I just wanted to -to mention that, you know, from my point of view, I think
it's also important to consider that we have to allow
time for the organizations that are going to be subject
to these rules to actually implement the mandate. And
the -- you know, there's this alternatives that the Chair
just highlighted that really required us to have a
conversation the second (indiscernible) changed the law.

But from my point of view, there are more simple solutions that we could consider if we are not able to have final rules by the deadline. We could consider

giving grace period for enforcement, which will enable
the organizations that are going to have to comply with
these to have some time where they can adapt their
practices to the requirements, and while being confident
that they are not going to be subject to enforcement when
they didn't really have a realistic kind of ramp-up
period to -- to implement the requirements.

So that is the more -- that -- that's completely on our agency to decide as a policy, as opposed to us wishing that will require us to go to Sacramento and implement the latest change.

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

I'll just amplify the point of the -- the nested for the -- sorry, not nested, but subsequent deadlines which are all connected.

Mr. Thompson?

2.3

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Thank you, Chairperson

Urban. And -- and thank you to both of you for this

presentation is well thought out, well laid out and -
and good -- really good work, so I'm -- appreciate how

much effort and clarity of thought is -- is demonstrated

here.

You know, I think a lot of your proposed course of action makes sense. The subcommittees make sense. I -- a couple of -- a couple thoughts and a couple of

questions. I think -- and they are similar to what Board Member Le said, you know, us looking at options on the deadline, because I -- I'm concerned that we're -- need to -- we're going to hit a fork in the road and need to make a decision on -- on how we're proceeding there.

The Attorney General staffing level was alluded to,
but I'm not sure that -- kind of where we landed on
that -- that discussion, because what I heard was is that
we're going to need more than they had or have. I don't
know what they have. And then what's it going to take
for us to get to more than they have --

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Right.

2.0

2.3

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: -- in terms of time. You mentioned the rules school, and I have a question on whether or not all of us should go and whether or not we can all go to the same thing, under Bagley-Keene, and can -- can we have a quorum attending the same class.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: I think the last bit, just because it's quick, if -- if anybody who wants to go rules school, very much encouraged. We can only go in pairs in our (indiscernible). And they -- they do offer it where -- when they offer it. So -- but -- but if we can work it out and there is appetite from members to go to rules school, it's definitely encouraged.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay. Well, it definitely

makes sense for it to be forbidden for all of us to learn simultaneously; that would be -- can we have an informational hearing with the rules school presenters?

2.3

CHAIRMAN URBAN: We -- we could. We could do a publicly noticed meeting if -- if they were able to do it. They have the schedule that -- it's a very efficiently run organization with not very many staff, so they have a -- they have a sort of sequence that they -- that they follow and school that they offer when they offer it. But I think, you know, we can explore various options.

that once we are able to onboard a general counsel, this should be something to consider. The general counsel doesn't -- I mean, we might be lucky enough to onboard a general counsel that doesn't need that kind of training, but we really need somebody to ask questions from more than, you know, having the information ourselves; it might be more efficient, but definitely we can -- we will report back in the next meeting about the experiences. It's a three-day commitment, but anybody who wants to participate in it should be welcome to do so.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Yes, they do have to accept you.

There's a process, but we can -- and we've heard great
things about it. So, you know --

1	BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: But if everybody has
2	for example, they were asking and I believe we all do
3	maybe it will be a good idea to just any board member
4	that thinks they will be interested just send her an
5	email to let her know and we can work from there,
6	Jennifer?
7	CHAIRMAN URBAN: Yes, please do send an email to Ms.
8	Castanon so she track the the logistics.
9	BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: I'm sorry. Who is
LO	administered by whom the rules school?
L1	CHAIRMAN URBAN: It's the Office of Administrative
L2	Law
L3	BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay.
L 4	CHAIRMAN URBAN: which is the regulating agency
L 5	that regulates our regulatory process.
L 6	BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: They they will have to
L7	approve our final version of the rules before they go
L 8	into enforcement.
L 9	CHAIRMAN URBAN: Yes.
20	BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Sure.
21	CHAIRMAN URBAN: And they also have some good
22	information on their website that isn't the concentrated
23	rules school.
24	BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: And so it's three days

25 each is three full days?

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Three full days, uh-huh.

2.0

2.3

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: So more than six hours?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: I think it ends -- I think it's (indiscernible) 5. Yeah. No. Mr. Thompson, I -- I thought that was going to be quick, so I apologize. Did you have more that you wanted to cover?

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Yeah. The -- well, and what Vinhcent mentioned about the CPUC process, you know, I think this is something that's -- that the process subcommittee can look at, but it bleeds into the earlier comment about our organizational model and how we're thinking about things.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Uh-huh.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Because those are well -well-documented and well-established processes, both for
their investigations and their rulemakings that -- that
we should learn more about. And I, you know, happy to
take that up in the subcommittee with -- with some
recommendations from what that agency and other agencies
do.

But I -- I do think that will also start to influence our structure because I do think there are some advantages to that commission structure and -- and how they -- how they operate. And there are some

similarities in their administrative law and enforcement functions and their policy-making functions. So I thought that point was -- was well made. So to go back to -- one is the AG's staffing level.

Was there something on the number of -- and types of folks that could be shared in -- in this meeting for our information?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Right.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Because that -- that then flows into the point about the deadline for rulemaking.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: We -- we do -- (indiscernible)
exact numbers. The -- the range is approximately ten --

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: That was the end of the process.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: -- at the -- towards the end of the process. Some -- that was people working pretty much full-time. You know, there's part -- people are devoting some portion of their time at various levels. The Attorney General's office, of course, also has a full panoply of support services and technical services and all of those things, which is not to say we won't have those things. We're working hard to have those things. It's only to say that we do have to keep in mind the -- the dual building the (indiscernible). We're building the --

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Right.

2.0

2.3

CHAIRMAN URBAN: -- we're building the capacity while we're -- while we're creating the rules. So, you know, if, for example, we're able to hire some retired annuitants with their experience with rulemaking, they can only work part-time, we have to think about how we will be able to build and allocate those resources.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you. That helps just give a sense of -- so ten people, of whom a certain number were attorneys, plus support that was existing in the agency in a way that we don't yet have. So add -- add some -- some multiplier for the support services that they were getting; is that a fair way of thinking about it?

CHAIRMAN URBAN: I think so.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Right.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: It's very approximate, but, you know, if we're thinking about are we talking about two people, are we talking about twenty people? You know, it does give us a kind of a picture --

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: -- (indiscernible).

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: And I think that -- I was really encouraged by the information shared by the Start-Up committee about the possibility of bringing in retired

people who are very experienced, because the one thing that we're going to have to consider is that this is not a permanent need of the agency. This is a need right now because we have to do rulemaking, but those staff positions will have to dedicate their time to something else once we're done with the rulemaking. So it might be an ideal fit for somebody who has the experience and comes for a limited-time engagement.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. Sierra.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Sorry. Just so that --

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Final point for Mr. Thompson and

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Sorry.

2.0

then --

CHAIRMAN URBAN: -- (indiscernible).

about the deadline, because I had a similar reaction that -- that Vinhcent did that -- you know, I look at how much time we have left and I look at what we need to do and the timeframes for the informational hearings, and there was something else in the winter/spring of -- of 2021/2022, my back of the envelope from the last meeting was that we needed to have draft rules around January or February of next year to have final rules by July.

That might have been a little conservative on my part, but I -- I would worry, if we're still gathering

information in the spring, how we're going to get to final rules in the -- in -- by July 1st. And we might want to set a deadline for ourselves of when we're going to make a determinate -- what are the milestones that we need to have hit to feel confident we're going to get to July 1st and have an offramp if, maybe January of '22, we can make a determination as a board, we don't think we're going to make it. So -- because we have to give the legislature time to act and consider a request if that is the -- the course of action. I don't mean to be negative this far out, but it is --

CHAIRMAN URBAN: No, we need --

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: -- a daunting task.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: No, we need contingency plans.

15 | There's no -- there's no question. This makes perfect

16 | sense to me. Our proposal is to try to start

17 | informational hearings asap. You know, I mean, there's

18 | just the question of practically how quickly --

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: -- we can do that. And we can do it in an efficient and meaningly way where we're covering topics that are -- are topics that will provide the most use --

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: That's right.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: -- of the process.

1 BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: But then that goes back to 2 needing the people to step --3 CHAIRMAN URBAN: That's right. 4 BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: We need people to staff 5 those hearings and to help us substantively --CHAIRMAN URBAN: Correct. 6 7 BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: -- in the hearings in 8 addition to administratively. Okay. Thank you. 9 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Thompson. 10 Ms. Sierra. 11 Yes. Just, first of all, I BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: 12 really appreciate all the work that went into this. 13 is really substantive and really very, very helpful, so 14 thank you. I think the approach, you know, in this 15 discussion and everything makes a lot of sense to me as 16 well. I had more of a logistics question on the 17 informational hearings. 18 Are they going to be board hearings that we can all attend, or will it be different subcommittees will be 19 2.0 just convening for different informational hearings, or 21 is that something that we just don't need to decide? 22 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: So -- so one thing that 23 we have during the pre-rulemaking process is a lot of 24 flexibility.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Uh-huh.

25

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: So we will encourage the subcommittees to reach out on their own and have conversations with different agencies or different experts that they want to get particular feedback from.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Uh-huh.

2.0

2.3

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: That can be done without an open hearing.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Right.

which we will leave really to the decision of the individual subcommittee, we think it will be helpful to create some kind of public informational hearing. We don't know -- you know, I think realistically we cannot have more than four, so we have to be very strategic about that. The advantage of having those right now before the record opens is that we are going to have more flexibility in terms of engaging in a conversation.

Once the record opens 00 you know, we were at a -we were at a call with the AG. And one of the AGs
mentioned that during the CCPA rulemaking process, he was
at a baseball game and somebody who was, you know, a
friend started to talk to him about the rules and he had
to say, you can't talk to me about the rules. You have
to file this.

So that's the kind of transparency that is there for

a -- for a very good reason, but we're going to have to account for once the formal process is start, so that the informational hearings and the informal process should be utilized for -- to help the board members form their own mind as to, you know, where should we go with the initial version of the rules. Definitely once they're published we'll have all of the public comments, and that's information that we have to absorb and use to adopt the initial version of the rules as we -- as we consider it appropriate. But I hope that answer your question.

2.0

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Thank you. No, that is very helpful. And I guess with the additional part of it is will we all be able to attend or because of Bagley-Keene, we will only be able to do this in groups of twos?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Jennifer probably can answer that better than me, but my understanding is that so long as it's in the agenda and it's properly noticed, we could -- we could, all of us, attend.

Jennifer, is that correct?

CHAIRMAN URBAN: That is my understanding. I won't ask Mr. Phillips is he can pause in case he wants to correct us, but my understanding is if it's properly noticed ten days ahead, we can treat it like a public meeting and all board members can attend.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Great.

1 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Mr. Phillips is nodding. 2 you, Mr. Phillips, for --3 MR. PHILLIPS: Yeah. Thank you, Jen. But you 4 can -- you can also slice it up different ways. If you 5 wanted to have just a committee hold a hearing, you can do that and not have the formal notice requirements of 6 7 Bagley-Keene as well. As long as you don't have a 8 quorum, you don't have notice requirements. 9 BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Okay. So we have a lot of 10 flexibility. 11 CHAIRMAN URBAN: We do have the constraint of 12 resources for this, so we'll have to keep all of that in 13 mind, but we do have flexibility in how we organize it. 14 BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Thank you. 15 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Other comments, questions? 16 Yes, Mr. Le. 17 **BOARD MEMBER LE:** Yeah. So how -- you know, these 18 informational hearings -- and we'll talk about it a 19 little bit in our subcommittee report. You know, most of 2.0 the substantive stuff comes in as written comments. And 21 you -- you mentioned about getting a platform. Is -- are 22 we just going to do emails, like ask folks to email us, 2.3 or is there any plan to get a -- a platform for -- for us

Thank you for the question.

24

25

to receive comments?

CHAIRMAN URBAN:

apologize for -- again, gauging detail. I gauged -- I gauged wrong there. The folks at the Department of Consumer Affairs, who are providing us with IT services, are working with Ms. Castanon to create the facility on our website for us to issue the invitation for comments and for people to respond. That may be via forum, it may via an email address, like regulations at CCPA.gov, but it will be a standard approach to having people submit written comments. In a second --

BOARD MEMBER LE: Thank you.

2.0

2.3

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le. I do want to -
I realize, Ms. de la Torre, we did gloss over a little

bit what we do when we have the comments. And for the

sort of full picture for the board, we -- we do have the

facility to collect the comments. One of the things that

we are actively pursuing resources for is the ability to

redact them, because we will want to make them public.

And we will be -- I think, board members can speak with

Ms. Castanon about how they prefer to proceed.

If one wants to access them on the state -- in the state repository, for security reasons, they do have to use state-owned laptops, but there's also the possibility for subcommittees to wait until the material is redacted and made public. And I think that's really up to the subcommittee.

Further comments or questions from the Board?

All right. I would like to propose two actions for you to think about, and then we will request public comment. The first action item will be a request for a motion to approve the regulation subcommittee's proposed course of action for preliminary rulemaking activities, including the preliminary information-gathering activities we described and the formation of new subcommittees as described in today's presentation.

2.0

2.3

And the second item is just to be safe and be sure that the Board has gone on record as approving releasing to the public an invitation for comments substantially in the form of the discussion draft for comments review today and inviting the public to respond with written comments within a forty-five day period. And that would -- as soon as technically feasible.

I have added substantially in the forum, because that document does have discussion draft at the top, and it doesn't have, you know, the email -- there's some -- some little changes that would need to be made. We could also first consider edits. But those are the two I would -- action items I would like you to have in your minds as we go to public comment.

Mr. Evan (sic) Panero, is there any public comment?

MR. PANERO: Thank you, Chairperson.

So if anyone wishes to make a public comment, please press the raised hand on your screen, or if you're connected by phone, you can press *9.

2.3

It looks like we have one additional comment from $\mbox{Yadie (ph.).}$

You have three minutes to make your comment.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi, everyone. Thank you for much for your hard work. I'm really excited for you and the agency. Two pieces of suggestions for you is maybe collecting feedback from consumers in regards to their success in exercising their rights under the current landscape to help, like, inform new and existing regulations and ensuring that, you know, organizations are complying with privacy laws, like, in the spirit of the law sense. And the other is to the extent that's feasibly possible, to consider making an option for Spanish-speaking folks to engage in this process as well. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you very much for your comment and those very helpful suggestions. Much appreciated.

MR. PANERO: And it looks like we have one additional comment from Tonya (ph.).

You have three minutes --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. Hope --

MR. PANERO: -- to --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. I hope everyone can hear me? Can you hear me?

MR. PANERO: Yes, thank you.

MS. FORTUNATE: Hi. My name is Tonya Fortunate (ph.). I'm an attorney. I just wanted to note given the discussion about the possibility of agency going to the legislature to try to get some sort of an amendment -possibly. I know that's only one of the many things that you're thinking about in terms of planning. believe and I'm just throwing it out there, in case others have other information just to -- to mention it, that I think that the current legislative session in California is actually closing this week, I think on the 10th, actually, and that presumably, then, if anything was going to happen on the legislative front, that that would have to wait until the 2022 legislative session, which I don't think opens until January, so just to sort of throw that out there based on what I know we went through in 2019, when we were many people on all different sides working on potential amendments to the CCPA, having to sort of work around those legislative schedules. I do believe they are closing this week.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you very much.

MR. PANERO: Thank you for your comment.

1	I'm not seeing any other any additional comments
2	at this time.
3	CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Joseph
4	Panero, and for the comments from our public
5	commentators.
6	I would now like to request a motion to approve the
7	Regulation Subcommittee's proposed course of action for
8	preliminary rulemaking activities, including the
9	preliminary information-gathering activities described
10	and the formation of new subcommittees as described.
11	Do I have a motion for this?
12	BOARD MEMBER LE: I I
13	BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: So move.
14	BOARD MEMBER LE: I'll second.
15	CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Thompson, for
16	moving.
17	And thank you, Mr. Le, for seconding.
18	Mr. Joseph Panero, could you please call the roll
19	call vote?
20	MR. PANERO: Yes. Thank you.
21	Ms. de la Torre?
22	BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Aye.
23	MR. PANERO: Ms. de la Torre, aye.
24	Mr. Le?
25	BOARD MEMBER LE: Aye.

MR. PANERO: Mr. Le, aye.

Ms. Sierra?

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

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Aye.

MR. PANERO: Ms. Sierra, aye.

Mr. Thompson?

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Aye.

MR. PANERO: Mr. Thompson, aye.

And Chairperson Urban?

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Aye.

MR. PANERO: Chairperson Urban, aye.

The vote is 5-0.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you very much.

The motion carries. And we will -- we will enact the plan recommended by the Regulation Subcommittee. I want to thank all the board members in advance for your work on these subcommittees. I'm really looking forward to hearing the plans that everyone comes up with. And I really appreciate the service.

I would now like to request a motion to approve releasing to the public an invitation for comments that is substantially in the form of the discussion draft for comments reviewed today and inviting the public to respond with written comments within a forty-five day period as soon as technically feasible.

Do I have a motion?

1	BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: I so move.
2	CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. Sierra.
3	Ms. Sierra moves.
4	Do I have a second?
5	BOARD MEMBER LE: I'll second.
6	CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le.
7	I have a motion and a second.
8	Mr. Joseph Panero, would you please perform the roll
9	call vote?
10	MR. PANERO: Certainly.
11	Ms. de la Torre?
12	BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Aye.
13	MR. PANERO: Ms. de la Torre, aye.
14	Mr. Le?
15	BOARD MEMBER LE: Aye.
16	MR. PANERO: Mr. Le, aye.
17	Ms. Sierra?
18	BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Aye.
19	MR. PANERO: Ms. Sierra, aye.
20	Mr. Thompson?
21	BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Aye.
22	MR. PANERO: Mr. Thompson, aye.
23	And Chairperson Urban?
24	CHAIRMAN URBAN: Aye.

MR. PANERO: Thank you. The vote is 5-0.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Joseph Panero.

The motion carries.

2.0

2.3

I thank the Board for its substantive and efficient discussion of our plan. I would also just like to quickly but very sincerely thank Ms. de la Torre for the work that she's put in on the Regulation Subcommittee. It's been a joy. As she said, it's been a puzzle. And we are grateful to everyone for the work ongoing. I will also miss Ms. de la Torre, but appreciate everything that she's done so far and appreciate everything that is to come.

With that, we are at 1:25. We have the public

Awareness and Guidance Subcommittee update coming up, the

delegation of authority for limited administrative

functions, public comments if there are any for items not

on the agenda, a discussion of future agenda items, and

when appropriate and sensible, we need to really circle

back to the agenda item to discuss our planning for

meetings and public events.

Mr. Le and Mr. Thompson, are you ready to do your -Okay. Wonderful. In that case, we will move to
agenda item number 7 -- or excuse me, agenda item number
6, a report from the Public Awareness and Guidance
Subcommittee. The Public Awareness and Guidance
Subcommittee was formed to advise the board on the

agency's duties to promote public awareness and provide guidance to consumers and businesses set out in Civil Code Section 1798.19940. The public awareness and guidance subcommittee is made up of Mr. Le and Mr. Thompson. I thank you for your service. And I will turn it over to you.

2.3

BOARD MEMBER LE: Okay. Thank you. Well, I wish we had a great set of visual aids like the other subcommittees, but we're just going to share some of our recommendations and notes through the process. You know, between Chris and I, we've talked to business groups, consumer groups, privacy groups, and the Attorney General quite a bit to gather kind of some input on the best ways to achieve our responsibilities of, like Chair Urban said, for public awareness about right and responsibilities and providing guidance to consumers and businesses about their responsibilities under their title.

At a high level, you know, we believe, you know, preserving privacy rights as a default, through tools like opt-in within the bounds of the CPRA, is key.

That's the greatest to way to make sure that, you know, consumers know -- I mean, have their rights protected, and, you know, recognizing that the vast majority of customers take -- consumers take the path of, you know,

least resistance and may -- may not understand the full
scope of their rights.

2.0

And then the Attorney General has recognized this with their work on the user-enabled global privacy control in dark patterns. And, you know, as an additional note, you know, we find that if people are given a choice in a clear, easy manner, they often choose to exercise their right. You know, Apple, for all their recent issues on -- on privacy, its opt-in tracking defaults, app tracking transparency has created a situation where ninety persix -- ninety-six percent of users opt-out of tracking across patterns.

But in terms of actual staff, I'll -- I'll leave it to Chris to -- to talk about kind of our ideas for the agency before coming back to -- to myself.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Thanks, Vinhcent. You know, we -- as -- as Vinhcent mentioned, in particularly, we -- we benchmarked what the Attorney General's doing as far as their public education and outreach function. And -- both as far as the level of staffing but also what functions they were performing. And so taking that information into account, the -- our recommendation would be to have dedicated staff to do this function, one to two peep -- one to two positions to provide the privacy education and outreach function; that would track with

the staffing level that the Attorney General's Office had.

2.0

2.3

This is something that was mentioned in the Regulation Subcommittee, so it -- it was almost foreshadowing our report, but the importance of accurately communicating what legal requirements are in plainly understandable language so that consumers and others can understand what their rights and obligations are, but in an accessible way that doesn't require a -- attorneys or legal expertise to interpret.

One of the things that was really critical to the -the way that the Attorney General's office executed this
was an interplay between the -- the privacy education and
outreach function and their enforcement in legal
operations to ensure that the outreach and education
function was not getting too far -- was not getting ahead
of or binding the enforcement and -- and legal teams.

So, you know, work that they were -- data that they were aggregating, reports that they were putting out, that there were not putting the enforcement folks in a position where they had given guidance to the public or to businesses that had the potential to conflict with enforcement actions down the road. And our understanding is that they did that quite successfully within the Attorney General's office.

There -- there's an observation that the media function was separated in the Attorney General's office, but the integration of the two functions is -- is needed because you know, broadcast and print media are going to be a vital way of getting information into the hands of the public, particularly consumers. So the integration and coordination of those two functions is going to be important.

2.3

And then understanding that the outreach and public education function understanding the goals of the executive team -- in -- in the Attorney General's operation, they had access to the executive team so there was kind of clear line of sight between what the goals were by the executive leadership so that that could be translated by the public education and outreach team into effective information sharing.

One last observation was that there is a -- there is a great desire by regulated entities who understand what is expected of them and how they reach compliance, how they achieve compliance, and so there is a desire to have best practice guides that could inform industry and other regulated entities in their -- in their compliance efforts because this is a relatively new area of regulation and not -- not a lot of case law to guide their compliance. So that was -- that was a piece of

feedback that came in quite a bit in addition to kind of best practice guides for consumers for what they can -how they can best protect their privacy.

And I think Vinhcent will touch on that a little bit later in the presentation, but those best practice guides for both consumers and business could be a vital piece of work out of this function.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you. Could I ask a clarifying question?

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Yes.

2.3

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. -- thank you both.

Two, actually, clarifying questions. The -- the first

one I think I understood, but I just want to be clear.

Mr. Thompson, when you were talking about functions being separated, media and -- you -- you were talking about public awareness on the one hand and guidance on the other; is that correct? I just want to make sure I have the right picture.

BOARD MEMBER LE: I -- I think actually, no. We were talking about how -- in the Attorney General, there was as separate media relations group --

CHAIRMAN URBAN: I see.

BOARD MEMBER LE: -- as opposed to the public education group. Attorney General -- well, privacy public education. Attorney General has a lot of

different responsibilities. Within our agency, we're only focusing on privacy, so it doesn't make sense to separate the two, so our privacy and outreach staff, we recommended two -- one to two full-time positions, ideally, two to -- to do that work. And they should also handle the -- the media relations, as opposed to separating those two functions.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: I understand. Because the communications department would be melded.

BOARD MEMBER LE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: I understand. Thank you very much. And then my second question was, have you explored to -have you sought advice or explored any -- apologies. Let
me just formulate this properly. What is appropriate to
offer in terms of guidance? Because my understanding is
that in California agencies can sort of restate the law,
and beyond that, we have to do regulations. And I could
be being too conservative in my description if you're not
quite understanding it. But my main question is just
whether you had embarked on doing any research into that
question.

BOARD MEMBER LE: I'm not sure I understand the question. So, like, what's the guidance versus, like, regulations?

CHAIRMAN URBAN: The difference between pure

description and interpretation.

it -- we -- we understand that the legal requirements

tech -- aren't very -- are a little impenetrable for lay

people. So for -- for consumers in particular, who don't

have access to legal teams, they -- they would kind of

need some plain English explanations, plain-language

explanations, I'm sorry, to kind of understand those

rights. So the guidance would be in -- in -- in many

ways interpretations of -- of the -- of the regulation.

And part of that was recommending that the legal teams work very closely with -- with this -- the privacy and education staff to make sure that we're not losing any of the substance so that we bind our enforcement teams when it comes to -- yeah when it comes to enforcing those regulations.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you. I apologize for interrupting your flow.

BOARD MEMBER LE: No worries.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Ms. de la Torre, did you have a point on this?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I'm not sure if -- if the presentation is -- is finished. I don't want to interrupt it.

BOARD MEMBER LE: No.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: I think Mr. Le had more to say.

Thank you, Ms. de la Torre.

BOARD MEMBER LE: Yeah. I mean, if we -- if you had -- this is our main recommendation is around these two full-time employment positions. I don't know if you had any questions on that. I'm happy to -- were happy to take them now if you'd like.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: That -- that makes a lot of sense. I -- I really appreciate the work that you have done. I have a comment, but it's not on that, so maybe, you know, finalize the presentation and -- and then I --

BOARD MEMBER LE: Okay.

2.3

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: -- I can raise it.

BOARD MEMBER LE: All right. So beyond that, some other observations that we made -- and -- and Chris already mentioned this -- is that you know, media relations is a primary way to amplify, you know, our -- our regulations, our best practices publications and guidances. So having that as part of the staff responsibilities is important. And we -- we noted that within the Attorney General, most resources go towards enforcement.

And as a result, materials may not be updated as much as standards evolve due to the fast-paced nature of

the privacy fields, so this is more a recommendation for the future ED is building a process in which when you -- when new regulations are issued, there is kind of a checkpoint where -- and -- and a database, perhaps, of -- of materials that need to be updated. So it's getting really in the weeds, but as a process and as a -- you know, yeah, as -- as a process within the organization, we think that makes a lot of sense.

And then beyond that, you know, we -- we found that partnerships and collaborations with diverse groups of partners such as you know, privacy organizations, IAPP, other industry associations, consumer groups, are great ways to get feedback and disseminate information.

I'll -- I'll highlight that Consumer Action and Consumer Federation of America are working on a privacy survey right now asking Californians if they know their privacy rights, whether they use them or not, and why that is the case.

So, you know, in a lot of ways those organizations are the force multiplier for getting education and outreach out there, so providing the materials for those organizations to use would be a really helpful way to -- just making it easier for them to take our message and carry it to their constituents.

The FTC is a good example of an agency that has --

has better outreach methods than we -- we've seen from perhaps, you know, other government agencies. So their staff write blogs to explain to businesses their responsibilities and potential enforcement. There's a -- they created a video and a one-stop page for consumer resources for consumer privacy. But we'll note that we do think that's a good minimum, but beyond that, we should also work on meeting people where they're at, right, for consumers in particular.

So that means working with other platforms. Maybe

I'm dating myself by saying this, but yeah, like going on

YouTube, going on TikTok, Instagram, and perhaps

outsourcing that to, you know, third parties that aren't

a government agency in some sense, at least exploring

that use of those alternative platforms to get the

message out to consumers around what their rights are.

And just as a bit of data, the FTC video from a few years ago explaining what folks' rights are has -- has about 6,000 views. And you look up internet privacy on TikTok that explain the same thing; they have -- the -- the very first result had 29,000 views; the other -- the other ways had one million views. It was in a succinct and a little bit more engaging, perhaps, than -- than government agencies are in -- in providing information.

So -- and that can also mean Twitter, podcasts.

Other ways to provide this information is something we should explore, whether that creates any conflicts and, you know, what is the process for us to perhaps outsource that kind of engagement while still having, you know, oversight to make sure the content is accurate.

2.0

2.3

And my final two points is that we need to -- and this is, again, for the ED -- is that we need to make sure there's solid communication between the Attorney General and the CPPA to make sure that there are parallel education efforts, you know, that not all the responsibilities are with us. We need to make sure that there's -- there's -- there isn't conflicts between what we're saying and what they're saying.

And then finally, this is around the informational hearings. As you may know, the Attorney General did a roadshow of sorts. They went to seven cities to get feedback from the public on the CCPA. And the feedback that we got was this was helpful from a public engagement standpoint, but there was actually very little public feedback during those hearings, right. The majority of the -- the actual comments were written and in response to -- yeah, the written request for comments, and folks didn't talk very much at those meetings.

The recommendation that we heard was to cut that back significantly and -- and maybe have one to two,

perhaps three at the most, knowing that most folks will be submitting comments in a written manner. And -- and if we do do informational hearings, I think it's really important that we make sure the public and other stakeholders on a good position to provide substantive feedback, right. So that's making sure that we're asking specific questions.

So as I mentioned earlier with the CPUC, when they do a scoping memo there's very specific questions that folks are -- are asked that will really help agency staff craft the regulations. So we need to really -- as in subcommittees and as we do these -- these hearings, we need to make sure we develop good questions for -- for public to comment on that provides us the material that we need to create the regulations.

And I believe that was it. I'm happy to take questions.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Wonderful. Thank you very much,
Mr. Thompson, Mr. Le. Your -- the clarity and substance
of your presentation did not suffer from the lack of
slides. So --

BOARD MEMBER LE: Thank you.

Ms. de la Torre?

2.3

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Actually, my main question was answered already, and it was around how we will coordinate our efforts with the Attorney General, given that we share enforcement responsibility with them. It is really important, I think, that they are also involved in anything that we do on the education side. was going to suggest, as well, in terms of the question that was raised by the Chair, which I don't have an answer for in my -- in my mind, but I know that a few years ago, when, you know, we all started using mobile telephones, the California AG put out a very good resource of privacy in the era of mobile, where they used the laws that were in place to interpret them in -- in the context of mobile. I think that could be a good reference as to the kinds of things that we might be able to do as an agency in compliance with the California requirements.

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

The other resource that they have put out is a data breach report. I think the last one is from 2016, and they are using, basically, a summary of all of their enforcement actions to derive some advice for organizations on how to put themselves in -- in a good situation to ensure that the information is secure. So those two resources, I think, are a good, kind of -- give us an idea of the kind of things that the agency, I think

we will be able to do in -- you know, remain in compliance with the California requirements.

BOARD MEMBER LE: Right. Yeah. I think to your first point around the AG and CCPA, communication, I think the -- the -- the feedback that we got is like this really has to happen on the staff level. Leadership has to make sure that these communication channels are open.

But us as a board have -- you know, we -- we can only do so much other than to say to ED, like, hey, create this communication channel between -- between these two -- these two agencies. And then to your point about, yeah, creating a resource like that, we believe that should definitely be part of the role of the -- those two full-time -- the staffers, right, is creating a one-stop shop where possible and then, yeah, just -- just a -- a resource center for other organizations to use as they, you know, popularize and -- and disseminate information to their constituents.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le.

Seeing no other hands at the moment, I would like to ask a question. In thinking about sort of traffic flow and traffic control for accomplishing some of these really good ideas, I was hoping that, if you are prepared to, the subcommittee could say a little bit more about these two staff positions, characteristics that you're

thinking of; could be in broad terms. I just have my mind on looking for classifications and wondering if you could flesh them out a little bit more.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Yeah, actually there was a specific role, and I wish -- I -- I had it, the specific role for -- at the AG that we could probably copy that classification for. I don't have it in front of me right now. But there -- there was one person. And then they had an assistant. So those were the two roles. And yeah, apologies. We never -- it never occurred to me to -- to actually grab that classification. But there was a specific one, and that, as far as we know, yeah, we could probably just copy that over as soon as I find that.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Wonderful. Thank you very much.

That -- that would be great. So I -- I -- I appreciate that.

Any other questions or comments from the board? Yes, Ms. Sierra.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: See if I'm -- great. No, this -- this -- great ideas, and I really love the fact of kind of thinking early on. I mean, the beauty of us being able to develop from scratch, even though it is a lot of work, is that we can put the system in, you know, as part of our infrastructure, and really so much agree

with the, you know, putting the folks that will be working on this outreach and communications to work either within our legal shop and/or, you know, working very collaboratively with our legal shop, I agree, is key, just to make sure, like, we are being, you know, as accurate as possible.

They can also -- if they're coordinating on that, they could coordinate with respect to -- for giving guidance. You know, what are the lines that we cannot cross in terms of, you know, is that a regulation versus guidance? You know, our legal shop will be able to help that team, those two or three folks that we're talking about, on those issues as well. So I just -- I really like the idea of starting from the beginning with that coordination in mind.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. Sierra.

To the subcommittee, are -- are there any things that you would like the board's sort of sense of or -- or anything like that or -- was it -- is this (indiscernible) update in?

Yes, Mr. Le.

BOARD MEMBER LE: Yeah. I -- I -- I believe, I think, in terms of prioritizing, it would be interesting to get the board's perspective on -- on the priority for this. You know, I think this may -- this could probably

wait until we get this -- these other hires first, to the extent of -- of you know, your resources and -- and putting out job postings and what -- and whatnot, but I'd love to get everyone's kind of input on, yeah, prioritization for -- for this -- this role.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le.

Ms. Sierra?

2.0

Oh, your hand was still up. All right. Wonderful. Thank you.

Thoughts on prioritization, Mr. Thompson.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Oh, sorry. I'm just going to add to that -- to echo what -- what Vinhcent said. You know, I think the work -- the -- this work can roll into the work that the process subcommittee is doing. So conveniently, I will come into that with some institutional memory of -- of this work. But I concur with him that, you know, I -- I don't think this changes the sequencing of our hiring plans, but it's something to factor in as -- as we're getting past the executive director and -- and general counsel and -- and chief deputy for administration hires, that looking forward to -- to kind of the next round of hires is -- is more appropriate.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Thompson.

Yes, that -- I was thinking the same thing, that

some of this informational hearing things can roll off
this is -- this is a pro forma reminder. I know that
you -- you don't need it, but just to say it, to be sure
to silo things under Bagley-Keene.

Ms. de la Torre?

2.0

2.3

MS. DE LA TORRE: Thank you. One thing that I was going to suggest -- and I -- and I don't know that I have clear feedback to give in terms of priorities, but given the fact that there's so much work to be done, if this subcommittee considers that the work of the subcommittee might be something that is more long term than short term, we might consider delegating additional things that are urgent just to best utilize the -- this resource, this subcommittee.

And I don't have a concrete idea of how that could be done. I know the Chair might have more, you know, (indiscernible) over everything that's going on, but perhaps if there is no -- time-wise if there is some time that the subcommittee can dedicate to help with things that need to be done in the next three to four months, we should consider best utilizing the -- the resource. I -- I know there's Bagley-Keene. There's a lot of considerations, but I just wanted to throw out there that we're stretched for resources and we should be wise on how we maximize.

what the board and subcommittee should do, at most, I would really like to (ph.) put out those postings. And we can discuss that at a later, like, what those — those — that posting should look like after I get that information, but I — I believe, you know, the ED, as we recommended that this position be — you know, have good line of sight to the legal team and the ED, though I do believe that they would be the one making that choice on who to hire. So we could maybe make it easier for them in the short term by maybe putting a posting out at most, and then beyond that I think that level of staffing should — should be held by, yeah, whoever — whoever runs the agency.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Ms. Sierra?

2.3

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Yeah. I -- I think that makes a lot of sense because, especially once we also have the general counsel, and we did identify -- we were on the same wavelength that this is an area that the general counsel will be -- or -- or the legal division will be involved in, and so I think they can take -- you know, we can provide all this feedback and thinking and ideas to them and kind of -- then they can kind of take the next step.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. Sierra.

Is there any public comment?

2.0

MR. PANERO: Yes. Thank you. So it looks like we have a couple of public comments in line. We have a first comment from Ray Kitty (ph.).

As a reminder for anyone else who'd like to make a public comment, you can press the raised hand icon in your meeting window or press *9 if you're connected by telephone.

So first comment from Ray Kitty.

You have three minutes.

MR. KITTY: Hello. Thank you. I wanted to just express -- I know these are very early days, but as an information resource for the public, you all could do something really amazing. You know, it occurred to me there's a resource -- I can't make up the name for this -- it's called Colossus, right. Companies have set this up and many companies buy into it.

It provides them data about torts and product liability lawsuits. It provides amazingly detailed case data, which is very hard to get for the members of the public. You know, it's theoretically accessible but hard to get. And so companies can come to a lawsuit and they can decide in this county, with this demographic, with this judge, with this kind of occurrence how will we win, how -- how can we avoid paying, how can we do -- you

know, be held as little -- non liable as possible? They had this access to a strategic resource.

2.3

As far as I know, no one is building that for the public. So I would just suggest -- you know, there's a continuum you all could publish the information that's legally required to be published about things that happened, or you could publish it, you know, everything you're legally entitled, you know, that it's legally possible for you to publish that's continuum.

And, you know, I would just encourage you to be as forthcoming with information about cases, what things have happened, who's sued who, who's had valid claims, how were things defended, how were things found to be wrong, how were mistakes corrected, and, you know, to put out any information which is public in any way, you know, including case data, any -- you know, public information. You know, you all can be putting that out too. So I just wanted you -- to encourage you to, you know, step up to that. And I'm really looking forward to seeing what you all do. Thanks. Bye.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you. I -- I did want to say, when I'm looking down and taking notes -- I know you can't see my notepad, but I wanted you to know that's where I'm looking. Thank you for you the comment.

MR. PANERO: Great. It looks like we have a comment

from Barry Weber (ph.).

2.0

Barry, you have three minutes to make your comment.

MR. WEBER: I'll be quicker than that. I've got three quick comments to separate. The first one is on the subject of resourcing for this awareness component.

I -- I think of it as two different kinds of components.

One's a public relations component. And the other one's a training/awareness component. And it's -- HR people or recruiters often talk about purple squirrels. It's tough to find purple squirrels. And you might want to have to consider how many people it really takes based upon actual skill set.

Specifically, on the education awareness space, you might want to consider going down the path or -- of gamification, so -- so there would actually be uptake of understanding. And that takes a different kind of skillset and thought process than PR, as an example.

The second comment has to do with the aware -- the general awareness. There's a lot of discussion about consumer awareness; there's discussion about business awareness. But theoretically, the -- your agency's going to come out with regulations for employees also, and that is, I think, a different audience than consumers and -- and -- and business. You might want to think through what that means from an awareness standpoint.

The third one is that I think that the six of you would make a great TikTok.

MR. PANERO: Thank you for your comment.

2.0

2.3

CHAIRMAN URBAN: We would have to do it in a public meeting. Thank you for your comment.

MR. PANERO: And it looks like we have a comment from Barb Lawler (ph.).

So you have three minutes to make your comment.

MS. LAWLER: Hello. My name is Barbara Lawler and I am the chief operating officer and senior strategist for the Information Accountability Foundation. And we're a forward-looking information policy think tank. I'm also a three-time former chief privacy officer. And I wanted to reinforce support for public hearings. I had the opportunity to provide feedback at one of them back in December of 2019.

And I think the challenge with public hearings is that they tend to be scheduled around what works for businesspeople to attend and not the actual public. And so I would encourage to use, where the statutes -- not just this one, but California law requires that public hearings could be held in a virtual manner just as these meetings are themselves.

And I think that will provide more opportunity for comment from a variety of individual citizens, consumer

groups who may not be able to make, for example, a potentially long drive and find parking to attend a public event. I also agree with everything Barry said in terms of a communication strategy, that it's consumerfocused, it's business-focused, and education is a different skill set that PR. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you very much.

2.3

MR. PANERO: I see no further public comments at this time.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: All right. Thank you very much for the comments from the public. I do want to do a time check. We have delegation of authority, public comments that are not on the agenda, media items, and circling back to our first agenda item. I propose we squeeze circle back and reopen our first agenda item now that we have some pretty solid information about resources and needs. And --

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Chairman --

CHAIRMAN URBAN: One -- so I propose that that's our next item, and we'll ask Ms. de -- recognize Ms. de la Torre.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you.

This goes to my comment -- my prior comment in terms of what else can the subcommittee do. It just occurred to me -- I just remember that one of the things that

(indiscernible) provides for is that the -- there's a percentage of the money derived from enforcement that has to be allocated to different initiatives that help locate (ph.) the -- the public et cetera.

I do not remember right now off the top of head what section that is. But maybe this will be a great subcommittee to start thinking about how that will look like once we have those resources, how should we, you know, create a process where different organizations, maybe different universities, different educational organizations, can request those funds and what are the priorities that we should have there.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. de la Torre. You -you're speaking about the grant-making authority of
the -- with the privacy public -- the privacy fund,
correct?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Yes. Thank you.

Mr. Le.

BOARD MEMBER LE: Yeah. I just wanted to quickly add the -- the rule at the California Attorney General was the Director of Privacy Education and Policy, if that helps you out in the finding -- I couldn't find the classification, but that would be the equivalent.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Director of Privacy Education and

Policy? Wonderful. Thank you very much.

2.0

2.3

BOARD MEMBER LE: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: I thank the subcommittee for this terrific work and for the clear presentation-sharing brain you are. At this point, I would like to move back to the first agenda item, which was the Chairperson's report, as a reminder, and recall that item for discussion of -- of resources and needs in terms of meetings and public events.

We now have a sense, I hope, after all the subcommittees' reports of plans that the subcommittees are reporting. And we have some information about resources and potential resources that we have. I'd like to remind the group that we have two board -- public board meetings scheduled after this one, currently in October and in November.

We have the option of scheduling additional meetings as long as we notice them ten days in advance. We do have some very difficult -- just simply they're there on staffing limitations, because each meeting requires counsel, Zoom webinar moderator, and those kinds of things. We've discussed a number of different interactions with the public over the course of the day so far.

And -- and I have -- and so I think we have the

information to try to work out what the -- what the sense (ph.) of board is and hopefully talk about options a little bit. I wanted to add one detail that I neglected to mention during the first agenda item. My apologies. And the last commentor, Ms. Lawler, reminded me of it with her good suggestion to -- to lean on virtual meetings.

2.0

There is an order -- there's an executive order that currently allows us to meet virtually and comply with Bagley-Keene. That order expires on September 30th. I don't have information about whether the order will be extended or whether the legislature might reform the current requirements for public meetings.

We had a previous commentor point out that their session is waning rapidly. But there are potentials for us to continue to be able to meet virtually while we have a quorum as long as we meet the other requirements.

There's also the potential that we can't. And I just wanted to be sure that everybody was aware of that so that we had full information as we engaged in this discussion.

And with that, what we have on the table, as I understand it, are at least a number of informational hearings or workshops. We've discussed a little bit how many those might be. Regular board meetings in which we

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

reports. We also are working hard, of course, to hire a number of people, some of whom require board approval. And we could include additional meetings to allow us to deliberate on that. They do have to be noticed.

take up topics from -- agenda topics and subcommittee

We welcome the public. We could spend most of the time in closed session for those meetings, however.

Ms. Sierra.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: I apologize. My hand should be down.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Oh, okay. Thank you, Ms. Sierra.

Other comment?

Yes, Ms. de la Torre.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Thank you. I -- I'm very concerned about the fact that in the last six months we have been able to meet only twice. And I do want to, first of all, acknowledge and appreciate the efforts that the Chair has made to get us to meet these two times. All of the work that is on her shoulders, the -- the limitation in terms of resources, but I do believe that even if we commit to meet monthly moving forward, we're going to put ourselves in a situation where we will not be able to meet deadlines.

I am of the opinion that we need to move to a situation where we can meet twice a month. I also would like to discuss how we can support the efforts that the Chair has been making to enable us to have the staff to hold a meeting. I'm not sure to what degree the leadership of the agency that houses us is aware of those constraints and really of the importance of us being able to meet.

2.0

We have a mandate from the California voters.

Millions of people voted to enact CPRA and to create this board. And we -- we have a commitment to them that we have to uphold. So two things. One is I -- I would like to have us agree to meet twice a month. I understand that we already have things in October and November that are set. I wouldn't want to distract (ph.) those. We already have secure staff for them.

But moving forward, I think it would be helpful for us to make a permanent commitment to say we are going to meet on the second and third Tuesday of the month, or whatever dates we decide, so that those can be just reserved for us in terms of our time, but also the public will be aware that we will be meeting.

I'm not -- I know that these meetings will have to be allocated to all of the different categories that the Chair just highlighted. It's not only public meetings; they can be informational meetings. There are some of those meetings that might have to be behind closed doors

so that we can conduct interviews. But again, my main concern is that on this we radically change the cadence of the meetings -- is not going to be possible for us to -- to deliver on our commitment.

2.3

In terms of providing support for the efforts of the Chair, I think that we -- we should be able to perhaps reach out to our appointing authorities and bring to their attention if we have difficulty securing the personnel that we need, that facts that they can perhaps provide support. That's just an idea. I am open to suggestions that other members might have.

But this is a really, really important thing. It is basic. It is basic for the Board to be able to function, that we need to meet. And I do not think that our prior commitment to meet monthly is going to be sufficient, given that we haven't met since -- we basically have skipped two meetings.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. de la Torre. If -if you don't mind, I'll paraphrase to be sure that I
understand. Your proposal is that the board commit to
meeting twice a month, starting -- starting soon. We
can -- we can -- we can talk about that.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: May -- maybe December, given that we have two months where we already have something that's scheduled and with the understanding

that, you know, if -- if there is a possibility to fit another meeting within to October/November frame where we -- we might want to try for that, but definitely starting in December.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you. That -- that's helpful.

And -- and this would be for the board to use for

meetings like this, closed session for hiring and

informational hearings. And if I'm -- what I'm working

at is I think that we may need more if we're going to do

some informational --

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Right.

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

I'd like to open it up for board comments.

Yes, Ms. Sierra.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Thank you. You know, part of me is not opposed to meeting more often. And I think, you know, there may be definitely things that we will need -- for example, closed sessions -- more often for hiring issues, but I'm just -- I am concerned that we have so much to do in our subcommittees that I want -- that I think, you know, there's a balance between the time being spent on our subcommittee work, which is going to be very substantive, you know, versus time spent in the board meeting, and I'd want -- you know, I'm a little

worried that if we're meeting too often -- they -- our board meetings won't be as productive as they may be if we space them out, you know, at least every four weeks so that each subcommittee will have more to report and have proposals for the board. I mean, I don't feel as strongly about not meeting, but I am concerned about -- you know, we have all limited time and would want to make sure we use it as productively as possible.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. Sierra.

I would clarify that I believe that Ms. de la

Torre's also encapsulated in there like public -- excuse

me, public informational hearings. Thank you for the

comment.

Additional comments?

Yes, Mr. Le.

2.3

Followed by Mr. Thompson.

BOARD MEMBER LE: Yeah. You know, I -- I think as long as we have enough to discuss in those -- in those meetings, I think our -- I wouldn't have an issue having, you know, more than one meeting. You know, scheduling's going to be tough. Thank you, Debbie, for doing all your work just to schedule, you know, those two in October and November. It wasn't -- it wasn't easy getting everyone's schedule to match. So, you know, with -- with that in mind, if there is something of substance, I would be okay

with meeting more. But to -- to add to Ms. Sierra's point, you know, I think a lot of the work's going to transition to this subcommittee, and perhaps that the better outlet.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le.

Mr. Thompson?

2.0

2.3

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: I would agree with -- with Vinhcent's comments that if -- if we have things to meet on, I'm happy to meet more frequently. I think we need to frontload our -- our level of effort, which I think is implied in what -- what Ms. de la Torre's comments are.

You know, we've all talked about the deadlines we're up against. I -- I'm -- I'm -- caution us against supplanting staff resources with our own time. And we're not the -- we're not meant to be the staff of the agency. We just are somewhat -- I think we -- we are taking over a little bit of those functions in -- because we don't have folks on board.

So whatever we can do to more quickly bring whatever resources we can onboard to do things faster, other than through our own efforts, I think, would be time extremely well spent. So how -- how we can do that, how I can contribute to that, how the rest of us can contribute to that -- I know that there's a lot of work that's been going on by the chairperson, by the staff that we have on

loan from agencies that are -- thank you for -- for doing
what -- what you're doing.

I meant to ask, you -- you'd sent -- you'd made mention of having sent a formal request to the Attorney General for staff resources. What form that -- that request took because I -- I do need to get more people of many different types as fast as we possibly can. And the best kind of people that we can probably get are the ones who've worked on this before. But if -- if it's not them, then I think we need to identify what our second and third preference types of resources are, because this -- we just don't have enough people, even with all of us.

And meeting twice frequently, I don't think, is going to make up for, you know, tens of people that we -- we ideally should have onboard --

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: All right.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: -- as soon as possible.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: All right. And I -- I just want to clarify that I -- I mean, if we do the math and we're thinking that we'd have to have a back traded (ph.) by May, we have seven meetings ahead if we continue to meet monthly. And I do not see the meetings as something that will subtract from the subcommittee work. I think it's something that will add to the subcommittee

work. Because one of the things that we really have to think about is how we can build consensus in terms of the two packages of rules that we will have to approve in an open meeting before we even put them out for comment.

2.0

So when you think about all those additional steps that apply to us because of Bagley-Keene, I believe that meeting more frequently, even if it's a meeting for three hours, where the subcommittees can bring up things that they are considering in terms of policy, which direction to go with any specifics of the rulemaking, and gathering the feedback from the other members so that when we come out with a version of the rules and we present it to the board for approval, we account for the different perspectives of all of the board members, I think that actually, that's going to put us in a much better -- in a much better position to accomplish the goals of the subcommittee.

I -- particularly, I'm thinking about my subcommittee, where everything is new; all of the rules have not been drafted. So I anticipate that as we are having that conversation as a subcommittee, we will benefit from input from the other members of the board, and the only process whereby we can get that input is an open meeting. So again, I appreciate the efforts that everybody has put in place. I am aware of the challenge.

I just -- I just believe that realistically if you count the months left, there is no path that is viable to us achieving what we're set out to achieve unless we switch to a calendar that allows us to meet twice a month.

2.0

And maybe we can have meetings that are shorter.

Instead of having a five-hour meeting or a nine-hour

meeting, we can have a three-, four-hour meeting that is

more concentrated that we can discuss things that are

more policy-oriented that might be on top of -- on top of

mind for the different subcommittees.

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

So my -- well, I'm -- I'm the Chair, and that this does make me slightly biased in favor of certainty in having a schedule. I also, however, have to acknowledge that preparing for a public meeting is, by itself, a lot of work. It does -- there is -- there is a competition there in the work that you're doing, so I think it's important to acknowledge that. I also want to be clear that I am willing to work as hard as I absolutely can to secure resources for as many meetings as we would like to have and as many meetings, of course, as we need.

And there have been some hard limits that are not tied to anybody not wanting to help us out or not working to -- to provide us what we need. So I just want to be clear about those things because I think that it's

important to be transparent about those things. With
that said, Ms. de la Torre, as I understand it, proposed,
I believe, Ms. de la Torre, that the board members
consider committing to some recurrent dates starting in
December.

2.3

I would not be able to commit the staff, but I do
think that we're on a path to -- to have more resources
over the next couple of months. So with -- I just -I -- you know, there's only so much that we can do, but I
believe that to be the case. And so I think what the
question is the sense of the board on changing our
recurrent meeting schedule and commitment starting in
December to two times a month.

And I believe, Ms. de la Torre, you were suggesting some concrete options, perhaps just in order to go ahead and --

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: -- supply those.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: My -- my original suggestion was to just -- since we are on a Tuesday, just to agree on the first and third Tuesday of the month with the understanding that we can change that in the meeting. So when we come back in October 18, if there is any reason why any particular, you know, first or third Tuesday is not viable, we -- we can discuss changing

that.

2.3

I do believe that that -- I believe to predict the schedule way in advance is also potentially going to be helpful in terms of enabling us to -- to secure the resources because we will have certain dates. I'm flexible if somebody wants to suggest something else. I just was trying to avoid a Monday or a Friday because those tend to be more -- they -- they tend to be more holidays on Mondays and Fridays, but I don't have any particular attachment to Tuesday other than today's Tuesday.

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

I -- I would need to check my calendar, but the -the thought of having a -- some sort of set expectations
that we can go to -- (phone ringing) -- I apologize -that we can go to staff with and maybe come back and
revise the dates (indiscernible) frequency if we need to
is -- I -- I generally support the idea.

I also hear what board members are saying. And I do realize that we have been asking you to do a lot. So I would like to go around the room and just have a final sense, and maybe we will have consensus on this item.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: One thing that I want to mention before we go around the room is there is much easier to cancel a meeting that has been put in the

schedule than to generate a new one. So, you know, the fact that we commit to two days doesn't necessarily mean that we cannot have a conversation in October about changing a date in December because it's close to Christmas. But I think it will be really helpful to just generate that expectation in advance, at least until the end of rulemaking.

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

Yes, and I want to check sort of Passover, right?

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Right.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: (Indiscernible), so forth. All right.

Mr. Le.

2.0

BOARD MEMBER LE: Yeah. I -- I think it's going to be tough first -- I mean, two things. We can -- we can figure out the date, but if -- if they're all-day meetings, that's going to be tough with other responsibilities. So if we knew they were only going to be, like, two or three hours --

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Right. That --

BOARD MEMBER LE: -- that -- that would be more appropriate and more possible, I think, from a logistical standpoint. And just to -- just to add to what Mr.

Thompson said is I think it's becoming clear that once we hire this ED, we probably should try to find a

1 legislative champion to -- to push back this deadline. Just it -- it doesn't feel right for, you know, the subcommittee to be, like, writing all of the rules kind 3 4 of from -- from based on our experiences, and -- and you 5 know, lot of -- lot of countries and a lot of states are -- are -- are looking at California for putting out 6 7 good rules for -- for this. And I would hate to rush 8 them, you know, un -- that in a way we don't have to and 9 just create more problems down the line. I'd rather get a good set of rules out earlier. So a little unrelated 10 11 to that, but just wanted to make that point.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le.

I think we are balancing a lot of things, so I do this it is relevant.

Mr. Thompson.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

25

Oh, I'm sorry. Ms. Sierra. I apologize if I'm going alphabetical order.

And Mr. Thompson, you and I -- next meeting, we're going to go backwards.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: I know (indiscernible) long time experience, I was at the end of the line.

Ms. Sierra.

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: You know, I do -- I -- I think the point Ms. de la Torre makes about consensus building

is a really good one. You know, and if we are meeting often, you know, I think that will help. I think, you know, it may be or about this -- bringing the point about talking about issues just in development. And I like this idea, though, again, in realistically maybe they're shorter meetings if we're meeting more often, you know. I still see there is like this tension between the different things we're doing.

You know, there is work that's just kind of -- you have to focus for preparing for a board meeting. But, you know, on balance, I'm supportive. I just -- you know, I -- I do think that focusing on the most important agenda items for each meeting will be key if we move forward in that way.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. Sierra.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: And I think we can trust the -- the Chair to deal with that, help us prioritize what goes into each meeting and -- and just agree to have shorter, more targeted meetings.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. de la Torre. I don't always have insight. But the other thing we can combine that with is what we've been doing today, which is subcommittees reporting back and recommending priorities.

-98-

Mr. Thompson.

2.0

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: It -- is the question our willingness to do more frequent meetings?

2.0

2.3

CHAIRMAN URBAN: I believe that the question is,
yes, willingness to do more frequent meetings. And
specifically, Ms. de la Torre has proposed that we commit
to two meetings -- events, at least -- starting in
December. And she had proposed as a -- as a -- a
strawman, I think, Tues -- she used the second -- the
first and third Tuesday --

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Correct.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Correct. Thank you. The first and third Tuesday. I reali -- I realize and do want to emphasize that I have to go back and figure out if that is possible, but it would give me something to work with.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Right. So whether or not it's the first and third Tuesdays of the month, I'm happy to do more frequent meetings. I agree with the comments that have been made that they should be shorter or more focused because, you know, multiple -- six-, seven-, eight-hour-a-day meet -- or per meeting -- meetings would seem -- is -- is a lot. I think there are multiple actions, and I'm sorry to repeat myself, that we have to take in order to accelerate. That's one. And I think, you know -- I think we need a dozen staff to fall out of the sky also. And how we can make that happen -- if I

was going to pick one thing, a dozen people up to speed falling out of the sky would be, I think, more urgent.

2.3

So whatever we can do to accelerate the staffing as well because there's only so much the five of us can do, plus, as you said, Chairperson, you know, prep for the meetings, burn staff — the limited staff resources we have on tasks that are not necessarily — well, they are — they are related to moving us forward towards — towards rules, so that would be an unfair characterization to say that they aren't, but that my — my number one priority would be accelerate the — the staffing. I'm happy to do more meetings.

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

My number one wish would be a fully formed team of twelve people falling out of the sky as well. And I hear and acknowledge and agree with your points that continuing to push in every direction to develop a good team is -- is a priority.

Can we, in principle, agree that I will take the second and -- excuse me, the first and third Tuesdays of each month, talk with staff, talk, perhaps with the Attorney General's office and figure out what we can do for resources? We're going to have to have meetings and hearings and everything in any case, and it would help me if I had something to shoot for with the recognition that

Ms. Castanon may be writing you if it turns out that 1 there's some unforeseen issue and ask about some other scheme, but with the goal of having a scheme if we can. 3 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I -- I support that. 4 5 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Okay. Thank you, Ms. de la Torre. 6 Let's just go around the room again. And then if we 7 are in support, then we can move on. 8 Mr. Le. 9 BOARD MEMBER LE: Yeah, that -- that works for me. 10 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you. 11 Ms. Sierra. 12 BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: I support that as well. 13 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you. 14 Mr. Thompson. 15 BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: Good with me. CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Thompson. 16 17 All right. I will do my best, and I appreciate 18 everybody, you know, making -- working to make things 19 work when -- when it is -- when it is a lot of time and 2.0 resources to ask. 21 Thank you very much, members of the board. I will 22 now re-close out agenda item number 1 and move to agenda 23 item number 7. We have three agenda items remaining and 24 a date with our closed session, so I do not want to limit

substantive discussion, but I do -- would like to people

25

to be aware of the deadline, and if I'm asking you to move along if you can, it is with that in mind.

2.0

2.3

Agenda item number 7 is a revisitation of the delegation of authority for limited administrative functions we discussed in the last meeting. This is the limited delegation that allows me to do things like sign contracts, and as Ms. de la Torre mentioned earlier in the meeting, approve hiring for the positions that are not carved out and that kind of thing.

It's based on section 1798.199.135 of the civil code from the CPRA, which says that agency board may delegate authority to the chairperson or executive director to act in the name of the agency between meetings of the agency with two very important exceptions: enforcement and rulemaking authority.

I will go ahead and bring the delegation that's been circulated up on the screen.

For members of the public, this is also on the website. The only change to the delegation is to change the -- the date. Please bear with me for one second.

I've shared a lot of documents today.

All right. With that, I will open this for board comment.

BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON: I've read it. I think it's good. I'm ready to move its adoption.

1 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Thompson. 2 Boy. Mr. Le and Ms. de la Torre happened at the 3 same time. 4 Ms. -- Mr. -- Mr. Le. 5 BOARD MEMBER LE: Oh, yeah, just -- I thought we 6 were going to make a motion, but yeah, I'm fine with 7 (indiscernible). Thank you, Mr. Le. 8 CHAIRMAN URBAN: 9 Ms. de la Torre? 10 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I am fine as well. Ι 11 will suggest that if we are meeting in the next month, we 12 need to consider how we going to transfer these 13 delegation to the executive director at -- at that point. 14 I also think that we might want to consider the idea of 15 delegating authority to a vice chair to support the work 16 that the chair is doing. We don't have time to discuss 17 that today. Perhaps that's something that we can discuss 18 in our next meeting. 19 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. de la Torre. 20 That is a -- it is a very important issue that I am 21 aware of and paying attention to. We will need to 22 transfer the authority cleanly to the executive director.

Ms. Sierra, did you have comment?

BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: No.

2.3

24

25

And the vice chair ideas is also noted. Thank you.

1	CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you.
2	Is there public comment from those in the audience?
3	MR. PANERO: As a reminder, if anyone would like to
4	make a public comment at this time, please press the
5	raised hand icon on your screen or press *9 if you're
6	connected by telephone.
7	I am not seeing any public comments on this item.
8	CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Joseph
9	Panero.
10	May I have a motion to approve the delegation of
11	authority as reviewed for this meeting, which starts from
12	this meeting to goes to the next meeting, with the carve-
13	outs that we decided upon last time?
14	BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: I will so move.
15	CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you.
16	BOARD MEMBER LE: I'll second.
17	CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Ms. Sierra.
18	Ms. Sierra moves.
19	Thank you, Mr. Le. Mr. Le seconds.
20	Mr. Joseph Panero, would you please call the roll
21	call vote?
22	MR. PANERO: Certainly.
23	Ms. de la Torre?
24	BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Aye.
25	MR. PANERO: Ms. de la Torre, Aye.

1 Mr. Le? 2 **BOARD MEMBER LE:** Aye. 3 MR. PANERO: Mr. Le, aye. Ms. Sierra? 4 5 BOARD MEMBER SIERRA: Aye. MR. PANERO: Ms. Sierra, aye. 6 7 Mr. Thompson? 8 **BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON:** Aye. 9 MR. PANERO: Mr. Thompson, aye. 10 And Chairperson Urban? 11 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Aye. 12 MR. PANERO: Chairperson Urban, aye. 13 The vote is 5-0. 14 Thank you, Mr. Joseph Panero. CHAIRMAN URBAN: 15 The motion carries. And we will operate under this 16 delegation of authority until the next meeting. We will 17 be sure to have a plan for clean transfer of delegation 18 authority to the executive director. And I will take under advisement the vice chair and the -- and -- and 19 2.0 consider and research that. 21 Thank you to the board for -- for carefully 22 considering efficiently working on -- it has been a long 23 day. I do apologize. I've been talking a lot. I will start over. 24

-105-

Thank you to the board for carefully considering and

25

efficiently disposing of this item.

We will now move onto agenda item number 8, public comments on items not on the agenda. This is an opportunity for public comment for any item, not those -- not just those that are on the agenda. Before we proceed with public comment, please note that the only action the board can take on these items is to listen to comments and consider whether it will discuss the topic at a future meeting.

No other action may be taken on the item at the meeting. Though this may seem at times like the board members are not being responsive, these guide -- following these guidelines is critical to ensure that the rules of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act are followed and to avoid compromising either the commenter's goals or the board's mission.

And with that, Mr. Joseph Panero, is there any public comment?

MR. PANERO: Thank you, Chairperson. So it looks like we have one comment initially.

As a reminder for anyone else who'd like to make a public comment on this item, please press the raised hand on your screen or press *9 if you're connected by telephone.

So our first comment is Ray Kitty. You have three -106-

2.0

2.3

minutes to make your comment.

2.3

MR. KITTY: Hello. I just wanted to sunshine my concern for privacy rights of the previously incarcerated people. I think this is something that deserves some attention. For an example, somebody who is in jail but not convicted of a crime, there is a lot of information out on public websites. I can point you to Sutter County Sheriff, Alpine County, every -- you know, all -- all these counties share a lot of information. Information scrapers scoop that up, and it's out there forever.

Plus when people -- when their crimes are expunged -- you know, we expunged all marijuana convictions and things like that -- what happens to the data that is now held by the data founders, they got it a year ago, two years ago, do they get rid of that data now that the crimes been expunged? I don't think they do. And so I just wanted to highlight that as an issue. Thank you. Cheers.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Mr. Joseph Panero, are there
further public comments?

MR. PANERO: There are no further public comments at this time.

Oh, sorry. A hand came up as I was saying that. We have comment from Barry Weber(ph.).

MR. WEBER: I actually have a -- a question that may -107-

require putting something on a future agenda. So as I understand it, the -- the employee exemption is due to expire on January 1st, 2023. And I would assume that if that occurs, then it's covered by one of the regulation subcommittees that's dealing with what already exists in CCPA. If that's not clear, or if the agency has the ability to, itself, extend employee exemptions -- it's not clear to me, and I'm just looking for either an understanding of that or possibly adding something to the next agenda.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Weber.

2.0

Mr. Phillips, is it proper to clarify where that is with the subcommittees?

MR. PHILLIPS: You -- you certainly -- if it's a simple question like that, you shouldn't really go into any detail or discussion about comments that are not on the agenda. If it's, like, a one subcommittee answer, I don't think that's a big deal. But -- but yes, be careful about discussing things not on the agenda.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Phillips.

This was an agenda-ized item earlier in the day. I would simply refer Mr. Weber to the presentation from the regulation subcommittee. If you go to the supplemental materials, you will see the subcommittee that issue rests with.

Mr. Joseph Panero, are there any additional public comments?

2.3

MR. PANERO: I am not seeing any at this moment, but I'll give just a couple more seconds.

I see no further public comments on this item.

CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Joseph Panero.

We now turn to agenda item number 13, discussion of future agenda items. This is an opportunity for board members to offer future agenda items, along with any information you have about prioritization and for -- for potential consideration in a future meeting. We have a list of items, I think, from our discussion today as well as some from June 14th meeting.

Obviously, hiring, interviews, and decisions by the board on the relevant positions, additional reports from subcommittees. We have the notice to the Attorney

General regarding our authority to do rulemaking as a holdover. Delegation of authority lasts only between meetings, and we will need to consider transfer to the executive director. The conflict of interest code that is currently out for public comments may need to be considered again with a vote or it may not. I will find that out. But that is also on the list.

And the other things that we discussed today,

informational hearings, engaging with the public. We also have the possibility of further information or presentations. As Mr. Thompson alluded to earlier, we can be trained all together if we publicly -- if we notice a public meeting.

We do have some items that I want to be sure I convey or have not gone unnoticed; we just haven't gotten to them today or yet. One is the question of whether California might apply for adequacy under the EU regime that Ms. de la Torre brought up next time. There's also -- there was a specific question about the communications policy.

We did end up -- at that -- we did end up at least clarifying that as long as board members do not -- make sure that they just -- that they just make clear that they are not speaking for the agency or the board, they are free to speak in public, but -- but Ms. de la Torre had some questions about some specific conferences. And that is -- that is what I have on my list initially.

Are there initial future agenda items from board members?

Mr. Le.

2.0

2.3

BOARD MEMBER LE: Yeah. Perhaps a presentation from -- from someone about kind of a little bit more detail on the legislative process or requesting an

1 extension of time, what steps do we have to take or the ED, hopefully by then, to get that. 3 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Le. 4 Further potential future agenda items from board 5 members? Thank you, board members. 6 7 Mr. Joseph Panero, is there public comment? MR. PANERO: I'm not seeing any at this moment. 8 9 As a reminder, if anyone would like to make a public 10 comment, please press the raised hand or press *9 on your 11 telephone. 12 I see no public comments on this item. 13 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Thank you, Mr. Joseph Panero. 14 We will now move to item 10 on our agenda for today, 15 which is a closed-session item. The board will now go 16 into closed session for the discussion of and possible 17 action on the appointment of an executive director. 18 Closed session is under the authority of Government Code 1126 subsection A, sub-subsection 1. We will return to 19 2.0 this public session briefly when we are finished with the 21 closed session today. We do hope to be done with the 22 closed session by about 5 o'clock. 2.3 When we return, we will come back into public

session but go directly into recess until 11 a.m. tomorrow morning, when we will continue in closed

24

25

session. I would like to express my deep gratitude to everyone on the board for all the work that you've been doing and the work today in this meeting. My gratitude to Mr. Joseph Panero; Ms. Debbie Castanon, who has been taking minutes and who's done so much to make this meeting happen; Mr. Chris Phillips for being our meeting counsel; Ms. Lila Mirrashidi, who's also done so much to make this meeting happen; and multiple staff at DCA, DGS, the board, and -- and other groups where -- for all of the help that they've given us so we can do this. And I would like to thank the public for its attention and valuable participation.

With that, we will recess.

2.0

2.3

Board members, we will return to go into public session. I propose that we go into public session and then do a quick discussion of the schedule there. I realize people may need a short break, and I -- I -- I suggest that we -- well, maybe we need to figure that out now. So I just realized we will be in closed session. So if people would like a short break, please let me know and we can take a short break and the board will reconvene in closed session at a certain time.

BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: I was just hoping to understand. Do we -- we log off and then we have to log in under a different link? Is that what's going to

1 happen? 2 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Yes. 3 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: And you will give the 4 time? 5 CHAIRMAN URBAN: That is correct. 6 BOARD MEMBER DE LA TORRE: Okay. 7 CHAIRMAN URBAN: I will be sure -- we will meet you 8 there at the link that we have for closed session. 9 BOARD MEMBER LE: That was my question. 10 CHAIRMAN URBAN: Okay. Wonderful. So we will leave 11 this meeting. It will remain open, but we will leave. 12 And we will reconvene after closed session link. I will 13 make an executive decision that we will reconvene at 14 2:50. And I thank you all for your continued efforts and 15 energy. And thanks to the public. We will see you again 16 later. 17 BOARD MEMBER LE: Thanks. 18 (End of recording) 19 20 21 22 23 24

-113-

25

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

This is to certify that I transcribed the foregoing pages 1 to 113 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.

lynthia R. Fieth

Cynthia Piett

eScribers, LLC

--000--