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

In the matter of:

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

621 Capitol Mall, 10th Floor Sacramento, California 95814

THURSDAY, APRIL 9, 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

Conrado Ulpindo

William Roy MacPhail

Debora Gloria

J. Craig Fong

# 3 INDEX PAGE Conrado Ulpindo 4 William Roy MacPhail 80 151 Recess Debora Gloria 151 J. Craig Fong 210 281 Recess

4

#### PROCEEDINGS

8:59 a.m.

CHAIR DICKISON: Good morning, time being 8:59, calling the Applicant Review Panel back to order.

6 I'd like to welcome Mr. Conrado Ulpindo.
7 Did I say that right?

DR. ULPINDO: Conrado Ulpindo.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. Ulpindo.

DR. ULPINDO: Yeah.

11 CHAIR DICKISON: I'm awful with names, so

12 --

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DR. ULPINDO: No, no, no. We're good.

CHAIR DICKISON: Welcome. Thank you for meeting with us today for your interview.

Before we get started, though, is remind everyone to silence all cell phones, both in the room and on the line. For those in the room, in case of emergency, just follow the CSA staff instructions.

With that, I'm going to turn the meeting over to Mr. Dawson to read you the five standard questions.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Dr. Ulpindo, I'm going to read you five

standard questions that the Panel has requested each applicant respond to. Are you ready, sir?

DR. ULPINDO: Yes, sir.

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. ULPINDO: Good morning, everybody. My name is Conrado Ulpindo and I'm happy to be here.

And I will respond to the questions in sequence.

I believe that the task of being Commissioner in drawing redistricting lines is crucial and critical to the citizens of California and of the United States.

I believe that Commissioners should be able to listen respectfully and humbly, no mannerisms, no perceived notions of bias, no judgment. They should be fair and open-minded. They should have no disrespectful mannerisms whatsoever, eyes moving, hands shaking, fingers tapping, and they should have no preconceived

notions or opinions that are contrary to the general belief of fairness and judgment and in doing their job.

They should have knowledge or understanding of community issues, racial issues, sexual preferences, genders, and other different types of notions.

They should be prepared to come to the meeting all the time. They should have studied their notes. They should have analyzed the data. They should have looked at the maps. They should have researched all the information, accurate information and data, before coming to the meeting.

They should have the ability to communicate and that means they should be able to read perfect English or any other type of language that is being used. They should be able to write academically and also normally in an understandable manner.

They should be able to have the skills to analyze all of the information and data at a very accurate pace.

Commissioners that have an extensive experience working around people. I've always

believed in a notion, as a teacher an as an educator from K to 12 and, also, at the university level, that we should be people persons. We should be able to understand people from the context, not only of their national origins but their culture, where they come from, why they are acting or believing or even having this opinion or ideas this way or that way. We should be able to be -- have the empathy to understand these people as Commissioners.

We are looked up by every single citizen of California and much more the United States when we become leaders in redistricting these lines. They look at us, the way we walk, the way we talk, the way we smile, the way we carry ourselves, our decorum, and other types of behavior that articulates a role model format.

What competencies should the Commission possess collectively?

They -- you know, in the United States, and particularly in California, compromise has been chastised and ridiculed by many, not only by the United States but also even people all over the world. I believe that compromise is an art form. You should be able to compromise with somebody

without necessarily giving your own personal opinion or ideas or even beliefs because, for me, as an educator, I teach my students that you can give up your stand or position if it's for the general interest of everybody. We're talking about California and that of the United States.

They should be able to problem solve quick, negotiate, use persuasive skills to convince the other people or party or group to believe that we need to get this redistricting job done. They should have analytical abilities, research skills. They should have open-minded ideas. And they should be fair and, at the same time, they should have knowledge of the entire political landscape.

And at the same time, again, I would like to reiterate, they should be able to listen humbly and respectfully. It's a very critical piece of the component.

Of the skills and attributes and competencies that each Commissioner should possess, I think I have extensive analytical and research skills. I sit as a committee member of all the doctoral studies at several universities for students earning their PhDs and doctoral degrees in education.

I am very, very, extremely familiar with software that analyzes data, maps, surveys, information, and responses from different types of people coming into the pipe so that we can create a conclusive recommendation or conclusion based on the data that's being presented.

I've studied leadership and management in my master's degree as an international scholar.

And, also, I have a doctoral study in leadership and policy studies. I have used this throughout my career of more than 30 years teaching and working and educating the people in my area and the state of California since I was 28, 29 years old.

Everybody calls me the people-person guy because I'm able to work and collaborate with every individual in my team. I enjoy working with people. Of course, there are challenges. But I see that as an opportunity to be able to articulate the mission and vision of any organization.

Currently, as everybody else is watching people die and suffer because of COVID-19, I was asked by the U.S. Department of Defense through the National Language Service Corps to use my language skills to work with people in the state of California and be a language translator/interpreter

in the different languages that I am very familiar with. I work in the evenings, my phone is always on so that whenever FEMA calls me, I respond to that phone and give them the necessary accurate information and data to help people. I don't want anybody to die, as much as everybody else, but that is the kind of commitment that I have when it comes to working with people.

How will you contribute to the success of the Commission?

I am a first-generation immigrant. And early on, when I was a young man, my parents told me that hard work, hard work, is very, very important in getting everything else that you need for yourself and your family. I have talked to work real hard, to study real hard, and to serve the people wherever I live.

And as a first-generation immigrant, I was 27, 28 years old when I earned my first scholarship to come to the United States. I was the Ambassador of Goodwill of Rotary International. And during that opportunity, I spoke in many cities in California, speaking about the Philippines at that time as a young man, 27 years old. I did not know anybody in the United States, I was alone, 27 years

old young man.

In 1988, I was, again, given an opportunity to come and study in the United States as a global scholar. I graduated with honors and worked as a Civic Engagement Coordinator for the California State University, Northridge. I find out that I'm able to steer my team to look at data and other information and be fair minded in arriving at consensus or decisions.

I am a very good collaborator. I enjoy fostering collaboration among my team wherever I'm assigned, whether it's the second largest school district in the United States, the Los Angeles Unified School District, or whether it's the Los Angeles Department of Public Health, wherever I'm assigned to work. I enjoy conflict resolution. I enjoy engaging people, whether it's public service or whether it's the Rotary International or whether it's the Union Christian College Alumni Association, for that matter.

I think I have that kind of mindset that would allow me to function effectively and efficiently in working with a variety of people to get this job done.

And thank you for the question, Mr.

Dawson.

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. ULPINDO: Thank you for that question.

I live and work in these types of environments as an educator. I work with students as early as kindergarten. I work with middle school students, high school students. I work with the parents. And I work with my community.

I think hyper-partisanship will always be present in an American democracy. And it doesn't matter who the president or who the governor is

going to be, there will always be people who will be on both sides of the equation. And it's up to us as leaders, in a position of leadership, to be able to use this type of conversation and convince the other side to do the job.

In such opportunity, I think the team or the Commissioners should be mission driven. I believe that if they know the mission, the expectation, over a certain period of timeframe, they should be aware and conscious during that job that these are the timeframes for you to be able to submit this deliverables and complete the task given to you because you have been anointed by the citizens of California to do the job.

However, in that process, you have to respect everyone's ideas and opinions. As I said, and I want to repeat this again, over and over again, humility and empathy is very important for Commissioners. They should be seen as very humble and empathetic to the beliefs and opinions of other people, no matter how deviant that could be in terms of how you look at it, no matter how — there's no such thing as a bad question. It's always going to be a question because that person has a reason for providing that underlying question

or opinion towards or against what you believe in.

At the same -- in the same token, there should be a collaborative spirit among the Commissioners. They should be able to collaborate.

When I teach graduate school, I always try to use this example. In many, many years of my work, between the antagonistic and, sometimes, annoying type of banter between RBG, Ruth Bader Ginsburg, and Antonin Scalia or Nino -- or Nino Scalia, that they are both on the opposite side of the equation but they are friends, good friends. They go get cups of coffee together. They've maintained their professional relationship despite their extreme political differences in the Supreme Court. And that is one example I use with my students.

I think that this kind of job will have two opposing positions, three probably, four, it could be more. But if we maintain that type of professional relationship among each other, and at the same time knowing that the mission is to complete these tasks over a timeframe, a period of time, we should be able to do this job.

Everybody should have a conflict resolution skill set. Conflict is a critical

component of what we're trying to do in that it's always going to be an essential component of trying to solve this problem.

Again, everybody should also be a team player and that we should be able to believe -- I'm sorry, I'm trying to get some -- the music is playing again, I just need to turn it off again.

I'm sorry. Let me just turn it off. Oh, I've already dropped that. Okay. I'm sorry.

So we should -- all Commissioners should be team players, at the same time, and they should be able to understand that they are a part of the team, that they are not in there for themselves and that they are not in there for something else.

How will you ensure that the work of the Commissioners is not seen as polarized or hyper-partisan?

I use this example, also, when talking about getting the job done. I use the example of the Civil Rights Act and also, at the same time, the Voting Rights Act. Those are extremely polarizing topics in American democracy and, also, in how we wrote the Constitution. People have their own agendas, they have their own beliefs, they have their own systems of trying to get things

done. But it was passed because everybody believed in those committees that they have to do it for the whole general public, for the United States of America, to serve the people, to do a better job in catering to the people of the United States.

And I think that's how -- as a Commissioner, I think everybody should have that type of mindset, that type of context, that type of belief pattern, that type of being a team player so that the job will be done over a timeframe that has been mandated by the Auditor's Office, also by the State of California.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

0 Ouestion three.

DR. ULPINDO: Mr. Dawson --

MR. DAWSON: Yes?

DR. ULPINDO: -- is it possible to know how many more minutes I have, so at least I can pace myself in responding to the five questions?

MR. DAWSON: Madam Secretary?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. We have 15 minutes, 30 seconds remaining.

MR. DAWSON: Thanks.

DR. ULPINDO: Okay. Let's do this.

MR. DAWSON: 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. ULPINDO: One of the greatest problems that I see would be that the Commissioners will not do the job. They will not agree on some critical decision that will allow us to complete and absolutely do the job.

I have worked with thousands of people with varying degrees of beliefs and perceptions throughout my career at schools, parents, students, the community at large, and even political leaders. I think it's very important that, when you become a Commissioner, you need to get to know those Commissioners at a personal level. Have a cup of coffee with them when you get a chance. During your break, get to know them. They have children. They also have wives or husbands or any other type of relationships. Get to a personal level.

I know that in the military you are not allowed to fraternalize (phonetic) but -- with the lower rank people. But at the same time, when you are in a commission like this, you are working for the people. So it's very important that you engage these people at a personal level and, at the same,

be polite, be personal.

I think the mission and purpose of the Commission is very important. When we disagree, I'd like to remind others to set aside our biases and personal agendas and, at the same time, look at the data, look at the information, and make inferential decisions based on the truth, not on any type of biases or agendas that you have.

respect everybody's opinions while prioritizing work. It doesn't matter what kind of opinion they have. Those opinions are critical to them being who they are and you just have to articulate your own so that you create some sort of an understanding that you accept their opinion but, on the same token, your opinion is also as important as theirs. And you come up with a compromise, a decision that would be for the benefit of California and, at the same time, for the benefit of the mission and complete what you are being asked to -- tasked to do.

At the same time, with all -- I encourage all the -- I would encourage all the Commissioners to work as one entity, as one body, not a deviant body that has other groups or other types of

alliances that they might have, and that's very important as a Commissioners, as a Commission.

Also, it's very important that we display, show and articulate kindness, humility, but being firm on the context that we need to get the job done in a timely manner, considering all the data and information that are accurate to solve the problem or get the job done.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

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

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

DR. ULPINDO: In 2015, I was hired to become Project Director of a USDA Grant with the Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention Program of the State of California that was handed to -- that was given to the Los Angeles Department of

Public Health Illness and Prevention Center,

Disease Prevention Program under the Nutrition

Education and Obesity Prevention of the L.A.

Department of Public Health. It was a large grant.

And the goal was to work in the different

supervisorial districts of this -- of Los Angeles,

along the school sites.

Board of Supervisors. And, you know, Los Angeles is large, not only in geography and landscape but, also, in the number of people that live here. It's large. I was given these 40 schools and I was given the task of hiring my own people and, at the same time, selecting the people that would be -- that would work with me to implement this program. The expectation was to submit deliverables every day to the State of California, and then the USDA, and at the same time complete the task that was given to us by the L.A. Department of Public Health.

As the Project Director, I was the leader. So what I did was to make sure that I hired the right people who have the experience and the capacity and the enthusiasm to articulate this program. The program was to reduce obesity among

schools, not only among kids but also among teachers, and at the same time, around parents.

It's very important that I hired the right people because at the beginning of my -- the first meeting, the first day of the meeting, I instituted some ground rules. I asked the people that we need to get the job done. This is the task that we're supposed to do. It's a large grant and we have to comply with all the requirements of the three different entities. I set the timeframe for the grant. I set the deliverables that need to be submitted at the end of the day, evaluations at the end of the month and, also, assessments every month to make sure that we are implementing the program according to the depth and breadth that has been given to us by the USDA.

One thing that I did to make sure that we're not going to have a lot of problems is that I made them understand that conflict and that disagreements will occur. And true to itself, after about six months, one of my teacher advisors — these are the people, like me, who would go to the school sites and do the articulation of the Nutrition Education Program, be it gardening, nutrition, cooking, creating of curriculum lessons,

and also, at the same time, visiting different types of communities -- one of my teacher advisors said, "Dr. Conrad, we have a problem, I need some more funds to work with a poorer, more socioeconomic and disadvantaged area of Bell Gardens." While we had divided the funding across the 40 different school sites, see this teacher advisor needed more.

And so I went back to the table and said, "Let's create an agenda. We'll meet with the time and find out how we can reallocate some of the funds." Everybody had different positions about why they won't give into the monies.

It's -- I cannot state the amount of money.

But the bottom line was, after a discussion of probably about a week, we were able to convince everybody that it's very important for that teacher advisor to allocate at least that amount of money to reach out to that socioeconomically disadvantaged group or community for purposes of equity so that -- they didn't have the support, like all the other schools that were in the north -- so that in the east area and in the west area, in that western area, they were able to get that thing done. It successfully articulated

our vision and, at the same time, submit the deliverables given to us, required by us by the L.A. Department of Public Health.

In the end the team was unanimously given an opportunity to receive an award from the L.A.

Department of Public Health and the Los Angeles

Department of Instruction under Dr. Frances Gibson because we had accomplished 200 percent of our deliverables effectively.

What lessons can you take from this group experience to the Commission is selected?

Again, I'd like to repeat again what I said in the former, it's that expectations. Those expectations can be over a timeframe. Restate the mission over and over again. Post it. Let them know. Set them in their computers. Put them on the walls. Put them in their offices.

Set a group norm and protocol in solving disagreements and conflicts. Build empathy. Use kind words. Focus on the work and do not deviate from the task.

Give breaks. Do not overwork.

And celebrate as a committee. Go to Starbucks as a group, you know? Go to a McDonald's as a group for breakfast.

Be kind. Ask about their parents. How's the family doing? How's your wife doing, you know? How's your car? What did you buy last week? And so forth and so on.

I think it's very important that you personalize the relationship and not just because colleagues and cohorts at the same time.

Secretary, what's my time?

MS. PELLMAN: Excuse me. Six minutes, thirty-four seconds.

DR. ULPINDO: Let's get this done. Next question, Mr. Dawson. I'm sorry, sir.

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

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

DR. ULPINDO: Humbly speaking, I have more than 30 years working with all sorts of cultures, ethnic groups, color of skin, gender preference, orientation, beliefs, political persuasion and the likes. I am culturally proficient and have an outstanding interpersonal skill set that allow me to work with the global world.

When I was a student at California State
University Northridge, I was chosen as an
Ambassador of Goodwill Speaker for the whole
university, so I spoke at many classrooms during
classes for at least five to ten minutes, waking up
the professor and, at the same time, barging into
the classroom, trying to articulate globalization
at that time.

I came to the United States with my first scholarship under the Rotary Foundation Rotary International as a global scholar and Ambassador of Goodwill.

I am a relationship builder. I am kind and respectful to other culture and backgrounds.

I am a minority. I am an immigrant, first generation. Most of the immigrants have been petitioned by their parents. I petitioned myself.

I have been recognized by my community in

many instances with many awards to be an Ambassador of Goodwill. My name has been put down at the largest shopping center in my community because of my community organizing activities.

I'm a global citizen. Every summer, since I came to the United States, I compete with 8,000 to 4,000 academics and educators in the United States to earn and ambassador scholarship to go and study outside of the United States and study their schools, their communities and their neighborhoods, and bring it back to my schools, wherever I work, as a person.

I have been a Fulbright Scholar in Japan and Germany. I have been a South Korea Foundation Scholar funded by the Korean government and the United States. I have been sent to South Africa to research HIV/AIDS. I have been -- I brought my students to the Nation of Greece to compete in the World Animation Festival on different types of schooling. I have been sent to the Philippines, also, under the Rotary Program.

I think I have the capacity to be a good relationship builder and able to foster collaboration in the Commission and, at the same time, give back myself to the State of California

27

and the world -- I mean and the United States as a servant of redistricting these lines. I enjoy working with people and would relish to serve the State of California in drawing the districts here.

In the words of Michael Jordan, "Talent wins games but intelligence and teamwork win championships."

Thank you very much, everybody.

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 will start with the Chair.

Ms. Dickison?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

24

CHAIR DICKISON: Good morning. So --

DR. ULPINDO: Good morning, Ms. Dickison.

CHAIR DICKISON: Good morning. So my

first question is in your impartiality essay, you talked about when you were selected to serve as a

|19| member of the Standards Setting Panel of the

20 California Department of Education --

DR. ULPINDO: Yes, ma'am.

22 CHAIR DICKISON: -- for the -- yeah.

23 That's for the Next Generation Standards?

DR. ULPINDO: Yes, ma'am.

25 CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. Can you tell us a

little bit about that experience and how you practiced impartiality as a member of that panel?

DR. ULPINDO: The panel was selected all over the state of California among the educators from elementary, middle school and high school.

And I was given the opportunity to sit on that panel. In fact, we do this every -- I think it's every ten years because it's very important to select those text books and, at the same time, prepare those students for assessments.

What I did was to go in there with a fresh, open-minded outlook about assessment. I looked at the assessment and I looked at all the different data that was provided to us. In fact, there was a secretary, or I don't know, I think she was the director, who keeps presenting to us the data from all the different school districts along that line and what has been going on for the past ten years. It's kind of like some kind of an example about the expectation of what we're supposed to be tasked to do to complete the objective, to complete the job.

I look at every single item and I measured it according to how I teach the class, and at the same time, allowed myself to be an arbiter in

basically making a decision about what type of question would my students be able to handle, and I'm talking about from the lowest to the highest, in that type of questioning.

In that Standard Setting Panel, I was also asked to design those questions. So, again, I put myself into a student, into a student, I'm talking about all my students, and created a formal, unbiased, no agenda, open-minded person to select the best question that would be the perfect assessment to measure the achievement of those students over a set period of time.

So I think that was very, very, very important for me. I removed my preconceived notions about achievement. I removed my bias about students from different type of socioeconomic spectrum, based that I know about achievement, based on the data of many things that I have worked with from any type of level of education. And I came in, in there, as a blank, blank notebook to come up with that decision and I made my judgment based on that. And I am happy to know that everybody else did exactly the same thing, like I did, and we were able to brave those subjects that would be part -- become part of the GSS.

30

Thank you for the question, Ms. Dickison.

Hello? I'm not getting you guys? Microphone?

MR. DAWSON: Are you hearing us in the

4 room?

2

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5 DR. ULPINDO: Okay. There you go.

6 CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. That was me. I'm

7 sorry.

So you talked about the scholarships that you have won, the Fulbright Teacher Program to Japan --

DR. ULPINDO: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIR DICKISON: -- being selected by the education -- International Education and Toyota

Motors to visit South Africa --

DR. ULPINDO: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIR DICKISON: -- going to Greece and Korea.

What did you learn from these experiences that could assist with the Commission in its work?

DR. ULPINDO: I have always, since I started my career in education in the state of California, I have always believed that in order to be the best teacher, to be the best servant, and in order to be the best mentor for kids, I believe that you need to engage people outside of your

fence, outside of your state. And whenever I teach in different areas of the education spectrum I see different types of people. And I understand that I have to be proficient with their culture, their beliefs, their opinions, why they're doing this, why they think like this. And I have learned a lot of things in being empathetic about their background, about the kind of belief systems or traditions or mores or even agendas that they have.

Look here, guys, I went in there to study the school system and the community. I just did not study the people. I went in there, into the schools, and looked at how parents, how community members, how the politicians, and how the leaders articulate the mission and vision of teaching these kids and, at the same time, also at this time, aligned myself with the politics of it, about how funding is being given to the schools to make sure that the job is done.

I think I have learned, also, to -- not only to be a global person in understanding the different culture and nuances of who they are, and I was just lucky to have been selected out of 8,000, the minimum was 4,000, American teachers in the United States from among the 50 states,

32

including colonies, to go to these countries and understand and work with different types of people.

I think I learned to be humble. I learned to listen to different types of people. I was able to learn how to adjust myself and be adaptive and also innovative in handling different types of conflicts among groups, political groups, among different types of cultures, ethnic groups, national origins. And I think that made me a better person and that made me -- that will make me a better servant, if given the opportunity to serve on this outstanding Commission, to do the job for our state and for the United States because -- I said United States because we are a model for the United States. Most of the states look at California. Whatever California does, most of the states either reflect what they do in their own decisions or, I would say, copy or model what they do in their own state. That's why I always try to use the word, that of the United States --CHAIR DICKISON: You used a --

DR. ULPINDO: -- (indiscernible) for

23 California.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay.

DR. ULPINDO: Sorry.

CHAIR DICKISON: Earlier, in one of your responses, you used the term "culturally proficient." Is that what you were talking about when you said that? I hadn't heard that term before.

DR. ULPINDO: Culturally proficient is a term that we used in graduate school, in graduate school of education. It's an ability of any individual to be familiar and to be adopted and be aware, consciously and subconsciously, about the different belief systems, traditions, behavior, practices, and even thinking, flawed or otherwise, or any other type of thinking, I use that. Flawed because -- I used the word because it might be against what you believe, what you've been brought up to.

From a perspective of that type of person or community or village, or even a race, if you might want to use that word, or tradition, that's what I mean when I say culturally proficient.

And I think whenever I win the scholarship, I am given the opportunity to submerge myself and just be educated about that type of culture. And I have been doing that for many, many years. I still am doing it right now. In fact,

I'm waiting for the ICT to give me an opportunity to at least work with them at a state level in Hawaii.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. Good.

So based on the work that you've done internationally and, you know, locally in your own community, what do you think the Commission can do to identify communities of interest throughout the different communities in the various regions throughout California?

DR. ULPINDO: You need to understand that there are communities in here who doesn't -- I would say -- I'm going to use the language that my students do, my students use whenever they do presentations, they don't talk much. You can't see them because they don't like to be seen. In American lingo, they call it shy, but it's just that they are not used to articulating their own opinions. They're not used to trying to be seen by the community, be seen by a group of people. They are not used to talking or even saying something about when the door is not locked and it's supposed to be locked, they're not used to saying that.

I think it's very important, we need to go engage those people, look at their leaders, and

have a conversation about the critical importance about how they can contribute and become part of a whole instead of just being themselves. If you do that, they will respond. If you don't, you will never see them. That's my experience when I've gone to those villages.

So I think we need to just go in there and tap their back and say, like, "Hey, mister, Mr. S., it's very important that we appreciate you in coming over to help us out. Give us your ideas. You are a part of our community and we would love to have you be a part. We would love to hear from you. We would like to listen to you and we would like to help you help us so we can be better Commissioners." I think that's very critical for those people. And there's a lot of them in the state of California.

We have 1,600 languages and dialects spoken in Los Angeles alone in every single classroom in the largest second school district.

We have at least, as a coordinator and a former principal, we have at least about 29 languages, not just majority Spanish and English. There's a lot of them. Dialects, also, is not national but sometimes some of those people only speak the

dialect. They don't even speak the national language. And I'm learning that right now as they volunteer for the National Language Service Corps doing translation and interpreting for COVID-19 testing.

Thank you for the question.

always enjoyed language.

CHAIR DICKISON: You're welcome.

How many languages do you speak?

DR. ULPINDO: You mean -- I speak the
Filipino language and I speak four different
dialects under that. I also speak Spanish very
fluently, having been a part of Spain when my
country was invaded by Spain for 370 years, before
it became part of the United States. I speak
Japanese (speaking Japanese). I also understand
basic Chinese. And at the same time, some of those
dialects, I can understand. A little bit of Italy.
I enjoy Italy because my sister lives there. She's
an Italian citizen and so I learned that also. And
some of the basic other languages in South America,
I also understand, because of the nuances of the
Spanish language. Also, I speak different dialects
in the northern part of the Philippines. I have

CHAIR DICKISON: Do you think your ability

to speak multiple languages brings a perspective that would be beneficial to the Commission?

DR. ULPINDO: You need to understand that I just don't speak the language, I eat their food, I dance their dance, and I'm talking dances, like when you do the dance. I also participate in weddings and different types of rituals.

When you come to the United States after a scholarship, this is what they tell you from those funders, "Conrad, the question is, if I give you a dollar in terms of scholarship to go to Japan, how could you return one dollar and make it a million dollars when you come back to your community in the United States and pay it forward? That's what they would like to see."

So when I've earned those scholarships, every single time, I've always been volunteering myself to be part of those communities. So I go to weddings, I go to, believe me, funerals, I go to different parties when I'm invited to speak about my experience in those different countries. And I think it would give the -- it would enrich and enhance the work of the Commission for me to be able to reach out when they see a person who can relate and adapt and, at the same time, engage

their community from that perspective of my experiences.

And I always am very, well, humbly humble and, well, I would say, proud in letting them know that I was in Asahikawa and Hokkaido or that I was in Rombrulone (phonetic) or I was in Thessaloniki or I was in the Cape, Cape Town, South Africa, or I was in Johannesburg, I was in Bento Sueto (phonetic) where Michelle Obama was. Oh, I'm just using that as an example. I've been to, what I tell them, I've been in Cuba and South Korea, and I eat the bulgogi. I think it's going to be very important for those people to hear me speak like that because they can relate. And at least you create some kind of a trust relationship when they know you know about who they are in those specific details.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. Thank you.

You also talked about serving as a dissertation advisor for PhD students.

DR. ULPINDO: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIR DICKISON: And in your essay on analytical skills, you said you use a variety of research methodologies and analytical protocols and processes to extract data.

Can you explain one of those processes to an analysis that you've done?

MS. PELLMAN: And quick time check. We have five minutes remaining.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

DR. ULPINDO: Thank you, Secretary.

We have -- I used -- whenever we're doing a dissertation, the most recent that I did was with Concordia University. This was about sometime in March. This was the most recent. And what we did was to study the different impact or -- an exploratory impact of depression or different types of variables. I'm not -- I'm trying to pick my words because I'd like to protect the privacy of that person and, at the same time, the university. So I'm trying to

get -- we were trying to get data about depression of teachers and how does that impact the way they teach and collaborate with their community?

We had 4,000 responses. And so what we did in there, according to the Dissertation

Committee, and also the students, we used Scatter

Plots. Scatter Plots is a software in which when a response is presented by a survey participant or an N, N as in Nancy, from the population, it will do

some kind of a dot on a specific type of landscape or geography in the software. And it's kind of like -- how do I do this?

For example, it's a map. Those Scatter

Plots exactly tell you where the response is coming

from so that -- that's not -- I'm just giving you

an example, I'm not giving you exactly the content

of the dissertation -- so that if you were trying

to look for whoever has -- if you're measuring one,

two, three, four, five, one being extreme

depression from that teacher, you know, for

example, that if there's a lot of concentration of

plots in Northridge, you know that the teachers in

Northridge have the most impact of depression

because of a variable that is given to them by the

environment where they teach.

Scatter Plots is the preferred survey software that we use in PhD and EDD dissertations at this point because it's very easy to manipulate in terms of converting it, not manipulate the date. I'm talking about converting it into a line graph, into a pie graph, or into a bar graph, so that if you use those type of data there is no way that you can skew exactly what you're looking at. Anybody who is looking at that would be able to understand

the data. They would say, like, "Oh, this thing spiked and this thing is located in this area and these are the variables that makes it so and so."

So I think that's the software that I like. I enjoy it. Oh, FlashLight is also one of my favorites in terms of survey because it aligns the patterns of the responses. But I would say Scatter Plots would be my --

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

DR. ULPINDO: -- one of the software that is my favorite. I used different -- six different types of software.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. Thank you.

If you were selected as one of the first eight Commissioners, who were all selected randomly, you'd be tasked with selecting the next six Commissioners that round out the Commission.

What would you be looking for in those individuals?

DR. ULPINDO: I would like to look for open mindedness, number one. No prejudged opinions should be -- they should not bring political agendas when they come to the door and become part of the team. I would encourage them to say so.

I'm not going got dictate. I'm going to let them know. They should be just and fair when making

those decisions.

They should be -- they should be a team player. They should understand that although, as I said, compromise has been chastised in the United States and in California, in particular, it is an art form, that it is a critical component of how we, as human beings, work together in solving our problems in order to achieve a mission, a goal, an established agenda so that we get our job done over a timeframe.

I also believe that they should have analytical skills. They should be able to understand simple datasets and analyze that data and use that data to make a decision, conclusion, or recommendation.

MS. PELLMAN: Thirty seconds remaining.

DR. ULPINDO: That would be useful in solving and achieving the mission and vision of the whole Commission.

Thank you very much for your question, Ms. Dickison.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

23 That's all of my questions, so I will turn 24 this over now to Mr. Belnap.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: All right. Good

morning.

You were a Restorative Justice Advisor for ten LAUSD schools. Are you currently still an advisor for Restorative Justice?

DR. ULPINDO: No, sir. The Restorative

Justice Program has been reduced into a skeleton

format because of funding by the Los Angeles

Unified School District at that time. But I spent

almost three years of my life working with -- well,

you say ten. I listed ten because those are my

assignments. But the program was that you have to

pair with somebody within your ten. And so,

actually, I had 20 or more because I was given the

opportunity to be a General Advisor to the RJ

people, also, at the same time.

So I, actually, I've work in about more than 20 schools during my time, and more, articulating the vision of Restorative Justice.

Yes, sir, I am RJ Advisor. I was an RJ Advisor.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: So what did you do in this role as Restorative Justice Advisor?

DR. ULPINDO: The Restorative Justice

Program at Los Angeles Unified was created because
a lot of the minorities and a lot of the people of
different races, different cultures, have had the

highest expulsion rate, detention rate, and at the same time they have the highest incarceration rate, and at the same time they had the highest absentees and (indiscernible) rates in the Los Angeles Unified School District. That was a quandary for the superintendent.

So Michelle King at that time, who was Superintendent, created it. And so we all believed that when we were chosen, in fact, I competed for that position, we all -- we believed that it's very important that teachers and parents in the community need to understand that when a student or when a child is in the dean's office, you can't just say, like, "You know, Jose, you know what, you got to stay here, I'm going to call your mom and you're going to be benched during lunch, and then you're going to be benched at four o'clock, too, at the same time." You can't just do that. You need to understand the underlying factors, why that student was in the dean.

So you ask five different questions, one of which would be, what happened? Don't just say, "Jose, you did wrong, because you don't even know what actually happened in the classroom, or even in the yard, or even outside the yard. So what

happened? And what made you do this?" Question like that. How can I -- how can we make things better, Jose? How can we fix this problem so you're going to be a better person and, at the same time, we can settle these differences with your teacher or with your mom or with your dad? And how can we move forward? How can -- what can I do to help you? Those are the several questions.

This has reduced the absenteeism. Also, this has also reduced the challenges that we have in the classrooms. We have taught teachers to deescalate the situation, to understand beyond the action, to understand beyond the child what's going on.

A lot of our children in the Los Angeles
Unified School District, we are at least 80 to 90
percent Title 1. These are socioeconomically
disadvantaged children from different varying
cultures, race, nationalities, national origins,
and where they live. A lot of them don't have
parents. They live in poverty. They live in
squalor conditions that we don't know. They don't
have any breakfast at home, or dinner. That's why
we need to understand and relate with these
students so that we can help them out.

What we did, also, in the Restorative

Justice Program, and I'm talking about myself and,
at the same time, my team, was to identify the

different support systems of the Los Angeles County
and the district under the Student Health and Human

Services and connect them to be able to get that
support system, whether it's counseling through

Penny Lane or New Directions for Youth or any other
type of support system, or whether it's the

Department of Social Services, or whether it's the
housing, Department of Housing through L.A. County,
because some of these students also are homeless.

I don't know if you know but an extensive amount of are students are homeless at the same time. And these kids, when they come to school, that will cause them to act differently, to act, sometimes, against the expectations of the norm set by teachers or even set by the school site.

And what I have done was to be successful in helping these children. That's what I have done in the Restorative Justice Program. I was -- that's why, I think, I became so popular that one of the awards that was given to me was to put my name on a big -- it's kind of like the star in Hollywood, down by the street of Victory

Boulevard by one of the new -- I think it's a mall, and celebrate my achievement because of that as a person, because of the schools that I have worked with.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

In your view, why was the Restorative

Justice Program -- why was the budget of the

Restorative Justice Program at LAUSD reduced?

DR. ULPINDO: First, the program was only implemented for about three years. It's supposed to end 2020. But then I think the School Board was coming in with a new system that would integrate the Restorative Justice Program as a part of the bigger picture, and that is what you call the Community to Schools Program. So what they did was to consolidate all of these different areas of focus and make Restorative Justice a part of that bigger picture and not -- and be focused in more areas.

And so I think it's not reduced but it was integrated into a different program. They call it, now, as a -- the Restorative Justice Program is still there but they made it what you call a Systems Support Program now so that it's not just Restorative Justice but it's also -- because they

found out that what we were doing should be what they should have done in the beginning before the implemented the Restorative Justice. It should be connected to counseling. It should be connected to schooling -- I mean to housing.

It should be connected to the needs of the child. The focus of the child should not just be about schooling but, also, the underlying factors that makes him live like a normal child, like some of the kids, some of the children of the people who make at least \$50,000 a year. These kids are at the brink or even at the lowest poverty level, making \$15,000 a year per household with at least three or four children, with only mom working. So it's been very, very difficult of these kids.

And the District did not have the funds to be able to continue on with that program, so they consolidated it and made it a part of a bigger service group or team.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

So you obtained a doctorate in educational leadership and policy studies. What was your dissertation on?

DR. ULPINDO: At that time, when I was working, I was the Principal of Vaughn Next Century

Learning Center. And the computation or even the evolution of our public school system was at a very, very rapid pace. The book that I read at that time was The World is Flat. And it's -- basically, it was written by Thomas Friedman. I believe that by looking at the school system at that time, I believe that everybody should be given the opportunity to succeed in this country.

I came here as an immigrant. I'm a firstgeneration immigrant. I brought myself here
because I believe in the American system of
education and I believe in the American system of
opportunity and that anybody can succeed if you
really work hard, if you give your best shot and
give your best in anything that you do.

So at that time, public education, the traditional public school at that time in my community, to me, to my own perspective, was not working. And so I said -- I looked at parents, and I worked with many thousands of those parents and they've articulated one vision, which means if the traditional public school is not working, can we have an opportunity to have any other school that would deliver a system of opportunity for our children? And I'm talking about poor children,

socioeconomically disadvantaged. And it goes beyond race or culture. It goes beyond national origin. That means I'm talking about everybody.

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

And so I was -- I believe that by working with the parents, I was able to design this dissertation to benefit them. So my dissertation was an exploratory avenue of looking at alternative public education for my community. And you call it charter schools, you call it options education, you call it nontraditional schooling you call it home schooling, you call it any other type of school, that was what I believed. If the traditional school at that time, in 2004-2005, the scores were very low, I mean, can we give an opportunity to these kids to at least go to a school in which they are given more opportunity instead of the cookie cutter that was given -- handed to them by our society? That's why I decided to choose that type of context.

Thank you for your question, sir.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Yes. And did that exploratory look into the alternatives for public education in your community? Did it involve any data analysis that you can describe for us?

DR. ULPINDO: Yes, sir. I did -- what I

did was to interview many parents. I focused on parents, teachers, students, administrators, and students. I went through all the stakeholders.

What I did was to use a FlashLight online interview. One of the surveys was that. One of the surveys was that. I did face-to-face interview and I also did group interview.

Okay, yes, I did. Do you want me to explain the data or --

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Yes.

DR. ULPINDO: -- does that answer your question? Okay.

I found that the majority of my -- the majority of the parents, I would say, in the -- I would say in the 75 to 86 percentile agreed that they should be given an opportunity to choose, I think, to choose a public education that is funded by our state to send their children so that they can also have the same opportunity as the other schools who are attending -- attending other schools that are succeeding.

Their issues has many, many, many variabilities. One was that the traditional school at that time had 50 students, so they would like a smaller class size.

Another issue was that they -- the traditional schools at that time were only given an opportunity to learn testing, testing, testing.

They would like an opportunity to have an alternate curriculum that does not just focus on testing but, at the same time, the whole child.

Field trips was one of them too. They would like their children to have field trips because they cannot afford to send their kids on their own to go to the Museum of Science and Industry. They would like that.

 $\mbox{I'm just remembering what I can remember}$  from the data.

Another thing, also, is that a lot of the differences that they would like principals to be more proactive in working with teachers and students personally not just, I would say, couch potato principals. They would like that. That's one of the data.

And students wanted to have more manipulatives and technology in the classroom at that time. At that time the charter schools or the option schools were doing a great job in using different types of variable curriculum, aside from the one standard curriculum given from kindergarten

up to 12th grade at the traditional public schools.

And so those are the variables that were -- that came out as a pattern, overarching decisions why children chose an alternative type of public education for their children.

Thank you for your question, sir.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Yeah.

Madam Secretary, time check?

MS. PELLMAN: Six minutes, fifty-eight seconds.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

So from your long career as an educator, can you briefly describe a success that you're proud of?

DR. ULPINDO: Okay. In 2004, 2002, I think, or '03, I was at Holmes International Middle School. And I was teaching in a classroom when my principal came and said, "Conrad, I know you're busy but I'd like to speak to you during your conference," which is the next period.

So I said, "Okay, Mr. Twombly (phonetic).

The class will end in about two minutes. Can you wait for me?" Which he did.

We went to the office and he said, "I'd

like -- I have a task for you. I know that you are being very enthusiastic. You are one of my teachers that really does a great job in getting the things done and everybody loves you, kid."

So I said, "Okay, sir, what's the job?"

He said, "I'd like you to be the student recognition coordinator of my school."

And I said, "That's a good one. Okay. Now what does it entail?"

And he said, "You will work 24 hours."

And I looked at him and I said, "Like, 24 hours? Man, I need to sleep."

He laughed and gave me a pat on the back and said, "The next year will be critical for Holmes Middle School." We are Holmes International Middle School, named after Judge Oliver Wendell Holmes, a jurist. And he said, "We are competing with 160 middle schools in LASUD.

Remember, sir, we have 1,000 school sites at LAUSD, all middle schools, about 160 or more.

So he said, "The competition is about attendance. Our attendance right now is in the 90s but the competition would allow us to compete with all the middle schools and win and I know we can do

it."

So I said, "Okay, sir. Give me a day, I will come back, present my proposals, and we'll get things done."

The bottom line, I know you have three minutes, I've worked with the whole community.

I've walked my community. I walked to every single business in my threshold by Northridge and asked them to be a part. First, I congratulated them to be a part of the program and asked them to be a part of this vision.

The bottom line, sir, we won the best attendance middle school in the whole district. And the L.A. School Board awarded Holmes Middle School to be a model middle school for the whole district. In fact, we received various awards that caught the attention of Vaughn International Studies Academy at that time and offered me a position to become principal, right then and there.

But the main important thing was for me to be able to collaborate with my whole community in Northridge. And the whole staff believed in that vision. We were all in that journey. And that the kids and the parents believed in the journey, that they came to school, and we received a 98.6

attendance with very few tardies over the school year. Every single day, I'm on a P.A. system during homeroom, offering a ticket to SeaWorld, a ticket to Universal Studios for Ms. So-and-So, a roundtrip ticket for a teacher at the end of the year to be able to go anywhere else if they won the best attendance in their classroom.

I think collaboration, I have mastered collaboration with my school, that I was able to be successful in making sure that we achieved that mission over a time period established by my school.

Thank you for your question, sir.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Madam Secretary,

15 time?

MS. PELLMAN: Three minutes, fifteen seconds.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: In the three minutes we have remaining, can you also describe a failure from your career and what you learned from it?

DR. ULPINDO: I think the failure, sometimes, is very difficult to respond to that. I mean, I did not expect this question. I'm a very ambitious guy.

But when I become -- became a principal,

my wife asked me to help her in taking care of the kids. I would leave my home at 5:00, I would come home at 10:00. And -- I'm sorry -- and then she said, "It's not working if you can't help me take care of the kids." And I think it's not a failure but it's an opportunity for me to reflect but to go back to the drawing board and said, what am I not doing right as a person to make sure that I accomplish my goal as a person, as an individual, as a public servant, at the same time keep myself to my responsibilities as a dad, as a father, as a member of my family, and as a leader in my home and take care of my children.

Since we only have three minutes, I went back to the drawing board, I talked to my wife. We have never been so happy after that conversation.

My first born is a registered nurse with Blue Shield NP. My second born is a CLS med tech doing the COVID testing right now in Thousand Oaks, positive or negative. My third son -- my third born is a freshman going through pre-med at UCSD. And my work -- my wife has never been so happy working as an L.A. County Sheriff Nurse Supervisor for the Men's Central Jail in Downtown Los Angeles. And I have never been a happier father, a happier

family member, and a happier Conrad Ulpindo after that conversation.

I'm sorry for that little two seconds of emotional outburst. I did not mean to say that. I did not expect this to happen. I did not expect this question from you guys.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: No problem.

DR. ULPINDO: You guys got me.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: We appreciate your response and your openness.

No further questions.

DR. ULPINDO: Thank you, Mr. Belnap.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

Mr. Coe?

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Good morning to you, again, Dr. Ulpindo.

Thank you again for speaking with us today.

DR. ULPINDO: Good morning, sir. Good morning, Mr. Coe.

PANEL MEMBER COE: So as you've said and talked a about a lot this morning, you're a dedicated educator and teacher for your entire career. And in your essays, in your application, you said that you specifically value educating children and young people because they will be our

future leaders.

Can you give us -- what drew you to being a teacher initially and what has kept you dedicated to that career for so many years?

DR. ULPINDO: I'd like to tell you about Conrad Ulpindo from the time he was a young man.

I came from a very poor background. It's difficult because I see my students and they're in the same boat like me. It's difficult.

As you know -- let me give you a map, a landscape about the Philippines.

The Philippines used to be a colony of Spain for 370 years. After the Spanish lost the war to the Americans, that's us, guys, we were sold for about \$20 million, called the Treaty of Paris. Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines was sold to the United States, ceded, basically, that's the right term, for about \$20 million in which the term called Treaty of Paris because it was signed in Paris for some reason. So it's basically a poor country because we become independent in 1918 under the Jones Law. And I've lived in (indiscernible) which is a village about eight hours from Manila by car. I don't know if things have changed in terms of transportation, but I would say six hours, seven

hours if you drive that fast, so it's a very poor village.

I grew up and the only thing that I'd see when I'd go to school was a teacher, a teacher who would do a good job like me, Mr. Bravo, a fortunate name. Bravo means hurray in Spanish -- I mean English. Bravo means congratulations. And he told me one thing. He said, "In everything you do, you always try to do your best, work hard, research everything, prepare. You go in there and beat that goal, achieve that goal no matter what. Even if you're hungry, even if you need to go to the bathroom, take care of business, get it done." And he has been model for that time.

When I graduated with honors at university in a little bit further town, about two hours, hired me to become and English professor. I dedicated my time. And I think that helped me become a scholar for the first time in the United States under the Rotary Program. And I come to the United States and I go to these schools and work at these schools, having this opportunity, not only to work at one school site, but become a coordinator, a principal, a district administrator running the program for the whole district, and I see these

children like me. I see their face is like me. I see their color is like me. I see their face and the color of their hair. I see where they live like me and I said, like, wow, this is not good.

That thing inspired me to become the best teacher I can find in my neighborhood for many years up to this time. And I will probably die a teacher and die an administrator and die as a leader in my community to help these kids. I have helping kids as aggressive as possible in many different areas, in many different capacities for the past 30 years, whether it's private school in California, whether it's traditional school in Los Angeles Unified, whether it's charter school at Vaughn International Studies Academy, whether it's a pilot school at Cesar Chavez Learning Academy. And I have been assigned voluntarily to the poorest neighborhoods that you can work with in the Los Angeles District. I have volunteered to go.

When the superintendent in my area asked me what schools I wanted to serve, he gave me three initially, to be -- to find a base. When he said Panorama City, Panorama City, California, as opposed to Northridge, as opposed to Woodland Hills and Chatsworth, I said, "I would choose Panorama

City. I used to live there. That was my home for many years, working for the private industry, a private school, and at the same time a public school, and so I work in there."

And he looked up. He looked at me and said, "Like, well, Conrad, you know where you're going?"

I said, "Like, yeah, I know where I'm going. I would like to be assigned there." And that was my base for three years as Restorative Justice Advisor. Because for me, it's not fun to go to a neighborhood when there's nothing to do. The kids are well off. The parents are rich. They don't have a lot of socioeconomic issues. I would like to go and challenge myself with the people like me so I can help them out and, at the same time, use myself for them to be able to succeed and be in the same position as I am.

Thank you for your question, sir.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

Do you think that it's important for this Commission to have the perspective of an educator on it?

DR. ULPINDO: I believe that in any commission, there should be an educator present

because the lifeblood of this nation are our students. The future of this country are our students. If we don't have the insight, the understanding, and even the nuance of an educator in any Commission, you will never understand where this country is going.

I work and shape and mold and collaborate with students every single time of the day with this online platform that they're talking about, being asked to consult with the districts so that I can help them out. A teacher's work is 24 hours, guys. A student will email you at nine o'clock in the evening, asking you how to solve Pascal's law, how to put Pascal's law in a platform and, at the same time, work that across the curriculum in science and math. They email that teacher, not thinking that it's nine o'clock in the evening, and that teacher will go in there and respond to that email and spend one hour without any overtime pays, without any extra work that other people would have.

I think you also need to understand, because a teacher does not only teach in a classroom. He goes into the homes. He goes into the mindsets of these -- the students and in the

parents. He goes into the social and emotional component of them being people. And I think having a teacher in every commission, especially this Commission, which it matters to us, many, is very, very critical, crucial, and necessary in order to design the future of this country, in order to give the best to this community.

We have seen the light. We have seen the challenges that we have with our community. A lot of people work in their offices. We don't. We work in the grapevine. We work in the dirt. We work in the streets. We work with our parents. We understand how they feel. We know their opinions. We know their ideas. We live with them. If you believe that the future of this country is not necessary, believe me, our children, no matter who they are, wherever they come from, will make this country great for many, many times again.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

You mentioned that a teachers role or job is 24 hours. In thinking of your current role and layering on top of the role of a Commissioner, how do you think you would balance those two sets of responsibilities?

DR. ULPINDO: I exaggerated, to work 24

hours. I mean, of course, I have to sleep and I have to sit down and stuff like that. I think I am the kind of person who knows how to prioritize his time. I'm going to give you an example.

When I was doing -- when I started my doctorate degree at California Lutheran University, I was told by many, including the superintendent, "Conrad, do not accept any job. Do not get divorced. Do not buy a home. Do not buy a car."

You know what? During that time, as I said, going back to what I was saying about scholarship, I was competing in every scholarship that I could find. In 2006, I -- when I -- 2004 and 2005, I didn't -- I left my job. I went to Los Angeles Unified School District. I changed my job. I also applied for -- I competed with about 8,000 American teachers to go to South Korea. I won a scholarship to South Korea.

I also -- I was hired by the National Language Service Corps to help them in language interpretation in the evening using the different languages and, at the same time, took care of my family.

I believe that, as a human being, going back to Mr. Bravo, you need to give yourself

totally to whatever you're trying to do. And I believe that I was able to do it.

When you look back in the corner of your room and reflect about what you did for that day, to what extent -- are you going to ask yourself a question, have I given my best to whatever I'm doing? And I believe that I have prioritized my time. I have managed my time to be able to accomplish this. And every single evaluation (indiscernible) or assessment given to me by any place where I have worked has always been over and above -- above the expectation that they set for their own teachers, administrators or principals. And I have been very, very successful.

I am willing to present to you a multitude of awards that I have received, with all humility and I'm not trying to say that, because of what I have done, whether it's political, whether it's community, whether it's group, whether it's students or parents that I have worked with, that I have collaborated with.

Thank you very much for your question.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

I'd like to -- in your essays, and a

25 little bit today, you discussed having either lived

in or visited many different areas of this state. I know you talked about opportunities you had to speak in many different cities across California.

And I'm curious about what you learned from your time in these other regions, the people that you met, their concerns, their perspectives, their preferences, what you learned about them that would make you an effective representative for them on this Commission?

property of the property of th

And I use that as an example because they don't know who I am. I'm not an American. I was a Filipino coming to the United States, a visitor, and I'm addressing a group of Americans I don't know about. My observation was that I know that

every single person in that room, about 300 of them, when I spoke in San Diego at Bahia Hotel as their guest of honor and speaker, as (indiscernible), every single question as they raised their hands about America and the Philippines at that time. They always had a lot of military questions, political questions, people questions, funding questions, money questions, and different types of variables that they asked me. It varied.

But I think I know that we live in a democracy. The American democracy is a model for all, no matter who you ask, and it doesn't matter what they tell you. But the truth is the world looks at America and looks at the democracy and pattern their thinking and their thoughts about America.

I know I was able to respond to the best of my ability about the relationship between the United States and the Philippines. And I know, also, that I was able to admire the American people at that time. I was able to see and taste what they were having.

It's kind of like they were drinking a different type of coffee because of the freedom of

expression that they had, that they were not embarrassed to ask me questions about the president of the Philippines. They were not embarrassed to ask me questions about Clark Air Base and Subic Naval Base. They were not embarrassed to ask me about the Bataan Death March, about the Philippines.

And they were not embarrassed, also, to share what they felt as U.S. Navy citizens, as U.S. Navy people, servicemen, living in the Philippines for many years while they were there during the Second World War and become one of the closest friends of the Philippines for more than 200 years, become as a part of our civilization and exchange of our relationships.

Thank you.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

DR. ULPINDO: I think that experience that I had made me -- it convinced me to come back to the United States on a different scholarship, to come and study here, and --

PANEL MEMBER COE: So based on some of those experiences and what you mentioned being a first-generation immigrant --

DR. ULPINDO: Yes, sir.

PANEL MEMBER COE: -- and some of the experiences you just talked about, do you think that having an immigrant perspective is important to have on the Commission?

DR. ULPINDO: If --

MS. PELLMAN: Excuse me.

DR. ULPINDO: -- as I said.

MS. PELLMAN: Quick time check. We have five minutes, fifty seconds.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

DR. ULPINDO: Thank you, Madam Secretary.

I work in the second largest school district in the United States. We are about 650,000 students, about 35,000 to 45,000 teachers and staff. And I think, I would say, without them telling me, it's obvious that from the data online and, also, from the data on paper, most of these --most of my people are immigrant people. And they come from more than 100 countries.

Sometimes, when you look at the word immigrant, everybody seems to look at just everybody's coming from Mexico. No, that's not true. There's a lot of countries that these immigrants come from, whether it's, yes, it's Germany, there are Japanese citizens coming here to

become immigrants, Hungary, Philippines, China,
Japan, Korea, I can go on and on and on because I
see what Cambodia allows, and so forth and so on.
I think I have lived the immigrant experience.

I remember my time when I came here, the first time that I was put in a hotel for at least a night, then I was sent to the university to live for the rest of my one-year scholarship.

I also remember that when I came here to become Ambassador of Goodwill, I lived in 60 homes. Every night, a Rotary International -- a Rotarian would pick me up and make him -- make -- bring me to his house and live there. And the only time that I would go to a hotel is that when there are opportunities for me to speak. And I also was asked to live in many of those homes. Some of them, I would say 60 percent, were immigrant Rotarians. And so I was so -- so they can -- I was able to relate to their families and understand the immigrant experience.

In my work right now, Lord, God bless me, but I have been in many homes of immigrant folks, more than a lot of people know, in my state. I have spoken to hundreds of thousands of immigrant parents and have -- they have shared with me their

experiences and I have shared with them my experiences. That's why a lot of the students, wherever I go, I let them know that I am an immigrant myself. And they just bow down and say they appreciate it for me being humble enough about where I came from.

I don't pretend -- I do not pretend to be different. I tell them that I am like you. I know everybody, even if you were born here, your parents and I are the same. We are immigrants and we experience all the challenges. But we can do it because of the American democracy and American freedom and the American opportunity that this great country has given us, so let's pay it back by, hopefully, becoming a Commissioner and redistricting those voting rights, voting landscapes.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

One more time check, Madam Secretary.

20 MS. PELLMAN: Three minutes, two seconds 21 remaining.

DR. ULPINDO: Thank you.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

Dr. Ulpindo, one final question for you.

If you were to be appointed to the

Commission, which aspects of that role do you think you would enjoy the most and which aspects of that role do you think might struggle with a little bit?

DR. ULPINDO: I would like to enjoy -- I would enjoy, for sure, working with people with different perspectives. I would like to work at an negotiating table and align all of these perspectives so that we can achieve our mission and vision at a global scale. When I say global, I'm not talking about the globe, I'm talking about the work that we're going to do, the mission and vision.

I would like to -- I would like to engage the challenges. I would like to work with those people that are difficult and work with them. In fact, if you look at the resume that I have sent you, I work in the most difficult environment. It's called CDS. It's, basically, a juvenile facility in which all the kids that the district don't like are sent to that school site. There's two high schools in that school site. And I relish the job in working with those kids.

I work with kids who have anklets. You know, they have these anklets on their feet because they're supposed to be in jail but there's no space

```
in jail, so they're basically sent to school, home, home, school. They're being monitored by POs, probation offices. I work with kids who come to me and look at me like I'm nobody. I like doing that.
```

But the most important thing for me is I like to negotiate with people to make sure that we get the job done. Because what is important for me is I need to give back to my community. This great country and this great state has given me so much that other people can only dream to do what I have enjoyed in this country and in this community. I'd like to give back myself by becoming a part of a larger opportunity so that I can prove to myself that I have, also, repaid (phonetic) myself with all the different gifts that have been given to me by this state and

17 my -- and, also, by this community.

Thank you for your question, sir.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you. I think I'm about out of time.

Madam Secretary -- Madam Chair, no further questions.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you, Mr. Coe.

DR. ULPINDO: Thank you, Mr. Coe.

CHAIR DICKISON: At this time, we'll turn

it over to Mr. Dawson for any follow-up questions.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just have one.

Dr. Ulpindo, you discussed several times your work with and familiarity with recent immigrant groups, students and their families.

One of the major inputs of data for the Commission's work will be the census. And, traditionally, recent immigrant groups have been hard to reach. And there has been, sometimes, a significant undercount.

Given the political climate and the climate surrounding COVID-19, what's your perspective? Do you think that there -- does this give you any concern about the reliability of census data, particularly with immigrant communities?

DR. ULPINDO: Yes, sir. I think this is one of the greatest concerns that we have these days.

The COVID-19, I am very familiar with the protocol that we have right now because, as I said, and I would like to redirect where I'm coming from so you can understand why I have this information.

I work with the National Language Service

Corps, funded by the U.S. Department of Defense, and at the same time implemented by FEMA, to assist in the linguistic interpretation and translation of different types of languages during my time, 24/7. And I say the word 24/7 because the Department of Defense and the NLSC has trained us, that if we are asleep and we don't pick up our phone, it's okay, that phone will be rerouted to a different person across the United States, so that I cannot turn off my phone. I cannot slide and say off on my phone because, if I do, it will cut me off and I will never have access. And those people asking for support through FEMA will never get tested and it's not going to help us out.

Let me go back to that problem. We have problems in Los Angeles because a lot of our students don't have opportunities to have an internet Wi-Fi, number one, they're so poor. As I said, 90 (phonetic) to 80 percent of our students in Los Angeles are Title 1 students. These are students that are considered poor or socioeconomically disadvantaged because, as a household, they only make at least less than \$24,000 a year or less. And so they don't have the ability to have a laptop, an iPad, or even a phone.

And if they have a phone, it probably is not connected to the internet or it's --

MS. PELLMAN: We have two minutes remaining --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DR. ULPINDO: Okay. So --

MS. PELLMAN: -- of the ninety.

DR. ULPINDO: -- I think it's not going to be reliable but I think we need to keep using alliances and relationships in tracking to make sure that every household and everybody who lives in those areas are given the opportunity to become part of the census. I think it can be done but it will need a lot more patience to do that thing because these people, they are out of touch. They cannot -- it's hard to contact them. You cannot contact them. But if you go knock and leave them -- and be persistent, it will be done. It will take a good group of people who are committed and dedicated enough to get this thing done and make sure that the census will work and everybody will be given the opportunity to give themselves as a part of the bigger data.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Madam Chair, I have no further follow-ups.

25 CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. I have no further

1 follow-ups.

2 Mr. Belnap?

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: No further follow-

ups.

4

5

6

7

8

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIR DICKISON: Mr. Coe?

PANEL MEMBER COE: No follow-up question.

MR. DAWSON: Madam Secretary --

CHAIR DICKISON: No more questions.

MR. DAWSON: -- how much time is

10 remaining?

MS. PELLMAN: Fifty-five seconds

12 remaining.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Mr. Ulpindo, if you'd like to say a few words in the less than a minute we have, the time is yours.

DR. ULPINDO: I have volunteered myself to become part of this journey because I would like to give back to the state of California, and to the United States in general, because of the many gifts and the many opportunities that I was given as a young man.

As an immigrant myself, first-generation,

I believe that everybody has a role to play in

making sure that we all succeed in articulating the

vision of trying to serve the people of the state.

I also believe that public service is one of the greatest gifts and greatest opportunities for every single person to exercise if given the opportunity in these times.

I hope everybody is safe. And thank you very much for this opportunity to be able to articulate my vision and mission. And I hope that I'm -- I'll be given the opportunity to serve this state and my community and my country, the United States, at some point.

Thank you. And good morning to everybody.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you for speaking

with us today, Dr. Ulpindo.

Our next interview is at 10:45, so we will go into recess right now until 10:44.

17 (Thereupon the Panel recessed at 10:30 a.m.

10:44 a.m.

CHAIR DICKISON: It being 10:44, we'll call the meeting back to order.

I would like to welcome Mr. William McPhail. Did I say that correctly?

MR. MACPHAIL: Yes. My full name is William Roy McPhail and I've always gone by Roy, but that's no problem.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. Thank you. So welcome for your interview.

MR. MACPHAIL: Thank you.

CHAIR DICKISON: I'm going to turn the meeting right over to Mr. Dawson to read you the five standard questions.

MR. MACPHAIL: Thank you.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. MacPhail, I'm going to read you the five standard questions that the Applicant Review Panel has requested each applicant respond to. Are you ready, sir?

MR. MACPHAIL: Yes.

MR. DAWSON: First question: What skills and attributes should all Commissioners possess? What skills or competencies should the Commission possess collectively? Of the skills, attributes and competencies that each Commissioner should

possess, which do you possess? In summary, how will you contribute to the success of the Commission?

MR. MACPHAIL: Well, I think there's a number of (audio issues) (indiscernible) I think any Commissioner should have.

Obviously, given the work of the

Commission is concerning redistricting, I think you

would need to have a deep understanding or at least

no fear of reading data tables and maps because

that's, obviously, going to be a significant part

of the work. You're going to be able to look at

the results of the geographic information system

that will be used to run different scenarios for

redistricting and to look at the output and to try

and understand, what does it mean? What does the

total population involve when we do the

redistricting scenarios?

Also, having the judgment to look at what happens when you start changing those lines. Look at the different data tables and see what aspects of the population composition are changing when you try to do different scenarios?

You know, maybe we'll -- when we do the work, we might be under some pressure or hear about

trying to keep a community together or a city together. And with the GIS, you can instantly see what the impact of that is and you can see whether you can meet those community demands to keep a particular community or city together without overrunning population size or other redistricting criteria. So I think that's -- I think it's important to have that sort of technical ease and comfort in reading maps and data.

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

On a slightly more qualitative and personal-type angle, you have to be ready to work as a group, as a team, to achieve the goal of redistricting, which is to redraw the state map, the legislative boundaries. And so skills in working as a team, you have to be able to listen respectfully to your other team members. Let everyone have their say. Don't interrupt. Let everyone get their opinion out. And given the mix of the people on the Commission, I'm sure there will be a lot of expertise in different fields. Ι have a particular level of expertise in certain fields. But let everyone talk. Hear everyone's expertise. Defer to people have expertise you don't have.

Also, be flexible with your team. Think of different ways, slightly out-of-the-box ways, maybe, of solving the problem at hand. And also be ready to compromise. You might have a particular viewpoint in a particular redistricting exercise. But be ready to listen to someone else and think, that idea might work, let's try that. So that's one skill of working with a team.

Also, when you go out to the community, as I suspect we will be doing, I expect we will do, we have to do, have some skills in absorbing public testimony and how to evaluate that public testimony, not just listening but actively listen, paying -- not just paying attention to what's being said. Try and understand why it's being said. What are the concerns being expressed and (indiscernible) be accommodated by the work of the redistricting Commission without breaking any of the rules and laws regarding redistricting?

When you're doing that public testimony, which I've done in my work for the school system, what is -- you know, pay attention to what is the source of that testimony? How widespread is that feeling that's being conveyed to you in the public testimony? Is it valid public testimony in terms

of are these real community people telling you about an issue or is it, maybe, some actor group that's trying to take a particular angle on redistricting?

I seem to recall the previous Commission talking about that in early meetings that you had, that there were some examples of a clearly orchestrated response to some redistricting problem. So you have to try and be careful when you evaluate all these different community testimonies.

I think another skill to have on the Commission is to be able to convey to the public when the Commission goes out complex ideas in a simple, clear manner. Why are we coming out to talk to the public? What do we need to do? And how can they help us try and make that very clear what the purpose of these meetings is? And hopefully they will see, when you explain these things clearly, why we're doing it. And they realize that we are, well, if I'm on it, that we are a group of citizens trying to solve a problem and we want their help, and we're not there with any partisan axe to grind.

So I think there's three or four, I think,

characteristics that the Commission should have.

And I think I've got some of them from my academic background and my career.

My academic background is I have two degrees, a bachelor's and a master's degree in geography. And my focus in my academic career was on demographics, computer mapping, and planning. So my academic career has been in this area. And it's always been a great interest to me, of course.

My employment, I was very lucky to be able to translate my geography degrees into a job, which used them very directly. And I have had experience in the private sector. I first worked for a computer mapping company about 30 years ago now where I went across the country installing the computer mapping system and training public school systems and police departments on how to use computer mapping to answer data questions.

I then moved into the public sector. I worked first in Virginia Beach, city public schools in Virginia, where I was there demographer and I used the mapping tools to redraw school attendance boundaries. And that was when I first learned, with the help of my director then, the whole process of community outreach, going out to public

meetings and explaining this sort of work. It was a little bit of a baptism by fire but it was a very useful experience.

And then the latter part of my career was with San Diego Unified School District. I worked for, I think, 21 years with San Diego Unified School District in three positions in the district, increasing levels of responsibility. I started off as a demographer and I ended up as being head of the Planning Department where we would go out on an annual basis to do things, like changing school attendance boundaries, which I think is, you know, highly relevant to the work of this Commission. I have experience in going out to communities, explaining geographic concepts and showing them how boundaries would change and what the impact would be, presenting that sort of information.

I've worked in, you know, San Diego
Unified School District. It's the second largest
school district in the state. It had about
130,000-plus students when I worked there. It's
dropped a bit. But I was in a large bureaucracy
and I had to work within that bureaucracy with
senior management people and teams for -- to answer
various questions for the school board of the

superintendent. So I have teamwork experience, presentation experience with the school board, so, you know, I have that kind of career background as well.

So I guess to summarize all that, I think
I could contribute to the Commission because of the
work I've done in my career has been very directly
related to the task of redistricting.

But it's also not just purely number crunching I'm my career, although that's a big part of it. I also learned the other side, which is how do you get community input, try and get some community buy-in to the proposals you're making? And I think that was a very important skill that I learned throughout my career as well.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

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

What characteristics do you possess and what characteristics should your fellow

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

MR. MACPHAIL: Well, I think a characteristic I would have and I would expect the other Commissioners would have is, although I'm being considered as part of a particular party subgroup to be on the Commission, my feeling would be that, if I was on the Commission, my purpose is there to get a job done, namely redistricting our legislative boundaries, irrespective of my party registration. And as I said, I would hope that all other Commissioners, and I'm sure they would, would have that same perspective.

So that would be an important characteristic to have, that you're there to do a task, you have a mission, and your partisan label, which is the way you're registered in this country, shouldn't affect how you do the job of redistricting in my, maybe, slightly naive opinion. But my background would suggest that you do not need to have a partisan perspective on this job.

And I think we see how that can be

manifested in the work of the Applicant Review

Panel. They, themselves, are each on there because
they have a particular party registration. But I

think we've seen, in the last six months or so of
their work, how they are following the rules
they've been given to select people, they're
meetings have been very open and transparent, and I
think that's very good modeling for how the

Commission should work. You know, we should be
seen to make decisions based on those rules and
regulations that we have to follow to redraw the
boundaries rather than our particular party
registration.

In terms of characteristics of the Commission, I think you've already done the work through your selection process in the questions you asked us early on in the application processes in terms of you asked us about any political activity we might be involved in. So I think by now, people who have strong political backgrounds, you know, such as maybe elected as Democrats or elected as Republicans, that might bring up some concern in the public about their ability to be impartial. And I think you probably, through your process, you know, pick people who don't have that background.

We all have political opinions. Probably many of us have contributed in a very modest way to causes or candidates. But I think that's an acceptable level of engagement in our political process but I don't think it makes you partisan or hyper-partisan.

In my work in the school district, you know, it was not a partisan environment but there were certainly differences of opinion that you had to work through on task forces and committees.

And, again, you're there to do a task. You're not there to bring your biases or history to the Commission. You're there to do a task. And I think everyone on the Commission could do that.

I think, finally, you know, I guess there's some small symbolic things that you could do on the Commission to make it obvious to the public that we're there to be a nonpartisan Commission, little things like even how you sit. You know, we have three subgroups on this Commission. We should all sit together. We should not be segregated by our party affiliation. We should be mixed up and rotated. The Chair of the Commission should probably rotate individually so that everyone gets a chance, so it's not seen to be

one particular subgroup is in charge of the meetings.

And I would hope that as the Commission is formed, you know, that they would have the opportunity to meet, to develop a sense of comradery through the training and understand what their common purpose is all about. I think having those personal interactions, once you meet the party, the Commission members, I think those party labels, we'd hope, would subside. You get to know them as people and not as that's the -- that's one of the Republican representatives or that one is the Green Party representative.

And it certainly sounds like the 2010 Commission did a very good job of that. And it would probably be useful for the new Commission to tap the resource of the previous Commission to ask about those sorts of issues too.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

MS. PELLMAN: You have 15 minutes, 55 seconds remaining.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

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

problem?

MR. MACPHAIL: I think I've got one-and-a-half problems. I think the first problem I thought about was the biggest problem would be gridlock on the Commission. I mean, that would suggest that we're failing in our duty to get maps done. And that goes -- maybe, hopefully, would not go back to the partisanship question.

It would be terrible if one of those subgroups was implacably opposed to a proposal and, hopefully, that would not happen. If it did happen, I think you could do some conflict resolution-type process in public to get every Commission to talk about why they're opposed to a particular proposal without interruption, just let everyone talk, get their viewpoints across.

Maybe chart it and try and find out what are the areas of agreement and disagreement? What does everyone think is good about a particular proposal? And what are the sticking points? Try and itemize what the sticking points are and that would help narrow the discussion.

Maybe there's someone on the Commission who has a particular local knowledge of the proposal that we're stuck on that could help. It

might reveal an angle that the rest of haven't thought about.

Also, I think if we're stuck on a boundary proposal, you should probably review the public testimony to see if there's anything that we missed in that testimony that might shed light on the thing that's causing the gridlock. And I think you would have to weigh the public testimony quite strongly over your own personal feeling about the proposal. You know, if the public testimony reveals the boundaries should be draw this way but what we have come up with is slightly different, I would probably defer to the -- all the public testimony.

The other half problem that the Commission could encounter is maybe to do with what's happening right now, this strange situation that we're in with the isolation. Hopefully -- we all hope it will be over quite soon. But if it drags on and we're still isolated, I'm not quite sure exactly when the Commission is going to start its work. But if we're meant to be out in the community meeting people and this is still going on, it won't be a public meeting in a community hall. It would have to be something like this.

That would be a big technological challenge to get valid public testimony.

Of course, we could have things like websites where people could submit testimony, as well, but it would obviously be inferior to getting out there and meeting people.

As part of this situation that we're going through now, the bigger problem, I think, is with the census. You know, we're right now in census time. And people are always highly focused right now on coronavirus. I wonder what our response rate to the census is right now? Are people paying attention to the census? What will the quality of the data be right now with the census as it's being collected? Are people who claim to be census enumerators, they'd be going out after the initial collection to try and mop up people who have not responded. But if we're in this environment, how will that collection process go?

So it gives you some concerns about the data quality that we might get. There will be a big file created from the census that would be used for redistricting. And what does this mean for that data quality? You'd probably have to do some statistical adjustments, which are never ideal.

You want to have a true, accurate count of the people. And when you start doing statistical models to adjust, that might cause some public concern about the numbers that you're using to do your work.

So, you know, one problem is, I think, gridlock, which I think you can work through if everyone has a good mindset.

But, secondly, we have -- we could have some big problems with data in the environment that we live in.

So those would be my problems.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

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

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

MR. MACPHAIL: Oh, I guess I have an

experience that's very directly related to the work of this Commission.

When I worked for San Diego Unified back in 2011, I was the technical lead on the team that redrew the San Diego Unified Board of Trustee boundaries following the 2010 Census. So I was one of, basically, two staff people that cared and fed for the committee that the school board set up to do the job very similar to what this Commission would do. We had to redraw the boundaries following the census because there had been population shifts within San Diego Unified and you had to equalize, or within a certain variance, the five trustee boundaries in San Diego Unified.

So, you know, what we did was the board picked a committee of five people, one for each board trustee district. And they actually reflected the district's demographics very well.

San Diego Unified, large urban district, very, very diverse. I might talk about that. And the five-member committee had Latino, Asian, African American, LGBT, White representation on it. It was very reflective of the district.

And my role on the committee, first of all -- well, feeding the committee was, first of all, I

provided some guidance to that committee on finding a GIS consultant to do the work. We wanted to outsource the work rather than doing it internally. So I helped them look at the RFPs that we received when asked for companies to do the work for us. I developed a little rubric about how to score the responses from the companies: How responsive were they to the task that we needed? We ended up selecting a company that's actually based in Virginia. And, you know, that caused a little bit of a difficulty, given that they were on the other side of the country. So I was kind of the calm between the consultant and the committee in passing along (indiscernible).

We went out to the community. The committee and I presented our scenarios. We took input from the communities that we visited as to how to change them and if they had any problems. I would say we had a high degree of conflict at those meetings.

You know, school board trustee boundaries are not a highly passionate area of concern. But, you know, people wanted to make sure, when we redrew the boundaries, as we would see on the State Redistricting Commission, that we weren't putting

up neighborhoods or school communities. And we would get that sort of input and we would go back. In fact, we didn't even need to go back. The consultant was there with their GIS live so that we could respond directly and live for questions from the communities, please don't split up North Park, which is the neighborhood island, and say, "Okay, if we don't split up North Park, let's see what that does." You can redraw the line live and that would show, oh, we just added 1,000 people to Trustee District D. That puts us over the ideal balance that we're looking for.

So you could interactively work with the community, which I think developed a lot of trust. We weren't in a back room fiddling with the boundaries. They could see how you were changing them and what the impacts were.

So, let's see, so that the example I have that I've gone through a process of redrawing boundaries, getting community input, finally going back to our school board with the impetus of having a committee and, by default, the community agreeing on these final boundaries. And that gave your consideration a lot of weight with the school board and they, you know, they unanimously approved the

boundaries that we came up with.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Time check, Madam Secretary?

MS. PELLMAN: Six minutes, twenty seconds remaining.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

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

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

MR. MACPHAIL: I'll try and be a little less wordy for the last few minutes. I'm sorry.

I guess, once again, I go back to my experience with San Diego Unified, which I said before, super diverse district both in ethnic and, also, socioeconomic terms. The district is roughly

45 percent Hispanic population, a quarter White.

And we have a huge variety of different neighborhoods of different socioeconomic levels, from La Jolla, which is probably one of the wealthiest neighborhoods in the country, and then we have new immigrant neighborhoods where families are just struggling to get by. And, you know, we have to work with those very different neighborhoods to do our work. And in some, you know, in some cases there might be trust or language issues in some of those communities in dealing with a large agency. And you have to try and engender trust.

And in my job, you know, I went to neighborhoods at all levels of that spectrum to present particular proposals. And I guess how I would -- how I approached that was I would first go to neighborhoods, reach out to the principals involved in whatever proposal I was bringing to them, and the parent leaders, to start the conversation. Now, usually, I was bringing a proposal that was something we had to do. So it wasn't like I was going to these communities to say we don't have to do this. I was -- I just, I needed input and I was welcoming the input that we

got to make the proposal better.

Our neighborhoods, as I said, were very diverse. And there's ways that you can appreciate that difference and show them that you appreciate it that I think were well received. For example, when I went out to present in neighborhoods where there was a language issue, we would bring a translator to the meetings. We also had headsets that community people would wear and they would get direct translation as I was presenting something. We -- you know, and I think that was a very good symbol of us showing that we appreciate their input, that we're giving these services so that we get the input from them and they understand what we're saying.

We would also do things, like we would hold our meetings after work. We would offer childcare because we wanted people to come to these meetings and we understand that people have other things going on in their lives that make it hard, especially in the more marginal communities where they're working. So there's no point in having a meeting in the afternoon because these people are working, so we'd have our meetings in the evening. They have families. Well, we want to make them

feel comfortable, so we'd offer childcare.

So I think those were ways where we would go out of our way to show we appreciate what's going on in your community and here are ways we are manifesting that.

So I think, you know, sensitivity to the conditions of the community that you're impacting is an important thing to show.

I can give you a specific example. I won't go into -- I think I'm going to run out of time, though, different perspectives.

One of my jobs was, and it was the toughest job I had, really, there's a state proposition called Prop 39 which governs how you share -- how you give space to charter schools on district facilities. And there's a whole bunch of regulations about how you do that and it involves having to share a campus with two competing and different schools who have different philosophies and different perspectives.

And my role was kind of to be an arbiter, to try and weigh both demands to share the space, and to be relatively neutral, to appreciate both sides' perspectives and to come up with a proposal. Both sides might not get what they want completely.

1 It sounds rather mundane, but it would be things 2 like there's only one auditorium on a school site 3 and now you have two schools who both need to use 4 the auditorium. How do you solve that? Well, we 5 have to sit down together, listen to what their 6 needs are, what their wants are, and try and work 7 out a schedule that meets as many of those needs as 8 possible. And it's hard to do things like that 9 because they're both competing against each other.

So, you know, my job was to appreciate where they were both coming from and kind of be a bit Solomonic sometimes, having to split the baby to come up with a solution that, hopefully, worked as well as possible.

So I'll stop there.

MR. DAWSON: All right. Thank you, Mr.

17 MacPhail.

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

We will now go to Panel questions. Each

Panel member will have 20 minutes to ask his or her

questions.

MR. MACPHAIL: Okay.

MR. DAWSON: And we'll start with the

23 Chair.

Ms. Dickison?

25 CHAIR DICKISON: Good morning, Mr.

MacPhail.

MR. MACPHAIL: Good morning.

CHAIR DICKISON: Give me one minute.

MR. MACPHAIL: No problem. I'll take a drink of water.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. In your partiality essay, you talked about the ability to be impartial as essential and that no one is free of bias, that it's vital to be open to diverse opinions.

Tell us, what are your biases and how do you ensure that they won't influence your decisions if you were selected as a Commissioner?

MR. MACPHAIL: I think it's rather hard to identify your own biases. What does someone think of you? What do they think you're biased in?

You know, I have a certain educational background and (indiscernible). I'm an immigrant myself. I'm a member of the LGBT community, so I guess that would suggest certain opinions but (indiscernible) I don't. I would try very hard and I sincerely believe any part of that experience would not bias the work that I do. I mean, that's been my entire career, is to be a public servant, to listen to different opinions and apply the rules as best I can. And that's an approach I would

bring to the Commission.

I have a particular background and it's my personal background. But it would -- I really do believe it would not influence me one way or the other, beyond having, you know, a little bit of empathy. And I think any Commissioner could have empathy and understanding of perspectives from an immigrant community or the LGBT community. I just personally know some of the things that might be in their minds.

I, obviously, had a very straightforward experience with the Immigration and Naturalization Service when I became a citizen compared to other immigrant groups but I do have a personal understanding of why it might be hard to get immigrant communities to be involved in this process. They might have a certain trust issue about dealing with a large agency.

I had, as I said, I had a very easy process but it was, actually, scary as well. You know, there's parts in the immigration process where you could potentially be sent home. I went through a Green Card process which allowed me to work in this country. And there's a part of that process where, if you don't get through, your job

is out and you have to go home. So that, I mean, caused a small degree of anxiety for me. I got through the Green Card process but, you know, it gives me a little bit of an insight into why immigrant communities might be afraid of dealing with an agency or a public body asking them questions. So that's -- but I would not let that govern how I would draw a boundary.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

You answered some of my questions as we went, so let me take a look. I'm going to ask about -- some questions about when you were a technical lead on the redistricting for San Diego. You answered some of my questions. But if I ask something that you've answered, I apologize. You told us what your role entailed.

What -- did you happen to identify any communities of interest as part of that process that you didn't already know existed in your area?

MR. MACPHAIL: No, not really. The work that we did in that redrawing back in 2011, it was relatively minor. You know, we had had some population change but not a lot of population change. And we knew which districts we had to equalize, so we concentrated our work on the areas

around these -- those particular boundary lines that had to change.

And given we knew a lot about the student demographics of the area and we had a little bit of census data, as well, about the areas we were going to effect, we knew that, oh, well, we're going to go out to a significantly Hispanic community, so let's gear our presentation, as I was giving some examples of how we would make that outreach to a community with a language example [sic].

So we didn't uncover any unique unknown communities of interest. You know, the major groups were ethnic groups, such as Hispanic population. In my neighborhood where I live it's a significant LGBT core for the city. And there were some representations about keeping that community together. But, obviously, it was a known community and, you know, we worked through that and they were not split up.

But, no, I didn't find any unknown communities in the work.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

You talked about the public outreach already.

You also talked about trying to keep

communities of interest together and neighborhoods and things of that sort. So part of the regulation puts, in priorities, communities of interest, neighborhoods, cities, and counties.

How should the Commission deal with those if you have those groups that might be in conflict as far as determining which should --

MR. MACPHAIL: Right.

CHAIR DICKISON: -- take priority?

MR. MACPHAIL: Yeah. I watched the presentation you got when it went out with the consultant who talked about the redistricting rules when you -- when it was live. I should have gone back and watched in preparation for this. I seem to recall there were that list that you just mentioned. But I also remember him saying that there wasn't, maybe, a direct priority that you had to keep all the plates spinning at the same time. And I think he used that analogy of driving a car and keeping your foot on the accelerator and the brake and the headlights. You know, you have to try and keep everything going at the same time.

bit of a hierarchy in the sense that, first of all,

there is population size.

But, you know, I think there is a little

There are certain rules

about how big the districts would be.

I seem to recall, I wasn't 100 percent clear from your presentation, at least for the congressional districts, whether they had to be perfectly balanced or whether there was a degree of variance allowed.

You know, in the work that the Commission would do, if there is a degree of variance it may allow you to take into account from community perspective, can we stretch the boundary to include this particular community of interest or all of this particular city in Boundary A, and do we still stay within the variance that we're allowed to have for the variance? Can we meet that demand? And if we can't, we can't. If it throws the variance out of whack, then we cannot accommodates the interests.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

So with your degrees in geography, would a really strangely shaped district alarm you and, if so, why or why not?

MR. MACPHAIL: Right. I must admit, with my geography background, I do have an affinity for things being compact and not looking odd. And, you know, the classic gerrymander or garymander

(phonetic), as it's really pronounced, would have very strange looking fingers to pack or crack communities and we don't want that.

However, once again, going back to your presentation that you got, the consultant made the point that compactness isn't really the be-all and end-all of redistricting, that if you're keeping a community of interest together, that's maybe a bit more important than a classic circular or square boundary. You may have a slightly odd shape but you've achieved the goal of keeping a community of interest together.

I think you went through an example where there was a rather large peninsula to a particular district. And it was more -- it's more important to meet the needs of the people living in the district to keep communities of interest together, keep cities together, than it is to have a nice perfect grid of boundaries, although my training does chafe at that but I do understand. That's really the goal, is to get communities together.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

So in your analytics essay, you talked about the census data and how important it is but it's not always enough, that it's equally important

to have an understanding of the quality and limits of the data.

MR. MACPHAIL: Right.

CHAIR DICKISON: And you just talked a little bit about the current social distancing and concerns about maybe the quality of the data.

The other part of that is that California, most likely or it's estimated, that California is going to lose a congressional district --

MR. MACPHAIL: Yes.

CHAIR DICKISON: -- this time around.

MR. MACPHAIL: Yes.

CHAIR DICKISON: Matching that with the concerns over the current census and the data coming out, what kind of proposals would you go forward with, with the Commission, on how to deal with that --

MR. MACPHAIL: Yes.

CHAIR DICKISON: -- and put that together as a team?

MR. MACPHAIL: It's very, very worrying.

You know, you have -- the census is such a trusted source of information. And we're in a very strange territory right now. And I guess, you know, initially, we would just wait to see what the data

is from the census. I hope that people will/are responding. It's very easy. You know, I hope you've all done it. You would have gotten a very simple letter in the mail where you enter a code and you answer about five or six questions. It's really not that hard. But, obviously, people are very distracted right now, so that makes you worry about quality of the data.

The Census themselves, if they have concerns, you know, they are -- they have greater statistical minds than me, they would do some kind of adjusting. They will have, no doubt, formulas to make adjustments. And they would produce what they deem to be appropriate data for commissions across the country to use.

As I said, it does bring out trust issues. In this era, we're talking about politically-charged era, there's distrust out there about the government. And especially redistricting, you know, the federal government last year was making efforts to change how census data was even going to be enumerated. And that would engender some trust issues as well. And those things are really outside the control of the Commission. And, you know, all we can do is take the data, which would

be the same data being used across the country and use that to do our work. And we will probably acknowledge that maybe it's not perfect this time around but it's what we have and it's what we have to do.

And you mentioned the fact that we might well lose a congressional district. Given that the data may not be as perfect in the past, where you decide to lose that district, it could be a really challenging set of public meetings to explain that you're going to remove a particular legislative district in a particular part of our state.

But it would then be the job of the

Commission to explain, this is why we're doing it.

This is the data that we got. It looks like the -and I'm going to make this up, I don't want to

upset anyone -- it looks like Northern California

has had a population decline of X percent, whereas

Southern California has gone up by Y percent.

Therefore, Northern California, you're going to

lose a seat. And let's -- that's why we focused on

your area and this is what we've come up with. It

would be challenging but that's what the data would

drive us to do.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

MS. PELLMAN: We have six minutes, twenty-seven seconds remaining.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

Okay, let's see what else I have here.

So if you were selected as one of the first eight Commissioners, you would be tasked with selecting the next six. What would you be looking for in those six Commissioners?

MR. MACPHAIL: Right. Well, if my lucky lottery number came up and I was one of the eight, I guess, you know, I'm assuming the way it's done that way with eight and then six is you don't want to leave it completely to chance. You know, what would happen if the first eight balls that come out leave you with older White gentleman, like me? You don't want the Commission to look like me in its entirety. And that's why there's six balls left or six candidates left to pick from.

And I think, obviously, the first eight people out should look at, well, what are the eight of us like? What's our demographic composition? What's our geographic composition? What's our -- what do we bring to the table? We've got a data map nerd sitting at the table. You might have someone who's more into community outreach and has

a lot more experience than I do how to reach communities of interest and marginalize communities. You may have -- in fact, I did look, you have an awful lot of attorneys and consultants in your pool. You may have one or two of those, as well, but they may have particular viewpoints.

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

And then I think the questions that you would ask for the other six would be, what are we missing? Do we -- we're lacking in particular demographic characteristics. We need some more Northern Californians on the committee. We need more women on the committee. We're missing Asian representation. That has to be part of the conversation. Because by that point, everyone in your pile, they're all qualified, that's not the issue. At this point you're saying, what unique characteristics in the eight out of -- you've selected eight and there's a total of 60, so that's 52 -- we've got 52 people in three silos. You would each in each of those groups to see if you can round out the Commission to be more representative than maybe the first eight balls out of the hopper.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

Can I get a time check please?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. Three minutes, forty seconds.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. Thank you.

What would you like to see the Commission ultimately accomplish?

MR. MACPHAIL: I would like, obviously, the Commission to fulfill its primary duty of redrawing the boundaries based on the data. That's one thing. But also to do that with public support, community input, and an understanding from the communities that we work with that we have been open and transparent in doing that job. And maybe we didn't do everything that certain communities wanted us to do but we gave it a really good try and we tried to accommodate as many of the competing interests as possible, and the to convey that to the legislature, I imagine. That would be what I would want to accomplish.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

Okay, I don't have any further questions, so I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Belnap.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Good morning, Mr.

23 MacPhail.

MR. MACPHAIL: Good morning.

25 PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Thank you for being

with us. My first question is a little bit just history and timeline.

You came from Scotland to UCLA for a master's program in geography. Why did you pick UCLA?

MR. MACPHAIL: Well, it's interesting. My bachelor's degree was at University of Glasgow.

And our geography department had a little bit of a history in sending students out to the U.S. to do master's degrees. And in the past, before my year, the main pipeline took students to Miami University, Ohio. Lots and lots of us went out there.

The year I came up, the professors that we all worked with suggested that we try and cast our nets further afield. And I had a couple professors I was working with and they suggested I apply, actually, to four, I think, universities for master's in geography. And some of them had done graduate work or postdoctoral work in the U.S., so they had a good -- a fairly decent know of what geography departments in the U.S. were like and what their specialties were. So I was encouraged to apply to a rather diverse group. I applied to Penn State, University of Kentucky, University of

Tennessee -- in retrospect, I think I had a professor who liked the south -- and then UCLA.

And I sent out those applications and I think, first of all, I got one back from Tennessee offering me a fellowship and pay my fees. And I thought, oh, my gosh, I can't believe someone is going to do this for me. And the professor I worked with said, "Just wait. Let's see who else comes in." And the I got a similar offer from UCLA and he said, "Take that offer. That's where you want to go. That would be good for the interests that you have and it would be a good place to live too."

So that's kind of how I ended up at UCLA. I didn't have a huge knowledge of the university. You know, my only knowledge of L.A. was from TV back home, so it was a bit of a shot in the dark, but I'm glad I chose the school I chose.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: And you graduated from UCLA in 1988 --

MR. MACPHAIL: Yes.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: -- and began working for San Diego School District in 1996, so there's a gap there.

What were you doing in those, what, eight

years?

MR. MACPHAIL: Yes. Well, after I finished my master's in '88, I had an idea that I might want to go on to the PhD program in geography but I was kind of -- I'd had six years in a row of school. I'd done my four-year bachelor and my two-year master's and I thought, oh, I'm not sure if I want to now jump into PhD programs. And the professor I worked with was actually from New Zealand. He was an immigrant himself. He said, "You know, you're allowed to take a year off and work for a company in an allied area. And then why don't you do that and then if you want to come back, come back?"

So he put me in touch with a computer mapping company in San Diego. And I went down and I interviewed and they offered me a job. And within about two or three months of doing that, I said, "I'm enjoying this." I don't think I want to go back into academia. For a whole host of reasons I decided I didn't want to go back into academia. And I started working for a private computer mapping company, I mentioned it very briefly, I think, already. They sold a computer mapping program across the country, mainly to police

departments and to school districts. And my job
was to work particularly with school districts to
set up their data and to show them how to run
reports. And I traveled across the country doing
that, which was a great way to see the country and
to see different demographics and different
problems to solve. So I did that for a couple of
years.

One of my clients was Virginia Beach City
Public Schools. And I trained someone in how to do
that. Then he got a promotion. And he called me
and said, "Hey, would you like to do the job that
you trained me to do?" And it was a nice pay
raise. And I decided to do it and I drove across
the country, which was a terrific experience. I got
to see the entire country. I drove from San Diego
to Virginia Beach, Virginia and I worked there for
three years. And then I came back to San Diego and
I started -- I worked for the private company I'd
worked for previously for a year and a bit. And
one of our clients was San Diego Unified. And a
position came up there and I got the position of
demographer.

So that was the gap.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: So, obviously, you

stayed in California. Did that just work out or did you find yourself drawn back to California, trying to find positions here?

MR. MACPHAIL: Yeah. I mean, I'm very happy I did my three years in Virginia but even -- I did miss being in California. And when the opportunity came to go back, especially to San Diego, you know -- I've lived in San Diego longer than anywhere else -- I grabbed it because I really enjoyed my time in San Diego. It's -- you know, the city is just the perfect size, there's a lot of diversity, but it's not L.A. It's not a huge city to get across. So, yes, I was interested in coming back.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: So do you believe your training in geography and your work as a demographer has prepared you to exercise impartiality on the Commission? And, if yes, how so?

MR. MACPHAIL: Right. Well, I think, hopefully, what I've conveyed so far is, yes, my interests and training and passion is in numbers and maps. And, you know, you can be very impartial and just say, "Well, the numbers work out this way and this is how we're going to draw the boundary."

So that's one level of impartiality.

But I think the work I did and the experience I gained in my 20-plus years in San Diego Unified also caused me to appreciate the other side of the coin, the more qualitative side of the coin where you might come up with something in your ivory castle and your data and your numbers but you've got to go out into the real world to see what people think about that. And you will be surprised and pleasantly surprised that there are other perspectives out there that can make your proposal better.

So, you know, I learned that have a particular opinion and I can come up with a proposal but you need that second part of the process, the community input, to make your proposal better.

So it's important not to hold on to your proposal, to be biased in favor of the proposal that you come up with, but to wait for others to weigh in and hopefully make that proposal better. So I think that would show my impartiality.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: I'm interested in what you just said. And I'd like you to provide an example where the qualitative perspective made your

quantitative work --

MR. MACPHAIL: Right.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: -- made your analysis better.

MR. MACPHAIL: I think probably the best example of that, and it was a very tough time for the school district, was around 2009, 2010, just after the big recession, the last big recession, you know, the district was in some financial hardship. And we were doing things like we were selling excess property just to keep the door open. The leadership asked us, the senior management team, to look into potentially closing schools. And that's, obviously, a hugely emotional issue for neighborhoods and people.

But what we had to do first was to look at the data. We had a whole bunch of people around the table. I had the demographic data. There were people who ran the school programs. Like how do you -- how would you supply particular Special Ed programs if we close school X? How would do transportation to get people from the school that we're closing to maybe where they would end up? So you had, you know, a bunch of quantitative data that each of us were bringing to the table.

What was the size of the schools? We were obviously looking at small schools, schools that had lost a lot of enrollment, had excess capacity. And then did they have schools next door where we could maybe accommodate everyone? We'd have to redraw attendance boundaries to shift people from a closed school to the schools around them.

So that was the sort of quantitative data that was being brought to the table, the senior management team, from which we would look at the different interests that we all had or our expertise, come up with a list of -- I think we had about ten schools on our list that we thought these, from our data, are potential candidates that we could close.

Then we had the challenging exercise of going out to those communities to start the conversation about, as you know, we're in financial problems and we have looked at the data for your cluster, it's a feeder pattern, you know, like elementary, middle, high school group. We've looked at the patterns for your cluster and we think we can close your school and send you to schools A, B, C and D around. And we think we can do it in this particular manner. You know, that

was never going to be a conversation that people would say, "Oh, yeah, that's great. That's a great idea. Thank you very much for letting us know."

It's always going to be a very emotionally charged meeting.

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 going out to the communities with that tough news, you would get input from them saying, "Yeah, I get what you're saying and, yeah, I want to keep my school open, but here's why? Did you take into account the fact that we -- it's five miles to the next school? that's a real challenge for our community because most of us are poor people who don't have access to cars. You know, the public transportation in San Diego is not that great. Did you take into account how hard it would be for us to get to the neighboring school that you're going to send us to or did you -- how are you going to accommodate our preschool at the new school? Do you have enough room to do that? What about this particular program?" And they'd come up with a whole bunch of issues, some of which we had already considered, others which we hadn't.

And, you know, we would go back after these meetings with -- take the arrows out of our

1 back and then look at, okay, you know, they brought 2 up a valid point. We did not consider the 3 difficulty of getting to the new school. Can we 4 change our proposal in light of that? And we ended 5 up reducing that list to a much smaller number. 6 And then it went to the school board and, although 7 we had problems, the school board was really not 8 keen on closing schools because it's, politically, a terrible thing to do, especially if you're up for 9 10 reelection. So I think we ended up maybe getting 11 one school closed after an awful lot of painful 12 public outreach. 13 But going out does give you different 14 perspectives that you don't think of with your 15 quantitative data.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

I don't have any further questions at this time.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you, Mr. Belnap.

Mr. Coe, the time is yours.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Good morning again, Mr. MacPhail. Thank

23 you for taking the time to speak with us today.

MR. MACPHAIL: Good morning.

PANEL MEMBER COE: So in your application

and in what you've said today, you mentioned that you're an immigrant from Scotland. And I'm wondering if you can tell us about your experience as an immigrant to this country and how you think that perspective could be beneficial to the work of this Commission?

MR. MACPHAIL: Well, I think, you know, it does give you a little bit -- I mean, my immigrant experience, as I've already said, is a relatively mild immigrant experience, obviously in terms of culture, of language. There's a lot I have in common with the dominant culture of this country. So the transition I made is not as traumatic. And the reasons for my move here are not dramatic either. I was very, very fortunate. I came here willingly. I wasn't leaving conflict or any horrible situations to come to this country.

And -- but it does give me a little bit of a perspective, and I'm not trumpeting it, but I am -- although I've lived here now for 34 years, 60-plus percent of my life now has been in the U.S., you know, I'm still an outsider to a degree, so it give me a little bit of an outside perspective on the country. And I think that's useful sometimes to just be able to take a step back and not be

completely in the culture, that you have a slightly different perspective that you can bring to the table.

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

It does give me a little bit of perspective, I think I said it earlier on, that, you know, as I said, my immigrant experience was very mild and very simple. But I think it does make me understand why, and this is useful for the work of the Commission, why it might be hard to get input from immigrant communities because there is sometimes fear, distrust, worry about interacting with a government agency. I mentioned, you know, I dealt with what was then called the Immigration and Naturalization Service. And as an English-speaker, it was still a very scary process. So I think I have that little bit of understanding where immigrant communities might have those concerns coming from, very mildly, but I think it does give me a little bit of a perspective.

PANEL MEMBER COE: So that leads me into a question I had that I was going to ask a little later but you thread into it quite nicely.

The idea of communities of interest in the state and in the identification of those is a huge task in front of this Commission. But as you

touched on, some communities are concerned or nervous about coming forward to government bodies to provide perspectives. And there could be a number of reasons for that concern.

But since their perspective is so vitally important, as you alluded to, to the work here, how can the Commission actually make them feel comfortable coming forward to share that perspective?

MR. MACPHAIL: Yeah. Oh, that's a very, very challenging question to answer.

I think one expression would be, what does our Commission look like? Will there be people on the Commission who have a much more direct link than I do to the particular communities that we're talking about who do have that trust issue? They can, hopefully, see that we're a Commission of citizens. We're not a Commission of politicians, we're not law enforcement, we're not taking people's names or addresses or any -- we're not recording that sort of level of information, and that we're really interested in getting people's opinions.

I mentioned, you know, also in terms of immigrant communities with language issues.

They're not issues, just different languages. You need to be able to talk to those communities in their language and you can show that you're interested in hearing their perspectives. You know, at the school district level, I don't know if that's possible with the Commission when you're going out to communities.

One way to demonstrate that we're interested and we value their input is to have translators there. I mean, that just sounds pretty mundane. I just don't know what resources the Commission has to do things like that but I think that's vital. You've got to be able to have -- give people that comfort level that what they say is important. And if they say it in another language, that's okay too. We we've got to get that input from them.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

Staying on the topic of communities of interest for a moment, it's -- some of those communities are -- they're engaged, they're easy to identify. They will willingly come forward and give you that information. Some are less so, maybe for reasons that we already talked about, but maybe there are other groups that aren't necessarily tied

by immigration that are less obvious and harder to identify.

So how, as a Commissioner, would you suggest that the Commission go about identifying communities of interest all across the state -
MR. MACPHAIL: Yeah.

PANEL MEMBER COE: -- and avoid kind of inadvertently missing some that are harder to identify?

MR. MACPHAIL: I think a couple of ways. First of all, depending on what the Commission looks like, and, obviously, with 14 people, you're not going to hit every community or every corner of the state, however, there might be someone on the Commission who knows that particular area. And they can say, oh, "We've got to get in touch with this particular community that's very important in our area. It's not one that might bubble to top of the list, like, you know, maybe there, I think, in some of the rural parts of the state.

I've been up to Modoc County many years ago and it's a very different experience from what I'm used to in Southern California. But I seem to remember in the inland, older parts of our state, there's like a small Basque community. There's

different levels, different communities out there. And if we have someone on the Commission who could say, "Hey, don't forget to engage the Basque community." How do we do that? Well, maybe there's a community newspaper or a church or something like that. You might want to contact city agencies or your (indiscernible) or through their web page.

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

And in the example of San Diego, we have defined community planning areas. And there's a pretty elaborate website where you can zoom into North Park, which is my particular neighborhood in San Diego, and there's a lot of information about what's going on in North Park. What are the different groups that you might want -- who are civicminded community groups versus like (indiscernible) either by directly contacting cities or governments? That might be a good starting point to make sure, okay, we're going to be redrawing the boundaries in your area. This is what the data looks like. What major community (indiscernible) do you work with in your daily work that we should be talking to? Maybe TV stations in different languages. Contacting local agencies or cities might help you drill down to those

communities that might otherwise be missed.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay. Thank you.

In some of your discussion today and in your essays you talk about the opportunities you've had to interact with or work with people of diverse backgrounds. And I'm wondering if you can tell us a little bit about what you've learned from these people, their perspectives, their concerns, their preferences that would make you an effective representative for them on this Commission?

MR. MACPHAIL: Right. I would just, I would go back to the fact that San Diego Unified School District, where I spent most of my career, incredibly diverse district (indiscernible). Very different and diverse parts of (indiscernible).

It was the first time I had any direct experience of Somali. There's a major Somali community in San Diego Unified that I had no perspective on whatsoever. And there's actually a charger school that caters predominantly to Somali people. And in my work with Prop 39, which I mentioned earlier on, I, for the first time, learned how you deal with a very different community that have different customs, and even down to things like you do not shake the hand of

the female people on the school team, that's just a taboo. You learn things like that. So you do learn those different cultural traits in a district as diverse as San Diego Unified.

I can't remember the -- do you want to repeat your question? I'm not sure if I've answered it completely. But the experience I had was to going out to very different communities. You start to learn their customs and cultures. And I think that makes your likelihood of you coming up with an all-around proposal that much better if you can engage with them and understand where they're coming from.

PANEL MEMBER COE: I have a similar question but more geared towards different areas in the state. And you mentioned having gone to Modoc County. And I'm curious if you can tell us a little bit about your experiences in other regions of California, what you've learned about the people in those regions, their preferences, their concerns that could be different by geography --

MR. MACPHAIL: Right.

PANEL MEMBER COE: -- and what you've learned from those people in different parts of the state that would make you an effective

representative for them on this Commission?

MR. MACPHAIL: I would say, you know, the Modoc example was the most radically different community I've been to. You know, most of my life has been in Southern California, the coast. Most of the people and friends I know are on a coastal urban environment. That's, you know, that's — there's no way around it, that's what I know. Visiting Modoc and working with people, I was up there for a whole week, really opened my eyes to a very different California. You know, obviously, predominantly agrarian, different politically, different concerns. That was very useful to give me another insight into the huge diversity of the state.

I haven't done a lot of -- you know, obviously, working for a school district, you're going to be stuck in your school district. You know, I've traveled for pleasure in other parts of the state but I haven't had, you know, a direct community outreach-type experience with other parts of the state.

But, you know, I mentioned, I think, in my application, it was fun to be in Modoc because it did remind me, in some aspects, of my home part of

the country, back home in Scotland. I come from
the far north of Scotland, which is very rural,
very sparsely populated. Go back a couple of
generations to my family and we're, you know, we're
poor crofters, which is a small farm, tenant
farmers, so I, you know, I have that background in
my own life. And a lot of my career is, obviously,
not (indiscernible) different but some similarities
to remember my own life. It was very useful.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay. Thank you.

So I want to talk a little bit about your educational background and your professional background in geography and your work experience, specifically with GIS software and analyzing data spatially.

Since you have, obviously, a lot of experience and expertise with this, how would you work with your fellow Commissioners, and perhaps members of the public even, who may not be as technically savvy with such data and tools?

MR. MACPHAIL: Right. This was something
I had to do a lot in my work for the school
district. I was going out to communities that
weren't GIS experts, that weren't population
experts. And the great thing about a GIS is it can

be interactive and live, so you can talk -- you can show people what you're talking about.

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

In our particular case in (indiscernible) maybe try to expand it to the Commission statewide. You know, we had student data that was in the computer mapping system so that you had individual dots representing our students and where they lived and you could show. And it was always a crowd pleaser that they got -- they understood what GIS is all about (indiscernible) without identifying anybody (indiscernible) the students in a particular neighborhood. Here are all the students in North Park. And you could then say show me all the second grade African American students who live in North Park and then little red dots would appear. And you could draw, you could show interactively and live, just draw, electronically, a boundary and it would -- you could show the people, okay, I've just identified 15 African American second grade kids in this area.

So one way to explain GIS, I think, to people is to show it live to show the power of it. What's the data in there? And also, as I said, it also gives people, I think, a trust level that this is real data. This is not black box stuff.

The presentation that you got from the GIS expert in your training showed you how moving, I think it was census tracts, or maybe blocs or bloc groups, I think, were being moved, what was the impact of that? That it would instantly show you the starting district has 1,000 people in it. What about we add in these six census tracts so that we're keeping a community of interest together? Well, that's going to increase the population to 2,000. And now look at how the composition has changed.

I think showing the public live how things change will, hopefully, engender some confidence and trust in what you're doing and I think that's useful.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

MS. PELLMAN: You have five minutes remaining.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you, Madam Secretary.

Mr. MacPhail, I just have one final question for you. If you were to be appointed to the Commission, I think I know the answer to the first part here, but which aspects of that role do you think that you would enjoy the most and,

conversely, which aspects of that role do you think you might perhaps struggle with a little bit?

MR. MACPHAIL: Well, I think I might like the mapping part of this job. You may have detected that from the answers so far. I love it. You know, since I was kid, I loved maps. And I would love -- you know, I don't quite know how the Commission will organize itself but I think I've heard in the past that maybe they had subgroups. And I would fight to be on that, on the subgroup that works with the consultant to redraw the boundaries because I have a real passion and interest in that.

You know, I don't think I really would loathe or be worried about any particular aspect of the job of the Commission. As I've mentioned before, going out to public meetings can be challenging at times, they can be very tense, but I've done it. Would I say it's my favorite thing? Probably not, especially if it's going to be a really controversial issue. You know, it's no fun going out to communities and telling them, we're going to close your school. That's hard but it's part of the job and I understand that.

I think that our public outreach that we

would be doing would, hopefully, not be that emotionally charged. I mean, if we're losing a congressional district, then it could become emotionally changed. But I don't think I have a lot of fear of that because that's how the census data crumbles. If we lose population and other parts of the country gain population, there's only going to be 435 congressional seats, some are — and it's not going to increase. And if it means we lose one, so be it.

And we have to then go to communities in California and say the National Census has worked out in such a way that we're going to lose a seat. So our mission is to look at how we can redraw things to lose that seat. Sorry, that's where we are. Let's make the best of it. I wouldn't enjoy that but I understand that's part of the job and I'd be comfortable doing it.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay. Thank you.

No further questions at this time, Madam
Chair.

MR. MACPHAIL: Thank you.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you, Mr. Coe.

I'm going to turn the time now over to Mr.

25 Dawson.

1 MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you once again for being here, Mr.

MacPhail. I wanted to follow up, just where you
were going with Mr. Coe, thinking back to your
answer on, I don't remember which of the standard
questions, but we talked about the impact that the
COVID-19 situation has on the collection of census
data. Now, obviously, some groups are going to be
more disproportionately affected. Traditionally,
it's been immigrant -- recent immigrant groups and

MR. MACPHAIL: Yeah.

MR. DAWSON: -- you know, folks like that, marginalized communities.

MR. MACPHAIL: Yes.

the homeless and --

MR. DAWSON: And these effects are not evenly spread across the state or across the country.

Is it possible or does it give you any concern that California might miss even more folks than, let's say, Tennessee or Kentucky because --

MR. MACPHAIL: Right.

MR. DAWSON: -- we have more immigrants, we have more homeless folks?

MR. MACPHAIL: Yeah. I think that is a

very valid concern. Our particular demographics probably lend themselves to missing communities that could severely impact us and maybe even cause us to lose two seats, who knows? That is -- that's a huge concern. Are there other parts of the country more monoethnic, more -- you know, less in migration, not so much mobility. All those factors are at large in California, obviously. And I think it would lend itself to be, potentially, a problem.

As you said, it's always a problem. Every census, counting the homeless is a big problem. In our city, you know, we -- there's a day every year where they do an informal homeless census. People, politicians, go out onto the streets to count homeless people. And, you know, the census itself, in normal times, I was mentioning how I know some people who wanted to be enumerators. And they were all set to do their training and training is on hold and I have no idea what that means or how they're going to do their job after this.

We're still in lockdown. I think I just saw a news report today. They're saying it's pretty likely we'll be in a lockdown in May, as well, and they might not even get into June. And

how do you go out, even just to knock the doors of, quote unquote, "regular folk," to make sure that they've sent in their census form, let alone homeless people? It's a huge concern and I think it would impact significantly more than other places.

Would the Census Bureau make some kind of statistical adjustment if, you know, if things are really badly off? I'm not an expert on the census so I don't know but I'm sure I know that they do make statistical adjustments. But if you're making significant statistical adjustments, more than you've done in the past, that does lend credibility issues to the data that some people might challenge but it might be necessary. This is a very unique year and it may, unfortunately, be necessary to do things like that.

MR. DAWSON: So given your technical expertise, assuming that you were chosen on the Commission, is that something that you could help your fellow Commissioner understand and also, maybe, the public understand how this statistical truing up works?

MR. MACPHAIL: Yeah, you know, I'm not a statistician. I wouldn't know -- I wouldn't be

able to go into the guts too much of what the census is doing. But, you know, I think my background in presenting demographic concepts to communities that are not familiar with them would be useful in explaining data problems and how we've ended up with the data that we have. I think that would be something I could make a good run at with my own -- with fellow Commissioners and then with the community at large, yes.

MR. DAWSON: Okay. Thank you.

When you were describing your work during public meetings for the SDUSD redistricting, how many of those meetings did you do?

MR. MACPHAIL: We had a total of, I think it was three public meetings. I mentioned early on that -- (coughs) excuse me -- that the changes were not dramatic. There had not been huge population shifts, so we only had to change, in a relatively minor way, four of the five district boundaries. So I think we had three public meetings. We had some internal meetings at first with the committee, just to do some basic scenarios, so that then we could go out to the communities to show, first of all, as I mentioned, why are we doing this? And here's some initial ideas that we've had. What do

you think about those ideas? And then gather the input.

So I think we had three of those meetings and we got input about -- you know, someone asked us at the community meeting, "Why can't you just draw our trustee boundaries to correspond to our high school future patterns? Why can't we have University City High and Claremont High as one of the trustee districts?" I'm just making up ideas there. And what you could do, as I mentioned, the beauty of GIS is that, okay, if we used our high school cluster boundaries to draw five districts, this is what you get. And we were able to show people, you'd be way out of whack in terms of the variance because some of our high school clusters are very densely populated and others are not so densely populated.

So you could -- it was a perfectly valid perspective to have and a very sensible perspective to have. Wouldn't it be good if your school board member was responsible for a particular group of schools altogether? That would be the ideal but the population distribution doesn't work that way and you were able to show that line.

So we, you know, we had, I think, about

three meetings where we were able to do those sorts of inputs.

MR. DAWSON: So I'm just curious how many residents are in SDUSD? And does that compare to an assembly district or a congressional district?

MR. MACPHAIL: Well, the -- I'm more

familiar with the student population than the total population of San Diego Unified because I -- that was what my data was. I was always working with the student data. As I mentioned, there's approximately, or there was, approximately 130,000 students in San Diego Unified. San Diego Unified does not correspond perfectly to the City of San Diego. It's smaller than the City of San

MR. DAWSON: So I appreciate your perspective of doing these public meetings. But now we're talking about, on the Commission, hundreds of cities, thousands of communities.

MR. MACPHAIL: Yes.

Diego. So it's a big diverse district.

MR. DAWSON: Is this scalable?

MR. MACPHAIL: Well, that --

MR. DAWSON: And, if so, how would you get

24 your arms around that?

MR. MACPHAIL: Right. I mean, that's

something I've thought about. You cannot do the kind of very intimate outreach that I was able to do in even a big school district, like San Diego Unified. I'm not clear on how -- you know, what's the budget of the Commission to go out and do public outreach? And what are the resources at our disposal? Do we have to -- do we get to hire or can we use state resources in terms of community relations, ways of reaching out to communities? Dο they have lists that we can use to identify communities to go to? Do we hire someone to do that? I don't know what our staffing budget is. know that we'd be hiring a GIS person but I'm unclear as to what our staffing resources would be. They're not going to be big, obviously. They're not going to be big enough to do the intimate level of meetings I've suggested.

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

I would probably -- I would really like, and I actually emailed, I think, your group asking, was there exit interview report with the previous Commission? Did they identify things that they wished they could have done differently? I think that would be tremendously useful to the new Commission. And what sort of community outreach did they do? How many meetings did they have? How

interactive was it? You know, I wish I could see how they did it because it would really inform the sort of answer I can give you about what scale we have to do those sorts of outreach.

MR. DAWSON: All right. Thank you.

So we talked a bit about your perspective as a geographer. We talked a bit about your perspective as an immigrant to the state and this country.

So my question then to you is about your identity as a San Diegan and what perspective from that part of the state the Commission could benefit from?

MS. PELLMAN: Time check. We have four minutes, fifteen seconds of the ninety minutes remaining.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

MR. MACPHAIL: Well, you know, I know, obviously, as I said before, a 14-member Commission is not going to be able to fully represent every aspect of this huge state.

Having said that, you know, San Diego is the, yeah, it's the second largest city in the state. And I think it would be important to have that sort of representation there.

```
1
            I think what San Diego brings to the table
2
   is that it's a good size city. It has diversity
3
   within it. And I think that's an important thing
4
   to bring to the Commission.
5
   It's -- I mean, I guess L.A. does as well. But
6
   there's a lot of things in microcosm within San
7
   Diego County in particular, not so much the city,
8
   that the county in microcosm is a lot like the
9
   state. The eastern part of San Diego County is
10
   like the interior parts of the state.
11
   beautiful out there. We have desert. We have
   farming communities in the eastern part of the
12
13
   state. Then we have diverse communities in the
14
   urban western parts of the state.
15
            So, you know, I think it might -- more
16
   than L.A. County, I think we're more of a microcosm
17
   for the state, so we should have some
18
   representation on the Commission.
19
           MR. DAWSON: Thank you. I have no further
20
   follow-ups.
21
            If any of the Panel members have any
22
   further?
```

CHAIR DICKISON: I do not have any follow-

23

24

25

ups.

Mr. Belnap?

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: I do not either.

2 CHAIR DICKISON: Mr. Coe?

PANEL MEMBER COE: No follow-up questions.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Madam Secretary, how much time is left?

MS. PELLMAN: Two minutes, twenty-five seconds.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Mr. MacPhail, with the time remaining, I would like to offer you the opportunity to make a closing statement to the Panel, if you wish.

MR. MACPHAIL: Well, I guess first of all, I'd like to thank you all for working in these really hard times to keep the process going. And I hope you're all doing okay in these strange times. You know, we're all dealing with it in our own ways. My niece had the coronavirus and she's doing okay. She works for the National Health Service back home but she's over the worst, so I hope everyone is doing okay.

So that's all I'll say.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. Thank you. Thank you for speaking with us today.

Our next interview is at 1:15, so we will recess now until 1:14.

(Thereupon the Panel recessed at 12:13 p.m.) 1:14 p.m. CHAIR DICKISON: Okay, calling the Applicant Review Panel meeting back to order. I'd like to welcome Ms. Debora Gloria for her interview. Good afternoon, Ms. Gloria. MS. GLORIA: Good afternoon. CHAIR DICKISON: We're going to turn it right over to Mr. Chris Dawson to read you the five standard questions.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Ms. Gloria, I'm going to ask you five standard questions that the Applicant Review Panel has requested each applicant respond to. Are you ready?

MS. GLORIA: 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?

MS. GLORIA: Well, first of all, I wanted to say thank you for including me. It's been an honor to be selected to be interviewed because I feel that the Commission has an important role to play in maintaining democracy.

The Commission's role to draw four district maps within a year seems to me like a huge challenge. Not only is there a lot to consider in a short amount of time but the public needs to have confidence in the Commission's decisions in order for the Commission to maintain its credibility and

its longevity.

So collectively the Commission needs to have public skills that it has to represent itself to the public, and then skills from within the group. Public skills would be its ability to project credibility. And that would mean that it would need to appear impartial and independent and have a sense of authority.

In the beginning, it would be a matter of having effective outreach, so the ability to communicate purpose, to welcome public input, and be clear about when and where the meetings take place. And then once those meetings take place it would be a matter of running effective meetings and helping the public feel confident about the Commission. That would include signaling listening during meetings, asking questions, repeating concerns of the public. And then, finally, to produce decisions that can be supported by fact, reason and legality, and then to communications are fair.

And then there are skills that the group as -- internally need to have and those would be more having to do with needing to work through tasks and issues. So things like cooperation,

respect, teamwork, a diversity of personalities and backgrounds to -- so that -- and the ability for each of the Commissioners to recognize each own -- their own and other strengths, and the necessity to have all voices to be heard and welcomed. So good communication among the Commissioners really needs to be encouraged for it to function as a whole.

So as for each of the Commissioners, for your part B of your question, each of the Commissioners I see as needing to have four different categories of skills and competencies, technical skills, analytical skills, communication skills, and practical skills.

For the technical skills, this would be for information gathering mostly. And it would be especially for comprehending legal principles, understanding the law, comprehending the data and the technical writing that comes with it, and then understanding statistical information.

The analytical skills involve individual judgment, understanding, and impartiality. And those include critical listening, knowing how to distinguish facts from opinion, relevance, and knowing how to distinguish the relevance of facts and other information, prioritizing competing

arguments, evaluating the credibility of those arguments, and recognizing the importance of legal standards.

Then there's also the ability to resolve complex problems, to evaluate ambiguities that might be involved in those problems. But, also, it's really important for each of the Commissioners to understand their personal bias in order to make these judgments.

As far as the communication skills go, this is really important for group decision making. I feel that empathetic listening to understand each other's points of view and the points of view of the public is really important because it helps you — it helps the Commissioners see things beyond their own vision.

And then the ability to discuss and negotiate and clearly articulate each of their thoughts and reasoning, either through writing or discussion, and not to be afraid to state their opinions and to hear others, so the ability to be open. And that would also include encouraging other people's points of view to promote discussion.

And then the practical skills would be

things like organization and timeliness, the ability to meet schedules, and to, for organization, to maintain the clarity of tasks and information.

So these are four categories I think the different Commissioners should have. But I think there's going to be different strengths and skills that each of the Commissioners bring to the table which is really important for seeing the issues that will be faced in different lights.

So as far as my skills are concerned, I feel like I'm a really good listener. As my work as an architect, I -- my work includes listening to clients every day to get to their goals and to even uncover goals that they didn't realize that they had. And then using -- getting those goals and then using my analytical skills to assess whether the designs that we come up with meet the constraints of those goals or meet the constraints of the Building Code. And so there's going to -- so it requires looking at competing priorities to meet the final needs of the client.

And all of this requires good communication skills. And the communication skills are needed to help us resolve issues in a timely

way so that we communicate early and well so that people understand issues. And then collaborating with others, working with my project teams and knowing their capabilities. And within that there is a sense of impartiality that I must bring to each project because I want to do what's best for the project. And sometimes the solutions that we arrive at may not be my favorite choices but they meet the client's needs and maybe the needs of the Building Code and the city really well, so impartiality is -- comes into play.

So each Commissioner will have his or her own strength and skills. And each is needed to provide a perspective for effective problem solving. But they also need to at least have good technical, analytical, practical, and communication skills. And I feel that this will support the Commission's effectiveness within itself as a group and as a face to the public.

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

and even in our own families.

What characteristics do you possess and what characteristics should your fellow

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

MS. GLORIA: I think the characteristics to protect against hyper-partisanship first start with a willingness for introspection. For me, I use introspection to question my own assumptions and, too, just to make sure that I'm on the right track. And with that there needs to be a willingness for openness for diverse viewpoints because diverse viewpoints help me put my assumptions, again, into perspective. But it also gives me clues to why they might be right or wrong. It helps me see blind spots that I might have.

And then with that, the willingness to apply critical thinking versus jumping to conclusions, in other words, asking questions for clarification. And also asking questions to uncover possibilities.

So those are things that help to clarify

my position against others.

And then, with other points of view, empathy is needed to understand other points of view and then maybe find out the reasons for those viewpoints, because using empathy, you can see where solutions need to go beyond what you might think they might be.

And then the other -- one other attribute that we might be able to find from listening to others is that there might be unstated goals.

Sometimes figuring out goals are not -- it's not a clear path and so they're not always articulated.

And it's always good to have an open mind that we'll -- that we need to find the true goals of people when they -- because they might be able to -- might not be able to articulate all their needs, their fears and their hopes. So flexibility of thought, basically, is important to avoid hyperpartisanship because rigidity locks us in and keeps us from seeing a broader picture.

So in order to avoid that, I feel like the first step is to be aware of our own biases and how they affect our judgment. Communicating, listening, is a way to project this, project an impartiality, communicate listening, communicate

openness, welcome comments to the public at public hearings, and in written documents by reiterating what was said and asking questions, and avoiding showing personal preferences and pitting one side against the other.

There has to be a striving to be aware of winning versus problem solving, so that winning doesn't become the goal but problem solving does, and that requires compromise.

So -- and then also try to resolve conflicts rather than let them sit because conflicts only get worse with time. And being effective at resolving conflicts helps you move forward.

And then to strive to maintain a clarity of mission, remembering that the role of the Commission is to counteract hyper-partisanship. So keeping that in mind keeps you on the straight path.

I believe that communications from the Commission, both verbal and written, should have references based in fact and justified by the standards and the law, by standards of the law. And the facts and the law will be powerful tools for the Commission's impartial decision making.

So it seems to me that the best way to mitigate hyper-partisanship is to be aware of our own biases, to be open to others to fill in the gaps of our understanding, and to remember the goal of the Commission.

And for me to help the Commission protect its impartiality, it seems it's by demonstrating to the public that it has been heard and projecting openness. And then justifying decisions with facts and the law.

MR. DAWSON: Okay.

MS. PELLMAN: Quick time check. We have 15 minutes, 35 seconds remaining.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

MS. GLORIA: Thanks.

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

MS. GLORIA: For me, it seems the largest problem is finding the balance points among competing interests. I've heard it said that we could have a computer draw our district lines but the concerns of the public are part of the process. There could be instances where drawing lines might

end up being fair for one group and then unfair for another, so -- and the Commission won't be able to please everyone. So the goal that interest groups be kept in whole requires a delicate balance.

So how do we figure out what's fair when there's winners and losers? And are we meeting the intent of the law? Do we -- how do we justify the decisions? Do the facts hold up? Are our priorities right?

So although some groups might be louder than others, determining the districts will come down to the Commission's ability to apply the law, apply facts and a sense of fairness to its decisions. And I don't think there's every going to be right answers because those solutions may not please everyone.

On top of that, there's a timeline.

This -- we only have a year to create four maps.

So how do you move forward when there's a difficult problem? Our analytical skills will become important. And open honest discussion among members will be important. But then when it comes down to it, decision making is an art. What does that little voice in the back of your head say the right thing to do is and how to be impartial rather

than what we want the answers to be? So, finally, there will come a point when decisions need to be made and we just need to move forward.

So, for me, the most daunting problem is figuring out the solutions for gray areas in a really short amount of time. But I believe those decision will come down to a couple questions of intent of the law, and then can the decision be justified? And the Commission can answer these questions by applying the law, by applying the relevant facts, and evaluating the public's concerns. There's no right answers but at least the Commission can come close to the best solutions.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

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

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

experience to the Commission, if selected?

MS. GLORIA: Well, my work as an architect is all about teamwork. We work with the owner, contractor, consultants, and other designers, sometimes. And the goal is to make a building that meets the goals of the client and to meet the code requirements of the city and the state. The cities and state, the code requirements are usually safety oriented, but they also have to do with zoning issues dealing with the character of the community.

Recently, I worked on a project to add a second story to an existing garage. And we ran into an issue where there was a gray area with the building inspector. The walls of the garage needed to be reinforced to add the second story but, because of termite damage, a lot of the framing had to be replaced. So the contractor had left most of the old lumber but there was a lot of new lumber too. And when the walls are considered new the code says that they need to follow different requirements than existing walls for distances from the lot line.

So if the inspector says that the walls were new, then they would have to be rebuilt in a different location. Unfortunately, the code is

vague about what a new wall is. So when the inspector came out he kind of understood that.

But a little background here. There was a neighbor who wasn't really happy with the construction and who was always contacting the inspector about any issues that he thought was suspect. So the inspector was very careful to make sure all his approvals were well substantiated. So if there was a question of whether the walls were new or old, he wanted to err on the side of caution, but this had big consequences for the owner.

So at first he said that he thought that the walls were new. But the issue of whether the walls were new versus old presented a set of conflicting interests. The owner wanted the inspector to say that the walls were existing so they wouldn't have to pay to move the garage. The neighbor had an interest in saying that the walls were new, possibly to stop the project. The contractor wanted the walls to remain because it would slow his schedule. The building inspector wanted to be sure he could justify his decision to the neighbor and, possibly, in court if the neighbor had sued. And it was my job to

communicate with the owner, the contractor and the inspector to understand how to resolve the issues so that everyone would be comfortable with the decision.

And after a lot of back and forth, there were a lot of iterations of the solution with the inspector and the building department, the inspector finally called in his supervisor. And after the supervisor saw the garage, he determined that the code intent was met because the walls could not possibly have been reinforced safely without all the new lumber.

In addition, we had photos of the garage during construction and reports from other inspectors who had seen that the garage were maintained when they had checked other work on the site.

So in the end the supervisor deemed that the walls were existing.

But it became clear toward the end of the process that the main issue was to determine whether the intent of the code was met and how the building inspector could justify that the code was followed. The owner and the contractor were happy for obvious reasons. The inspector was comfortable

because he was able to justify his approval. And then the neighbor would accept the decision because there was documentation to support it. So we were able to find a solution that was acceptable to everyone.

So the lesson learned was that when an issue is unclear, resolution is a process. And sometimes it takes a lot of iterations of solutions and a lot of discussion among parties to get to the core of the problem.

And in this case there was a gray area that we had to go through with the inspector to find out what the core issue was and that, the core issue, was the intent of the code being met, and then how to resolve it so that the inspector was comfortable? What do we do to substantiate that?

I feel that the Commission will encounter a lot of unclear gray areas. It will need to utilize an iterative process that takes advantage of its diverse viewpoints to be able to see many angles. And so minimizing the blind spots will help the Commission make decisions that minimize imbalances. There's no right answers, as I said before, but the Commission can take measures to get a balanced answer.

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

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

MS. GLORIA: Well, as an architect, I work with people from many backgrounds. My clients have ranged from -- I've worked with companies that have clients that range from the upper one percent of the socioeconomic scale building mega mansions to blue collar workers in my own work, converting a patio to a living room, say, or doing a bathroom remodel. And coordinating -- but coordinating with clients, consultants and contractors, who have varying abilities, expertise, personalities and interests, is part of my job. So finding common ground is what I find gets the job done.

However, these experiences are all professional. But what's really given me perspective on various backgrounds is my own family.

I come from a middle-class family in L.A. suburb. I grew up in the '60s when the aerospace and aeronautical industry was a big economic driver in the region. My dad, who's from the Philippines, was an aeronautical engineer. And the kids I grew up with in school were from families whose fathers were engineers or were associated with the aeronautic industry in one way or another, so we all had a common background, ideals and goals. And I've pretty much lived in that environment most of my life.

But my mom is from Texas. And I said my dad was from the Philippines but I didn't see much of his relatives on that side, but we did visit my mom's family every summer when we were kids in the '60s and '70s. And my mom is from a small town called Laredo in south Texas where families are raised with a lot less education and income and mostly stay where they grew up. So when we visited them, I got to experience their lifestyle and what it's like to live in a border town with Mexico.

Back then the streets were still unpaved and it was a really small town. It's grown a bit since then.

And the town is still -- was and still is mostly

Mexican American with the majority of who are poor.

In the '60s and '70s the job opportunities were pretty limited. And my mom's family was pretty typical. My grandmother cleaned houses to support her family. My uncle worked maintaining the local water treatment plant. And my aunt, whose husband had died, had to rely on government assistance to raise her family. One uncle did own his own business and managed to earn a middle-income lifestyle but it was pretty modest.

So, as a result, my mom's family didn't have a lot of disposable income and college was out of reach for my cousins. So instead, they ended up focusing on their families and finding a decent job, which meant dealing with the dynamics of a close-knit community, and then just getting by. But even though my cousins weren't economically comfortable, they were, they are really good, happy people, I mean, generally speaking. They've shown me that how we treat each other is really important for a good quality of life and that a strong community helps them to be resilient.

Unfortunately, as my mom used to tell me, their community has experienced a lot of discrimination and that those in power don't really hear their voices. So, as a result, they're not very engaged in the political process.

And visiting them every summer reminded me how much luck and opportunity determines where we are. Sure, hard work is needed to get ahead, but opportunities need to be there and my cousins didn't have many.

So my hope is that the work of the Commission is to help address some of these inequities by helping us choose policymakers who hear us. I feel like the goal of the Commission is to make sure that all communities are properly and fairly heard and represented. This is one of the largest motivations for me to apply to be on the Commission. And it's also because I could have the opportunities to use my skills to serve the public in a way that impacts many.

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'll start with the Chair.

Ms. Dickison?

1 CHAIR DICKISON: Good afternoon, Ms.

2 Gloria.

MS. GLORIA: Good afternoon.

CHAIR DICKISON: So when I was looking at your application, I found it interesting. So you got a bachelor's in chemistry and biology?

MS. GLORIA: That's right.

CHAIR DICKISON: And then you were working as a staff research associate?

MS. GLORIA: Yes.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. And you were working on infectious diseases?

MS. GLORIA: Correct.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. In doing that work, did you do any mapping or any of that kind of work when you were doing -- when you were a researcher?

MS. GLORIA: No. I was mostly a technical person so that I wasn't heading the research, I was supporting those who were doing the research. So there were doctorates -- doctorate fellows in the labs that I was working in. And they would set the agenda and I would implement the protocols needed to gather the data.

So I did help gather data but I didn't do

any mapmaking or anything like that.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. Thank you.

And then you later went on to get a master's in architecture. Why the change?

MS. GLORIA: Well, you know, I have -- as we all do when we're younger, we have ideals of changing the world. And my ideals were to do research but I quickly realized, after I started doing research, that I wasn't really that interested in reading the papers. But I also had a real desire to apply my artistic skills and creative skills that were more visual and, for a while, I didn't really know how to do that.

But I took a while to figure out that, actually, architecture was a really good way of mixing the technical and the creative, artistic creative because I do have a bent toward the technical. I mean, I really enjoy understanding how things work. And architecture gives me that opportunity to understand how buildings work. And it's just a really generalized kind of profession that gives me a broad point of view.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. And then -- so in your work as an architect, you talked about working with ordinances or, you know, Building Codes or

whatnot.

MS. GLORIA: Correct.

CHAIR DICKISON: Does that give you a perspective on neighborhoods?

MS. GLORIA: Yes, actually, it does. Some of the ordinances are geared toward preserving historic neighborhoods. And I've presented in front of historic preservation committees before and each one of them is different. It's interesting to see how these committees, who are made up of the neighbors in the -- people who live in the neighborhood, how they each take on their own interpretation of how the historic preservation should occur.

So, for example, one person on the Commission might say, "You know, you have to put back the same fence that was there to begin with." Another one might say, "Well, no, it's not necessarily -- the fence was not necessarily historic, it just needs to be in the vein of what was there." So there's -- it's open to interpretation and it's a matter of figuring out what the -- what each organization or neighborhood organization wants as a priority.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay.

MS. GLORIA: So that's one way.

And then the other way is, you know, just even building around the city, you get a sense of what the different types of neighborhoods are within, at least, the Los Angeles area because it's so widespread that when you have clients in different areas, you get a good sense of where they are and what's going on in those areas.

CHAIR DICKISON: So with the skill set that you incorporate there, do you think you could translate that into the work of the Commission in trying to identify communities of interest and, if so, how?

MS. GLORIA: Yes, I do, because not only -- because I feel like working as an architect, I have the opportunity, actually, to speak with people from different neighborhoods.

And so in doing so I sort of like learn what their priorities are. Like people from the -- that I was working with original on these really mega mansion projects, they have a real distinct set of needs versus somebody who I work with, say in the San Fernando Valley, who has a much more modest lifestyle and then just wants to get like an office built for himself or herself.

So just the opportunity to having worked with people in various communities, I think I can translate that into figuring out how these special -- these interests that they might have can be grouped together.

CHAIR DICKISON: How do you -- so in the various regions of the state, obviously, they might have different needs.

How do you -- what things do you think would contribute to the needs of a community based on its geography and how might that translate into voter preferences?

MS. GLORIA: I see. Well, the northern part of the state is -- I mean, there's -- okay.

So there's various parts of the state that are more populous than others. And just generally speaking, I feel that the more populous parts of the state tend to have a much more, I don't know, I'd say, I guess I'd say a liberal kind of bent, rather than the more -- less populous parts of the state. And I'm not sure why that is but -- and that's a very generalized statement.

However, so in the state, in the parts of the state that are more agricultural, I think the agricultural industry is really -- has a vested

interest in keeping its business going. And so, because it relies on the water in the state and the land that's there, I feel that they will advocate for things that will help maintain their business there. So that would be in the central part of the state and just along the agricultural regions. So I think water is a big issue there.

And then in the -- in like the northern parts of the state where it's a lot less populated, they're much more isolated. And I think that there's probably a much more independent streak there where they don't want to be in a city situation, so they'll want to maintain that.

And then in the cities, there's a greater sense of diversity in the cities. And so I think there's a much more openness to diverse people and cultures because we're so used to living next to each other. And I think that there's an acceptance of each community being so close to each other.

So every part of the state is going to be different.

CHAIR DICKISON: So in your impartiality essay, you put something in here, "Usually the most effective way to resolve an issue is to avoid placing blame and get directly to the solutions."

MS. GLORIA: Um-hmm.

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

CHAIR DICKISON: What steps can the Commission take to build a team atmosphere that gets directly to solutions?

MS. GLORIA: I think that being -openness to points -- to everybody's points of view and to encourage that is really important to open communication. I feel like the more people express their -- the issues that they see and express the solutions that they might see the more the Commission, as a whole, can see a broader range of -- well, basically, just a broader view. I think that even sometimes there might be somebody who might have an opinion or a solution that the others -- that everybody else may not think is correct. But on exploring that, I think questioning, like I said, questioning your own assumptions, but then also questioning to be able to uncover possible solutions, is really important. So questions become a really important part of the Commission's communication.

So just gathering as much information and opinion as possible is really important in understanding the problem and then being able to negotiate and compromise to get to a solution.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

In your essay on diversity, you were talking about housing discrimination. And you said you feel that it's still with us but that, currently, it's probably more the ability -- it's more related to economic status or ethnic diversity -- or ethnic identity. I'm sorry.

MS. GLORIA: Um-hmm.

CHAIR DICKISON: With that in mind, how much do you think economic status will affect the drawing of the district lines?

MS. GLORIA: Oh, well, that's -- I mean, economic status and diversity are really closely tied, I feel, and because I feel like economic status has a lot to do with discrimination and the fact that, historically, people have been discriminated against, so the opportunities are just not always there. So in a sense, I feel like economic status is going to drive a lot of the lines for the districts because, just over time, people have -- you know, we haven't completely eliminated our discrimination.

So as much as we can try to keep people together as far as ethnicity or a culture goes, I think people of the same ethnicity and culture are

going to have a similar economic status.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

MS. PELLMAN: We have six minutes, five seconds remaining.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. Okay.

The way the regulation is set up, neighborhoods, cities, counties, and communities of interest are on the same priority level.

MS. GLORIA: Um-hmm.

CHAIR DICKISON: How should the Commission handle these areas in instance where they come in conflict with one another?

MS. GLORIA: Neighborhoods, communities, and what did you say?

CHAIR DICKISON: Cities and counties.

MS. GLORIA: Cities and Counties. And then you said communities of interest; correct?

CHAIR DICKISON: Yes.

MS. GLORIA: Well, since it is -- I
believe that three of the maps are for voting
district and the fourth one is for the Tax
Administration. So for the voting districts, I
would think that you would want to err on the side
of keeping communities of interest together or
whole so that you have a more -- so that that voice

could be a stronger voice, rather than splitting them up and splitting that voice up. I mean, so in a certain sense, the communities of interest are kind of vital to the voting, to the voice, the voting voice.

As far as the cities and neighborhoods and counties are concerned, I think there's -- there might a balance of sometimes you have to split up the interest groups so that the cities and counties can remain whole because of just logistical issues or even just the numbers, the population in each of those areas. So it would be a compromise that the Commissioner members would need to decide on.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

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

MS. GLORIA: Um-hmm.

CHAIR DICKISON: What qualities or qualifications or what -- I guess, what would you be looking for in those other six Commissioners if you were one of the first eight?

MS. GLORIA: I'd be looking for the qualifications of being able to handle the material that's presented before the Commission, like the

statistics, and understanding legal aspects.

But also, I think for me, what's really important is the ability to collaborate and have a sense of teamwork and, you know, being able to wear different hats and sort of like -- I mean, I guess what I'm trying to say is that in my work there's usually, like really, there's usually really distinct roles that each team member plays. But I think in the Commission what's going to happen is that the Commissioners are going to have similar roles but they're going to just have different skills. So we would have to be able to recognize each of our strengths and be able to work with others based on that.

So I think most of the applicants are probably really motivated and openminded people who want to fulfill the role of the Commission, which is impartiality. So I think that competence in the skills that you asked for as far as technical skills and analytical skills are something that I would look for.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

Can I get a time check?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. One minute, twenty-

25 five seconds.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. I don't have time for the final question.

MS. GLORIA: Okay.

4 CHAIR DICKISON: So I'm going to pass my 5 time.

And Mr. Belnap?

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Good afternoon, Ms. Gloria. Thank you for being with us.

MS. GLORIA: Good afternoon.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: So I'd like you to explain how an architect has to exercise impartiality?

MS. GLORIA: Okay. So when I speak with the clients about their projects, they set out their goals. And a lot of times, as we're looking through -- we're going through the designs of the project and we're going through the goals, I might see something that I feel is important for the design of the project, either aesthetically or function-wise, but that client might not feel is that important.

So when that happens, I try to understand the underlying goal that the client has that -- who -- that prioritizes what he feels is more important than what I'm thinking. And most of the time we're

able to come to an agreement that maybe his goals were more important and so I become impartial to -- in trying to complete the project with that goal in mind.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

Still on the issue of impartiality, can
you provide another example outside of your work as
an architect --

MS. GLORIA: Um-hmm.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: -- where you've had to set aside your personal beliefs to achieve a broader objective?

MS. GLORIA: Well, I'm trying to think of the times when I've worked in a group outside of work. And I think, for me and my family, I can say that I think -- well, okay, here's an example.

When my mom was -- my mom passed away a while ago but before she passed away she had an illness. And it became clear that the doctors -- she had ALS -- and so it became clear that the doctors where she was living weren't treating her very well because they saw that she had ALS and there's really no cure for it. So whenever she'd go in for a cold or something, they, you know, they just basically let the course of the cold go

whichever way it might, so the quality of her life was not taken care of.

Oregon. And there's a center there for the OHS,
Oregon State Health -- I can't remember -- OHSU is
a university that has a department that treats ALS
patients, and so she knew about this. And so it
was our task to get my mom over there to see those
doctors, so that she could have a better quality of
life.

Unfortunately, she didn't want to -- at first she was resistant on seeing those doctors but we had to convince her to, well, to go over there. And eventually it became clear that she needed to live with my sister, my mother, that she needed this help and that she was better off living over where my sister was and being taken care of by doctors there. But it was a big -- it was a big move for her.

So I guess I was part of the family who was trying to convince her to move. And it was just a matter of us explaining to her what the issues were with her health and what the -- and how those issues could be alleviated by making a change, so it was just making a big change.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

In your essay on appreciate for diversity, you described your travels throughout California where you pursued your interest in water infrastructure.

MS. GLORIA: Um-hmm.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Can you talk about an experience that you had in your travels that increased your understanding and appreciation for California's diversity?

MS. GLORIA: Yeah. Actually, there were a couple of instances on our travels.

The first one was my husband and I took a trip along the Colorado -- well, actually, along the aqueducts down into Mexico to get to the mouth of the Colorado River. And in so doing, we passed through the Imperial Valley, so we were just tracking where the water from the aqueducts goes, and into the fields. And so we got to a field and we were just looking at sort of like the pollution in the field because there was runoff from the fields that, I guess, has a lot of -- I'm not -- a lot of pollutants that make it foam up, so we were just looking at that. And there was -- and then we

thought we were by ourselves.

And then somebody drives up and says, "Well, isn't that interesting. There's a lot of foam in that water, huh?"

And so it turned out the person that we ended up talking to was a lawyer from the region and he represented, I guess, he represented farmworkers. So we ended up talking to him about the people who live around that area and what they were doing about the pollution from the fields and if there could be anything done?

So I got a sense of who was working in the farm fields, because we ended up going, actually, to a party, his birthday party that happened to be that day, and spent some time with his family. And they weren't unlike my cousins, actually.

And then the other incident was we were doing a Metropolitan Water District tour up north to see the San Joaquin Delta area. And we were looking at the delta region where there's been a lot of subsidence because of farming there. And so it was actually pretty amazing because the land level is way before the sea level, so it's kind of interesting to see that situation.

And then as we were looking around, one of

1 the farmers who had his land there yelled to us and 2 he said something like, "This is" -- you know, he made it clear that the farmers had a real interest 3 4 in keeping that land because it's been in their 5 family for a long time and that's their livelihood. 6 You know, they didn't want somebody taking that 7 away from them and, you know, because that's --8 it's what they do, I mean and I can completely 9 understand that because even though it's an 10 environmental problem, there's an issue with these 11 people's livelihoods. So that gave me a real 12 different perspective.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, again on the subject of appreciation for diversity, but getting away from your travels for a moment, can you provide a different example of a project where you worked with people from different backgrounds to achieve a broader objective?

MS. GLORIA: A broader objective? So you're asking me about a situation where -- I mean, because I can fall back on another architectural example, if you'd like.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: That would be fine,

as long as we're talking about the subject of appreciation for diversity and how an experience you had increased your understanding or appreciation for California's diversity.

MS. GLORIA: Oh, I see. Okay. Well, I mean, this is kind of a very localized project that I'm -- or situation that I'm thinking of because right now, I work in an architecture office, as well as doing freelance stuff. But one of our clients in the office is of Egyptian background. And he -- one of his goals, I mean, he wants to remodel his house. But one of his goals is to have a roof deck on his house. And we're sort of resisting it because the roof deck, where he wants to put it, is going to create a lot of water problems, probably, in the future. And so we need to be able to figure out a way to fix the -- you know, like prevent water problems in the future.

But then we took the project out for the contractors to place bids on them. And one of our contractors is of sort of like Middle Eastern origin from that region and so he explained to us that for our client, the roof deck is kind of like a really important cultural item because they -- it gives them the opportunity to see the city below

and to go out and be outside in the open air. And it becomes a social place to -- you know, a social gathering place.

So it put perspective into me the importance of the roof deck and how we really needed to keep that in the project.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

So I'd like you to compare and contrast the work and analysis that an architect does with the analysis that the Commissioner would do. So how is the analytical work of an architect similar to the analytical work of a Commissioner and, also, how are they different?

MS. GLORIA: Okay. Well, for architect, analyzing the goals of the -- okay, so there's a few things that the architect needs to analyze. The architect needs to analyze the goals of the client. They need -- he needs to analyze the site, the building site itself, and what the conditions are and what is possible to -- structurally because we work with a structural engineer to analyze what can be done structurally. And then we need to analyze what the Building Code is going to allow, not just for safety reasons but, also, for what the zoning -- the city zoning department needs.

And so taking those legal aspects, the physical aspects, and then the aspirations of the client and our aspirations together, we need to analyze all those things together in order to come up with solutions that meet all those goals.

And then for the Commission, I would think that the same sorts of aspects are being drawn in here because there are legal aspects that we would need to consider. And then there's the physical aspects of, you know, what -- where the populations are, what the city and county lines are. And then aspirational goals of how do we want to keep the communities of interest together and not disrupt that? So it's going to -- it's all those three different kinds of aspects that are very common to both.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: And then how are they different?

MS. GLORIA: In the case of architecture, things get built, and there's a concrete result. In the case of the Commission, it's you -- the results are not going to be known for a while. I think that the results will come out when voting takes place and people see the results of how the elections went and how well they -- the elections

tracked the communities of interest. And so it's sort of -- it's a much more abstract kind of a result and outcome.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: So in the Commissions work, lines will get drawn. And that's fairly concrete and sensitive that the lines will be on, at least, a map somewhere.

MS. GLORIA: Um-hmm.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: But what you're talking about is the end result of having good lines.

So tell me about that end result. What are you hoping that the Commission achieves by putting together these fairly drawn district lines?

MS. PELLMAN: Quick time check. We have four minutes, thirty seconds remaining.

MS. GLORIA: Okay.

Well, what I'm hoping is that -- first of all, I agree that the lines should be fairly regular, not irregular, as in gerrymandering. I would hope -- my hope for the lines would be that the most -- like for every region, that a diversity of people is represented and not just one point of view. I think that doing that gerrymandering, I would say, keeps politician -- or keeps the

powerful in place. And as a result, I think that over time, when society changes, politicians need to change, as well, and so do policies.

So allowing a diverse population within a boundary line would, I think, help keep policies more diverse and resilient.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

I have no further questions, Madam Chair. Thank you.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

Mr. Coe, the time is yours.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Good afternoon, Ms. Gloria. Thank you for taking the time to speak with us today.

MS. GLORIA: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

PANEL MEMBER COE: On your application, you discussed your volunteer efforts, including helping design and construct Habitat for Humanity Homes.

MS. GLORIA: Yeah.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Also, your membership with Toastmasters International.

How do you go about selecting the volunteer efforts you choose to join? What are you

looking for when you decide to dedicate yourself to these causes?

PANEL MEMBER COE: Well, in the terms -for Habitat for Humanity, I felt like it was
important because I feel that poor communities or
poor families don't have a lot of opportunity to
own property. And I -- that's one thing I really
like about Habitat for Humanity is that they don't
just give it away, they make you work for it. And
I think that that teaches values, not just -- and
I'm not saying for the people who are getting the
houses. I think it's also for the people who are
helping out on the projects.

And, of course, Habitat for Humanity, because I know about construction, so that was kind of an obvious one for me. But for me, it was mostly about helping these families have something that they can call their own and be proud of and have something that is of quality. So that's how I chose them.

As far as Toastmasters, that was much more of kind of a selfish kind of motivation where I wanted to learn how to speak publicly. I had -- for my architect license for California, you have to present yourself in front of a panel of people

who test you, and so that was an effort to try and build some confidence there.

So -- but in any case, for volunteer work, I think helping others is a real motivator, and helping others in a way that I can use skills that I'm good at.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Do you think that your volunteer experiences could at all be a benefit to the Commission?

MS. GLORIA: Absolutely. I mean, I feel like keeping other people's lives in mind is really important. And, also, understanding that people unlike me are -- I have a lot to learn from and, which, I think I did learn when I did Habitat for Humanity, not just from the homeowners but also from the other volunteers. So there's a lot to be learned in a group volunteer situation, not just for those who you volunteer for but also the ones that you volunteer with.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

In your essay on impartiality, you say that,

"Impartiality is the ability to act beyond selfinterest and personal bias to achieve larger goals and promote fairness." You spoke about this a little bit, too, in some of the remarks you made from the standard questions at the beginning of the interview.

In your essay, you on to say, "This requires an awareness of one's own beliefs and ability to see and understand other's perspectives." And, also, your own beliefs and your own biases is something that you've talked about a few times today also.

And so my question is, how does a person go about identifying their biases and how do you keep this from influencing your decision making?

MS. GLORIA: For me, I -- you know, it's not easy to identify one's own biases, I mean, mostly because they're biases and they do present blinders.

So, for me, I see my biases through the eyes of others. And in talking with others, and when I disagree with somebody, I'll -- I often have to question myself as to why I disagree or feel strongly about something. So it's not just seeing it through other people's eyes but, also, the willingness to look inside and ask why I feel a certain way. I think that's a really important part of identifying my biases because I know myself

best and so I'm going to know the reasons why I feel why I feel the way I feel.

So -- but then, like I said, when you speak with other people about an issue or a circumstance, they present a different point of view. And once you're able to relate your point of view with theirs or with a bunch of other points of view, I think you can put your point of view into better perspective.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Are there any methods for ensuring that a personal bias doesn't influence your decision making when you may not be aware of it?

MS. GLORIA: Oh, methods? I think questions are a really good method of doing that, well, not just questioning yourself but questioning others to try and understand their point of view. And then questioning others to try and figure out if there are -- where your blind spots are because I think -- and I think, also, willingness to hear something that you don't want to hear and taking that unwelcome comment or unwelcome piece of information and trying to reconcile that somehow with your own point of view.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

I'd like to move on to your essay on appreciation for diversity. And in that essay, you mention the experience of your parents who had limitations to purchasing homes or property in the 1950s and '60s that weren't financial limitations.

MS. GLORIA: Um-hmm.

PANEL MEMBER COE: And you've talked a little bit today, and in your essays, you discuss having met or worked with various diverse groups of people.

And with these perspectives and experiences in mind, what have you learned about the needs, the desires, the preferences, and the concerns of diverse groups of people in California that would make you an effective representative for them on this Commission?

MS. GLORIA: I think that keeping my parents situation in mind and knowing the community that my cousins come from, I think I understand what it means to not have a voice, and what it does to a community. Because in my cousins' case, I think they're disengagement from the powers that be also has a negative impact on what -- how they feel they can impact the world, just self-confidencewise and things like that.

So one part of listening to others in the community is, I think, for me, also trying to figure out what's not being said. Because a lot of times, I think, people articulate things but they don't always articulate things that may be the core issue of what they're facing.

So, I mean, maybe this is case in point, I think that understanding that less represented communities might have issues that aren't being said is really important for understanding the communities that need to be represented.

PANEL MEMBER COE: So in line with that subject of communities, I wanted to talk a little bit more about communities of interest, I think Ms. Dickison asked you about them earlier on, about specifically how to identify them. My question is a little bit -- I want to continue that line of thought, but some communities are more obvious than others. Some are harder to identify for one reason or another, they're not as engaged or they're not -- they're just harder to find, harder to locate.

MS. GLORIA: Um-hmm.

PANEL MEMBER COE: How could the Commission go about, in their efforts to identify the communities, as you've already spoken about,

how can the Commission avoid inadvertently overlooking some of these harder to find communities of interest?

MS. GLORIA: That's a tough one because then you're trying to uncover something that's not seen, basically. I think that the Commissioners can look at, well, the statistical demographics — I mean, not statistical, but the demographics that they get in the census data will probably reveal some groups that maybe aren't represented. So looking at data, looking at the various neighborhoods to see who's there, and I think that even looking at just what's in the neighborhood, for example, stores or food establishments or things like that, to gather data on various communities might be helpful in identifying people who aren't as vocal.

PANEL MEMBER COE: So in line with that same thought and in line with the idea you were talking about a moment ago, about making sure that communities have a voice, some of those communities may feel uncomfortable or concerned about coming forward and sharing their voice and perspective for different reasons. They are generally not folks who come forward and share their points of view.

But since feedback and input from as many communities as possible is so important to the work of this Commission, how could you -- or how could the Commission go about making these particular communities that don't necessarily engage feel comfortable to come forward and share their voice and share their perspectives to help better inform the Commission?

MS. GLORIA: Well, I think, well, part -I think a lot of the communities that we're talking
about might be ethnic communities that speak
different languages. And knowing that the
different languages are out there, putting
Commission communications out in different
languages, I mean, we do that for our voting and I
think that's helpful.

But I think also being able to -- I think I mentioned before that outreach is really important for the Commission. And somehow, getting people out into the community, perhaps, or on the media that those communities use is important in communicating with them and letting them know that they're a necessary voice in this process and that they are welcome in the process, so just being really creative about outreach.

PANEL MEMBER COE: So in regards to outreach, and you mentioned some groups that we're talking about may speak different languages, I noted in one of your letters of rec it says that you speak several languages; is that right?

MS. GLORIA: Well, I do speak a little bit of everything, actually. I speak a little bit of Spanish. I speak -- but it's not really very fluent, it's much more a matter of knowing important phrases and words, but Spanish, Italian, French. I've tried to learn Thai. So it's actually a collection of languages that I've sort of been interested in as I travel, as I've traveled.

So, yeah, I mean, I have to say that English is the most fluent language that I know. Spanish is like a second but not -- I'm not as comfortable with that one.

MS. PELLMAN: Quick time check. We have five minutes, twelve seconds.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

Could your ability to converse, maybe not fluently in all of these languages, but could your ability to converse in many different languages be an advantage to the Commission during outreach

efforts?

MS. GLORIA: To a limited degree, I think so. I feel like I want to communicate with other people in different languages. You know, as with learning any language, there is a sense of intimidation that you won't be able to understand the response, so -- but I think I have a willingness to try and -- to communicate.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

Yeah, earlier, you were talking about that teams generally kind of fall into distinct roles.

MS. GLORIA: Um-hmm.

PANEL MEMBER COE: What would you see as your role or the role that you think you'd naturally fall into on this Commission if you were appointed?

MS. GLORIA: I feel like I'm good at organizing things. And so I feel like I would be the type of person who would try to organize, like maybe notes or information, and then make sure that the rest of the team got those, got -- it was, you know, it was distributed.

I feel like I'm the type of person who wants to make sure that people are talking to each other and that when we do talk to each other, that

there's, like there's an outcome, like a tangible outcome of some sort.

So, for me, because that's pretty much what I do for work, but I really feel like I'm always trying to make sure that I communicate with others so that things get done. So that's pretty much how I work in a team.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay, really quickly, since we're about out of time, if you were to be appointed to the Commission, which aspects of that role of Commissioner do you think you would enjoy the most and, conversely, which aspects of that role do you think you might struggle with a little bit?

MS. GLORIA: Oh, okay. I do like the aspect of organization and connecting and, you know, making sure that everybody's doing what they need to do. And I do like the part of analyzing the data and looking at the maps and understanding those maps.

I think, for me, the hardest part is
that -- might be leading the group. I mean, I feel
like I'm much more of a leader from behind than I
am in front. I tend to be a much more one-on-one
type of person rather than speaking to a group. So

-- but I -- not that I can't speak in front of a group but it's just like I prefer speaking to people one on one or in small numbers. So that probably my weakest point.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay. Thank you.

No further questions at this time, Madam Chair.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you, Mr. Coe.

Mr. Dawson, the time is yours now.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

MS. PELLMAN: Mr. Dawson --

MR. DAWSON: Madam Secretary, how much

13 time?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. PELLMAN: Oh, sorry. Thank you. Six minutes, thirty second.

MR. DAWSON: Okay. Thank you.

I just have one, maybe one-and-a-half

18 questions --

MS. GLORIA: Okay.

MR. DAWSON: Ms. Gloria. We talked a bit about your work as an architect. And I noticed that in your essay on analytical skills, you say,

"As a licensed architect, I'm tasked with solving design and technical problems and resolving the design with the requirements of

local Zoning and Building Codes. In that process, I strive to meet the often competing goals of clients, superiors, and state and local jurisdictions in which the projects are built."

So, to me, and based on your answer that you've given to the other questions, it sounds like you enjoy the process of solving these problems. It's like a puzzle you're trying to get to put together.

MS. GLORIA: Um-hmm.

MR. DAWSON: And so my thought was that drawing these maps, there are -- these are designs that you are trying to have competing interests in, do you have, as an architect, do you have a bias towards and aesthetically pleasing design?

MS. GLORIA: Yes, I do, actually. I mean, that's kind of a given. And I guess you're referring to the maps and there is an aesthetic value to those maps and I understand that. I find maps fascinating. And I think that I would have to be aware that drawing an aesthetically pleasing line on a map needs to be tempered with the practicalities of what the needs of the community are, so --

MR. DAWSON: And that's where I was going with that. Because like during our training, we had the -- we were given the -- the Panel was given the example of a C-shaped district which, on its face, seemed to be a gerrymandered district. But as it turned out, that contained a community, a homogenous community of interest --

MS. GLORIA: Um-hmm.

MR. DAWSON: -- which had sort of moved out of the city center.

MS. GLORIA: I see.

MR. DAWSON: And so is that the sort of competing interest that's not on its face that you're talking about?

MS. GLORIA: I would think so because I think when we -- when -- going into the mapmaking or drawing the district lines, maybe I would have the presumption that, okay, this community is all, you know, in one localized area. And I think in my mind, when I think of my city, I think that way. I think that, you know, the Thai community is over here, the Filipino community is over there, the, you know, the Mexicans are over here, or that kind of thing when, in reality, you know, they're pretty spread apart and, you know, they're like fingers

1 that interlock.

5

21

So I think that that's -- I mean, it's just like biology, you know, things are just not clear cut.

MR. DAWSON: Okay. All right. Thank you.

That was my only follow-up, Madam Chair,

if the other Panel members have any additional

follow ups?

9 CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. I do not have 10 any additional follow ups.

Mr. Belnap?

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: I do not have any further questions.

14 CHAIR DICKISON: Mr. Coe?

15 PANEL MEMBER COE: No further questions.

16 CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. No further

17 questions, Mr. Dawson.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.

19 Madam Secretary, how much time is

20 remaining in the 90 minutes?

MS. PELLMAN: Two minutes, fifty seconds.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Ms. Gloria, in the time remaining I'd like

24 to offer you the opportunity to make a closing

25 statement to the Panel, if you wish?

MS. GLORIA: Sure. What I'd like to say is that I really feel like this process so far has been really clear, open, and well run. I feel like the questions I was given were both thoughtful and really thought provoking, and that the communications from the Application Team have really seemed thorough, explanatory, and welcoming to my comments and other -- and questions. So I feel that, in a sense, this whole process is a model for what the Commission needs to do.

I really feel that the application process has given me confidence that motivated, fair, sincere and capable Commissioners will be chosen because this is a really big challenge and an important task. So -- and I believe that the competence and the success of the Commission will determine how well California can set an example for the rest of the country.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Gloria, for speaking with us today.

MS. GLORIA: Thank you.

CHAIR DICKISON: Our next interview is at three o'clock and so we are going to recess until 2:59 p.m.

(Thereupon the Panel recessed at 2:43 p.m.)

1 2:59 p.m.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

CHAIR DICKISON: Good afternoon. Time being 2:59, calling the Application Review Panel meeting back to order.

I would like to welcome J. Craig Fong.

MR. FONG: It's Jay, actually. My friends just call me Jay.

CHAIR DICKISON: Jay? Okay. So Jay, Mr. Jay Fong to his interview.

I'm going turn the meeting over to Mr. Chris Dawson to read you the five standard questions.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Madame Chair.

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

Are you ready?

MR. FONG: Yes, sir.

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,

25 which do you possess?

In summary, how will you contribute to the success of the commission?

MR. FONG: Well I think the first thing I would address is the fact that I've looked at some of the credentials of the people that you've been looking at, and it's an incredible wealth and depth of people. And I actually think that the universe of people that you're looking at I think it will be very hard to go along with a lot of these people.

But I do think that one of the things that we need to look at together are the shared goals.

Obviously we're trying to create a fair and defensible redistricting map for the state of California. But I think that we need to be all on the same page when it comes to making that evaluation.

In my mind, there are three things that we need to look at and of the members of the group, we need to be sure that we have a common grasp of those issues. The three are the law, which is to say the law that not only creates this Commission, but also the law that impels us to create these maps and to do so fairly.

Two is the data. We're going to be receiving an enormous amount of data from the

Bureau of the Census. I think it's important that people -- I don't think everybody needs to be an actuary or an accountant or a master at Excel, but we should all be comfortable with looking at the data, not be afraid of what it is, not be afraid of the numbers, not be afraid of how to approach that material.

And then the third issue are the voices in the community. Obviously the law guides what we do. The data is obviously the input, but there's also input from the community. Where the community of interest is, where the people are. Where they go to school, where they work, what industries do they work in, are any number of ways to carve that up. And I think that it's important that the members of the Commission understand that there are those three things out there.

Having under -- I mean, you know, you can understand the law. I'm an attorney, I'm sure that all of us could come to some understanding of what the law is. You know, Shelby versus Holder, and Crawford versus Marion County. There are any number of cases, there are any number -- there's any amount of data that's out there. I just think that we need to be comfortable with what's being

presented to us.

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

And then finally I think the thing that's most important of all is what I'm calling teachability. We talk to a lot of people about, although I listen very well and I'm very open to getting new information from people.

I remember when I first -- on the very first day I went to university, and I walked into the university library. This is a university that has over 12 million volumes. And I walked in to the lobby, I quess, for lack of a better word, and there was row upon row, bank upon bank, of the card catalog. It was monstrous. And at that moment, I felt this big because I realized that in my lifetime, I would never read a tenth, a hundredth, a thousandth of the stuff that was there. And it really taught me that I had to be, I'm not going to learn all of it. I have to be open to be teachable. I have to be open to learning a lot of this stuff, whether it is learning more -- learning then more about the data, learning more about the law, I'm not perfect in the law. Learning more about the communities that California makes home for. And so I think we need to be aware not only of what we know and the expertise that we bring,

but to be teachable about the new stuff that's coming in. And I just think it's really important that we learn how to elicit that information, learn how to listen to it, yes, but learn how to be taught by it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

You may note that in my original application credential, I mentioned the fact that I grew up in the Solano County, that I went to school in Alameda and then Contra Costa County. But it's been 30 years since I've been up in the farm country. If I pretended to tell anybody that I know what it's like growing up in a farming community, I don't. I have some background. remember a lot of it. And it will inform what I learn from others, but it's not the last word. It's not the only thing. There's so much more to learn because I'm not there now. So, yes, I have experiences. Yes, I have background in the law and reading, but it's really about listening to what people have to tell me about their lives now. And I'm hoping that you -- that we can create a group of people that does that well.

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. FONG: There's no question there's an awful lot of tension in the air these days. It disturbs me a great deal. I think many of us grew up at a time when some was on one side of the couch or the other side of the couch and we had a dialog. Our legislature process was a dialog where you sometimes got a little and sometimes lost a little, but you found a way into the middle. And that doesn't seem to happen very often.

I think one of the solutions to that is, as I alluded to earlier, not just listening better, but allowing yourself to be taught. There are

times I think when, especially right now, there are times when I think our elected leaders and indeed many of our opinion shapers depart from the truth.

And I think that our first lodestone, our first place that we touch should be going back to what the facts are.

So, again, I'll echo what I was saying earlier, the facts about the law. We know the cases that give rise to our duty and the Constitution. We can read those. We can interpret it all differently, but we can read them and understand where we are.

Second, there's going to be the data from the Bureau of the Census. That data is right there. We can't pretend that the numbers are other than what they are.

And then the third thing is listening to the community. And obviously those are open to interpretation as well. But I'm hoping that if we remind ourselves and I will certainly do what I can to remind other commissioners, if I'm selected, that we need to come back to the place where we know where the facts reside. Where we know the principles, even if we see them differently, where the principles of the law reside, and go back to

refer to those.

I am worried if we have commissioners who are deciding to make up facts on their own or making up testimony that nobody heard, that would worry me. So I think it's really important to be able to not only, yes, look at the facts in front of us, hear the things that the people are telling us, but go back to the first principles so that we know and remember what we were told, what we read.

It's a little like that old story about the guy who, the philosopher who wants to learn more and more about philosophy and hears about this wise man and he goes to the top of the mountain and he says, I've read about Zen and I've read about Christianity, and Judaism, I've read about all of things and I've read all the philosophers, please teach me the meaning of life. You're a wise man, you're up in the mountain, teach me the meaning of life.

And so the wise man, let's just make a cup of tea. So he goes over and brings a teapot over and he starts, he puts two cups down and he starts to pour the cup of tea. You've probably heard of this story. And what happens is that he pours the tea for his guest and the cup fills and he keeps

pouring. And the tea just overflows and it's all over the table, he goes, stop, stop, there's tea all over the floor. And he goes, you're like the tea cup, you are so full already that there's nothing left for me to teach you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

If we are so full of our own preconceptions and ideas about what the data is and what the law requires that we can't bring anything else in, I fear for what the process is going to be. I think we have to be open. Again, I use the word teachable. We have to be teachable, we have to be open, and rather than doing this teacup and teapot and teacup thing, I would say that each commissioner is a cup. Our skills, our experiences are the cup. We are the vessel. We're not the tea. The tea that comes in is the data. The tea that comes in is what the community tells us in Ukiah or in Imperial Valley. That's the tea. And it may taste different to all of us, but the vessel that we are, are our experiences as lawyers and doctors and social workers. But the tea itself is what comes from the people that we are listening to.

24 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?

MR. FONG: I'm hoping that we're all grownups, that we'll be able to communicate with one another. For all of our differences, which I'm sure there will be, that we can be grown up and talk to one another. And as we get to know each other, we will probably recognize, I hope, that we all have California's good in mind. I certainly hope so.

But I think the real thing we need to guard against is what I call indefensible decisions. Strangely illogical and indefensible districts. Our job is to draw lines, right, for the Assembly and the Senate, and the Franchise Tax Board, and for congressional districts. If we cannot defend the districts we draw, if we have no basis for saying that the line should be drawn here or there, there will certainly be a challenge. As I understand it, the prior Commission's work was challenged in court. I'm guessing that this one will be as well. And the truth is, is that if we could logically, legally, and reasonably draw the line in one of three places, there may be advantage and disadvantage to any number of interest groups

to draw it here, there, or someplace else.

What I am concerned about, what I think will harm the Commission, harm its mission, harm its credibility is if we draw a line that doesn't make sense. So in other words, there may be a number of places where the line could go and you could defend it. What will harm us is if we do something arbitrary, something capricious, something that anybody reasonable that looks at that and says, that's the, what on earth were they doing? This doesn't make any sense, why did they put it here? Why did they exclude the community there? That's what I would be worried about.

And it's true, there may be some unusually creatively shaped districts. And as long as we can talk about it, talk them out, and say this is I was thinking. This is why our thinking is this way.

Then to ourselves, even if we have minor differences about where the lines should be, if we among ourselves as commissioners can say I understand why it went there. We voted it out, we talked it out, the line is here. And we can vote it out and defend it. If each one of us can do that, whether we agreed exactly what that line, I think that our work will be successful or at least

as successful as it can be.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

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

MS. PELLMAN: Yes, 16 minutes, 35 seconds.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

If you are -- excuse me, 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 goal of the project, what your role in the group was, and how the group worked together, worked through any conflicts that arose.

What lessons would you take from this group experience to the Commission, if selected?

MR. FONG: I'm thinking back to quite a while ago, actually, 1986. It was the Ronald Reagan administration. Some of you may remember that he created the -- what was so-called the Amnesty Program at that time which is where people who were illegal could file certain papers and apply for a Green Card.

At that time, I was the director of the Immigration Project of the Asian-Pacific American Legal Center of Southern California, which is I think today called Asian-Americans Seeking Justice. At the time, it was the Asian-Pacific Legal Center, and I was the director of their immigration project. And, of course, this was an enormous undertaking to be able to get a bunch of people who did not trust the government, did not trust the immigration service and come in and say, "Listen, come in from the shadows, file the papers, let's get you legal, we'll get you a Green Card."

So this was a frightened community that had a bunch of paperwork that had to get done and they were very suspicious. And at the same time, this was a time when AIDS was running rampant, people did not understand it. It was highly stigmatized, it was a misunderstood disease. The community, the people that were getting it were misunderstood. It was a dearth of facts.

So what happened was that as working in the immigration environment that I was working in, one day in 1986, '87, I got a phone call from an AIDS organization on the west side of Los Angeles. And they said to me, we've got a family here and

they were applying for amnesty, they were going to apply, they had to get a medical exam. Everybody needs to take a medical. And all of them, mother, father, two sons, and a daughter, all tested positive. And they're afraid, of course, of what this is going to do for their amnesty application, but they're all -- we as an AIDS organization, they were afraid of what it's going to do to the family. I mean, it was incredible, terrible news.

So I said that I would go with them. I do speak Spanish. So I said I would go with them. We went out with a social worker and a couple of medical workers and some other people to talk to the family. They were willing to talk to us. And we started the conversation with them. But at one point the mother said, "This HIV thing, I don't understand. We're not Haitian, we're not IV drug users, we're not gay. How come this has happened to us?"

And, of course what had happen -- and just so you realize here, the 17-year-old son, who did not classify himself as gay, would go out on a Friday or the weekend with his friends and play. But even still, the eldest son is one thing, but there were four other people in the family. And

they were totally stunned as to how this could have happened. So we talked to them some more. And it turns out like many good Mexican-American moms, she wants to keep her family healthy with good food. And as it turns out, every other week on Friday night, she would line up the family for a B-12 injection. Yeah, you see it already. And what happened, of course, was that they shared a needle. Needles are expensive. So they got the B-12 and everybody was going to be healthy and the family ended up infected, all of them. Obviously a tragedy.

But what was interesting to me was the message that we were sending. Right? Gay people, Haitians, and IV drug users get AIDS. This was, again, 1986. So when she hears these three things, she looks at her family and says this isn't me. I don't need to think about this message. This is not something I need to worry about. So she's just taking care of her family and doing what she does best. And, of course, now we see this problem where the family didn't realize that this can touch them too.

I use that example because after that interview with the family, the AIDS organization on

the west side of L.A. and my organization, Asian-Pacific American Legal Center, we got together and said you know what, there are two messages here for each of our constituencies, the people that we work with. And each message is important to the other group. What if we created a project that combined the two? Because immigrants don't want to hear this AIDS message. First of all, it disqualifies many of them. Number two, they're already stigmatized as it is. And number three, there are a million other things to worry about, why think about being gay, about having AIDS, about using drugs, we're worried about just the immigrant stuff.

On the other side, this organization is saying, listen, these people are worried about HIV, about their health, about getting access to healthcare and yet we are beginning to discover that many of these people can't get the medication, can't get the healthcare because they have no legal status. What if we can take these two points and merge them into one project? So we did. We created something, I hesitate to call it now, but we did, we called it a bait and switch.

What we did was we would go out as the

Asian-Pacific Legal Center and say, listen, "We've got an immigration message. We've being doing this, we had over 2,000 clients, we can tell you how to get legal, we can show you what to do." And as part of that dog and pony show, we would also say, "Listen, you need to get a medical exam. By the way, part of that medical exam was an HIV test. Here are the people over from this AIDS organization. We want you to listen to them as well."

And then whenever the AIDS organization would go out and talk about the AIDS message, they would say, "You know, here's what AIDS is, blah, blah, blah, and by the way, if you have HIV infection and you happen to be a foreigner, it could affect your ability to get a Green Card. Here are the people from the Asian-Pacific Legal Center, listen to them about the legal program."

So that we were able together very different different messages and quite often very different groups, to tell a story that both groups could benefit from. We had to create a program that was workable. We had to create a program that social workers on the AIDS side could quickly understand a little bit of the law so they could problem spot

for their clients. We needed to be able to create a sensitivity program so that those of us in our legal assistance, our paralegals, could spot a problem with a community or with an individual and refer them to where they needed help. And work together to cross refer to one another with people and immigrants and people with HIV who didn't necessarily trust at the beginning. But as they got to know each other, as they saw our faces and realized we were working to understand one another. We had reached a place where we trusted each other and these clients trusted us.

So it's an example of where you could create a project, work across groups that were very different with different goals, different catchment groups, and create something that I -- frankly, one of the proudest things I've ever done. It really put me in touch with people in the community I never thought I would be in touch with and I'm very proud of that.

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

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

MR. FONG: I would echo back to the story that I just told you about the project we created. But to build upon that, a lawyer, like any professional person, when somebody comes into your office because they need a hand, they need help. They need to tell you their story, how they see it, what has happened to them, how they are in the place that they are in. You'll never get somebody to tell you their story if they feel you're not listening properly.

So, again, everybody talks about, well,

I'm a good listener. It's true you must listen

well, but the person that you're talking to, there

has to be some perception from their end that not

only are you listening, but you're really taking it

on board, that you're teachable, to use that word

again. That you're really listening to them, that you're understanding what they're saying.

So over the years, I mean I've been doing, I've been an immigration lawyer for over, what, 35 years now, something like that. I've really learned to do this because of course everybody comes from a different country with a different story. Everything from marriage cases to political asylum to everything else. And every story that comes into the room is different. So I have learned over the years, I will listen to those stories.

learned how to ask the questions that I hope will elicit the answers that I need or that I'm hoping to hear. Again, from my credentials you may have noticed I spent a little time with the Coro Foundation. One of the things that they train you on, we spent hours of time on learning how to ask questions. Evaluating the answers that come back, listening and learning from those answers, also developing what's called the -- well, there was a different word for it, but a BS detector of when somebody was trying to pull the wool over your eyes. And learning to develop that detector. And

being able to evaluate what's coming in and ask the question to get the answers back out again. So that's something I think that is a learned skill. I think I do it pretty well.

Compassion. The other thing, too, is about being able to not only hear the story that's coming to you, but letting the person know that you care about what you're hearing about. That you really do care, that it matters to you in some way. That it's, even as a lawyer, you know, I make my living doing this work and yet it's more than just about the paycheck. It's about making sure that this person is taken care of. That this person, that you can respond to them.

So the thing that's kind of interesting is that a number of years ago, I was also the regional director of and AIDS -- pardon me, a gay and lesbian civil rights organization, called Lambda Legal. And I was their first regional director here in California. It's a New York-based, it's like the ACLU, it's a New York-based gay and lesbian civil rights organization. I could tell you stories of what it's like to try to explain California to New Yorkers, but leaving that aside for the moment, one of -- part of my job was to go

out to various organizations and give speeches. So you rise to your hind legs, talk about what the organization is, how we were founded, what we do, what we do for the community, what kind of cases we're looking for.

I was at universities here in Southern California giving one of these speeches, so about 400 people in the audience. And at the end of my speech, I said, "Listen, if you've got questions, please do ask. I'm interested to hear anything." And so this young woman stood up and she looked at me and she put out her finger and she said, "You're not doing enough. It is now, at the time, what, 1992. We still cannot serve in our country's military. We still cannot get married. We still have no protection in the workplace. You haven't done enough."

And, of course, while she was speaking to me, the hackles were going up. Because I just thought, you young whippersnapper, how can you tell me after 30 years of doing this work that I haven't done enough? Thank goodness before I opened my mouth, it occurred to me that she had a point. Not because I personally haven't done enough but because civil rights activist, advocate lawyer that

I am, that I was and am, I was standing on the shoulders of people of color, of voting activists, of women, of gay men and lesbians, who fought this fight, have been fighting this fight for many, many years. And it is on their shoulders that I stood and still stand.

And the work -- it reminded me that this work is ongoing. It continues. It doesn't end. And the truth is, is that when she says we can't get married yet and we have no job protection, it's because it was a reminder to me that for all of the things I think I am doing, there is still more to do. And for the generations that come after me, there will be more to do. And for the Commission that came before me that was seated in 2010 and the ones that will come after me, if I'm privileged to be on this one. There will always be work to do.

There is a California out there that is changing and becoming and there are new things happening in the state all the time. Everybody says we're the fifth or sixth largest economy in the world. And because of these changes, the California republic is always changing. And what that means is that we need to perfect this map, this voting map, these district maps. And it is

that perfection, even if we try to fight for all the civil rights in the world, and all the voting rights in the world, there will always be that work to do. And so we can continue.

And she reminded me that, yes, you understand and you listen and you try to be compassion, but in the end, ironically we are trying to draw a perfect map that will never be perfectible. Well let me take that back. It will perfectible but will never be perfect.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

We'll 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, Ms. Dickison.

17 CHAIR DICKISON: Good afternoon, Mr. Fong.

MR. FONG: Good afternoon.

CHAIR DICKISON: So you've talked about being an immigration attorney for many, many years.

21 What motivated you to go into that area of law?

MR. FONG: Well, you know, it's

23 interesting. I, as you can see from my credential,

24 I have kind of a white-collar,

25 blue -- blue, white shoe, white belt type of law

and undergraduate background. I went to law school that trained people to go to Wall Street and places like that. And when I originally got out of law school, I thought that I was headed for Wall Street and the big corporate job, and all that that meant.

And originally for the first couple of years of my law practice, I did do bank mergers and acquisitions. And I have to say that my mom was proud. I was making a frankly unreasonable salary for somebody my age. This is 1981, '82. But I was miserable. I was truly miserable because filing papers and doing bank mergers was not exactly what I enjoyed. I found it removed from what I understood, I found it removed from the things that mattered to me. And so when I heard that the Asian-Pacific Legal Center was getting involved with this amnesty project way back in 1986, that's when I decided to leave.

It was a frightening pay cut. It almost gave my mother a coronary because she said, "You did what? You went and you took a job where? You know, you left one of San Francisco's largest law firms and you're doing what? At approximately 10 percent of the salary." But I have to be honest, I never looked back. It's work I love, it's work

that I come to every day knowing that I'm going to meet people who have great stories to tell. Some of them tug at the heart, some of them that infuriate me. But that's why I left. I really needed to be back where I felt I was doing something for people, for everyday folks. And not corporations. Not that corporations aren't nice people, but it's something that I wanted to do.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you for that.

So in your impartiality essay, you kind of listed some items that someone needs in order to be impartial. One of those was to recognize your own ideas and prejudices.

What are your ideals and prejudices that you would need to recognize and how would you ensure that they did not influence your decisions in that throng?

MR. FONG: Sure. A difficult question. I think that I know who I am. I know what my politics are. They haven't changed much over the years. And I know when they are different from somebody else's.

But I think that going back to what I started with, there's the law, the data, and the community information. And we're entitled to a

political view about any of those, all of those three things. But I think what's important is to come back to that.

And it would be easy to say well Mr. Smith over there, I know he's a very conservative person from the Central Valley or something like that.

But we can still look at the data and have a discussion about the data. Or what we heard from a community person or an organization when we were visiting the Central Valley. Or what she thinks about the law and we can talk those pieces through.

But I think that recognizing where I stand, knowing who I am, knowing what my values are, if I can listen with sincerity, openness, to what he believes as well, I think we can find some place in the middle. Because the goal is to draw defensible, reasonable, sensible maps. Not a map that's going to favor one party over the other, but to do something that's sensible that we can both understand.

And I think that if you dealing with somebody who is a reasonable person, who understands who he or she is, even as I think I understand who I am, I think we can find a place in the middle. It was sort of the old-fashioned

politics of when you had Republicans and Democrats and you had to come together for a budget or something or other. And then the Congress used to get together and rub elbows and talk to one another and find a place in the middle. It's perhaps done less now than it used to be but I think we can still do it. That's my hope.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

So my next question has to do with you were just talking about being the director of the Asian-Pacific American Legal Center and working on the amnesty program.

MR. FONG: Yes.

CHAIR DICKISON: And you talked a little bit about getting communities that -- the communities that don't trust government to trust in you and to talk to you, right?

So there's a number of community groups or communities of interest that don't engage. What did you learn from that experience that you take forward and recommendations you might give to the other Commission members in reaching those communities?

MR. FONG: I think the first thing is being able to identify and identify with some of

the things that concern that community. I think one of the reasons why communities stay separate or they don't talk much to one another is because they think they have nothing to talk about. You couldn't possibly understand my struggle as an immigrant. You couldn't possibly understand my struggle as such and such.

And I think that there needs to be -sometimes the commissioner, he or she could do it.
But very often I think if the Commission is working
with community, for lack of a better word,
stakeholders, people who can be honest brokers, who
talk between and with all the groups.

Again, I'll use the example of it, Asian-Pacific advocacy organization and an AIDS group where we discovered that there are definitely things we can talk about. And after that experience, anytime I wanted to talk to them about something that was unrelated to immigration, maybe was something else entirely, I could pick up the phone and talk to those groups and say, "Listen, you know who I am. You know my bona fides. You know I've got no axe to grind here. Here is my position about what I'm trying to do. Can you help me?"

And that outreach from one person who has worked with me before and trusts me from before can say, "Listen, okay, I don't agree with you, but let me -- let me -- let me see if I understand what you're saying to me. I mean, see if I can understand what you're looking for." And that entrée, that expression of goodwill, knowing that you are trying to do something hopefully for everybody's good, for everybody's betterment, if you want to talk about the Commission for California.

If -- I'm hoping that as we speak, as we communicate, as we talk about what's important to us, if the other people who are listening to us hear that and hopefully hear the sincerity of it, we mean it, then I'm hoping that those lines of communication, maybe not instantly, but slowly, would open so that we could talk to them about what their concerns are, where the communities are. Why they don't vote. Why they can't reach their elected official. What are those barriers? How do we do better? And I realize not, the Commission can't address all of that. I'm not sure that's the job, but it would be nice if it were, but it's not. But to at least stay open to what those concerns

are and perhaps address them in some way through how we draw the lines for the various opposite.

CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. Thank you for that.

So you did talk about talking with leaders or people that speak with -- for the communities.

Something that last Commission noted was there were times when they thought some of the public comments and information they were receiving was from groups or people that were representing themselves as part of a community when they really weren't.

From your experiences, what can the Commission do to guard against that?

MR. FONG: Another tough question. I think we live in a time now, and I'm not so sure this was as relevant or as big a problem as it could be this time given that ten years ago the Internet was not nearly as full of trolls and misinformation as I suspect that it is now. So I'm not sure how we're going to be able to

attach -- attack all of that.

One thing, again, I'll come back to the idea about communicating with one another within the Commission to not only if we hear something but

test it among ourselves. Is this the way you read this? Did you see this too? Where did it come from? Where can we learn more about it? Is this really true? In other words, testing with veracity of the thing that we're seeing. Because I'm guessing that a lot of it is misinformation or somebody that says they represent a group that they don't truly, they're not a member of, truly aren't a part of.

And, again, I think that there are probably reliable community brokers who know who is a member and who's not. I would be hesitant to put community members in a place where they would have to vouch for the bona fides of somebody else. That gets a little strange. But at least I think that we can use some of that information to inform what we, as a Commission, might need to do about how we value, okay, does an incoming piece of information from Jane Doe who says she represents X, Y, Z. And as we begin to get our information and develop our sources of information, we test it among ourselves.

We probably shouldn't put a member of the public behind the 8-ball that way, that's why we're there. So I would say we need to test it out among ourselves and try to explain it to one another to

see whether we are right or not. I don't know whether or not support staff of the Commission could be a help in that either. If they could, that would be great. I don't know enough about how the support staff structure is or will work, but that might be something, too, as a research arm.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

What -- do you think there's a role for advocacy within the Commission?

MR. FONG: Wow. I think I would rather say that there's a role for information. I have to be careful here because I incompletely understand the role of the commissioners in the sense that are we drawing lines to keep communities together? Are we drawing lines so that each community has a few Republicans and a few Democrats and a few Independents? Or are we trying to keep communities together? What exactly are the goals?

And I don't pretend to know all of that the way I should because I don't. But it seems to me that when people come to us and say, "Look, here's where the communities are, here's where people go to school. Here are the unions people belong to. Here are the organizations that people belong to. Here's the major industry in an area."

That is information we can use. How we apply it in terms of what districts need to be where, that's probably the burden that should be on the shoulders of the commissioners.

In my mind, advocacy is somebody that says, I want you to draw the line here. Because immediately I'm thinking why do you want me to draw the line there? I may be thinking about fair representation, you may be thinking about excluding somebody's group from being represented or being able to elect their own representative. And I don't know that. I don't -- I don't know, I don't know the bias. I don't the agenda of that individual so that does concern me. So, yes, information. Yes, talk to me about where you think communities are. Talk to me about where they're not. Talk to me about what churches and schools they go to and how they commute. Lovely.

I don't know what the role would be of advocacy in that sense. Now I can image where they would say, "Well, we're printing out some proposed maps, here they are. And then somebody will go, no, no, no, look at what you've done here, you've drawn the line here and what you -- the result of your line drawing is X, Y, Z." I could see that

because that's correcting an information lack or an interpretation lack on my part.

But advocacy makes me nervous in this context. I mean, I'm a lawyer. Advocacy makes me nervous in this context because it invites me to think that somebody has an axe to grind at somebody else's expense. And so I would be very careful about that.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

MS. PELLMAN: We have 4, oh, sorry, 4 minutes, 20 seconds remaining.

CHAIR DICKISON: Oh, thank you.

Given your background, what role would you think you would play on the Commission?

MR. FONG: Oh. Well I do like the idea, it's what I do here at my work, of listening to people's stories. Listening to how they live their lives, where they go to school, what their kids are doing. I love that stuff. I realize it's not always the bread and butter of lawyers, but I love that stuff. So whether it's electronically or face to face in this new coronavirus age, I look forward to being able to get that information. Because I have lived all over California and indeed in many places throughout the country and the world, but I

love this state.

And there are places, there are parts of it I know nothing -- I hate to say this, that I know about. When I think about the far north and some of the areas up against the Pacific Coast and the Oregon border, they're like a mystery to me. And I would love to learn more about those areas. Who's there? What makes them tick? And I'm guessing that they're really different than people here in Los Angeles. Or out in the desert. And I would love to learn that. I would love to be able to gain a perspective and what that means. And then apply that to the task that we would have. So, yes, talking to people and listening to people would be one thing I would love to do.

I love, as a little kid, I was fascinated with maps. And I don't know why. But you know you get those big Atlas and you're sitting there like a child looking at all the, where the lines are and where the big dots and the little dots and I found it fascinating. Where we draw the line. How we draw those lines. And what they mean. So, for me, although I will not present myself as a master of data, I would be able to take the data we have, I mean I can certainly understand that well enough,

and try to apply it to the map that's in front of us. And that replicating the road, the application of the data to the map is something that would be lots of fun, I think. Lots of fun.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

I think you have less than two minutes, but you said you wanted to ensure that we, that the maps that were drawn were defensible.

What steps could the Commission take to do that?

MR. FONG: Well, as I mentioned, the maps have to be defensible. And the first place it starts is among the commissioners themselves. If the maps don't make sense, if we've drawn a line that is illogical, that is not based on the data, it is not based on the law, it's an outlier in some way. I think, first of all, that if we are -- if we have built up a rapport among us that's strong enough, we should be able to say to one another, listen, I don't know how this got here, but this can't be here. This doesn't, this neither meets the law nor the data nor the community stories we've heard. Why are we putting it there? And to be able to question ourselves.

With knowing what each of our biases is,

knowing that we all have different viewpoints about the way the world is, to be able to question ourselves and say why is this here with the idea that at some point, as I understand it, the last Commission's map got litigated all over the place and I'm guessing this one's going to get litigated too. Each member of the Commission, even if he or she says, well, you know what, I really wanted the line to be here but we drew it here and I get it.

understand --

MS. PELLMAN: Thirty seconds remaining.

MR. FONG: -- why it's here. We could have done it here, but we did it here. And even though I may not have agreed with it, I understand why. And each of us needs to be in a position where we could say we understand why that line was drawn. Because the next step is to be -- is being able to say that to the community, to the state, and presumably eventually to a judge.

So I do think that the first step is to being able to explain it to one another. If the lines we have drawn are sensible and in line with the data and the law, I'm --

MS. PELLMAN: That's 20 minutes time.

MR. FONG: -- guessing that the community -- the community will understand it as well.

So that's how I think how we do it. We test the lines amongst ourselves first so we understand what we've done and why we've done it.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

Mr. Belnap, the time is yours.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Good afternoon, Mr.

10 Fong.

MR. FONG: Good morning -- good afternoon, sorry.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Yeah.

Can you describe some of your typical or common clients that you're working with in your immigration law practice?

MR. FONG: Sure. It's very, very interesting because first of all, there's an office in Pasadena, there's an office in Palm Springs.

And the clientele in Palm Springs is radically different, polarized even.

First of all, I have quite a number of people who are retired people. Typically, not always, but pretty typically well-to-do. And they may have married somebody and want to bring in a

spouse in from another country or they want to hire a maid or they want to do something like that.

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 way they act, the way they perform, the level of service that they require, the level of handholding that they need, and indeed the amount of law I need to explain to them is very different than the clients who come from down valley, the Coachella Valley, who are from Indio and from Coachella, and those folks, first of all, many of them don't speak English. As I'm sure you know the Coachella Valley is right by Imperial. People come up all the time from Mexico. These are workers, they are people with a very different educational level. So many of them are applying for asylum, they're not applying for their maid. Many of them are applying because their son or daughter is born in the United States so sending your boy or daughter is going to apply for mommy and daddy, as opposed to a spouse or a maid.

So the nature of what we need to explain, what needs to be done, the nature of the handholding is extraordinarily different. The demands on me in terms of how I behave to them is extraordinarily different. It means both that I must talk like a corporate lawyer to many of the

people in Palm Desert who expect a corporate lawyer, as well as talk like somebody who, hey, I understand and I'm -- I understand the language, I can speak with you. I'm still your lawyer, but I can speak with you. I count myself as part of the community even if perhaps an imperfect one.

So I try to, the word I don't want to use is code switch, but it really is. There's a language, an attitude, a different way that you talk to people. Because like all grownups, we adjust our message and how we speak with the audience that we're talking to. I, not surprisingly, I talk to you differently than I talk to my Auntie Daisy. It's just different. So all grownups do it. You have to do that to communicate clearly.

Here at the Pasadena office, again, it is very different. It's a little bit more homogenous in that sense, there's not the big extremes. Also because of the San Gabriel Valley here, I get a lot of Asians whereas there are fewer Asians, Asian-Americans in the Coachella Valley and the Palm Springs area.

I get lot more investor visas here, which is to say I get people who say, "You know, I'm from

France and I want to open a business in San Gabriel. What do I need to do? How can I organize it?" And interestingly, these are business people so when I talk to them business, because I used to do corporate work, I can quack like that duck.

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

Then more importantly what you learn is that people from other countries, when they come to the United States, they go -- a good example, I had a client to me say to -- say to me just very recently, what do you mean employment contract? So we're in California. You hire somebody, you hire them. You fire somebody, you fire them. But where we're from, everybody needs a contract. No, you can have one if you want to, but no. You mean that I can hire people and I don't need to write a contract? No. I mean, you'd be smart to have at least a good job description. But, no. And it was stunning, there was this revelation on their part that we do business differently. I'm not saying we're better or worse, but we do it differently.

So part of the job is explaining our ways to somebody who's coming into the system. So I do that a lot, it's part of the job. Explaining what the job is, explaining the conditions into which these people are walking. Giving cautionary

lessons about be careful about X, Y, Z, something I do a lot too. So, yes, there's a very different level of communication. And I do it all.

4 PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: All right. Thank 5 you.

So you have the clients on one -- on one side and you are petitioning I'm assuming government entities or cities, counties, or federal. Who are you -- what agencies are you dealing with in this world?

MR. FONG: Sure. A very typical case would be, let's say an American who has a foreign spouse and wants to bring them to the United States. So you initially deal with the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. You see offices here and there. And then you file a petition with them that says this is an American who's married to the foreigner. So you have to show them that the foreigner, that they're really married and that they both consented to marriage and that it's a real marriage. Are they in a real relationship?

After that, they need to apply for the visa, immigrant visa. That's typically done at a U.S. Embassy or U.S. Consulate General. That's

part of the Department of State. So suddenly the application that was part of the Department of Homeland Security now moves to the Department of State. State Department is a very different animal and acts very differently than the Department of Homeland Security.

And then finally when the person does get that visa and is able to come to the United States, they land in the United States and have to go through the Port of Entry which is run by Customs and Border Protection. Again, a different agency entirely. So you have to prepare them for that experience as well.

So at each of those stages, I'm required to talk to these people about how to approach the interviewer, what to talk about, what materials to have, what that particular agency is interested and looking for, what they really find irrelevant that you don't need to mention, so that they can talk intelligently and speak to the concerns that that agency has. Because each agency will look at something a little bit differently.

And that's true whether it's a marriage case or, for example, a labor case where let's say you want to bring a nurse to the United States, you

have a clinic in East L.A. and you need to bring a Spanish-speaking nurse. Or a Creole-speaking nurse and you want to bring somebody in that way. So then you would begin with the California licensing authorities to make sure that this nurse is qualified to practice in the United States. That kind of thing.

So you do end up doing a lot of bureaucratic speak as well and translating that bureaucratic speak so that your client can understand it.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

So in your essay on impartiality, you speak to your experience and credentials as an attorney.

How does an attorney who represents the interest of their clients also have to exercise impartiality?

MR. FONG: Well there are two pieces to that. Number one is, I very often see a client who wants me to do something for them and it's simply not possible. I should step back a little from this because there are some clients especially some that are perhaps not as well-off as others

financially.

I guess I can talk about the Mexican community generally. This is a community that's had a lot of disappointment and a lot of bitterness. So when somebody tells them, I'm sorry, senor, there's nothing I can for you. And he'll just kind of take my word for it and kind of sort of just say, "Oh, well, what about this? I heard about that. What about that?" And I'll explain, no, this doesn't apply to you, that doesn't apply to you, that doesn't apply to you. And he'll just go away. He'll just go away.

Whereas a businessperson who says I want to open up a business or open a new restaurant in Beverly Hills, you make it happen for me. And I'll have to say, "The way you're doing it, the way you've got it planned, the business plan you've got, the business model you're using, the source of your funding is wrong. It simply will not fly." And I've had people offer me embarrassing amounts of money say, "No, you're the attorney, you've got a Yale degree hanging on the wall, you make it happen."

And I have to say, "I mean, as tempting as the money is, I'm only human, but the answer is no.

The law doesn't allow for that. I'm not going to go to bat for this." This is not what the -- first of all, it's not my job to change the law. My job is to follow the law. I will be glad to help you within the law with whatever you want.

But that doesn't work and if you want me to make it work for you that way, I will be lying to you. To say to you, oh, sure, I can have you create your restaurant and get an investor visa, I can help you with that. You'll pay me oodles of noodles for that work and you'll get your visa. And it would be just as easy to say, "Oh, you know what, we did it. You've paid me, but oh my goodness, the Department of Labor and the Immigration Department didn't accept your application. Thank you very much. It was a nice good old college try." And I get to take the money to the bank. That's not right either. Because I knew from the beginning that this wasn't going to fly.

So there are times when a client will beg me, a mother or a father will beg me, can I do this? And I have to say no. And I have to say no to the rich and famous too. Both for very similar reasons. The law does not permit that and that's

not my rule.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

So still on the subject of impartiality, 5 can --

MR. FONG: Sure.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: -- you think of and describe for us another instance in your life outside of your law practice where you had to set aside your personal views to achieve a broader objective?

MR. FONG: Yes. A very small but recent one. Right now there's quite a bit of work in the office in a variety of different areas. And there's quite a lot of work to do.

Around the time that Mayor News -- Mayor
Breed up in San Francisco said you know what, we
need to shut the city down. L.A. hadn't done so
yet. The numbers we can watch the news, we all see
what the numbers were doing with COVID-19. And I
was very worried. We have, not surprisingly, had a
lot of foreigners coming in and out of the office.
Because of the work we're doing, we have contact
with all kinds of people from all different walks
of life. We receive documents and things all the

time. And I was getting more and more worried about exposure, not just to myself, I'm a little older than some of the people in the office, but to everybody else in the office. I mean, we're a small office, but I was still very worried about it.

At one point I had -- I was concerned also because with the amount of work in the office, there is a lot of money at stake, there's a lot of work to do. Some of it would be very awkward to do electronically from home.

Also we're a firm that likes -- one of our hallmarks that we pride ourselves on is meeting the people face to face, talking to them so they can see us, they can feel us, they know that we're here with them. Especially for the families, that makes a big difference. We pride ourselves on this. And to say suddenly that we're going to close the office, not be around, I got flak from two or three other people in the office about doing that. Why don't we wait a little while? And then of course by Friday, the -- the City of Los Angeles said no, we're in this, too, you've got to close down.

So for us, I had decided early, middle of

the week that we were going to close the office.

We did so both in the Palm Springs Office where I normally spend most of my time and here in Palm Springs -- pardon me, here in Pasadena. Because it just, it was impractical. At the time we had -- the state hadn't closed everyone down, mayor of our city hadn't closed the city down, it was just my judgment call that we're going to have to do this sooner rather than later, and we should do it.

So although I did have to sit down with my colleagues and reach a decision together. The way we reached it was to say look, yes, our case is at the office; yes, there's lots of work to do and it's going to be really awkward to do this work from home. But what was very concerning to me was everybody's health. And there's no price you can put on it.

And despite the fact that one or the other attorneys came to me and said well, there's this money and this money, we collect this, we collect this, and there's about three new cases coming in. We had to make a decision. And we had to make it based on the data, which is to say the appearance of the numbers going up, the appearance of the

number of deaths. The -
even -- I'm not a doctor, I'm not an

epidemiologist. It's only common sense that if you

are not out there spreading the virus and receiving

it from other people, that you will begin to put a

stop to this.

So although it was not in our financial interest and it was not even in the interest of the way we practice law, our style, if you will. Even before Governor Newsom said, "You know, we need to -- we need to stop everything but essential services, we decide here -- decided here in our office two or three days early that we were going to do that for just that reason. We looked at it and realized the data leads us to one conclusion notwithstanding our own personal interest.

So although there was a bit of a fight in the office about it, we -- that's what we did.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

Madame Secretary, time check.

MS. PELLMAN: Five minutes, 10 seconds remaining.

24 PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Okay.

In your law practice, have you ever worked

on voting rights issues?

MR. FONG: I have not. It had always been interesting to me. I've read a number of the cases. Like all good law students, especially my strongest interest was in constitutional law and what are called civil rights, if you will. But that's been my interest, my strong interest. So yes, I've done a lot of reading in that area; but no, I have never practiced in that area.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

And my last question is, why do you think your interests have lied in the protection of the rights of underrepresented groups in civil rights?

MR. FONG: Well I guess that would be very easy for me to say, "Well, you know, as a gay Asian-American of a certain age, there are all kinds of groups that I fall into and I want to be an advocate for the things I believe in." I suppose it would be easy enough to do that.

Truth to tell, it is a little bit
embarrassing but it's also true that I decided I
wanted to be a lawyer when -- about as soon as I
could say the word three times correctly in
succession. I saw To Kill a Mockingbird, I read it
in seventh grade with Ms. Gunderson in junior high

school and that was the end. I knew that -- that the other people's rights, the Constitution, was a big deal. I mean, really a big deal.

Growing up in Solano County, it doesn't matter today but when I was six years old, I was walking down Texas Street and somebody spat on me and called me a nasty name. And when you're six or seven years old, it's what's this about? I mean, I didn't -- I -- you know, it's funny because the school that I went to, there were Mexican kids, there were Spanish kids, there were Chinese kids, there were a couple of Japanese kids. And I just didn't think race, I thought it was a nationality. I didn't -- I didn't have an understanding of that.

So when my mom was trying to explain to me why this man did this, I didn't understand. And in a certain naïve way, I don't understand today. The truth is, is that after I read To Kill a Mockingbird, I wanted to do this. Because the Constitution is the one place that made us -- that made it all fair. That made us all equal. That gave us all a chance. That -- that -- somebody couldn't over there make up their own rules. And somebody over there couldn't just decide what he thought of me based on their

own -- the pricking of their thumbs. This is one document that we all we all tip our cap to.

This is the one document and the law that brings us together.

And so as Pollyannaish as that sounds, that's why I got out of corporate work and then into civil rights and immigration. And although I'm getting close to the point where I was thinking of retiring when a friend of mine said you should think about this Commission. I decided that it was something that I would try to toss my hat in for.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

Madame Chair, no further questions.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you, Mr. Belnap.

Mr. Coe, the time is yours.

17 PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you, Madame

18 Chair.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

21

22

23

MR. FONG: Thank you.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Mr. Fong, good afternoon to you. Thank you for taking the time to speak with us today.

MR. FONG: Thank you.

PANEL MEMBER COE: So you mentioned in your application that in 2011 you were ordained as

a monk --

MR. FONG: Yes.

PANEL MEMBER COE: In School of Zen Buddhism. For those of us who don't know, what does it actually mean to be an ordained monk?

MR. FONG: An ordained monk is a person who has -- in a Catholic environment, they might say that they have been -- that they have gone through instruction, that they have taken Communion. But there are a few more steps as far as Buddhists are concerned.

Basically, there are 16 vows that a Buddhist monk takes. You know, you don't lie, you don't steal, you don't do drugs, you don't do anything that will interfere with your perception of reality. There are 16 of them. So those 16 as for a monk, those are the 16 that I took.

I'm not on my way to anything in sense of oh, are you going to become a teacher? Are you going to become a priest? No. It was just something that I realized that although my family -- I grew up Christian. My family also observed many customs from China that were at the time were very mysterious and I realized that they were Buddhist in origin.

And as I began to get closer to some of my roots and understanding a little bit better, I realized that this is sort of where my heart and my faith belonged. So I started studying earlier right after 2000 and then was ready to take my vows in 2007. So that's what I did.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

Do you think that there are any, the principles or the skills or the traits of -- from that that would be particularly beneficial to the work of the Commission?

MR. FONG: Oddly, I do. But it's a very -- it's a very secular principle.

Buddhists talk a lot about what we don't know. Everybody talks about oh, well, I know this and I know that. And I studied this and I studied that. The example of the man who wants to go and learn the meaning of the universe. And over and over again every good Buddhist, every Buddhist teacher, every Buddhist priest will tell you there are a million things you don't know. And you have to be open to sharing them, including the lessons you don't want to hear. The things that you don't like to hear that may not necessarily be a part of your experience or a part of your politics or

whatever. It doesn't matter.

And so you have to be open to what you don't know. Learning to recognize this is something that I don't know. And being open to it. Because things that you don't know, like those 12.5 million books in the Yale library, I'm never going to know all that. So I need to be open to it, somebody may know some of it, and I should be willing to hear it and learn from it and listen to it.

So that's one of the central tenets of Buddhism is that -- that one, nothing is permanent; and two, there's an awful lot you don't know.

Those are -- those are the two I think I would use.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you for that.

In your essay on impartiality, you say that you've learned that creating a safe space to listen and hear is vital to all regardless of belief.

How does one go about creating such a safe space?

MR. FONG: At least in my view when I think about here in the office talking to clients or even in larger groups when you're talking to a group of students at UCLA when there's 400 people

in the room, maybe not. But when you are with a small group of people, you need to be able to communicate the idea that I am listening to you, that I am hearing you, and that if there's something new that you're saying to me, that I can communicate to you that I'm listening to it and learning from it.

It may be -- a lot of it I suspect may be -- it's not a technique in the sense of well you arrange the room a certain way, you use certain magic words. A lot of it is people contact, how I talk to you, letting you know even if I think differently, that I'm still listening to you and that I haven't shut myself off.

So part of it is, is the same thing that I think people say that there are -- that -- and I haven't met enough of them, politicians have. Many certain politicians are said to have a charisma that when you sit and listen to them, you just know that they are right there, you just know they're listening to you, you just know that they get you in here. Or that when you hear them discuss an issue, that they get it. And it's about an ability to communicate that and let the person know that you are listening, that you're not going through

the motions, that it matters.

Sometimes it means following up. If somebody asks a question, I'm not quite sure how this would work in a given situation, but if somebody says well, wait a minute, what are you going to do with this data, and what do you want to find out about this community? I would be very happy and willing, assuming that the format for our work allows it, to say I need to get back with you. I need to follow up. And then do it so that they are very clear that you've heard them, you've heard the question, and you're willing to take a stab at the answer. So I think that's important. A lot of it is attitude and maybe not charisma in my case but attitude.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

And in the same essay on impartiality, you state that you have -- you've provided legal assistance to those that you disliked, but you never advocated positions that you were convinced that are less than good for the community at large.

As a commissioner, how would you handle a situation where the perspectives of others, either maybe your fellow commissioners or somebody from the public, was advocating for a position that you

personally didn't approve of?

MR. FONG: I think I would fall back on the three things I keep doing this that I started with, the law, the data, and what people are telling me.

Now you've just given me a situation where somebody said, "I think it should be this way, I see it this way, I think the community needs this." So that's part of the intake. And I -- I think that if somebody from Ukiah told me this is the way our community is set up, this is where people live, this is where people commute, this is where people work, these are the companies that are local. I'm not in the position to gainsay that and I have to be that open cup to receive those -- that information.

What I am allowed to do is to take my knowledge of the law, what my task is to draw these lines, to draw them wisely, to draw them fairly, to take the law -- to take the data to see whether or not what this person is talking to me about makes sense, whether it rings true, and whether or not a line should go here or here.

But I'm not in the position, especially if I don't know myself and if the data doesn't

contradict it, I'm not in any position to tell this person you're wrong, I'm right, I draw the line where I want to. Because that's not my role.

For the same way where somebody comes to me and says listen, I want to do -- I want to do an investor visa and I want to do it this way, I can tell you exactly -- I can read you chapter and verse what it says about you're not being able to do that. The law says you cannot accomplish it that way. And so I would simply have to say so.

So the same way here, I would have to be open to considering it simply because I think that the law permits it, the data supports it and the community -- some of the community anyway is in favor it. So I think I would have to look at that and at least take that to heart.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

So you've spent most of your career as an immigration attorney working with people from all over the world, diverse backgrounds.

I'm wondering if you can tell us what it is in your 30 or so years doing this that you've learned about the variety of desires and concerns and perspectives that such diverse people, groups of people have that would make you an effective

representative for those groups of people all over the state of California.

MR. FONG: On the one hand I have learned that for all the variety, and there's a lot of variety out there, people are basically the same.

I don't want to equalize everybody but their -- their -- their daily concerns, their daily needs, the thing -- the -- not the thing but the things that motivate and drive them are very similar. And if not the same, similar.

But I think changes is the style. How people express their need to save money. How people express their desires for their children.

Some groups stereotypically all want their children to be doctors. Some groups stereotypically say oh, no, I want my -- everybody is different in that sense in style. Where custom leads us, where our local practice leads us, where our local -- the way our communities have grown, the way these local industries have grown. Those style issues change. But the basic needs of people and their -- the fundamentals of people, those things are the same.

The way a client will come in to me and say I want to accomplish X, whether it's to start

up a company or to bring my family over from the old country. They may all say it with different accents and different ways and what have you. But I've learned is that how to communicate with them about what they need to do to accomplish that, although I very often do need to code switch, to tell it, tell the story in a way that they can understand because culturally the place of where we're listening from is often very different. I need to be able to make sure that they understand what's needed. If you want to accomplish X, you need to share these here, we need to do it this way because this is what the law and our customs require.

So in that sense it is about communicating clearly, realizing that the person -- the person that I am communicating with may speak with an accent but doesn't understand with an accent. The needs are the same, it's just that very often our perspectives about what -- like the fact that in every country -- in this particular country, everybody has an employment contract even down to the person who -- the janitor and the person who's in the CEO's position, they both have a contract. We

don't do it that way often.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So it's about explaining those differences, explaining the places where we are the same, and then allowing them to sort of adjust based on what they think their needs are. So, yes, I think that -- that communicating with different people from different cultures, different languages, different religions, different business practices, all means that a good communicator indicates a buy off of a good immigration lawyer. What we try to do is to make sure that as we explain you want to do X, Y, Z. In order to get to that goal, you have to do certain things. Because our way in the United States, there are certain rules you have to follow. So I'm going to explain to you hopefully in a way that you can understand what you need to do. And so I'm going to make a list for you, we're going to go over it two or three times so that you can meet the requirements of our law and accomplish what you want. So it is about that translation function that I think is really important. I've been doing it for a long time. I enjoy doing it. Because

somebody -- if you've done this before, I'm sure

sometimes it is a puzzle. When you talk to

you know it. You talk to somebody and you realize their eyes glaze over, they're either not listening to you anymore or they just don't get it. And you can see it in their face, they just don't get it.

So you have -- if you're not sensitive to that, you just keep talking. Sometimes you have to change the language, code switch, describe something in a way that makes sense. Describe it in a way that even if I haven't lived up in farm country for a long time, there are certain ways I can explain that that might make more sense to you.

And that would be a way to cross a barrier to explain something in a different way. And if that doesn't work, to try another way. Because the Commission does have to effectively communicate with the people that we are trying to draw these lines for.

So I think that if we communicate one way and it doesn't work, we have to be prepared to do it in several different ways. And I certainly do that all the time in this office.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay. Thank you.

Earlier I think in some of the questions

Ms. Dickison asked you, you were mentioning what

you would really enjoy of the position if you were

to be on the Commission.

I'm going to go with the opposite of that and ask you what do you think you would struggle with if you were a member of this Commission?

MR. FONG: I mentioned earlier that I'm not a great numbers person, that's why I'm not an accountant. I -- I -- I'm not a huge numbers person. I am very good at, I think, I am very good at analysis. So although when you say well, there's numbers, there's a page of numbers here. But if you provide me with a contact. Okay. Okay, this is the population of every city, this is the population of every area, this is the population of a current senate district. You know. This is the population breakdown. I can certainly make sense of that, that part doesn't scare me.

I think the part that would freak me out a little more, it's for example, the part of the job that would actually scare me more is the job that your assistant Christian is doing in terms of helping everybody get connected here, that technical part of this is beyond my ability, I will be perfectly honest about that. He does a great job, I couldn't do it.

So when you talk about the task with

respect to this Commission, learning the law, expressing the law, understanding the law under which we work, analyzing the data, looking at the data, taking the map and applying that data to that map and then going out in the community and testing our understanding, getting more information about what they understand how people move, where people go to school, what they do, where they congregate, I think I can do that.

So although I would be a little hesitant about the numbers part but numbers in general, the idea of taking the data and applying to that map I think would fascinating.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Fong.

Madame Chair, no further questions.

MR. FONG: Thank you.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you, Mr. Coe.

Mr. Dawson, do you have any follow-up questions?

MR. DAWSON: Just one. Thank you.

Mr. Fong, in your response to Standard Question 5, you talked about having developed the BS detector.

Can you tell me how you developed this

detector, how it works, how you would bring it to bear in your work on the Commission?

MR. FONG: Oh. You know, it's funny because I'm sure some of you up in Sacramento probably know the Coro Foundation. When they take people in, one of the key skills that they try to teach us is how to interview people, how to evaluate the information that's coming back from them. Test it against what you know and then apply it toward whatever policy issue that you happen to be working on.

Coro is all about policy and making policy happen. So you may know that one of the first things that you do, almost the first meeting you have is your Coro trainer will stick you and your group into a room with a perfect stranger. And that -- the only thing that they will say to you is interview him or interview her. They won't tell you who they are, what they do, why they do it. And you have to go at this person and try to build a picture. And of course there's 12 others -- 11 others of you in this group.

And so the -- the BS detector, the crap detector that my trainer always used to talk about was it's a little like the question I answered for

Mr. Coe a moment ago, some of it is style, some of it is looking at the person, looking in the eye and saying -- perhaps not to their face -- but are you telling me the truth? Does the message you're giving to me, does the information you're giving to me match with what I understand what the law, the data, or in this case, the way the rest of the state of California works? How government works, where the funding comes from, where the funding goes to.

The more you know about your task, whether it's making law, the auditor's office, or the legislature. The more you know about this, you begin to develop a sense that somebody -- sometimes they just don't know. And then there are other times where you realize they're trying to make this into something that it's not. And you have to either correct it, educate them, or realize they're advocating for something that's quite outside what you want to do or what is proper.

So it is a sense, but it is also testing it against what you know, testing it against what you understand about the facts as opposed to your own opinion. But testing it against facts that you know you can verify. And then applying your own

common sense to asking more questions.

When you ask more questions, very often it allows you to dissect what has been told to you. And without calling somebody a liar to their face, you can simply say you can take out little bits, and little bits here and little bits there until pretty soon you realize that what's left is evidence to you and to everybody else as not being quite right.

And sometimes that's the technique you would have to use just because you don't want to be nasty to people. So sometimes you have to just kind of pull the ideas apart.

MR. DAWSON: Great. Thank --

MS. PELLMAN: You have one minute, 30 seconds remaining.

MR. DAWSON: Oh, thank you.

Madame Chair, I have no further questions.

CHAIR DICKISON: I have no further

20 questions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: I don't have any other questions either.

23 CHAIR DICKISON: Mr. Coe.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Yeah. No further

25 questions here.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Mr. Fong, in the time remaining, I would like to offer you the opportunity to make a closing statement to the panel, if you wish.

MR. FONG: Thank you.

Timekeeper, how much time do I have?

MS. PELLMAN: You have one minute.

MR. FONG: Very good. I'll keep it short.

I've said a lot of this already so I don't need to go over it.

There is a lot of talk about American exceptionalism. And I dare say that within the American community, we are an exceptional place. But I would also say that California is an exceptional place inside the United States.

There's an organization that used to be called Somos Californianos. And I don't actually know if they exist anymore. But it's we are Californians, we are California. And I believe in this place. And my travels around the state have taught me not only that there's so much here but that there's so much to learn about it.

Our mission is a mission that I see to this is to create a fair representative map of districts to represent the people of California.

That would be my goal. I would always have the law, the Constitution, and the facts to back me up. I don't believe in doing things other ways. Hopefully we can do something where everybody's lives are represented. And with that in mind, if I'm selected, it would be my honor to serve. Thank you. CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you, Mr. Fong. Our next interview is at 9:00 tomorrow morning. So we are going to recess now until 8:59. (Thereupon the Panel recessed at 4:30 p.m.) 

## REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested

person, and was under my supervision thereafter

I do hereby certify that the testimony in

transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 22nd day of April, 2020.

PETER PETTY CER\*\*D-493 Notary Public

## CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

MARTHA L. NELSON, CERT\*\*367

April 22, 2020