STATE OF CALIFORNIA CALIFORNIA STATE AUDITOR'S OFFICE (CSA)

In the matter of:

2020 CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION (CRC) Applicant Review Panel (ARP) Public Meeting

621 Capitol Mall, 10th Floor Sacramento, California 95814

THURSDAY, MARCH 26, 2020 9:00 A.M.

Reported by:

Peter Petty

APPEARANCES

Members Present

Ben Belnap, Chair

Ryan Coe, Vice Chair

Angela Dickison, Panel Member

Staff Present

Christopher Dawson, Panel Counsel

Shauna Pellman, Auditor Specialist II

Applicants

Debran Jones Reed

Raymond Tong

Antonio Le Mons

Genevieve Murphy

INDEX

PAGE

Debran Jones Reed 4

Raymond Tong 58

Recess 109

Antonio Le Mons 110

Genevieve Murphy 160

Recess 224

PROCEEDINGS

2 8:59 a.m.

CHAIR BELNAP: It being 8:59, we'll call this meeting to order.

5 Mr. Coe, Ms. Dickison, are you guys here?

PANEL MEMBER COE: I'm here, Ben -- Mr.

7 Belnap.

1

6

12

16

21

8 CHAIR BELNAP: Ms. Dickison?

9 PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: I am here, Mr.

10 Belnap.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. And we also have our

Applicant, Debran Jones Reed. Are you here?

MS. REED: I am here.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Great. So all the

15 standard reminders, silence cell phones. And use

the restroom if you're here in person. We don't

17 have anyone here in person. With an emergency,

18 follow a CSA staff member.

19 So with that, we're going to ask Mr.

20 Dawson to give the five standard questions.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Reed, I'm going to ask you five

23 standard questions that the Panel has requested

24 that each applicant respond to. Are you ready,

25 ma'am?

MS. REED: I am ready.

MR. DAWSON: First question: What skills and attributes should all Commissioners possess? What skills or competencies should the Commission possess collectively? Of the skills, attributes and competencies that each Commissioner should possess, which do you possess? In summary, how will you contribute to the success of the Commission?

MS. REED: Well, I believe that as a Commissioner, of course, I should be -- have the ability to analyze data.

I also think that a Commissioner should be a good judge of character.

A good Commissioner should have patience and the ability to talk through challenges, so that solutions can be arrived at amicably, and able to understand other's point of view. I believe I'm a flexible person and I know that there's always a way to get things to work if people, you know, just communicate. I think, as a body, as a team, each individual Commissioner should have those qualities.

But I -- one of the most important qualities, I believe, is commitment. If you're

going to be successful on a project or whatever it is that you're doing, you have to commitment or it will not work, it will not be successful, I should say. Commitment is so important.

But, also, you know, the ability to stay in contact with one another, to regularly discuss the issues that are being worked on.

But I do believe that there's always a way to get a goal achieved.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Question two: Work on the Commission requires members of different political backgrounds to work together. Since the 2010 Commission was selected and formed, the American political conversation has become increasingly polarized, whether in the press, on social media, and even in our own families.

What characteristics do you possess and what characteristics should your fellow Commissioners possess that will protect against hyper-partisanship? What will you do to ensure that the work of the Commission is not seen as polarized or hyper-partisan and avoid perceptions of political bias and conflict?

MS. REED: First of all, there is a lot of

partisanship today. I mean, we have, actually, a toxic environment. And that's actually one of the reasons why I decided I would like to serve and give my time and efforts on the Commission. I know we can do and be so much better than what we have today.

One of the ways that I think -- or several ways, actually, is to really stay away from the news today. I don't really think it's news.

There's a lot of talking heads, people putting their opinions out there. And, you know, you're either left or right. And people have forgotten the fact that we are a -- we're one country, we're one state, and that we have to have our best interests at heart as a people.

I think the best way for an individual member to stay impartial and not be seen as partisan is to really avoid political discussions, as I said before, avoid partisan news, and even just stay away from the appearance of being impartial.

It's also good to stay away from politicians, not be seen with politicians, and just to be forthright but, really, always to remember to be impartial. That is very, very important.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Question three: What is the greatest problem the Commission could encounter and what actions would you take to avoid or respond to this problem?

MS. REED: What we just discussed, I believe.

One of the worst things, really, that could happen with the Commission is to be seen as partisan or for its members to be seen as partisan. We have to avoid taking a political stance.

I think one of the reasons we have the Commission is because there was so much partisanship, which resulted in gerrymandering in the state of California.

And development of the Commission was one of the best things that we could have done. Having citizens choose lines is for the public interest, for the public good, I believe.

And so it is important for Commissioners to avoid any sense, any appearance of partisanship. But if that should happen, I think that the best way to correct that would just to be truthful, point out the failure that was done, and then have solutions, the actions that you would take to

correct that appearance and stick to them and be transparent.

MR. DAWSON: Question four: If you are selected you will be one of 14 members of the Commission which is charged with working together to create maps of the new districts.

Please describe a situation where you had to work collaboratively with others on a project to achieve a common goal? Tell us the goal of the project, what your role in the group was, and how the group worked through any conflicts that arose? What lessons would you take from this group experience to the Commission, if selected?

MS. REED: Well, I have an interesting one there.

I was part of a team that was putting on a conference. We were putting on a singles' conference. The reason we were putting it on was because we wanted to develop a larger team. There were three of us but we really needed for there at least to be five to seven of us.

And so we had a conference and we came together, all of us, to put our ideas together, just kind of have a, you know -- I forget what you call it -- but everybody sit around, offer their

ideas. And we would list them and put them all together and see, you know, what the best ones were and how to achieve our goal of increasing the team. And it worked well, we put everyone's ideas out, but we had to narrow them down and we had to decide which ones were going to be the most productive and help us to develop the team that we needed, and for each one to have a different, you know, a different specialty on the team that they could manage and be in charge of for the greater team.

There were some ideas that didn't make it and a couple of people got a little pushed out of shape. And so we sat down. I sat down. I decided myself that we needed to sit down and just talk it out, and so we did. And the way I did that was just to ask each one, what did they think were going to be the best ideas to get our team rolling so that we could increase the group as a whole. And we just did it by process of elimination. And there were still some -- a couple of people that weren't satisfied.

But what I had done was developed an event, a project agenda timeline. It was a package and it had everything on it from beginning to end.

And I gave it to everyone and it kind of gave them

an idea of what was really needed and which things that we could really eliminate, so it was more -- doing it that way was -- wound up being better than, you know, trying to make everyone satisfied by discussion because there was one person that just was not going to be moved.

But after she went through the package that I had developed, she saw, really, what was needed and what was not and she was, you know, she was okay with giving up a couple of ideas that she thought was important to the team, so it worked out. It worked out.

There was another group I was involved in more recently, and that was finding someone for our office who would handle agency issues. And in that, there were -- there are three of us on the team but I was going to be the, quote, "decider," unquote. And it was a very -- it was a similar situation. But there was one person that was really, you know, really bent on one of the interviewees. And I just saw something in the character that I thought would not work. They actually wound up hiring the person and they lasted about two months.

And so the next time around, you know,

when I -- I was asked to be the decider on that and it worked out. We got a person to fill that spot and she's been great. She's been terrific.

So that sort of helped me going forward because I'm going to be on another team soon to choose two persons to be regulatory managers, so looking forward to that.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Question five: A considerable amount of the Commission's work will involve meeting with people from all over California who come from very different backgrounds and a wide variety of perspectives.

If you were selected as a Commissioner, what skills and attributes will make you effective at interacting with people from different backgrounds and who have a variety of perspectives? What experiences have you had that will help you be effective at understanding and appreciating people and communities of different backgrounds and who have a variety of perspectives?

MS. REED: Well, first of all, being a person of color myself is already an advantage with that.

But as I had pointed out in my

application, I come from a family that I would call Rainbow Coalition. We have Native American, Asian, Hawaiian in our family, so we're kind of a little melting pot ourselves. It's very enjoyable when we all come together because everybody has something to contribute. And we can always learn something different, something new, languages, even foods.

So, for me, there is -- it's very beneficial. It's enjoyable to talk to people of different backgrounds, of different ethnicities, and from different places all over the world.

I think the skills that I do bring, is

I've been told, that I have a manner that helps

people to feel at ease, help people to feel

comfortable, and so I use that to my advantage and

to the advantage of, you know, everyone involved.

Yeah, it's -- it's been a real benefit to me to be able to interact with people of all different cultures, ethnicities and languages. I find it to be enjoyable.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

At this point, we will go to Panel questions. Each of the Panel members will have 20 minutes to ask his or her questions. And then we will -- we will now begin with the Chair.

Mr. Belnap?

CHAIR BELNAP: Good morning, Ms. Reed.

MS. REED: Good morning.

CHAIR BELNAP: So I want to follow up on a few of your answers this morning before I get to the application.

I noticed, one of the things that I highlighted from your answer to question one, is that a Commissioner should be a good judge of character. And then in question four, you talk about an experience where you saw something in somebody's character that you otherwise would not have hired the person if not that other folks wanted to hire them.

So what was it that you saw in their character and how did you recognize this trait to be a problem?

MS. REED: I saw arrogance. When I noticed, in a couple of questions that this person was asked, they just said, "Oh, you know, oh, that's not a problem, I can handle that," instead of explaining to us.

We asked the question in such a way, like, "How would you go about, you know, doing this? Can you give us a couple of points?" And it was, you

know, it was the attitude. It was the attitude, just kind of shoving off the question, and it happened more than once. And we needed --

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay.

MS. REED: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

CHAIR BELNAP: Thank you. I understand.

So as a legislative analyst for the San Diego Gas and Electric, do you ever have to work with politicians and/or their staff?

MS. REED: Not politicians directly, usually just staff, because it's -- I'm communicating with them, like our position on certain bills, and also getting -- asking for information as far as if a bill is going to be amended and if there's language available, you know, those types of things. And if we have amendments, I will share those.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. So in question two, I understood the context of your statement but I think we should clarify.

When you said that a person should stay away from politicians and not be seen with them, you were saying that as a Commissioner, you would stay away from politicians and not be seen with them; is that correct?

MS. REED: Yes, sir.

2 CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

MS. REED: Um-hmm.

CHAIR BELNAP: Now that principle, that we -- that a Commissioner should stay away from politicians and not be seen with them, that wouldn't be in conflict with your current role at San Diego Gas and Electric?

MS. REED: No, it would not.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. All right. Thank

So moving on to the application, so over three decades you've worked at San Diego Gas and Electric as a legislative analyst.

How does a legislative analyst have to exercise impartiality?

MS. REED: Well, number one, you are going to partial because you're looking out, as a company goes, you're looking out for your customers, number one, so what's good for your customers is good public policy that's going to be good for the customer and for the company.

Impartiality comes in, actually, when you're just trying to identify legislation, because there's really not a lot of, you know, not a lot of

situations where you're going to come into a situation where, oh, you know, really got to practice impartiality.

Impartiality is just treating everyone fairly and equitably and not showing favor, in my position, not showing favor to anyone.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

In that same capacity, how often do you need to perform some sort of data analysis?

MS. REED: Well, that's regularly. When you're looking at a bill, especially if you're looking at a mandate that would say, for instance, you have to purchase so many megawatts of this type of power or whatever, you have to actually sit down and, you know, work with other staff in the company and find out the impact that that is going to make. So you have to do the analysis as far as, okay, this is what we're doing now, this is what we have to do, and then find out, okay, what are we going to have to invest or change to make this happen? Because, of course, that's going to determine our position on a piece of legislation, so I wind up having to do that frequently.

And then we'll get asked, for instance, how many customers do you have on this program or

that program? And most of the time, now, we'll have the data. But sometimes it will be where I'll get data but it might be raw data and then I'll have to either combine it and, you know, put it out on a spreadsheet to see what it looks like.

CHAIR BELNAP: And in your current role, how often do you have to prepare or work with maps?

MS. REED: Let's see, on a time -- on a timeframe, probably about ten percent. Because, for me, maps are showing critical infrastructure.

And then, actually, I do have to look at our redistricting maps when it comes -- you know, when elections, when it comes election time, to look at the statistics, you know, and how certain districts -- the demographics of certain districts

CHAIR BELNAP: Thank you. Similar question.

MS. REED: -- trying to -- okay.

CHAIR BELNAP: Similar question.

MS. REED: Um-hmm.

CHAIR BELNAP: How often do you have to write or oversee the writing of reports that you compile that has various datasets in them?

MS. REED: Oh, I do that once a year. I

do monthly reports. But for each year, I have to do a legislative. I call it our report card or our yearbook, our legislative yearbook. And I have to provide a short analysis of every bill that we have actively advocated on. And, you know, depending on what the bill does, I have to provide analysis as far as what -- how it would impact the company, whether it be adverse or whether it be favorable, and so -- and I have to do that. It usually, on average, it's for about 60 or so bills each year after the session, legislative session, is over.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

MS. REED: Um-hmm.

CHAIR BELNAP: So I want to talk about appreciation for diversity. And I'd like you to provide an example of a work or a volunteer experience or project that demonstrates that you can work with people of different backgrounds to accomplish a positive outcome.

MS. REED: Okay. Well, on a regular basis, about once a month, I work with a group where we go out and we tend to the homeless. There are all different types of people out there.

There's families -- I've met them -- families, single persons, veterans, you name it, attorneys,

you know, that have just fallen on hard times. And our group is very diverse. There's men, women, you know, there's different races of people, but we all work together. And we'll gather food, clothing, and coats, you know, depending on the season, and we work together to do that.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

MS. REED: Um-hmm.

CHAIR BELNAP: Is that a particular organization that you're working with?

MS. REED: Oh, it is. Yes, it is. It is our church, which is Word of the Kingdom, but we'll also partner with others periodically and work together so that we can cover, you know, wider areas where people are in need.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you. I have no further questions.

I believe that Mr. Coe is up next.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good morning, Mr. Debran Reed. Can you

21 hear me okay?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

MS. REED: Good morning. Yes, I can.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Great. Thank you.

I wanted to continue the conversation Mr.

25 Belnap started about the impartiality essay that

you provided. And he already kind of touched on some of my questions but I wanted to ask if you could provide maybe a specific example of a time where you had two make a difficult impartial decision that involved maybe setting aside your preference or self-interest?

MS. REED: Yes, I can. It's one that sticks with me all the time.

My husband and I, we do premarital counseling, or coaching, actually, and -- but we'll also help couples that are having problems. And we had a situation where a very, very dear friend of mine was having marital problems with her husband. And they were, actually, newlyweds. And this was a really close friend of mine.

But when sat down and talked to them, I did -- I was able to pick up on the fact that a lot of their problems originated with her and things she would do and, you know, personality issues and things like that. But it was hard. I had to sit down and talk with her and share the things that she was doing to really sabotage the relationship. And she was not in agreement with that at all, to put it mildly, but I had to -- we had to bring them together and I had to really point out those

things. And, of course, you know, she thought I wasn't being a good friend.

But we, in that particular situation, it's not about the friendship, it's about them -- helping them get to the bottom of their problems and, you know, being successful and finding solutions that are going to help them to be honest and upright with each other but, yet and still, tolerate, you know, their different personality quirks or just things that -- their feelings, you know? It doesn't have to be a feeling but when you're with someone, you don't like something that they do, that's a feeling to you.

But anyway, it was a very emotional situation. It took a lot of time. She began to see what she was doing to sabotage that relationship. And -- but it took a while for her to -- we had to meet frequently for her to understand, to see if clearly and know that, you know, she needed to do something to change the situation, change her behavior. And, eventually, it did happen. But it did change our relationship. But it was important. The most important thing was their marriage and helping them to find ways to get through it because you can get through it.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

In your -- I'd like to switch to appreciation for diversity topic. And in your essay on that topic and in some of your responses to Mr. Belnap's questions earlier, you talked about having worked with or provided assistance to widely diverse groups of people

And I'm wondering what you most learned from those diverse groups of people that would make you an effective representative for them on this Commission?

MS. REED: Well, I took the time out because I don't -- I like to talk about things. I like to learn things that I don't know. And so I just, when I approach a person, I, you know, I take the time out to ask them, what's on with them, you know, what's happening in their life. I just like to get to know a person and I think people appreciate that. And I always learn something new and start something.

So what I've really benefitted from is actually learning new things and helping people feel comfortable in, you know, in talking and opening up. A lot of times, people, they just don't see themselves as either meaningful or, you

know, worth the time and effort. I see that a lot nowadays. But just, you know, sitting down and asking questions, and I've learned so much, so much from that. So it's, you know, it's been really beneficial. You learn a lot. You learn a lot about culture and you just learn an awful lot about people in general.

PANEL MEMBER COE: And how do you think that that will help you specifically on the work of this Commission?

MS. REED: I think just the experience itself in dealing with different types of people.

Also, just the fact that I think that we can get through whatever challenges that there are. I think it's all about, really, communication. I think it's about being fair. I think it's about listening to people and really, really listening to people, not talking at people but waiting to, you know, say what you want to say, but I think it's listening.

And I think people can sit down -- I could see a situation like this, like in a meeting where, because you're grouping people, where people may not want to be in a certain group or, I don't know, in a certain area or with a certain sector. But I

think if you sit down and you talk things out, that you can come to agreement that, whatever the goal, it's going to be achieved. Yeah, just talking, communicating, taking the time and, you know, being committed to solving disagreement.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay. Thank you. I have a similar question but in the vein of geographic diversity.

So I'd like you to just tell us a little bit about your experiences in various regions of the state and what you maybe have learned from the people that live in different parts of the state that would make you an effective representative for them on this Commission?

MS. REED: Well, I have been to many parts of the state and I've seen a lot of disadvantaged people in disadvantaged areas, whether it's environmental or whether it's just, you know, economic. I've seen a lot, just because of what I do and the people that I'm involved with, being involved with the ministry and all.

And so I see people in a lot of different situations. And you come to understand people.

You come to understand people that feel like they're caught up, you know, in a certain area,

certain neighborhood, certain just circumstances, situations. And you do, you come to understand it, but you can also help people to see their way out of something. If you can show something, how they can make something, how they can speak up, or how they can just study something, that they can make a change. They can come together. They can, you know, group together and they can make change.

I have been in situations like that. I've talked to people about that. I have talked to people about how to make a bill become law, how to, you know, come together as a group, how to get their facts there together, how to meet with their representatives and to articulate their problem, their issues. Because a lot of times, people don't understand how simple it is, it's just, it's a grassroots thing. And when they find out, they're encouraged, they become more and more encouraged, you know, groups that are successful, and they get it. They get it.

And that is very, very rewarding to be able to help people do that, just by explaining to them how a bill becomes law.

I've also been involved in speaking to people about how to prepare a living trust and, you

know, how simple it is to get it done. And I used to actually do that. I'll do it sometimes now for family members. But when people realize, it's just a matter of steps, taking steps to get something done, and they're so encouraged and that motivates them.

And so that's where I think I can be helpful because talking to people, asking them questions, finding out what their needs are, finding out, you know, what their desires are, what they want to see happen, and then helping them get there, that's how I think I can be helpful. I've done that a lot.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you. One other question on your essay on appreciation for diversity.

In that essay, you referred to a Public

Policy Institute of California report on which

voters state that, "Voters and non-voters reflect a

growing economic divide."

MS. REED: Um-hmm.

PANEL MEMBER COE: "Voters most likely to identify themselves as the haves in society and non-voters are likely to identify as the havenots."

Why do you think that is?

MS. REED: I think that is because of the way our society is set up. But a lot of the people that don't consider themselves a part of the process, I think that a lot of it is just cultural. And a lot of it is just plain discouragement and then they become -- they just dis-attach themselves. They see things happen that they are strongly against. And they see things happen that makes them feel like they're victimized or their group of people, their demographic, their district, their neighborhoods, you know, their cities, they feel like they can't really impact what's going to happen. They feel like everything is already set up.

But I think it's important that we talk to them, that we get them interested, that we get them involved. And the only way to do that is to talk, you know, to talk to people, to bring them together through whatever ways, social media, through email, through groups, like public groups, like church, other public groups, you know, that meet together. However you can get people together, I really think, and educate them. Because it's just a matter of public education, really, and showing

people that this can work. Give them examples of things that have worked and getting them motivated to see, it's just a matter of acting and not, you know, just not participating, but to be active, that it takes time but that it can be done.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Do you think that the Citizens Redistricting Commission can help with this trend? And, if you do, why do you think that?

MS. REED: I do. I think the Commission can help with public education. You know, that would be something that the Commission would sit down, talk about, and develop a plan. But I think there does need to be public education. I think the Commission can help with that after sitting down and developing ideas, coming up with ideas to, you know, communicate with the public and increasing voter participation. I think it would have to be very, very careful to point it out in a very -- make sure that it's totally nonpartisan. It's not about parties, you know, it's not about political parties but it's about you becoming involved in your gov.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay. Thank you.

Can I get a time check please?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. Have 5 minutes, 38

seconds.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

Ms. Jones Reed, one of the biggest jobs the Commission is going to have is to identify communities of interest throughout the state. Some of those communities are easier to identify than others.

How would you have the Commission go about identifying communities of the state, paying particular attention to avoiding overlooking potentially harder to find communities throughout the state?

MS. REED: That would take a lot of time.

First, I would start, though, with maps, sitting down with maps and determining, first of all, assessing, evaluating how things have worked and what it looks like from the last ten years and how things are changing, how -- look at how communities, how different areas are changing, how the populations are changing, looking at where people are moving to and moving from. And, of course, meeting with the people in those areas.

But looking at a map first. I think, first, you have to evaluate after looking at all of those -- all of that data. But looking at maps

and, you know, looking at what seems logical and what does not. And planning it, really, you know, sort of holistically but looking at things in a logical way, in a logical order. I know that's a tall -- I know that's a tall order but things have changed over the last ten years compared to how the maps were drawn ten years ago.

And so I think it's something that it really does have to be recreated using what we have now. And we do have to cover lots of areas of the state because of how the population has changed and move around, especially resulting from wildfires, you know, disasters, also, things like that. That's moved a lot of the people around to different areas than they were ten years ago.

PANEL MEMBER COE: So some communities are less engaged and less comfortable coming forward and sharing their opinions or their perspectives organizations, like the Commission or a governmental organization.

How would you reach out to these communities and make them feel comfortable to share their perspectives and their thoughts and their concerns and their needs with the Commission's help and inform the Commission's work?

MS. REED: Well, first of all, especially where diverse communities are concerned, you've got to do your homework. You need find something out, something about the community. You need to find out, you know, who's influential in a community. And I would hope that the Commission itself, this new Commission, is going to be equitably diverse which would, you know, aid in reaching different communities. Because a lot of times, it shouldn't be but it is, that certain ethnic groups identify easier or feel more comfortable around those with the same ethnicity. So I would hope that the Commission would be diverse.

But in any event, whatever the content is of the Commission, before you approach a community, you do need to find out what's important to them. And you do, you need to find out who is influential in a community? And you need of find out what makes that community tick, what makes it work, you know, what's the -- what sector, business sectors are there? What type of sense of community do the people have? And, you know, after learning that, it would put you in a better position, in a position to where you could go in and you could be relevant to them.

MS. PELLMAN: We have one minute left.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you. In the interest of time, I don't want to go over, I will yield my time to the next question asker, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Coe. We'll now turn the time over to Ms.

8 Dickison.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Good morning.

MS. REED: Good morning.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: So my colleagues have asked many of my questions.

I wanted to ask, though, in the work you've done looking at legislation, have you ever had to do any work or analysis looking at how a piece of legislation would actually impact different areas of the state?

MS. REED: Actually, yes, and that involved what is called the CARE Program. And it's -- it impact rates because if you live in an inland area, during the summer, your rates are going to be higher. If you live near the coast, your rates are going to be lower. So it's important to try and work at getting equity, you know, for the different areas because it impacts them differently. Then

you have some areas that are pretty balanced as far as weather, you know, not too hot, not too cold.

But we do -- I've had to put together spreadsheets about -- to see, you know, the number of customers that are impacted in certain areas. And it has been the case that there's been a lot more customers in the inland areas that get a lot warmer that are impacted and that wind up paying, you know, or having much higher energy bills than those who live on the coast.

And that, yeah, that's -- I've had to do a lot of that over the years because there's been quite a bit of legislation over the years about, you know, bringing relief and brining equity.

Because there are certain programs, energy programs, where people are penalized for using lots of energy in certain seasons or more than a certain amount of energy than, you know, others, and they get dinged for using me. We have all these projects we're -- because, as you know, we're trying to conserve energy and we're trying to reduce emissions. And so there are certain rates that I would call penalizing.

And so I get involved in just determining, you know, the number of customers in our area who

would be impacted and, you know, trying to figure out things that we can do to alleviate the situation.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Okay. How do you -- do you think that the work that's done in that area would help you identify some of the differences between communities geographically and maybe some of how their needs may differ?

MS. REED: I do because each area is different. You'll have some areas where there may be, for instance, a huge factory or something and most of the people are employed in that area. And then you may have another area that's just really disadvantaged and they don't have a lot of industry or they are -- culturally, there are people that are low skilled and they need, you know, they need help in building skills.

And so, yes, I do because each situation is different, some are similar, but each situation is different. And the people that are impacted, a lot of their thought process is different. So, yes.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: So based on those differences, do you think there's certain things that may influence somebody's preference for the

type of representation they're looking for?

MS. REED: I do. I think there are some people that would like a representative, let's say, that's focused on a certain industry or, you know, one that is prevalent in a particular district or focused on, let's say, renewable energy. It depends on the demographic but, yes, I think people want representatives that are going to look out for what they are interested in. And I know that there can be challenges. I know that there can be different interest groups all in one area. But I do believe -- I know people want someone that's going to look out for their interests.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: So you talked a little bit earlier about -- that you would look at the maps and see what, you know, what they looked ten years ago and trying to dig into it and taking into account the changes and things going forward.

One of the concerns that has arisen is that California may lose a congressional district. How would you take that into account as you were looking at the maps and redrawing those maps?

MS. REED: Well, one thing that would be important is having census data to evaluate and look at that. Though, in California, even the way

1 the state is shaped and the different areas of the 2 state, it's hard to account for everyone, 3 especially since we're on the border of Mexico. 4 It's hard for us to account for everyone. 5 are going to be people that really don't want to be accounted for. But it's important that we, you 6 7 know, count everyone, get as many counted as 8 humanly possible because it is important. I think 9 that California is growing. I understand that 10 there are a lot of people leaving because it's so -11 - it's becoming more and more expensive to live 12 here.

But it's important that we get the numbers, that we get the numbers as closely as we can because I don't see, realistically, where it is, or if it's just in the census numbers, where it is we would lose a representative. I would really have to see numbers. But it's really, really important that we count everyone because that's who we're going to get, you know, to the bottom of whether we lose a representative or not.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

You also talked about looking at what seems logical and what does not.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

So in thinking about that, would a

district that has a very strange shape alarm you in any way?

MS. REED: I would have to see what district it is. But on a general -- in a general sense, that would, the -- it would be concerning. I would have to see how it's shaped. And I would also have to see what it consists of, what's in it, the population, and the business or industry in the area. So it, you know, it would depend on the specific district.

But, generally, contorted, misshaped like that, that would, that would be bring concern.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

So the way the Commission is selected, the first eight are selected randomly, and the next six are selected by those first eight.

If you were one of the first eight Commissioners, what would you be looking for in the other six?

MS. REED: As I stated earlier, I would be looking for someone that can be impartial because I think that's one of the top requisites for this, is to be able to be impartial and to draw areas that are truly reflective and are logical and not politically motivated.

I think, yeah, a Commissioner must be a good judge of character. I think the Commissioner must be a good judge of character.

I think a Commissioner must be a good communicator with people and have experience dealing with people of all cultures and ethnicities and areas. I think a Commissioner need to be patient because you're going to deal with lots of personalities.

I think a Commissioner does need to be able to see the position of another, to put yourself in someone else's shoes or allow yourself to see from the perspective of another person.

I also think a Commissioner needs to be committed. They must understand commitment and they must be fully committed to the goal.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

So if you were selected as

Commissioner -- as a Commissioner, what parts of
that role do you think you would enjoy the most and
what parts do you think you would struggle with a
bit?

MS. REED: The parts I think I'd enjoy the most is really meeting with different people, talking things out, you know, learning from each

other, but learning about a district from the people that live there.

And I think just being a Commissioner, along with the other Commissioners, building our team. Because you come in, you're all new people, we don't know each other, basically, I mean, you may know some people at a distance or whatever, but building a team, finding out each one's qualities and strengths and drawing -- organizing the team, you know, from that beginning.

I think the thing that would probably be maybe a little uncomfortable is when you come into a situation where there's toxicity, where people are in -- they're in a group, they're in a district, but there's a lot of infighting or just disagreement or, you know, failure to want to cooperate together. I see it as a challenge but I think that, you know, that's probably the least favorable or least desirable situation as far as, you know, dealing with people or coming together, working together.

But, like I say, it's a challenge. And there's always a way to make things happen.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

MS. PELLMAN: We have 6 minutes and 39

1 seconds.

2 PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

I don't have anything more at this moment,

4 Mr. Chair.

5 CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you, Ms.

6 Dickison.

7

8

9

14

23

I will turn the time over to Mr. Dawson.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

MS. PELLMAN: Mr. Dawson, sorry. Mr.

10 Dawson, we have 31 minutes and 58 seconds

11 remaining.

12 MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Ms. Reed, before we start, could I ask you

to maybe check our window? Sometimes we're only

15 getting a partial look at your face.

MS. REED: Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. DAWSON: There you go. Now we can see

18 you.

MS. REED: Oh, is that better?

20 MR. DAWSON: Yes. Now we can see --

MS. REED: Is that --

22 MR. DAWSON: -- your whole face.

MS. REED: Okay. Okay.

24 MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

MS. REED: Uh-huh.

MR. DAWSON: Let's see, I wanted to follow up on something you had said about that in your work, you analyze district maps or maps of the various legislative districts. Why is that? Is that so you can go to the individual members and discuss those issues with them individually?

MS. REED: No. That is usually for our political contributions budget. And that's just my part of it, looking at the districts, who's in what district, how the district is swaying, whether it's more red or whether it's more blue, and looking at -- or just kind of trying to figure out like who might win this district. Actually, that's what I was involved in this year. Which way does it look like the district is going?

MR. DAWSON: I see.

MS. REED: Yes.

MR. DAWSON: So, as you may know, that the district lines are not allowed to be drawn in such a way as to favor or disfavor any particular incumbent.

MS. REED: Right.

MR. DAWSON: But it sounds like this perspective might give you some particular insight as how to look at a district map and see who is

living there and who has a particular political interest. Would that be fair to say?

MS. REED: That would be fair. That would be fair, yes. Um-hmm.

MR. DAWSON: I wanted to sort of follow up on that, that another aspect of your legislative work.

The 2010 Commission did a number of public meetings up and down the state to determine local communities of interest. And there was some indication that there were some folks who were coming to give public comment, claiming to be members of grassroots organizations but they may not have been who said that they were, that they might have been coming with a particular political bent.

How would you guard against that? And do you think that your legislative work would give you any particular insight?

MS. REED: I do. I think guarding against that is really checking into the organization. You do have to do your homework where organizations are concerned because there are a lots of people that would do, try to do, exactly what you're talking about, just to get influence in an area they want

to influence of, like you say, just have their own political agenda.

And so you really do have to look into the organizations and just do background work on them. Who are they? Who's a part of these organizations? How long have they been with the organization? What are their tenets? What do they believe in? What do they say they stand for? Who are they -- who do they say they're trying to help? How long have they been organized? What -- who have they been affiliated with? What groups have they been affiliated with? What people or politicians or representatives, whatever, that they've been affiliated with? And then you make your determination.

But you do, you want to see some history, and you want to see some time of work that been done and the results of that work.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Going back to the question of maps, and I think this was part of a response that you had for Ms. Dickison, in your work do you ever work with census data in your analysis?

MS. REED: I wouldn't call it census data but population data, you know, determining, what is

the predominant demographic group in this area or that area? And so, yeah, I wouldn't call it that. But, yes, finding out how many customers are in certain programs or how many customers are impacted by disasters or live in, you know, live in high-risk areas, I do get involved in that as far as, yeah, population --

MR. DAWSON: Okay. And does that --

MS. REED: -- and determine --

MR. DAWSON: -- include economic or demographic data?

MS. REED: It includes demographic data frequently. I think a lot of times you can just figure out the economic data just by looking at, you know, is it a heavily -- is it a heavy labor district or is it a heavy, you know, higher education or, you know, is it a college town or something like that, so, yes.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

I wanted to follow up on a question that I think that Mr. Coe had. And I think we'll have time, if he has a follow-up, but I was interested in your experiences up and down the state. I noticed you live in Sacramento County but you work for San Diego Gas and Electric.

So have you always lived in Elk Grove?

MS. REED: Not in Elk Grove. I lived
in -- I've lived in Sacramento. I've lived in San
Francisco. And -- but I've, yeah, for the better
part of my time here in California, because I am a
native, I have traveled frequently the Los Angeles
area, the County, because our other company,
SoCalGas, is -- you know, serves the Los Angeles
area, the county area. And SDG&E serves the east
San Diego County vicinity.

And so I have gone out and I've seen -gone to sites and seen, you know, power plants and
substations. And looking forward to going out
pretty soon in San Diego County to visit high fire
risk areas and see the work, this vegetation
management work and all that, that we do out there.
So I do get a lot of exposure to, you know, the
southern part of the state.

I have acquaintances. I have friends in the northern part of the state, up in Redding. And so -- and they're so different but, yet, sort of alike as far as how the country is, you know, how the country is situated. There's forest in the south. There's forest in the north. But then there's a lot more metropolitan feel, like down in

the south, whereas the north is just more rural. But it's beautiful in every part.

MR. DAWSON: Can you expand on that? I'm interested in how you see the commonalities between groups of folks who might be separated by 500 miles and then, of course, the differences? How do you see them alike and how do you see them different?

MS. REED: Well, I see them alike in, mainly, in an agricultural sense because there's a lot of agriculture in the south of the state, not as much, it's getting smaller, it's more in the Central Valley now, but they're -- and there's agriculture up north. I mean, there's different types of agriculture. And there's also -- well, I guess that would be the dairies. There's dairies up north. There's dairies down south. So I think that's a lot of the commonalities.

However, there are huge differences in the weather. Whereas the south is a lot warmer and there's a lot of cold in the north. So there are differences but -- and I think the main differences that they do share would be agriculture and cattle and, yeah, things like that.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

MS. REED: Um-hmm.

MR. DAWSON: Just give me one second. I want to make sure that I covered everything I wanted to cover.

MS. REED: Oh, sure.

MR. DAWSON: In your response to standard question three, which was about the greatest problem that could affect the Commission, you sort of referenced back to standard question two which was the partisan nature of or even the hyperpartisan nature of political discourse at this time.

The Commission is set up so that it will comprise 14 members. And it actually is partisan in the sense that there will be five Democrats, five Republicans, and four non-affiliated folks. And I believe you are registered as a no party preference.

MS. REED: Non-affiliated. Right.

MR. DAWSON: Do you see the -- a particular role or significance for the members of the Commission who are not affiliated?

MS. REED: I do. I think that the people who are not affiliated can look at both sides, look at the parties, the political -- the Democrat

party, the Republican party. It's kind of like looking at it, viewing it from the outside because a lot of it is actually same, but then a lot of it is totally different. Being the same, where they both want what they both want, they both have their own agendas. And being different is how they go about, you know, achieving what they want, I think.

And I've made it a point, really, to look at it that way, to look at the different agendas of each side, to look at the toxicity, whereas there has been a time where people worked together better. They saw that there were just policy differences. Now we have personality differences getting and that -- getting into it and who, you know, expressing things in a personal way, and that's what I think is what has turned it toxic, whereas we need to talk about what the state needs and how to get there, and how to get there in a way that it would benefit everybody in the state, or as many as possible in the state, but we've gotten so far away from that.

But I -- and I -- so I do think that being like (indiscernible) nonpartisan, by being unaffiliated with any party, can help you see things clearly and, sometimes, clearer, and help

you to reach certain policy ideas.

2 MR. DAWSON: Thank you. I have no more 3 follow-ups.

Do any of the Panel members have additional follow-ups?

CHAIR BELNAP: Mr. Coe, do you have any follow-up?

PANEL MEMBER COE: I do not have any follow-up questions.

11 CHAIR BELNAP: Ms. Dickison?

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: I do not have any follow-up question.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. I do have one. So this goes off on something that Mr. Dawson was asking about. And I want to go a little bit deeper dive.

So are there particular legislators who have been more favorable to the interests of the customers of San Diego Gas and Electric?

MS. REED: You know, I don't really think so, because they do, I mean, if you watch them, they try to make it a point to be what we would say fair or im-partisan -- unpartisan. They wanted to be seen that way, so they take everybody

opportunity to be seen that way. And you have most of them that don't even accept political contributions from utilities, they won't, you know, they don't take it. So, you know, I don't see it.

Now as far as voting on certain bills, I think that you'll have -- you do have party differences there. For instance, you'll have Democrats voting on, maybe, greenhouse gas bills and voting them on -- voting, like let's say aye on -- for them all the time, whereas you may have on the Republican side not voting for those bills that they see may hurt local business or -- yeah, may hurt local business because that's huge as far as employers are concerned.

You want to have as many people employed and I think that's a policy issue amongst them. I think one sees, you know, this is critical, this issue of greenhouse gas emissions, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and must be reached at --for, you know, no matter what. And then I think the other policy side, because they make the arguments in committee, is we have businesses that would be hurt by this policy. There has to be some kind of middle ground, you know, where everybody can -- we all benefit but that it doesn't hurt an

important sector of the community, and so I do see that.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

How does San Diego Gas and Electric choose which legislators to provide financial contributions to?

MS. REED: Well, they choose. They make contributions, I believe, to most of our representatives, our state representatives, to everyone, to all the members, the members who will receive contributions.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. So the analysis that you were referring to earlier about districts, that was mostly about who might win and, therefore, who would San Diego Gas and Electric most likely want to give contributions to; is that correct?

MS. REED: That is true but SDG&E will give contributions to both, I mean, as far as parties go, especially in an election. You're going to look at candidates, the candidates they want to meet your senior management or political, governmental affairs staff. And, of course, you want to be able to gage what kind of interest do they have? Do they have the interests of your ratepayers, you know, at hand? And so you're going

to, of course, try to support those who are going to, you know, see things from your own perspective.

But as far as contributions, you give contributions to, you know, most of those who are running in your own area.

CHAIR BELNAP: So in your analysis of districts and voting patterns, do you have information or have you had information about where incumbents, or people that are running for office, live?

MS. REED: As far as --

CHAIR BELNAP: Where, what their --

MS. REED: -- what do you mean?

14 CHAIR BELNAP: -- what their home address

15 is?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

MS. REED: Oh, not their home address but, you know, the area that they live in because they will -- you can even use a directory and you find out what area they're in because they left you know. They'll let you know the city they're in.

CHAIR BELNAP: Right.

MS. REED: And so, yeah.

23 CHAIR BELNAP: But it's not granular, the 24 information that you've looked at, to know exactly

25 where they live?

MS. REED: Oh, no.

2 CHAIR BELNAP: Yeah.

MS. REED: No.

4 CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

MS. REED: Um-hmm.

CHAIR BELNAP: I have no further

7 questions.

3

5

6

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DAWSON: Could I have a time check,
Madam Secretary? Madam Secretary, are you on the
line?

MS. PELLMAN: I apologize. I thought I label had un-muted.

We have 14 minutes and 5 seconds.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Ms. Reed, at this time, I'd like to offer you the opportunity to make a closing statement to the Panel, if you wish.

MS. REED: I hadn't prepared a closing statement but I would like to say, I thank you for your time. I really have a desire to serve this state. I think that I could really contribute to helping to draw the districts for the next ten years. I just, I love the state. I appreciate the opportunity to apply. And I look forward to, you know, what happens next.

But like I say, I think we can do a whole lot better. We can do much better. I think we can get more people involved in the political process of voting, getting involved in their community. I think we can do that and I really would like to be a part of doing that on the Commission.

Thank you for your time. Thank you for your questions.

One thing I did regret was having to meet this way and not in person. I don't know how it -- I'm sure, I mean, I know it doesn't come off as well as it could come off as if we were all together, facing one another, but appreciate technology or we wouldn't be able to do this.

So I just want to thank you for the opportunity. And I just realize the gravity of what the Commission does. It's really important. It really does shape the state. It really does determine what we look like and what different areas look like in the state.

So thank you again.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. And thank you.

We are going to go into recess now and be back at 10:44 a.m.

(Thereupon the Panel recessed at 10:44 a.m.)

1 CHAIR BELNAP: I want to welcome Mr.

2 Raymond Tong to the interview.

Mr. Tong, can you hear us?

MR. TONG: Yes, I can.

5 CHAIR BELNAP: And, Mr. Coe, are you here?

PANEL MEMBER COE: I can hear you just

fine, Mr. Belnap.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. And Ms. Dickison?

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Yes, I can hear

10 you fine.

3

4

6

7

8

9

13

14

16

19

11 CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

We're going to start with the standard

five questions and Mr. Dawson will read those.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Tong, I'm going to ask you five

standard questions that the Applicant Review Panel

17 has requested that each of the applicants respond

18 to. Are you ready, sir?

MR. TONG: Yes, I am.

20 MR. DAWSON: First question: What skills

21 and attributes should all Commissioners possess?

22 What skills or competencies should the Commission

23 possess collectively? Of the skills, attributes

24 and competencies that each Commissioner should

25 possess, which do you possess? In summary, how

will you contribute to the success of the Commission?

MR. TONG: Thank you, Mr. Dawson. I wanted to start off by really thanking the entire Panel and staff for the opportunity and for being here, particularly during this particular time, these difficult times. I really quite honored and excited, nervous and scared, but quite eager to move forward.

So with that as a start, let me just jump into the answers to the questions. tried to organize it in really rough order of importance, though an argument to be made to adjust that.

I think the first thing is fairness. I think every Commissioner should intuitively know what it's like or what it is to be fair, not that you wouldn't have your own particular views but you need to have those views, be able to set those aside, you know, hear the viewpoints of others and make a decision without the interference of your own personal views.

The second, which I just alluded to, is the ability to listen. And, really, it's the ability to hear what others have to say, to enter into a dialogue to hear what they have to say and

to take that as a datapoint in the decision making process and not allow any particular statement to be a decision point. It should be taken as a whole.

There will be, I imagine, I have not done this sort of thing before, but I imagine there's an enormous amount of data that we'll be getting. And I don't believe any one particular piece of data will be our decision point, rather, each one is, again, a datapoint in that decision making process. So I think the Commissioners should all possess that capability.

The third item is that the Commissioners should possess some ability for critical thinking, to be able to gather all the information, evaluate the information, ask questions, formulate ideas, weigh opinions, consider alternatives, test conclusions, and then verify, you know, if the evidence support the conclusions, you know, the standard sort of things for critical thinking. I think those -- that's an important element that the Commissioners should have.

The fourth one is some sort of basic computer skill and the ability, if not the current knowledge, of GIS now, GIS-working abilities, you

know, knowing how to work with shapefiles, for example. I think that's going to be relevant because that is really containing a large amount of the data, the census data that we'll be having to work with.

And the fifth one is, you know, in looking at this, as I prefaced the whole thing, I could flip things around, might be even more important is the ability to work collectively. We're not in this alone. We're only 1/13th of the package. And 1/13th of the package is really, exactly, that. We are only part of it. We have to work together. We have to respect each other. We have to trust each other and assume that, you know, everything that everyone else says is just as important as what we're thinking.

So those are the things, those five items, are the things that I think each Commissioner must possess. And there are probably two that I think that Commissioner as a whole need to possess that, perhaps, are not possessed by every one of them, and one of those is the legal background. You know, we need some sort of legal counsel within, maybe a couple, within the group that can guide us through some of the legal issues that, no doubt,

we'll face, guide us through the -- some of the -- how to handle some of the legal challenges that will occur after year one or, maybe, even year -- even during year one.

And then we should probably have somebody who has -- and I don't know how to describe this -- somebody who has some political awareness, some political savvy that can advise us of, perhaps, some mis-falls, some misdirections that could occur, some things that we might do that could result in public misperceptions of what we're doing. I mean, obviously, we need to be all aware of that. But there might be some subtleties that somebody might be able to tap us on the shoulder and say, yeah, you might not want to do that. And you know, basically, it's what we don't know could really hurt us. And somebody with some background in that would probably be of great help.

The second -- or, yeah, the second part of the question was, you know, what do I possess?

Well, I think it's -- I'd answer that from a perspective of granularity.

I think I possess many of those skills.

Certainly, I possess the first five that I mentioned. And not to be boastful at all but, you

know, I would hope that we all do, but they're in various levels. And there are certain times when, perhaps, my computer skills are not going to be as good as the next persons, or there are times when mine will be better, and we need to be able to recognize those. We need to recognize where our strengths and weaknesses are.

Certainly, you know, I don't -- I'm not a lawyer, I don't have a legal background, so I would certainly look to somebody with that sort of background to guide us through legal issues.

In summary, I would say that I would apply the skills that I have which, I think, are fairly strong, to the best of my ability, foremost keeping the goal in mind as to what this Commission is about, in other words, resulting in fair elections for every person in the state of California. We want to leverage the individual, every individual, every Commissioner, but we want to depend on the strength of the group to be successful.

I hope that answers the question. I appreciate the early warning on these questions and I did try to give it some thought, and made a few notes, so thank you.

Thank you.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Question two: Work on the Commission requires members of different political backgrounds to work together. Since the 2010 Commission was selected and formed, the American political conversation has become increasingly polarized, whether in the press, on social media, and even in our own families.

What characteristics do you possess and what characteristics should your fellow Commissioners possess that will protect against hyper-partisanship? What will you do to ensure that the work of the Commission is not seen as polarized or hyper-partisan and avoid perceptions of political bias and conflict?

MR. TONG: I'll try to answer that question based on the handling of what might be perceived as hyper-partisanship within the Commissioner members itself, and the second one being outside perceptions of hyper-partisanship moving the Commission.

So within the Commission, I think the overarching characteristic is to keep the goal in mind, you know, where it's, again, having fair elections where everyone in California has an equal

voice.

Following that, I would encourage myself, first of all, and those that would find it helpful to avoid using labels because it will spring up innate biases. You know, whether we call each other a Republican or a Democrat or an Independent, let's just not do that because it infers, automatically, other things and it just sways our view of anything that follows. So, again, the first thing is to avoid using labels on each other.

The second is not -- let's not oversimplify the topics. Let's get into the details, go into, really, what's important about we're discussing. Let's try to find some common ground. We're all part of humanity. It doesn't go -- we don't have to dig very deep to find that common ground. And I think that if we discuss items without simplification, that we can find that common ground quite easily.

But the third item is -- refers back to what I was saying earlier, listen to get a datapoint, not to take a side. We get that information. And, again, it's just part of this enormous amount of data that we're going to be getting to make a decision.

And then the final and fourth item is when we do have partisanship going on, and no doubt we will in some respects, but let's try to work on strengthening the middle argument so that there is a third side to this thing, a more moderate view that we can more easily gravitate to.

So that sort of is my summary of how I would address hyper-partisanship within the Commission.

And then -- and I'm not sure if this was the intent of your question but how do we ensure that, in the work of the Commission, methods used from the outside is not hyper-partisan. I would encourage some really standard things which, you know, though I didn't use these terms when I was in my career, one of those things is to encourage assemblies of different groups. And I think the current term of that is intergroup connect. In other words, if you have two sides that are highly polarized, get them to talk with each other in a nonthreatening sort of environment.

The second thing is to do the perspective taking. Again, it comes full circle to what I was talking about before, listen to gain a perspective, not to gain a side. Listen to get a datapoint, not

to take a side.

And then a third one is to superordinate your goals. In other words, let's not talk about being a Democrat, let's not talk about being a Republican, a liberal or a conservative, but let's talk about humanity. And, you know, you might even talk about economic things because are common goals on everybody. Again, find common ground in the -- in what we are discussing. Again, that would be to avoid hyper-partisanship being -- that's to avoid the outside looking in to the Commission as being hyper-partisan, okay?

I hope that answered your question.

MR. DAWSON: Yes. Thank you.

Question three: What is the greatest problem the Commission could encounter and what actions would you take to avoid or respond to this problem?

MR. TONG: I thought this was a great question and I went back and forth on it. And I listed it, as I normally due, in order. And I keep reordering it, so I'll go ahead and recite it and I'll sort of comment as I go along.

I think one of the things that might be a problem for us is how do we handle the absolutely

huge amount of data that's going to be coming in that we're going to need to assess?

I'm particularly concerned about the testimony data that we'll be receiving. Whereas someone who may -- and I'm just, you know, hypothesizing here that we have an evening meeting, let's say going from 7:00 to 11:30, you know, and somebody gets to speak at 7 o'clock, gets a fresh ear, whereas the person that gets to speak at 11:15 is going to get a tired ear, and I want to be able to collect that information so that we give the 7 o'clock speaker and the 11:15 speaker every word equivalent import. I'm not really sure how we do that yet but that is a concern of mine.

The second concern is how do we determine those communities of interest? I sense that that's an important area that will be very influential in how we modify the lines that we're going to be drawing for the various districts.

The third thing is I guess the loss of a congressional district and the noise that we may be receiving from folks that feel like they're losing representation. I think that can be fairly easily justified but, you know, if you're losing a seat, less so.

And then, of course, bad press that we might be receiving. I think our relationship, our public relationship, our public persona is quite relevant because people have to believe that we're doing the right thing here in order for them to believe that they have an equal voice, that the results are fair and equitable.

And then the final thing, and this is where I was getting to what is the order, is what I don't know, what surprises. What lurks out there that we don't know will happen that we will not have a response to, an appropriate response to, that we will just kind of -- you know, if you know what the problem is, you can at least think it through and be able to formulate some sort of way to address it. But if something pops out of nowhere, you're really kind of having to struggle to figure out what to do.

So, anyway, those five are the things that I came up with as what I think are the greatest problems the Commission may encounter.

MS. PELLMAN: We have 12 minutes, 26 seconds remaining.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Question four: If you are selected you

will be one of 14 members of the Commission which is charged with working together to create maps of the new districts.

Please describe a situation where you had to work collaboratively with others on a project to achieve a common goal? Tell us the goal of the project, what your role in the group was, and how the group worked through any conflicts that arose? What lessons would you take from this group experience to the Commission, if selected?

MR. TONG: Yeah, in my international work, I was really always placed in those situations. I was in the sales and marketing side of things where price objections were always common but, more often than not, they were just masquerading as other issues.

We'd have multiple interviews with various stakeholders. You know, they varied from the seed level managers to project managers, development managers, programmers, business line managers, to the actual users, our sales teams and the technical teams, and there's probably many others that I'm not even mentioning here. In many cases -- well, let me, before I move into that, what we were trying to do or what my business was, was we were

providing a service where we were offloading mainframe development from mainframes onto a PC.

And there was a huge cost justification for that, as well as efficiency justifications.

So the argument from the people that used to do it on the mainframe was that we've done it this way forever and ever and why change, you know? And the reason that we wanted the change is because we wanted to sell the product, of course. But, really, the reason for them was because there was a lot of money to be saved, millions and millions of dollars.

Then the detail of the issue was it was COBOL, CICS, which is -- I'm not making this up, this is all real stuff, but I'm not going to go into the details of what this means, but it was COBOL, CICS, and 370 Assembly. They developed it on a mainframe. And they were afraid that if they developed it on a PC and put it back up on the mainframe, it would not behave identically. And in some cases, they were right, and in some cases they were absolutely not correct, they were just not doing it right.

But as a result of actually getting the development teams and our technical team to work --

to talk and work together, we made changes, they made changes, and we eventually got them, basically, to move from the mainframe onto the PCs for development and, hence, save them millions and millions of dollars every year. Everybody came out a winner.

But that's a clear example of what is today called intergroup working. In other words, you get the two opposing parties to talk together, to work together, to come to a conclusion.

And the lessons that I'll -- that I've learned from that and I would take to the Commission is exactly what I talked about before, getting opposing views to work together, trying to find common ground and, you know, basically adjust where they can and go for a situation where both parties can win.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

MR. TONG: Thank you.

Question five: A considerable amount of the Commission's work will involve meeting with people from all over California who come from very different backgrounds and a wide variety of perspectives.

If you were selected as a Commissioner,

what skills and attributes will make you effective at interacting with people from different backgrounds and who have a variety of perspectives? What experiences have you had that will help you be effective at understanding and appreciating people and communities of different backgrounds and who have a variety of perspectives?

MR. TONG: I believe that one of my greatest skills is reaching out to people and engaging with them. I really listen well. I empathize with what they have to say. I play back repeatedly what they tell me to make sure that I understand not just the words but the feeling, the nuance of what they say. And I try to respond with real interest and support of what is important to them.

My recollection of all of this goes back to the early days as a medical technologist. I think I wrote that in one of my essays early on where I was doing a heel stick on an infant, probably less than, I don't know, two weeks old, and the mother did not speak English and I did not speak Spanish. And, you know, with body language or whatever, you know, we made it work.

But I do observe that my effectiveness at

understanding and appreciating people really spans my entire career.

You know, as I mentioned, as a computer -- as a medical technologist but also as the owner of one of the first computer stores in the world, as a software salesperson, and as I migrated to international sales.

In fact, I've got a short story to tell you about that, is that I was a software salesperson with my company, Micro Focus. And I had talked to the Board about, you know, boy, wouldn't it be really good if we had an international presence. And I talked to them about it for probably six, seven, eight months, about a year. And they finally told me, well, go ahead and do it.

Well, you know, it's one of those things where you've got to be careful what you ask for because they gave it to me and I had no idea what I was doing. I flew into Seoul. I remember I didn't know anybody. I just had a couple of phone numbers of people I had called and that was the start of a, basically, a \$30 million business. I didn't know anybody but I think just the ability to listen to people and work together with them is what made

that all work.

Thank you.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

We will now go to Panel questions. Each of the Panel members will have 20 minutes to ask his or her questions. And we will start with the Chair.

Mr. Belnap?

CHAIR BELNAP: So, Mr. Tong, I want to follow up on question number four, your answer to it.

You indicated that the general principle behind your answer was to get two opposing parties to talk.

So as it relates to the Commission's work, who would the opposing parties be?

MR. TONG: You know, at this point I don't know if I could identify them because I think the - as we, perhaps, had hearings and listened to testimony and began to, let's say, draw the initial lines for the maps, we'll get objections. We'll get those people who say, yeah, this is a great map. And then we'll get people who say this is, oh, this is a lousy map. And, you know, I don't know if we can get them exactly to talk together

but we've got to get some exchange going on.

I mean, I think you asked a good question but I'm afraid I don't have the knowledge at this point to point to particular groups or, you know, interest groups to say that these are the people that will be put together.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. So let me give you a scenario.

What if you have -- you put out -- the Commission puts out its initial lines, its initial districts, and you have one group that says you've ignored us, so they're one party, but there is no opposing party, other than the Commission itself. So, in this case, the two opposing parties are the Commission and then someone who disagrees with the Commission. What would it mean to bring these two together to talk?

MR. TONG: When you say "party," are you talking about a party in general or are you talking about a political party or are you talking about a party of a particular, let's say, economic or social interest?

CHAIR BELNAP: I'm using the word party in the general sense of group. So you have one group that's opposed to the Commission's draft lines and

the Commission is the other group that's in support of those draft lines, what I want to know is how would you have those two groups talk?

MR. TONG: I'm -- I think that we -- I need to understand what that other group -- I mean, we. When I said I, I didn't mean I, I meant the full group, I mean the Commissioners need to understand what that other group was trying to put across because, obviously, we missed their message.

And, conversely, we need to explain to that party, to use your words, why the Commission drew the line the way it did. That would be the first go around.

And, you know, again, I think perhaps, you know, to make it nonthreatening is to express that this is the first go around. Let's talk about it. What -- you know, perhaps a question might be, what modifications could we do to, you know, to address your concern? And perhaps that modification is a simple thing that the Commission could do. Or perhaps it would be that our explanation to that party as to why the Commission drew those lines would be completely, in effect, oh, yeah, I got it. Okay. I didn't understand that. But it just, I think it just requires dialogue.

I'm trying to dig a little deeper here because I don't think I'm answering your question.

I'm being a little too superficial, but I don't know.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right.

MR. TONG: Mr. Tong, I don't think you're being too superficial. What I was trying to do was take that concept into the realm of the Commission, and I think we did that just fine.

MR. TONG: Thank you.

CHAIR BELNAP: so in your essay on impartiality, you describe how a medical technologist, a job you had in the past, must set aside initial impressions and focus on what the data shows. Can you provide an example of a time when you had to do this?

MR. TONG: Well, that was a long, long time ago. But as a young man, and I was very young then, you know, you have this feeling of invincibility and living forever, for example, and nothing could harm you. And I know I'm guilty of this and it's not something I'm particularly proud of. I see folks who had problems with their lungs because they smoked. And, you know, it automatically put a sort of a negative thought in

my mind. But, you know, it was probably -- I mean, not probably, it was improper in that, you know, the final sort of diagnosis and, you know, this is all -- I don't know if it was pre-HIPAA days but, you know, it was obviously, I was wrong, you know?

You know, you make assumptions looking at someone. And time and time again you're just proven wrong, I mean, just like you don't know what you're talking about.

You know, I go back to this thing that I was talking about earlier about making a decision on a single datapoint. That's the dumbest thing one can do, you know? It's just not a smart thing to do.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

MR. TONG: And that's what I did, so I --

17 yeah.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. So in your essay on appreciation for diversity, you discuss your travels throughout California.

MR. TONG: Um-hmm.

CHAIR BELNAP: Can you provide us with a volunteer or work experience or project that demonstrates your ability to work with people from a variety of different backgrounds?

MR. TONG: Oh, gosh, you know, I closed out the standard questions citing my experience in international where I went to Korea not speaking the language, just having a couple of phone numbers to call. That was an example. And it grew into, you know, a multi-million-dollar business.

Just earlier today, I spoke in my best
Spanish I could, which was pretty poor, with a very
kind gentleman who is helping me with one of my
mom's places that had a water problem. I think I
mentioned in my essays and my disclosures, the
application, that I manage some properties. And
within that, I work with a lot of different ethnic
groups, a lot of different socioeconomic groups.

Does that answer your question?

CHAIR BELNAP: Yeah. Thank you for reminding me about the example related to the international business. I do think that's very applicable and I've noted that.

Your application outlines the years you worked in sales and management in the technology industry.

Can you provide an example or two of the types of analysis you performed that would be most applicable to the work of the Commission?

MR. TONG: That's a good question. I think, probably, it was to -- you know, when we moved into new markets, like when Vietnam was just emerging in '93, where do we go? You know, who do we reach out to? You know, it was -- I don't remember the specifics but it was making a lot of calls, talking to a lot of different people, getting a lot of just, you know, perhaps anecdotal information, as well as solid information as to, you know, what things were going on.

In fact, now that I'm talking about it, I remember one thing. We were particularly interested in the -- their telephone company because we knew that they were using a particular version of the CBIS, the Cincinnati Bell Information Systems software for their billing system, and we knew we could be of assistance there. And so that was the sort of analysis we did in terms of, you know, who could use what within the domain of what we were providing.

We also, you know, now that I'm -- you've got me on a roll now -- we also and did VietSoPro (phonetic), because they were an old company out of Saigon, operating out of Untao (phonetic). And, you know, that was an interesting one because --

1 and again, that was because we were just 2 investigating, you know, where the businesses were. 3 We had a pretty good relationship with IBM at the 4 time and, you know, they gave us pointers as to who 5

Does that answer your question?

CHAIR BELNAP: Yes. And now you have me curious. Were you guys successful at offering and securing your services with the telephone company?

10 MR. TONG: Yes.

we might talk to and so forth.

11 CHAIR BELNAP: Yeah? Okay. All right.

Thank you. 12

6

7

8

9

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

13 MR. TONG: It was a good time. It was a 14 fun time.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. I have no further questions.

17 I will turn the time over to Mr. Coe.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good morning, Mr. Tong. Thank you for taking the time to speak with us today.

MR. TONG: Thank you, Mr. Coe. I think it's Mr. Coe. I can't -- let's see, it's not working. I'm sorry. Let me see if I can --

PANEL MEMBER COE: Can you hear me okay?

25 MR. TONG: Oh, I can, yeah, I can hear

you. Yeah. It was -- yeah, I can hear you, and now I can see you.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay. Great.

In your application, you indicate that in your role as president of your homeowner's association in Olympic Valley, you were the primary voice in discussion with a proposed project neighboring your property called the PlumpJack Redevelopment Project at Squaw Valley which is --

MR. TONG: Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

PANEL MEMBER COE: -- represented by
Hilary Newsom, the sister of California Government
Gavin Newsom.

Can you expand on this? In what way is that project represented by Hilary Newsom?

MR. TONG: She was the main driver and she offered to speak to our HOA as to -- HOA in regards to the project early on. Since then,

19 I -- you know, we've maintained a relationship in

20 terms of discussing what was going on.

21 Effectively, you know, our objection or the issue

22 for us is that our HOA is, basically, a two-story,

23 13-unit condo adjacent to PlumpJack which was

24 building a five-story, multi-million-dollar

25 structure adjacent to us, to which we objected, so

we had cordial but opposing views on that, and it continues.

On a related note, just to -- as full disclosure, I am no longer going to be running for the Board on the HOA.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay. And what was your role in the interactions with that other project?

MR. TONG: I was the spokesperson. I was, you know, I was the elected president and, I would say, probably the biggest thorn in their side.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay. Thank you.

On the subject of impartiality, Mr. Belnap kind of addressed my question a little bit but I wanted to see if you provide us with a specific example of a time where you had to make a difficult impartial decision that involved maybe setting aside your preferences or self-interests?

MR. TONG: In relationship to the HOA?

PANEL MEMBER COE: In relationship to anything, any example you could provide.

MR. TONG: Ah. Oh, okay. All right. The thing that comes to mind is the HOA. I mean, we recently had to -- and I'll relate this out of convenience because it just comes up -- we recently

had to do a residing of the entire building, you know, it just needs refreshing. Our unit is, you know, south facing, frankly, one of the units that seem to take the wear and tear fairly well. And the -- I'm at a loss for what the world is.

Basically, it's kind of like what you lean on, on your balcony. What is that?

The --

PANEL MEMBER COE: The railing?

MR. TONG: -- there's just a bunch of wood there that you lean on and all that. And, you know, I frankly thought that we did not need to replace any of it because that looked as good as it was the day it was built, as was the interior siding, which is T-111. Being a board member and, again, the president, you know, the argument was made that we needed to replace everything, all the siding on the building, and for these particular reasons. I actually voted for replacing it all, despite the fact that I thought that my unit didn't need it. I was going to pay for the replacement of something that, basically, was not necessary for me.

But that was a decision that I made that was, basically, counter to my personal interest but

for the good of the HOA.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay. Thank you.

Switching topics to appreciation for

diversity for a moment --

MR. TONG: Yes.

PANEL MEMBER COE: -- in your essays and some of your discussions already in regards to the standard questions and responses to Mr. Belnap's questions, you touched on some of these points already. And you mentioned having worked with or interacted with groups of diverse backgrounds in some way in your experience. And I'm wondering what you have learned from those interactions about those people, about their concerns and their preferences and the things that are important to them that would make you an effective representative for them on this Commission?

MR. TONG: We're all the same. We're all the same. We all have children we love. We all have mothers and fathers we love. We all want to go home to a comfortable place. We all want to have aspirations that we meet or that our children meet.

You know, what I've learned is that what I see as I look at you, for example Mr. Coe, is not

someone with glasses but probably someone who has a mother and a father who he dearly loves, someone with, perhaps, a family that he dearly loves, someone who has concerns about his finances that are important to him, as they are to me, someone who has beliefs in things that are just as important to him as they are to me, someone who, you know, has desires for recreation, just like I do, that there's a whole lot more similarities to you and I than there are differences. We both wear glasses. Heck.

But there's a whole lot more similarities, a whole lot more. Don't let the skin fool us. Don't let the skin fool us. Don't let those terms fool us, you know? We are so much more similar than we'd like to admit. That's what I've learned.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you. I think the glasses thing is a similarity that we share with everybody on the Applicant Review Panel, if I may -

MR. TONG: Oh, yeah.

PANEL MEMBER COE: -- mention.

I've got a similar question but slightly different. And this is about geographic diversity and the concerns that can be different. In

different parts of the state, people have different concerns or different things that are important to them based on where they live.

If you could tell us a little bit about your interactions with people from different places throughout California and what you've learned about those people that would make you and effective representative for them on this Commission?

MR. TONG: I'll have to be frank here and say I probably have -- well, I would desire to have more interaction, more knowledge of those differences. I think that I have little appreciation, little knowledge, you know, intimate knowledge of folks that live, for example, in the northern part of our state, and I would like to. I think I have probably a little more, but not nearly as more as I would like to, knowledge of the folks that live interest the Central Valley.

During my road trips, for example, I'll camp out somewhere, you know, where every so often run into somebody kind of camping next to you, for example, that is from one of those areas. And it's just interesting to talk to them, again, to understand or to realize what you don't know, but then to realize that very deep -- you know, once

you scrape away issues you don't know, we're really pretty much the same.

But back to you. I'm sorry, I was digressing here. Back to your question there.

You know, the -- I think some of the things that are kind of different in, for example, rural areas is things like issues, things like internet, like why my internet is so lousy, and transportation, water. You know, water is a big issue. If you don't -- for example, well, in the Central Valley, certainly, it's a big issue.

I think representation is probably a big issue in the northern part of the state. They feel like, you know, they don't got to listen to you. You know, you get the coastal people. You get, perhaps, a little noise from the Central Valley. But, you know, the north coast, they're nobody. So I think that's an issue for them.

Sorry, I don't think I really answered your question. I kind of danced around it and I'd like to talk about it but I don't know if I have an answer to your question, frankly.

PANEL MEMBER COE: I understand. Thank you.

In your interest in serving essay, you

discuss a time when you spoke with someone who felt that she didn't need to get involved in an upcoming presidential election because she felt that her vote or her voice would not matter.

MR. TONG: Correct.

PANEL MEMBER COE: However, after a bit of discussion with you, there was a noticeable change in her outlook from her, more positivity, as you describe it.

MR. TONG: Um-hmm.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Do you think that you have a unique skill for eliciting participation from people who traditionally would avoid getting more civically involved?

MR. TONG: I think when given the right tools, I do. Yes, I do. I've been accused of being overly animated and getting overly excited about things I actually believe in. And I do believe in, you know, what I'm doing here.

You know, in her case, it was an issue of, you know, California is so heavily Democrat that it didn't really make any difference. It was going to go Democrat whether or not she voted. And, you know, there were different ways for her to have her voice heard, even if that were truly the case

which, you know, that is the case. But it shouldn't be that, you know, we just keep quiet because it is a foregone conclusion.

But to answer your question, yes, I do believe that I can get very excited, very enthused, very animated. And I do know how to best use those faults to best benefit.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

Could I get a time check, Madam Secretary?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. We have 6 minutes, 56 seconds.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Great. Thank you.

Mr. Tong, one of the biggest jobs in front of the Commission is going to be identifying communities of interest throughout the state. I think you referenced those in your -- in question number three, in the standard question, a struggle or a problem the Commission could face in terms of identifying those communities of interest --

MR. TONG: Um-hmm.

PANEL MEMBER COE: -- and that that might be difficult. Some of those communities are easier to find than others, as you alluded to.

How would you go about having the

Commission find those, find communities of interest throughout the state, particularly those ones that may be more difficult to identify and locate?

MR. TONG: I actually gave that some thought and I made some notes on that. I was looking for my notes but I couldn't find them. But I'll try to speak more from memory and all that.

I think we, of course, we start with the census data which is, you know, what we're starting off with anyway. I think there are probably some other demographic studies that we could use to overlay the census data to sort of cross with that.

I think listening to the local activists and community leaders would be another point where we could get more input as to where those communities of interest are, the significant ones.

Look for trends of behavior as to, you know, whether that be on the internet or wherever, as to, you know, what might be happening in a particular area. And then consider other actors, like social factors, economic factors, transportation, geographical factors, then, of course, the ethnic and racial factors which, I suspect, much of that will be in the census data.

So that would be, I think -- yeah, that's

the way I would kind of dig into trying to identify the communities of interest. There may be others that will surface, little nuances that may surface as we dig into some of this, particularly when we listen to the community leaders and the activists.

PANEL MEMBER COE: All right. Thank you.

MR. TONG: Um-hmm.

PANEL MEMBER COE: If you were to be appointed to the Commission, which aspects of that role do you think that you would enjoy the most and which aspects of that role do you think you might, perhaps, struggle with a little bit?

MR. TONG: I think engaging with people, speaking with them, listening to them, trying to understand what you're telling us, that, wow, that's exciting. That is going to be really -- that is going to be amazing, learning about something that I don't know. That is going to be really exciting.

My least favorite will probably be the legal defense, not that I wouldn't do it but that's my least favorite.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. 24 Tong.

No further questions, Mr. Chair.

1 Thank you, Mr. Tong. 2 CHAIR BELNAP: Thank you, Mr. Coe. 3 We'll now turn the time over to Ms. 4 Dickison. 5 PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. 6 Good morning, Mr. Tong. 7 MR. TONG: Good morning, Mrs. Dickison. PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: So while we're 8 9 along the lines of communities of interest still, 10 have you spent any time interacting with 11 communities of interest at all? 12 MR. TONG: I mean, I suppose I have 13 because I think I'm engaged. I'm part of certain 14 communities of interest. You know, I grew up in 15 San Francisco Chinatown and still maintain contact 16 with the -- what is it? -- the grammar school group 17 that I went to school with, you know, St. Mary's.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Okay. So in your diversity essay, you talked about the fact that you've been -- that the first part of your life, you lived primarily in urban areas, and then you

You might have heard of them, popular. We had the

drum and bugle corps that performed regularly. So

the Chinatown area is something that I, you know,

communicate with fairly regularly.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

moved to a rural area.

MR. TONG: Correct.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: What did you learn about the differences, the concerns of the communities, as a result of where you were located?

MR. TONG: I think the rural areas, the folks there here tend to be much more self-reliant, less dependent upon government services, at least, you know, superficially. They tend to view themselves as more, you know, independent, I suppose.

From a social aspect, you know, they tend to be more alone, not antisocial, just more alone. They treasure their time alone because, and I do note, that when there is a need in the community, they come together very strongly.

Does that answer your question?

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Yeah.

MR. TONG: Um-hmm.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: So you talked about living in San Francisco and then now you live in the southern San Mateo County?

MR. TONG: Correct.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: What are the differences in the communities in those two areas?

MR. TONG: Oh, gosh, you know, there's no public transportation here. There is no structured internet here. The only thing -- the only service we have to speak of us PG&E and, even then, that is very spotty insofar as many of us are off grid.

From kind of a social perspective, though,

I believe that the community is tighter in their

rural area than it is in the urban area. The urban

area surely has, you know, it's silverware and

charm and others. There's a lot more going on

there, a lot more culture and so forth.

You want to direct the question a little bit more? And maybe I'm missing something that you want to hear about?

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: No. I think you're going in the right direction.

So considering those differences, how do you think those can influence one's presence when they're looking for government representation?

MR. TONG: I think the rural areas would tend to look for more basic services, more fundamental services. I don't sense, and again, I'm not -- I don't mean to say this as an edict or anything like that, but I don't sense that there would be great support

for -- there would be less support for a handout in a rural area than there is in a urban area. That's probably not a very popular thing to say right now. But the -- that self-reliance seems to be very strong in a rural area. You give me the basics and I'll do with it as I see fit and I will survive. I will do what I can to raise my family. To address my concerns, you know, give me water, food, shelter, things like that, but don't give me a handout.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Okay. Thank you.

So in your analytical skills essay, you discussed how every medical decision is based on a large pool of data that comes from many different sources.

What sources of information will the Commission heed to gather and consider in its decision making?

MR. TONG: Well, I suppose we're looking at that census data. We're looking at -- and when I say census data, I suppose I'm -- you know, I'm not -- I don't have experience in this area as to what the Commission actually does. So when I say census data, I guess I'm also saying that GIS data, the shapefiles and so forth. I imagine we'll get a

large amount of information there. I imagine we'll get a large amount of information from the hearings, the public hearings. I think those are the two main sources.

We may, as a Commission, elect to search out other sources of data, let's say demographic studies that may be out there that other people have done. We may look for, you know, other trends that are going on and we may look for other, let's say, transportation data that may not be included in the census data. Again, I'm probably speaking out of school because I don't know what's going to be in the census data because I haven't done this before.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Okay. Thank you.

16 I'm just looking at my notes --

MR. TONG: Um-hmm.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: -- because many of my questions have been answered.

So the way the Commission is selected the first eight Commissioners are selected randomly and they will select the remaining six.

If you were one of the first eight

Commissioners, what would you be looking for in
those other six individuals?

MR. TONG: I think, first, I'd consider what were the people who were selected? You know, were we or what was the makeup of that? And assess, you know, what our goals were in terms of the skill set that we needed, which I addressed earlier, I think, in the first basic questions, as well as diversity, and diversity in terms of geographic distribution, as well as racial and ethnic diversity. So I would look to balance all that out as much as we could.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Okay. On the flip side of that, if you were not one of the eight, why should the other eight select you as one of the six?

MR. TONG: I'm reminded of when my kids used to always say they wanted something and they couldn't have it. And I asked them, "Why do you want it?" And they would say, "Because I wanna."

No, that isn't -- no, because I really care.

Because I want to make a difference. I really do care about how the California voter feels, that their vote counts, that their one vote is their one vote, my one vote is equal to your one vote, is equal to everybody else's one vote. No one's one vote is more one than my one. I really care about

that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

20

21

22

25

You know, I reflect back on, you know, just going and talking with people casually. And, anecdotally, I hear so often people say, "I'm not going to vote because it doesn't make any difference." It just drives me nuts. It's just that, I mean, the, you know, the reason it doesn't matter is because you say it doesn't matter. It's a self-fulfilling prophecy.

You know, it does matter, really. I mean, I'm sorry, I'm going off on a tangent here. It's just because I care. I really do care. That's why they should pick me.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you so much.

MR. TONG: Okay.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Mr. Belnap, I
don't have any further questions at this moment.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you, Ms.

19 Dickison.

Mr. Dawson, the time is now yours.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good morning --

MS. PELLMAN: Mr. Dawson, excuse me.

24 MR. DAWSON: I'm sorry.

MS. PELLMAN: We have 24 minutes and 18

seconds remaining.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Mr. Tong, I was looking over your application and --

MR. TONG: Yes.

MR. DAWSON: -- you started -- your college degree was in the biological sciences. You started your career as a medical technologist, but then you spent quite a bit of time in the computer world. How did you get there? How did you get involved?

MR. TONG: A good friend of mine, Mel Wong, told me about some guy named Steve who made this little thing called a computer. And I said, well, you know, okay. And he was really into it. And he said, "You know, you want to do an Apple -- you want to open up an Apple store -- a computer store?" He didn't use the word Apple.

And, anyway, one thing led to another. We opened up what I think was the first Apple Computer store in the world at 301 Balboa in San Francisco. Any time, yeah, that's how I made the change.

MR. DAWSON: In your response to standard question one, you were saying that one of the necessary skills for the Commission will be able to

-- the ability to use GIS data. Do you have any direct experience using GIS data in your work?

MR. TONG: No, I don't have any direct experience, but I sort of looked at it and it looks like it's fairly standard, you know, shapefiles, DBF files. I mean, it's not -- nothing -- it doesn't sound like it's anything too magical. You know, there's a read and display of those shapefiles and, yeah.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

In standard question three, you noted that one of the potential problems that the Commission could face is the things that we don't know and the challenge about how to deal with this.

What should the Panel be looking for in candidates who will be able to deal with what they don't know?

MR. TONG: I suppose be comfortable with, you know, really the fact that you're diving into something that, you know, something that you don't know about is entirely possible, and that it will happen and you need to just deal with it in due course and move forward to the best of your ability.

You know, yeah, we can't think of

everything. But I'm saying that, you know, what we don't know will be a challenge. It doesn't mean that we can't deal with it. And we can deal with it by accepting it the way it is and doing the best job we can, you know, getting various inputs and pulling in the resources that we need to deal with that surprise unknown that has come before us.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Another one of your concerns -- I'm sorry,

I don't want to say your concerns, but you've

identified as a possible problem that the

Commission could face was dealing with the large

amounts of data.

Thinking about that one of the largest data inputs will be census data, there is -- do you have any concerns about the quality of the data, given the COVID-19 pandemic and other issues that it could face?

MR. TONG: Not yet. I mean, I -- you know, as the COVID-19 situation proceeds we'll see what affect it has on the collection of that data and the input of that data. And we'll have to see. I mean, it will have to be -- we will have to just ensure that it is good data because it's, you know, it's an old garbage in, garbage out sort of

1 scenario. So, yeah, the first -- so I suppose the first order of business will to 2

be -- will be to ensure that that is good data, 4 which includes any, you know, negative aspects of COVID-19 or anything else that might happen.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. DAWSON: So even under the best of circumstances there are always folks who get missed by the census. There are various statistical analyses that can help true that up.

But in your mind, are there any particular groups that are -- that you think are most likely to be missed, especially in these circumstances?

MR. TONG: Well, probably some of the illegals will be missed. And, you know, it's like you said, there's probably some formulas that could accommodate for that to some degree. But we'll have to probably be comfortable and live with, you know, that level of ambiguity.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. You said that you grew up in Hong Kong, and then later in San Francisco --

MR. TONG: Yeah.

MR. DAWSON: -- and that you maintain connections to your Chinatown origin, I suppose, is a good way to put it.

Do you think that as an immigrant, even though you came as a young kid, does that give a perspective that would be useful in your role on the Commission?

MR. TONG: Yeah, I do believe so, because, you know, rather than -- it's sort of a half glass -- a glass half empty, half full. I think it's I have two full glasses. I can do it as I belong to both cultures and I feel equally at home in both cultures.

So, you know, an immigrant is blessed with that. And it's one's choice and, you know, the opportunities and what are given to whether or not they can, you know, push themselves into, let's say, this new environment and thrive. And, you know, I've been fortunate that I've been given the opportunities and, you know, I feel pretty happy about it.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. I have no further questions.

Madam Secretary, could I have time check please?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. We have 16 minutes and 40 seconds remaining.

MR. DAWSON: Great. Thank you.

Are there any additional follow-ups from the Panel members?

CHAIR BELNAP: Mr. Coe?

PANEL MEMBER COE: I have no follow-up questions.

CHAIR BELNAP: Ms. Dickison?

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: I have no follow-up questions either.

CHAIR BELNAP: I do not have any follow-up questions either.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Tong, at this time, we'd like to offer you the opportunity to make a closing statement to the Panel, if you wish?

MR. TONG: Thank you, Mr. Dawson. Thank you to the entire Panel and all the staff. I'd like to really thank you for the privilege of this interview and the opportunity that this presents to me. You know, I'm not -- I don't have a legal degree. I've never done this before, so this is all new to me and, I must say, it's really exciting.

I have to share a story with you and I'll make it really, really short. All this kind of makes me remember back when I was a little boy in

Hong Kong thinking, when I first heard that we were going to America, and the Chinese word for America is beautiful country. And it's really quite amazing that as a little boy, you know, in Hong Kong, that I find myself, after a lifetime of sharing this beautiful country, to be sitting in front of this Panel being able to, potentially, do what I might be able to do.

And whatever the outcome is, I want to continue to strive to allow the dream that I've had to be made possible by others. So thank you for all of you to make this possible.

Thank you.

CHAIR BELNAP: Thank you.

We're going to go into recess now and we will be back at 1:14 p.m.

17 (Thereupon the Panel recessed at 12:00 p.m.)

CHAIR BELNAP: All right. We're going to come back

out of recess.

1

7

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I want to make sure that -- Mr. Coe, are you on line?

4 PANEL MEMBER COE: Yes, I'm here.

5 CHAIR BELNAP: Ms. Dickison? Ms. Dickison, you're 6 on the line?

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: I am here. Thank you.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Great.

I want to welcome Antonio Le Mons. Antonio, can you hear us?

MR. LE MONS: Yes.

12 CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Excellent. We're going to 13 have Mr. Dawson read the standard five questions.

MR. LE MONS: Okay.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Le Mons, I'm going to read you five standard questions that the panel has requested each Applicant address. Are you ready, sir?

MR. LE MONS: Yes.

MR. DAWSON: First question: What skills and attributes should all Commissioners possess? What skills or competencies should the Commission possess collectively? Of the skills, attributes and competencies that each Commissioner should possess, which do you possess? In summary, how will you contribute to the success of the

Commission?

MR. LE MONS: I think that all Commissioners should possess analytical skills, communication skills, empathy, objectivity, the ability to engage openly, and the ability to see beyond oneself.

I feel like I personally possess the aforementioned skills, and the way I would contribute to the success of the mission would be to bring those skills to bear at all times, and to remind my fellow Commissioners of our commitment to them if we venture off course.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question two: Work on the Commission requires members of different political backgrounds to work together. Since the 2010 Commission was selected and formed, the American political conversation has become increasingly polarized, whether in the press, on social media, and even in our own families.

What characteristics do you possess, and what characteristics should your fellow Commissioners possess, that will protect against hyper-partisanship? What will you do to ensure that the work of the Commission is not seen as polarized or hyper-partisan, and avoid perceptions of political bias and conflict?

MR. LE MONS: As I mentioned earlier, I think the ability to engage openly and the ability to see beyond one's self will be very important in avoiding hyper-

partisanship.

Of course, each Commissioner will bring with them their personal political beliefs, and probably a commitment to those beliefs and values on some level. However, it will be important to remember the task at hand requires an interest beyond our personal political leanings, and I think modeling that in my participation, as well as reminding and inviting fellow Commissioners to do the same, would be my approach.

In order to ensure that the work of the Commission is not seen as polarized or hyper-partisan, I would, one, commit to open communication and support improved communication among Commissioners when needed. I would lean on my neutral facilitation skills in terms of both my participation in maintaining respectful interaction, and encourage that to fellow Commissioners, and take every opportunity to help facilitate and build trust among the Commissioners, and, finally, always look for the common ground by focusing on the strengths of the middle, the nonpolarized middle, as opposed to the outer frames. That's where people tend to go when hyper-partisanship is at play.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question three: What is the greatest problem the Commission could encounter, and what actions would you take to avoid or respond to this

problem?

MR. LE MONS: I think, internally, a failure to perform my duties in a way that meets the desired objective would be the biggest internal problem. Externally, I think, would be unhappiness with the outcome as either perceived by community members or special interest groups, that we, as a Commission, somehow failed to do our job fairly and accurately.

How I would avoid that is to consistently remind myself of the importance and the profound impact of what we're there to do, and the greater public good versus my personal interests would be my primary focus of concern, and I think, as the group, how we respond is by having transparency and solid documentation of our process, so that that can live up and address — that lives up to the expectations, of course, of the Commission, and that can be used as evidence to support at least a process that — no one is every going to be absolutely happy.

So, if you can at least show your transparency, through your documentation process, that you have followed the guidelines and rules of the process, you have delivered the objective as designed by the criteria, and be able to provide that to those that I would consider to be people who may be upset, then that would be the best that we really could do.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question four: If you are selected, you will be one of 14 members of the Commission, which is charged with working together to create maps of the new districts. Please describe a situation where you had to work collaboratively with others on a project to achieve a common goal.

Tell us the goal of the project, what your role in the group was, and how the group worked through any conflicts that arose. What lessons would you take from this group experience to the Commission, if selected?

MR. LE MONS: What comes to mind is being a part of a jury, and I've actually had two opportunities to participate in that process, and the goal in both of those processes were to determine the guilt or innocence of a defendant in felony cases.

My role in one of the cases was the jury foreman, and my role in the second example was -- what's interesting about that role is, I was a juror who brought leadership and support to a reluctant jury foreman, and what I mean by that is, the person who -- when we went in to start deliberations, the first thing you do is decide who the jury foreman would be, and someone recommended right off the start that the jury foreman should be a woman. That was the opening statement, the jury foreman should be a woman.

So there was, I think, four women as a part of the jury, and there was a librarian who a subset of the group had, I guess, predetermined that she would be a good jury foreman. So she was nominated.

Before she was nominated, another individual was identified, and that person declined, and then, when the librarian was nominated, she reluctantly accepted, and she stopped and she looked at me and said, "I was thinking you should be the jury foreman."

I asked her what her concerns were about being the jury foreman, which she shared, and I said, "Well, we'll be here to support you." And so she took the role, and what I realized in the process is that, having had some previous experience of being the foreman, I was there to -- was able to be able to support her, and at the conclusion of us coming up with the verdict and completing our task as a jury, she commented about how much she appreciated that support.

So I think that's an example of where that could have been a conflict. We could have argued about whether it should really be a woman or not, or, you know, any number of things could have happened around that simple declaration to derail the process, but what I recognized is that we were there for something bigger, and so I stayed focused on that, and tried to use every opportunity in the

process to keep us going in that direction.

So, of course, in the jury process, people bring their own personal experiences, as much as the prosecution and the defense attorneys try to manage for that in terms of the jury selection process, which the last one I was on, it took five days just for selection, which was like, "Oh, my God." But, as much as they try to manage for that, the reality is, we all bring our own biases, etcetera, to an experience.

So that was the biggest, I guess, challenge in that group in terms of conflict, people who had really strong opinions about guilt and what constituted guilt, but we also had a set of guidelines that identified what guilt looked like, so that might be different than how we felt, versus the law.

So how we worked through that conflict was through facilitated engagement, with respect, and a real high-end commitment to empathy, and I think that was really the hallmark, is being very respectful and allowing people to express themselves. I think the lesson was that common ground could be found, and in doing so, no one had to be diminished or vilified.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question five: A considerable amount of the Commission's work will involve meeting with people from all over California who come from

very different backgrounds and a wide variety of perspectives.

If you are selected as a Commissioner, what skills and attributes will make you effective at interacting with people from different backgrounds and who will have a variety of perspectives?

What experiences have you had that will help you be effective at understanding and appreciating people and communities of different backgrounds and who have a variety of perspectives?

MR. LE MONS: So, in my experience as a former therapist, I have experience of engaging and supporting people from all kind of different backgrounds and diverse perspectives. I think my training in that area allows me to be present to another person and be focused on that individual, their belief system, their perspective, and not look at it through the filter of my own.

The key attributes that I have that make me effective is, I believe, my genuine curiosity and interest in those who are different from me, and a belief that our value is intrinsic rather than based on external factors like race, class, gender, geography, to name a few.

A particular experience that comes to mind beyond my private psychotherapy practice was my role as the coordinator and facilitator of a state advisory board on

HIV and AIDS that was made up of representatives from all of the public health jurisdictions across the state of California, which represented, of course, a large and diverse population across a vast geographic area.

My approach, and the tactics that were used -- well, before I get into that, the issue of HIV and AIDS was very controversial at the time. The needs of the diverse communities across the state was vast, and we had to come up with strategies that had to respect the needs of the various counties throughout the state when they have varying needs.

So, oftentimes, the board was faced with coming up with creative and innovative ways of meeting the local communities' needs, as well as meeting the public health crisis that was being faced at the time, and I think the way we got there was a commitment and demand for respect and openness, and support for communities that were not necessarily like our own.

I think that was a really, really important point because, oftentimes, when you sit on an advisory board, you're coming to represent a constituency. You are there to advocate -- or your belief is that you're there to advocate for them in some kind of way, and if that's your sole focus, and you're not also as committed to the outcome supporting those beyond your constituency, it creates a

kind of environment for conflict, wheels to grind to a halt, and you not get where you need to get.

So some of those earlier commitments of the group was really around getting to that place where yes, we're here to advocate for respect, have respect for the constituencies that we represent in our own communities, but we also want to be looking at it through the larger context, and make sure that, while that may not be how we would do it in this particular county, that county really needs that, and I can support their needs for that, and I think that was very productive for the process.

I actually was on that -- facilitated and participated in that board for, I think it was, like three and a half years, also as a member of an institutional review board for the protection of human subjects, which I did for five and a half years, a different board, similarly bringing together very talented people of varying expertise, and getting people to look beyond their expertise, be open, and listen to what the other members around the table are there to bring, and to really value that input, and have it be a true part of your consideration set, rather than just "Okay. Each person gets their turn to say what they need to say."

So those are some of the experiences that I've had in my career that I think position me to be able to

participate in processes that require an outcome that has to serve diverse, vastly diverse, populations, and both of those experiences were here in California. So I've been able to appreciate and experience that diversity.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

At this point, we will go to Panel questions. Each Panel Member will have 20 minutes to ask his or her questions, and we will start with the Chair, Mr. Belnap.

CHAIR BELNAP: Thank you.

Mr. Le Mons, you touched on your time with a state advisory board. I understand it was the California AIDS Clearinghouse.

MR. LE MONS: Yes.

CHAIR BELNAP: In your application, you indicate you were a deputy director. Can you tell me about your role in that organization?

MR. LE MONS: Yes. So the California AIDS
Clearinghouse was the state depository for HIV
prevention/education materials, and so what the
organization's responsibility was, was development, the
housing of materials that were made available to all of the
public health departments across the state of California,
as well as local community-based organizations.

My role as the deputy director is I oversaw those processes. So, I managed a staff that handled our

warehousing, our acquiring of materials from commercial producers like Achaemenid (phonetic) or something like that, our development teams in-house, our writers, our graphics people, production, and training, in particular.

So one of the things I'd like to, if I can, share about that process -- because, also, bringing direction to vision and innovation as well -- so one of the challenges I mentioned earlier about the state being so diverse, and what would happen is, by the time you start out with a particular product, and by the time it got usable, it was diluted, many communities felt were very diluted, and not a good, solid product for them.

So what I remember is, in the earlier days, before the California AIDS Clearinghouse existed, before these particular processes existed, these things were being developed at the community level, and so I thought, "Well, we have our standard fare. We have what we can purchase, which is very similar to the standard fare, because it goes to the same kind of development process. Why not create an opportunity where we train local entities to be able to design things that will be outside of the box, but will be more intentional to their community?"

We were able to do that, and the first training, we did a small pilot in Los Angeles, and, based on that training, we were provided 1.2 million dollars to do that

training statewide, and so we did. Now we're on Zoom. You know, back at that time, this type of engagement wasn't as commonplace, but we engaged a communications company to actually do a multi-site training simultaneously, quite like we're experiencing right here, where we moved between Los Angeles, Alameda County, and San Diego, and was able to train the local communities, and then offer mini-grants to them, to allow them to be able to have the funding to be able to actually produce the product that they ultimately create.

I was very proud of that. That was something that was my vision, and, fortunately, because of my role with the California AIDS Clearinghouse, and my position, I was in a position to put both the resources and the expertise to bear to bring that program forward.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you. Out of curiosity, how was it that the materials came to be diluted over time as they went through the process? I'm not understanding that part.

MR. LE MONS: Okay. So let's say you have -- well, just say you have five people who have different needs, and you divide focus on the needs of person one. It doesn't meet the needs of persons two, three, and four. So, if I choose any of those particular people to focus on their needs directly, by the time you get to something that meets

all five of those people's needs, they don't feel like it meets their needs at all, because it had to take too many other considerations in. So that's what I mean by it became diluted to the point of not usable, in some communities' minds.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you. You mentioned three locations that you traveled to. How broad or how far were your travels in that role?

MR. LE MONS: So the three I mentioned, that was just that training.

CHAIR BELNAP: Yes.

MR. LE MONS: Because of the -- with the advisory board, we hosted it in various counties throughout the state. So it might be Yolo -- and we met four times a year. So we'd go to Yolo. We'd go to the small counties as well as the large counties, so that we would be on the ground and have a full experience, and when I would go to the counties, it wasn't just flying in or driving in for the meeting. It was to really be able to also have an opportunity to meet with some of the local CBOs, to have a real feel for the environment.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you. In those travels, I'd like you to describe some of the experiences you had in your role as deputy director of the AIDS Clearinghouse that increased your appreciation and understanding of

California's diversity.

MR. LE MONS: I think going to Santa Barbara was one that was very interesting. So I live in L.A. County. My perception -- I've been to Santa Barbara many times. I've gone to Santa Barbara socially, though. So what was very striking is the difference in an experience socially.

So let's say -- well, I had a perception of what Santa Barbara was like, based on my social interactions in Santa Barbara, but when I was there in a professional context, completely different, and completely different in that I got to appreciate it's a much more conservative environment that I was able to see as a, quote/unquote, tourist in Santa Barbara. There were certain things that I learned that we needed to be mindful of and appreciative of. So that's one small example.

Another example would be some of the more rural counties. Again, because I'm naturally a curious person, I think, when I'm engaged in interacting, there's a compare and contrast that's sort of automatically happening, and then seeing where "Wow. I mean, that's powerful. That's interesting," so going to some of the rural environments, and just how the pace -- you expect, "It's rural. It might be a different pace." But really seeing the impact of pace was something that I remember standing out for me, and you might think that you can just get something done, done,

done, like that, in certain environments. In other environments, that's not the case.

So, even when you're putting time lines together, particularly when you're talking about reaching out to communities for testimony and feedback, you've got to really be willing to go in and understand how the community works, so that you can get there that much faster, in terms of what -- what I mean by "faster," in what it is you're trying to accomplish. You don't make the kind of mistakes of making a ton of assumptions.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you. How many years were you on UCLA's institutional review board?

MR. LE MONS: Five and a half.

14 CHAIR BELNAP: Five and a half. And what was your 15 role?

MR. LE MONS: A member.

17 CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. And what does a member do for 18 the review board?

MR. LE MONS: So I was on the medical IRB. So there are multiple IRBs at UCLA, and so meaning I would review medical research, devices, and drugs, et cetera. I represented the community. I'm not an MD. I wasn't there -- at the time, I wasn't a therapist. So I was there as a community member. I shared the board membership with MDs and psychologists, but that was the makeup of that

particular board.

What we would get is proposed research that was to be done in a community, whether that be a drug or a device, and we had to review the protocol. We had to make sure that the protection of human subjects was happening, that there was not undue influence in state compensation that might induce people to participate in something that wasn't in their best interest because the compensation was placed too high. We had to look at whether or not the research protocol as laid out by the researcher made sound sense, and that was the board responsibility.

So, as a member of that board, I was required to read the entire protocol, and the protocol could be 100 pages, be 150 pages, and I would have to go through and understand what they wanted to do, understand who the target was, understand that the waivers that are there for people to sign acknowledging their participation were accurate and included all of the things that were in the protocol, because oftentimes what will happen is something might get left out that might scare people from participating that would conveniently not be in the disclosure, so making sure that those things were there, and then voting on whether or not we should proceed with a particular — whether we would approve a particular protocol or send it back for additional information, and

then have that rotate back into our caseload, and the caseload may be -- I might have anywhere from, you know, 50 protocols to read and be prepared for, for the meeting.

CHAIR BELNAP: So I noted that you didn't use this particular example in your essay on impartiality, but I wanted to give you the opportunity to talk about how you need to exercise impartiality on this particular review board.

MR. LE MONS: Well, I think the first thing in terms of being impartial is to examine where you see conflicts of interest. So I think that's important, because I think sometimes you may not understand -- you may have a blind spot in that area.

So I think that's the first step of personally committing to impartiality, is looking and seeing "Is there a conflict?," whether that's a belief conflict, whether that's an affiliation conflict, whatever, and, with that said, when you go in, objectivity on something like this is crucial.

So the way you ensure impartiality is to -- in the case of the board, it really isn't about my personal point of view. I mean, that just doesn't come to bear there. So I can acknowledge if I have a personal point of view, to myself or even to my colleagues, but what I also respect is that it's not about my personal point of view.

So what I need to be evaluating this on is based on a very clear set of criteria that I fully understand, and if I don't understand that criteria, my commitment is to inquire and get clarity with fellow board members and those that also govern our board as well, to ensure that that's how I'm approaching it. So I think impartiality is a commitment. It's ability to recognize where you may be impartial, and then to know how to manage for that.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you. You indicated in your application that you have had some data mapping experience. Can you describe what that experience was?

MR. LE MONS: Yeah. So, when I worked for the L.A. Gay and Lesbian Center as a director of HIV prevention, I worked in consort with the health department, the local health departments, and a lot of data mapping was being done, of course, to track transmission, where there are clusters and things of that nature. So, while I didn't, as a research, do the actual data mapping, I was a part of teams and processes that supported that work being done, as well as being able to receive and review and understand those reports as they were done and distributed.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

MR. LE MONS: You're welcome.

CHAIR BELNAP: I don't have any further questions

at this time. Mr. Coe, if you want to take over, that would be great.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good afternoon, Mr. Le Mons. Thank you for taking the time to speak with us today.

MR. LE MONS: Of course. Thanks for having me.

PANEL MEMBER COE: In your final essay, you state that you have a passion for maximizing human potential, and you've spent your career dedicated to improving the quality of life and well being for all, especially those that are vulnerable or in underserved communities. Where do you think that this passion comes from?

MR. LE MONS: That's a good question. So, as you were asking me that question, I smiled a little bit, and it kind of took me back to -- I'll tell a quick little story.

So, when I was a freshman in undergraduate, I went to school -- my major was business/pre-law when I enrolled, and I remember coming home for the first break, and my grandfather, who was a physician, was asking me, querying me about, you know, my career trajectory, et cetera, and so I had to tell him that I wasn't as certain as I thought I was, because initially it was "He's a doctor, so I don't want to do that. I'll be a lawyer." That was sort of the motivation.

So he was already not happy with me because of that

choice, and then now I wasn't so sure that that was my choice. So what I realized is, I had made that choice really in reaction to him, and not really because that's what I wanted to do.

My childhood best friend, who I hadn't seen since the sixth grade, I had ran into someone freshman year at school who had his picture in a yearbook kind of thing, and I'd gotten his phone number. So, on this break, I gave him a call, and, like I said, we hadn't seen each other or talked to each other since we were 12, and we were on the phone with each other from 11:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m., catching up, like eight hours of phone conversation.

In that phone conversation, he said -- just let me preface this with one thing. My mother was asking, "Well, what do you want to do?" And I said, "I don't know." That was where we kind of left that. So back to the conversation. In the course of the conversation, he said to me, "Antonio, I want to thank you." And I said, "For what?" He said, "You were the only person who believed in me."

I had no idea what this person was talking about, and he said, "Do you remember when we were in Ms. Hawkins' class? That was third grade." I said, "Yes. Of course I remember Ms. Hawkins." He said, "You remember I was a D and F student?" "Yes, I remember you were a D and F

student." He said, "No one believed in me, including my family," he said, "but you used to always say to me, 'Don't listen to them. You can be anything you want to be,' and I carried your voice with me, and today I'm a freshman at" -- whatever university he was at. He was a pre-med student.

I remember just starting to cry, literally tears just -- and I'm not quick to emotion like that, generally. And I harkened back to the question my mother had asked me, what did I want to do, and in that moment, it just was clear to me that I want to help people see the best in themselves, and in doing that, when people see the best in themselves, and they're bringing their best to whatever the situation is, that is the epitome of maximizing human potential.

So that's why I think I do what -- it triggered something in me, and maybe, as a kid -- I'm the oldest, and I didn't really have anybody to follow. I had to figure it out on my own, so to speak, and I remember telling my dad that if I had half a road map, oh my God, what could have been possible, or what could be possible, and, I mean, I'm a pretty successful guy.

So it's that kind of people seeing you, people holding you up and encouraging you, is something that really touches my heart, and that's what I do in anything I

do, is really look for that opportunity to be that person for someone else.

PANEL MEMBER COE: How do you -- with that experience, that perspective, that passion, how do you think that can help you be an ideal Commissioner for the work of this Commission?

MR. LE MONS: I think the greatest thing we all want to do is be witnessed, and I think I do that. I know I do it. I mean, it's just who I am. And I think, when people feel seen, it helps them not feel as defensive. I think, as a Commissioner, that will be great. If you don't have 14 defensive people trying to get a job done, you have a better environment for cooperation.

I think my ability to express empathy is very strong. I think that's also very important, but I'm also very logical and very analytical, so it's this sort of balance of being able to be both of those things. I think those would be the kinds of things that would help have us be a successful Commission if I were a member.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you. In the same essay that we were just talking about, you also -- your career to the ability to listen, synthesize the information received from multiple contributors, clearly and succinctly help to find objectives and develop comprehensive plans. Can you provide us with a specific example of a time where you have

done this?

MR. LE MONS: Can you repeat that, please? The first part of what you said I didn't hear, unfortunately. It kind of was --

PANEL MEMBER COE: Sure. Okay. Yes. In the same essay that we were just talking about, you attribute the success of your career to your ability to listen, synthesize the information received from multiple contributors, clearly and succinctly help define objectives and develop comprehensive plans, and I'm wondering if you can give us an example of that.

MR. LE MONS: Sure. So, well, I talked about the advisory board, so I'll talk about a different -- because that was a great example of that, actually, but, also, as the executive vice-president at FAME Assistance

Corporation, we had diverse departments and divisions, so everything from property management to nutrition to tobacco control, transportation, like, all these units with different agendas, with different needs, different expectations.

So, as the EVP, I'm responsible for resource distribution. I'm responsible for operations and support of all of these different divisions, and what I believe is, when I bring my teams together, my first order of business is to hear them, is to truly hear them. Like, I hold the

vision and the mission and all that. Yes, I got that. But my goal isn't to go in trying to bend someone to that.

It's "Okay. The way we achieve that is through this collective process."

So I have to understand what each of these individuals need, and I have to understand very clearly what the obstacles are, because, in my role, what I'm responsible for is mitigating those obstacles, and so whether that is in, you know, a team of professionals who have a common objective but different paths to get there, whether that is sitting with a person in the therapy room and having a very clear understanding of what they've expressed their objective is, and being able to see, by listening, where the obstacles are for them, where the development needs to happen for them in order to meet those objectives.

So, once I hear that information, I litmus it to "Where is it that we're trying to go? What is it that we're trying to achieve?" And through that, bringing those two pieces together, I'm able to see pathways to those objectives, and then offer those pathways up for consideration with the people that I'm talking to. So it isn't just me saying, "This is how you do it." It's "How about this?" And then that begins to open up where we find agreement and consensus, and then how we go about moving

forward. So that would be an example.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you. One of the biggest tasks in front of this Commission is going to be identifying communities of interest across the state. Some of those communities are easier defined and located than others, and some of them are less engaged and harder to identify. How would you go about, if you were a Commissioner, having the Commission find communities of interest, particularly those that might be harder to locate?

MR. LE MONS: Well, I would begin with being on the -- not necessarily physically saying "on the ground," but reaching out initially to people who are on the ground, who understand the community, particularly if it's a community that I'm not familiar with, and understanding from those individuals who engage with the community, who understand how the community behaves in terms of movement, communication, communication channels that work best for them, et cetera, first getting that understanding.

So it would be partnering with local community, and "local" could be anything from the neighborhood council organizations that are high-profile in those particular areas, and then, once you have an understanding of kind of who's in the field, the first question I always ask a group of people when I bring them together is "Who is missing?

Who is not here?" So that's really important. I'm really big on -- you don't start setting the table and then invite people.

Before you start setting it, understand who is not in the room, and so is there a way to get them in the room? Is there a way to get in contact with those representatives as well? So making sure that inclusion happens, and then, you know, once that has happened, then they'll teach you how to reach the community. That's really what it's going to come down to. They'll tell you how to reach the community.

I've been involved in community participatory research for many, many years, and, you know, as a community first model, it is all about going to the community respectfully, in the very beginning, and asking the community, partnering with the community toward your goal, not using the community, because most of our models do just that. We use the community for our own benefit, say, "We want to do such-and-such. We want to target that group. Let's go" -- they have no -- they weren't a part of the design. None of their needs were taken into consideration.

So community participatory research is a fundamentally different philosophy about how you approach and engage community from the beginning, and I would lean

on that experience and those skill sets in order to reach communities.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you. Kind of to dovetail off that, some residents or some communities are less engaged with government and governmental activity than other communities, and that's for various reasons, and because of that, their influences and their perspectives may be harder to come by and harder to find.

Do you think that your background as a therapist could help encourage some of these communities that are less engaged, or would be concerned about engaging for one reason or another -- do you think your background can help encourage them to get involved in the redistricting process?

MR. LE MONS: Sure. I don't think it rises and falls on my therapeutic background, actually, but, as you were saying it, I was thinking about, well, the first thing would just be to understand what the barrier is of engagement for those communities, so, A, if we can access them, and then query, genuinely speaking, you know, with real curiosity, as to why don't they participate, and then look at the reasons why they -- and can we affect why they don't participate, because that's really what it comes down to.

If we can't affect why they don't participate, then

where we may be left is just documenting that "We have individuals that, for these reasons, aren't ready to be engaged or aren't prepared to be engaged. However, here's recommendations on how you prepare these communities for future engagement." You know, don't stop at "Well, you know, they're not" -- it could be any number of things. It could be language. It could be fear of government. It could be immigration status.

I mean, it could be all kinds of things that individuals are like, "I don't want any part of that," and you may not be able to move the needle on that in this particular process, based on its time line. However, I think we would do ourselves a disservice if we aren't documenting that, and then coming up with recommendations so, next time around, we have more people engaged. That would be how I would conceptualize it.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

MS. PELLMAN: We have six minutes and four seconds remaining.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you for that.

Mr. Le Mons, if you were to be appointed to the Commission, which aspects of that role do you think that you would enjoy the most, and, conversely, which aspects of that role do you think you might perhaps struggle with a little bit?

MR. LE MONS: I think I would enjoy engaging with the community and getting their, you know, contributions. I would enjoy the engagement with the fellow Commissioners as well. I'd enjoy the analysis of the data collection that we would be acquiring. I think the thing that I would -- I'm trying to think of what I would like least. Ι would like least having to constantly have Commissioners off task and off mission. I would enjoy that the least, especially as grueling as this process has been. I would hope that there would be a group of people that were up for the task. So I think that would be, probably, what would be most disappointing, but, as far as the tasks at hand, I think I would enjoy all of them, for different reasons, because I loved puzzles as a kid, so those would all be pieces of the puzzle. So that part would be exciting to me, and it's like bringing all those pieces together. I guess that's what I would like most, is bringing all of those pieces together and, at the end, saying that we had a phenomenal outcome. So that would probably be my answer to that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you, Mr. Le Mons.

No further questions, Mr. Chair.

23 CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Coe.

We'll turn the time over to you, Ms. Dickison.

25 PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Good afternoon, Mr. Le

Mons. Give me just a minute. Some of my questions have been answered, so let me just look really quickly, here.

MR. LE MONS: Good afternoon to you as well.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: So something you talked about is your training as a psychotherapist, and I know that, in your impartiality essay, that you talked about some of this training has taught you how to recognize biases, including your own. What are you biases, and how will you ensure they don't influence your decisions?

MR. LE MONS: Okay. So my positive bias is toward people who are confident and driven. So I know I have that bias, like, I privilege that. And so, going into a situation, understanding that, what I have to be mindful of, like in a therapeutic situation, would be the very fact that they're there working on something may have them present as not confident, and you have to be mindful of that. Like, you can't just cheer the finish line. You've got to cheer the whole journey, and, of course, I do. I mean, I'm about the whole journey. But I know that my bias is toward those that really want to work.

So where that could be frustrating is if I have a client who's canceling and missing their sessions, they're late. So that, for me, it's like the person is not there to work and get the job done. So I know that about myself, and so, while it's not just knowing it, it's about -- so

say, for example, I have a client -- and I've had this situation, where I have a client that fits that profile, where they're constantly canceling or coming up with excuses to be late for session.

It is to feel like the sensory part of that, like, "Oh, okay," be aware of how that triggers me, and so be extra mindful in my communication with them, that I would go back and re-read a communication in that case, to make sure that I haven't shown up in that communication influenced by my reaction to what they're doing, as opposed to understanding it clinically as very appropriate, what they're doing, based on where they are. So that would be a practical example of how I would recognize my bias, be present to it, but then also know how to manage for it in real time.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. So, thinking about that training, and your understanding on that, do you have tips and tricks that you could share with other Commissioners that could help the Commission in its goals?

MR. LE MONS: I'm sure I do, absolutely. I mean, I don't have, like, something right at this moment that I would go, "Yes, we'd do that." I think, just in how I would be on the Commission, and the commitment with my fellow Commissioners. Those things would come automatically. I'm not a -- so I'm a little bit of a

storyteller, but I do want to tell this little quick story that I hope gets to that point.

I was a part of a Rand study on the force of homelessness for L.A. County a couple decades ago, and I was someone -- it was a longitudinal study, where we tracked cohorts of homeless people for two and a half years. So I had a cohort of about 80-something respondents that I had to keep up with and interview every month for two and a half years, and one might think that keeping up with homeless people was easy. It's not.

So one of the things that would come up time and time again our debriefs was -- I had the highest retention rate of any of my colleagues, fellow researchers, and the question would always be "Antonio, what are you doing? What are you doing?" And I was like, "I don't know." I really didn't. I mean, it's like, I have no idea what I'm doing, or why I'm able to find my people, why they show up, because one of the things that was different for me is I didn't have to find a lot of my people. My people showed up.

At the end of the two and a half years, when we were doing the exit interviews, it was at that time I discovered why I was able to be successful with having maintained throughout the project the highest retention rates, and it came accidentally. I was doing these exit

interviews. What I constantly kept hearing from them was "You treated me like a human being. I felt like a human being with you." So there was something that I -- just who I am as a person and being open to the population I was working with.

At the time, you know, I dressed pretty much the way I dress always. So I was dressed just like I'm dressed today. I drove a convertible BMW on skid row, and no one ever broke into my car, any of those things, right? And one day I was -- one of my respondents was walking down the street. I saw him.

I had not seen him in a couple months. He had been in jail, I later found out, but I told him, "Come on. You know, jump in the car, and let's go do your interview now." And I remember he stopped. He looked at himself. He looked at the car, as if to say, "You're going to let me get in your car?" And I saw him do that. I said, "The seats are leather. I can wipe them off. Let's go," you know, and he jumped in the car, and we went to the office, and we did his interview.

That, for me, first, it was very genuine, and I think he realized that. This property, this stuff, this perception, all of this stuff, is not more important than you. I don't value this stuff over you, the human being, and I think that's the kind of connection that helps

facilitate engagement with people, not just in that scenario, I think very similarly around the table.

I may have a different view than a fellow

Commissioner, but my openness and respect for them as a

fellow human being, I think, really creates the opportunity

for us to be able to engage and move forward together, and

I think just doing that throughout the process, and then

maybe saying, "Well, here's a tip on how you can come to

that place if that's difficult for you." I would say that

tips emerge more organically than me having some, you know,

bag of tricks that I do, because that's not how I operate.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Okay. Thank you for that. So you talked about, as part of the advisory board, you went to a lot of the different counties in the state as part of that work. As you were traveling to those different counties and areas, what did you notice about the differences between those areas that, you know, might influence their preference for representation?

MR. LE MONS: Well, I think that, you know, whatever goes into someone's consideration set as it relates to representation, it's probably going to be driven by the belief that "Whoever I'm supporting in terms of representation for me has my best interests at heart." And so where the diversity comes is, in our society, there are key groups of people whose best interest is served more

often than not, and there are other groups of people whose interest is never served.

So I think that, as I've traveled throughout the state, our state, like any other state, as progressive and amazing, and fifth largest economy, and all the great stuff that makes California what it makes it, we have some of those same challenges when it comes to representation, and so I think being able to recognize where people are, what they need, and to be able to make sure that, again, we're supporting it, we're trying to move the needle toward the sort of more utopian idea of representation and needs being met, but, at the same time, all needs aren't going to get met. They aren't.

I think, as a Commission or as any group of people who have a responsibility, legislators, et cetera, who have a responsibility for a group of people's needs, is really making sure that the intention is there, there's honest effort toward that, and if, I think, communities see that that's really what's happening, like, "This person really has to balance my needs against a broad base of needs, but I'm a part of the consideration set," then that's what they really want, and I think we should be, as Commissioners, as we're out in the community, throughout the counties, looking at "Do we understand the needs?" That's the key, not our perception of the need. Have we did what we needed

to do to understand the need? Therefore, we can communicate.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Well, I see that you currently have your own coaching and consulting firm. Is that correct?

MR. LE MONS: Yes.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: And then you're also working with FAME?

MR. LE MONS: Yes.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Okay. Do you have other commitments, volunteer commitments, or other types of commitments as well?

MR. LE MONS: I'm a parent. I have a commitment to my children. I have two teenage boys, too.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Oh, my. So how would you balance your professional, parental, and the commitments for the Commission? How would you balance those?

MR. LE MONS: So I guess I'd look at, you know, I worked full-time, I went to graduate school, and I volunteered. I like to be engaged, not only engaged, but engaged in different things, and I don't know -- as I'm saying this, I'm wondering, is that because it, you know, pulls on different parts of my brain?

I'm not sure, but I'm always a simultaneous,
multi-project person. I always have been. That's where I

thrive best. I'm not the "singularly focused on one thing" guy. So I have just the experience of that, A, and, B, it's what drives me. So I don't see it as much of a challenge in juggling all that. It's actually preferable to me. Yes.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Okay.

MR. LE MONS: I'm pretty organized, too.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: And so the way the Commission is selected, the first eight Commissioners are selected randomly, and then they will select the next six. If you were one of the first eight, what would you look for in the other six?

MR. LE MONS: All the things I said earlier. Let me ask this. How would those eight -- what would be provided to those eight in order to make that selection?

MR. DAWSON: I can answer that question.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Yes.

MR. DAWSON: Well, they would have the benefit of all these interviews and the application materials that the Applicant Review Panel is reviewing.

MR. LE MONS: Okay. So, then, I would, of course, examine those things, and do it through, presumably, the things that I outlined earlier that I thought was important, alongside the things that the Commission has identified, you guys have identified, as important to the

1 Commissioners.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

20

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. What would you ultimately like to see the Commission accomplish?

MR. LE MONS: Being able to meet the objectives of why the Commission was commissioned in the first place, and to successfully do that. That's what I'd like to see the Commission do.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Okay. Mr. Belnap, I have no further questions at this time.

10 CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

We're going to turn the time over to Mr. Dawson.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Madame Secretary, could I have a time check,

14 please.

MS. PELLMAN: Excuse me. Yes. We have 32 minutes and nine seconds.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Mr. Le Mons, I see that you got your bachelor's at Michigan State.

MR. LE MONS: Yes. Go, Spartans.

MR. DAWSON: Go, Spartans. Did you grow up in

22 Michigan?

MR. LE MONS: Yes, I did.

MR. DAWSON: So I'm always curious about folks who

25 came to California as adults, because they chose

California. Why did you come out to California?

MR. LE MONS: Okay. I love this story. So I was 15 years old, and I'm the oldest in my generation, so I grew up with a lot of adults, and my grandmother's brother was coming out here to bring his daughter a new car he had just brought her, and he called my mom, and well, he asked me -- I went to an all-boys private school, and we got out early, earlier than most of the other schools, and so he asked if I'd like to come out here on the road trip with him and help him drive the car.

Now, he didn't know I didn't have a driver's license, because I had been driving since I was 14, and he just assumed I had a driver's license. So, of course, me being the 15-year-old, wanting to go, I said, "Sure. Yes. I'll go help you drive out there," and that's what I did. I helped my great-uncle drive out to California from Michigan, and he stayed two weeks, and I stayed the rest of the summer, and I fell in love with it. I just felt -- I felt like this is where I belonged.

The cousin who we were bringing the car to, she was probably in her -- well, she was in her early 20s, and she was dating some guy, and always gone. So, when he left, imagine a 15-year-old in L.A. with a car, because she gave me the keys to her car. So I was able to -- I can't tell you how much fun I had.

I went up to Hollywood High School and talked to a counselor about enrolling myself, because I told my parents I wasn't coming back, and I was going to stay here, and I ended up staying the entire summer, and my mother basically threatened me, and told me, "Do not make me have to get on a plane to come get you."

So I vowed, as I marched to the airport to fly back to Michigan one day before school started for all that year, that I'd be back, and the moment I graduated undergrad -- I actually got into some schools out here, but

when I was a senior in high school.

So I decided, rather than -- I delayed my coming here because I didn't know -- it was very touch-and-go for her. So I decided to go to a college within the state so I'd be closer to home, but, the moment I graduated from Michigan State -- I graduated in June. I moved here in July.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. So the reason I asked the question is, California, often more than other states, has a lot of folks who were not born here, but made it their home, and I'm wondering if you think that this is a perspective that would assist you in your work on the Commission that maybe a native-born Californian wouldn't have.

MR. LE MONS: Well, it would be a perspective among perspectives. So I'd say, okay. If you have only the perspective of native-born Californians, with no other perspective, then there are certain considerations you may not have to address, but, because of the diversity of not only -- you know, I came here from the Midwest. People come here from all over the United States and make this their home, with diverse perspectives, diverse upbringings, et cetera.

So I think, just having an additional perspective to bring into the equation, there would be value in that, as would any other perspective, though. I don't see it as uniquely being something that would have me stand out, per se. I just think it happens to be a perspective that could add value.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Sort of staying on the same vein of thought, so my understanding is that, while living in California, you've primarily been in L.A. County. Is that correct?

MR. LE MONS: That's correct.

MR. DAWSON: And primarily in an urban environment?

MR. LE MONS: Yes. I also lived in Palm

23 Springs -- well, actually back and forth. So I was in Palm

24 Springs half the week and L.A. half the week for a period

in the late '80s, early '90s.

MR. DAWSON: I see. During your travels in California, with your work or otherwise, do you think that you could still bring an appreciation of the inland and rural communities up and down the state?

MR. LE MONS: Sure. Absolutely.

MR. DAWSON: You talked about, you know, going to these smaller communities as part of your work -- I think it was on the CAC -- and having preconceived notions about certain parts of the state. What were some of those where you were genuinely surprised about what you found in a place where you thought you might find something otherwise?

MR. LE MONS: I'm trying to pick a particular one. Well, you know, what's interesting is, I think, Alameda County, quite frankly. So you think, "Big city." So this is a perception, right? You think, "Big city." If you're from that area, that may not be how you necessarily see yourself, right?

What I found was a very hometown feel in Alameda County. That surprised me. I didn't expect that. I expected something more New York in terms of engagement, or L.A. L.A. is distinctively different from Alameda County, but both are, of course, urban areas. So I think that was surprising. So something that seemed -- or you could expect to be similar was dissimilar in ways that I found surprising.

MR. DAWSON: Interesting. In your analytical essay, you referred to something called a "community participatory research approach."

MR. LE MONS: Yes.

MR. DAWSON: That's a term I'm not familiar with.

Can you explain that, and how that would be significant?

MR. LE MONS: Yes. So I think the best way to kind of succinctly explain it is, most research in our country is done at the academic level, and what happens is, people in academia come up with research ideas to solve for certain problems or issues, which usually requires the community of subjects, and so, once the research protocol is established, they reach out to those perspective communities in order to get participation, and the community members either decide to participate or not.

With a community participatory research -- okay.

So, before I go there, they do the research. They tell them why they're doing it. They get them to participate, and then they go off and they crunch the data, and they come up with whatever they come up with, and wherever that leads, it leads. It gets published in journals, and people make careers, and, you know, whatever else happens, and the community never hears about it again. They just know that some researcher came in a few years ago and did research on high blood pressure on them, never see

them again. That's usually the model, and I don't say that to be critical. I just say that because that's the model, right?

In community participatory research, it is a different frame of mind. So what happens is, the universities, UCLA -- I'll use that as a great example, because I've worked with them. So UCLA partners with the community. What happens is, in the very beginning, if it's ideal, they'll go to community first, and ask community, "How can we be of value to you in us working together? This is the expertise we bring."

Then the community may say, "You know what? In our community, we have a lot of pre-term delivery issues, and, as much as it is talked about nationally, blah, blah, blah, the statistics have not changed over the last decade.

We're really committed to bringing down those statistics in our community." And the researcher says, "Okay. You know, there's people on our team who have a passion for that.

Let's design a protocol." So a protocol gets designed.

The key piece here is, the community is at the table from the beginning. The other key piece is that it's not the community trying to fit their needs into the objective of a researcher. It's the researcher genuinely being interested in being of service to the community.

So the protocol gets designed. It gets approved.

It gets executed. There is a commitment for the data that comes out of the protocol to be given to the community.

The community goes in understanding that they have ownership in the data. So the data is given to them. They may share that amongst community-based organizations.

Community meetings are done to be able to share the data more broadly.

So it's making sure that a full loop happens from beginning to end, so that the community is involved, the researcher gets what they need, community gets what they need, and they may need different things. Like, how the researcher may use that data, ultimately, may be very different than how the community uses the data, but they have access to the valuable tool that came out of the process, which was what? Data. That's probably a way -- that's the best way for me to describe it. There's a lot more nuances to it, but that's the general idea.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

I have no more further questions. Mr. Chair?

CHAIR BELNAP: Did no one do follow-up questions?

MR. DAWSON: I'm sorry. Follow-up questions from the Panel, if there are any.

CHAIR BELNAP: So, Mr. Coe, do you have any follow-up questions?

PANEL MEMBER COE: I have no follow-up questions.

CHAIR BELNAP: Ms. Dickison?

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: I do not have any follow-up questions.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay, I have one. So, Mr. Le Mons, as a former therapist and a professional coach, you have had many experiences interacting with people one on one in small groups. What I'm wondering is, have you had much experience holding public meetings, in particular the type of large public meetings that the Commission might have?

MR. LE MONS: Yes. So, in the community participatory research example I just gave, I worked on several projects where I was a part of that community engagement and bringing communities together in large groups, sometimes hundreds. Usually they were probably 300 or less, I'd say, for the most part, dependent upon exactly what the purpose of the meeting was.

So, if the purpose of the meeting was to actually get data, those groups would have been smaller. It might have been 50 people, 75 people, depending upon the environment. If it was to report data, it's been, you know, 500-plus-type meetings. So it just depends on the nature of the meeting.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

MR. LE MONS: You're welcome.

CHAIR BELNAP: That was my last question.

Madame Secretary, could I have a time check, please.

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. We have 20 minutes and 22 seconds remaining.

CHAIR BELNAP: Thank you.

Mr. Le Mons, I believe that all the questions are done. I'd like to offer you the opportunity now to make a closing statement to the Panel, if you wish.

MR. LE MONS: Sure. So I'd just like to, first of all, make the Panel for making this opportunity available to do it via video. I have to say I did have a little anxiety about having to trudge through the airport and the whole process with COVID-19, you know, going on.

So this I really, really appreciate, and to me, this is a great example of having an objective that you have to meet, because I know there's a deadline that you guys have to meet in order to complete the work that you have to do, and there are unforeseen circumstances, and that's life, but being able to pivot and come up with a way to make it happen so that you can still stay on the path to your objective. I have a ton of respect for that.

Ms. Dickison, you remember that was one of my biases, so I like people that are ready to get it done.

So I wanted to thank you guys for that, and say I really appreciated the communication in the process as

well, from the very beginning up until now. Communication is oftentimes a thing that people don't do well, and I feel like you guys, in terms of keeping us, the Applicants, involved and understanding the process and what's going on, and the little ticklers, and just all of it, was refreshing, and not often the case when you're dealing with government entities sometimes. So I appreciate that as

well.

I look forward to, if selected, being able to bring my experience, my commitment, and what I do think is unique about me as a person is just that, who I am as a person, to the experience. So I think I could have the same resume of all the things that have happened, but without the ingredient that is uniquely Antonio Le Mons, that would be a very different guy talking to you. So that's that hidden part that only I can really kind of articulate, and, hopefully, you felt some of that during this interview, and I look forward to serving, if asked to do so.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

We're going to go into recess now, and be back at 2:50 p.m.

(A recess was held from 2:27 p.m. to 2:59 p.m.)

23 CHAIR BELNAP: It being 2:59, I want to call this 24 meeting back out of recess.

I want to check, Mr. Coe. Can you hear me?

PANEL MEMBER COE: I can hear you just fine, Mr.

2 Belnap.

3

7

8

9

10

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIR BELNAP: Excellent.

4 Ms. Dickison?

5 PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Yes. I'm here, and I can 6 hear you.

CHAIR BELNAP: I want to welcome Genevieve Murphy.

Ms. Murphy, can you hear us?

MS. MURPHY: Yes, I can.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay.

MS. MURPHY: Can you hear me?

12 CHAIR BELNAP: Yes.

MS. MURPHY: Great. Thank you.

14 CHAIR BELNAP: All right. We'll turn the time over 15 to Mr. Dawson for the standard questions.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Murphy, I'm going to ask you five standard questions that the panel has requested that each Applicant respond to. Are you ready, ma'am?

MS. MURPHY: I am, thank you.

MR. DAWSON: Question one: What skills and attributes should all Commissioners possess? What skills or competencies should the Commission possess collectively?

Of the skills, attributes and competencies that
each Commissioner should possess, which do you possess? In

summary, how will you contribute to the success of the Commission?

MS. MURPHY: Thank you. Well, I'd like to start, and make sure I'm not just sort of repeating back to you what you outlined so clearly for us in the application process, and really underscore what's important for you to hear, but I'll do so in the context of why I think certain things are so important.

So, first off, in my opinion, this whole idea of the ability to be able to be impartial is absolutely crucial, because it's at the heart of everything that this mission -- or that this Commission is tasked to do.

I think you have to put aside all of your own potentially political preferences, et cetera, and make sure that you're really focused on what's most important, which is drawing lines, district lines, that will allow each person the ability to elect the candidate of their choosing. That's really at the spirit and the heart of everything we're doing. So I think that's absolutely critical as a group, and individually as to Commissioners.

I think the other thing that goes hand in hand with that is just an appreciation and respect, I think is the key word, for diversity, and I think, in order to truly serve in the best manner the constituents of California, you really need to understand their wants, their needs,

their desires, and be able to respect that, and any differences included in that.

Thirdly, analytical skills, not just quantitative but qualitative, I think, are absolutely critical. I think I understand that you're not expecting every Commissioner to be a statistician. However, let's be clear. This is going to be a very data-intensive process, and I think, you know, it really starts from the beginning, which is understanding all the laws and mandates that are applicable to the work of the administration -- or to this Commission, and so thoroughly understanding them pretty quickly, so that you can identify what data is required, and you have to start that rather early.

So, again, that's both quantitative and qualitative, and, clearly, I don't think there will be a lot of -- you know, thankfully, the Commission will be able to hire some help, some experts, to help with the major data crunching, but, still, you have to understand enough where that data is coming from, what makes it useful information, be able to make sure that you have what you need early in the process, to be able to base your decisions off that, ultimately.

I also understand that, between the federal and state law, there will be some, you know, prioritizations that have to be made. You have to look at, holistically,

each and every mandate, but then all together, too, to understand that there are going to be trade-offs required, and that may not be the right word, but, you know, lawfully meeting the mandate of one law will also constrain some of your decisions in prioritizing some of the others. So, overall, I think you have to be able to look at that analytically, process a ton of data, and be able to do so very thoughtfully.

I also think it's important for the Commission as a whole to have project management skills and experience. You know, the time line, you can say it's a full year, but, you know, it's rather tight, given everything that has to be accomplished. So I think it's very important, from the onset, to be able to set milestones first, actually, a line on what the key objectives are, set milestones and make sure you're adhering to that, and, you know, executing currently (sic).

I think the ability to work together as a team is key, so you need to have Commissioners who are good team players, can communicate well, who can create an environment where they trust one another, and feel comfortable asking difficult questions and having some serious conversations.

I also think -- and this is something I learned to appreciate early in my career, but more and more as it goes

on -- especially in project-based work, you need to have some stamina, quite frankly, and a sense of urgency. Early on, I was a management consultant, one of my first jobs out of school, and I said, "My gosh. What's, you know, a new graduate going to be able to do and keep up with these intellectuals, et cetera, et cetera?"

What I found was the work -- it wasn't so much that -- well, it was intellectually challenging, but I think the hardest part was the endurance and the stamina, just making sure that you were extremely focused on the task at hand, and you will do anything you can to meet it. A deadline is a deadline. You have to pull together and do that collectively.

So I think that those are all sort of important skills and competencies, et cetera, that's required of the Commission, and I do think that I could capably fulfill all those, and otherwise, honestly, I wouldn't have applied, and I think it's what appealed to me so much, is a combination of those things in my own background and experience, I think, would go hand and hand with all of that.

I'm trying to think of the other part of your question, make sure I answer it all fully. So, in summary, I would just say, too, all of my career-based work up to date, the majority of it has been project-based, both

for-profit and non-profit, so I'm very comfortable working in teams on project-based work.

I don't think it's any coincidence, actually, that I've spent my career doing this, because it's what appeals to me. I love people. I feel like there's so much more to be accomplished when you work together as a team, especially if you have some wonderful people coming together with the best of intentions.

So I think that's a lot of what inspired me to apply for this role, and, honestly, I think, again, why I answered with being able to be impartial is so important -- my number one response is that I do. I think it's at the heart of what we're doing. It's what appealed to me most. There are many things that made me jump at this opportunity, but that's the thing that appealed to me the most.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question two: Work on the Commission requires members of different political backgrounds to work together. Since the 2010 Commission was selected and formed, the American political conversation has become increasingly polarized, whether in the press, on social media, and even in our own families.

What characteristics do you possess, and what characteristics should your fellow Commissioners possess, that will protect against hyper-partisanship? What will

you do to ensure that the work of the Commission is not seen as polarized or hyper-partisan, and avoid perceptions of political bias and conflict?

MS. MURPHY: You know, personally, I believe I do have a high degree of patience and self-control, and I think that's really important, to be able to distance yourself and your personal views and bring them into a situation where they really shouldn't -- where they don't belong, quite frankly.

I also personally just value other people's opinions. I find you can arrive at a much better conclusion, actually, sometimes, when there is some difference of opinion. You have to be able to respect that, but it kind of sometimes will ultimately get you to a better outcome or conclusion. It would be quite boring if we all thought the same way.

However, I do trust that this panel, too, will make, you know, prudent selections, to make sure, again, that people aren't just responding that being impartial is very important, but I think you'll get to the heart of pulling people who truly they mean it, because that has to be one of the superseding kind of factors.

With that said, I think it's fair, early on in the process, for this Commission to say, from the onset -- kind of make a declaration of sorts, to say this is the highest

priority for each and every one of it. Let's self-police a little bit, and be willing to call each other out if, you know, anyone is sort of branching out in a direction that's a bit dangerous or definitely off course.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question three: What is the greatest problem the Commission could encounter, and what actions would you take to avoid or respond to this problem?

MS. MURPHY: I think it's a great question. I think, in trying to come up with the best response for this, I look at what variables the Commission will be most dependent on, and to me, data kind of is the first thing that comes to mind, and I have worked in very data-intensive kind of project management scenarios before, and things go wrong with the data sometimes.

To me, I think that would be one of the most dangerous things that could confront the Commission, and especially if it happens, you know, late in the process, where data that they were relying on to -- that they based on their decisions on were somehow wrong, inaccurate, et cetera, because, in this case, from my understanding of the work, you would have to go back and revisit absolutely every decision you made, and have to, you know, redraw, potentially, if that data was bad.

So I was thinking, you know, again, if it was late

in the time line and that happened, what would you do to rectify that situation? Clearly, you'd have to get the right data. You would have to know how to do that, and then you would have to go back and re-question or revisit every decision you made, and do so quickly, and, again, I think I said it earlier, but a deadline is a deadline. So you would all have to pull your weight, and just make it happen. Maybe it's sheer will and determination, but it would have to happen.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question four: If you are selected, you will be one of 14 members of the Commission, which is charged with working together to create maps of the new districts. Please describe a situation where you had to work collaboratively with others on a project to achieve a common goal.

Tell us the goal of the project, what your role in the group was, and how the group worked through any conflicts that arose. What lessons would you take from this group experience to the Commission, if selected?

MS. MURPHY: Okay. I'm going to share an experience that I had most recently, and I'll give you a little context as I delve in, so you can understand my role a little better, but, several years, probably six or seven years ago -- I'll tell you first I have a business called Visiting Angels that I run, and we provide homecare for

seniors, and I'm very active in my community, and wanted to get involved with our local hospital.

So I met with someone from, you know, our foundation there, and the liaison was telling me about a corporate program that they have, where each business donates a certain amount of money, and each year, they are able to pool that together and then purchase a big piece of equipment for the hospital from their wish list that they otherwise wouldn't be able to afford.

So it sounded great, and, you know, I jumped in, but I did ask the same liaison if there was anything else available that might pull on my heartstrings a little more, where I could connect a little more with patients, and she said, "You know, it's interesting you ask at this time, because we just had a young patient dying of colon cancer, actually, who" -- he had requested -- he had a doctor, an oncologist, a very young, out-of-the-box thinker, wonderful man, and he had had a conversation with this young patient and said, you know, "Now, while you're still -- you know, towards the end of his treatment, he said, "You know, you still have a lot of vitality. You're feeling good. Make a list of everything that you want to do, and we're going to help support you, and figure out how to check off, you know, this list."

He didn't have money. He didn't have any money at

all, and he actually reached out to friends -- he had

Facebook -- and asked for their support, and his list was

simply he wanted to go onto the Ellen DeGeneres show, he

wanted to have a photo shoot done, things of that nature.

And so it was actually his fellow patients, social workers,

and nurse, doctor, who rallied around him and made this,

like, list come to life.

They checked everything off. They made everything happen. And he got very reflective at the end, and he said, "You know, I want everyone to be able to have this opportunity," and so they had this idea to create this bucket list project. It was really his. It was his final real wish, it was beautiful.

I kind of came in at that time when this group was getting together to make this happen, and so we did, and ultimately, well, under the chair of the -- sorry. As part of the foundation, I actually chaired the committee, and we grew and grew, and it was a wonderful experience, and I'm going to take you from here, kind of, but we actually got so much momentum that the foundation said, you know, "If you would like at this point, feel free. You can branch out and go out on your own, become your own 501(c)(3).

So, we had, you know, a small board at the time.

It was more of a committee. And some people wanted to stay with the -- you know, current foundation, but most people

said, "No, let's do it." And so we did. We took a leap of faith, and from that point forward, I've led the business side of things, and really have been the president ever since. To establish ourselves, we got our tax-exempt status in January 2017, and have grown the organization since then.

As you can imagine, there are many steps along the way, and this was done as a volunteer. I run my own company, so this is on the side. But, you know, it was full of lessons, and people and personalities, and we made it happen, though.

We're at the point now where, actually, I'm going to step down as the president, because we've raised enough money where we can hire an executive director, and it's really been one of the more satisfying career experiences I've had. So it's been wonderful. It's taught me lots of lessons.

So I think that's the other part of your question, and I would say I actually -- you know, I was going to share a work example, because I've led a lot of, you know, for-profit work projects, but this one is near and dear to my heart, and I think, too, when you're working with volunteers, everyone has to be treated with that much more respect and kindness and patience.

You're all in it together, but, you know,

volunteers are donating their time, their talent, their treasure, and everyone kind of wants something different from, you know, the experience, and what I've learned, though, I think, can be applied to any project team.

I think, early on, it's important to set norms and expectations for how you work together. I think it just avoids conflicts, like, down the line, to kind of set that up, up front, so expectations are clear, similarly, setting objectives, and aligning yourselves to those, being clear on roles and responsibilities, who is going to do what.

I think, once you do those things, they may seem overly formal, but then I think that you can also always give people the benefit of the doubt. It's easier to hold people responsible and accountable for their roles in what you're doing, and making sure everyone is contributing.

Again, I'm not saying everyone needs to be treated equally, either. That's something else. Some people want to do a lion's share of the work. I tend to be one of those, and I'm willing to do the time, but I think, again, especially in volunteer-type situations, you know, people get burned out, too.

So you have to be careful of that and mindful of that, but, again, I think it's just amazing what a really group -- amazing what people can accomplish if they're well intended, and they collaborate, and they get together in

the spirit of doing wonderful things.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

MS. PELLMAN: We have 14 minutes, 35 seconds remaining.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Question five: A considerable amount of the Commission's work will involve meeting with people from all over California who come from very different backgrounds and a wide variety of perspectives. If you are selected as a Commissioner, what skills and attributes will make you effective at interacting with people from different backgrounds and who will have a variety of perspectives? What experiences have you had that will help you be effective at understanding and appreciating people and communities of different backgrounds and who have a variety of perspectives?

MS. MURPHY: I think my answer starts from when I was young. I've always sort of sought out opportunities that would, in a way, open up my own world and expose me to different things, different cultures, different people, et cetera, and, you know, I traveled extensively as soon as I could.

I volunteered in Africa one summer, and even locally, too. I've always been a committed volunteer, and I think all of those experiences have been wonderful in

terms of giving me an appreciation for people of different backgrounds, different than my own, but just in general, different from one another.

I'm a people's person. I really genuinely have an interest in connecting with people and understanding their stories, where they're from, and always want to serve, and you know, I say diversity, too. I think, still, quickly, people always look at race and ethnicity, but, I mean, diversity across the board, in terms of gender, sexual preference, et cetera, economically speaking, and I think, too, people always assume that, when you talk about diversity and appreciating it, you're talking about people, perhaps, who have circumstances perhaps sometimes seen as less than their own, and I think it goes across the board. It could be anything, too.

So I have a genuine appreciation for that. I've always sought out opportunities where I could work with a lot of different people. Right now I'm in a service industry where I work with families of all types. I have a very diverse workforce, and relationship-driven businesses, I think, require that, that appreciation, that respect, and I think it really does boil down to that word, "respect." I think, if you really have it, and you practice it, it's everything, really.

I'm fortunate to have lived in Long Beach for the

past, you know, 14 years, where we're an extremely diverse city. I was part of the Leadership Long Beach board for a long time, and we weren't just concentrating on one neighborhood in our city. I think over 40 languages are spoken.

As a matter of fact, the Cambodian community was going through something recently where they were explaining that they're split up amongst four districts right now, and were making a big case for being pulled together, so that their community of interest would not lose their voice, and I found that very interesting, especially given the type of work we're doing right now.

So, in any event, you know, again, I've always been drawn towards volunteer experiences, and more service work.

I think some people tend to get uncomfortable with diversity. I'm the opposite. I seek it out. I'm more uncomfortable when there isn't diversity.

I can even tell you my daughter, when she first started kindergarten, our first experience with school, we had selected an elementary school of choice which was very diverse. We have a naval base, and I mean that economically as well as racially, ethnically, et cetera, and it's part of what makes the school so wonderful.

At the last minute, we were bumped to a nearby school, which was fine, another amazing school, but it

actually struck me at the first day. We looked across the sea of students, and there was no diversity at all. It actually made me uncomfortable, and I talked to another parent. She actually shared the same concern, but other people were like, "What are you talking about?" It's just something I'm aware of, and, again, I just think it's part of what makes our state, in particular, so wonderful.

I was listening to the governor the other day, and it was only 24 or 48 hours after he had given the orders to stay home, and some people were saying, you know, "Look at all these people. They're not listening. They're not paying attention." And he said, you know, "In all fairness, some people just literally have not gotten the message, partially because, you know, we haven't even had a chance to go do a campaign, soon you'll be seeing billboards, et cetera. We're doing out best, but 30 percent of our state is, you know, born elsewhere, non-native."

He said, "And, again, the only reason why I'm bringing attention to that is that, quite honestly, we haven't even translated everything into every language we need to and gotten the word out." So I think it's something that I think needs to be understood, appreciated, and kind of important.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

We'll now go to Panel questions. Each Panel Member will have 20 minutes to ask his or her questions, and we will start with the Chair, Mr. Belnap.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Murphy, for being with us. I have a follow-up question from question four.

MS. MURPHY: Okay.

CHAIR BELNAP: You indicated that when the Commission gets together, they should have a session, a brainstorming session, where they talk about norms and expectations. What would your contributions be to that discussion? What would you say should be some of the norms and expectations for that group?

MS. MURPHY: Well, I think Commission is so key, and it can make or break the Commission's work. So that would be my first area of focus, to say, you know, how can we expect to communicate with one another? I mean, a simple example is, like, some people expect a reply to your voicemail or an e-mail within 24 hours. So I'm being very specific here.

I think that is sort of the level that you have to get into, so that people don't get -- you always think of what's going to rub someone the wrong way, too, especially when you're working together as a group, and those are the type of details I would actually dive into, because I

think, once you decide -- you know, some people will say, "Well, I could never get back to you within 24 hours. I work. I take care of kids. I do this," and that's great.

Those are the types of discussions you need to have, to say, "Okay. Collectively, as a group, what will we agree to, and how will this guide the work that we're going to do over the next year?" And you can always revisit them and change them, too, but I think that would help kind of facilitate that process.

Then, also, I mean, that's just how we will work together, but what is the work we'll be doing together? I think coming up with a plan for all of that is obviously extremely important. So then you're kind of getting into the nuances of the law, et cetera, but kind of, very early on -- you can never plan or prepare too early. So I think all of the discussions early on would be focused on that, setting us up for success, really.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you. In your essay on impartiality, you indicate that you have been trained as a facilitator. When and from whom did you receive this training?

MS. MURPHY: You know, it was an outside company. Early on, when I used to live in Philadelphia, I was part of the Junior League there, and that's where I was in charge of all of our training, and so that was one that we

offered, was how -- I was basically using a "train the trainer" approach. So I took training, and, quite honestly, I don't remember the name of the company, but it was an outside company that trained me, and then I, in turn, trained the organization.

CHAIR BELNAP: And this was at your time at Accenture?

MS. MURPHY: No, actually, at the Junior League. So it was a non-profit that I was involved in, the Junior League.

CHAIR BELNAP: The Junior League. Okay.

MS. MURPHY: Yes. Sorry.

CHAIR BELNAP: So what are some of the key principles of facilitation that you learned at that time and that you've implemented since?

MS. MURPHY: Well, the facilitator, sometimes it's difficult for people to play that role, because you would think it's different than the leader of the organization or group. So you're maybe setting strategy, setting the vision, and kind of pull everyone on board, but you're really imparting your message.

Facilitation is when you're actually taking, you know, your personal stuff out of it, and guiding the group to go ahead and arrive at conclusions, or brainstorm, or kind of try to accomplish whatever task is at hand, but you

have to keep the discussion moving. You have to keep it healthy.

You have to learn where to table certain things, certain items for follow-up that's going to drag you down, and you're not focused on, you know, the task at hand, that's one of the key things, I find, and sort of set everything up for next steps, if it's a sort of like a workshop or something that would require multiple meetings.

CHAIR BELNAP: And how would you use that particular principle and others like it in your work as a Commissioner?

MS. MURPHY: Well, I think the reason why I included that in my response is because it really did teach me early on how to kind of remove your own thoughts and opinions from a process. Even if you may have some that are even potentially strong, and that could even help move the group along, you have to learn self-constraint, self-discipline, and really just do what's best for the group than one of the other parts.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you. So either you were in the past or are currently on the board of directors of Leadership Long Beach -- I don't remember which it is -- but what is Leadership Long Beach, and what was your role in that organization?

MS. MURPHY: Sure. It's a fascinating

organization. I think it really is one of the reasons, or maybe just -- I don't know if it's the reason, or just sort of a by-product, what makes our city so wonderful, but a group of very forward-thinking leaders got together years ago, 30 years ago, and said, "How can we not only continue to keep our city great, but make it ever better?"

So they put together this program to empower and connect leaders, to make a difference across the city, and, you know, Long Beach really is a special place, and we have so many involved and well-intended people. It's just amazing, and so it's interesting. It's not so much -- it's not a leadership program that develops leaders. It's a program that takes current leaders and connects them, all in the spirit of trying to improve the city, and trying to, you know, do what's best for the city.

So you get continued fresh thinking, and, again, I mean, I remember going through the program myself, and what was so fascinating about it was you get to spend a day, you know, with your local police, like, you actually get to do a ride-along. You do the same thing with the local firehouse. You're exposed to the arts.

Like, everything that makes -- all the different components of your city you're exposed to, and the leaders of those groups, and, again, the whole fun is how you activate and come up with some sort of service project to

improve, you know, what we already have, or keep it great.

So that's what we do. We have these programs in place each year, both for adults, for senior leaders, as well as for youth, and they're put together and run beautifully. We actually have an executive program in place right now. So I served on the board of directors for a long time.

CHAIR BELNAP: And so the organization is -- it's all about making a difference. So what are some of the initiatives and efforts that the organization undertook and achieved?

MS. MURPHY: Well, like I said, each year, we have a group of students -- I'll go through our main program -- that are divided, ultimately -- they come through and learn all about different aspects of the city, like I said, but, ultimately, they're supposed to break up into subgroups and then come up with these service projects, which they present to the community, and some are adopted and move on.

Some are sort of one-time projects, but, also, they can ultimately, potentially, connect with another non-profit that already is in existence, or it doesn't have to be a non-profit. It could also be a government-posted FEDRA.

They're exposed to so many different areas of the

city, and, again, Leadership Long Beach is not just about, like, the service projects themselves and what happens to them ultimately, but it's just, again, connecting people, and making sure that people with these amazing intentions kind of ultimately go out to the right place to serve, indefinitely, hopefully, a bigger, better role than they would have otherwise filled.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. So right now you're the owner of Heavenly Homecare or Visiting Angels. Which one is it?

MS. MURPHY: The DBA is Visiting Angels, but it's a franchise, so the S-Corporation name is Heavenly Homecare.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. So why did you start this company or start this franchise of the company?

MS. MURPHY: I wish I could claim credit for starting the franchise, but, you know, actually, I was getting my MBA, and I've always been blessed, because I've always loved whatever I'm doing at that particular time, but I knew I was ready to go back to business school and get my MBA, and so, as I was going through, my final assignment was "Pick any industry. Dissect its soup-to-nuts numbers. Send it back to the group," so kind of "Wrap up the whole program and show what you learned."

It was then that I found non-medical homecare, and I thought, "My goodness. This is exactly what I want to

do," because it had both components. It had a very philanthropic side -- you know, you're caring people, you're helping society -- but it also is a true business opportunity, too, and I'm not saying non-profits are not. I'm just saying there's sort of a nice marriage between the two, and my personal desire is to serve, but also, you know, to build a business.

So, anyway, I found out about Visiting Angels, in particular, and had called our corporate headquarters, and at the time, I'll never forget the conversation, the woman I spoke with. I was just initially asking for her information, and she said, "Well, you know, we're actually pretty well blanketed out in Pennsylvania," where they're headquartered, and I said, "Oh," and I said, "Well, would you happen to have an opportunities in Long Beach, California?"

She actually let out a little bit of a, you know, expiration, and she said, "Well, you know, if you're serious, let me know, because the owner just passed away two weeks ago, and I'm pretty sure the family is going to put the business up for sale." And so it's almost as if the stars aligned, but I met this gentleman Bob's widow, very soon after, and we immediately connected, and fell in love with her family, and I was very fortunate that they chose me to buy the business, but I did, and I started a

whole new career around it. So it's a really big lesson for me.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you. So I understand from your application that you worked for nearly 12 years for Accenture. Can you list - Accenture, does it have other names as well?

MS. MURPHY: Well, it was two different companies, yes. So it was Accenture, and then I left for ICG Commerce, just so I can (indiscernible), and then Accenture ultimately bought ICG Commerce back, but just the --

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. So I'm just going to call them "Accenture," just for now.

MS. MURPHY: Okay. That's fine.

CHAIR BELNAP: Can you list some of the things that you enjoyed working on at Accenture, some of your accomplishments, and then, also, maybe some of the things that you found to be a struggle when you were working there, maybe even identifying some mistakes that you made during that time?

MS. MURPHY: Okay. Sure. One of my favorite projects when I was with the ICG Commerce side was -- and ICG Commerce was a procurement outsourcing company, which may not sound too glamorous, but I loved the work. It was wonderful.

Basically, companies would outsource part of their

procurement groups to us, mainly for non-directs or nonstrategic buys, initially, but it was a great deal of spend, and what our company was able to do was build a business case where you could go ahead and source their deals for them, and then put these new deals in place, and then, more often than not, also roll out some sort of technology platform to allow their buyers to purchase from, and so they could actually realize the savings. It wasn't just sort of a business case. It was, you could actually see the savings.

My role in all that is, I was an account lead. One of my biggest clients was Kraft Foods, and, actually, before I took over all of Kraft, one of my favorite roles ever was the implementation, of leading the implementation team for what I just described, and it was definitely challenging.

Kraft's plants and facilities are all across -- we were looking at North America, mainly the U.S., and I will say this was a deal that was -- a lot of the plants and their personnel kind of perceived it as "This great idea by corporate, but we don't really want it. We don't want to have any part in it."

I was sort of responsible for making it work, and people have been satisfied with it, but I had a wonderful team in place, and we worked a great deal on communications

and training, and we built all that ourselves, and rolled it out ourselves, and I felt what made it successful is really reaching out to those individual plants, in person, multiple times.

Again, we were blessed to have the budget to be able to do that, but we were on the ground, understanding what they needed, what their objections were, and including them, ultimately, in the design of what we did roll out, and so we kind of gave them a voice, which we weren't necessarily asked to do, but we insisted on, because we knew, ultimately, that's the way the solution would work, and it was an incredible, incredible experience.

It was very challenging, and I think, when you ask about mistakes, I think what was challenging for me is, I ultimately wrote the training, and I didn't know the system, and I relied on -- Kraft had a group. There was one person who said he would train me, and we didn't really think much about it. We just thought that would be fine, but I think it was someone who, unfortunately -- I'm not trying to say his intentions were wrong, but he didn't really want to help me. He didn't want it to succeed, the project. So I really had to go out and learn it myself, but there's some risk in that, too, making sure I was doing things properly, and ultimately creating sound training.

I wish we had kind of figured that out a little

1 sooner, because I would have gotten more outside-expertise

- 2 help, but, ultimately, it worked out just fine, and I
- 3 think, to some degree, the fact that I did dive into the
- 4 weeds and do it myself, and then rolled it out to my team,
- 5 and used the "train the trainer" approach, really worked
- 6 well, because we knew that software probably better than
- 7 they did, at the end of the day.
- 8 CHAIR BELNAP: And that software was something that
- 9 Accenture built in-house?
- MS. MURPHY: Or ICG Commerce, that we were using.
- 11 Yes. Sorry.
- 12 CHAIR BELNAP: Yes. All right. I don't have any
- 13 further questions. I'm going to turn the time over to Mr.
- 14 Coe.
- 15 PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you, Mr. Belnap.
- Good afternoon, Ms. Murphy. Thank you for taking
- 17 the time to speak with us this afternoon.
- MS. MURPHY: Thank you.
- 19 PANEL MEMBER COE: I wanted to ask about a
- 20 framework that you mentioned in your analytical skills
- 21 essay called the "situation complication resolution
- 22 framework."
- MS. MURPHY: Yes, yes.
- 24 PANEL MEMBER COE: Yes. You say in your essay you
- 25 apply this to professional and personal relationships, and

I'm curious if you can tell us briefly about what that strategy is, and how you think you might be able to use that in your work for the Commission.

MS. MURPHY: Sure. Situation complication resolution. So I use it all the time. It's just a way to frame up a problem. I think, when people are not even necessarily struggling, but you know you have a problem, and you can't even totally describe what it is, and you're sort of at that grappling stage, it just helps provide a focused area where, if you are tasked with nailing down those three things, it helps you focus.

So, if you say, "Okay" -- and, actually, if you don't mind, I'll use a personal example, because you mentioned that, but, you know, so many of us are in the sandwich generation right now, and not this past Christmas season, but the one prior holiday season, my husband and I took our kids back east to visit family, and we realized my mother-in-law -- her dementia has actually gotten a lot worse than people, I think, realized, and she was living alone, and we had just spent one night with her, and sort of were, you know, grappling with "What do we do?" And we were the visiting siblings, if you will.

The reason why I'm telling you all this is, my husband laughed at me, but, you know, we had 10 minutes when the kids were going to bed one night, but I actually

used this. I was like, "All right. What really is the situation here? What are we dealing with? What's the complication? And, ultimately, what's the resolution?" And perhaps people who journal have the same experience, but I think, when you just start writing and provide that framework, the answers come, and maybe, even if it's not a definitive answer, it's answer choices that make sense and have logical reasoning, if you're forced to kind of put it down in that format. So that's a -- I will say, the outcome was we decided to bring her back with us. It was a temporary move, and she's been with us ever since.

You know, with work, I find the same thing, if we do it, and I would say I -- maybe not so much at the onset of a huge project, where "Okay. Here's our vision. Here's where we're going. Here's the next step." I find I use it at a very granule level, too, for, like, little decisions. I think it's just a way to clarify and gear your mind around, you know, how to solve a problem, and so, absolutely, I would use it, probably just to formulate my own thoughts and get clarity, so that I could contribute in a meaningful way some ideas that have been logically reasoned out first, before just brainstorming.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you. In your impartiality essay, you describe a time where you realized that your motivations may be a bias in your decision-making process.

How does one go about identifying their personal biases that could get in the way of a decision that needs to be made?

MS. MURPHY: Well, I think you do have to be self-aware. I think, sometimes, when you look at what might get you agitated or upset, that's a good tell sign, or kind of like -- I don't want to say "warning," but it's a good message or "Ah-hah" to say, "Okay. What is it that sparked that in me?," to see what your position is, or somebody else's, to sort of answer that first part of your question.

I think, if you're aware of that, and know how you react in certain situations, it's better, or what kind of gets you sparked up in those situations. It helps you better learn, too, how to say, "Okay. Like, I feel pretty strongly about this or that," and, to be honest, I think that's why, again, this opportunity is so good for me. I'm a pretty even person. I almost feel more comfortable in situations where I'm not sharing my opinion. I'm kind of not that opinionated.

I like logic and reasoning, and looking at everyone's perspectives and opinions, and can absolutely separate myself from that. I'm more comfortable doing that, to be perfectly honest, but, again, I'm self-aware. I think the only thing that would ever spark that in me is

when I find that things are unfair. Sometimes I tend to get, you know, defensive or this or that, but, again, I'm aware of that, and can remove myself from it and kind of take it from there.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Do you have a specific example of a time when you maybe realized that your bias was getting in the way of making a decision, and how you got around that and didn't allow it to affect your decision making?

MS. MURPHY: Well, actually -- and I'm sorry. It's been a while since I wrote the essays. I will say, just kind of recognizing -- with the bucket list project that I just shared with you, sort of what we did there, this past year, I would say one of the chief medical doctors that had been part of our team from the beginning, he had said -- we were talking about our growth plan.

So I have a strategic plan for the next five years, and we're in year three. We're chugging along, and it's at the point where people are really interested in creating -- kind of mimicking the structure that Make A Wish has, and I met with their CEO in Southern California. They're referring their cases to us, and going ahead, and if the need is that great, and demand, then we would like to be able to offer this wonderful service to as many people as possible.

So we've been talking about putting together local chapters and setting up that organizational structure now, ahead of the actual need when we would have to execute, to get ahead of things, et cetera, and we're mindful of "Okay. Are we all agreeing this is what we want to do, year one, two, three, four, five?"

I sort of put together that initial vision, and most people were on board, but we definitely had a couple people who loved the fact that it's local to Long Beach, specifically to Long Beach Memorial Hospital, and there's people that are -- there's a little bit of a conflict of interest, because they're staff members, right? It's a social worker and a doctor, and I understand that. I really do. My bias is definitely towards growing, but I recognize that.

So I did move into more of a facilitator role in that conversation, and the way I did is, I told the group, quite frankly. I said, "Listen. I'm not going to be shy about this. You all know my passion for this, and I want to grow it for this reason," and I said, "But that doesn't necessarily mean that's the answer, and so I want to know what the groups wants and thinks."

The truth is, the majority probably does want to grow it, but I actually gave a lot of -- just out of respect, too -- I kind of drew out this particular doctor,

why it was he wanted to keep things local, and I said, "You know, I think that this is really important, and maybe we should pause. We also don't want to get ahead of ourselves. We want to make sure we're doing a really good job here first -- you know, we're only a three-year-old organization -- and be mindful of that."

Again, I'm very open. I'm a transparent person. I find that's the best way to communicate with people, is, if you do have a bias, share it. Make sure people are aware of it, and then control it.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you. In your essays and some of your answers today, you've talked about working with or meeting people of various backgrounds, diverse groups of people. What have you learned from those diverse groups of people, about their needs and their concerns and their perspectives, that would make you an effective representative for them on this Commission?

MS. MURPHY: Well, I think you have to appreciate where people have come from. Everyone has a different set of experiences, and a life story, and I think you need to respect that, something I really do, and, to be honest, I struggle with, sometimes, my own office staff, who doesn't have that appreciation for some of our caregivers, for instance. I can give you an example.

Just recently, I had a woman, a wonderful,

wonderful, technically speaking, caregiver, and she's really struggled to complete her training, and, you know, we're a licensed business by the state. We have certain requirements as far as training is concerned, and we were kind of coming up to the time line, and I was following up with this caregiver.

I said, "You need to get your training done," and she said, "You know, I'm working three jobs." You know, she works for us, she works for the Staples Center, she's you know, "Boom, boom, boom," and I was speaking with one of my office managers, and I said, "You know, I really respect her work ethic and her -- she's doing everything she can to better herself, to, like, provide for her family," and I said, "So let's be patient. Let's work with her. Let's give her every opportunity."

To be honest, my care manager was like, "Well, I don't agree. I think you should be able to focus on one thing, do it well, and boom." And I was like, "You know, let's talk about that a little more," because this is someone who's managing my employees, and, again, it could be difference of opinions, and the way we're looking at things, but I really think you have to kind of put yourself in people's shoes sometimes.

I think it's easy to make kind of -- probably people err on the side of kind of making judgments or this

or that, but I really feel like my experience working with so many different people has given me such appreciation for that. I really don't -- it's made me very nonjudgmental, actually, or I've chosen to be nonjudgmental, but, again, very self-aware, but I do -- I don't think -- I actually teach my kids -- maybe if I can boil it down a little simply, but I've always taught my kids -- I'm like, "You know what? No one is better than you," and I said, "But guess what? You aren't any better than anybody else, either."

It may sound simple, but it's something I really believe and I live, and I really respect people at the end of the day, so even those with opinions different than mine, et cetera, but I do think that that would be useful in serving well as part of the Commission.

PANEL MEMBER COE: I have a similar question to that, but instead more geared towards geographic diversity, different regions of the --

MS. MURPHY: Sure.

PANEL MEMBER COE: -- where people may have different concerns and perspectives based on where they live.

MS. MURPHY: Okay.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Can you tell us a little bit about your experience in other regions of the state, and

maybe what you learned from the people there that would make you an effective representative for them?

MS. MURPHY: Sure. Well, I've only lived in two places in California, I mean, areas. I've lived in the San Francisco Bay Area. I've lived outside of San Francisco, in the city, now in Long Beach, and, actually, I'm just now moving to Huntington Beach, but, you know, I think, you know, I've traveled pretty extensively, even outside of California, but I think, you know, people, as different as they are, are more alike than different in many respects, too. I think we all want the same things, ultimately.

So, again, I think I was in different stages of my life when I lived in different places. I was a very young professional in San Francisco. I have a family here where I am in Southern California. But, you know, I think there's a spirit amongst Californians where I feel like everyone feels more united. I don't feel major -- I don't feel separated. I feel like the spirit of unity, actually. I will say I've experienced more diversity here than I did in San Francisco and the Bay Area, which I've loved. I really have. So I don't know if that answers your question.

PANEL MEMBER COE: I'd like to move on to another question, a little related. One of the biggest tasks in front of the Commission is going to be identifying

communities of interest throughout the state. Some of these communities are easier to identify than others. Some are less engaged, or may not feel comfortable in engaging in government processes, for one reason or another.

How would you, as a Commissioner, go about identifying communities of interest in the state, especially those that might be harder to identify and locate?

MS. MURPHY: Well, I think I would start with data as the initial starting point, and kind of overlay whatever new maps we get that show, you know, on a demographic level, where certain communities of interest are, and sort of be able to see where the changes are, too, and I think it's important as a Commission to be able to start to prioritize where you spent your time, et cetera, too, to see if that has shifted considerably, but you can start off at least with a prior set of maps, to sort of see where you need to focus your time and energy initially.

So I think I'd use that as a starting point, and then, I'm sorry. You said, "How would you identify where to go?," and then what was the second part of your question?

PANEL MEMBER COE: It was, how do you identify the kind of harder-to-identify and harder-to-locate communities of interest that may be less engaged with processes like

the Commission?

MS. MURPHY: Okay. And I think, again, that's where you can use the data, to kind of show you or give you some insight or clarity into that, and then I think, you know, that's where communication comes into play so importantly, is, during the process of holding town meetings, et cetera, you really have to step up your, you know, awareness campaign, for lack of a better term, to make sure people understand the opportunity, and encourage them to participate.

You know, right now I'm the president of the PTA for our school district, and we actually had speakers from the Census Bureau come out to speak with us, because they said, "You know, actually, as parents and engaged parents, you're sort of a trusted source. So we're asking you to help us spread the word and encourage people to participate in the census process," and then help spread the message, too, that everything is, like, ironclad in terms of responses and people feeling safe with that information, because that's obviously, as I think you all know, a big reason why people don't participate, is that feeling of distrust on some level of government or whatever, and people need to be seen, counted, and heard.

So, also, I think I would look at areas where -- I believe there's a source of data that people or groups have

used. So, since we're still far from the last census, if we didn't have the new set of census data to work with, you could kind of -- is it AFC? Forgive me.

Anyway, the American Community Survey, ACS, I think, that can be used, too, to kind of look at voter turnout rates and other things, and other demographics and breakdowns of income levels, housing values, things that might help you get to that, and be able to help you locate where you need to focus and really draw people out, and encourage them to participate in the process.

So I know -- we actually just went through something in our school district recently -- and cut me off if I'm taking too long. I apologize. But we actually had an at-large voting system, and so we realized it wasn't compliant with the Fair Voting Act, the California Fair Voting Action, and so we proactively took steps to go ahead and change that process, and so, starting this past fall, we actually just went through it, which was so interesting, and such a great experience for me personally, having applied for this position.

So it was just a wonderful experience, but we did have to look back at some of that data and try to match it up again, to make sure that we were really looking at the whole pictures and identifying, you know, communities of interest.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

Madame Secretary, a time check, please.

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. We have four minutes, 40 seconds remaining.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

The local redistricting effort that you were just talking about, how did you come to be involved in it?

MS. MURPHY: So we have our school board, and the superintendent basically led that process, and I'm president of the PTA for the entire school district, and so I'm kind of the leader of, you know, the PTA presidents and everyone who rolls up under that, and so it's a great sort of platform for any sort of school districtwide communications, and you typically have parents -- I don't mean to generalize -- but who are engaged, and so we can reach out to our schools, disseminate information.

So the role I played was inviting people to town hall meetings, and making sure that schools were represented, you know, the people within those district bounds were represented, and that became extremely important, because I can tell you, from the initial set of maps, not one was chosen.

We had over 36, I believe, town hall meetings, and, again, I forget how many maps were initially proposed, but not one made it to the end, and it was an extremely

lengthy, integrative process. However, it was wonderful, because people really were engaged, and, actually, too, even at our maps, I think -- was it close to 50 percent? -- is actually federal land, because we have a Navy base. We have another Army base.

You know, again, it was a really interesting process to go through, and I think, too -- I think initially there was just a lot of communication at first that had to go around, what the Voting Act, you know, bill or statute even said, because people weren't even buying into the fact that we had to make this change. They were saying, you know, "Maybe we should just wait. We don't think we should have to go through this."

In the meantime, other school districts in the state of California are being sued for not doing it, and I think, in Santa Monica, they tried to fight the fact that they had to do it, and I was told -- don't look me up, but I was told they spent upwards to \$100,000 to try to fight having to make the change in the first place, and our school district, that's why they took the stance of, you know, "We want to be proactive here. If we're going to have to pay \$100,000, we want that to go to students, not to law firms," and it's the right thing to do.

So it sort of first initially gained people on the board that this was something that had to be done, and

then, B, going about the business of getting it done. So we hired a demographer, and, again, forgive me if I'm jumping around, here, but we talked about the importance of quantitative and qualitative analysis. It's interesting, people's reaction to numbers.

I was so surprised at how few people even questioned the stats themselves, and I had some side conversations with some parents, and they said, "Gosh. My eyes just blaze over. I just trust the experts to know what they're doing, and, well, I don't know. I can't even go there."

So that's why, again, I know this Commission won't have to necessarily do all the chugging, data-crunching themselves, but you have to understand, you know, the differences, or what's being presented to make information really useful and understand what you're basing all your decisions off of.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

One more time check, please.

MS. PELLMAN: We have one minute, 35 seconds remaining.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay. Really quick, Ms. Murphy, if you were selected as a Commissioner, which aspects of that role do you think that you would enjoy the most, and, conversely, which aspects of that role do you think you

might struggle with a little bit?

MS. MURPHY: My gosh. There are so many things about it that appeal to me. I think the fact that -- just getting to know California so much better, and being able to go out -- and I know we're not going to go out to each every (indiscernible). Maybe we do, but I would love that. I would love the opportunity to go out and really understand the communities and the districts that we're drawing. I think it's just such a fabulous opportunity on so many different levels.

I love the idea of working together with a really capable team to achieve something that I quite personally think is so important. You're just preserving everything that makes our democracy so great. It's such critical and important work. It would absolutely be an honor to serve in that role in any way. I just think it's an amazing opportunity to be a part of history, too, and that's not why, though. It's the actual work I just find absolutely fascinating, and, again, so critical.

PANEL MEMBER COE: And what would you think you would have trouble with?

MS. MURPHY: I don't know. I mean, you could always say with the different -- you would hope that you would work on a team that just got together, got along swimmingly, right, and there's a lot of camaraderie-ship,

et cetera. I don't know what --

MS. PELLMAN: Sorry to interrupt, but that is 20 minutes.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MURPHY: I don't know. I honestly think I would love the work so much, I wouldn't expect much trouble.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you, Ms. Murphy. So, talking about the local redistricting effort, were you were involved in collecting the public comments in any way?

MS. MURPHY: No, just observing that, and being part of the town hall meetings themselves.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: What did you learn from that experience that you think would be beneficial if you were chosen as Commissioner?

MS. MURPHY: Good question. You know, I think I just realized how important it was, the outreach effort to get people to the table in the first place, because what was interesting is that so many people spoke up at the end of the process, when we were down to, say, like two or three maps, and expressed, you know, regret on their part for not getting involved earlier on, because, you know, some people were so opinionated on how it should be.

I should mention, too, we have a very large part of our population that lives in a retirement community. It's

called Leisure World. And so there was a lot of debate about how that particular group should be broken up, if at all. They have a very high voter turnout rate, and yet a lot of them don't have school-age children, and I think that was like a big part of the debate, was, you know, "How do we break up, if at all, that group?"

And the people who came to the meetings had very strong opinions on those, but, again, we tried to make sure -- you know, some of those seniors, unfortunately, couldn't make the meetings, for mobility issue reasons, et cetera, but we did work hard, I think, as the district. I mean, I shouldn't take too much credit on that, but, again, the nice thing about our school district, too, is it is very open and transparent, and really does engage with its citizens.

So there were many different opportunities to get involved, and, again, I just did my part to try to get as many of our schools, and those two I kind of worked with, to participate and give new input into the process.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: So, on the last Commission, one of the things they noted was the difficulty in looking at the amount of data that they received as a result of those public meetings. So, thinking about that, and your experience with the local redistricting, what would you bring in from the background that would help this

Commission deal with the amount of data they're going to get from public input?

MS. MURPHY: Well, to be honest, I think some of my experience with analyses themselves -- I'm kind of reaching back to my early business analyst days, but I think that there are other analyses that you can pull from to kind of reach some conclusions, and I know it gets very complicated, but, when you're looking at communities of interest and the breakdown of race and ethnicity, there are other regression analyses, I believe or understand, are available that you can also look to.

So I don't know how heavily weighted the Commission was in terms of relying on that data, but I think that there are other approaches or other ways of obtaining the same results, and they're probably not even, but I think they have to also be considered or explored.

I think that's the type of thing I would look at and say -- and, honestly, too, I think it comes back to project management, where I think, if that's delayed -- well, I don't want to say "delayed," but, if that's planned for too late in the process, I imagine just the sheer amount of data that amasses and has to be analyzed -- you know, there just may simply not be enough time to go through it all and to control it. So I think perhaps, looking back at the time line, and building that

in earlier, to the degree it's possible, would be something else I could help the team look at and consider.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: And just speaking about communities of interest, you mentioned race and ethnicity. What other drivers do you think could put together a community of interest?

MS. MURPHY: I think educational levels. I think income levels, for those, you know -- I don't know if the data only shows the voting age, and kind of their jobs and what they're doing, but I think gender, to some degree. I think other variables come into play, and I think there are other data sets that you can look at to try to help you define, but then reaching out to the communities themselves, too, and asking for their input, to kind of help you round out that kind of set of variables.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Okay. Thank you. So, in response to the third question, you talked about data being one of the problems, it being inaccurate or coming in late. Given the current situation with COVID-19, and then also with, maybe, some groups that are less likely to be counted, how concerned are you with the reliance on the census data?

MS. MURPHY: Well, I will say, when I thought about even our interviews being kind of postponed, we don't know what's going to happen over the next, you know, subsequent

months, but my first thought was "Oh my goodness. Thank God this isn't happening later," when you would be in the middle of holding town hall meetings and everything else.

Granted, there are always dilutions, but I also jump to, well, people can't necessarily just jump on a meeting like we're doing right with Zoom, because not everyone has technology or the ability to do this, although that could be, you know, further kind of fleshed out to see what the options are.

I'm sorry. Your question, again? I'm sorry.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: What kind of concerns do you have with reliance on the census data and meeting the deadline?

MS. MURPHY: Well, I think, because of the census, when it did go out -- so it was earlier in March, and I think a lot of people have already completed it, but I was even thinking just recently -- even with my own school district, I was kind of playing an active role, like I said, in helping people, you know, complete that, and kind of putting an emphasis on it, almost just like a public service announcement.

I do think that that's being lost right now, and it's obviously not everyone's highest priority. So, no, I definitely am concerned, and I think, like with anything else, this is a such a fluid situation that, if needed,

ultimately, we have a deadline, but I imagine that, too, is part of what has to be explored, is, if we don't have that data, what happens next?

A plan has to be put in place ASAP, contingency planning, basically. What do you do? Do you request to have the deadline moved, or the entire time line moved? That's quite possibly what would happen, and, again, just based -- I mean, the whole idea of redistricting is to acknowledgment that people have passed on. A lot have been born. The population shifts and moves.

So, if you don't have that, the whole point of redrawing lines becomes almost obsolete, but I think you have to be prudent, and just reasonable at the end of the day, and I imagine our state government would be as well, but someone has to make their request, and at least put the contingency plan in place, and that has to happen sooner than later, too.

So, depending on when this Commission would come together, end of August now, if that even happens, according to that time line, yeah, I think the Commission would have to work closely, I imagine, with your Panel to kind of put those steps into place.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Another issue that's come about is, California could lose a congressional district after this next census. With that, then, a lot of the

lines would need to be redrawn, and might not have as much reliance on what the last Commission did.

How would you ensure that communities of interest are -- how would you reassure them that they are being considered, their concerns are being considered, if for some reason they start to lose representation?

MS. MURPHY: Well, I think the process is the same. I think the benefit that this Commission has or will have that the previous one did not is, they really had to lay the groundwork for everything, including deciding what data did need to be required, what they would use, et cetera. So, even if the data has shifted considerably, the process remains the same.

So this Commission would just be tasked with the same thing, and make sure that they're publicly conveying the process clearly, and give assurance to anyone who would be concerned in any way that this is what's being done, and just because things have changed doesn't mean our process does. Everything is the same, and we'll achieve the same goals we have, and it will be done equitably and according to the same set of standards.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. Should you be selected as a Commissioner, what do you see as your role on the Commission?

MS. MURPHY: Well, I think everyone -- again, you

never want to presume anything. I think that me personally, I will come in willing to work as hard as possible, completely dedicated to the mission of work at hand, and really give it my all, and you would hope that, you know, everyone would come in with that eagerness, willingness to serve, and kind of work ethic, but, even if they don't, I think that's okay.

There's always group dynamics. I think people pick up where others leave off, and I think we could really jell, and work together, learn what each other's strengths are, play to those, and I have no doubt it would be an absolutely amazing experience.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Okay. So the first eight Commissioners are selected randomly, and then they're tasked with selecting the next six. If you were one of the first eight, what would you look for in the other six Commissioners?

MS. MURPHY: Impartiality, again like I said, that's at the heart of everything, but, you know, the same things that I outlined earlier, I think, that ability to demonstrate, you know, analytical ability, being able to work well within a team setting, and really being able to contribute. I think that they're all sort of key factors, and, again, it's hard, right? You have applications, you have interviews. Will that group be interviewing as well

or no? It's just kind of based on, I guess --

2 PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Mr. Dawson?

MR. DAWSON: Well, the first eight will have access to all these interviews and the application materials, if that's the question.

MS. MURPHY: Oh okay. So they could view the videos, et cetera. Okay. So they would kind of be tasked with a similar role that you're in to try and make those determinations. So I think it would be just using that same information, but to kind of pull it all together, and at least they have a much smaller pool than what you're dealing with right now, to be able to make those selections.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. What would you ultimately like to see the Commission accomplish?

MS. MURPHY: You know, what I said earlier, which is really just to make sure that the lines are drawn so that everyone has an equal opportunity to elect the candidate of their choosing. I really do. I think that's at the spirit of everything making this an equitable and fair process, and I think, if you've done that, then you can feel good at the end of the day.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Belnap, I don't have any additional questions at this time.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you, Ms. Dickison.

We'll turn the time over to Mr. Dawson.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Murphy, I wanted to follow up on a couple of questions that you had made either in your application or in your responses to the standard questions.

MS. MURPHY: Okay.

MR. DAWSON: Let's see. In your essay two on impartiality, if I can find it --

MS. PELLMAN: Mr. Dawson, if I could interrupt, we have 23 minutes exactly remaining.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

"I've always been fair-minded and nonjudgmental, but was also fortunate early in my career to be trained as a facilitator, which requires neutrality to be successful, and that background has served me well, and I believe it will serve the Commission well."

So my question is, was there any specific part of that training that gave you specific techniques to achieve that neutrality?

MS. MURPHY: I think it was just clarifying what the role of the facilitator is, and it made it very clear that you are not to impart your opinions or views in any

way, simply to guide along the work of the group, that that is your role.

Again, I think someone who, you know, can think quickly can ultimately contribute, or likes contributing in group settings like that -- it is kind of hard, or you have to learn to restrain yourself, but I thought it was great, especially early on, to be able to get that coaching and practice, quite frankly.

Again, I think almost all my work, you know, with the exception -- I wouldn't say that Visiting Angels is not that, but it's not just project management, right? But all my work experiences have required, you know, project management, project goals, sort of achieving something together collaboratively as a group, and I've found, you know, it's so important to, you know, contribute, play your role, but also be respectful of everyone else's contributions, and not only to just achieve what you come together to do, but to do so in a pleasant manner, too.

I mean, you can have wonderful experiences working with groups, and it makes all the difference in the world, and I think you ultimately arrive at a better product when people can work together well, and, again, it's somewhat learning to control yourself. It's not just what you have to say or what you think. It's honoring everyone and their views, and giving people, you know, room to vocalize their

opinions. Everyone has to have a turn at the mic, so to speak, and you have to make room for that, for one another.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Returning to one of your responses to the standard questions -- I think it was number three, about -- and I think you just had a little bit of this conversation with Ms. Dickison, but you were talking about the census data, and the reliability of it.

My question is, in every census, there's been an undercount, to some extent or another, and that undercount is not evenly distributed. So are you aware of are you -- what groups of Californians do you think are likely to be undercounted, and how could the Commission account for those folks?

MS. MURPHY: Well, I will say -- I can even tell you -- my nanny is of Mexican descent, and she's shared quite openly that she has many friends and, you know, family members, to some degree, that are still very wary of the whole process, and she said it's nice to see a change with the next generation, like her son, you know, and his friends, et cetera, and cousins, et cetera, but she said definitely, in her generation, there still is that fear, and we know what happens. We know what happens.

I'm just trying to think back to, again, what the school district did to the address that, and since the census data was so aged at this point, there was another

source of information that was used to sort of show, even estimate, voter turnout, and to accommodate for that. And so there are sources of information that could aid the Commission in trying to factor that in, and do so in a quantitative, sound way.

MR. DAWSON: All right. Thank you. So, in the 2010 Commission, they undertook a series of town hall meetings up and down the state to, you know, meet folks, and to seek out those communities of interest, but there was some indication that there were some folks who turned up at the meetings representing themselves as local community members that really weren't who they said they were. How could the Commission, the 2020 Commission, address that possibility and deal with that?

MS. MURPHY: Well, I think first is taking the lessons learned from that first Commission, to say, "Hey. Let's not be naïve. This happens," to be aware, to be on the kind of lookout for that, and I think, to the extent possible, to be -- as you're hearing testimony, et cetera, people speak, there is a level of vetting you're doing to understand where the speaker is coming from, et cetera, and just to be aware of those potential opportunities for kind of false -- whatever you want to call it -- to be wary of that.

MR. DAWSON: Sure. Thank you. I think we

discussed a little bit about the makeup of the Commission. There will be 14 members, five Republicans, five Democrats, and four non-affiliated, and in addition to the criteria of analytical ability, and ability to be impartial, and appreciation for diversity, the Commission is intended to be representative of California's diverse demographics and geography. So, as you can imagine, it's quite a puzzle to put together.

My question to you, as a resident of L.A.

County -- L.A. County is very well represented in the pool of Applicants. Could a successful Commission -- does it require an L.A. County Applicant?

MS. MURPHY: Well, I think L.A.'s kind of just prominence and overall landscape of California -- I think, just by sheer numbers alone, and kind of representation of various minority groups, et cetera, makes it a clear contender for representation. I really do. I think to reflect, you know, California as a whole, I think it would be wise to select someone, but I don't know how the rules are set up for the Commission to make those selections.

MR. DAWSON: So the flipside of that question is, could the Commission be successful if there was no representation from L.A. County?

MS. MURPHY: Well, I think, if the Commission is doing its job, and holding the right town hall meetings,

and hearing from, you know, communities of interest, yes.

MR. DAWSON: All right. Thank you.

MS. PELLMAN: We have 16 minutes, eight seconds remaining.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

I have no further follow-up questions. Do any of the members have any additional follow-ups?

CHAIR BELNAP: Mr. Coe?

PANEL MEMBER COE: I have no follow-up questions.

CHAIR BELNAP: Ms. Dickison?

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: I have no follow-up questions.

CHAIR BELNAP: I have one. So, Ms. Murphy, what kind of life experiences can you draw on to both have but also demonstrate empathy for people who have been through struggles, and who have felt that the odds have been stacked against them?

MS. MURPHY: To be honest, just recently, with the bucket list project work I've been doing, I've found that the majority of people who have applied to have their wishes granted are -- many, many of them kind of fall into that group, and, you know, especially given where people are in their life at that point, it's been sort of an extraordinary and privileged experience to be a part of that.

It's hard not to feel empathy for someone going through not just, you know, their struggles or health struggles at the time, but to know that they've come from such difficult circumstances, in many respects. So I think that's why I've always been so focused on that work, in doing what I've done to play that role, is to help people kind of experience some joy in their lives that they otherwise might not otherwise have been able to.

So it's sort of like, what do you do? You know, what do you do in these situations? And you do what you can, and for me, that's been really fulfilling, to be able to connect with people in that way, kind of just to do what I can to contribute, but it's absolutely made me more empathetic in general to what people have gone through and kind of what life is all about.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

MR. DAWSON: Madame Secretary, can I have a time the check, please?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. We have 14 minutes, 11 seconds remaining.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you. There being no more follow-up questions, Ms. Murphy, I'd like to offer you the opportunity to make a closing statement to the Panel, if you wish.

MS. MURPHY: Okay. Thank you. Well, I want to

just thank everyone not only for this opportunity to interview, but also under such special circumstances. I really respect your time, and appreciate the opportunity, and I will say I think -- I'll never forget where I was when I first heard about the opportunity to apply for the Commission, and when I read it, I just absolutely got the chills, because I thought, "Oh my goodness," like I really do -- not only would it be an amazing opportunity for me, for so many different reasons, but I really thought it would be a perfect match for where I am in my life right now, in terms of all my work experience, volunteerism experience, board experience. They kind of all come together, I truly think.

I've always had the desire to serve, even at the state level, but in such an impartial way -- I don't want to say "apolitical," but nonpartisan way. I just think it would be a wonderful fit. I absolutely know I could contribute. I'd be capable to meet the expectations of the Panel and the state, and I would serve eagerly, with enthusiasm, and, again, just be a huge contributor, and do everything I can to make sure that the Commission is successful.

PANEL MEMBER COE: All right. Thank you, Ms. Murphy.

We're going to go into recess, and come back Monday

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and

place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 21st day of April, 2020.

PETER PETTY CER**D-493 Notary Public

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

Marthat Melson

April 21 2020

MARTHA L. NELSON, CERT**367