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

In the matter of:

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

#### TELEPHONIC

621 Capitol Mall, 10th Floor Sacramento, California 95814

> TUESDAY, APRIL 7, 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

Linda Abbott Trapp

Robert Murillo

Colmar Figueroa-Moseley

Michael Allawos

# 3 INDEX PAGE Linda Abbott Trapp 4 70 Robert Murillo 124 Recess Colmar Figueroa-Moseley 124 174 Recess Michael Allawos 174 218 Recess

4

#### PROCEEDINGS

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

9:00 a.m.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right, I'll call this meeting out of recess.

For those in the room, and we don't see any present but I'll give these reminders anyways, please silence all phones and other devices. I guess that reminder is good for all those who are with us remotely as well. In case of emergency, us in the room will follow a CSA staff member.

And with that, we're going to get started. We want to welcome Dr. Linda Trapp to our interview.

Ms. Trapp -- or Dr. Trapp, can you hear us?

DR. TRAPP: I can. Thank you.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Then we're going to get started with the standard questions.

I'll turn the time over to Mr. Dawson.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Belnap.

Dr. Trapp, I'm going to ask you five standard questions that the Panel has requested each applicant respond to. Are you ready, ma'am?

DR. TRAPP: I am.

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?

DR. TRAPP: When I begin to think about skills, the first thing that comes to mind, of course, is all of the needed knowledge and ability and proven skill set to accomplish the work before the Commission. So, collectively, that would be the first thing, the ability to perform all required tasks.

As a group, they should also represent the diversity of California. I have put in a couple of requirements that I think, particularly as a psychologist, they have need to have the ability to speak, not only with confidence but with humility, rather than becoming overbearing and presenting their findingss. And care, because there is so much anxiety around these issues. If they're able to speak with confidence and care, they will engender the respect due the work of the Commission.

Individually, the members of the

Commission should have a genuine desire to serve in
this capacity. It's a demanding position. And
without that desire, interest, and perhaps work
ethics, would lag somewhat. So the desire is -- it
must be strong.

They should be independently able to meet the interaction requirements of the position, as well as the knowledge requirements.

Individually, they should model impartiality and respect for the diversity, particularly cultural sensitivity.

They must be able to work with large and complex datasets and present the findings with clarity, sensitivity, without bias.

Individual qualities needed also include good humor and generosity of spirit because this is a long process loaded with land mines, difficulties. So good humor and generosity of spirit are necessary as long as -- as well as perseverance, strong goal orientation, and the ability to work respectfully and effectively with people of different backgrounds or opinions.

You asked which I possess and I selected a few and a couple of examples as to how I felt they

were worth selecting.

One is impartiality. I have held a number of positions where that was an essential part of the job. Student admissions at colleges, for example, had to be handled with impartiality.

Conflict resolution retreats, which I've led very often, have to be handled with impartiality.

Hearing student discipline cases, you cannot prejudge such things.

I have a very strong goal orientation.

And some of the evidence that came to mind for that was owning a successful consulting business for a number of years, 18 years, I believe.

Earning a PhD, that takes a certain amount of stick-to-it-iveness, if you will, writing a number of books, becoming a member of Leadership California.

And the perseverance to overcome obstacles, that one took me back to a number of situations in my life.

I have been the first women dean at three colleges and universities. I have managed to, generally, hold a full-time job and a part-time job and raise four children simultaneously. I moved

beyond the deaths of my entire close family. And I remained in Ethiopia to work, even though there was a revolution going on.

My prior research and work experience have made me comfortable with data, although on a smaller scale than what the Commission will be working with. I've learned to pace myself and to work around obstacles in order to complete tasks on time.

The travel requirements for the position may, again, become daunting. For me, that's a pleasure. I have traveled throughout the country, the world, the state, in work and in pleasure and greatly enjoy it, and I've done that for a number of years.

So my summary is that my consulting and training business have prepared me to understand both the difficulties and the rewards of conducting a number of forums, whether they're training forums or informational forums, throughout the state in rapid succession. I have done that for many years.

I have had a great deal of experience with contentious topics, perhaps more than anyone should want to have, but I've taught a large number of conflict resolution seminars and retreats. I've

worked with working groups who were nearly avoiding each other rather than working together, conducted a lot of retreats to help them find that glimmer of hope, to help them find a way they can be of use to each other, so contentious topics don't frighten me. While I no longer seek them out as much as I once did, they are something that I'm comfortable working with.

Sometimes the training topic itself was to teach people how to do that, how to work in difficult situations with people that they weren't especially fond of. I did over 3,000 seminars in an 18-year period and earned uniformly high ratings, which is the reason I was able to receive the CSP Award from the National Speakers
Association, which is given to the top seven percent of public speakers in any given year. That requires 80 letters of reference from 80 different clients. It requires tabulations of ratings from individual attendees of various sessions. It's a very long and intense process, somewhat like this application process.

But it was extremely helpful to receive that because it opened doors and I was able to work with individuals and corporations and agencies at a

higher level and, I'd like to think, got more done, had a better effect because I was able to work with the people who could make those decisions.

I know what to expect. And I'm familiar with the methods that get the work done.

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?

DR. TRAPP: That is a wonderfully appropriate question. I appreciate it.

Characteristics first.

I'm interested in seeking understanding

rather than dominance. I want to have knowledge, not necessarily the upper hand. I believe each person's experience is unique and shapes their core beliefs, so I can genuinely respect their views, even when they differ from mine. And as a member of a minority opinion set in this county, I have lots of experience working with those with whom I don't always agree. And many of those folks are good friends and we enjoy each other's company and we don't talk a lot about the things that we differ on and we manage to have quite a nice relationship.

With the Commission's charge, it's really for a fair outcome, not one that's personally gratifying. And I understand that and would contribute to it.

I do not yet know the structure of the Commission. I do not know if there is a tiebreaker. With 14 members, it seems unlikely. I'm not sure just how all of that works yet. But it seems to me that given the work that needs to be done, every single member needs to have negotiation skills and conflict resolution skills. Those are things that I have taught for years and years.

The other characteristics I think that are needed in tense situations are forgiveness. If you

can't get past the first ornery thing someone says, you're not going to have a prayer for resolving the issue. You simply have to let that one slide by and work on process, work on common goals, work on things that you can agree on and come back little by little to the things you don't agree on.

Indirectness and challenge seems to me a reasonable way to find common ground. Rather than saying, I think you're wrong or I think you're stupid, or some of the other things we hear people say, tell me an experience you had that brought you to that opinion. Let me understand where that comes from in your life.

Those kinds of things are awfully helpful because they don't make anyone defensive. You show a genuine interest, people will respond with genuine information.

I have three core principles that have served me very well. One is the belief that we more alike than we are different. The second is that people come to their opinions genuinely. And the third is the knowledge that we are not duplicates of each other but resources for each other. The person who thinks exactly like you do can't teach you anything. The person who thinks

nothing like you do may be irritating to be around but they have a lot to teach you and you, them.

That's a very powerful understanding that has served me well over the years in many different situations.

For the last few years, I've primarily been involved in the world of arts and the world of voluntary associations. With your leave, I'd like to illustrate these beliefs with one example from that world. It as a memorable experience for me, although not necessarily for everyone else there. It was a business meeting of a medium-size church.

The chair of that meeting was distressed because there had been some rather corrosive episodes and he wanted to prevent further quarrels and so he proposed that we add to Robert's Rules of Order, what he called biblical principles.

Everyone in the room stiffened. No one dared contradict him in that setting.

I waited a few beats and then raised my hand rather gently and said, "May I speak?" All I had to do was say, "With this number of people," there were nearly 100 in the room, "with this number of people, there probably is some dissidence about what principles might apply to any given

situation. Probably not everyone has the same idea. For example, there are over 50 women present. I suspect a few of them, like me, are uncomfortable with the principle that women should be quiet in the church." As I said this, of course, I was talking in the church.

There were a few smiles, a few nods. The mood lightened a little bit. And someone remembered that the national organization, indeed, had some principles for communication on a poster in a back closet. Everyone breathed a sigh of relief, the poster came out, and that was the end of that issue.

We are not duplicates of one another.

There was no reason to attack the chair for what he said. There was only reason to find a way to draw the circle a little larger.

What will I do to assure the work of the Commission is not polarized? Certainly, seek resolution of differences, agreement on goals and processes, and guidelines about any public comment. I'll come back to that in response to another question.

But if the members of the Commission have a sense, a common sense, of what is not appropriate

for public comment, a lot of the material that might be used in engendering hostility on a broader basis will disappear.

I learned something from a mentor many years ago. There was a gentleman he was known to have a number of conflicts with, Mr. Blakely, and he said to me one day when I asked him, "Why don't you ever tell me what it is about Mr. Blakely that you don't understand or don't like," he said, "Mr. Blakely and I always speak very highly of one another."

Wow. That lesson was terrific and it has served me well.

Thank you.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question three.

MS. PELLMAN: Just a quick time check. We have 14 minutes, 34 seconds.

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?

DR. TRAPP: Before jumping into the coronavirus issue, which certainly is a huge problem, I want to spend a minute on the managing

of fear. Because when you talk about problems, there's an element of fear.

And in my training experience, as well as my personal life, I've found the best way to manage fear is to do risk assessment. And you do the risk assessment by asking every single member of the group what could go wrong? Make a list. What is the likelihood of each of those going wrong? Give it a value, and some values are set, one to ten, or however. What would be the impact, the negative impact, if that, in fact, did occur? Again, values are set. So you have a means of managing the fear by doing a risk assessment and plans for risk management.

So the current health threat is one of a number of potential risks that are hard to anticipate, hard to plan for, but if both the anticipation and planning are done, they're more manageable. Those kinds of things might include earthquakes, severe weather events, attack, something like that, hard to plan for but possible if the time is taken to do that and a risk management and a risk mitigation plan put in place. What you have done by moving to videoconferencing for these is one example of managing an unwanted

event.

One of the most popular seminars I did for at least ten years was managing unwanted change. There is a process. There are things that can be done to make the process less negative and that's something I really enjoyed sharing with people. It turned out to be a very popular one. And I still get comments from people who were in those programs years ago.

As kind of a 1B in that category is the current issue with the census data. I know it's essential to the work of the Commission and it's proving to be difficult to collect in a timely and accurate fashion. And there, of course, is some discussion about that, I'm sure. I'd like to be able to participate in that.

Another category that doesn't need too much attention right now is a planned attack of false information, data, or something like that from an outside source. And I am not an expert on how to deal with that. I would hope the Commission would have expert resources available to manage that, just as there are resources to help with the tax on election process.

Beyond those three, those kinds of

external steps, there's -- external threats,

there's a third type, and that's the possibility of

distrust of the results of the Commission's work

due to lack of trust in the Commission's, not quite

honesty isn't the word but commitment to

impartiality.

And the only recommendation I can make in a brief statement on that one is that members of the Commission have to, in my opinion, swear to avoid hostile comments about other members of the Commission, negative comments about the process, frustration, belief in conspiracy theories. Any kind of public comment or comment that might become public that negates the work of the Commission on the part of the Commissioner has to be absolutely out of line. It has to be positive. It has to be unified. Otherwise, this threat becomes quite a serious threat.

Thank you.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Could I have a time check, Madam

22 Secretary?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. We have 9 minutes, 51

24 seconds remaining.

MR. DAWSON: Okay. 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?

DR. TRAPP: I chose two examples, one from the world of arts and one from the world of voluntary associations, which are where my work has been lately.

When we first moved to Foothills I found no museums, no symphonies, no visible large-scale support of the arts, so I founded an area arts group. There are, in fact, some supportive organizations in this area, I just didn't find them at first. But our group has grown to about 15 members at this time with monthly meetings.

The first objective, the goal, was to improve our quality of our work by having critiques for each artist of one or two pieces a month by all

the other artists. This seemed to me, and to some of the other professional artists, as a way of quaranteeing improvement.

Well, it turned out to have some problems. The newer, younger, less experienced artists were absolutely terrified of critiques. And they would come in fear and trembling, hold up a piece of work, shaking, and start apologizing, well, this isn't really finished, well, I didn't mean to do this, well, I'm sure I should have used this color, like that. And the result of that introduction was that everyone else started taking care of them rather than doing critiques of the art, oh, it's all right, oh, you used this color beautifully over here, oh, I see what you were trying to do with that. It wasn't working.

So we had some discussions about what was working, what wasn't working, and we learned that it's okay for each person to hear both suggestions for improvement and compliments, that isn't going to kill anybody. It worked out really well once we raised it as an issue and talked about how to do it. And some of the people have grown enormously and won some spectacular prizes. And one of them is off teaching on cruise ships now. It's just

wonderful how the confidence has been built by accepting the fact that not everybody's at an equal level of readiness for a critique and that it is helpful to hear both strengths and areas needed -- where improvement is needed, so that was very, very useful.

The other one is a little bit more complex. And I think in the interest of time, I might leave it for a question later on. It's from a voluntary assoc.

MR. DAWSON: All right. Thank you. We'll move on to Question 5. 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?

DR. TRAPP: I deliberately kept a minute

or two extra for this one because it's my favorite question. It's the thing that most reflects who I am.

Curiosity, which is absolutely unstoppable, is one of my core characteristics. And the other is a warm respect and appreciation for differences. I absolutely love every place I've ever been. There's something to love about each place and those are a lot of places. And let me say it a little more formerly. I found something to love in each of the many places I've lived and worked, as well as a fascinating variety of friends and acquaintances.

Because I've studied and worked in several countries and traveled in many more, I'm comfortable trying new ideas, new ways of speaking, new ways of sitting, new ways of holding my body so that I'm not offending someone. I'm comfortable with that. And I recognize that I'm always a beginner. People have been in that culture for 15 to 80 years. I've been there, maybe, six months, so I'm a beginner. And I have to respect and expect their criticism, their comments, their suggestions. I'm very comfortable with that. I think they really want to communicate better, just

as I want to, and that's not naiveté. It's a belief that our common interests outweigh our differences.

Because of my psychological training, I approach differences as resources. If we don't immediately see eye to eye, to me, that means you have something to teach me. In all likelihood, I have something to teach you as well but that can wait. Right now I want to know what you have to teach me.

The person with whom you have the least in common has the most to teach you because they don't have your blind spots and you don't have theirs.

You don't share a background. You don't habits of thought. So being open to that, which is one of my core characteristics, is really helpful in a number of settings.

You asked about the experiences. I just want to list them, rather than discuss them, at this point. There's quite a few.

By the time I completed graduate school, I had attended 17 schools in several states. I've lived and worked in Ethiopia, in Mexico, and briefly in Siberia.

In my consulting practice, I delivered

over 3,300 hundred seminars, retreats, and presentations throughout the country, as well as a few abroad. This included nearly all of California, urban, suburban and rural areas. I've taught every level from preschool to graduate school. I served as a Black student advisor at one college and informally as foreign student advisor as another -- at another.

My dissertation was on cross-cultural counseling. I've written a few books and hundreds of articles, columns and reviews, many of them dealing with cross-cultural topics. Even so, I approach every interaction with curiosity, knowing I have something to learn about this person, their way of thinking, their desires. Once I understand a little of that, then we can start working on our commonalities, and there always are some. Openness and goodwill is essential to developing understanding of cultural differences.

Thank you.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

We will 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: Good morning, Dr. Trapp. Thank you for being with us.

DR. TRAPP: It is my pleasure.

CHAIR BELNAP: In your essay on impartiality, you indicated that you were a Dean of Students at three different colleges. Which colleges were they and what was the timeframe of your career for that service?

DR. TRAPP: Okay. The timeframe, I'm going to have to be general, early '80s, okay? I was Dean of Students and has some other administrative functions at the Minneapolis College of Art and Design. Okay.

The -- let's see, I'm trying to get them in order.

In Forest City, Iowa, there's a small
Lutheran college, the same town where Winnebagos
are made, I don't know if you know about that, but
there's a small Lutheran college there which is
called Waldorf, and I was Dean of Students,
directed the counseling office, and had
administrative duties there as well.

And then most -- more recently, mid-'80s,

I was Dean of Students and Faculty at the

California School of Professional Psychology, which

was located in Fresno and has since then moved to another location in Fresno, so the address had changed but, I believe, it's the same school.

CHAIR BELNAP: Thank you.

DR. TRAPP: So those are the three.

CHAIR BELNAP: So from your experience, how does a Dean of Students need to exercise

impartiality?

DR. TRAPP: Well, may I tell you a story?

CHAIR BELNAP: Absolutely.

DR. TRAPP: When I was living in Mexico, there was a book signing held at a local book store and I had some of my books there, and another gentleman had some of his books there and he was a Dean of Students at part of the California State University system, at one of those campuses, so the two of us were signing books and talking in between people who came along and wanted to visit with us.

And he started telling me about his admissions process. And he had a pile of papers to symbolize admissions applications and he would go like this. And I saw that he was very proud of his ability to discard a number of those applications. And he asked me some questions. And I finally said, "Well, you're looking for reasons to say no.

I'm looking for reasons to say yes."

I recognized that those students who filled out their applications put their heart and soul and hopes into them. And if there's any way that I could say yes, I would. We had completely different perspectives.

So that is a way of saying even if they didn't have one of the criteria that we said we needed, they still had something to offer, and I needed to see whether that would balance with some of the other offerings from some of the other candidates and if that would make for a good student class.

So that's impartiality in a way. I wasn't just going by the book, I was looking for someone with something to offer.

CHAIR BELNAP: Thank you.

So you just mentioned that your dissertation was on cross-cultural counseling. Please describe this concept and how it would be applicable to the work of the Commission.

DR. TRAPP: It was cross-cultural counseling for college students, so not necessarily as applicable as one might hope. But if we're talking about fairly recent immigrants or people

who have found it a little jarring to enter the environment where they are now, there might be some applicability.

I can't give you a strong beacon of hope, however, because the finding of my study was that at that point in time, they much prefer to talking with other foreign students than talking to counselors. They wanted someone who were more familiar to their culture and not necessarily familiar to the departments at school. It makes sense but it wasn't what I was hoping for since I hired the counselors.

CHAIR BELNAP: And how would you apply that insight into the work of the Commission?

DR. TRAPP: I think every individual has to learn how to build trust in whatever setting they find themself. We can't, obviously, we like everyone we're talking with in cultural terms, that's not possible. Although I've given it a really good shot in my lifetime, it's not possible.

What we have to do, in my understanding, is learn to build trust, to show that we genuinely want to hear their perspective. We want to know what information they have to offer. We want to know why they feel strongly about this?

Each person who brings their point of view to the Commission cares about it. Otherwise, why bother? The Commission is kind of a big, scary, government thing. Why would you show up to be grilled by those people if you didn't really hope that they would hear you.

So we need to know how to hear. And we need to know how to build trust and have that person feel heard.

CHAIR BELNAP: So from your training and experience, how can a Commissioner help people feel that they are heard?

DR. TRAPP: Minimize distractions. Attend carefully. Ask questions in a nonthreatening manner. Take the time to learn how they want to be addressed, for example.

I am not yet familiar with the setup for these hearings, these public forums. I don't know how many Commissioners there are. I don't know if their chairs are elevated over the chairs of the people who are bringing forward their opinions.

There are things that can be done to reduce intimidation and increase trust. And it's not just smiling, it's being fully present. If someone is talking to you and your mind is on something else,

of course, they can tell that. You can. I can. Who's to say they couldn't? Of course they can. So fully present, fully attending, taking notes, asking questions.

I don't know if there's any opportunity for follow-up. In times when I've needed to be in a similar situation I have said, "If I run into a problem summarizing your point of view, may I call you for further information?" I don't know if that's possible with the Commission but sometimes it's very helpful, "I didn't understand exactly what you meant about that? Can you give me a little more detail? Can you give me an example?"

Those are the kinds of things that build trust and never, ever, ever saying something negative about that cultural group that can be overheard by anybody. First of all, never say it in the first place. But secondly, if you say it and someone hears it and someone brings it, you're dead. You cannot build trust. So that agreement within the Commission to guard their speech is just critical for trust. Without trust, you're going to get surface information. You're not going to get the real thing.

I'm not trying to turn everybody into a

counselor but there a few tips from the field of counseling that anybody can use if they care enough to do it.

Thank you.

CHAIR BELNAP: So follow-up question.

If you were selected to be a Commissioner and you were put on a subcommittee charged with designing how the public hearings should be run, you mentioned that you didn't know how the chair setup would be, what -- I mean, that subcommittee would be charged with setting up -- not setting up the chairs but setting up the design behind the public hearing.

How would you suggest that the chairs or the physical arrangements in the room be set up?

DR. TRAPP: There is a lot of experience available in former Commissioners, current Commissioners, people like yourself who have worked with Commissions for a while. What worked? What was the most effective thing you did? Why let that experience go by the wayside? It's a shortcut. It's not the only part of the process but it's a shortcut to avoiding a number of mistakes.

Is it important for there to be a gender order when you're talking with a certain cultural

group? Is it important to address people in more formal ways than you're accustomed to if another cultural group requires that? Is there a reason to avoid setting people near each other who are of groups that don't get along very well? Or could you possibly hear them at different times?

Everybody who speaks to the Commission really wants to be heard. So anything that can be done to make that possible, easy, effective, should be done. And it doesn't cost money to think about those kinds of things. That's not an expense item, that's a consideration item. And I found that you get a lot further with a little consideration.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

You mentioned that as a management consultant, you've conducted thousands of training sessions and seminars.

DR. TRAPP: That's why I'm sitting down right now. I'm tired. That was a very demanding job.

CHAIR BELNAP: What are some of the frequent themes of your seminars?

CHAIR BELNAP: At the last ten years or so of doing this, there was one standout request, higher above all the other ones, and that was

building a workplace of mutual respect. That covered everything from gender communication, to culture, to religion, to what the laws are about accommodation in the workplace, to personality style. I always gave them an assignment over lunch to determine from very little evidence the personality style they thought their lunch server had. And most of them came back knowing how to do that. It doesn't take a lot of detail, it takes a lot of attention. And it was my favorite thing to do.

I really enjoyed teaching those seminars and got standout ratings which helped a lot with my professional development. I had an 80 percent repeat business with clients all over the country. And I tried to empathize California for ease of getting back home to see my kids now and then, but I also emphasized other places for other reasons. I did a lot of North Carolina training because my father was there living with my sister in her retirement city. And so I would do a Friday workshop and a Monday workshop and spend the weekend with my family. So that's one of the delights of being able to move around some. You get to see people you like that you've lost touch

with a little bit.

But that seminar was the most popular.

Most frequent during an earlier period was sexual harassment prevention because it was mandated. And I had a large number of government agency clients and so we had six trainers that would go out and do sexual harassment and prevention seminars, half-day seminars.

But my overall favorite was the one that had to do with diversity, building workplace and mutual respect.

Second to that would be managing difficult negative kinds of events in your life, managing unwelcome change, I called it.

CHAIR BELNAP: Madam Secretary, did you have a time check that you were wanting to do?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. Six minutes, eight seconds remaining.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

So from your trainings, can you think of a time when you had to deal with a difficult person -

(Dr. Trapp giggles.)

CHAIR BELNAP: -- and can you tell us how you dealt with them?

DR. TRAPP: Well, I tried not to giggle, actually. It was a sexual harassment prevention training with Forest Service clients in a remote area of California. And as you might imagine, they did not all want to be there and their body language showed it. And I found that amusing.

And so when they came into the room the first thing I would do, once everyone was seated, I would say, "You know, I've been traveling a lot.

I'm not sure I'm in the right place. Just to satisfy my curiosity, make sure to reassure me, would you assume the position?" And then I did that. Well, then, I just leaned back and glared.

It broke the ice.

But there was one man I could not reach, could not reach this man. He came in late on purpose. I'm sure he'd just argued with his supervisor, didn't want to be there. He sat at a different table from everyone else. He put his cowboy hat on one chair. He put his books on another chair. He pulled a chair from across the table and put his feet on that so his boots were facing me. And then he pulled out a book, stood it up and read it, and it was called Iron John. I had only one reaction and that was I have to suppress

my giggles because this is hysterical. I want to videotape him. I want to show what resistance looks like.

I just went over and talked to him a little bit, told him, "You know, we both have to be here all day. We're both getting paid. Why don't we just kind of make the best of it?" It was fine. It was fine. I don't think he's ever going to be an convert, but he was, at least, civil. That was fun to do.

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

Mr. Coe, I believe you're next.

DR. TRAPP: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR COE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good morning, Dr. Trapp. Thank you for taking the time to speak with us today.

DR. TRAPP: Good morning. My pleasure.

VICE CHAIR COE: So you mentioned it earlier and you talked about it in your application, that you've written several books.

22 What were the topics of these books?

DR. TRAPP: Well, the most popular one, I think the only one that made any money to speak of, was Ornamental Plants and Flowers of Tropical

Mexico, which is a picture books with little paragraph descriptions.

When we lived in Mexico, people would come and say, "What is that beautiful thing in your yard?" And I had no clue. And so I went looking for a book and there wasn't one. And I thought, well, I know how to write a book and I know how to do research. But it turned out I didn't really know how to do research in Mexico because I went to people who worked in nurseries, gardeners, people who ought to know. I wrote in my introduction, "Hey, I'm a psychologist, not a botanist. You get what you get with this book." So it was to entertain visitors, to satisfy the curiosity of people who wanted to know, what is that gorgeous thing?

So I went around to all these people and asked them, what's the name of that, the name of that? Wrote it down. I had an average of six different answers for every plant, so that was a little bit of an organizational issue. I decided to do it alphabetically by Latin name and cross-reference everything in the index.

So then I learned, after I sold a number of the books, that people just look at the

pictures. They don't care what the name of it is.

They just want to see the pictures and maybe have

some clue about them. But it was a lot of fun, so

that's my point.

I won't be that longwinded about the others. It was just such fun to do something totally out of my wheelhouse, something I had to just learn all about from people on the street, walk up to them and say, "What's the name of that thing?" That was fun.

The earliest one I did was a book -- was a very brief manual on writing resumes. I think that was the least successful.

Then there was a book made out of my dissertation, which I did with a gentleman who did most of the work. And he just took my dissertation, turned it into a book, and that was fine with me.

One that I am really proud of is the result of all the training that I did. I took the ratings from all of the attendees on the things they found most helpful and put it in language that middle school kids could understand and wrote a book called Letters to My Granddaughters. And in that book there are tried and tested tips on

communicating with people who aren't like you, on handling disputes, on understanding differences of culture and age and things like that, all the things we've been talking about. They're all there in two or three page bits. At the beginning of it, at the beginning of each section there's this is what you're going to get. And at the end of it is the application question, so how would you apply that to your life? And that book was fun to do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The last one I did was called Intentional Living, and that had to do with where you are in your life, is that where you thought you'd be? it where you want to be? What could you have done different and what might you do differently now? And how does that reverberate to the people that are around you? What do they expect from you? Have you satisfied their expectations or disappointed them? Does that matter to you? Ιt was all that kind of thing, how to live intentionally rather than accidentally, which a lot of people do. They wake up in the morning and they do the nearest thing again and that goes that way all day long. And by the end of the day, they're wondering where the time went.

So this isn't totally obsessive about time

management but there's a little of that in there, and an awful lot of management of relationships. So those are the basic things.

VICE CHAIR COE: Were these published books?

DR. TRAPP: Some of them are selfpublished, some of them are not. Some of them are
university published.

VICE CHAIR COE: Okay. So you've lived in several different locations, both nationally and internationally. And this morning you mentioned your time in Ethiopia. Do you see this experience and perspective as something that could benefit the work of the Commission?

DR. TRAPP: I certainly hope so. It definitely has benefitted me. I have learned so much about different ways of being in the world by living in what we call a third-world country and seeing how people go about their relationships, their life, what's important to them, what they're afraid of.

I lived there in a very testing time during a revolution. And the emperor was taken away shortly after I saw him, the only time I saw him.

I taught. While I was there, I was teaching K-12 art in a mission school, and the children in that school were the sons and daughters of diplomats and the sons and daughters of high-ranking government officials. One Sunday afternoon, 40 of their fathers were gathered in a yard and shot.

That's the kind of circumstance you never hope to have to live through again. But it's informational. It tells you what you're made of, what's important to you, what you will do for others, what you hope they'll do for you.

Our house was across an alley from a girls' school which had been closed during the fighting. And before it was closed the rebels would come and throw stones, breaking the windows in that school, and the girls would scream.

We don't have a lot of people throwing stones and making us scream here but we do have threats. And how you respond to threats is something we've all learned from our earliest childhood when your -- perhaps your mother said, "Oh, that's a big bug, stay away!" How do you respond to don't go in that water, it's too deep!

How do you -- what does that do to your psyche, how

you're formed, how you take on the next breath, the next challenge?

This process, under the conditions of a pandemic, is full of threats. People's experience determines how they're going to deal with these threats. And my experience is really broad, not so deep in some issues but really, really broad. I see how -- what works and what doesn't. What doesn't is screaming. I've learned that. It doesn't work particularly well.

After I came back from Ethiopia, I was doing my master's and one day we're sitting in a circle in a psychological training class, I don't remember which one it was, and all of a sudden I heard screaming. I hit the floor. And the rest of the students, of course, said, "Is there something you'd like to talk about?" Because that's what psychologists do.

And I got up and said where that came from, that when the girls were screaming across the street from our house, my instructions from the embassy were grab the baby, fill a tub with water, get some bread, hit the floor. All I had there, I didn't have a baby at the class. I didn't have water or bread, but I could hit the floor and I

did.

So there's some learning that's not effective in other situations but an awful lot of learning is effective in other situations.

What do you do when you're threatened?
What do you do when someone clearly doesn't like
you and doesn't want to answer your question? What
do you do? Yeah, I think cross-cultural exposure
helps tremendously with things like that.

Does that answer your question?

VICE CHAIR COE: Yeah, I think so. Thank
you for sharing that.

I wanted to talk about communities of interest for a moment. One of the things that -- kind of the big task for the Commission is to identify communities of interest throughout the state. Some of those communities are easier to identify than others. Some are more obvious, more engaged. Some are less so.

How would you go about identifying communities of interest for the work of this Commission, particularly putting effort into not inadvertently overlooking some of the communities that might be less obvious or harder to locate?

DR. TRAPP: That is a very technical

question for me. And I would begin by relying on the work of prior Commissions to see what they did, how they did it, what worked what didn't work, and then update the information, what is different about our circumstance now? What is different about the distribution of various communities now? What is different from the work of the last Commission?

I think that's where I would have to start because that's something I have a tremendous experience with. In my training, I went wherever I was hired. I didn't go looking for a particular kind of community. So this is something I would have to spend some time learning from what's already been done. I don't think it's necessary to reinvent the wheel, it's just necessary to update the engine.

VICE CHAIR COE: So some of those harder to find communities, when found, or some other communities may be less engaged or don't feel comfortable coming forward to speak, provide their opinions to a government body like this. I think you mentioned something similar. But I wanted to take it -- or take a step back a little bit because when you mentioned it, you were talking about

people speaking at the Commission's meetings. And

DR. TRAPP: Right.

VICE CHAIR COE: But in order for them to get the courage to speak at the meeting, they have to get the courage to actually show up.

How would you go about reaching out to those communities that may be uncomfortable for one reason or another to show up and provide their opinions and perspectives? How would you go about trying to make them feel comfortable so they can come forward and share the perspectives of the Commission?

DR. TRAPP: Again, I don't know the structure of the Commission well enough to know if what I'm going to suggest is possible.

In my view, if you really want someone to develop trust with you and the willingness to share their thoughts on a difficult subject with you, you need to meet them where they are. So walking around, talking to people, asking who's an opinion leader? Who do you trust here? Who represents the community best? Who should I be asking these questions of?

Sometimes it helps to just break bread

with somebody, just sit at some little café with someone who lives there and say, what can you tell me about your home life here? What is -- what's important to the people here? Are there people who disagree with that?

Now I don't know if there's time in the Commission's work for somebody on the Commission to go there and do that in these communities of interest. But if you really want the information, that's how it happens in my experience.

I'm sorry if I don't know enough about the structure and what's available to be able to tell you, well, do this and do this and do this, but that's a suggestion.

VICE CHAIR COE: Understood. Thank you.

If you were to be appointed to the Commission with the 13 other folks, what do you envision the role would be that you would fall into?

DR. TRAPP: I do not know if every Commissioner is expected to do the same kinds of things.

My favorite thing to do is what I gravitate towards, of course, which is talking to people, finding out whereabouts and why do you

think that? What happened that made you sure of that? Is that okay? Is that one of the rules? I love that. I would be happy to do that all day long. But that starts within the Commission because there has to be strong trust there.

So maybe some time together, just learning who you are -- What do you do? What do you think, why do you think that? What don't you like? Would you be willing to do that thing you don't like if I went with you? -- all those kinds of questions so that there's, first of all, so much trust that you know that we're almost interchangeable, that whoever goes will do the job right, in your view. Whoever talks to that person, will they elicit the information that's needed from that person?

The people who speak at a hearing care a lot or they wouldn't be there. It's intimidating. They have hopes. They have fears. And if you negate that or neglect it or disrespect it, you're not going to get what you need. So trust is the big deal that I would go to.

And, again, what role does each person play? I don't know because I don't know what you've done in the past. I'm willing to play that role with the Commission first, with the

individuals we need to seek out second, in a more formal forum, at hearings, third.

VICE CHAIR COE: Thank you.

Madam Secretary, a time check please?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. Five minutes, thirty-five seconds remaining.

WICE CHAIR COE: Thank you. Dr. Trapp, you were referencing earlier that in order to establish trust you would like to go to where they are and speak to the people in the communities themselves. And I think in an ideal world that would be a great way to go. In the current state of the world, the ability to do that remains kind of a question at this point. How much it will affect the timeline of the Commission is uncertain yet but let's assume for a second that it could.

How can you go about establishing trust when you can't go to them and you have to do things in different ways? How do you reach out to those communities without being able to go there, in light of the pandemic situation?

DR. TRAPP: Surrogates which -- by which I mean people who live there, who are trusted, who are community-thought leaders with whom you have serious extended discussion by phone, by video,

whatever the process is that you can use so that there are people who understand what you're trying to do and mean you no harm, they really want to know. And surrogates can be useful.

It's may preference, as I'm sure it's yours, to do in-person as much as possible, but it's not possible. And I would so much rather be watching your body language and everybody else's body language than looking at this tiny little -- over the camera, but it's not possible. So we accept the limitations that we're given and work within them.

I think a sincere interest in someone can be communicated through a number of methods. And it helps so much to have a surrogate on your side who you've already convinced that you mean well, who is trusted by the others.

So in addition to technical approaches, like this, I would go to surrogates, find them.

VICE CHAIR COE: Thank you.

One more time check please?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. Three minutes, fifteen seconds remaining.

VICE CHAIR COE: Great. Thank you.

Dr. Trapp, one more question. You

mentioned going and speaking with people and getting to know the people would be a thing that you would enjoy in the role of a Commissioner. And I know you've mentioned that you don't know everything about the structure of a Commissioner or the things that they will necessarily be doing day to day.

But if you had to guess, which aspects of the role of the Commissioner do you think that you might struggle with?

DR. TRAPP: I suppose the part I've had the least experience with is the technical datadriven part. I would have to trust others and have them available to question because that's how that's worked for me in the past when I needed somebody to explain something technical to me.

For example, right now I'm trying to get some sort of cell tower for our house which seems to be unreachable by any communication technique known to man. And I don't know much about cell towers, so I'm finding people that I can trust.

So I've always done that for -- I do get out into some areas that seem unlikely. I've learned how to fly a plane. I've climbed mountains in Colorado, technical climbing. I gave birth to a

baby six months after landing in Ethiopia. I mean, I'm not risk adverse, but I do want to ask for help from people who spent their life learning something that I've spent six months, maybe, trying to figure out.

VICE CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Chair, no further questions.

CHAIR BELNAP: Thank you,

Ms. Dickison, the time is now yours.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

Many of my questions have been asked.

Give me just a minute to look at my notes here.

You've talked extensively about your time in Ethiopia. One of the things I noted was that you talked in your essay that you had lived and worked in Ethiopia, Mexico and Russia, and that those experiences renewed your appreciation for our democracy.

Can you talk about your experiences in Mexico or Russia and how those experiences renewed your appreciation for our democracy?

DR. TRAPP: Of course, as long as you can guarantee me there are no Russian heads of state listening in on this. That's a little bit of a dangerous area to tread on but speaking strictly by

experience. But I went into Russia with two
Russian colleagues was to establish an ecotourism
site on Lake Baikal. Lake Baikal, as you probably
know, is 20 percent of all the world's fresh water.
It's 40 miles across, 400 miles long, and
extraordinarily deep and clear. It's beautiful.
It's also frigid and it freezes over in winter.
And they drive trucks across it to see their
relatives on the other side.

So we were trying to set up an ecotourism plan based around a hotel that was half built. We would acquire that hotel, complete it, start this ecotourism thing. So we had meetings with the state officials, meetings which always began around breakfast time and always included vodka and chocolates and oranges. I'm not sure why that mix. But I had to learn how to pretend to sip vodka because eight o'clock in the morning is no time for that. And those meetings were very, very warm and friendly.

I have, in my files at home, a document in Russian giving me permission to develop this ecotourism project. So we came back to the states. I brought my two Russian friends back. They stayed with us for a while, then rented a room. They and

I each put up some money, decided to raise more money for the hotel by selling aftermarket auto parts. We filled a container, shipped it to Vladivostok. The mafia killed our driver and took the shipment and that was the end of our program in Russia.

met. I learned a lot about cultural interactions between the White Russians, and that's the official title, who were descendants of people sent to Siberia as punishment, then the Mongols, because Mongolia is just below that area. So those people are different cultures, they get along beautifully, and I learned so much about the Mongol culture being of opera (phonetic). They have horseback fights with arrows that are strange to watch but very effective.

The government was willing to let us do that but not willing to provide us with any protection. And as a naive young American at that point -- I'm still me but much older -- they -- I could not raise more money and send yet another shipment over to be stolen. That was not going to work. And I was very disappointed because like Baikal is an international treasure. It is 20

percent of all of our fresh water on the planet.

So, yeah, I had some trust issues there and some wishes for them not just to give me a pretty document saying I had permission but to actually help and there wasn't any of that coming.

So did you want to know about Mexico as well?

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Yes, please.

DR. TRAPP: My business in Mexico was producing books, primarily, writing books that -- getting them printed and getting them sold and that sort of thing. And that went quite well. Some of our other experiences, not so much.

There were always bribes required. There were always things that were difficult to see, people -- police, particularly, beating people publicly. There were so many cultural differences that were wonderful and so many that weren't wonderful.

And I remember going to a meeting of the ex-patriot American community with all the mayors locally to the area where we were, which was just north of Puerto Vallarta. We asked if it would be possible to have a booklet of the driving regulations in English that we could purchase. And

the response was universally, what a wonderful idea, which means we're not going to do it. And you have to learn that that's what that means. If they say it's wonderful they're not going to do it because how could they possible fine you for breaking the law if you knew what the law was and you didn't break it?

So all those laws that we wrote in all those areas, all the people who over and over again said we were speeding when we weren't, and those kinds of things, the lack of trust with some of the officials, that was difficult. And I appreciate it here, that I trust the officials, even if I don't agree with them, I trust them.

extraordinary. That was one of the most jarring understandings. There were people with polio.

There were people with diseases, begging in the streets, that have long been conquered here. It was a very proud culture. A very wonderful culture in so many beautiful ways but so impoverished.

At one point I had a baby there. And at one point I took to publicly nursing my child, which I would not do here, but there I was trying to communicate, please feed your babies this way

because they had a company, which I won't name because I don't want to be sued, that gave away small samples of formula using people with white jackets to hand it out, go give away these formulas, and that was just enough for the mother's milk to dry up and they couldn't afford to feed their baby after that and the babies died. That's, you know, a very painful memory, although most of the memories from there are wonderful. But I still keep track of what's going on.

You may have noticed, in most urban areas in California, there are taxi drivers who are Ethiopian. Those are my news sources. As soon as I get in I greet them in their language and ask them what's going on with the revolution? What's going on with the war? What's going on with the (indiscernible)? And they know. They know.

So, yes, I love it here, I'm here, but it's hard.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Okay. Thank you.

So based on your experiences there in other countries and learning about the different issues that they had and, also, just, you know, traveling around California, how do you think that where someone lives in California could influence

their -- what they're looking for in representation and their needs?

DR. TRAPP: Excellent question and complex because where they live is one factor in a multifactor identity and it may be temporary. I live in a very rural area right now. I'm not a very rural person but I live in a rural area, so I wouldn't be representative. Some people who have lived there for generations are more representative of a mindset that is similar to other rural areas more than it is similar to other more heavily populated areas in California. So there are those kinds of divides.

But within that there are various cultures. There are immigrants from various countries. There are people of various religious affiliations or none. There are higher levels of education, lower levels of education. All of those things affect the expectations from government. And where there is fear, again, fear is an overwhelming factor in so many of these issues that we've discussed this morning, where there is fear, government is not trusted. And that's where the Commission's work will be most difficult, I believe. I would love to hear from former

Commissioners whether that's, in fact, the case, but that's my experience.

Does that help?

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Yes, it does.

One of the things you just mentioned was that you live in a rural area but you're not really a representative of the area.

DR. TRAPP: Right.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: One of the things that the last Commission noted was that there were times when they felt that there were individuals that were speaking up and stating that they were speaking for a community where maybe they were not actually part of that community and were, you know, speaking to -- for their own agenda or whatnot.

Do you think your experiences could help the Commission in kind of seeing individuals that might be doing that?

DR. TRAPP: I think that requires a little more time in the questioning, what's the viewpoint which is, in that manner, suspicious, as stated, the obvious place to go for me would be to dig deeper. Why do you think that? What in your experience has led you to believe that? How do your neighbors feel about that? How have -- what

have they said when you've discussed it with them? Just probe.

It would be unhelpful to make any snap decision.

When I said that I'm not representative,
I'm thinking of the fact that I grew up in Upstate
New York and that's my home, is New York, and I
have a PhD, and there aren't a lot of them in my
county. But I don't very often talk as if I have a
PhD, I talk with my hands and I speak emotionally,
and so it's easier for me to blend because that's
also authentic.

And I think authenticity is what builds trust. And so when you see something that looks to you as if it's not authentic, dig deeper. That would be my first reaction. And trust your instincts. That's why you know to dig deeper.

Thank you.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

Let me look at my notes a little bit more.

So you taught -- one of your seminars that you gave was Building a Workplace of Mutual Respect.

How could you use the information you shared in those seminars to work with the other Commissioners to build a team in the very

beginning?

DR. TRAPP: I have no reason to believe that the other Commissioners who are equally qualified and knowledgeable would want to listen me to ramble on about that but I'd love to because it's my favorite thing to do. I would have to be very sure that they weren't looking at such a thing as a waste of their time, that they already knew all that, because I bet they don't but I accept that they think so.

It's a deep subject and it has changed over time. And assumptions are so dangerous. I would love to do a workshop on that but only if it was welcome.

I've done my time with hostile audiences.

I'm not sure I want to do a lot more of that but,
especially, if they're going to be brothers and
sisters of this task, it's something I'd really
love to do. And if it was welcomed, I would just
jump at the chance.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

MS. PELLMAN: We have 6 minutes, 22

23 seconds remaining.

24 PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

25 So the first eight Commissioners are

selected randomly and then they are tasked with selecting the next six Commissioners --

DR. TRAPP: I read that.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: -- to round out the Commission.

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

DR. TRAPP: Some things that weren't there in the first eight. Representation is a big deal. And if, for example, there are no Asians, or no old people, or no whatever is missing, that's where I'd start.

I know there has to be a distribution that's politically acceptable. I know there are some other characteristics. But how about urban-rural? How about different religious affiliations? How about different cultural affiliations, different age groups, different educational levels? What isn't there? Because it's easier to hear something familiar. So if the person that we would pick to fill that hole was there, that person would hear things the rest of the people wouldn't hear. It's easier to hear someone speaking in your language. It's easier to hear someone who has

shared some of your upbringing, some of your expectations about life. It's easier to hear someone who's suffered as you have suffered.

If we don't have that distribution as best we can do with only 14 people, there's going to have to be some work done on learning to develop trust with folks that were not represented. But if I were to choose, I would plug those holes. That would be what I'm looking for.

It's not about personal preference. It's not about, gee, I like the way you do your hair or the way you smile. It's not about, oh, you'd be fun to go out to lunch with. It's not about that. It's about what am I not seeing that you see? We all have blind spots, lots of them, and we prefer not to have them pointed out. But on this Commission it's absolutely critical that there be as few blind spots as possible.

So I'm being repetitive. I'm sorry. It's important to me.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. Thank you so much.

Mr. Belnap, I have no further questions at this moment, so I yield my time.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. We'll turn the time

over to Mr. Dawson.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Dr. Trapp, I wanted to follow up on a couple of questions, your responses to the standard questions.

In standard question three, you identified the COVID-19 situation as a threat to the work of the Commission. I understood you to say that it represented a threat to the census but also a threat to the work of the Commission itself. Could you expand on your thoughts there?

DR. TRAPP: Well, there are a couple of things that occur in that regard. One is, again, fear. That people are justifiably nervous about going to different places, about interacting with people they're not sure are appropriately scrubbed and maybe clean enough to interact with. Did you touch that table that I'm about to touch? Did you -- you know, all of that fear stuff gets in the way of listening to each other, of really understanding, because it's so overwhelming at the moment.

We all hope this moment will pass and we can get to a new normal that is more normal and not so struck with fear as this time is. It's very

difficult to keep your mind on the business at hand when you fear for your life, and people do in various degrees at various times of day, but people do.

I was scolded the other day in the grocery store for bringing a bag in to pack my groceries in. It was as if I had brought the contagion in that bag itself. And I had to back away and put it away. That person was very rude and very afraid.

So that's part of it.

Nhat else can we do to return to that new normal and stay within the guidelines for time and process to get the job done? I think it's really important to build trust fast and that's an unusual request. Usually we take our time coming to trust somebody. I think we need to step that up a little bit, understanding that there's normal, natural reluctance, but we have to trust each other to get any job done, and this is an important job.

When I mentioned the census, it's based on some news reports I've been reading about difficulties in collecting data, particularly from communities of color, difficulties in having them trust the person knocking on the door. I'm from the government, I'm here to help you, is an old

not-so-good joke, but that's how some of the communities of color see it. Some of those individuals are not pleased when someone comes to the door announcing they want information, detailed information about who lives there, especially if there's an immigration issue at hand.

So trust, trust building, probably, has to happen very early in the process within the Commission so that each person can speak, really, for all. Each person can inquire, really, for all. I don't know whether that has happened in prior Commissions, whether there's been an esprit de corps built that goes deeper than friendship, that is actually trust based and responsive to reasonable fears that people have. I think to get the work done, that has to be addressed.

And really remote meetings, remote hearings, they are an option. They have so many down sides. Maybe we could get some technical brilliance going and find out how to overcome some of those down sides.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

23 Madam Secretary, how much time is left in 24 the 90?

MS. PELLMAN: Six minutes, twelve seconds.

MR. DAWSON: All right. Thank you.

I just want to have one quick follow-up also.

In your essay three, which is on diverse demographics and geography, you said that, "Recently I've been able to travel widely, learning about the original cultures of many -- of California's peoples."

Who were you referring to? Who were the original cultures that you were talking about?

DR. TRAPP: Last year was my first time in Asia and I had a lovely time. I went with a friend. She and I went to Singapore and Malaysia and just had a marvelous time learning about the foods and about the peoples and about the religions. And just that kind of exposure. I am a newbie at that one. I haven't had opportunities to spend much time in Asia, except for the fact that Siberia is pretty darn close to Mongolia. That's on the Asian side of Russia.

I went to Morocco not long ago. That was new for me and an extraordinary pleasure. The artwork that I saw, the wood carvings that I saw, the -- just beauty. And I happened to be where I witnessed a local funeral, right, witnessed some of

the cultural behaviors. That's new to me. I have a newfound appreciation for the Arab world's guarding of all of the original texts from the time of Aristotle, while Europe was in the Dark Ages, the old world took care of making sure the libraries were safe. And so when the European world was ready to go back to work and think about things again and not just shoot each other for differing, those texts were available. How often do we say thank you for something like that? Wow.

So there's just so much that I'm learning as I travel to new place. The next on my list is Patagonia. I'm not sure that's going to be about people, it's about gorgeous scenery, but I'm very anxious to spend more time in South America when it's possible to do that.

And my husband and I have been talking about a quick trip over to the Adriatic. Eastern Europe is something I'm curious because my undergraduate degree was political science, Soviet studies, that has a resonance there. And so -- but every time, we meet locals that we come to love. And it's just such an enjoyable thing. It helps to have an arts background because that's a universal connection. And I hear language well. I can read

key words pretty accurately. I wouldn't say I'm a fountain of knowledge about what those words ought to be but I can grab on to the basic politeness in each culture where we are. I can say the appropriate thing, and for this file, and that's a start.

So those are new and fun.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Madame Secretary, how much time is left?

MS. PELLMAN: Two minutes, fifty seconds.

MR. DAWSON: Are there any follow-ups from the Panel members?

13 CHAIR BELNAP: I have no further follow-up 14 questions.

Mr. Coe?

VICE CHAIR COE: No follow-up questions.

17 CHAIR BELNAP: Ms. Dickison?

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: No follow-up

19 questions.

7

8

9

10

11

12

21

22

23

20 CHAIR BELNAP: Thank you.

Dr. Trapp, in the time remaining, I'd like to offer you the opportunity to make a closing statement to the panel, if you wish?

DR. TRAPP: Oh, I was hoping you were going to say I could ask questions after all.

won't do that.

I think I'd emphasize in several different contexts the importance of building trust, the importance of respect for each other, because understanding it's a good thing, that we don't agree about everything, because that means we know something the other one doesn't know and we can share.

The work of this Commission is important for the entire state, not just for the people that are like you or like me. And I think that generosity of spirit, which is such an old-fashioned phrase that I don't apologize for, I think it's something I would want to see strongly encouraged and engendered in the work of the Commission because it will enable the reaching out to all the communities of California much more successfully.

And thank you so much for the opportunity to talk about things I really enjoy.

CHAIR BELNAP: And thank you for being with us.

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

(Thereupon the Panel recessed at 10:29 a.m.)

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

We want to welcome Robert Murillo to his interview.

Mr. Murillo, you can hear us?

MR. MURILLO: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. We'll turn the time over to Mr. Dawson for the standard questions.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Murillo, I'm going to read you five standard questions that the panel has requested that each applicant respond to.

Are you ready?

MR. MURILLO: Yes, I am.

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. MURILLO: Well good morning, all.

25 For the skills and attributes that all

Commissioners should possess, my first thought is that we must all understand the mission. And the mission as outlined is to promote a fair districting efforts and inspire citizens and legislatures and perhaps the judiciary by sharing the California system of drawing Electoral Districts in a nonpartisan and transparent way.

Additionally, I think that all the applicants, or Commissioners, need to understand the commitment and the responsibility to the process.

So I did a little bit of research on what the previous Commission, or current Commission has done. And it looks to me like they undertook seventy meetings in about the first year. Four of those were public meetings -- meetings that they did over the course of ten weeks and in 32 locations in California, speaking with 2,700 participants and having received 20,000 letters over the course of their various meetings. So a huge commitment there from any potential Commissioner.

The other thing I think is important for any or all Commissioners to possess in terms of a skill is a knowledge of what I call the two

roadmaps that the current Commission presented. So current Commission made a final report in September 2011, and they also did an earlier report, I think April or June of 2011 which they referred to as a handbook. The handbook went through all of the actions that that Commission needed to take to get off of the ground. And they identified several skills and attributes, which were quite important.

So among those are interaction with the public, the -- the need to function as a high-performance team, the skill of being open-minded, and I added to that to be able to learn and to transfer knowledge. Of course, along -- in that handbook they also referenced analyzing data and forming logical conclusions.

And then among the skills that I thought are also important would be some administrative skills, foundational tasks, planning and scheduling, and forming working subcommittees.

Now that handbook also spoke quite a bit as to how the first Commission hired staff, consultants, an executive directive, their -- their legal advisors, and additional professional consultants.

Finally, I think in terms of this initial

question, the first Commission had a list of outreach of up to 170 groups. And that's going to be quite important in the current times to be able to go back and utilize that database, again, reaching out to as many groups as possible via social media, or whatever other things are available.

In terms of competency -- competencies that the Commission should possess collectively, again, these skills and competencies were itemized or spelled out in the handbook, and also to some extent, I think addressed in the final report. But they primarily deal with the relevant analytical skills needed to successfully complete the work of the Commission. The ability to read and understand dense technical materials.

And so as an example, in the final report there was reference made to both U.S. and State Supreme Court cases which it looked to me at least in some review, where they had modified, or given more direction to the existing Voting Rights Act. And those -- those were applicable rulings to what the Commission had to do.

I also think collectively the, while the Commission should have the ability to resolve

complex problems, they also need to be able to speak out. And by speaking out I mean to ask how. For example, how would a consultant have drawn maps and what selections did he make? Why were those selections made, or maps designed in a certain way? And this all needs to be done in a constructive way.

Finally, in terms of this question, to understand the overlap of the mapmaking factors, and there's several, and again this is called out in the final report of September, or pardon me, it looks like it's August 2011. And -- and there's six main criteria that the Commission must use. And again, some of those were modified by, it looks like court cases with some examples of -- there's a Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act that speaks to geographically compact areas.

And then there was a -- a Section 5 where it looks like there were five or six districts that need to be submitted to DOJ for approval of how the map was drawn. So again, all of these things are skills, reasoning skills that the council -- or Commission must have collectively.

Now of these skills, one -- one of the questions would be, which -- which do I possess?

So I'd like you to -- to know that I come to this as more or less a common citizen. I've observed some of the interviews, and I also went back and looked at the existing Commission Members. And I must say, you have quite the task of -- you have very skilled applicants in front of you now, many with professional degrees that have a significant bearing on tasks of what the Commission would be expected to do.

training to this in terms of, you know, I'm not a lawyer with experience in the Voting Rights Act or civil liberties, nor am I a professor that would understand various social aspects and studies that might be applicable to minority voting patterns. However, I do bring a wealth of business experience to this, having a career of over 30 years in business. And that allowed me to develop very good decision-making skills and gave me quite a bit of administrative skills. Both I think are quite necessary to bring to the Commission.

So I'm not coming at this from a purely professional perspective, but more of one as the citizen volunteer with the goal of being impartial.

And I do not have any political agenda coming into

this.

Additionally, I think my skills of gathering and comprehending information that bears upon redistricting are up to the task as I've -- you've probably noticed, I've done a little bit of research on this coming into the interview. I can also, I think, validate the significance of information. My business experience would have given me many opportunities to have information brought in front of me where I had to make sound decisions.

With regard to the specifics for the Commission, if we were going to look at proper placement of communities within districts, I would have the ability to apply the appropriate legal standards of -- of the Constitution and the Voting Rights Act in Section 21 of the California Constitution. All, of course, with input from the other members and guidance from any potentially hired legal experts on that.

And in summary, what I'd like to say is that in one of my essays, my application essays, I described how someone reached out to me and recommended that I apply to the Commission. And that person I worked, along with others, for a

period of two years. We still have a little bit of ongoing work where we meet up. And that person observed my work in that group, including both my personal and my analytical skills. He was also at many of the public hearings where I spoke. And given his background in the military, as a government worker, and as a political activist, when he said, and this was unsolicited, in his initial letter to me saying hey, why don't you apply to the Commission. He said, I can't think of a better candidate for the Commission. So that was based on his personal knowledge of me. And we didn't know each other prior to working on that particular project.

So as he confirmed, I'm confident that I can demonstrate the ability to effectively speak in -- in public hearings about redistricting. I can listen carefully to any testimony that was given, and critically judge that testimony of witnesses, or consultants, or legal advisors of information that would be presented to the Commission.

In my essays I also mentioned my business experience. And again, to reiterate, that experience has given me the ability to distinguish relevant facts from irrelevant facts and assess the

relative strength of competing arguments. So this is a common practice in business, I think you would agree.

And then importantly I think, and what we saw referenced in the handbook and the final report is there is a fair amount of expert advice that the Commission relies upon, particularly of a legal nature. And that advice needs to be applied to the decision making.

So I have a strong belief in using experts and professionals and legal consulting and research. And I've had occasion to work with attorneys on several matters. For a couple examples would be supplier agreements, seeing leases, business planning, employment law, and I had a couple of experiences with actual litigation in terms of cleanup.

So just to finalize the summary portion, I do also believe that I have the other relevant skills. The ones that I've spoken about here are ones that I would highlight as my strengths. But I have, of course, basic mathematical skills, familiarity with using computers and software, word processing, and I do have some familiarity with some mapping websites. So our Santa Cruz County

GIS system, I know how to get into that system and work around the various layers that are in that system for -- for mapping purposes.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Question 2. Work on the Commission --

MS. PELLMAN: Can I do a quick --

MR. DAWSON: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

MS. PELLMAN: Sorry. Can I do a quick time check?

We have 15 minutes, 34 seconds remaining.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Question 2. 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. MURILLO: So it is an interesting premise and I would agree with you that since the 2010 Commission was formed, that there probably is a greater emphasis on increased political polarization.

So the -- so I do not feel that I bring any political agenda to the committee. Any political agenda that others may have, in my view that needs to be completely set aside. Agenda and impartiality do not mix for this work on the Redistricting Commission.

Now it's spelled out in the handbook and the guidelines, is that an applicant with the ability to be impartial —— be impartial means that although an applicant may have strong views and may have participated in social or political causes, he or she has the capacity and willingness, while serving as a member, to set aside his or her personal views in order to evaluate information. So I've said that I don't bring any particular, or any agenda whatsoever in terms of the political nature to this. And I'm fully confident that I could set aside any views that might pop up. But this is more pertaining to other members of the

Commission.

If I could just give an illustration of this. So my work with an ad-hoc group that I mentioned in my application. It is a good example, I feel, of setting aside one's first personal views because we had to bear at the task at hand. So the people that I worked with were from our local area, which is very heavily Democratic -- Democratic. And I'm coming as an applicant to the Commission as a Republican since I first voted when I was eighteen years old. So it's been a fair amount of years.

The people I work with, one of them is on the Democratic Central Committee locally, and the others were all quite liberal. So we really probably did not agree on much in the way of policy outside of the work that we were trying to do. And I want to point this out as an example of where both sides had to set aside their personal views to solely focus on the work that needed to be done. And we can go into more detail if you have questions about that later, about what we actually did.

In terms of trying to ensure that the work of the Commission is not seen as polarized or hyper

partisan, I would say that in my view that there's two potential types of hyper partisanship, and that's an internal hyper partisanship and external. Internal, of course, within the Commission itself. So I would say that the Commission should strive to be free from any political influence. That they continue to solely focus on the mission and the legal guidelines, and establish neutral good faith and a collaborative spirit, and encourage team building.

Additionally, I think each member needs to be transparent within the group and to the public itself. There was a mention in the handbook that the current Commission delegated authority to a chair and a vice chair and that those chairs were of opposite political persuasion. And I think that's a good idea and again, gives the -- at the very least, gives an appearance of lack of partisanship, or at least a balance of partisanship. And finally, I think they need to focus on facts and policy, as shaped by the legal requirements.

Now I mentioned I thought there were two types of hyper-partisanship, and the -- I call the other one the external factor. So in terms of

external factors, I would avoid interaction on social media, and don't let -- try not to let hyper-partisanship in social media drive decision making. And I have a quote here that I wrote down from some of my research. And the quote says that "Society appears to be split so polarized is that the loudest and most extreme viewpoints monopolize airtime and social media space." So I do believe there's a good use of social media, but it should be for use of the Commission for terms of outreach and education, and never policy discussion.

MR. DAWSON: Madame Secretary, can I have a time check please?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. Nine minutes, 49 seconds remaining.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Mr. Murillo, I want to make sure that you have the opportunity to answer all five of the standard questions, so let's move to Question 3.

MR. MURILLO: All right.

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

MR. MURILLO: So the greatest problem in my view is, to quote Donald Rumsfeld is, "We don't

know what we don't know." So I would say, by example, when you started the interview process at the beginning of March, you probably did not anticipate that we'd be doing video conference interviews at the beginning of April. So what we don't know, when the Commission starts its business next year, we don't know.

Additionally, the greatest problem -another great problem that the Commission could
face is loss of public trust. Now there's a chance
that the current health crisis is going to have an
impact on census data. And it may delay census
data. There may be down the road challenges to the
census data, so I see these as potential large
problems.

Ongoing personal distancing that limits interaction as a group and -- and public access. So I believe there's probably pretty good technology to allow people to watch the meetings and good ways to get notification out that the Commission's going to have meetings. What I'm not as confident on is that there's a good way for people to interact within those meetings in live time.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Question 4. 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 group of the project -- 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. MURILLO: Right. Can we have a quick time check, so I don't want to go too long on this. I know we have one question remaining.

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. Seven minutes, 24 seconds.

MR. MURILLO: Thank you.

So in my application to be a Commission member, I referenced the work that I did on a Short-term Rental Vacation Rental ordinance. And in the county of Santa Cruz, there was not an ordinance back around 2011 and the onset of vacation rentals was starting to have severe impacts in the neighborhoods. And so I became a member of an ad-hoc group with the goal of that

group to develop an ordinance suitable to address the issues that we were seeing from the proliferation of vacation rentals.

And that took us down a route of about two years where we worked with people at all levels.

We worked with folks at the -- at the political level, various political levels from the Housing Advisory Committee through the Planning Commission to the county supervisory -- supervisorial members, and finally to the Coastal Commission. And the result was that we did get to write, and support, and bring into place an ordinance that was praised as the best ordinance that the Coastal Commission had seen to that date. That was about 2013.

Also learned in that role about opposition. And we went to several meetings where there were probably ten of us and up to 150 opponents that were vehement in their opposition to the ordinance. Now what we did over time was by being persistent and to sticking to policy as to why we thought our argument was better and why the ordinance was needed, we were able to convince many of those opponents and bring that ordinance to a successful vote for passage at the county supervisor level.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Question 5. 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 have a variety of perspectives?

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

MR. MURILLO: Well as I mentioned earlier,

I have a long business experience. In that experience I dealt with all socioeconomic levels. And that was in terms of both customers and employees. So I have 30 years of that experience literally working on a first-name basis with up to 200 people over the course of that time.

On the -- additionally, on the administrative side of that, I was responsible at least for either direct hiring or review of hiring for many of those people. So that interview skill

I think would also serve me well as an attribute to the Commission.

In my mind I also have the perspective that from the business where I was dealing with customers, and I would at least try to relate customers to the regular citizens that I would expect to see at Commission meetings. And treat those other citizens in a way in which I would like to be treated as a customer or citizen myself.

Finally, I have fairly extensive state and international travel, which has given me perspective from some places that are quite different from the -- where we live in California. And I can fully bring that perspective to my work as a Commissioner.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. We will now go to panel questions. Each panel member will have 20 minutes to ask his or her questions.

We'll start with the Chair, Mr. Belnap.
CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Good morning,

Mr. Murillo.

MR. MURILLO: Morning.

23 CHAIR BELNAP: In your essay on 24 appreciation for diversity, you emphasized the

25 experiences you've had while cycling throughout

California. Can you describe a particular experience you had while cycling that increased your understanding and appreciation for California's diversity?

MR. MURILLO: Sure. I'd like to share a couple of those experiences with you.

So I have cycled all over California and the pace of cycling is one in which where you have a lot of time to observe and to -- to interact with people and understand the geography.

So one place of note that I cycled is Rialto, so it's in the eastern part of the Los Angeles basin. And right next to it are -- are some much higher upscale communities. So literally in the course of cycling the -- for perhaps five miles, you could go from a very white, moderate income demographic to a fully Hispanic neighborhood of working-class people. So a very obvious difference between those in a short -- in a very short space.

I felt extremely comfortable in either of those communities. And it would give me an appreciation for the diversity between those two.

Now I didn't go back and study the assembly district maps close enough to see if Rialto versus

the -- the neighboring cities were in the same district. But it would be interesting to look because the needs of the people between those two neighboring cities are quite different.

The differences as stark as someone with a perfectly manicured yard to someone with chickens running around in the front of their yard. So that's one example of understanding diversity and an appreciation of which I got solely through cycling. I wouldn't have been in the Rialto neighborhood except I was at an event that was proximate to that and I could ride my bike there.

A brief second example I have would come from the far northern regions of the state. I think it's Assembly District 1 actually. And somewhere around Plumas County, I found myself cycling one day and what was I stopped by on the road? I was stopped by a shepherd walking his herd of sheep across the small highway that was there. Literally there was (no audio) it was a fascinating thing to watch the sheep cross the highway when most of my time's spent cycling in an urban or suburban environment.

That person's perspective and who he might vote for based on his demographic and -- and his

geographic area are much different than mine are.

That -- that person very likely would ever be impacted by a vacation rental because he's got hundreds and hundreds of acres and -- and sheep on those acres versus me in a dense urban neighborhood with more of a rental or a vacation rental area in the surrounding to my house.

So again, that cycling has given me some interesting perspectives.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

Still sticking on the subject of the appreciation for diversity, can you think of any other experiences outside of cycling, either from work or any volunteer efforts that demonstrate your appreciation for diversity?

MR. MURILLO: Certainly in my work environment, there was a great deal of diversity. So over the course of about 30 years in my first and primary career, I did -- had up to 200 employees. And the mix of those employees very much look like the mix of the California population. And that wasn't by design, it was more, of course, by circumstance and skill set of the people that we're hiring.

But as you might imagine is that -- and the businesses were located in both San Jose and Los Angeles. So we had a high minority amount of workers and they were from all minorities. We had a good balance of men and

women. So having to work with those people on a daily basis gave me a very good appreciation, not only of them of workers, but I had an open office door. And my office door was if you have an issue, please come in and let's discuss it.

Now what I did is a good appreciation of some of the parties had a much different way of thinking, an importance of their family as opposed to other folks that were more focused only on their job. So on the minority side, what I came away with was a strong appreciation of those people having put family first over their employment, if it needed to be there. And that's why I had an open door so that really wouldn't become an issue if they had a family problem that they had to deal with, really tried to make it so it would not affect their employment.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

So the business you're referring to, was it Specialty Baking and if so, what -- tell us more about that business.

MR. MURILLO: So Specialty Baking was a wholesale bakery. We had two locations in California. We had one in Northern California and one in Southern California. And we made primarily a French bread that we delivered to a chain of restaurants throughout California. And we were required to operate seven days a week. I think we had three

holidays per year and we had a delivery radius of about 100 to 125 miles from each of those locations.

And so in my application, I think I mentioned that we had used zip code maps for projects to determine our delivery radiuses to the customer base. So I had some familiarity with bringing in great big maps that showed zip code within about 125 miles of Los Angeles and of San Jose, which is quite a wide swath.

So I brought that up because I have that information familiarity with maps and to be able to utilize those maps to design effective routes that would serve the customers. And in using the maps, you also had to go out into the fields to check that the maps were right and that the timing, in terms of the route timing, was accurate enough where the costing would work out.

CHAIR BELNAP: It says in your application that after Specialty Baking, you moved on to Sweet Earth Natural Foods and you were involved in product development.

Can you talk about your role and any analyses that you performed in that role?

MR. MURILLO: Sure. So I did product development. It's vegan and vegetarian food. And that company, while it had been in existence for, since 1978, when I joined it, it had new ownership and really was very much like a startup. So there was significant analysis that we had to make for

capital expenses as we were trying to grow the business.

And that required us to understand process very carefully.

So what is process? Process is what does it take to make a product? In my case, I was more interested in new product development rather than existing products. But as the analysis that I worked on projects, we utilized -- used or dealt with both of those. But the process would take you from acquiring ingredients through all the commercialization steps that are needed. And so to break down those steps, you might do things like analyze that the -- what are the throughput rates that are required? How many people are going to be used at each of the process steps? What is the labor cost for each of the various steps? And does that tie to an acceptable final product cost?

There was equipment that we need to source and look at. And at times there were some -- we'd have to go outside and ask for sometimes in a legal nature so we might have a new product that we would want to trademark the names for. There was product analysis and sometimes you would have legal people look at the ingredients callouts or any other health claim callouts that you might make on products.

So all of those things speak to one type of analysis that we did in that role as a product developer.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

You also talked about your experience as a jury foreman.

What did that experience teach you about being impartial?

MR. MURILLO: So I've been a jury foreman on two cases. They were both cases where someone had been injured in a car accident. And one of them taught me a very important lesson and it was addressed earlier as a skill that all Commissioners would have and one that I believe I have myself.

So the plaintiff had been injured in a car accident and his legal counsel brought in a physician expert to examine him on the stand. And the expert palpated, I remember the term from that trial, palpated the gentleman to demonstrate that the injury had caused some type of permanent pain damage left over from the accident. So far pretty straightforward.

Now we go back to the way I arrived at the courtroom in the morning. I was able to ride my bike to the courtroom in the morning. And what did I see on one day on my way into the courtroom? I saw the plaintiff walking perfectly across the street with his counsel. No obvious pain impediment. He looked absolutely perfectly normal to me. Nobody would have ever looked at him and

said, that guy's got a problem. In the courtroom he had a problem, outside he didn't.

So what happens in that circumstance? The judge gave clear direction, right? You may only consider what you're seeing in the courtroom. I had to set aside my preconceived notion that maybe this person really was okay. Right? I could only listen to the testimony and the facts that were presented in that courtroom. And I adhered to the judge's instructions. And as I recall, that that jury -- that jury did award the plaintiff a sum of money for damages left over from that car accident.

CHAIR BELNAP: And now I ask you a question, it's more curiosity in my mind, the ordinance that you helped develop and get passed through the California Coastal Commission, what did the ordinance require and what problem did it resolve?

MR. MURILLO: So at the time, there was no vacation real ordinance in County of Santa Cruz or other counties that had the ordinance but had ordinance similar to ours. But it was very early on in the game.

What the ordinance put into place was a registration system for vacation rentals. It put into place signage where any impacted neighbor would have an easy ability to contact the owner of that vacation rental to report a problem. It put in spacing requirements or

density requirements. So how many vacation rentals could there be on a particular block? How many could be in a particular area? We defined a specific area where I live, it was called LOTA, the Live Oak, something, area. So we had a 20 percent limit in the LOTA and a 15 percent limit on each block.

So that was all while, basically from scratch, that the county did not have any of that as an ordinance in place. And the results of that ordinance, and it's been modified now with our help a couple of times, has been quite successful.

One thing that we did learn in the course of developing that ordinance and there was someone who was very pressing at the time and we didn't pick it up as well as we could have in the ordinance, was someone on the -- one of the members of the Housing Advisory Committee. He realized that the proliferation of vacation rentals was pulling housing stock which had primarily been long-term rental housing for the citizens of Santa Cruz. It was pulling that housing out of the rental stock. And he spoke to that problem.

We tried to address it in terms of limiting the amount of rentals on a per block or per area basis, but that was more about preserving the identity and the characteristics of each neighborhood. At the time, it was

not realized by our working group that there would a housing crisis in a number of years later. Had we known that, I think the politics of getting that ordinance in the place would have allowed us more restrictions than where we ended up.

So for example if we landed on a 20 percent overall maximum amount of vacation rentals in a particular area, that probably likely would have been decreased to somewhere around 10 percent so that the housing stock wouldn't have been as depleted as we've seen. And we're up to around 15 percent in some of these areas now.

CHAIR BELNAP: Thank you.

Madame Secretary, time check.

MS. PELLMAN: Sorry, 3 minutes remaining.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. I'm going to end my questions and yield my time over.

Mr. Coe, do you want to proceed?

VICE CHAIR COE: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

I want to talk a little bit more about a story you mentioned in your first essay and that you alluded to in your earlier comments about how you came to apply for this commission.

As you mentioned, you indicated a colleague who is

a registered Democrat, suggested that you, a known registered Republican, apply for the Commission.

Why do you think that a member of an opposing political party would want you to sit on this Commission?

MR. MURILLO: It's an interesting question. And, you know, when he -- he's more of an opposing political party. He is a member of the Democratic Central Committee for Santa Cruz and was just reelected.

So why would he recommend someone who very likely has many policy views that are quite the opposite of his? And in my view, the reason that he recommended me is he saw that with our work on this ordinance, that I was able to analyze problems in real time and make logical decisions (no audio) about next steps going forward. And he also, because again, we are working with, in my view, people that were primarily democratic. He knew that I could work across party lines on an issue. And he saw that in every meeting that I went to.

Finally, I think his recommendation, again because we had to go and speak at -- at so many public meetings, he saw that I was able to do that.

Finally, there was one meeting that our group held that wasn't, it was a public meeting but it wasn't a meeting where we were speaking to an official government group. So we actually did our own outreach and tried to do

a little bit of advertising where we invited anyone who was interested to the local Grange Hall and put on a presentation, our viewpoint of why this ordinance was important. And I think that this person also saw that and was aware of that and saw the value in that.

VICE CHAIR COE: Do you think that this speaks to your ability to work successfully with people who may have different ideas from yours?

MR. MURILLO: I do. I think it addresses it directly. That when I focus on policy and task, that just because someone has a different view or viewpoint, that they may be politically opposite of me, that is not, for me, a problem. I would strongly prefer to discuss policy and interactions with other commission members. And to the extent that a strong political opinion enters into that, my focus would be let's concentrate on the policy and applying the standards to make the best maps that are possible.

VICE CHAIR COE: Thank you.

I want to switch over to the topic of impartiality for a moment. I know Mr. Belnap asked you a question in regards to your jury service and you gave a good example there.

I'm wondering if you have any other examples where you had to make an impartial decision that was maybe outside of a jury service setting.

MR. MURILLO: Well I do. And for that I think I would go back to my employment history.

So when you have a couple hundred people working for you, issues arise. There were times where we had to do formal investigations of someone's behavior, misconduct, whatever it might have been. There were investigations like that and there were also investigations of workplace injuries.

And so there's always a temptation because you work with these people who know it to jump to a conclusion about what you think probably happened. And very much learned along the way that that was not an acceptable way to come to a good decision about a person's employment because of misconduct or in the case of a work injury so whether a person really was injured or not. So I very quickly learned that when examining the facts and doing an investigation, I had to be impartial up front. Now at the end of the day, once the facts were in place and understood, I oftentimes was in the decision-making capacity and therefore no longer the impartiality applied because a decision had to be made. But that was a good lesson learned, not to jump to a conclusion and to be impartial coming into an investigation.

VICE CHAIR COE: Thank you. I was also going to ask a question about your cycling, but Mr. Belnap beat me

to it.

From the examples that you gave in your experience having met with lots of people across the state and people of different diverse backgrounds and cultures, what do you think that you've learned from your interactions with those folks about their preferences and their concerns that would make you an effective representative for them on this commission?

MR. MURILLO: Well, first of all, you'd learn that the needs of one area or person are very likely significantly different than the needs and concerns of someone else in a much different district. So when you look at the demographics and the geography, they both play a part in what various groups would need. And there were interactions that I would have with -- from cycling and from other travel where this would clearly be evident that the needs and their concerns, their ability to vote might be impacted.

So I mean, let's go back to that example I said about the chickens in the yard in Rialto. It's quite possible that those people could be disenfranchised by maps that were not correctly drawn. In terms of the work of the Commission, those people probably, at least in my view, would also be at a disadvantage in trying to address the Commission. Not so much in terms of language, but I'm not

certain, even though there were up to 170 partner groups that all of those, that one of those groups would have reached out to that particular area to make it known that those people had legitimate input into the decision-making process to draw maps.

So it's a concern that I brought out of visiting those neighborhoods.

VICE CHAIR COE: Thank you.

Kind of in a similar vein, I want to talk about communities of interest for a moment as that is a big task in front of this commission is to identify the communities of interest throughout the state to ensure that they're represented appropriately in the drawing of these maps. And some of those communities are easier to identify than others for various reasons for that.

How would you go about, as a Commissioner, identifying communities of interest particularly paying attention to not inadvertently overlooking some of these communities that might be harder to identify?

MR. MURILLO: Well I think the current Commission actually, they did identify communities of interest. So for a starting point, I would go back through their records and as a final report, the final report actually lists every district by number and some of the characteristics of the districts. Although it doesn't necessary spell out

that they were fully communities of interest.

I do know from the report that they were about seven majority-minority districts identified, and so that would be a starting point, I think, to go back and look at the data to see if those had changed, if that data was still relevant, if there were new districts in place. So that's, I think, where I would start on the identification piece.

VICE CHAIR COE: And some of those communities are less engaged or do not feel comfortable coming forward to speak or providing their opinions and that could be for a variety of reasons. But since getting as many perspectives as possible is important for the work of the Commission, for the Commission to be as well informed as they can, how would the Commission go about making those communities that are less engaged or less comfortable coming forward engaging with government making them feel comfortable enough to go forward and share their perspectives --

MR. MURILLO: Yeah, so that's --

VICE CHAIR COE: -- with the Commission?

MR. MURILLO: Yeah. That's a -- so we talked earlier about what are the greatest problems that the Commission might face? And I think I addressed that in some aspect. So outreach, right? We have, I'm pretty sure the current Commission has a database that they can use for

outreach of the partners.

I don't -- I couldn't find a lot on the -- what budget was available for advertising, but I do see that there was advertising outreach to those communities.

There were also Commissioners that went out and spoke, it seems, to various groups. So that would be a really good potential to in these districts where there's potential of them being fearful to interact with the Commission, that perhaps various Commissioners can go out and arrange to actually speak in person with the neighborhood groups.

And finally as I mentioned before, I think if we're still in a situation where it's not possible to have group gatherings for Commission meetings, this is going to be a significant problem for these areas that where the people may not have the same ability to have Internet access and input to the Commission hearings. So there's going to have to be a way, discover to allow that kind of access where they know it's simple for them to call in to address the Commission. And that any call-in, that there's never any chance of any retribution or inquiry. Have to make them feel very comfortable that in their participation, they're not putting any of their status at risk for them or anyone in their family.

VICE CHAIR COE: Thank you.

Madame Secretary, time check please.

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. Seven minutes, 49 seconds remaining.

VICE CHAIR COE: Very good.

Mr. Murillo, I'd like to go to your essay on your analytical skills. And in that essay you described you work on a local issue in which you work with a small team of concerned citizens and local politicians. You indicated that this project required the collection and analysis of data.

What kind of data did you collect and how did you analyze it?

MR. MURILLO: Well that project did require some collection of data. So first thing we did is we tried to develop a database of the people who were interested in the cause. There was also a database that we developed that the county didn't have of how many existing housing units were being used as vacation rentals.

We did information search of all the existing ordinances that dealt with vacation rentals in California. So all of those things in combination came together and that was the basis for the first draft of the ordinance that we presented to our local political leaders' supervisors in this case.

VICE CHAIR COE: And was that the project where you

also had geographic analysis with the GIS software that you were talking about earlier?

MR. MURILLO: So that's correct. So there -- we were looking at GIS overlays so we could try to determine where the largest amount of vacation rentals were.

And as it turned out in our particular area, and I think we actually ended up at the time of the ordinance with three call-out areas and now they're up to five, is that they were primarily located within the area of the coastline and of about a half a mile. And so we had to come up with an area to identify where these were.

And specifically in that area, and I think it's pertinent to what the work on the Commission might be is what were the neighborhoods like in this area? Was it one big neighborhood, were there different neighborhoods? If we drew a map, essentially what we did, we drew a map, did we -- was it geographically compact? It was in our case. Did we split up neighborhoods? No, not really. The neighborhoods were pretty consistent among that. Did the people in the neighborhood in our map area have the same kind of concerns? Well there were two concerns. There were of course the people who wanted vacation rentals and didn't want any regulation. And there were the people who thought regulation was necessary. But they all ended up in the same kind of mapped area that we came up with.

So we actually made specific recommendations and that was at the planning commission level in terms of generating that ordinance, and that they took our information and coalesced that into the actual verbiage of the ordinance which was approved by the board of supervisors.

VICE CHAIR COE: How did you -- you mentioned that you didn't split neighborhoods. How were definitions of things like neighborhoods established?

MR. MURILLO: Well I -- we did not make an attempt to make a formal definition of neighborhood. So specific to that project because all the people working on it actually lived here, we had a very good sense of what the neighborhood was. We knew where the local gathering points were, where the public offices were. All of the neighborhood is along the shoreline so there's physical limitations. Our map, you know, we used the shoreline on one side and the railroad tracks on the other. So there were obvious physical characteristics to define the neighborhood.

And while the neighborhood's not homogeneous, it's -- it's pretty close. So we didn't go back and actually try to pull up exact demographics. We probably could have done that, it wasn't necessary to get the ordinance in place. But what I would be pretty confident in saying is

that if we were to pull up demographics, you would see that it's pretty consistent among the type of people who lived in the neighborhood.

VICE CHAIR COE: Thank you.

One more time check, please.

MS. PELLMAN: Two minutes, 45 seconds.

VICE CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Murillo, one final question. If you were to be appointed to the Commission, which aspects of the role of Commissioner do you think you would enjoy the most? And conversely, which aspects of the role of Commissioner do you think you might struggle with a little bit?

MR. MURILLO: Well I'm going to start off with -- with the struggle part.

So when I reviewed the final report, there are several instances in that report that are specific to court case rulings. I'm confident that I can understand the tenor and the gist of all of those and how they would necessarily be applied to the six criteria that the Commission needs to work with.

That said, the density of those rulings, you know, some of them went back to legislative intent. There's a lot of information in there that was complex rulings. That would take some time to digest. So you ask me could it be a struggle? It would be harder to do than many other of

the aspects of looking at the criteria.

For things that I would enjoy doing, I do enjoy the mapmaking. In my early days of cycling, I used to make my own maps. Now admittedly they were Point A to Point B maps, but there were calculations on the maps where I had to look at geography and towns and figure out where to stop. So that was -- that was quite an enjoyable experience, and I could see that playing into the mapmaking at least a map review. I highly doubt that the Commission itself is going to draw maps. From what I read, they rely on consultants to do the initial map drawing. But to look at apps to understand the geography of the maps, to understand the demographics contained in those maps to make sure that you had the idea of nesting kind of interesting concept.

MS. PELLMAN: Thirty seconds remaining.

MR. MURILLO: All of those things I think I could do quite well and I would enjoy doing those.

VICE CHAIR COE: Thank you very much, Mr. Murillo.

Mr. Chair, no further questions.

CHAIR BELNAP: Ms. Dickison, the time is now yours.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

So you were just talking about your joy of making maps and you were talking about the different geographies and whatnot.

So thinking about the maps and the different districts, would -- based on your knowledge of maps, would you be alarmed at districts that were oddly shaped or had shapes that didn't physically look like they made sense?

MR. MURILLO: Yeah. I most -- I most certainly would be alarmed by that.

When I looked at the various maps that the Commission drew as it's pointed in a couple of examples, so I looked a little bit at the Assembly District 1 map the Assembly District 2 map, and Assembly District 29 and 30. One and 2 take up big swaths of northern California. And I think actually when I looked it up, have been to most of those cities even those are quite a stretch outlined in that map. There's a pretty diverse community in that big swath.

The one that I started looking at in particular was a little community of Kings Beach, Lake Tahoe. Very highly Hispanic, right? But it was all picked up in the rest of that Assembly District 1 map. And those people are probably at somewhat of a disadvantage given the rest of the population. I think that was about 85 percent race white and, you know, the balance being some other minorities. So I'm not sure those people were well-served. If one was to crop out into looks like -- maybe they could get close District 5, I don't know, those two districts

would still be contiguous. I didn't just -- I didn't go into the details that carefully.

With regard to Assembly District 2, I believe that the town of Santa Rosa is in that district. And given the population spread of the Assembly District 2 with a population concentration in Santa Rosa, I think that probably also -- it could limit the ability of some of the voters in Assembly District 2 to shape the results of an election to their preference given the high amount of population in Santa Rosa. So I didn't dig into the exact population of Santa Rosa compared to the rest of population of Assembly District 2, but it would be a concern and it might be a place to where, again, someone might try to scoop out Santa Rosa and put it in, you know, maybe District 4 or District 10.

The other two districts that I looked at are the one that I live in which is 29, and then I looked at District 30 which is Monterey and San Benito County. And the reason I looked at those is because they're -- they matched all the criteria, they were contiguous, they're relatively compact.

The big difference I saw between those two is -- is one was, again, very high percentage white race demographic. And District 30 was over 50 percent Latino but it didn't look like it came up on the list of majority

minority districts. I don't understand exactly why that happened but there's diverse interest in District 30, more so than what we would see in District 29. District 29 because it's most of Santa Cruz County is more or less homogenous.

But if you were to look at District 30 which goes from the coast of Monterey and the City of Monterey out to the foothills in eastern Monterey County, those are pretty two distinct areas with in my view probably distinct demographics. And the fact that the district was 50 -- 50, 51 percent identified Latino minority is also interesting.

So those are regularly shaped, they maintained the cities well in that, I didn't see cities being split up.

So again, I think they met the criteria but those and I'm sure many other assembly districts are going to be part of what the Commission's going to review.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. So one of the issues that is going to -- could be facing this next Commission is California's expected to lose a congressional district. And given that, some communities may, you know, feel like they aren't given their fair voice.

What steps do you think the Commission can do to address that in their work?

MR. MURILLO: Yeah. So I am aware of that speculation that the population of California might change

enough where they do lose a congressional district, and that is an interesting element that the Commission's going to have to consider. And I think it might actually require a redrawing of many of the maps to balance out the population as required by the criteria.

I will note that I read in the final report that the current Commission did an excellent job of, you know, getting the percentages balanced within 1 percent in many cases.

I will say part of my research, I did go back and I looked at some of the letters that were written in early on in 2011. And those — those letters ran a gamut of, you know, how should the Commission set up its chairs to a more important one which to point would be there were several letters where because of the redistricting that was going on and the mapmaking that there were communities where the person that they had previous elected, they were no longer going to be able to elect. That that person was in a new district or the line had been drawn where, you know, there were certain communities were no longer able to vote for that person.

So I think that is speaks to your point where we would want to be able to go back, if the population is lessened enough, the maps are redrawn, to try to retain communities that had, you know, consistently voted for

their representative. They've had the benefit now of several elections under the current mapping system. Well in the 2011 Commission did their work, those communities may not have the advantage of these more fair maps. Right? So there was a change.

My expectation coming into this was that the current maps wouldn't change dramatically, certainly I wouldn't expect them to change as dramatically as they did from prior to the first Commission's work until their first set of maps. This second set of maps there's going to definitely be changes because of the potential population change. I think that they're less and it'll be the Commission's task to try to minimize the impact as I've described where certain communities really might have their representative that they elected at the last election split off because the maps need to be changed.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you for that.

With your experience as a business owner and a product developer, what do you see as your role on the Commission?

MR. MURILLO: Well we have the mission of the Commission which would be is to make the maps in an impartial nature, that is the primary role.

Now with the strengths that I bring to that, right, are having -- or I can assure the Commission that I can

look at this impartially, that I do not bring any political agenda to the table on this with the goal of making fair maps that give all the voting-age population their best chance at (indiscernible). That's really the primary skill that I would want to bring to the Commission.

And secondly, as I've spoken to, I have well-developed skills of analysis where I can look at problems, in many way I view myself in the product development field as a problem solver. I mean, we've had a marketing department come to us and say we want X. It's like, I have no idea how to make X, but I'm going to figure it out for you. And I've done so successfully.

So are there problems that would come to the Commission? Yes, there are going to be problems that come. It -- can I be on that Commission as a problem solver where I can apply real time analytical skills to address a problem? And my -- my skill when you mention business, right, is I like -- I always like to be presented with options. So people come to us and say here's an issue and say, okay, how do you -- how do you want to solve it? Give me some options so I can help decide what the best course for it is. I would like to bring that skill to the Commission.

You might go to a hearing, you'd hear of concerns.

There might be -- much as I said in a letter. Do you --

these people are used to voting for Assemblyman X and they're no longer going to get to. This looks like it's a problem for that community. Fellow Commissioners, what are our options to try to address this issue? Right? That is how I'd approach it. And I think that's one of my stronger skills that I can apply in this work.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

So you talk some about when you were working with that ad hoc committee to develop ordinances, you looked at neighborhoods in your area.

When you were doing that, did you learn anything about the different communities that were in your area and some of the concerns they were facing that might be outside of what you were looking at?

MR. MURILLO: That certainly wasn't the focus, but what I will say is we did in that project walk the neighborhoods. So we did petition gathering. So in the petition gathering really we were knocking on people's doors. And, you know, we -- we did have conversations where there were other concerns that were brought up. So, you know, we -- we heard from some people, you know, didn't quite slam the door in our face but said, you know, leave me alone, you're crazy, I don't want to get involved. We heard from other people that -- that were more interested in other issues in the neighborhood, not this particular

issue. So we lent an ear, although we didn't try to address it.

What I will say in our neighborhood and the ones that were affected by the ordinance, they were more homogeneous demographically than some of our more minority-dense areas here where I live. And unfortunately the minority-dense areas were not within our purview to be able to affect by the ordinance. And by that I mean that the fair amount of the minority-dense -- dense neighborhoods are in the City of Santa Cruz and this ordinance was specific to the county areas. So we -- we were not able to address those people's concerns if they were there.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you for that.

You mentioned earlier in your response to Standard Question 5 that you have traveled internationally and could bring that perspective to the Commission.

What have you learned in your international travels that will benefit the Commission and its work?

MR. MURILLO: Yeah, thanks, I was hoping somebody might circle back to that.

So I want to tell just a very brief story about an encounter that I had. So there was this one time when I was riding along the Bosporus River, it was early in the morning. So outside of Istanbul. And here I was in my little fold-up bike, wearing my helmet, I was wearing

cycling clothes that you might see here in the United

States and it was about 8:00 in the morning. And what I

came across at 8:00 in the morning was a group of women

exercising on like playground equipment, something that you

would commonly see here.

Every one of those women was dressed in a full burka. They literally stopped what they were doing to look at me. And you know what I did? I stopped to look at them. And it was mutually respectful. What I came away with that, right, is that we are probably as polar opposite as you could be. That it would — there was probably not a whole lot in common. But what I did and what I think that they did, too, is that we had mutual respect that we're both on our own paths and we were doing our own thing.

Extremely important lesson there that I took away. So to broaden that out in terms of travel, when I -- I try to fully respect the modes that you see in faraway places because they're different than ours. And I enjoy learning about those different ways. And it adds to my perspective. And what I take from that perspective, if I were to bring it back to the Commission here, is to fully understand that people that are going to approach the Commission or the fellow Commissioners are going to have different perspectives. But that should not be an impediment for trying to accomplish the task at hand. If you have some

amount of mutual respect and appreciation for differences, that the task can be fully successful.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

MS. PELLMAN: You have 3 minutes, 44 seconds remaining.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Okay. Thank you.

So the first eight Commissioners are selected randomly and then they are tasked with selecting the next six.

If you were selected as one of the first eight, what would you look for in the other six Commissioners?

MR. MURILLO: Yeah, well if my ping-pong ball comes up in the first eight, the first thing I think I would do is I would want to meet with the other seven Commissioners and determine what skill set that the group had that was going to be able to successfully complete the mission. And to the extent that there was an obvious skill lacking and to the extent that it's permitted to identify skill sets among the rest of the applicant group, my recommendation to the fellow Commissioners would be that we go out and identify skill sets that might be lacking and look for the fellow Commissioners of the remaining six that would best fill any of those missing skills.

Now the other part is because the first eight are drawn, you know, somewhat at random, obviously after this

initial selection process, that there might be just by circumstance a good lack -- or a lack of diversity. And so that would be my -- my second probably criteria that -- in identifying the balance of the six was that -- Commission would have a diversity that represents the voting-age population of the citizens of California.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

Can I get a time check?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. One minute, 20 seconds remaining.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: I have no further questions at this time.

Mr. Chair, I yield my time.

CHAIR BELNAP: Thank you.

Mr. Dawson, the time is now yours.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Murillo, I wanted to follow up on one of your responses to Mr. Coe. And actually, I think Ms. Dickison touched on it as well.

When you were on this ad hoc committee, you stated that you knew where the neighborhoods were and what the flavors of the neighborhoods were because you lived there.

Now when, assuming you're appointed to the Commission, you won't be able to do that going around the state. So based on that experience, what questions would

you be asking of local folks to learn something about their neighborhoods, their communities of interest?

MR. MURILLO: I think one of the first questions I would ask them is, are they happy with their political representation? So, you know, are you a voter? Are you in the voting-age population? Are you happy with your current representative?

I realize that we're not drawing maps to help a representative stay in place, what my goal there in asking that question would be to see is if they thought that they had legitimate input into the voting system in such a way that there was no perception that it was skewed against them.

So in my own area, I mean, if you were to look at election results, I as a Republican oftentimes get outvoted probably 90 to 1 with the Democrats being in power. Now I don't find that to be a problem. But if I were to go and ask in neighborhoods or try to gather factual data from voting records, that would be something I'd want to look at. Say, are these communities, are the voting-age population served? Do they have the right opportunity to vote as they might choose and that the mapping system was not drawn in such a way as it wasn't impartial and it was for some reason an impediment to their voting?

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Madame Secretary, what's our time left in the 90?

MS. PELLMAN: Three minutes, 27 seconds.

MR. DAWSON: All right. Thank you.

I have no further follow up, Mr. Chair.

The other -- do panel members have any follow ups?

CHAIR BELNAP: I have no further follow up.

Mr. Coe?

VICE CHAIR COE: I have no follow-up questions.

CHAIR BELNAP: Ms. Dickison?

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

MR. DAWSON: Great.

Mr. Murillo, with the time remaining, I'd like to offer you the opportunity to make a closing statement to the panel, if you wish.

MR. MURILLO: Well I'm very much looking forward to being a member of the Commission. And I hope what you've taken away from our interviews today are one, that I have the commitment to follow this through to the end game.

Secondly, I'm hopeful that I've expressed well enough my ability to be completely impartial.

Thirdly, I believe I demonstrated that my business experience, my travel experience have given me the ability to apply the needed criteria for decision-making to come up with the appropriate maps.

And finally, and I think importantly, I hope that you come away with the understanding that in terms of my commitment, that I've been able to demonstrate that I've done a fair amount of research into what the work of the Commission would be and so try to dive down into some of the specifics. And that we take away the importance for either me or any Commissioner that is selected of using both the summary report and the initial report from 2011 as roadmaps going forward to succinctly direct the work of the new Commission.

And thank you for the opportunity.

CHAIR BELNAP: And thank you for your continued interest in serving on the Commission.

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

(Off the record for Recess at 12:13 p.m.)

(On the record at 1:15 p.m.)

CHAIR BELNAP: It being 1:14 we're going to go ahead and get started. I want to welcome Mr. Colmar De Von Figueroa-Moseley to his interview. Mr. Figueroa-Moseley can you hear us?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: Yes, I can. Thank you.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. I'm going to turn the time over to Mr. Dawson for the standard questions.

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: All right, thank you.

MR. DAWSON: Hello, good afternoon. I am going to read you five standard questions that the panel has requested each applicant respond to. Are you ready, sir?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: I am, thank you.

MR. DAWSON: First question. What skills and attributes should all Commissioners possess?

What skills or competences 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?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: So beginning with your first question about the skills and competences that the Commission should possess collectively, I would say inclusivity, a focus on public good, a focus on true representation of all people of California residents and people. That the Commission as a whole has a sense of teamwork, that we care about the communities. And patience in times of challenge, because there may be certain time — instances that there will be a lot of challenge. A focus on collective good, and consensus building and a sense of impartiality.

Of the skills and attributes that each

Commissioner should possess I try to find the common

ground. I try to be inclusive. I focus on the public good and also on true representation. I have a sense of teamwork. I care about my communities in which I have lived. And I have patience in the times of challenge. I focus on the collective good as well with consensus building. I'm also personable and impartial. And I'm also a person that's willing to have courageous conversations. I think when people hold back and don't speak about things that may be on their mind they're not having the courageous conversations. And having these conversations allows people to connect together.

So how will I contribute to the success of the Commission? I'll focus on openness in the Commission, working together to ensure public trust, guard against microaggressions. And what I mean by microaggressions is the idea that when people make snide comments, or make comments that don't focus on moving the Commission forward, that's the thing I want to make sure we protect against.

And then I bring a perspective of a person that lives and understands diversity and also a willingness to be or have impartiality.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Question 2. 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 hyperpartisanship?

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?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: So addressing your first question about the characteristics that my fellow

Commissioners possess that will protect against hyperpartisanship, I think being an independent thinker is very important. We will focus on consensus building and coalition building, personable. And there's a term called "beginners mind," that knowing that I don't always have all the answers and that it's important to be open to different viewpoints in order to move things forward. To approach each issue that comes before the Commission based on its own merits, again a willingness to have courageous conversations and guard against microaggressions.

I bring to the table also my research background, which allows me to have an analytical mind. And my decisions will be based on qualitative data that comes from

public responses and observations in public hearings, speakers' deliberations and written submissions. And the quantitative data that are gleaned from draft maps, visualizations of the districts of our community of interest.

What will I do to ensure that the Commission is not polarized? Openness and impartiality, recognizing and supporting the minority perspective for any group who differs racially and politically from a large group of which it is part; I think honoring the diverse and different perspectives of those selected to be on the Committee is very important. And in terms of our communities of interests I will emphasize that we follow decision-making processes that are congruent with the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which outlawed discriminatory voting practices across the country. I also again will guard against microaggressions which inhibits collaborative work and consensus building.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Question 3. What is the greatest problem the Commission could encounter, and what actions would you take to avoid or respond to this problem?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: So the greatest problem that the Commission could encounter is partisan challenges from various organizations in both the state, local and

federal court on the redistricting maps. So the actions that I would take to avoid and respond to this problem is number one, have a sincere pursuit of transparency and openness in all that we do as Commissioners. And I also think that it's important that we have sound planning and careful execution to protect against political interference.

Our efforts as independent Commissioners will be confronted by a greater and more savvy environment as opposed to what happened ten years ago. So using some of my analytical mind I think our processes must be data driven. We must be professional about what we do. The process must move in a transparent manner and stepwise manner from our selection to the training to the planning to the public hearings to the drawing of the maps and finally, to any need of adjustment in the maps that may come before the Commission.

I also think that we have to remember that our decisions may activate a barrage of political challenges. And we must guard against and reduce the undue influence and any appearances of bias in our process. And keeping that in mind I know that everything that the Commission may, that the Commission does may not be perfect and that we may have some stumbles and disagreements. But as a group we must always remember our purpose. An old African

proverb says, "If you want to go fast you go alone. But if you want to go far, you go together." And I choose together.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Question 4. If you are selected, you will be one of fourteen 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?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: Okay. I would like to give you the example at Mayo Clinic in Rochester,

Minnesota. I was the Director of Community Engaged

Research. I was hired at Mayo with the goal of increasing participation of community of color in clinical research.

Once I got there I was able to create, foster and maintain relationships between communities of color in relevant clinical research activities at Mayo.

I identified and recruited community leaders from the Dakota Sioux native people, the Somalis, the Latino

population, and the Hmong to participate as community health workers. So within this community health worker model, community health workers, networks have been shown to increase health outcomes of various communities of color. I provided guidance for the community health workers and we met weekly to identify gaps and opportunities in our outreach.

I also supported and worked collaboratively with the Mayo Clinic investigators in developing cultural-specific methods in bringing the benefits of clinical research to the communities of color. And as the example of this I was deeply involved in a colorectal cancer screening study. And the investigator had asked our Department to assist in connecting with communities of color. So my staff and I had developed a relationship with this Somali community through our community health worker networks in Rochester, Minnesota and in Minneapolis.

We also had communication with Somali doctors and nurses that had identified colon cancer as an issue within the community. We recruited Somali women at first. And with a little more education and nudging from their wives and friends Somali men entered the study. For the study we facilitated participation by providing transportation to Mayo Clinic, use of our Somali community health workers for translational purposes, provided babysitters from the

community and even gave remuneration to participants. Mayo research leadership was very, very happy with our efforts and in connecting between the communities and the investigators. That was a success.

The problem that occurred was one month later my office and the investigator's office began receiving concerned communications through our community health workers concerning participants receiving a bill for their screening. What we had not considered was that the hospital was actually charging the participants for the colorectal screening in the amount of \$1100 if they did not have an established insurer that worked with Mayo Clinic.

So there was a lot of things that we had to clean up. We met with the leaders of the Somali community and with those affected we apologized for the mistakes that we had made and assured the members that we would take care of the bill.

The way that we did it, as for the investigator and I, we were able to have the bills' charge covered by our local Rotary Chapter, which I was the member of and by Mayo Clinic's Charity Care Fund. So we were able to keep a very positive relationship with this community.

But in terms of lessons learned, going forward all investigators were asked to build into their research budgets the extra costs associated with any procedures that

were being done in the hospital and the lab and that were not covered by their own insurance. So in terms of the lessons that I would take from this group experience to the Commission, it alerted me to the possibility of unintended consequences and with the responsibility of not doing harm.

The other thing that I learned was admitting my mistakes. Community members are more willing to accept an apology then you ignoring their concerns. And in most cases partnerships with communities creates better outcomes. And I think thinking out of the box in terms of how we used the community health workers. That was very important, and how we made sure that we did no harm in terms of participants in our research studies not being billed.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Question 5. 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 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?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: So first of all I'm an advocate against hate and have learned to be an ally to communities. I'm personable. And I have an understanding of my own culture and histories and how it affects my life experiences. I'm pretty comfortable with speaking about my own background. And it allows me to be a better listener to others that talk about theirs. I understand how biases of others has affected me and makes me more open to how it has affected others.

The other thing that I do is I do my own research on the different communities of interest every time I come into a community. I do homework in terms of knowing about the histories and speaking to the people within the community, because it will definitely give you a better perspective.

I don't fear making mistakes in building relationships. I think relationships are lost because of a fear of making missteps. Again, having courageous conversations with people in these communities and learning about their life and their experiences potentially slows judgment and stereotyping knowing that everyone brings their own perspective.

And I find that building friendships with different communities is very important. My connection

with other people it gives me great -- it's of great importance in my life. And caring and understanding each other is in my opinion what motivates us as a people to change. And establishing with people from diverse backgrounds and places can be key in making significant changes within the communities.

In terms of the experiences I've had that will help me be effective in understanding and appreciating people from communities of different backgrounds and who have a variety of perspectives, I have a keen understanding of what it feels like to be the other. My family is multiethnic and multiracial. I'm Jewish and I'm black Creole with other ethnic racial mixtures. I've had a lot of diverse life experiences in living in and interacting in developing relationships with individuals from diverse and varied communities. I've lived in metropolitan areas and rural communities where you have a keen understanding of the various opportunities and challenges in each of the communities.

My work has also focused on working with diverse populations within the Hispanic population living in San Diego, working as the Director of Community Engaged Research at Mayo, my experiences of working with immigrants and new immigrants in rural communities, and that being the newcomer has its own opportunities and challenges. And

celebrating their diversity as well as building bridges is important.

I've had a lot of experience on boards and committees: Mayo Clinic Executive Board; the Chamber of Commerce of Rochester, Minnesota; the Jewish Federation; our congregational boards and as well as the San Juan Unified Curriculum and Standards Board.

I'm a life member of the Alpha Phi Alpha
Fraternity, Incorporated. Our fraternity has a national
program called "A Voteless People is a Hopeless People."
That was started in the 1930s, which at that time focused
on voter registration. And voter education and recently in
terms of the '90s, focused on shifting the focus to include
political awareness and empowerment.

I participated and helped organize town meetings and candidate forums for this program since joining the fraternity in 1993. I think that our most powerful sort of marketing piece has been the first of all we vote, every voter, every election. And it's a sort of a nice little program that talks about -- and across all of our fraternities, whether it's a college level or at the graduate level, it -- we have several different sort of forums and drives and things like that for dealing with the voting amongst different people and increasing their empowerment and understanding of the political process.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. And I apologize. I neglected to ask do you prefer "Mr." or "Dr. Figueroa-Moseley?"

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: I'm fine with "Mr." Yeah,
I go by "Comar" as well, but you know for these purposes
"Mr." is fine with me.

MR. DAWSON: All right. Thank you.

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

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay, thank you for being with us. So you obtained your Master's and PhD degrees in psychology in the late '90s. And you indicate in your application, and I think you provided some links to them, that you have published various empirical studies. Can you provide us with an example or two of the types of analysis you have performed which you think would be most applicable to the work of the Commission?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: So I think in terms of analyses, one sort of study that I did was looking at racial, ethnic differences in skin cancer and what reports of skin cancer and things like that. And so what we were able to find from the study was that we used an analysis method of logistic regression, which basically it talks about how people can -- what's the predicted value that a

person would have skin cancer and how their reactions would be to radiation. And so we created a model that basically said, "Look, this person has skin cancer." We moved it to understanding that based on various different conditions African Americans were less likely to report their skin cancer or skin cancer problems based on what they had been directed to do.

So I think one of the things that also came out of that project was how particular physicians may treat skin cancer as well as other cancers in terms of their perception of the individual. And what we did was we called it "social cognition." And that those physicians with higher social cognition were better equipped to treat their patients with cancer then those with lower social cognition.

And so it helped develop further research looking at other racial ethnic differences in terms of how we may approach the physician body in terms of being able to make them more aware of their certain social biases.

And also be able to give fair -- what I would call it -- fair treatment to both, to all parties. And so I think that is something that was very, very important.

And from those sort of cancer studies it promoted a lot of other studies in terms of moving the ball forward in terms of how we can bring equity to cancer and cancer treatments.

CHAIR BELNAP: Thank you. So you said, "social cognition." What is that? And how did you guys end up measuring it in physicians that were treating cancer patients?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: So social cognition is -it's a kind of way of measuring racial and ethnic
discrimination, so social cognition is of the ability for
people to put aside their own beliefs about a person or a
group in order to be able to treat the person as if he was
like everyone else. And so in terms of social cognition
it's a very salient piece in terms of those of us that look
at issues around race or behavioral interventions.

 $\label{eq:and_so_I} \mbox{And so I think I missed one part of your} \\ \mbox{question.} \mbox{ Could I -- I think you --} \\$ 

CHAIR BELNAP: How do you measure it?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: And so I think it's basically measured on how the physicians' knowledge, their knowledge of how they are treating the various individuals as well as how they are communicating their treatment plan to the various individuals from whether they were Black or white. And so I think it's very important that the goal of the study was basically to let people know that based on their social cognition that they may treat individuals differently. And that there's a greater need to be basically inclusive in terms of treating, because sometimes

what ended up also happening was that sometimes the physicians would end up treating the individuals and if they had pain they would give them less pain meds in terms of being measured. Basically the patients would have very similar measurements of pain across ethnicity, but the African American patients got less pain meds. And it was based on their perceptions what they thought was appropriate for that particular group.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay, thank you.

So after studying and working in the public health field then your application indicates that you started your own catering business in 2013. Why did you take this career path? And what did you learn from it?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: So one of the major things about being able to cater is I've always had a love for cooking. And because at the time we had young children in our house and my wife is a physician, so it became a conversation that we had in our own house to say who's going to be slaying dragons in the house? And so we made a family decision that our kids were very important and that I would have greater time doing catering as opposed to being on the track of being this, the pure academic person.

And so the catering has allowed me to meet a wide variety of people, have a wide variety of interactions.

It's also allowed me to help others, especially within our

community, who cannot afford to have an expensive bar mitzvah or an expensive program. So it became for me a service to others. And so the reason why I stick with that is because it's very meaningful to have as my goal a service for all and focus on really presenting a good product at a less expensive price. And so I've been very proud of that initiative.

And over the past few years since I've been the Vice President of Development at our local synagogue we've raised \$35,000 last year for programming. And we are expected -- well we were expected before the coronavirus came -- to beat that goal. So I'm very proud to be involved in that. And also find a way to give back to the community.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay, thank you.

So in your essay on impartiality you emphasized your experience on the Curriculum and Standards Committee of a school district. You spoke about the Committee's navigation of the new LGBTQ curriculum in particular. So can you briefly describe that experience? And how you had to exercise impartiality in this instance?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: So being part of the Curriculum and Standards Committee what had come before us was the education state mandate that for LGBTQ we needed to make sure that we included individuals in our -- in all

that we do, whether it was in our science curriculum, in our social studies curriculum. And it was important for us as a group to emphasize that when a person sees someone who is like them it also gives them a sense of belonging. And I think for our group we had people from various political and religious backgrounds, but ultimately it was our group decided that it was important to focus on inclusion of others in terms of our curriculum adoptions, in terms of our book adoptions.

And so we did have pushback from parents who had their own religious concerns concerning the curriculum.

And what I would say is that we honored their needs and we said that, "If you don't want your kid to be involved in terms of this development of the LGBT curriculum for specific in terms of sexuality and stuff like that you can pull the kid out of the health class during that section."

But in terms of social studies we had to honor the state's rules and say, "Look, whether the person looks like you or whether they are of a different sexual gender preference or things like that, that we really, really should have that included in the social studies curriculum and in the science curriculum." And it was adopted by our school board unanimously. And as we continue to go through our meetings and further developments there might be certain changes in the curriculum. But as of now we have

continued to support what our educational -- EDCO had basically said that we must follow. So that's it.

CHAIR BELNAP: So do you have another experience, either from your work or your volunteer experiences where you've had to exercise the impartiality? And if so, can you share that with us?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: The other experience is I worked with a group in San Diego County called "Por La Vida." And as an Evaluation Director within the Por La Vida Program I've had to, within that program is a program that was supported by the First 5 Initiative out of San Diego County. And we had basically developed relationships with various different communities: the Barrio Logan community, the Chula Vista community, the National City Latino community.

And in the development of the curriculum we had to balance as a group what was important in terms of the curriculum going forward. And we had gotten a lot of input from our community health workers where basically they presented a perspective. And then we also got other input from other local community members that lived in the Latino communities. So I as an evaluation director had to basically step back. And even though I may have had my certain opinions of what curriculum was adopted and what curriculum was excluded I was able to work with both our

community health workers and community members in creating a better product which became our curriculum for the community health workers in how they moved things forward. So I think it's important that with that I was able to really show that I allowed the process to be open. And to be very -- you know, just take steps back in terms of being impartial.

And in the end I felt that the product was a much stronger product. And that by year three of our program we were able to connect 3,000 children who were American citizens from that Latino community to access the care to other -- meeting their mental health needs as well as helping them have a greater health knowledge and understanding of their health.

MS. PELLMAN: We have 5 minutes, 18 seconds remaining.

CHAIR BELNAP: So first of all let's make sure that Mr. Figueroa-Moseley, can you hear us?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: Yes, I can.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. So I believe where we were at is I had asked for --

VICE CHAIR COE: Mr. Belnap, I'm sorry. When we lost you guys and everybody else on the Zoom meeting was still present. I as the Vice Chair had the Secretary stop the clock. So I just want to ensure that we have the clock

appropriately set up to be started again.

MS. PELLMAN. Yes. I'm going to make -- if you could bear with me for a minute I want to make one adjustment here.

On the clock I'll tell you what we had heard up to that point. I had asked a question about another example of impartiality and you had begun telling us about your time as an Evaluation Director. I didn't quite hear the program name but that it was supported by First 5, so that's where we were at. Kind of we heard the background and the setup, but not necessarily the rest of the details on that example.

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: All right, is everyone on or are --

CHAIR BELNAP: Well, this is Chair --

MS. PELLMAN: Yeah.

CHAIR BELNAP: Madam Secretary, we're good?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes, we're good. Thank you.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. So Mr. Figueroa-Moseley if you would just please continue that example.

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: So the program was called Por La Vida, which means "for life." And basically I served as the Evaluation Director for the program. And at that point we were developing a curriculum under the First

5. It was for a three-year grant. And so we went out and hired community workers from the Barrio Logan community in the San Diego County, the Chula Vista communities and National City communities.

And so in the development of the program we had allowed the community health workers and other community members have input on what would be the proper, what would be good in terms of inclusion in terms of the curriculum.

I as the Evaluation Director had to take a step back and let the community health workers as well as other community members speak on what was very important to them in terms of inclusion in the Por La Vida curriculum. And based on that I had to be impartial to listen to both sides in terms of what was good to include as well as what may end up being excluded.

What I ended up finding out from the community health workers they thought that there was a greater need to cover mental health and that folks needed to be connected to mental health locations and other possibilities. So we were able to create a curriculum and a checklist within San Diego that said where you could go in terms of mental health concerns.

We also connected people to various different settings in terms of dealing with public health concerns.

And also made sure that the curriculum was that folks were

having their medical needs met. And so within that program, being the Evaluation Director I really had to step back and let the process flow instead of putting in exactly what I wanted out of the program. And I think by utilizing our community health workers as well as other community input we came upon a product that was very well received by these various communities.

And of course after it had been again piloted and put in these communities we made changes. And we were able to connect 3000 children whose parents were not citizens, but the kids were citizens to medical services, mental health services as well as increasing their general health knowledge.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

Madam Secretary how much time is on my clock?

MS. PELLMAN: Three minutes, 28 seconds.

CHAIR BELNAP: Mr. Figueroa-Moseley as I go through your application I can see that you've had educational and work experiences all over the country. I'm not clear on when you came to California and what caused that to be.

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: So I came to California with my family in 2007, in August of 2007. And the reason why we left Rochester was that my wife's father had gotten ill, he had ALS. And so we needed to be closer to him in

terms of making sure that we were taking care of my wife's 80-year-old parents at the time. And be able to intervene and be closer just in case there was any sort of medical needs because my wife is a physician, that we could help support. And so it was better for us to be closer to our family out here in California where we can actually be able to help with the support.

And unfortunately the next year my father-in-law passed away. But we're happy to be close with family. My mother-in-law is still living; she just turned 89 a couple of months ago, so we're close. And because of the COVID we haven't been able to see her as much right now. But that was the main reason why we came here, to be closer to my wife's family.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right, thank you. Mr. Coe, I'll now turn the time over to you.

VICE CHAIR COE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good afternoon to you Dr. Figueroa-Moseley. Thank you for taking the time to speak with us today.

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: No problem.

VICE CHAIR COE: In regards to the small business that you had started I'm curious if you think that -- Do you think that having a small business perspective on the Commission is an important thing?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: Well I think it's very

important to have that small business perspective because me as a small business owner, and especially in these times where working in the food business people are not being supported and because they're losing their jobs, and people like us have basically had to think out of the box on how we could support others. I couldn't support people in terms of cooking for them, but I am aware of a lot of small businesses that had said, "We're staying open. We're going to do what we can to support both our workers and the community in terms of making sure that they get fed."

There have been initiatives out of my particular group within our synagogue to make sure that we had things like gloves and masks that we were able to donate. But in terms of me as a business owner I think it's extraordinarily important that a business perspective is on the Committee, because if we are basically part of the community and we're on the ground and we know our communities and we interact with our communities greatly, and I think it's important for us to have that perspective.

Also know the challenges various business entities go through in terms of stumbles, falls, also changes in health. Sometimes a business, just because one person who is the head of the business has a tragedy it may change the course of what an ability for the business to continue at a certain level. And so I think amongst us as

business owners it's important that that perspective is on the Committee because it's important to know that business owners that are in the community, that we interacted with the Committee, were very much able to hear and know the perspective of community numbers because we have direct interaction with them. And it's a good thing to have people who own small businesses to be on the Committee.

VICE CHAIR COE: Thank you.

In your application you indicate that you authored 16 empirical studies in major journals and that you've authored one book chapter. How could the experiences of writing, editing and publishing scholarly articles be beneficial to the work of the Commission?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: Well, being able to write empirical articles, like I said before in terms of these empirical articles, they look at various different ways of analysis. And so I've done what some people may not understand is predictive analysis for various communities. My major focus in terms of when I was at Rochester, University of Rochester and other locations, was looking at behavioral interventions as well as looking at symptom management.

And I think for the Commission it's important that someone that can look at the data and slice the data and say look this is the problem. These are the methods

that we've used. And these are the results. And so I think it's clear for someone who has an empirical background or an analytical background to know that we're not missing steps in terms of the analysis and that it's important to understand that in order to make sure that we have a good outcome, certain analysis may be needed to be conducted.

And with discussion with other Commission members certain analysis may not be there, but I think a person with an empirical mind as well as an analytical mind that takes qualitative and quantitative data and puts it together will be able to preserve a better product.

Because some things that you may use quantitative data to answer certain questions, but it's also the qualitative data in terms of the public hearings and the feedback from the public community that's not always picked up in the quantitative data that helps inform the process going forward.

VICE CHAIR COE: Thank you.

As Mr. Belnap indicated earlier you've lived in many different places across the country and internationally too I believe. Do you see this experience and perspective as something that can benefit the work of this Commission?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: So I think living in

different areas has allowed me to have a better understanding of other people. Having the courage to go to Rochester, Minnesota -- And I don't know if people are familiar with that area in Minnesota, but it's a southern-southeastern sort of rural community that at the center has Mayo Clinic as its draw. And Mayo Clinic has drawn a lot of different people to the communities. And I think from Mayo Clinic, Rochester, to Rochester New York, I'm able to understand or have a perspective on those living in rural environments and the challenges there, those living in metropolitan environments and the challenges there.

Being one of the 125 Jewish families in Rochester, Minnesota, and the perspective that we understand what it means to be "other." And that we have an understanding that it makes me much more accepting of those who are different and allows me to reach out and make those courageous conversations because I've lived in these areas. And my work has primarily focused on connecting people and because of that it's made me a better person. And I think it will help the Commission move forward in terms of a person who has had those perspectives.

Also as a person who has that perspective a lot of times I try to play devil's advocate if I'm in any certain meetings. And I may have a certain view, but I may play the devil's advocate and ask the question of what of

the concerns that could arise from a minority group or a group that's not supported within the organization, I mean within the area. So I think it's important that a person really have a wide variety of perspectives and a wide variety of interactions with various different cultures in order to, I guess, be a better person and it's made me a better person.

And it's allowed me to be fortunate to interact with the Hmong population, the Somali population which up to that point when I went to Minnesota I had not even encountered Somalis. Now I come here into Sacramento and I've had other interactions with Ethiopians and Somalis and as well as other groups, Serbian people. And it's a way that by being and living in these different areas that has allowed me to bring people together as well as allows me to I feel that I would be very qualified in understanding the diversity of others.

VICE CHAIR COE: Thank you for that. Speaking of others and other people, one of the biggest jobs the Commission is going to have to accomplish is identifying communities of interest all across the state. You mentioned research you've done in the communities when you've gone into new ones to work. This is going to be that multiplied many times I think, but some communities are easily identified. They are out there, they're eager

to give you information about them and what binds them together. And other communities are less easily identifiable and maybe not as forthcoming with information and therefore are harder to identify.

As a Commissioner how would you go about identifying communities of interest throughout the state, particularly trying to find those that are maybe harder to identify to inadvertently avoid overlooking some of those harder to identify communities?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: So what I've done in the past with communities that have been harder to identify has been that I've taken a systematic approach in terms of knowing, speaking with individuals within the community and finding out who are the leaders in that community because the first step is if you could connect with the leaders and you can create a relationship with those leaders I think people are — they may be not always — they may be suspect of why you're there. But I think continued interactions with these communities that may be harder to reach.

And as in what I have had experience in doing is using people that are from that community to help me connect to the community. And if I have those individuals play a role in connecting to these communities that are much harder, then they have people who I've already had an interaction with that are respected in the community. And

it becomes very, very important to the other people like, "Well we got their buy-ins."

A lot of times what I've done, especially with the native Sioux population, I do my homework about individuals from the native Sioux population. My stepdad is half-Cherokee and so there are certain ways that you interact with the population. Knowing that you don't look a person in the eye, that looking a person in the eye may be seen as offensive. So it's taking the things that for one culture may mean a greater sense of trustworthiness, into another culture looking in the eye is a sign of disrespect. And so I think getting, using the people who are the leaders of the community and helping, they will be able to help us infiltrate into those communities that may be hard to get.

But I also think just talking to people. I mean I think the biggest thing that will happen when we come in into these communities is how we speak to people, how we interact with them over how they — in terms of having food — sharing time with them I think is the things that are very important that you'll get a perspective as to what are the community's needs and the community's concerns. And I think in the end having open and courageous conversations will help move the needle to bring the Commission to a better spot in terms of understanding the needs and

concerns of various communities.

MS. PELLMAN: We have 6 minutes, 10 seconds remaining.

VICE CHAIR COE: Thank you.

So Dr. Figueroa-Moseley, as a relatively recent - you said it was 2007, I think when you moved to
California. So as a relatively recent transplant to
California I'm curious to hear about your experiences in
other regions of the state outside of your home region of
Sacramento. And what you have learned from the people in
those regions about their concerns and their perspectives
that would make you an effective representative for those
folks.

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: So one, I've lived in San Diego and I was able to understand the experiences of folks living in San Diego, especially the Latino population because San Diego has a large Latino population. And I of course had interactions there. I also have had experiences interacting with communities of color in Los Angeles as well as in Riverside, where I first came to California like when I was a young 25-year-old and was able to work with several different groups in terms of their (indiscernible) -- oh, I think there's a loud noise in the back. And so for me I've had interactions, direct interactions with folks from El Centro, California where that community is a

rural community -- and part of my family lives in El Centro -- in terms of their particular challenges, the particular opportunities of being in a rural community like El Centro.

Also the experiences that I've had in terms of interacting with former members of a gang and how I became a mentor to one of these particular individuals. And was able to help this very smart former gang member basically connect to San Diego State and found a way for San Diego State to provide an excellent education for him. And he went on to go to Columbia and graduated with his doctorate from Columbia.

So my life, in terms of I've been a mentor to a lot of different students and people, and because I was a mentor it allowed my students to go on to be City Council members in Chula Vista, to become very prominent and important people within their own communities. And so I've had a lot of interactions with people from around the state based on my mentorship as well as the things that I've worked with. And because I also have family that live in these small rural communities, these big metropolitan communities and I'm able to glean from them what is important to them in terms of their community. And I get an insight as to what's important moving forward there for the work on the Commission.

VICE CHAIR COE: Thank you.

One more time check please?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes, 2 minutes and 18 seconds.

VICE CHAIR COE: Okay, really quick, Dr.

Figueroa-Moseley if you were appointed to this 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 struggle with a little bit?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: I think I would enjoy the most the interaction with people. I think through interactions I gain a perspective on the individuals within the community. I would also enjoy the analytical part of the program.

What I may enjoy the least is, even though I've done this before, is actually leading the public meetings. But I think a lot of times when some things are new I'm a little bit nervous in terms of making sure that my nervousness does not communicate anything negative to people, so I kind of tend to take a step back. So that would probably be the least part of wanting to be a participant in terms of just leading meetings. But I have been a co-chair, so I have led meetings. But I think each one of us has a role to play and that we don't always have to be the leader or chair of a committee, we can do our part by being committee members or being co-chairs. And when it's time maybe having to step up and do more.

VICE CHAIR COE: Okay, thank you Dr. Figueroa-Moseley. I appreciate it.

Mr. Chair, no further questions at this time.

CHAIR BELNAP: And Ms. Dickison the time is now yours.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

So Mr. Figueroa-Moseley, thank you for meeting with us this afternoon. I want to go along with what you were just talking about. In the different roles you have experience as a small business owner, as a researcher. And you said you're willing to play devil's advocate in meetings. What do you see as your role on the Commission if you were to be selected?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: I think my role on the committee is that I bring a background in understanding diversity. And it's something that I live and I work and so I have a strong understanding of diversity. And that's what I would bring to the community, to the Commission in terms of I have experiences working with rural populations, working with metropolitan folks, people from various different communities, ethnic and racial communities. And have found that to be very, very meaningful.

And I think for me the other part of working with various communities is that I feel that I would bring an analytical mind when I look at the data. And I can look at

the data from a qualitative and a quantitative way, could make recommendations to the Committee as to what is important that the Committee may need to focus on.

Also, like I said before I'm willing to play devil's advocate because I may have my own views, but I like the idea that taking the perspective of those populations who may not have a strong voice and asking the difficult question. And I think when we ask the difficult question and we have courageous conversations it actually helps bring a better product.

And I think it will bring a better product to the Commission. And that it will also allow the Commission's work to be seen that we've been thorough, we've been impartial, we've taken a stepwise approach in terms of dealing with our various populations. Also how we work, how we go from our public meetings, how we go through analysis of public responses to creations of maps. And finally, any changes of the maps that would occur. So I agree that I would bring diversity and an analytical mind. And I think those are the two strongest points that I would bring to the Committee.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

You also talked about mentoring a former gang

24 member.

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: Yes.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: What did you learn from that individual that would be of benefit to the Commission?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: Well, I think not making judgments about people and knowing that people may come from various different backgrounds and various different places in life. And that sometimes you see a spark in someone and that spark just needs a little bit of direction. And within that particular individual I said, "This kid is really smart." I taught him in my Developmental Psych class. He got a C in my class, but I said, "You know, he's very, very smart and I like the way he thinks."

And so because of that I was able to connect him, like I said to San Diego State and work with the Dean to make sure that he found a way to change his life. And I think through mentoring and mentoring of several different individuals that their lives have been changed. And I didn't have to be the Chair of the Department or didn't have to be the head of a certain group in order to make a change. It's that everybody can contribute and make a change for the better.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

23 (Indiscernible) in terms of my questions that answered.

CHAIR BELNAP: Ms. Dickinson, can I interrupt for

25 a second?

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Yes, you may.

CHAIR BELNAP: So we just had a little bit of technical difficulty on our side. I would say I probably heard 95 percent of what was said, so I feel like we should continue. And I think those are streaming probably saw that we were having a little bit of technical difficulty as well. But rest assured that we heard most if not all of it and we can go back to the archive. At least I think I'm the only person that didn't hear about 30 seconds of it. So with that Ms. Dickison, continue.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. So today you've talked a lot about communities of color and ethnic communities and racial communities. Do you think that communities of interest can be bound by other things other than ethnicity?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: Yes. I mean, I think communities of interest can be gay-straight, gay-to-gay, gay communities, LGBTQA communities (phonetic). It can also be rural communities, communities that may not have had a voice in the past that may still be unidentified, our smaller communities. So I don't think communities of interest has to always be tied to race, but it can also be tied to political parties and that people within terms of the communities of interest, it's a wide variety of different people.

And I think I've mentioned my extensive work with ethnic communities, people of color. But I think one of the things that I have learned in terms of being on the San Juan Unified Curriculum and Standards Committee is that we have had kids who have come from various different communities, for example the homeless children, children who have had very, very hard situations and abusive families. Been able to connect with foster children and been able to understand their perspective as well. And so I think it opens me up to in terms of community of interest to expand what I have actually said in terms of just working with communities of color.

But all communities can be included in that communities of interest. We just have to think out of the box in terms of what these communities look like and homeless, foster, kids who have come from abusive situations. Some of those things can apply to adults who vote. And it's important to be able to include those individuals as well in the voting process.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. What do you see is some of the things that may influence one's preference when they're looking for representation? And how can that differ between different regions of the state?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: I think a person's history. And what I mean by history is their own stories

can vary from community to community. I couldn't hear the last part of the second question.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Okay. So what do you think are some of the things that influence one's preference when they're looking for representation?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: Uh-huh.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: And how may that differ between the various regions of the state?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: Okay. So like I said it is that representation is based on a person's history. And I think that different histories and different communities have their own story why they came to a certain community or why they didn't. And that they differ in terms of being able to -- a person who is a rural person who owns a farm may have a lot of different needs that are nowhere -- it's not less significant -- but nowhere similar to those living in San Francisco who may have a completely different set of needs. And knowing that meeting people at where they are and seeing how we can move things forward is how I would deal with various differing communities.

And that yes, our communities may have, may live in different places. But understanding that we need to meet with them, that we meet them at where they are because their story is important, their understanding and backgrounds are important. And that in the end we'll have

to make sure that we consider all viewpoints.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

So you mentioned that you're a small business owner. Are you still doing program consulting as well?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: So I do some program consulting with the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. So there's a program called, "A Culture of Health" and so I've done somewhat similar -- or have done things where I have been a grant reviewer for the Culture of Health. And so the Culture of Health Program is what they do is they recruit leaders from various different communities across the United States. And I have been a participant in the review of applicants at each phase except for the actual in-person interview to evaluate the individuals and their contributions to a culture of health within their local environments.

And so that's something that I've been very proud of to do. It also allows me to have time to balance work/life things. But I find that that's also very, very meaningful in terms of the selection of people to this Culture of Health Program sponsored by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. You actually anticipated my question in balancing your work life and your professional life and your small business, how would

you balance that if you were selected as a Commissioner?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: Well I think the other question I would have to ask what's the FTE on doing these things? But the way I found that is that family is important. And you know, my family is a non-traditional family where my wife is the physician and I've taken a secondary role, which for our family it works. And I think I've been able -- I put my children and family first.

And in terms of that work/life balance my family and I have had these discussions about what if you make it on the Commission? Will you able to have the same work/life balance? And I say, yes. One of the questions that I'm not allowed to ask but dealt with is how much time would the Commissioners be having to deal with? But I think for my family we actually had a conversation about my participation and does this affect our family and how it will affect my family. And my family feels that they are very, very supportive of us going forward.

And I'm very happy of that because we make a lot of sacrifices. And for that I applaud my kids and my wife for leading me to, allowing me to pursue something that I found very, very meaningful.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

So I have one last question. The first eight Commissioners are selected randomly and then they are

tasked with selecting the next six Commissioners to round out the Commission. If you were one of the first eight what would you look for in the other six?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: So I think it's important in looking through the other six I don't want people that are just like me. I think it's important to understand that when you have people who are different from you that a better sort of product comes out in the end. And that if selected to be the first eight that would be what I would be looking for. I would be looking for a lot of the things that I answered in the question number one.

But also looking for people that have -- that are different, and especially different in things that I may have never thought about before. Until I've been selected for that, randomly selected for that particular job, I think it's important that I look at those who come from diverse backgrounds. And that because of their diverse backgrounds should be included. And that they have an analytical mind. That they have diverse interactions, and I think that's important.

And so I would say, for me, choosing the six is looking for people with diverse backgrounds that can be impartial and that can contribute to a better product going forward from the Commission.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

Mr. Chair, I have no additional questions at this point. I yield my time.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Dawson, we'll turn the time over to you.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you once again Dr. Figueroa-Moseley. I want to flip around Ms. Dickison's question. If you were not chosen in the first eight why should they pick you among the last six?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: So I think that if I was not chosen in the first eight, I think I bring a diverse perspective, I have diverse history in terms of my own personal background and the background of my family. I can be impartial. I can also have, you know, I've worked to contribute to the public good so I think based on my -- and I've also had experience in terms of voting drives and getting out the vote; that I would be a pretty strong candidate as an advocate for others.

And I think it's important for me to, if I'm selected, that that would be what I contribute. And also, an analytical mind I would contribute to the Committee if chosen. But I think that is how I'm going to answer your question right now.

MR. DAWSON: Okay, thank you.

It's been noted then among the applicants' pool

there are quite a few JD's but also quite a few PhD's. And my question is there a, I want to say an academic bias that scientists, research scientists might have that might handicap them in finding out the real California?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: It all depends. And I think as a person from an academic background there are some academics that work strictly on just doing quantitative data. And what you end up missing is the other part; the other part of that particular person are the other reasons why this person may be reacting to a particular research question. And I think the balance of having qualitative and quantitative data is very important.

I did a qualitative study where I actually went to six different communities across the United States. So I was in Topeka, Kansas; Rochester, New York; I was in South Dakota -- I can't remember the place right now -- I went to Albuquerque, New Mexico and was able to garner an understanding of the various different communities and was able to hear their cancer story. And because I was able to hear their cancer story, in their cancer stories there were some similarities and some differences, but it allowed me to really get a picture that cancer for various groups might be one thing, but even within these groups there are differences based on where people live in terms of their perceptions of cancer, that cancer knowledge, things like

that. I mean, I think I have a unique experience in terms of seeing the United States.

And I've also lived in California and I've lived out of California. And I take the experiences that I had outside of California and will bring it back to my home state and be able to really contribute to the Commission in terms of that.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Madam Secretary, what is our time left in the full 90?

MS. PELLMAN: 10 minutes and 20 seconds.

MR. DAWSON: Oh, okay. Thank you. I have time to ask another follow-up. On your response to Standard Question 2 something caught my ear. You referred to a "beginners mind," which I took to mean that you shouldn't assume that you know anything. Do I understand that correctly?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: No. What it means is that you are open to a variety of different perspectives. So in the beginner's mind when we're trained in academic and academia work we're told, "You need to be the expert of this and the expert of that and the expert of that." And what I have learned throughout my life is that if you approach each issue based on its merits instead of just coming in with, "Oh, I'm the expert so I'm going to guide

this to this direction." But say, "Look, I'm open to various viewpoints."

And I based my view on these particular issues based solely on their merit, on their own merit, not what I can bring into the situation in terms of what my background may have been. But I have to be open to different viewpoints in order to move things forward. And so a beginner's mind allows a person to be open to various different views and allows me as a person to be able to take it in and say, "Oh, that was a perspective I never would have thought about," if I had an "expert mind."

MR. DAWSON: Okay, I think I understand now.

So in applying this to the work on the Commission I suppose that you could also put yourself in the beginners mind if you were visiting a part of the state that you never visited before or encountered a community of interest that you didn't know existed. Does that --

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: Yes!

MR. DAWSON: Am I understanding you?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: So what a beginner's mind allows a person to do is to be open and have an understanding of being open to a different view that you may have never experienced before in those various communities. And so when you're going out to the communities you don't come in making assumptions that this

community is this and this and this.

Also, I have to leave my perceptions or my -- and knowing that I may have my own biases, but I have to leave those aside. And I have to focus on being open and being able to receive, because if you can't receive with a beginner's mind then you won't hear the nuances of that's what's happening in the communities and you may miss something. I'm sorry I think beginners mind is my approach in terms of how I can hear the community's voices and allow us as a Commission to move forward in a different way.

MR. DAWSON: OK, thank you. Speaking of beginners mind I just realized that you were talking about two different Rochesters, one in New York and one in Minnesota. Is that correct?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: Yes.

MR. DAWSON: Okay.

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: Yes. (Laughs.)

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$  DAWSON: I was a little confused in there. I was trying to make the dates work.

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: Yeah, it's Rochester,
Minnesota. And then after Rochester, Minnesota we moved to
Rochester, New York, so yes.

MR. DAWSON: And that was just a coincidence?

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: No. That was a

coincidence. And what had ended up happening was when my

wife and I, two Californians, met in Minnesota and ended up being the family who had two kids in Minnesota. And after a number of years being in Minnesota we moved to Rochester, New York because my wife had also found a position within the hospital in Rochester, New York. So we've been in both Rochesters.

And so that has allowed us to have a different perspective on the needs. And it allowed me to be involved in the Rotary in Rochester, Minnesota which was very different from the Rotary Club within Rochester, New York. So I've become very informed as to the diversity of life and things that may challenge one community but may be opportunities in another.

MR. DAWSON: Okay, thank you. I have no further follow-ups. If the panel has any additional follow-up questions?

CHAIR BELNAP: I do not have any further follow-up questions. Mr. Coe?

VICE CHAIR COE: No follow-up questions.

Ms. Dickison?

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: No follow-up questions.

MR. DAWSON: Okay. Madam Secretary, could I have one more time check please?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes, 5 minutes, 5 seconds

25 remaining.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. With the remaining amount of time I'd like to offer you the opportunity to make a closing statement to the panel if you wish.

DR. FIGUEROA-MOSELEY: Sure. I want to first thank the panel for taking the time to consider my application. And I want to say thank you. And also that no matter what happens in the process I know that I will continue to be involved in the work of community. And I really want to thank everyone going forward. And that you've gotten to learn my story and that's an important thing.

And so in terms of other things I think I'm pretty grateful for having the opportunity to show you a little piece of me or a lot of me in terms of the way I think and my involvement within various communities. And I thank you.

CHAIR BELNAP: And thank you.

We are now going to go into recess, and we'll be back here at 2:59.

(Off the record at 2:47 p.m.)

(On the record at 1:14 p.m.)

CHAIR BELNAP: Good afternoon. We're going to call this meeting to order. I want to welcome Mr. Michael Allawos. Did I say that right, Allawos?

MR. ALLAWOS: Absolutely. Close enough.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. We're going to turn the time over to Mr. Dawson with the standard questions.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Allawos, I'm going to ask you five standard questions that the panel has requested each applicant respond to. Are you ready sir?

MR. ALLAWOS: Absolutely.

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. ALLAWOS: Okay. Well, thank you for that. The ability to listen, to be a bridge maker and calmly debate the issues while asking good and relevant questions is a skill that I believe that we all should have. And to work as a team in the collegial matter removing as best as possible personal biases and differences and without political influence.

I'm a good listener. And I do my homework. I do my best to be collegial, bridge ideas and thoughts. And those who know me, I ask a lot of good questions or at

least I think I do, utilizing my skills as a good listener,
bridge maker, debates, independent thinker and asking
relevant questions -- a leader amongst leaders, if you
will.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question 2. 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. ALLAWOS: Knowing yourself and your triggers is a first step of being responsible and granting each other mutual respect. Studying the ground rules upfront is also key to creating a safe environment to debate the issues. Being myself open, honest and straight forward and available is key. Listening to all points of view, even if they differ from my own beliefs, is I think quite important as a basis to move forward.

MR. DAWSON: Question 3. What is the great

problem the Commission could encounter, and what actions would you take to avoid or respond to this problem?

MR. ALLAWOS: Well, in political interest groups, social media, Commissioners talking out of hand, behind other Commissioners back could be an issue. I would help to lead the conversation to instill the goals and remind everyone that we are a team and if we don't act like a team a team would not be seen as credible.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question 4. If you are selected, you will be one of fourteen 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. ALLAWOS: Well, that's a great question and an appropriate one for our discussion today. The common goal was to establish districts in the City of Glendora from an at-large voting system in less than 90 days. The goal of going to districts as we were forced on us, in the City of Glendora in 2018, my role was one of five that set

the policies and the direction the project.

We wanted to include the northern and the southern areas of the City for inclusion, at the same time keeping communities of interest together, managing the percentages of the protected classes within each district while evenly distributing the population. It was a lot of work, but actually was quite fun. It was a nice puzzle I liked to work on. I didn't actually like having to be forced to do it, but I enjoyed the puzzle.

The City received over a dozen maps from the community as well as from council members. And I was one of them that submitted. The City Council chose my map and a fellow council member's map as a basis and made minor modifications to it that is now our district voting map. In fact, the map was just recently proven out to this last election in March.

The lessons would be logic. Checking the boxes is the first step, so that everyone can agree on the goal and the requirements of the law. I would also encourage creativity in accomplishing the goal or goals and ask for help from the professionals especially the demographers.

MR. DAWSON: Question 5. 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 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. ALLAWOS: Over my lifetime, I've employed hundreds of people from a variety of social, ethnic and economic backgrounds. I now travel the world as a business consultant helping clients solve problems across cultural divides, using my listening skills to establish trust, which is the key is establishing the trust.

I was also trained as a facilitator many years ago working with people that it may be challenging to get through to. I found this experience enlightening as well as rewarding helping folks get through challenging times.

The ability to communicate means that the message that was communicated is received as it was intended, which takes a lot of patience. Give people the respect they deserve and the personal walls will come down.

As I mentioned, I've employed many people from all different backgrounds. And we all face common goals together for success. And I've always enjoyed those

challenging times.

I've been on numerous boards that needed to have consensus to move forward, bank boards, international trade boards, community festivals et cetera.

Traveling the world and getting to know what is perceived as different and moving forward. Besides cultural differences that lead to a variety of ethnic ethics, people are basically all the same. We are all faced with a past of pain and triggers, us, and we all tend to operate from that level.

And getting to know your fellow Commissioners and understanding that mine field, I believe is key because you have to, at the end of the day, be very cohesive in moving forward and develop consensus.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

MR. ALLAWOS: You're welcome.

MR. DAWSON: We will now go to panel questions. Each panel member will have 20 minutes to ask his or her questions. We'll start with Mr. Belnap, the Chair.

CHAIR BELNAP: Good afternoon, Mr. Allawos.

MR. ALLAWOS: Good afternoon.

CHAIR BELNAP: Over 20 years, you were CEO and owner of Mikana Manufacturing. Can you tell us more about that company and your role in starting and leading that

company?

MR. ALLAWOS: Well, my father and myself started that. By trade, I'm a tool and die maker. And we'd started just the two of us. He had a dream of working with a son and he had had other businesses in the past and we did it together. We grew from basically nothing to a midsized corporation, which we manufactured parts and equipment mainly for the aerospace industry with the prize to Boeing, McDonald Douglas, Lockheed Martin and companies around the world.

We ventured off into the healthcare industry where we made devices and gauges and things of that nature.

Then in tandem with that, I have a software company that did MRP systems, because at the time when we started this in the mid '80s, there was no real good system or software. And that aided in our ability to manufacture, track and be transparent with our clients and our customers of where we are in the process.

We went thought all the ups and the downs. We had great respect from our clients. We were the first silver awardee from McDonald Douglas, which set the standard for the industry. We took the test for the Malcom Baldrige. We passed with flying colors. In fact we were one of the only ones that passed it out of three. It actually started with

five, three passed. And we were the leader in that.

So I really enjoyed -- I guess our key to its success was working collaboratively with our customers and our clients to get to that goal. You always identify that goal and work towards it.

CHAIR BELNAP: So I'd like you to talk about something -- still talking about Mikana -- something difficult that you and your company faced and how did you work through this problem?

MR. ALLAWOS: I have several that come to mind over a period of over 20 years. But one that came to mind was the Joint Strike Fighter. We were given the award to make the counter-measure doors for this, which was a very complex assembly. It's the size of an old desk and has many different parts to it. And it was a complex design that we had to work collaboratively with our clients, with our folks in the manufacturing process, engineers, machinists, assembly folks, inspectors.

And this had a hard deadline. I mean really a hard deadline down to the hour. In fact, the night before we were supposed to ship the products, both of them, we actually held a FedEx airplane. That never happens, but we actually were finishing this thing up as they were loading it into the plane.

And we had been working Lockheed Martin for over 20 years at that point. And they

got it the next day. They fit it up the airplane with no adjustment. And we actually gained our reputation from that one situation for actually coming through when the client needed us to come through.

We did a lot of great things in the past. We were a partner with Lockheed Martin on the Joint Strike Fighter. We were one of the first 26 in the world to get contracts. It was absolutely rewarding to be a part of that process.

CHAIR BELNAP: Thank you. So I think you -- I was going to ask you about your company's greatest success and a failure. I feel like you just gave me an example of a success.

MR. ALLAWOS: I'm efficient. What can I say?

CHAIR BELNAP: Tell me about a failure and what you learned from it.

MR. ALLAWOS: Failure. We had a situation not knowing that a customer wanted a certain product at a certain price and didn't understand their pain level that they had to get underneath. And that led to a challenging time.

And we actually took a product of theirs, reengineered it for efficiencies. And then we spent like I said the resources to do, but when they came across and they found that we were doing a good job at this, that we

actually saved quite a bit of money from our own internals they wanted the funds, they wanted the share in our success. And at that point I was unwilling to do so, because we had spent so much upfront capital making this happen I didn't think it was fair and equitable for us to do so at the time.

We have done that in the past with other projects. In fact we go into it with that notion with the customer that we would share, but when that agreement was not up front I didn't feel obligated to do so.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay, thank you. So after Mikana, you went on to become the Chief Operating Officer at California Energy and Power. So how and why did you make this career switch?

MR. ALLAWOS: Well, actually I'd sold my company in 2006. And one of my customers reached out to me and said "Listen. We're trying to get this fledgling renewable energy company off the ground and you'd be the perfect person to help us get there."

The company didn't have any money. And their technology was challenging. And so I said, "Okay, fine. I need the challenge. I just can't sit around. I'm too young for that." And we started that process which Caltech had the technology tested. We reengineered it, back for testing. Applied for patents, got patents, and launched

the company with some really unique technology.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay, thank you. What were some of your responsibilities as Chief Operating Officer?

MR. ALLAWOS: Everything. Finance, talking with clients and customers, working with the technology, working with the engineers, working with the assembly folks and all of the supplier base.

CHAIR BELNAP: Can you think as an example of a complex analysis you performed in that role that would at least be analogous to the work of the Commission?

MR. ALLAWOS: It was challenging working with the Board of Directors from the standpoint of they did not have the engineering backgrounds. They were more money folks. And it was hard and challenging to bring them along from a technical standpoint and correlate that with finances. So bridging that gap was challenging, but it was successful at the end. When I left the company it had money in the bank. Bills were paid, so I did my job.

But you know, CEO, COO, it's always that challenge with the Board at times in getting your points across and keeping them informed, because at the end of the day they're the ones making the decisions.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay, thank you. You won election as council member for City of Glendora. You've been a council member since 2017. Why did you decide to run for

this position and what have you learned?

MR. ALLAWOS: Well, I think most people run for those positions because they want change. They want positive change or at least in their mind. And I knew it was a lot of work, because I've been around politics for quite some time.

It was -- actually I ran actually before that in 2015 and didn't make it. And I learned an awful lot then, more so then, than in 2017. And I really actually enjoyed quite a bit running the 2017. It was a lot of fun. I got to meet a lot of different people in the community, went from a coffee and doughnuts from one house to dinners and to different things. And I got to meet so many wonderful people and get to listen to them of what it was that was concerning of theirs. And also get feedback of what I have learned through the process and made a lot of wonderful friends. And it was just -- even today they still reach out to me and I reach out to them to keep those lines of connection and communication open.

So the lesson is basically to just keep the contacts, to listen to folks to go out and communicate as best as possible, which is challenging today because we have ourselves with the COVID-19 situation. Not everybody has social media. Not everybody necessarily reads the paper or gets the paper. So you have to go out there and

try to inform them of what the City is doing and how they can reach out to us if they need help.

CHAIR BELNAP: So I'd like you to provide an example of a Council decision for which you had to set aside your own personal beliefs to achieve a broader objective.

MR. ALLAWOS: We had one recently as far as public comment that the council was kind of split. We've been dealing with -- we've dealt with this for a little over a year about how to deal with the public comment with the laws and everything that are involved with that, the Brown Act included. And so we had to -- I wanted to keep the public comment on every topic, every item. And some didn't, some did. And at the end of the day we compromised and we went ahead and limited it for the public comment. We revised -- actually we updated our resolution that we had that actually governed that and will have our final reading in May on that process.

And that was challenging where I had to -- I had my own personal biases about that, but saw other people's opinion and for the greater good we made the change.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay, thank you. So if you are selected as a Commissioner, what are your intentions regarding your council member position?

MR. ALLAWOS: To keep it. I don't follow your

question.

CHAIR BELNAP: My question is related to a particular statute, which I'm not sure --

MR. DAWSON: I don't have it in front of me, but my recollection is that a Commission member is ineligible to hold public office for a period of 10 years after selection, which would include an incumbent term. So my reading is that if a person who holds a public office who then accepts the selection as a Commission member would have to resign that public office.

MR. ALLAWOS: From my understanding that did not go down to the council level. It went to above, Assembly, Senate, Congress. It didn't affect council members.

CHAIR BELNAP: So, Mr. Allawos, obviously that'll have to be resolved. It's not going to get resolved today, but it good to understand your thinking on the matter.

Thank you.

MR. ALLAWOS: Uh-huh.

CHAIR BELNAP: In regards to appreciation for diversity, I'd like you to tell us about an experience that you've had either work of volunteer or even as a council member that increased your understanding and appreciation for California's diversity.

MR. ALLAWOS: Well, several year ago, around 2009, 2010, I was the Chair for our church's festival.

That's where they get about 10 percent of the revenue every year. And that was made up of about 12 individuals from all different backgrounds and they're all volunteer-based.

So that took a great deal of patience going through the different cultures that we had at that time. And I had a great appreciation for where they were coming from and the goals that we had to accomplish, because we had several. We had a community goal to accomplish. We had a financial goal to accomplish. And everyone came from completely different areas. So the patience there, in dealing with an all-volunteer board, was challenging but we got through it. We ended up setting records for the church of the monies that we had and attendance as well.

CHAIR BELNAP: Alright, thank you.

Madam Secretary, time check?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes, 7 minutes, 29 seconds.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right, thank you.

I'm curious about the backdrop behind you. It's a beautiful environment. Where are you right now?

MR. ALLAWOS: It's my backyard.

CHAIR BELNAP: Oh. Okay. Well you've done an excellent job.

MR. ALLAWOS: Thank you. A little bit of practice. We have to have our council meetings and our briefings and everything now via Zoom for obvious reasons.

So I like technology. It's a good tool.

CHAIR BELNAP: Well, you've set up a great backdrop.

4 MR. ALLAWOS: Thank you.

CHAIR BELNAP: I have no further questions. I'm going to turn the time over to Mr. Coe.

VICE CHAIR COE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good afternoon Mr. Allawos. Thank you for taking the time to speak with us today.

MR. ALLAWOS: Good afternoon.

VICE CHAIR COE: So in addition to your role of city council member, you're also owner of a management consulting firm, called Allawos and Company?

MR. ALLAWOS: Yes.

VICE CHAIR COE: Tell us about the kind of work that your company does.

MR. ALLAWOS: We do business plans, strategic planning, employee delegations as far as making efficiencies for employees and in smoothing things out and making things work the way the owner wants them to be.

But mainly what we do is we do a lot of business development around the world, both domestic and international. I have clients all over the world from Dubai to China, to Europe. In fact I was supposed to go to the Farnborough Show in July, but that got cancelled for

obvious reasons.

We will do a business plan. We'll do strategic planning and put it in place and help the customer along with whatever issues that they need to do self-improvement.

VICE CHAIR COE: Can you -- who have been some of your clients? Can you give us some examples of some of your clients?

MR. ALLAWOS: Sure. I have the San Bernardino International Airport, is one of them. In doing some business development I have a company called Longxi Bearing in China. And they've also opened up an office here in the United States, in California, which I'm also the COO for -- basically oversight. We've had some companies that have had some issues with developing software, which I was able to help and now produce some planning for them, some road mapping. It's a variety of different folks. Automobile shops as well.

All the companies are pretty much the same. It's business basic 101. It's usually when they get away from that is when they end up in some trouble.

VICE CHAIR COE: Thank you. So it's private companies is who you work for?

MR. ALLAWOS: Right.

VICE CHAIR COE: You don't have any government clients, government agencies or anything like that?

MR. ALLAWOS: I'm sorry, what was that?

VICE CHAIR COE: You don't have any government clients or government agencies that are your clients or anything like that?

MR. ALLAWOS: Well, I would imagine that the San Bernardino International Airport is a government entity. They get regulated by the FAA.

VICE CHAIR COE: Okay. I wanted to talk about something in your essay on impartiality and in the letters of rec, your role with the San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments is mentioned in both those places. What exactly was or is, I suppose, your role with that organization?

MR. ALLAWOS: I'm a delegate from our city to that, on the general assembly. So there's roughly about 28, 30 or so cities there plus some governmental agencies. And we work on construction items in the area, water issues. And we all collectively work together for what's good for our district. There are different cogs throughout California. And this happens to be the San Gabriel Valley cog.

VICE CHAIR COE: In that same essay, you discuss a proposal that you made to make an investment to finish the Metro Gold Transit Line at an investment cost of \$127 million. You said you got your proposal selected by a 27

to 0 vote. How does this example of getting your proposal selected unanimously illustrate your ability to be impartial?

MR. ALLAWOS: I don't know about necessarily impartial. It was a common goal for the area that we all wanted the Gold Line to be finished, so that for transit reasons and for congestion.

In going to the meeting, I always like to be prepared. So I had a motion prepared with different elements to it, because there's three different elements to it. And we put it up there and we had a debate. And usually what's challenging is, is when you have folks from different areas that might not be directly affected to it and want to know why should we invest in this, which is not necessarily within our area? And so the Gold Line was brought up to from LA all the way to Azusa, which is a border city of ours and it was going to go on to Pomona. And this is why they need the extra funds.

And so it was important that we start with the topic of discussion with a motion, because usually you don't focus then at that point in time without a motion.

You have a lot of ideas, a lot of questions, but it doesn't get focused without a motion. So I thought that motion, focused us into the yeses and the noes and getting past any road blocks.

VICE CHAIR COE: Great. So in your essays and in some of your discussion today, you discussed having employed or worked with many diverse groups of people. And from your interactions with them, what is it that you've learned about their perspectives and their desires and their preferences that would make you an effective representative for the diverse population of California on this Commission?

MR. ALLAWOS: Well, a lot of people talk about how diverse people are. And really people aren't as diverse as people might think that they are. You need to listen to them to see what their specific issues might be for their community.

They have the same problems that everyone else has, their pains. They want to put roof over their heads, send their kids to school, clothe them, feed them. We all have a lot of this as the basic issues. And finding out what those basic issues are for that community of interest is key. And to see how that fits in with the census that's going to be taken and to see how they can be helped in that community.

So it's again -- people aren't as different as they're always made out to be. I get to see people from again all over the world. And they all have the same basic pains. It doesn't change. It's just how you get there to

how you resolve those issues and those pains.

VICE CHAIR COE: So you mentioned communities of interest a second ago. And that is one of the biggest challenges in front of the Commission is to identify communities of interest statewide.

Some of those communities are easier to identify than others. Some are less engaged and harder to identify. As a Commissioner, how would you go about identifying communities of interest across the state, particularly avoiding overlooking inadvertently some of those harder to identify communities of interest?

MR. ALLAWOS: Well that's always the challenge.

And again the key is going to be on the census of what

comes back if you have areas that you know should have had

a higher input of census information. That should draw you

into it.

But there's other areas you could look at.

You've got LAFCo. It's a Local Agency Formation Commission that's 58 counties. They have their own statistics that they have. You can reach out to them and say, "Listen, what statistics do you have for these areas?" You have the League of California Cities that has their own statistics as well. You have Cal chambers, individual chambers as well. You have communities of interest such as churches, synagogues, temples that can be reached out to with their

leaders and ask them to help participate and help identify areas that need special attention, perhaps.

For other areas you have to get creative and think outside of the box. And that's I think where I have a bit of an advantage since I do work in those areas to think that those recourses are out there and available.

VICE CHAIR COE: So once the communities are found, some of them are less comfortable engaging with government. They may have a variety of reasons for being so, but generally they don't engage and they feel uncomfortable for one reason or another. But since getting as many perspectives and as much input as possible is important for the Commission to be successful, how would you go about reaching out to some of these communities to make them feel comfortable to come forward and provide their perspectives and engage the Commission, so that the Commission can be better informed in its work?

MR. ALLAWOS: Well, that's the big question isn't it? How do you go out there and do that? I'm sure there's lots of ideas that are floated, but going through some of those areas that I mentioned such as churches, synagogues and temples, we worked with their leaders to have the trust that they have with their folks to help feel comfortable in inviting these individuals or these groups into community meetings, town halls of sorts to get information, to dispel

any disbeliefs and to try to reach out and to help these folks.

There is no magic bullet for this. It's just being out there and being assertive in trying to look for ways of getting in front of these people. It's not easy, its' not going to be easy, but it's something that you have to strive for.

VICE CHAIR COE: So, earlier, it was discussed, you discussed the City of Glendora redistricting that you were part of. What specifically was your role with that?

MR. ALLAWOS: We had to set the policy of what the districts might look like -- what we want, not necessarily look like, but what we wanted to accomplish. And what we wanted to accomplish, since originally the City of Glendora was much smaller than it was and we had annexed many, many years ago county. And we have some folks that didn't believe necessarily that we cared about them, even though we did. We did quite a bit of work in that area. So we wanted to make sure we connected the north and the south and not necessarily have pockets or islands onto themselves.

And so we developed the goal of seeing if we can make the districts vertical, so we're connecting the north and the south together. And that was a big key for what we wanted to do. In fact, that was the driving key of the

goal of the process. And we did accomplish that.

VICE CHAIR COE: And what kind of data did you use in that effort?

MR. ALLAWOS: We hired a demographer to come out, and -- a Dr. what was his name -- Johnson. And he came out, gave us the census information, gave us the tools of maps, so we can draw our own maps. So we had to make sure they used rows for contiguous, we had equal population. We had to work with the protected class to make sure they were within certain margins. And it was a puzzle. Again, I enjoyed the process. It was a fun puzzle. I just didn't like being forced on having to do it. But we used those tools and came up with a map that met the goals that we had set as a council.

VICE CHAIR COE: Okay, thank you.

I know there is, based on Mr. Belnap's question, there's still some question out there as to what the legal requirements are regarding public office holding and also being a member of the Commission. But if it is the case that you can't hold both positions where would your priority lie?

MR. ALLAWOS: Well, I'd rather not get to that point right now, since it's a big unknown. I don't want to answer a hypothetical.

VICE CHAIR COE: Okay.

Mr. Chair, no further questions.

CHAIR BELNAP: Ms. Dickison, the time is now yours.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. Thank you for meeting with us today Mr. Allawos.

MR. ALLAWOS: My pleasure.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: So a lot of my questions got asked, because I'm last today, but --

MR. ALLAWOS: I know the feeling quite well. (Laughs.)

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: So I wanted to ask about the redistricting that was done for Glendora. You said that the council's goal was to join the north and south together.

MR. ALLAWOS: Correct.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: So in doing that how did you ensure or how did the council ensure that it wasn't splitting communities of interest?

MR. ALLAWOS: Well, because you have certain percentages of the protected classes that you had to keep together. And there's metrics there that gets graded on your work product. And so that pretty much ensured that we did it correctly, because you have to have a certain range of the protected classes and you can't be out of balance with that concentration in that certain district.

And on top of that then you have to have an overall concentration or a segregation if you want to call it that overall in the whole city, so there's so many different metrics that you have to manage all at the same time with percentages. And that's how it gets graded.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Okay.

MR. ALLAWOS: Kind of a math problem.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: So as part of that process did the city council hold meetings with the public to identify various communities of interest within the city?

MR. ALLAWOS: We had various council meetings and workshops we held over a period of time. We were under a mandate of 90 days to get it done, so we didn't have a lot of time for the outreach. So we sent social media, news flyers out there; we did the best we can to do the outreach that we needed to do in such a short amount of time.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: As a result of the outreach that you were able to do did you find any communities of interest that maybe you weren't aware of during that process?

MR. ALLAWOS: No. But what was interesting I think we had over a dozen maps that were submitted from the community, which was great that we had community involvement, so they were paying attention. And then out

of those from a legal standpoint a good majority of those were discounted because they didn't meet the legal definition of a map that needed to be done. So but what was nice though was that we had the participation of the community with these maps. They were engaged and they were involved and that was a healthy discussion to have.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. So in your response to the first standard question you talked about -- I'm sorry, it was the second one -- setting up ground rules upfront. What are some of the steps the Commission can take to set up those ground rules up front?

MR. ALLAWOS: You have to set the goals. You have to set up a safe place, saying that this is not personal. And to make sure that it's not personal and that there's no personal attacks, because this could happen because of your certain biases and things of that nature. And that has to be really enforced upon greatly if you want to get together as a group and again, to be credible. That is probably by far the most important, the goal setting and the safe environment. And I'm not sure quite how that will be set up with the Commission, if there's going to be a chairperson or how that would work, but I guess collectively that has to be put out there straight, right in front.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: With your background what

do you see as your role in the Commission?

MR. ALLAWOS: Be a leader amongst leaders, not be bashful, think outside the box, creative. And to be a bridge maker as I said earlier, because you have folks sometimes that are so far off from the spectrums, off from polar differences, sometimes it takes a translator in between to bring the two parties together.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

(Puppy whining in background.)

MR. ALLAWOS: It sounds like you have a puppy.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Yeah, she's in kennel

12 training, sorry. (Laughs.)

So in response to that Standard Question 5 you talked about solving problems across cultural divides. What did you learn in doing that kind of work that you think will assist in the work of the Commission?

MR. ALLAWOS: Well, it takes a certain amount of time and patience in working with different cultures because a lot of times what happens is if English is not your first language people will end up taking what you tell them, translate into their own language and then regurgitate that back to you in English. And sometimes it gets lost in translation. So you have to ask follow-up questions so that they understand, and you understand what was communicated. And communicate you have to actually be

in agreement with what was communicated on both sides so the people understand. And unfortunately that's what happens a lot when English is not your first language.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: So the Commission, the first eight Commissioners are selected randomly. And then they're tasked with selecting the next six. What would you be looking for in the other six Commissioners should you be selected as one of the first eight?

MR. ALLAWOS: Contrast the first eight, that's you don't want everyone who is thinking the same.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: If you weren't selected as one of the first eight why should the first eight select you as one of the final six?

MR. ALLAWOS: That's a good question. It's probably why you asked it, right? Well it depends; what information are they going to have about the balance? Are they going to have copies of this interview? Are they going to have all the information that you have?

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: They will have all of the information we have.

MR. ALLAWOS: I would hope that they want contrast. I would hope that they want folks that are going to be equally as leaders as they would, they are. They don't want to necessarily be seen as driving the process by themselves, that's not healthy. That's why you have a

Commission of 14, so hopefully they want diversity just like what you're trying to reach out right now is diversity.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

MR. ALLAWOS: You're welcome.

interest together.

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

MR. ALLAWOS: Well, the goal is to divide up the districts. And well, that's a challenging one to not split cities up. I know that full well, and not make districts that are unmanageable, to keep those communities of

And also, I think the most important is to have the Commission seen as credible and not being pulled apart by political interests. I think that's probably the key, because if you don't do that then no one is going to have faith in the work that you've done. And they're just going to say, "Oh, this politics got in the way. And it was gerrymandered." And nobody wants that. And this is why you have this Commission for, so that it is credible.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. You mentioned cities and I think you said counties and communities of interest. How would you weigh those interests should they come in conflict with one another?

MR. ALLAWOS: Oh, this whole Commission is about

conflict isn't it? Unfortunately counties have a lot of pressure. They're the big 800-pound gorilla in the room. But you also have situations and issues too with going over county lines. Sometimes cities can't work with another city right next door to them, because they're in a different county.

That would take -- I don't have a clear answer for you, but that would be very challenging. I would imagine even though you're not supposed to succumb to political pressure but you're going to get political pressure; you're going to get emails, you're going to get phone calls. And you're going to have to work it out with your colleagues of what everyone thinks and someone's going to come up with a great idea and you'll run with it. And that's the best you can do is talk it out, talk it through.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Talking about political pressure, something that the last Commission noted was there were times that they felt that some of the people that would make public comments on behalf of communities of interests, weren't actually a part of those communities. And were participating in as a way to, you know, game the system. What skills do you have that would help you in recognizing that kind of activity?

MR. ALLAWOS: You're absolutely correct. We even have that in our council meetings. We have folks that are

not from the area or folks that just want to come in and either cause trouble or put their own point of view and change our opinion. And that does have a lot of effect of pressure from the community.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But I have a lot of experience now of dealing with this. And you have an idea of, "Okay, are you from the area? Are you from these groups?" And then you can also fact-check them as well of going to those particular groups and individuals and classes and say, "Are these folks with you or do they represent you folks?" You have to ask the right questions of the folks that are in that audience, or if you're doing a town hall, or the people in that community. You have to do your fact-checking, you have to do your homework. If you're going to want to be a Commissioner and you don't want to do your homework you're already going to fail. Just like on council or any other entity that's governing you have to do your homework and your background, because you have to ask the right questions. And then formulate in your own mind if that was correct or is that correct, credible? Or is there another equation that you're missing?

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

Mr. Chair, I don't have any further questions at this time. I yield my time.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. We'll turn the time over to

Mr. Dawson.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Allawos, I wanted to return to a response you gave to Standard Question 1. You used the term "bridge maker" several times. And I was wondering if you could expand on that, exactly what do you see -- how does that apply to your work on the Commission if selected?

MR. ALLAWOS: Well, as I stated earlier, you know you have people from different socio-economic backgrounds that can be on the Commission. They have certain life experiences that they've had that's got them to where they are right now. And they may have their set of beliefs or biases and might be completely polar opposite to somebody else on that Commission. And so you have to be able to bring those folks together with the polar opposites and come to some sort of an understanding of where they're coming from with an idea. And actually get them to communicate.

A lot of times what happens is when you have folks that are completely polar opposite they stop to communicate, they don't communicate anymore. And because they're set in their ways, they put their walls up, you've got to break those walls down and actually get down to communicating. And I'd like to think that I do a fairly good job of that.

MR. DAWSON: So this assumes that you are not one of the polar opposites. What if you are one of the poles?

MR. ALLAWOS: As I said earlier, I have to be open-minded even though if I have my certain biases that might get in the way, I have to step back, know my triggers and know my biases and put them off to the side and listen.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Sort of on that same topic, in Essay Number 2 which was on your ability to exercise impartiality you wrote, "My proposal was selected by members of the San Gabriel Valley of Governments to make the investment of \$127 million to finish the Metro Gold Line with a 27 to 0 vote."

Can you expand on that? How did this decision demonstrate your impartiality? Did you have any personal interests that you had to set aside in this example?

MR. ALLAWOS: I was on the fence post with the train going through, because of the cost overruns, what it was going to do to our city. We were going to have two flyovers. They were going to actually be as barriers or walls that would split our city in two, so that was really challenging for me to want the train to go through. And listening to all the different cities, looking to the future, what was going to be. I had to put those aside for the betterment of the community for the future. We needed to make this happen.

You know, when you're sitting on a Commission or a city council, you're not looking about what's going to happen now. You always think about 50 to 100 years down the road. And that's what I had to do in this situation. I had to put my feelings aside for the negative impact it would have to our city, to the future good.

MR. DAWSON: So the negative impact was the potential to split neighborhoods, but also the \$127 million?

MR. ALLAWOS: Well, the 127 was from the COG itself. They had through smoke and mirrors and financial wizardry, they had this money out there that all of us cities had to approve to be able to give to the Gold Line or the Metro Gold Line (indiscernible) construction authority to finish the project. So it wasn't our city's money, it was a group of cities' monies that we all had to vote on.

MR. DAWSON: Was that through fares or a special tax or something like that?

MR. ALLAWOS: No. No, that was money that was given through Metro State Bonds and the issues of other monies collectively put together.

MR. DAWSON: Okay, thank you.

MR. ALLAWOS: Uh-huh.

MR. DAWSON: You said that you enjoyed the

process of drawing the district lines for Glendora, but you didn't enjoy the fact that you were forced to do that. And I'm sorry if I missed it, why was Glendora forced to district?

MR. ALLAWOS: Well, Mr. Shankman (phonetic) went around suing cities that were not already into districts. And so at the time, a letter would be sent out to cities and you had a certain amount of days to comply or you could fight it legally. And it was just too cost prohibitive to try to fight it in those cities that won. Palmdale, I think spent over \$100 million trying to fight it and they ended up losing and so we acquiesced. And we went to districts.

MR. DAWSON: I see.

MR. ALLAWOS: No one likes to be forced to do anything and so what we did on ours, we did the districts for voting purposes only. But we put in our ordinance that you represent the entire city. Some don't do that. They say, "Okay, you vote for a council member for your district and they represent that district." But we didn't do that.

MR. DAWSON: Okay. So I'm not that familiar with municipal law, so how many districts? Five?

MR. ALLAWOS: Five.

MR. DAWSON: And so there are five districts that each member is voted on by a district, but they act as at-

large council members?

MR. ALLAWOS: No, they vote. They take, let's say we have the five council districts. We just had elections where we had three districts. Two were unopposed and one had an election, District 2. But let's say a constituent in District 5 calls the council member from District 2 and says, "Hey, can you help me with this?" Then they're free to do so per our ordinance and the other council members won't get upset, because that's in our ordinance.

MR. DAWSON: I see. I see, okay.

And then is the Mayor chosen by the District?

MR. ALLAWOS: No. The Mayor is chosen amongst

14 the council members.

MR. DAWSON: I'm sorry, that's what I meant. But yeah, so they're chosen by the -- and do I see that you're Mayor Pro Tem currently?

MR. ALLAWOS: Correct.

MR. DAWSON: And how long have you been in that position?

MR. ALLAWOS: A year.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. I wanted to switch gears a little bit. What exactly did you make for the Joint Strike Fighter?

MR. ALLAWOS: Oh, lots of things I can't tell you

about. (Chuckles)

MR. DAWSON: Or is it that you could tell me, but you'd have to kill me?

MR. ALLAWOS: I won't go that far.

MR. DAWSON: Do you have -- your background though is as a business person. You're not a mechanical engineer?

MR. ALLAWOS: I'm a tool and die maker by trade. I also have a degree in business.

MR. DAWSON: I see. And what's an MRP system? I'm sorry, I don't know that term.

MR. ALLAWOS: Material Resource Planning.

MR. DAWSON: And what does that mean?

MR. ALLAWOS: It means you take all the raw materials. All of the labor, all the equipment, and you put it all together. And the system helps you get the product out the door. It's a resource management, so all of your resources you can manage them so that you get the product that you need on time to the customer with the highest quality you possibly can get.

MR. DAWSON: Do you think that this experience is transferable to the Commission if you're selected?

MR. ALLAWOS: Oh, absolutely, because it's a process that the Commission has to go through. You have an end goal.

MR. DAWSON: You mentioned that when you were working on the districting process for Glendora that you relied on Census data that was brought to you by a demographer. Given the COVID-19 situation, do you have any concerns about the quality of the Census data that will be coming out of the ongoing Census?

MR. ALLAWOS: I don't have an issue with that. I do have an issue with the economics, the fallout from this that's going to happen. We have what Friday's the 10th for property tax? The Governor's talking about maybe giving a property tax holiday. If that happens you're going to have a cascade of cities having financial issues.

Before going into this we had about 25 percent of the cities in California that were on the edge financially. And this could put them over the top. Needless to say the pension fund right now, what they've lost \$50 billion right now and that will add to the fund liability of cities that will trigger layoffs. So you're not going to have a lot of the folks out there working with the different municipalities.

So I'm more concerned with the fallout financially going forward than I am about the virus itself. It looks like we're plateauing right now with the virus, which is a good thing. But it's the aftermath that concerns me.

1 MR. DAWSON: All right, thank you. I have one 2 final question, you're from L.A. County. L.A. County is 3 well represented within the applicant pool. The previous 4 Commission did not have great representation north of the 5 American River actually. Can an applicant from Los Angeles 6 County fairly represent and understand the interest of 7 folks in the far north? 8 MR. ALLAWOS: Absolutely. And in fact, it's kind 9 of funny you brought that up. I have a ranch in Northern 10 California, so I have a ranch in Northern California in 11 Glenn County. 12 MR. DAWSON: Can you be more specific? Where is 13 that? I grew up north of here, so I'm curious. 14 MR. ALLAWOS: Glenn County. 15 MR. DAWSON: Okay. 16 MR. ALLAWOS: Near Willows. It's a quarter 17 section, 162 acres. So --18 MR. DAWSON: Cattle, sheep? 19 MR. ALLAWOS: I raise cattle, bees. We tried to

- MR. ALLAWOS: I raise cattle, bees. We tried to
  do some wheat at one time, but its dry land farming. So
  that's challenging. So no, I know the north quite well -great people.
- MR. DAWSON: Alright, thank you for that.
- MR. ALLAWOS: You're welcome.
- MR. DAWSON: I have no further follow-ups. Mr.

Chair, if there are any panel follow-ups?

CHAIR BELNAP: I don't have any further

3 questions. Mr. Coe?

VICE CHAIR COE: No further questions.

CHAIR BELNAP: Ms. Dickison?

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: No further questions.

MR. DAWSON: All right. Then, Mr. Allawos, with the remaining time -- oh, Madam Secretary, could I have the time check please?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes, 33 minutes and 40 seconds.

MR. DAWSON: All right, thank you. Mr. Allawos, with the remaining time, though I don't think you'll need all of it, would you like to make a closing statement to the panel?

MR. ALLAWOS: Well that was a lighting round, wasn't it? Well, thank you again for the opportunity. I know what it's like from your vantage point to down select candidates and to be in consensus with your panel. Our own counsel performs this task on a regular basis. And it's not always an easy task to take, because you usually have a lot of great candidates that you have to sort through and you want them all sometimes.

As I articulated in this interview, and the materials and research that you have in front of you, you probably know more about me than I probably know about

myself or even can remember about myself. And obviously you've done some digging.

I'm confident that I'll make a trusted and competent Commissioner with the people of California, especially in this hyper-partisan environment that we find ourselves in. Trust in doing the right thing and the ability to disagree, but not be disagreeable while building confidence in the process with an eye to the goal that is paramount to success.

So thank you again for this incredible opportunity and hopefully I get to be picked and we get past the issue if I can be a Commissioner or not, and still keep my other daytime or part-time job. We'll wait and see about that one. So thank you very, very much.

CHAIR BELNAP: And thank you Mr. Allawos, for your time today, and also your continued interest in serving on the Commission.

We're going to go into recess now and reconvene tomorrow at 8:59 a.m.

MR. ALLAWOS: Thank you.

(Thereupon the Panel recessed at 3:57 p.m.)