BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA BUREAU OF STATE AUDITS (BSA)

In the matter of

Citizens Redistricting Commission (CRC)
Applicant Review Panel (ARP) Public Meeting

621 Capitol Mall, 10th Floor Sacramento, CA 95814

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 2020 8:59 A.M.

Reported by: Peter Petty

APPEARANCES

Members Present

Ryan Coe, Chair

Ben Belnap, Panel Member

Angela Dickison, Panel Member

Staff Present

Christopher Dawson, Panel Counsel

Shauna Pellman, Auditor Specialist II

Candidates

Stephanie Beauchaine

David Burdick

Scott McCarty

3 I N D E X PAGE Stephanie Beauchaine David Burdick 58 Scott McCarty 105 155 Recess Certificate of Reporter 156

PROCEDINGS

2 8:59 a.m.

CHAIR COE: Okay. The time being 8:59 a.m., I'd like to call this meeting out of recess. Just a few quick reminders, those of us in the room please silence cell phones, other devices, while the meeting is in session. Phone calls in the hallway, if needed to be -- need to be. Those of you virtually, also, also silence phones and devices.

Restrooms at the door to the left for those in the room. And, again, for those in the room, in case of emergency, please follow the instructions of the State Auditor's Office staff.

At this time, I'd like to welcome Ms. Stephanie
Beauchaine --

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Yes.

CHAIR COE: -- for her interview. Did I say your name correctly?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Yes, perfect. Thank you.

CHAIR COE: Great. Welcome. Thank you for meeting with us this morning. I'd like to turn the time over to Mr. Dawson for the five standard questions, please.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. And before I begin, in the interest of full transparency, I would like to put on the record that I was involved in an audit that I

believe that Ms. Beauchaine was also involved in when she was with the -- a consultant with the City of Lincoln. But we have had had no conversations about this, about her application or otherwise.

Can you confirm that, Ms. Beauchaine?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: I was not aware of that, but, yes, I did work on that audit.

MR. DAWSON: I believe we were in one or two meetings together, but --

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Okay.

MR. DAWSON: -- with many other folks. All right. Thank you. I will go ahead with the five standard questions. Ms. Beauchaine, I will ask you five standard questions that the Applicant Review Panel has requested that each applicant respond to. Are you ready?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: 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?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: I think that there are three basic skill sets that need to be present amongst the Commission

as a whole, and also that we need to as Commissioners, possess individually. I would start with technical capacity. I think we need to have the ability to understand the law and to work within the confines of it. I think we need an understanding of mathematical and statistical data. We need to have critical thinking and problem-solving skills. I think we also need to possess executive and administrative leadership skills, including management, recruitment, team leadership, delegation, organization and time management skills.

And, finally, I think we all need to possess the necessary soft skills. We need to have good communication. We need to be even better listeners. We need to an appreciation for diversity, and diverse ideas. We need to be impartial and objective. And I think we need to have the desire to work cooperatively, and to be positive, supported members of the team. I believe I possess all of those attributes to one degree or another.

And professionally I've demonstrated success as an executive member of a number of teams, in both support and lead capacities. I've spent a considerable amount of my career in a face-forward position, so I'm very comfortable working with public policy, identifying stakeholders, taking input and drafting collaborative products. So, I think I possess all of those skills and I have a

demonstrated ability.

I think that they would all be useful to the Commission, but I think my specific role on the Commission would be, really be determined based on collective skills and our individual strengths, and how we decide to delegate tasks amongst one another. But, ultimately, I'm prepared to serve in whatever way the Commission deems appropriate.

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 hyperpartisanship? What will you do to ensure that the work of the Commission is not seen as polarized or hyperpartisan and avoid perceptions of political bias and conflict?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: I think the necessary characteristics are first and foremost, strong integrity. I think we need to truly have the desire to be fair and impartial. I think good communication is of paramount importance to this Commission. And we need to have genuine, active listening skills. And also very important, we need to be respectful.

Respectful of the folks who decide to participate, and respectful of one another. And I think that we need to understand the weight of our words as Commissioners as we're serving on the Commission, but also in our personal lives during this process.

I think we need to place our focus on outreach. We need to strive for public participation. And we need to listen respectfully and value the input that we receive, both from the public and from one another, from our fellow Commissioners. And I think that we can ultimately provide a work product that is representative of all of that input and collaboration. So, I think if we can achieve all of those deliverables, we could at least minimize the perception of polarization and hyperpartisanship.

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

MS. BEAUCHAINE: I've kind of toyed with this question back and forth, and I was initially thinking that legal challenges would be of paramount concern. And then I shifted to time constraints. And then, ultimately, to Covid-19. California is a large state with a lot of communities, and we need to reach each of those communities to get the necessary participation and input into our final

maps. And so I think that under the best of circumstances that would be a challenge, but I think that as Covid-19 and the epidemic evolves, you know, there could be additional challenges in our ability to travel and to reach various communities.

So, I think it will be really important that we develop a thorough plan, and that we execute it well. I think we'll have to quickly identify what each of the Commissioners' strengths are, and we'll have to delegate appropriately. We may also have to think out of the box, as far as how we can engage the public if we do remain restricted from traveling. But, again, I think if we can achieve all of those deliverables, that we can mitigate those concerns and overcome the challenges.

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've 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. BEAUCHAINE: Throughout my career I've had the

privilege of serving on a number of teams and projects.

But I think that one example that comes to mind and is most fitting in this circumstance, is when I was working as a city finance director during the last recession, our city, like most cities at that time in California, needed to make significant budget cuts in order to offset our lost revenues and to remain solvent.

The city manager and I had spent several weeks working together to come up with ideas and to outline potential cuts, including layoffs, furloughs, program reductions and, most notably, the elimination of our police department and potential outsourcing to the County Sheriff's Office. And so we spent a fair amount of time evaluating those different cuts. But I think he was uncertain how he wanted to proceed, and how -- what the best way was to bring those ideas forward.

We had talked about having study sessions, and ultimately letting the city council kind of guide us and prioritize. But ultimately he decided that developing a community outreach and participation plan was the best way for us to proceed. So he established an ad hoc committee that included a couple representatives of the city council, members of our executive team, as well as community leaders. And we scheduled community meetings in each of the primary neighborhoods within our city. During that

process we really took the time to bring everybody up to speed, and to educate about the challenges that were facing the city.

We responded to literally every idea that we received, and vetted every potential cut that was presented to us, and we prioritized the community's concern. I think, ultimately, I distinctly remember my giant spreadsheet that had about 25 different budget scenarios that we drafted based on all of the input that we received. But, ultimately, the final proposal that we brought forward to the council was the -- was reflective of the collaborative effort between the council, staff and, more importantly, the community. And when we brought it forward, it was actually adopted without any dissent from the council, and more importantly, without any dissent from the community.

And I think that what was most interesting about the proposal is that when we reached out to the community, their highest priority was preserving public safety. They made it very clear that they did not want to outsource the police department. And so we did find enough ways to preserve the police department. But I would have never guessed that to be the priority. And had I been tasked somehow in my early career with bringing forward a proposal like that, it would have definitely had elimination of the

police department at the top of the list, because it was our biggest ticket item. It was the biggest tool that we had to work with. And had I done that the community would have been very upset. It would have been obvious that I was completely out of touch with the community that I was serving.

And so I think that that is -- that was a really big lesson for me in my early career as to the importance of public input when you're drafting public policy, important public policy. And I had up until that point been involved with, you know, public participation in a number of ways, but I think that was the first time that I had engaged the public for the purpose of actually being the experts at making those determinations. And so I'm really grateful to the city manager at that time. He had a background in community development. I mean, he had the vision to understand that that was something that we needed to do.

And I think that was a really valuable lesson for me in my early career, because at that time I would have definitely thought, and I think I did go into that process thinking that he and I were really the experts. We had all of the information, and that really we would have been people to make the best proposal. And, in fact, that was a tremendous miscalculation on my part.

So, I think that that directly correlates to our work on the Commission, because as Commissioners, we are the voices of the State and the people of the State. We are not the experts. I think that the people are the experts, communities are the experts. They know their community better than we do. And so our role is to really seek out that participation and learn from what it is that they have to tell us.

And if I have time, I have one other recent story to tell you. One of my client cities is moving from general elections to district elections. And I happened to be at a public hearing. I was presenting on an unrelated item, but I was sitting through the process and the presentation. And there was a consultant who was hired. He brought forward and was making representation of the maps that he had drawn. I don't really know what process he had practiced, but in any case, at this point he had brought forward, I want to say it was 12 or 14 different maps, that he went through with the council.

And when he was done presenting his maps, a member of the community came forward and asked to present maps that he himself had drawn. And I want to say there was maybe two or three maps, and then a couple slight, different variations of those maps. But what was very interesting is that this community member was really focused on a

particular community of interest that the consultant in all of his maps had bifurcated and divided up. And this member of the community really stressed the importance of maintaining this specific community, and he was able to outline a geographic barrier, which happened to be a ravine.

And, ultimately, the council decided to move forward with this community member's map and dismissed all of the consultant's maps. I'm not sure how that actually rolled out moving forward from that point, because I wasn't involved. But, again, I think that that demonstrates the importance of public input. And the fact that it was that member of the community who really understood his community, understood the geographical boundaries within his community, and understood what made sense. And the city council recognized that.

So, again, I think that's important to our work on the Commission, because, as I stated before, I see us as being the voices of the community members, but not the experts. We really have to value and listen to what members of the community have to say. And we have to seek out their participation and really draw out that information, and make sure that our work product is reflective of that.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question five. A

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

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Thank you. I think that professionally, as a public servant, I have extensive experience in drafting public policy and interacting with the public. I have the experience of working with technical data and information, working within legal confines, and gathering all of that data and really bringing forward a collaborative work product that is reflective of the input that's been received.

But personally, I'm a consumer of history. I'm an avid world traveler, and I have a fascination with the development of civilization and how's it's evolved in one region to another, how it's similar, how it's different, and how cultures adjacent to one another have evolved in such different ways. But more importantly than how they're different, really how they're similar. And I think that it

really says a lot about who we are as a people, the similarities between all of these cultures. And so, I definitely have an interest and a respect for culture.

I also have a personal respect for minorities. I know the challenges and the struggles that they face in their daily lives. My husband is an immigrant, and I have witnessed firsthand the prejudice that minorities face in many aspects of their lives. And I also know that they're underrepresented in the political system. So, ultimately I believe that I have the professional experience, a demonstrated experience at being respectful and appreciative of diverse ideas when drafting public policy. But I also think, you know, I have personal experience and a genuine interest in culture and an appreciation for culture.

So, I think that the combination of those will guide me as a Commissioner, and will guide my communications and my demeanor and how that is perceived, as genuinely interested and respectful of what people have to say and what people have to contribute to the process. And, again, when I say people contributing, I mean the public, but also fellow Commissioners. Because I think that it's to be expected. I think we know that we're going to have Commissioners with a diverse set of political backgrounds and a diverse of ideas, and I think that it's

really important that we value the perspective that everybody brings to the table.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Thank you.

MR. DAWSON: 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, Mr. Coe.

CHAIR COE: Thank you, Mr. Dawson.

Ms. Beauchaine, good morning again to you. Thank you --

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Good morning.

CHAIR COE: -- for taking the time to speak with us today. So in your application it looks like you've been involved, I believe, in a volunteer capacity with several organizations, including the Association of Bay Area Governments and Small Cities Organized Risk Effort. I wonder if you could tell us a little bit about the roles you played in those organizations and why you wanted to be a part of them.

MS. BEAUCHAINE:

MS. BEAUCHAINE: So, my participation in both ABAG and SCORE pertain to my role as finance directors in various cities. In both capacities I was the representative for my city. I had kind of different roles and responsibilities in each of those groups, so I'll just kind of talk about

them briefly, separately.

In ABAG, I was actually the secondary representative. I didn't have a tremendous amount of input there. I did attend and bring back information, but the city manager was the primary and really served as the voice of our community. So, a lot less participation there.

With SCORE I was actually the primary in that group. And my initial role was to understand liability and how it affected our city, risk management and mitigation.

But in SCORE I actually became involved to a higher degree.

I ended up working on the finance committee, and ultimately being a chair of that committee for a period of time where we took a more active role in evaluating the -- our groups' finances, our audits, and specifically, the liability calculations, the retrospective calculations, and kind of served as the voice and translator to the group as a whole.

CHAIR COE: Thank you. So you own your own municipal finance consulting business, is that right?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Yes.

CHAIR COE: Can you give us a little bit of a background on what a municipal finance consultant does?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Sure. So, actually, I do different types of consulting. I also do business consulting. But as a municipal finance consultant, essentially what I do is I assist other finance directors

or cities in various ways, depending on what their needs are.

When I was a finance director I learned very early on that there was a tremendous amount of work to do. There were always changing mandates. We were constantly involved in this cyclical reporting, grant reporting and infrastructure financing. And it seems that no matter how many hours we worked, that there were always more projects and more work to be done.

And so, as a consultant, there's a number of things that I can do to assist in that capacity, whether it be just adding some extra bandwidth to an existing team to help get through a reporting period, to provide additional technical input on a project, to help with infrastructure financing and other activities.

I've also served in acting in interim capacities while teams are recruiting and making a transition on their team. So I can kind of help keep the ball moving, so that they don't lose any extra time and maintain current on all of their reporting. And so I think there's a number of different ways that I can provide support.

CHAIR COE: So your clients are small, local governments, cities and counties and things of that nature, is that right?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Correct.

CHAIR COE: Are most of those in California?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: All of them, yes.

CHAIR COE: How do you think having such clients as part of your business could reflect upon the public's perception of the Commission's ability to fairly draw lines in the areas where those cities are?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: I think it's hard to say what individual citizens could think about that. I think that my role really is very small in the grand scheme of things as far as trying to report all the financials and continue with financial policy.

As a consultant I don't really have any input into public policy or into drafting programs or making decisions that way. I really am focused on the accounting, financial reporting aspect. So I would hope that it wouldn't be perceived as any sort of a conflict. I believe that it isn't a conflict. I don't have an alliance to any specific community or any specific programs or policies.

CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you. So you own a small business. I believe from your application, your husband's also a small business owner, is that right?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Correct.

CHAIR COE: Do think having a small business perspective on this Commission is an important perspective to have?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: I don't know that it's of particular importance. I do think it provides a unique background, and I think it's representative of a lot of people in California. I think that, I think that being a small business owner there's -- it takes a unique skill set and a certain amount of grit to be successful. And I think that all of those qualities would benefit the Commission and also help relate to the community as a whole.

CHAIR COE: Thank you. I'd like to switch topics for a moment to your, the essay you wrote on appreciation for California's diversity. And in that essay you say that, "the Commission must remain impartial and sensitive to the needs of various geographic regions, minority groups and other demographic factors that make people, their culture and concerns unique." And as a demonstration of -- as an example of your demonstration of this, you speak about drafting and presenting public policy, receiving feedback from community members, which you also talked about this morning, and ultimately coming up with a product that is representative of the community demographic.

So, from your experiences there, what do you think you've learned from the different people, the different diverse groups of people that you've come in contact with about their perspectives and concerns that you think would make you an effective representative for them on this

Commission?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Well, I think, as I mentioned, I worked on a lot of different programs and public policy initiatives. And within every community you definitely have different groups with different opinions, different concerns. But I think that what I have learned is, more than their differences, what's important is trying to understand their similarities. And, ultimately, when people express their concerns and participate, that everybody has the same fears and concerns.

Everybody wants to have the best quality of life. And I think that if you really get to the heart of people's concerns and understand where their fears are, I think that you can often times bring something forward that addresses one's concerns, and also provides the quality that the others are asking for. And so I think it's that balance, and also being able to kind of dive below the surface of what people are saying, because people get heated, they get upset. Sometimes they feel like they're not being heard.

And so, I think that you kind of have to cut through some of that noise and some of that emotion, to dive a little bit deeper, understand what people are really getting at, and, you know, to be creative in your solutions. And I think if you can do those things, you know, you can come to a place of compromise.

And I think that that speaks to something that you guys had mentioned earlier in your questions, the polarization of politics right now. And I think that if you -- if public servants and political leaders get to a point where they're not really willing to listen to one another anymore, and they're not willing to compromise and be respectful, it's virtually impossible to develop a collaborative work plan. And so you really have to cut through all of that and get down to more basic levels.

CHAIR COE: So I have a similar question, but more in regards to geographic diversity, and the concerns of communities can differ based on where they located, different regions throughout the State. And I'd assume this is most of your client -- governments across the State of California, you've had a chance to travel in different areas and meet different people in those regions. So my question is, if you could talk a little bit about your experiences with people in different regions of the State. What you've learned from the people in the different regions that you think would make you an effective representative for them on this Commission?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: You know, I hate to throw people into groups, because I think that, you know, everybody is different. But I think that there are some deferent -- different geographical differences amongst people in

different areas of California.

I'm from Northern California, and I think it kind of makes me laugh a little bit when folks refer to Sacramento area as Northern California, because I'm about five hours north of Sacramento. And so I am in Northern California, and above me, we have another two hours. So there's about seven hours north of Sacramento, and yet Sacrament is referred to as Northern California. So it's kind of a joke here in Humboldt County, that people don't really know what Northern California is.

Having grown up here, I have been aware, long before my work in public service, that there's a difference of opinion of people here politically in rural Northern California, north of Sacramento. And that there's a general feeling that rural Northern California is really underrepresented politically. And that most of these interest is really focused on the urban hubs, Los Angeles area, San Francisco, and then what is referred to as Northern California, being Sacramento. And that that is in fact just not accurate.

I think that, you know, my involvement in public service kind of shed some light on these issues for me, and I know that one of the biggest concerns about -- in our geographical area is underrepresentation of water rights, and how a lot of the water comes from Northern California,

but based on agreements that were drafted in the 70's, actually gets moved into Southern California. And that we do not have the same political representation in rural Northern California.

I think that in a different way, my work, both a as public servant in rural areas versus in the city, as well as a consultant in rural areas versus in the city, definitely gives me a little bit of insight into people and their differences. And like I said, I hate to, you know, categorize people and their personalities by geography, but as I mentioned, I think that there are some real differences.

I think that in urban areas, people live in these great melting pots. I lived in the Bay Area, and so I use that as an example. In one day you can hear any number of languages. You run across people from any number of countries, immigrants and cultures. And in the city, you really see all of those cultures coming together, and people living together and interacting on a daily basis. And I think that those people have been exposed and access that kind of diversity.

I think that a lot of people who congregate in the city and work in the city, because they're exposed to these different ideas and these different types of people, have a different comfort level and a different paradigm from which

they view life through. I think that people who live in rural areas, some of them grew up there and they never left. Others moved there intentionally because they wanted — they intentionally prefer to live kind of a more rural area.

And I think that when you live in a more rural area, you have less exposure. Less exposure to culture, less exposure to ideas that are different than your own. I think that my living in the Bay Area, the people that I work with, people travel. People are familiar with different cultures and have a different kind of understanding and respect.

Whereas, I think in more rural areas, people are more stationary, and they're just less exposed. And so, I think that there are definite differences in the ideas of people in rural areas versus urban areas. But in a different way, I think that there are different concerns of people in rural areas versus in urban areas.

And I think that one of the things that I want to make mention of, and I did write in my essay, is that in researching this Commission and the mission of the Commission and the work product of the prior Commission, I did go through and read the various profiles of the Commissioners. And I want to first say that they are all very accomplished and well-deserving of their positions.

But one of the things that I noticed is that I think that the most northerly Commissioner was in the Sacramento area. That there was no representation of Northern California, the real Northern California on that Commission. And I think that geographic diversity adds to the integrity of the Commission.

I think that in order for the Commission -- or the best way for the Commission to engage those rural areas is to have a representative from a rural area, because there are differences in perspective. So, if it were up to me, which it is not, you know, I would advise that the Commission should include geographic diversity. Because, as I mentioned, I think it adds to the integrity of the Commission.

One of the other things I noticed in regards to diversity, is that there wasn't a lot of diversity in age. I think that there's a large conversation politically that younger generations are not represented in politics. They are not being adequately represented in public policy. And so when I looked at the prior Commission, there was a little bit, but not a lot of diversity in age. I think it was, the Commission was definitely heavily representative of certain age groups. And so, again, you know, I would advise that the Commission, in order to better relate to the population as a whole, should be diverse in that way as

well.

CHAIR COE: Thank you.

Madam Secretary --

MS. PELLMAN: At this time we have two minutes, 20 seconds remaining.

CHAIR COE: Great. Thank you.

So, Ms. Beauchaine, if you were to be appointed to the Commission, which aspects of the role of Commissioner do think that you would enjoy the most, and conversely, which aspects of that role do you think might cause you to struggle a little bit?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: As far as which aspects I would enjoy the most, I think I mentioned that I love to travel and I have a genuine interest in various cultures. And I think that -- you know, California is a large state. And I'll been all over California, but there are definitely areas that I haven't traveled to and that I don't know about. And so I would thoroughly enjoy learning about the various communities within California, and learning about the people within our State.

I think I would also really enjoy working with my colleagues on the Commission. I have no doubt that they will be multi-talented. And so, I would really enjoy learning from each of them and working with them and learning about this process. But most importantly, I think

I would really enjoy working on a project of this magnitude. I think it's really a legacy project. And, you know, being able to have the opportunity to serve as the voice of the community, and to truly shape the future of California, I think would be the most enjoyable.

As far as what I would dislike or what would be most challenging, probably procedure and bureaucracy. You know, those are rules that we have to follow and work within, but I would say that that's probably the least enjoyable. But it's something I have done and will work through appropriately.

MS. PELLMAN: That's 20 minutes.

CHAIR COE: Thank you. It sounds like I'm out of time, so we'll go ahead and turn the time over to Ms.

Dickison.

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you, Mr. Coe.

Good morning, Ms. Beauchaine. Did I say it right?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Yes. Perfect. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Okay. So I wanted to start with, in your impartiality essay, I want to read a statement that you wrote, and then I'll ask you a question about it. It says, "as a former government staffer and current municipal finance consultant, I am familiar with the public process and the lengths that must be gone to in

order to ensure public participation and support." Can you expand on how the Commission can ensure and encourage public participation in this process?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Sure. So, as you mentioned and as I mentioned, I think that public participation is very important. I see the public as being the experts in their communities, and our role is simply being their voice and relying on their skills. So, I think that as we look at different communities, we're going to have to identify the community leaders who can advise us about the specific issues within their community, communities of interest and let us know who -- where we can get information and how we can generate and encourage the participation that's necessary.

I think that a part of my answer will be indicative of my experience, but I think that as we go into communities, not having any sort of information or background, I think that a good place to start is with local government and local government leaders. I think that they will be able to tell us where to look, who to reach out to, what specific communities of interest we should be taking a look at, what geographical concerns that need to be considered. And I think that they will have a wealth of information and can point us really in the right direction.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. In your impartiality essay, you discuss that you had remained impartial while performing the functions of a finance professional. Can you provide a specific example of setting aside your own views when making a decision?

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

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Yeah. I think, I think I have one example that is pretty demonstrative of my role and my need to set aside my personal feelings. I had talked earlier about my role in drafting budget cuts during the recession. And I mentioned that one of the biggest ticket items kind of on our list was eliminating the police department. And that was something that we had to look to. At the time, my husband was a police officer for that police department. And as a finance director, my responsibility was to ensure that the city was solvent, and as I mentioned, had it been my responsibility to bring forward a proposal, I can quarantee you that eliminating the police department would have been at the top of that list, regardless of how it impacted my family and my family's finances. I take my duties and responsibilities seriously, and that is my first and primary role.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. You talked about being a world traveler. Can you provide me of an example of an experience in your travel that increased your appreciation for diversity?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Sure. My husband at one time early in his career was a flight attendant, an international flight attendant, and so there were a lot of benefits that came with that. I was able to get on various flights when I had the opportunity. And so I probably had a lot of opportunities to travel and see the world that maybe others don't have. I had also mentioned that he is Jordanian. And the first time I went to the Middle East, I think that that had a significant impact on me. I think that, you know, as Americans, you know, what we see of the Middle East is really indicative of the wars that we've been engaged in, and the terrorist attacks that we have been subjected to. And I think a lot of the media that we see is really about the negative aspects of the Middle East, the restrictions and terrorists. And so, the first time I went to the Middle East, my family was very upset. They were very concerned about my safety. And I really felt strongly about wanting to go there, not just to visit my now-husband's family -- he wasn't my husband at the time, but to really see the country and to see a different of life.

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 when I got there, it was just a tremendous eye-opener to me, because as adventurous as I am and as I was, I wouldn't be truthful if I didn't say that I wasn't concerned, obviously, for my safety. And that the ideas of

terrorists and kidnapping and things like that weren't on my mind. But what I found was that people were so kind.

And that, you know, in going through the villages and going to the shops and interacting with the people, even though in a lot of cases there was a language barrier, that those people were so kind. When you go into a shop there, they greet you with coffee and they want to talk with you. They want you to leave with a gift. And I think that that's not something that I understood before I traveled there.

And I think that, again, that just shows, you know, how our own paradigms are formed, and our own perceptions and perspectives of different people. And so, I was definitely surprised by the generosity and the kindness, despite obviously the political issues that our countries have and our language barrier. So, again, I think that goes back to how similar we are as a people, and how we relate to one another outside of kind of those bigger issues.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. Can you walk us through an analysis that you've completed that would require skills similar to those that would be needed to complete the work of the Commission?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Huh. That is a good question. I don't know that I can outline a project that is exactly

similar to the work that we need to complete on the Commission. I think I can talk about aspects and deliverables of the Commission and individual things I have worked on that relate to them, if that would be helpful.

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 think that as the Commission forms, we'll have to, you know, determine one another's strengths and delegate appropriately. And I think that happens on executive teams all the time. As a department head, when I came to -- you know, we would come together, especially in a small community you don't have enough people, you know, you kind of have to identify, regardless of what your title is, okay, what strengths do we have here on this team and who can do that? And that's how I, as a city finance director, ended up getting involved in economic development and community development and building water and wastewater plants. Not because that was my role as a finance director, but because that was the strength that I can contribute to the team. And so I think that that is very similar, in that we will have to identify each other's strengths and lean on them and delegate appropriately.

I think that once the Commission is formed, we're going to have to hire an executive director. We're going to have to recruit for a team. And, again, those are all things that I have done professionally, in building a team and going through a recruitment. I've done that many

times. I think that as we start looking at various communities and dividing -- or deciding rather, how to draw those boundaries, as I mentioned, we were going to have to engage the public. They're going to be the experts in their communities. And that's something that I have done a number of times in my career as a public servant, whether it be on the budget that I talked about, or community development programs, CDBG programs, determining what kind of housing programs the community needs.

So, I think that those are all experiences that I have had, and that will benefit this Commission as a whole. But I think that all of these different activities relate to kind of different experiences and projects I've worked on throughout my career.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. So, Mr. Coe asked you about your clients earlier. I have another question that's kind of related to that. How would you respond if a client approached you about your work as a Commissioner?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: I think that the first thing I would want to do is listen to what it is that they have to say and what their specific concerns are, and I would have to go my best to address and respond to those concerns. I think that, you know, my response would really be, like I said, dependent on the specific concern.

As I mentioned, I don't see any of my work in various communities as being disqualifying or inappropriate in comparison to the work that the Commission will do, because I'm not involved in policy there. I really just am involved in the accounting and the numbers. But, ultimately, as a Commissioner, that would be my first priority and responsibility. So, any feedback or specific interest that a client would have, would not -- I would not be able to allow that to have any sort of impact on my work as a Commissioner.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Okay. If you were selected as one of the first eight Commissioners who are selected randomly, you would be tasked with selecting the next six. What would you be looking for in those individuals?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Well, I first want to say that this has been a very thorough process. So, I'm confident that the remaining pool to choose from, that they would all be excellent candidates. I'm sure of that. But I think that in going to the second round of selection, I think that we would need to do is really kind of take inventory of the existing skill set of the first eight Commissioners. And that the remaining picks should help to balance or round out the existing skill set.

And just for example, you know, if the first eight were all heavy in technical skills, I would say that the

remaining six would need to round out the group with, you know, executive management skills or with more public outreach and participation experience. And so I think it's really important that on that group, on the Commission as a whole, that we are well-rounded in skills, but also we would have to take into account I think diversity, as I mentioned before.

If, you know, if we need to look for someone who has really good executive management skills, if we think that would be beneficial, and there's, you know, 10 different potential candidates, how does their diversity and background round out the group as a whole? If we have everybody from Northern California, maybe we would need to look for some representation from Southern California, and vice a versa. So, I think that kind of taking stock of the existing Commissioners' skill set and demographic, and then trying to round that out with the, with the next selections.

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

MS. BEAUCHAINE: I think I would like to see the Commission accomplish drafting maps that are truly reflective of the input that we receive. And that we really go the extra mile to engage with these communities and to seek out that input. And that we bring forward a

collaborative product that really is representative of the people of California.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

Mr. Coe, I have no additional questions at this time.

CHAIR COE: Thank you, Ms. Dickison.

Mr. Belnap, the time is yours.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: Good morning, Ms. Beuchaine.

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Good morning.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: Now, I want to establish your geographic experiences in California. I understand that you've traveled throughout the world. And you are generally from Northern California, but I also heard you say that you lived in the Bay Area. So, can you describe what parts of California you've lived and work in?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Sure. So I am originally from Humboldt County in Northern California. I lived here all of my life. I went to school here. And up until -- gosh, I can't remember my exact age, early/midway through my career, I moved to the Bay Area. I worked on the peninsula for a city there. And I lived in East Bay, in Danville. I also worked in Berkeley, before I ultimately moved home, which was really a decision of necessity, so that my kids could be close to their family here. We're pretty connected, and their needs were really more important than

mine professionally. But -- so I do have experience working and living in a rural area in Northern California, as well as in various areas in the bay.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: Okay. And you also mentioned you've traveled throughout California. In what capacity were those travels?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: I think both personally, as well as professionally. Professionally, I have worked, as I mentioned, in rural California, as well as in urban California in the Bay Area and Sacramento area. Personally, you know, I've spent time in L.A., in Palm Springs. We ski in Tahoe. You know, so I think we have traveled all over the primary segments of the State. Spent time in the valley, as well as very Northern California, as my kids travel, also in sports. So both personally and professionally I've kind of been all over.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: All right. Thank you. So you've been working in municipal finance since 2005. So 15 years. How did you get your start in municipal finance?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: It was not deliberate. I was working for a small firm, an accounting firm. And when I took that job I was actually still going to school, and I took it because it was a good wage for a student, and also because it provided a mechanism to maintain my health insurance. At that time I really wanted to go to law

school, and I really didn't know that I had an aptitude for accounting and finance in that way.

But after having worked there for some time, I realized that I was actually kind of good at it, and I really enjoyed it. I kind of found a rhythm to the numbers, and I was really interested in the story that they told if you could understand and interpret their language. So I knew that I had an aptitude and an interest in accounting and finance, but I didn't really know what I wanted to do with it.

I definitely knew that I did not want to be a CPA. I did not want to work in a public firm. From my perspective, in that kind of a consulting role we really just gave service, tax preparers, tax advisors. We did, you know, make recommendation, but we really didn't have an active role in the operation of a business. And I knew that I really wanted to do something higher impact. I wanted to mold something or build something more tangible. I didn't really know what that was.

But at a certain point I was recruited to be a part of a reconstructive team for the city. I had a connection to the chief of police at the time, who was serving as the acting city manager, and he had kind of talked through and bounced some ideas off of me about some of the troubles that they were having. And so I ended up being asked to

come to the city as a part of that reconstructive team.

At that point I didn't really have any specific interest in government work. I didn't really know what that meant or what it even looked it. My interest in making that transition was really about the project itself and the investigative work that needed to be done to solve kind of the accounting issues. And so I did make that jump over to the city, like I said, with a particular interest in the challenge that they were -- the challenges that they were facing with their accounting.

During my work on that team, I kind of rose to being the leader of our reconstructive team. And, ultimately, I was offered the finance director position after having spent some time there. So, again, that wasn't a choice, it wasn't a deliberate choice. But what I found in working for the city was that the areas of work were so diverse. You know, each of the departments had such diversity in their own missions and the own programs that they were providing to the public.

And that in working in finance, because ultimately everything comes back money, you know, I really had the opportunity to take part in all of those various departments and in all of their missions. And I was able to help craft the direction and the policy within each of those departments.

And I wouldn't have anticipated it, but I really had a significant sense of fulfillment in that work, and really seeing my work product out in the public in a way that I hadn't seen before. And so, I think that that's when I really discovered my particular passion for public service, and for being mission and service driven. And I think that that has really guided my career at every step forward. That's always in the background of something I know that I want and enjoy doing.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: So you mentioned you were going to school. Were you studying accounting?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: I was actually studying business at the time. My initial plan was to get my undergraduate in Business and then proceed to law school --

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: Okay.

MS. BEAUCHAINE: -- which I did not.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: Okay. What school are we talking about?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: I went to college at the Redwoods.

I spent a number of semesters there as I kind of toggled back and forth. And eventually went to Humboldt State. I also took on-line classes as well and extension classes.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: Okay. Did you -- so you've transferred to Humboldt State. Did you end up graduating from Humboldt State?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: I did not.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: Okay. So I want to come back to -- well, you talked about the start in municipal finance. Now what I'd you to do is kind of summarize your career from two questions. The first is, I'd like you to talk about an accomplishment from your work that you're proud of. And then I'd like you to describe a mistake that you made and that you learned from.

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Sure. Accomplishments. I think that, you know, when I went to my first city and I took that role, I mentioned that I was a part of a transition theme. And the city had some unique financial challenges. They had — they were behind about five years in their audits. They were receiving letters from both the Federal and State Government, essentially saying that they were going to have their funding withdrawn.

Their former finance director had to leave the city suddenly, and when she left, she left in the middle of a project to transitioning from an old DOS base accounting system into a new accounting system. And that position was vacant for about a year and a half, and so they were actually operating dual systems that had never been reconciled, in addition to the fact that they were about five years behind on their financial reporting.

And I think that in that circumstance, because of

the state that I found it in, I think that that's where, you know, I had the most notable contributions, because there was so much room for improvement. Within, I think the first three years, we were able to get them transitioned into their software, fully reconciled, and have all of their audits brought up to date. I think that was a tremendous accomplishment. I didn't do that by myself. We had a great team, and we also had a great audit team, who served as support for the work that we did. But we worked tirelessly to achieve that.

Also, in a small community, you know, with limited staff, I think that, you know, you also have a tremendous opportunity to fill gaps and voids. And so I'm proud of the various community projects that I work on. But I think that for me, my -- I don't know if it's my biggest accomplishment, but I think what I'm most proud of is really being able to go back to a community that I worked in and really see tangible parts of my work in the community.

I live now about eight miles from the first city that I worked in, and I had a really active role there.

And being able to drive through and, you know, see the park that we helped build with the facilities there, and families enjoying that. To drive down a street and see the streetscape that, you know, we designed and funded. Or to

go down to the river and see the water intake system that we built and funded, that's providing clean water to the community, and that will be there, you know, hopefully a long time. I think that that is — those are my biggest accomplishments and what I'm most proud of, and I think that they're tangible parts of my legacy.

As far as maybe the biggest mistake that I made -gosh. I think of one circumstance in particular. I had
talked earlier about the decisions that we had to make
during the recession. And one of the, one of the ways that
we balance the budget is we kind of rearrange staffing.
And we did our best to take staff who were going to be
eliminated or laid off and slide them into positions of
people who were retiring. And so within my own department
I had one of those positions. I had a retiree who was
leaving, and I took another employee from another
department and put her, we put her in that position,
essentially to preserve her job.

And it was, it was kind of clear early on that she was struggling with really catching on. And the various members of my department would come from -- come to me at different times and tell me about some of the issues that they were having, and how this one individual was impacting their work and their accuracy.

And so, I had many conversations with that

employee. We did training, a number of trainings. And I really did everything I could to try to get this person up to speed, because I really valued their job and their personal livelihood. But I think in this specific example, I think that I didn't act swiftly enough. I actually didn't realize the depth of the errors, and what it was doing to my own team and my own staff, and the negativity that was creating. And I think that probably went on for maybe six or nine months. I can't remember. It was a significant amount of time. And I think that based on the damage that it caused to my department, I think I let it go on too long. I think that, you know, finding a balance between business and people is always difficult, and I tend to err on the side of people, but that was a mistake in this circumstance, and I should have acted more swiftly.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

Madam Secretary, can I get a time check?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. Five minutes, 25 seconds.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

So I want to return to a subject that Mr. Coe and Ms. Dickison has asked you about, and that's your role as a consultant to local entities. Mostly cities, right, is that fair?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: That's correct.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: Okay.

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: So as you've rightly pointed out, being a consultant to cities, or being an elected local official for that matter, is not a disqualifying conflict of interest. That's really not the issue.

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: The critical issue is, what happens after you're selected as a Commissioner, if you were to be selected. In particular, the concern behind our questions is whether or not you, because of your contacts in the cities, would be a special conduit for access to the Commission by particular local entities. So that's, that's where that question's coming from.

And in your response when you said you'd listen to their concerns, if that were done outside of Commission meetings, I want you to see how that might be problematic, because it would create that special access. So, now that you hear exactly where I'm coming from --

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Right.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: -- that's the background behind my next question. I'll now the question. If you were selected to be a Commissioner, how would you separate your work for Government entity clients from your work as a Commissioner?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: I think I -- I think it's a good

question, and I kind of want to approach it from a couple of different perspectives. The first thing I want to say is, you know, I've already anticipated, you know, my workload, and what happens if I join this Commission. And, really, you know, I've already kind of been thinking that this will have to be my job during this period of time. Obviously, I would have to wrap up loose ends and projects, but I would not be able to serve consecutively as a consultant on a project, as well as a Commissioner. So, if selected, I will not be working as a consultant during this period of time. It's just, there are not enough hours in the day. So I want to say that first.

I think secondly, in my response to your earlier question, that I would listen to their concerns, I think that I was making that comment with the thinking that they would be coming to me, suggesting that I was conflicted in some way. And if somebody suggested that I was conflicted, I would want to understand what their perspective was.

Now, if they were coming to me with interest about their community, or trying to transmit information through back channels to me, to influence me on the Commission, that is a completely different situation. And that line of communication would not be open. I think that one distinction I do want to make though, is that my role as a Commissioner is very different than my role as it was as a

public servant. As a public servant I really did have influence and shape policy. I was interacting with other executives, as well as politicians on a regular basis.

As a consultant I'm really behind the scenes. I'm not face forward. Most of the local politician and council people, they don't even know who I am. I do not have active channels of communication with various politicians in these cities. You know, my direct reports are really to finance or to city managers, who in my experience are typically very apolitical for very obvious reasons, because it's their responsibility to serve whoever is in those political roles. So, I would find it not impossible, but maybe very unlikely that any of the contacts that I have would have any specific interest in redistricting.

If, perhaps, a local politician was able to somehow see a connection and reach one of those executives to try to get information to me, I think that that is just an obvious no. It's not acceptable, and it's not something I would participate in. Because, as I said at that time, while I'm serving on the Commission, I do not see myself maintaining active contracts and being engaged in work with any cities.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

MS. BEAUCHAINE: So, hopefully that answers your

25 question.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: It did. Thank you.

And, Mr. Chair, no further questions.

CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Belnap.

Mr. Dawson.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Beauchaine, once again, thank you for being here. Good morning. In our response to standard question three, you mentioned the Covid-19 situation possibly giving additional challenges to the work of the Commission. But I took your response to mean that it would have particular effect on travel and outreach.

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Correct.

MR. DAWSON: Do you have any concern about the Covid-19's situation's impact on the Census data that the Commission will be relying upon?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: I think that's possible. Did I lose you? There you are. Okay. Sorry. I think it's possible. I know that the Census has gone to an on-line format, so in addition to being able to mail things in, you can submit on-line. But I think it, I think that that doesn't necessarily address the issues specifically, you know, in -- with minorities and in certain demographics of the State. I think there are a lot of people who don't have access to technology and are reliant on that kind of outreach. And for those people who do go out into

communities and, you know, knock on doors and talk to people and really educate and explain why it's important to participate. So I do think that that is a real concern. What the impacts will be, I'm not sure that we will know until we have that data.

MR. DAWSON: All right. Thank you. I notice in your application that you were a CFO for Cher-ae Heights Casino. Did I pronounce that correctly?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Yes, Cher-ae Heights.

MR. DAWSON: Cher-ae Heights. Is that in Humboldt?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: It is.

MR. DAWSON: And then that's a tribal casino?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: It is.

MR. DAWSON: Do you think that your work with the tribe gives you any insight as to the representation or lack thereof of the indigenous peoples of California?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: I think a little bit it does. This specific casino was run very independently from the tribe, which my understanding is, somewhat unusual. But we did -- as a CFO I did report to the tribal commission. And so I do -- you know, I have sat through those meetings. I have, you know, been involved with the interaction from tribal members, and I think I do have some understanding as to what their concerns are and, you know, that they do have

a lack of representation. So, yeah, I think it provide

some insight there. By no means an expert, but I have, I do have some insight.

MR. DAWSON: Okay. Thank you. So, I take it from some of your answers that you'd mentioned that you had participated in public meetings, and that is, if I understood correctly, as a consultant or staffer?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Correct.

MR. DAWSON: So making reports to councils, that sort of thing?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Yes.

MR. DAWSON: And then, do you do have some familiarity with the Brown Act and the Public Records Act?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Absolutely.

MR. DAWSON: Okay. I was struck by your response to, I think it was standard question four, you were talking about one particular city that were working in where they were going to district elections. And the local community presented a map. Does -- that was ultimate accepted by the council, is that correct?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Yes.

MR. DAWSON: So, was it that the consultant just didn't know where folks -- I mean, he knew where folks lived, but didn't understand the connections between them?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: It's hard for me to know exactly

what happened, because as I said, I just happened to be in

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC
229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

that meeting when it happened. I don't really know what the consultant's process was. I don't know how he engaged the public, or what kind of prior hearings they had had. So, I don't know how that situation evolved.

MR. DAWSON: All right.

MS. BEAUCHAINE: What I do know from sitting in a number of meetings, is that this specific resident is what I would kind of define as a community leader, regularly participated in council meetings, voiced his concerns and opinions on a number of various policy items at almost every meeting I attended in that city. And so definitely interesting that either the consultant was unaware of this citizen's concerns or did not incorporate them. So, which happened here, I'm not sure, but it was striking to me.

MR. DAWSON: I see. Thank you. Sticking on the topic meetings, you mentioned that you'd read the 2010 Commission's report, noting that the furthest north member was in Esparto. But also in that report, the Commission noted that they felt that during public meetings there were folks who represented themselves as being community members who may have had, you know, some partisan backing. And I was wondering if your perspective, as having worked for city government, might give you some ability to suss that situation out?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: I think that -- again, you know, I

had talked earlier about, you know, my involvement in public policy, and listening to the comments that you receive. But the real job is to kind of access and dive below the surface. And I think that if you give people an opportunity to speak and you really listen, I think you can identify those connections. If you allow people to speak and you ask the right leading questions, I think you can get the information you need. So I do think it would be our responsibility to identify those situations, and I think that I do have that experience and ability.

MR. DAWSON: All right. Thank you.

No further questions, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Dawson.

Any follow-up questions from the Panel? Ms.

15 Dickison, any follow-up questions?

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

CHAIR COE: Mr. Belnap?

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: I do not have any follow-up questions.

CHAIR COE: I have one I could ask, but I don't want to step on the time of the applicant's closing statement.

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

CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you, Madam Secretary.

I'll ask it really quick, Ms. Beauchaine. In the work of the Commission, when you're reaching out to communities of interest, it's possible that you could come across a community that — or more than one community that maybe is less engaged or has concern about engaging for one reason or another. And I'm wondering that since perspectives of as many communities as possible is so important to the work of the Commission, what can the Commission do to make some of those communities feel more comfortable coming forward and sharing their perspective if they're having some apprehension about doing so?

MS. BEAUCHAINE: I think that there's a few things that the Commission can do. I had talked earlier about, you know, identifying each of the Commissioner's strengths and delegating appropriately. And I also talked about, you know, diversity on the Commission and how that really adds to the credibility of the Commission itself.

And so, I think that one way that we could help open the lines of communications in these communities is to identify which of -- which member of the Commission really would be the closest matched for that community. Who might have the background and experience to really reach out and find some sort of connection to these communities. And I think that that's the first thing I would try to do.

Secondly, I think that, you know, in my experience of not only working on public policy, but also, you know, working in business and negotiating deals, that, is that, you know, if you can find a commonality between two groups or between two people, and establish some sort of a rapport or a little bit of a personal connection, I think that people are more trusting, and they feel more comfortable with you.

And so, again, I think that, you know, if you can find a way to find some commonality, that it can open lines of communications with people. And so I would be looking to the Commissioners to kind of bounce those ideas off of one another, and determine, you know, who would be best fit, and what kind of tools do we have to find commonalities and similarities between us to inspire that comfort and conversation.

CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you.

I don't have any additional questions, counsel.

MR. DAWSON: All right. Thank you.

Madam Secretary, how much time is remaining in the 90 minutes?

MS. PELLMAN: Four minutes, 20 seconds.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Ms. Beauchaine, with the four minutes or so left,
I'd like to offer you the opportunity to make a closing

statement to the Panel, if you wish.

MS. BEAUCHAINE: Thank you. First, I just want to say, thank you to each of you for having me here today.

I'm sorry I wasn't able to be there in person. I have a genuine interest and a respect for the mission of this

Commission. And I believe that my professional experience and also my personal experiences would benefit this team.

I think this is a legacy project, and I would be so humbled and honored if given the opportunity to participate and serve, and I would do so with the utmost integrity and respect for this process. So I just want to thank you for your time.

I'm, again, grateful for having the opportunity to meet with all of you, and I appreciate your interest in me thus far, in getting me to this point. And I just wish you the best of luck with the rest of your recruitment process.

MR. DAWSON: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Beauchaine. Thank you for taking the time to speak with us this morning.

Our next interview is scheduled for 10:45, so we'll be in recess until 10:44.

(Off the record at 10:27 a.m.)

(Back on the record at 10:44 a.m.)

24 CHAIR COE: Okay. The time being 10:44, I'd like 25 to call this meeting out of recess. At this time I'd like

to it over to Mr. Dawson, who I believe has some information for us.

announce to the Panel and to those watching at home, we received some indication, initial indication from Dr.

Carpenter that he attempted to withdraw, but we don't have confirmation of that. So in the interest of fairness we will -- I recommend that we stand at ease until 11 -- until he logs on, or 11:00 o'clock, whichever is soonest.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'd like to

CHAIR COE: Okay. So, that being the case, we will be at ease until 11:00 a.m., or if Dr. Carpenter happens to join the meeting.

(Off the record at 10:45 a.m.)

(Back on the record at 11:00 a.m.)

CHAIR COE: Okay. The time is now 11:00 a.m., and as Dr. Carpenter hasn't joined us for the interview, we will go into recess until our next scheduled interview, which is at 1:15 p.m. So we will be in recess until 1:14 p.m.

(Off the record at 11:00 a.m.)

(Back on the record at 1:14 p.m.)

CHAIR COE: Okay. The time being 1:14, I'd like to call this meeting out of recess. At this time I'd like to welcome Dr. David Burdick for his interview.

Dr. Burdick, can you hear us okay?

DR. BURDICK: I can hear you fine.

CHAIR COE: All right. Great. Thank you for being here this afternoon.

I'd like to turn the time over to Mr. Chris Dawson for the standard five questions, please.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

DR. BURDICK: Yes, although you were cutting out a bit. So, this is going to be a little jumpy I think.

MR. DAWSON: All right. I -- let me know if you need me to repeat a question.

DR. BURDICK: Okay.

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

DR. BURDICK: First, I'd like to thank the Panel for the invitation to participate. With respect to the first question, there is a sentence in the article in the Constitution that the -- State Constitution, that I think

goes to the heart of what each Commission member must do.

And, basically, it says each Commission member shall apply
the law in a manner that is impartial, and that reinforces
public confidence in the integrity of the redistricting
process. That applies to every Commission member, not just
to the Commission as a whole, and I take that as a mandate.

So, on that basis, every Commission member, as I think every applicant has said to you in the previous interviews, must be open and transparent, comfortable working in full public view, able to apply the redistricting criteria that are spelled out in the Constitution, act with integrity and fairness, participate in a full public consideration of the process of drawing the district lines.

And, finally, exercise what I have learned is good boardsmanship. Among other things, that requires every one of the Commission Members to participate in the process. These are 14 seats, and there's really not room for somebody that simply wants to be appointed to the Commission and sit on the board so they can put it on their resume. It's going to be a working Commission. It's probably going to be working very hard. So, I guess my message to any Commissioner is, if you don't want to work, don't accept the position.

Now with respect to analytical abilities, each of

us would have to be comfortable with a great mass of statistical data, and the display of that data in maps, of course. Exercise a certain amount of patience during map adjustments to meet the law, including the Voting Rights Act.

And I believe that in the process of contracting for the map software, I would like to see the Commission issue a request for proposals from any one of a number of GIS map makers, and then present their wares, their products, by illustrating its performance with a standard problem the Commission would present each potential contractor with, so that we can evaluate their techniques, their accuracy and, probably very importantly, the data display capabilities.

I myself would be particularly interested in the ability of any software package to give us a three-dimensional display. That is to say, one that allows you to rotate the data from, let's say, and overhead view to a side view, and so on. I think that's going to be very useful in determining where gaps in the data might be. And when we get to question three, there are going to be a fairly large number of potential gaps.

So, in addition to that, everybody's got to stay engaged, stay focused on the task in front of us. Stay awake during long meetings. And I think every Commissioner

should be a notetaker. And the reason I say that is because I (indiscernible) the Commission is going to be faced with a very high probability of legal challenges in this particular effort.

And, finally, as a measure or as an element in boardsmanship, everybody should participate in the discussions. You know, all 14 Commissioners need to be able to hear the point of view of all 13 other Commissioners, but you have to do that respectfully, not dominating the conversation, give everybody a chance to clearly explicate their position on the same, but don't deny the Commission a view into your opinions.

And, finally, I think the Commissioners need to look forward. The -- again, as we get to question three, I'm concerned about a number of things. One is, the failure of the Federal Census. The second is the continuation of the impact of the Covid virus on the community, on the State. And the third is possible manipulation by external third parties. And so those are the, those are the elements that a good Commissioner and a good Commission are going to have to exhibit. And, I suffice it to say, think I can do this job.

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 hyperpartisanship? What will you do to ensure that the work of the Commission is not seen as polarized or hyperpartisan and avoid perceptions of political bias and conflict?

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

DR. BURDICK: Well, let me start by saying, I think the issue is not simply hyperpartisanship. The notion of a hyperpartisanship strikes me as being extraordinarily extreme. I think the Commission ought to be striving totally for no exhibition of partisanship whatsoever. all come from different backgrounds, and there are going to be different views among the Commissioners, but in the end the Commission should be discussing issues and solutions to the problems that the Commission faces, without any partisan input whatsoever. So I don't expect anybody to mention their -- excuse me (coughing), their particular affiliation with a party, and frankly, I think that the Commission ought to do something as simple as a simple pledge before every open meeting that says, we're basically going to work together without any partisanship, so that we reinforce at every juncture the impression by the public,

that this group, this CRC, is indeed aiming at solving a California problem, doing a job for California, and not for any particular party. So that's how I'd approach it.

MR. DAWSON: Question three. What is the -- DR. BURDICK: Excuse me (coughing).

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

DR. BURDICK: Okay. So this gets to the heart of my view of the Commission, and in particular, it's work over the next year or so. So, I would like to begin with a, sort of a very quick review of what actually the goal is, and how the law outlines what should be done. The goal of the Commission is to draw lines on a State map, so that we carve up the -- excuse me (coughing), the -- sorry. The -- yes, the four districts needed, Congressional Assembly, Senate and Board of Equalization.

Now the law outlines seven legal constraints on the process and on the result. And, again, I would reiterate the law also says, once again, that each Commissioner will apply the law in a manner that is impartial, and that reinforces public confidence in the integrity of the redistricting process. Now, which leads me to the overlying or overarching problem that the Commission is going to face, and that is, the problem of uncertainty.

The uncertainty in the whole effort I think is going to be rooted in three areas.

The first is the quality and the timeliness of the Federal Census. And the Federal Census was compromised early on by the administration in Washington when it attempted to put a citizenship question on the Census. This issue was immediately challenged by the State of New York, among others. It ultimately went up to the Supreme Court -- excuse me (coughing), after a district court had issued an injunction against the asking of the question. The Supreme Court sent it back saying, you guys can't do this.

The reasons that were given by Wilbur Ross, the Secretary of the Department of Commerce, that runs the Bureau of the Census, were basically described by the courts majority as being a pretext. And the pretext was that somehow asking that question about citizenship of any respondent would somehow (indiscernible) enforcement of the Voters Rights Act. The Supreme Court said, no.

The administration tried for another, basically three weeks, to figure out a way that they could leave it on there, but ultimately said, okay, we will, we will obey the mandate from the district court, and the question got pulled. But the damage to the populous in California was already complete. This question had received a great deal

of coverage in the media, and I feel certain that as a direct consequence, the administration actually achieved its end. It's going to have scared off participation in the Census by folks who are immigrants, who are not citizens, and yet who must be counted according to the Constitution, during the decennial Census.

So I think that is going to become a real problem for the CRC. And I actually believe that once the CRC has been constituted, it should start virtually immediately trying to deal with the legal ramifications of a faulty Federal Census. Now, it's known that the Federal Census is not the only source of data used in order to determine what the population is in the country, but this is going to become a big problem.

Okay. The second source of uncertainty for the Commission has to do with the impact of the coronavirus, Covid-19, on the population as a whole. I think it's going to be very difficult for the Redistricting Commission to conduct itself in the manner that the first one did 10 years ago. People are going to be extremely reluctant to come out in public for fear of spreading or being infected by the virus. It appears that venues that might have been logical sources for public meetings for the CRC are pretty much closing down shop, the churches, the assembly halls of all kind. So, the logistics of actually conducting the

outreach that I think the CRC would like to do is going to become very problematic. Travel will be virtually impossible if it has to be done by air. Even if you get to the location where you want to hold a meeting, you probably won't be able to find a hotel or a motel open. No place to eat under the current circumstances. So I think that is another source of great uncertainty, and the CRC will have to deal with it.

Finally, the third source of uncertainty that I see coming down the pike is the very real possibility of an attempt to manipulate CRC by political entities, and I will call them the Democratic National Committee and the Republican National Committee, although those may not be the only ones. There were good, credible reports from the 2010 Commission that such manipulation was attempted. It took place through the trojan horse of the community-of-interest approach, which is a fairly vaguely defined entity in the law, and it seems like it's sort of ripe for manipulation by parties that are trying to influence in the wrong direction the output of the committee.

So, those are the three sources of uncertainty that I see. Now, the other part of the question I think had to do with, what would I do about it. And I do have some ideas, and probably the most important one and the most interesting one to me is a recognition of the fact that in

the process of selecting the 14 members of the CRC, the Applicant Review Panel has actually created a very useful database of very interested people who might want to serve, as what I'm going to call the CRC's auxiliary. These 120 folks who you will have interviewed, minus the 14 that will ultimately get on to the Commission Panel, I deem to be almost invaluable resource.

I've paid a fair amount of attention to the interviews of a fair number of those folks, and I would conclude that as a body, they are the sort of people we would like to (indiscernible) into the community, if you will, to (indiscernible) information would be useful in the Commission's process of actually trying to identify communities of interest and other information.

One other thought that has occurred to me was that if the threat of political interference from the outside, from the DNC and the RNC, as examples, is significant, it might start showing up fairly early. These folks who want to exert political influence have already started planning a far more sophisticated approach than they were able to use in 2010. And we might find elements of those -- that planning process reflected in newspaper accounts, editorials, opinion pieces that have appeared throughout the State over the last, I don't know, three or four (indiscernible). And so, one thought that I've had is that

the CRC auxiliary could be useful in examining through newspaper accounts the process that might be leading to another attack from the political foes. So those are the three areas, and that is essentially my approach.

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've 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. BURDICK: I've had a number of board type experiences, and the one I want to draw upon to address that question goes back to my service on the local school board. I should point out that I'm -- that I live in a very small community. It's about 30,000 people in the area. We have one school board that covers the entire district. The district includes a couple of high schools, a couple of secondary -- sorry, middle schools, and 10 or 11 elementary schools.

Now some years ago when I was on the board, a proposal came forward to the board that we would -- we

should take one of our elementary schools and turn it into what the proponents at that time were calling a basic school. This is probably a forerunner to charter schools, but I don't think the concept of a full-blown charter school had actually cropped up yet, at least not in our district.

So we had a seven-member board, and the board discussed this proposal. And we decided there might be sufficient interest that we should do some kind of an outreach survey to find out what actually the community thought of it. So we did a postcard survey mailing to every elementary parent in the district, to find out what their interest might be. And we got those data back. It, again, still looked fairly positive. So we fleshed out in somewhat greater detail the actual composition and goals and makeup of the so-called basic school. And that then became the goal of the board.

Now, at that point, the question arose, so, where will the students come from? Will they come from a particular geographic area? Because we had identified a particular school that could be the site for the basic school. So would the students come from that same service area, or would they come from basically district wide.

And my approach, which I brought to the attention of the school board at the time, was, great. Now we need to find

out just how to go about populating the school. And my approach was, let's, once again, have an outreach to the parents. Now they know more about what the district -- what the school would look like, and they can tell us whether they're really interested in having their child in that school. And we would put, essentially put all those names of people that say, yay verily, I want to be a part of this into a hat, and we would pull out, I think it was like 350 names at random.

The bulk of the board, bulk of the school board didn't particularly appreciate that. Their view was, we've already done the survey. We already have a list of people whose names we think are interested. And so the contention was, do we go with Burdick's recommendation or do we do it another way. Ultimately they decided to just take the names that had been submitted in the survey, the first one, and those folks then would have first crack at seats in the basic school.

My feeling at the time was, that in order to represent the entire district, including those people who may not have participated in the first survey, who didn't know what the school, what the school would look like, they needed another opportunity to be part of that process, either in or out. The -- I did --

MS. PELLMAN: Time check. We have five minutes

remaining.

DR. BURDICK: Okay. Thank you. I lost that vote, and the lesson I took away from that was, don't get too upset when you lose a vote. You've made the best case you can, and I think that the same sort of thing would take place during the CRC's deliberations on any one or some of the district lines. So that's the end of that story.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question five. A considerable amount of the Commission's work will involve meeting with people from all over California who come from very different backgrounds and a wide variety of perspectives. If you are selected as a Commissioner, what skills and attributes will make you effective at interacting with people from different backgrounds and who 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. BURDICK: So, I've outlined my experience on a school board. Now, I recognize that I do not come from the most diverse community within California. We are a small community. We are essentially a one-company town. It is the Naval Air Warfare Center. And the bulk of the jobs and the bulk of the people that are, live in the community, are engineers or scientists or technicians that are working on

the base. And they all tend to be uniformly Caucasian, with some exceptions. So the question is, how does a guy like that, like me, from an area like this intersect with the great diversity in the State of California?

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 what I would say to you is this. First of all, I came from a small farming community in South Dakota. And I, you know, as a grew up in that community I became aware of the interest of farmers and things like the weather, crop prices, the daily grind of working with the weather and so on. So, I think that gives me some insight into the Central Valley condition.

From there, after I graduated high school and went on to college, I ended up in school in Montana, a very western state, much like the north end of California. the attraction of living in a forested area was pretty evident. So -- but there are also some pitfalls in living in that area what -- not the least of which is wildfire. And we all know what areas up north, Paradise, in particular, went through this year and past year with respect to wildfire. I have fought fire in the one and only area in South Dakota, in the Black Hills, that actually is forested and looks like the north end of California. I've spent time on fire lines, both there and in Montana. So, again, that gives me some appreciation for what folks in that area of California are undergoing. Lots

of smoke. We've had lots of smoke from fires in the Sierras blowing down into our valley, the Indian Wells Valley here in Ridgecrest over the years. So, I have some (indiscernible) for what they're up against.

MS. PELLMAN: Forty-five seconds remaining.

DR. BURDICK: (Indiscernible) thing I would say is that I do have some appreciation for what the immigration — or the immigrant community is undergoing, because I, too, have had to learn or — yes, had to learn a foreign language in order to get my PhD. And so it gives me some sense of what it is that the folks down in the L.A. area, the large immigrant community there is undergoing as they, too, try to integrate. So I'll leave it at that.

MR. DAWSON: All right. Thank you, Dr. Burdick. We'll now go down to, we'll go to Panel questions. Each Panel Member will have 20 minutes to ask his or her questions.

We'll start with the Chair, Mr. Coe.

CHAIR COE: Thank you, Mr. Dawson.

Dr. Burdick, good afternoon to you. Thank you for taking the time again to speak with us today.

DR. BURDICK: Sure.

CHAIR COE: So in your application you discuss a number of activities you're involved in. You spoke about your time on the, serving on the board of your local school

district. That you've also been involved in the local library system and the board of your homeowners association. Since you already talked about the school district roles, I'm wondering if you could give us a little more insight into the roles you played on the homeowners association and the, and with the library system, and why you chose to be a part of those efforts.

DR. BURDICK: Okay. I missed the tail end of that question. Now, homeowners association, and what was the next part?

CHAIR COE: And your time with the library system.

DR. BURDICK: Okay.

CHAIR COE: The roles you played there and why you got involved in those efforts.

DR. BURDICK: Okay. Well, let me start with the library association. I spent a great deal of my time in education, getting one, and libraries are a very big part of that in my mind. I've learned over the years to appreciate the ready accessibility of a wide variety of books. And our local -- we, the local library here in Ridgecrest is a one branch of the Kern County Library System. So, it's a county-run operation. It's a county operation in large part. And I was asked some years ago by the member of the Friends of the Ridgecrest Branch Library if I wouldn't get involved. And more importantly, they

wanted me to get involved as president as the operation. It knew nothing about how they functioned, but I took the job on, and quickly became aware of the fact how badly underfunded the -- not only the Ridgecrest Branch was, but indeed, the entire library function in Kern County.

years with the Friends of the Library, one of our biggest - well, we had two big efforts. Annually we had to do
hand-to-hand combat with the Board of Supervisors in
Bakersfield concerning the budget for the entire library
system. And I led those things. We had a VTC hookup from
the district supervisor's office here in Ridgecrest with
Kern County, and we were able then to talk directly to the,
to that board during their budget negotiations, and so we
made really good use of that time. We would put what
turned out to be a fairly large number of people in the
room, to express their opinions and their desires for
increased library support.

The other aspect of working with the Friends of the Library was that we would hold two used book sales every year open to the community. We would have thousands of books that had been donated, and those all had to be -- cataloged is too strong of a word, but categorized, so that you could find a history book if you wanted to look at history books, et cetera. And we worked very hard on that.

A lot of heavy lifting, hard physical labor, in addition to all the activity of actually running the sales. So, that was my activity (indiscernible) the library.

The -- I live in a, what's called a PUD, a planned unit development in Ridgecrest. There are almost 300 units here. So it's like of like a small city in its own right, and it is governed, as I said someplace, by state law, the Davis-Sterling Act. So it outlines what a board can do, and, of course, we spent a lot of time concerning ourself with what the law had said.

And then in addition to that, many of the problems that we had were things, just the mundane operation.

Groundskeeping, roads, periodically the roads have to be upgraded. We have swimming pools, tennis courts, that kind of stuff, so you have to worry about the maintenance of those things. And then, of course, deal with resident complaints, usually about barking dogs or perhaps parking problems, things of that sort. So, that's pretty much it.

CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you. In your essay on impartiality you discuss how your training as a research physicist and service on several boards have required impartial judgments on your part. I'm wondering if you can give an example of a time, a specific time where you had to make a difficult, impartial decision that involved setting aside your self-interest?

DR. BURDICK: Well, good one. I -- let's see. One second. The Naval Air Warfare Center is the Navy's premiere research and development institution for air-to-air and air-to-surface weapons. And a weapon in these categories consists of a number of subsystems, ranging all the way from (indiscernible) control section, which is usually found at the front (indiscernible), so all the way back through the warhead, the fusing, the propulsion system and the airframe that actually controls how the, how the weapon, the missile travels through the air.

Now, we were organized, and pretty much along those subsystem lines, so I started my career at the naval (indiscernible) in the guidance and control area. And when it came time to divide up the money of the discretionary money that was made available to promote new development ideas, there was always a scramble between the various subsystems. So the guidance and control folks would come in with a couple three, four proposals. The airframe folks would come do the same. The fuse folks would -- everybody had their own bag of tricks that they wanted to get funded, to aid the development of the next weapons system.

So, when I shifted from guidance and control to actually handling, let's call it all the engineering concepts for the weapons department, I had to shift my focus from just doing our own thing in the guidance and

control area, to giving equal balance to the problems that were being proposed and the solutions that were being proposed by the other engineering groups. And that required abandoning partiality to guidance and control, and actually looking more, much more carefully than I had historically, at the other technologies involved. So -- and we would make decisions about who got funded.

These things always caused a certain amount of consternation among managers and engineers and departments that didn't get everything they wanted, but that turned out to be pretty much my job at the second half of my career.

analytical skills you discuss having gathered dense technical material from published sources and evaluated it in relation to your own research. And that such sources included computer models and simulations based on geographical information software. I'm wondering if you could expand a little on this, and tell us specifically what kinds of work you have done with geographical software and maps?

DR. BURDICK: Well, GIS software itself was not a big part of my package. It would -- it comes up most often in an air-to-surface weapon configuration. And so the folks that are -- that were developing the guidance and control for a weapon, like a Tomahawk cruise missile, for

instance, they are very interested in -- they plan their flight actually over from the geographic information that they have, including three-dimensional, just where the mountains are, where the lakes are, but also where are (indiscernible) entities. That is to say, towns and cities, and possibly even defensive batteries on the part of a potential enemy. So that's kind of my exposure at the planning level.

Everybody who has a car that's probably newer than 10 years probably has a GIS system in it right now, Google Maps. And so you can see -- I mean, most people have seen what a GIS system can actually do for them. So you have to, in the end, like Google usually is doing, or perhaps exclusivity doing, is taking very precise GPS, global positioning system data, that is to say, where are things on earth, and then coupling that with information they have gathered by literally driving these cars that have the cameras on top and a very good GPS system in the receiver, and they're just matching cultural things, like streets and houses and house numbers with the GPS data. And that's kind of the way these things are constructed.

Conceptually, I don't think it is very complicated. It gets a lot of data, and that's where you want to have a good system for incorporating, literally, millions, if not billions of pieces of data into a system like that. But

once it's in, and once it's correlated with maps, you can manipulate it pretty much any way you like.

CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you. So one of the biggest tasks in front of the Commission is going to be identifying communities of interest all throughout the State. And some of those communities are going to be easier to find, they're a little more obvious than some others that are less obvious or more hidden, less engaged for one reason or another. How could the Commission go about identifying communities of interest throughout the State, and avoid the pitfall of kind of inadvertently overlooking some of those communities that are harder to find?

DR. BURDICK: Well, the first -- my first reaction with communities of interest and this problem, the one that you outlined is, there are communities out there whose primary interest's not being found. But, of course, we're not going to try to accept that because we want to count them. As a bare minimum, we want to count everybody, even if they don't want to be found. And so, for instance, you might argue that a community of interest of homeless people living along, you know, the L.A. River or something like that, really doesn't want to be found.

Setting that aside, my -- one approach, and I alluded to this earlier, is this notion of the CRC auxiliary, the 114

that won't get selected, just all a very committed group of people who are interested in the very problem that the CRC is trying to set out to do. And I noticed in the interviews a very large number of them are already working in what's called, communities of interest. And so, I think the Commission should actively try to solicit the help of these folks, and give them at least an opportunity to educate the CRC about areas that they know, that they, the auxiliary members know much more about. So I can see them sort of guiding the ability of the CRC to, first of all, identify groups. And secondly, and probably equally important, is to tell us how big they might be, both geographically and numerically. Because both of those things I think would play directly into the question of how do you meet the needs, and identify communities of interest that need to be contiguous, that need to be reported in their particular ramifications, what they're looking for. So, again, I tend to look to these people that aren't selected as being a real insight into a lot of the problems. And, of course, I also think that the community of interest is one of the, it's the fuzziest area in the definition of the CRC's task, and it's going to be -- we're going to need the greatest amount of help. So, that's how I would approach it.

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, some of these communities that you

CHAIR COE:

may encounter in your outreach efforts as a Commissioner, as you alluded to, they don't want to be found necessarily. They're less engaged and may be concerned about engaging for a number of reasons. But, also, as you alluded to, the input of as many communities as possible is very important for the work of the Commission to do its best job. So, how could the Commission go about kind of making some of those communities that may be a little more apprehensive to feel comfortable to come forward, and then share their perspectives to better inform the Commission?

MS. PELLMAN: Just a quick time check. We have four minutes --

DR. BURDICK: Well --

MS. PELLMAN: -- twenty seconds.

DR. BURDICK: One -- I'll try to be brief. One way is obviously to send in folks who already communicate with them, to act as our intermediaries, before we actually get the CRC on the scene. Folks who don't want to be found, you know, may have confidence in religious leaders or community organizers that are -- that they're already working with. And it's that type of person that I think we should try to make maximum use of in order to establish some sort of rapport with an identified community of interest.

You can utilize newspapers and local

(indiscernible), but you know the number of newspapers that has -- that are out there now is diminishing rapidly. A lot of these public-publications are dropping away. So the, some of the obvious approaches that we might have used 10 years ago just don't exist anymore. And yet you -- we would have to try to utilize those that do exist. So, Spanish language T.V. and radio would be one example that's probably still out there, that can be utilized. But the folks we put on there should be speaking basically about the issues that these potential communities of interest are actually interested in. It's not going to be an easy task, that's for sure.

CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you. Really quick before we run out of time. If you were to be appointed to the Commission, which aspects of that role do you think you would really enjoy, and conversely, which aspects of that role do you think might cause you to struggle a little bit?

DR. BURDICK: Well, I'm obviously not the most conversant with the diversity issue, but I certainly can appreciate some aspects of the diversity of (indiscernible) big. We had our, the largest earthquake in the last 10 years or so, and we also sit out here in the middle, so (indiscernible) characteristic with folks on the east side of the mountains.

The things that I would enjoy the most, I think,

85

```
1
   are dealing with what are potentially the legal --
2
            (Whereupon the feed for Mr. Burdick stops.)
3
            MR. DAWSON:
                        Yeah. We should try to get him --
4
   have we lost? Yeah. We should call him.
5
            CHAIR COE: Shauna --
6
            BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: I still can hear you in the
7
   room.
8
            MS. PELLMAN: Should I go ahead and stop the clock?
9
            MR. DAWSON: Yeah, stop the clock, please.
10
            MS. PELLMAN: Okay.
11
            UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: In the interest of
12
   stability, we've stopped the clock. What I'm wondering,
13
   Mr. Burdick, is, if you could leave your video running, but
14
   we could have you connect by a telephone for the audio?
15
                   (Off the record at 2:03 p.m.)
16
                 (Back on the record at 2:10 p.m.)
            CHAIR COE: Madam Secretary, let's restart the
17
18
   clock now.
19
            MS. PELLMAN: Okay. And there are two minutes
20
   remaining. So that factors in the lapse of time when --
21
            CHAIR COE: Two minutes on my question --
22
            MS. PELLMAN: Yes.
23
            CHAIR COE: -- questioning period? Okay.
24
   you.
25
            Dr. Burdick, I think I caught most of your answer,
```

but the tail end of my question regarding what you would enjoy and what you think you would struggle with, I think maybe we lost.

DR. BURDICK: Okay. Well, let's see. I think the tail end of it was the things that I would enjoy. And what I think I was saying to you was, I'm very much interested in the legal aspects. That is to say, what we can do -- or what the Commission can do about dealing with possible late and flawed Census data, if there's something that can be done either by the state legislature or if we need court input on something like that, how we handle that.

And the second thing is similarly related, and that is, what do we do about, legally, or even operationally, about interference from external sources. And, again, I characterize them as either the DNC or the RNC, two groups that really do have an interest in the outcome of the Commission's work. So, those are the aspects that I think I would enjoy the most. Does that, does that fill in your question?

CHAIR COE: It does, and that was actually my last question. So I'm going to go ahead and turn the time over to Ms. Dickison for her questions.

DR. BURDICK: Okay.

24 BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you, Mr. Coe.

Good afternoon, Dr. Burdick.

DR. BURDICK: Hello.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you so much, thank you so much for meeting with us today. So, I'm going to carry on with one of the things you said that you would enjoy most had to do with the Census data. My question's going to kind of go in that direction. So, are understanding is that the Census is most likely not going to -- there's a good possibility that the Commission will not get the Census data until the end of July --

DR. BURDICK: Right.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: -- which sets it back. What steps can the Commission take to, to take that into account and still meet its deadline?

DR. BURDICK: And still meet its deadline. You pose a difficult question there. You know, the Census data could come in about, I think by my calculations, like three weeks before the -- or, sorry, two weeks after the CRC has to submit its first draft maps, and maybe three weeks before the final maps have to be done. I would start looking literally for legal relief on the deadlines for the committee. Now we got to do that -- I mean, we should do that in parallel with any other approach to the problem.

And one -- you know, if we really have no confidence in the Census data, we -- the committee -- the Commission might ask for resources from the State in order

to -- I hesitate to say it, but essentially conduct our own census in those areas in the State of California that we think are the worst undercounted of all the areas. If the Commission is going to have any credibility with the population, it's simply going to have to go to the mats on trying to retain integrity of the 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

The fallback area that I would suggest for the Commission is, if none of these other things approach and if the rest of the Commission members don't have any ideas that we can implement in such a period of time, the thought has occurred to me that the Commission just simply ought to go ahead and submit maps that we know will be thrown out, and freely admit that because of the problems with the data. And then ask -- I guess the Supreme Court at that point is the one that would appoint the special master to deal with the problem. And I realize it's crazy, but -and then the special master can then turn back to the Commission and say, okay, you know, by using this ruse, you are essentially getting a little more time to do your job correctly. In the end, I think the special master would prefer to have the Commission do a credible job. I know I would. And I think the citizens of California would. But if we're going to get caught in this trap that the Federal Census data is going to spring on us, it's going to take some exceptional work to get out of it.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. So one of the, one thing that has been discussed is that California could lose a congressional seat. Given that what the others have said, issue. What can the Commission do to create confidence with the public that it's taking into account the public input that it's receiving and everything else in redrawing the district lines?

DR. BURDICK: Again, that's a problem associated with, at least in part, with the quality of the Federal Census. There, I think the biggest -- let's assume just for the sake of discussion, that the Federal Census is not as bad as I fear it's going to be, and yet various segments of the population have been overlooked. Now, we're not -- we, CRC is not required to lean exclusively on federal data. In fact, it's not required to lean on it at all. All you have to do, ultimately, is to prove to the judge that you've done a really good job of dividing up the State into districts commensurate with a good measure of the population.

So, I come back to the notion that perhaps the CRC could mount an effort to do a better job than the feds have done in counting those areas that are basically underserved and that don't want to be found. And one of the things that would contribute, at least in my own mind, to expediting or facilitating that sort of an approach, is a

really good display of the geographic data that is available. And I come back to that because I think the holes that would show up in a 3D display of the data would be very instructive as to where the CRC could look to improve the data that are available.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Okay.

DR. BURDICK: These are not easy questions. Ask me something about the weather, will you?

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Some of my questions -- so, you spoke with Mr. Coe on communities of interest, and what methods you could take to look for those. My question goes to thinking about the various communities throughout California and all the different regions. Tell us what you know about the concerns of different communities throughout different regions, and what -- and how those concerns would bind a community together to -- that could identify it as a community of interest.

DR. BURDICK: Well, probably the easiest one to point to is -- and it's not because I'm intimately or even personally familiar with it, but the Northern California area, all those counties that are up along the California-Oregon border, and, indeed, some 20 Northern California counties have systematically in the past voiced the opinion that they'd like to break off and become the state of Jefferson. Okay. So now, it's clear, at least to me, that

these people have certain needs or desires that are not being met by the State of California at this time.

And one thing that we could do in order to clarify that, let's call it a fairly large community of interest, but it might be very more than I think, but again, looking — talking first all to the political leaders in that area as to what the interests are and what is it that gives rise to this notion that a state of Jefferson is something that everybody ought to be interested in. That's one thing.

The other thing I would do if I were God, is I would get my hands on as many of the newspapers that have been published in the last five or 10 years in that area, and scrutinize editorials, letters to the editor, opinion pieces that have been written, to see if we can extract from it the issues that would bind these folks together. I also think they ought to have a representative on the CRC, and I don't know that one is actually -- I don't think one emerged in 2010, and I have no idea what the pool looks like now, you know, for this 2020 CRC.

The -- and let's see, and I think your question extended to other communities, possible, is that correct?

I -- I'm sorry. I didn't -- I can see you talking but I can't hear you.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: I apologize. I muted it, so it wouldn't switch back and forth. So, yeah, it's the

different (indiscernible) cover the northern region, and what could bind those communities together. What about other regions of the State, what do you know about the needs and concerns of those areas?

DR. BURDICK: Well, the other one I would -- the next one that I would turn to is the Central Valley. And the only reason I guess I would do that is, first of all, I do have some historical background in farming and ranching areas. But they also have a problem, at least as they perceive it, similar to the one that we have in the desert, and that is the lack of water. So, the availability and the accessibility of water that I guess the folks in the Central Valley seem to think should be flowing more readily down into their fields, is one area where you might find a fairly vociferous and easily bound together community of interest. So, I think that's one other place I would look.

And there -- oddly enough, as you go down in the Coachella Valley, same sort of thing, crops up there. And there's a community, in fact the <u>L.A. Times</u> was just talking about it this morning, a community -- actually, there's a number of small communities down there who are being severely affected by cut back in farming because of the coronavirus issues. And so I think that, that issue would bind them together, I don't know how long, but they definitely have an interest in the farm problems and water

issues.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: How do think these concerns and these differences can influence their preference when they're looking for representation in the Government?

DR. BURDICK: How would it affect their preferences? Well, certainly the -- I would think that the farming communities, and in particular, the folks that are actually working on the farms, are going to have a great deal of interest in somebody who is bilingual, they can speak both Spanish and English, and are politically active enough to actually run for an office in those areas.

I know from my own experience here in Kern County, Kern County had to redistrict the board of supervisors here about two years ago to create, essentially, another Hispanic majority area in the county. And the assumption was on the part of MALDEF and everybody that I think was paying attention to it was, that if that supervisorial district actually got carved out, that a person of Hispanic heritage would be elected almost automatically. That didn't happen. And I don't know why, but my suspicion is, is that it's because many of the folks that are over there, first of all, are not citizens. They can't register to vote. And secondly, perhaps those who are registered to vote didn't actively campaign for that seat. So, you know, it's a difficulty, and I don't know the answer to it, but

I'm -- I think I can recognize some of the problems
associated with it.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Okay. Thank you. If you were selected as one of the eight Commissioners that are selected randomly, what -- you would be tasked with selecting the next six. What would you be looking for in those individuals?

DR. BURDICK: Well, I think I'm like every other applicant that you've spoken to. I think, you know, the first eight have to try to fill in the holes that exist. So, if there's a definite geographic mismatch, they're probably going to want to look at people who, all other things being considered, might fill in that. And a good example I think is the northern counties, for instance. And I don't know what the applicant pool looks like in terms of geographic representation, but that's an example of the sort of gap that one should try to fill in.

If there's a misbalance, in other words, if the first eight were all male, I think you would to find some female representatives in the next six, and vice a versa. You would like to find a certain amount of heritage involvement in those, in those six. So the basic message is, fill in the gaps, do the best job you can to get both the diversity of California reflected, and the law really recognizes the fact that 14 people can't be completely

representative of the wide diversity of ethnic backgrounds in the State, but you can certainly try.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

Mr. Coe, I have no additional questions at this point.

CHAIR COE: Thank you, Ms. Dickison.

Mr. Belnap.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: Dr. Burdick, good afternoon. Thank you for being with us.

DR. BURDICK: My pleasure.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: I want to have you just give us a brief overview of your long career as a research physicist, in particular, what type of projects did you work on?

DR. BURDICK: Oh boy. I started off -- well, let's see. My training, my PhD thesis in that area was in an element of physics called, many-body physics. Nobody at the Naval Weapons Center needed anybody that was an expert in many-body physics, so that's when I got into the guidance and control area, because it's a form of solid-state physics. I was first interested in the type of infrared detectors that were being utilized in the missile systems, and then pretty rapidly moved into the area of the optical properties of the materials that are used for what are called the domes or windows in air-to-air weapons.

Let's see. When I left that and went over to the research department, I was again working pretty closely on the optical properties of thin films that are used to coat windows and mirrors and domes in missile systems. And I sort of ended up at my bench-level career doing something called, biomimetics. That is to say, trying to utilize the lessons that nature can teach us about the processing of images, to simplify the computing load, if you will, that a guidance system actually needs in order to take a look at a scene that it's seeing, and extract the targets from that scene.

So that's kind of a quick overview. I went from optics to biomimetics. I still have a warm spot in my heart for the biomimetics, because I think it's -- as a source of ideas for all kinds of development, it's underutilized. Nature has solved many of the problems that we think we have to spend a lot of time on.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: All right. Thank you. So I'd like you to talk about a different project that you worked on in your career, a project that had tight timelines and faced a variety of uncertainties. Describe the project, how you helped complete the project, and the lessons you learned from it.

DR. BURDICK: Tight timelines. Well, I'm going to have trouble with that, because I don't remember any tight

timelines that were, that were really laid upon us. Some of the, some of the interactions that we -- that I had when I was on the international committee for their guidance and control, we had to produce a report of the committee's activities in a timely fashion. And it usually devolved on to the so-called, national leader of that particular committee, when the committee's deliberations and meetings were over with. I mean, I'm -- and so, because then you had to submit these reports up the chain for the entire national group that -- which the guidance and control committee was just a subpart.

So, I'm -- you know, that's probably the best I can do. And, you know, at one point, I was a national leader and I had to write these reports and get them in on time, and get them verified or accepted by the folks ahead of us. But that's -- we weren't working under a terribly big gun at that time, but you did have to meet some deadlines.

And the problem was getting stuff out of the rest of the committee members to submit. I mean, we would have many presentations, technical presentations at these meetings, and they had to be, basically had to be refined, so that a lot of the minutia was taken out, and yet the essential parts of the technical presentation, whether it be from the Australians or the UK or whomever, as they were working out a reporting on their research activities. You

want to get it into a form that somebody, who doesn't have the kind of time that you do, to -- I mean, me, not you -- that they have, in order to digest the thing, and see whether or not you're headed in the right direction.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: Okay. Thank you. So, switching gears, in your essay on appreciation for diversity, you described your travels throughout the world. How much have you traveled throughout California?

DR. BURDICK: Not much, and that I think is probably the biggest weakness in my application. As I think I alluded to, I have been in this community that I live in for pretty close to 50 years. Hired in at the Naval Weapons Center. My entire professional career, other than graduate school, has been here. I've traveled within the State, down into the L.A. and San Diego basin and other places in the eastern desert, but I have never been any further north than probably Healdsburg in the -- on the other side of the mountains.

So, that's it. I mean, I don't pretend to be a world -- or an experienced California traveler, but I do read a lot of newspapers.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: All right. Thank you. So in your application, and you've already talked about it today, you served on a local school board, also a local hospital advisory body, homeowners association and a library

volunteer group. How did participating in these volunteer activities increase your understanding of and appreciation for California's diversity?

DR. BURDICK: Well, the school board experience is probably the most relevant one, and I don't know whether I spelled it out in one of my essays or not. But we were a seven-person board when I was there. We had -- in that seven-person board we had one Latino, a fellow by the name of A.J. Napolis, who was a school board member from a district that had been combined with ours. We had one African American man, who was a technician on the base. And then there were, we had one retired female schoolteacher, and then the rest of us were either scientists or engineers, either of recent tenure or retired tenure.

And we didn't deal with a lot of diversity issues as a board, because we didn't, we don't have -- or didn't at the time, have many minorities or other ethnic groups in the community. So, we did have some, but they certainly didn't constitute anything like even 10-percent, as I recall, of the population.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Chair, I have no further questions at this

24 time.

CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Belnap.

Mr. Dawson.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Dr. Burdick, thank you for being here again, and thank you for working with us through the technical difficulties. I was looking at your application and noticed in your, the part about your education, B.S. in Physics and M.S. in Physics, PhD in Physics, and then Russian. What led you to get a degree in Russian while -- it looked like you were doing so well, you were also in your PhD Physics program.

DR. BURDICK: Well, I don't know what physics departments are doing these days, but when I got my degree, when I got my PhD, we had to have two languages that we had shown some sort of "competence" in, and I put that word in quotes. I had taken German when I was an undergraduate. We also had a requirement to take some foreign language, you know, for a Bachelor's Degree in Physics, and so I took, I think, two years of German, and promptly forgot most of it.

I got to my PhD program and my de facto faculty advisor said, gee, it would really be nice if you studied some Russian. So, as it turned out -- and because you needed a second, you needed a second language, okay. Well it turned out that for me, Russian was much simpler than German, and so I just kept doing it.

And, indeed, half-way through the second or third year, as I recall, I was pretty well on a track to qualify for a degree in Russian, but I also had answered an ad to do technical translating. So I spent maybe, I'm going to say 30 years, translating Russian technical material into English for the number one publisher at that time of technical translations. It was called, Consultants Bureau.

And I remember one day I took a stack of my translations, which had been edited by the publishing company, I took them over to the modern language department and had a meeting with the head of the department. I said, look, you know, I've had all these classes in Russian.

I've been obviously using it as a way to support my family, which was the case. You know, what about it? Can we talk about a degree? And he -- we talked about it for an hour or so about his degree, and then he said, sure. So, that's how it came about.

MR. DAWSON: Do you get a chance to use it? I don't -- I'm not aware of a large Russian speaking community in Kern County.

DR. BURDICK: No. And that always was a problem.

I had one fellow at the base, another engineer, he was a ethnic Ukrainian but he spoke Russian. And so periodically I would get just stopped on a translation, and I would take it down to Marco's office and say, look, Marco, read this

for me. Tell me if my translation even makes sense. And - but that was the sum total of it. He used to stop by my
office and he would speak a little Russian to me, you know,
just, I guess just to keep his facility up to speed, but it
didn't take much to overwhelm mine. Spoken Russian in my
mind is much more difficult than reading technical Russian.

MR. DAWSON: I see.

DR. BURDICK: You could do it.

MR. DAWSON: Madam Secretary, could I have a time check, please?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. There are 13 minutes remaining of the 90.

MR. DAWSON: Okay. Thank you. Dr. Burdick, you're not a lawyer, but you did cite by my count, three SCOTUS cases, the Voters First Act, including the constitutional provisions. What legal research did you in preparation for this interview?

DR. BURDICK: Well, I actually did a fair amount. I have one of these crazy hobbies. I like to read Supreme Court cases, primarily to absorb the language of the justices. And my favor linguist, not to say my favorite jurist on the Supreme Court -- Anthony Scalia died, but I have a couple of his books. And it was always fun to read his analysis of things.

So, I spent a fair amount of time with the decision

103

in <u>Commerce v. New York</u>. I've looked at a couple of the decisions that the Supreme Court didn't deal with in terms of the gerrymandering in Maryland, and I think is was North Carolina, if I -- it sticks in my mind. It's a rewarding hobby, but it's not one that many people share.

MR. DAWSON: Not those of us who don't get paid for

MR. DAWSON: Not those of us who don't get paid for it. Mr. Burdick, I have no further questions. Thank you.

CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Dawson.

Any follow-up questions from the Panel? Ms.

Dickison, any follow-up questions?

7

8

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

23

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: No, I don't have any follow-up questions.

CHAIR COE: Mr. Belnap?

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: None here.

CHAIR COE: Okay. I also have no follow-up questions, Mr. Dawson.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Madam Secretary, a time check again, please?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. Eleven minutes, 10 seconds remaining.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Dr. Burdick, with the 11 minutes remaining I'd like to give you the opportunity to make some closing remarks to the Panel, if you wish.

DR. BURDICK: Thank you for that. And I will indeed. First of all, I want to thank you for your

attention, especially through the difficulties. I suspected we were going to have some communication problems, given the fact that we're literally on the other side of the Sierras from you folks, and I'm not blessed with the greatest internet connection, obviously. But I am honored to be your penultimate interview. I know you're all looking forward to the next one, if only because it's the last one, and I wish you well after that.

I wanted to tell you that I applied for this

Commission 10 years ago, and obviously didn't get even to

the stage we're at right now, but I came pretty close. And

I haven't lost my interest in the whole problem. That was

a historic CRC just simply because it was the first one

that got to deal with the gerrymandering issues and the

voter suppression issues that were then fairly common. But

if the -- I think this new CRC is also going to be

historic, if only because of the crises that it's going to

face. And here I'm talking, again, about the Federal

Census that's going to be both late and flawed, the

difficulty that the CRC is going to have in meeting with

the public because of travel issues and reluctance of

people to get together in a big room.

And I think -- I don't see how the DNC and the RNC can avoid or justify not trying to influence the committee primarily through the definition of a community of

interest. So that's something the committee's going to -the Commission is going to have to be I think fairly aware
of.

The, I think the Commission is going to hack —
have to act swiftly and boldly to deal with these issues,
and I'm seeing parallel efforts in that area. So, CRC must
get up and get ready to talk to the courts and the
legislature for mandates and the tools it needs. I do want
to be a part of this crusade. And even though my wife told
me not to say it, I think every Commission needs at least
one physicist.

MR. DAWSON: Okay. Thank you, Dr. Burdick. Thank you for taking the time to speak with us today.

DR. BURDICK: It's a pleasure.

MR. DAWSON: Our next interview is scheduled for 3:00 p.m., so we will be in recess until 2:59.

(Off the record at 2:44 p.m.)

(Back on the record at 2:59 p.m.)

CHAIR COE: Okay. The time being 2:59 p.m., I'd like to call this meeting out of recess. At this time I'd like to welcome Mr. Scott McCarty for his interview this afternoon.

Mr. McCarty, can you hear us okay?

MR. MCCARTY: Yes, I can.

25 CHAIR COE: Fantastic. Thank you. Welcome, and

thank you for being here. I'd like to turn the time over to Mr. Dawson for the five standard questions, please.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. McCarty, I am going to ask you five standard questions that the Applicant Review Panel has requested that each applicant respond to. Are you ready, sir?

MR. MCCARTY: 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 Commissioners should possess, which do you possess? In summary, how will you contribute to the success of the Commission?

MR. MCCARTY: First of all, thank you for giving me this opportunity. I very much appreciate it. I first started considering a question similar to this many years ago in my post-college days. I was starting to consider what kind of qualities I would look for in somebody with whom I might want to start a long-term relationship. I didn't have a specific checklist that I was looking for, however, I think the qualities that I came to deem important kind of crystalized in my mind as I processed through a number of relationships.

Now, fast-forward to the present, and when I

consider this question in light of the Commission, what attributes would I like all Commissioners to possess, surprisingly, to me at least, those boiled down to the same three that I would look for in a life-long partner.

The first of those is courage. And by courage I mean, not being afraid to do the right thing even in the face of opposition. Courage is the power to let go of the familiar, and to make decisive choices that create a path for a better future. I think in the context of the Commission, that would be particularly important.

The second attribute that I think all Commissioner should possess is awareness. And by awareness I mean, having good observational skills that allow you to interact effectively and appropriately with the environment you're in. I think part of -- back in my naval aviation days, we would call this, situational awareness. And that includes knowing what your goal or mission is, knowing what your timeline is for reaching that goal, and knowing what resources you have on hand to help you attain the goal, and what obstacles might be in your way.

In addition, I think you need to be cognizant of what I would call your sphere of influence. In other words, do those resources and obstacles, are -- do they lie within your sphere of influence? Do they have -- do you have control over them, or do they lie outside of your

sphere of influence and you don't have control over them?

The third attribute that I think all Commissioners should have is compassion. And by compassion I simply mean, a genuine concern for other people. For work that the Commission is going to do is going to be very datadriven. And I think data are a good starting point for telling us about real life, but to get the full story you need to have real-life interactions.

So, in the context of the Commission, I think compassion would mean, having an appreciation for public viewpoints and a respect for public viewpoints, and also a respect for matters of importance to the communities of interest that the Commission will be working with. So, the three attributes that I think all the Commissioners should possess are courage, awareness and compassion.

In addition, I think there are four competencies that the Commission should possess as a body. And the first of those is the ability to come to consensus. The Commission will be -- will have a heavy workload and a short timeline to do that work, and it will really help the Commission to be able to reach consensus on a recurring basis to keep going forward on the mission.

The second competency is legal expertise. The Commission will be involved in a lot of legal issues, and I think having some sort of legal savvy would be essential to

team success.

The third competency is analytical skills. I don't think every member of the Commission needs to be an expert in statistics or GIS, but there should be some number of Commission members who understand the quantitative models enough so that they can translate or explain them to the rest of the Commission members, so that the Commission as a whole has some level of comfort with the analytical aspects of their work.

The fourth competency would be good public communication skills. I think there should be a number of Commissioners who are able to speak clearly to the public and the press about the progress and the work of the Commission on an ongoing basis.

So, the four competencies I think are critical for the Commission as a whole, are ability to come to consensus, legal expertise, analytical skills and good public communication skills.

Of the three attributes that I mentioned that I think all Commissioners should possess, I believe I do possess at least a modicum of each of those and -- which I hope will be borne out both in this interview and by my supplemental application.

How I could best contribute to the Commission, I think to a certain agree depends upon the skill sets and

the strengths of the other Commissioners. I would be happy to be called upon in any way that would best benefit the Commission in whatever fashion that is. That being said, I believe that my background as a systems and human factors engineer would allow me to provide a critical eye toward data analysis, toward visual display of quantitative information, and perhaps as kind of a pressure tester for any assumptions and conclusions that come about as part of the Commission's work.

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 hyperpartisanship? What will you do to ensure that the work of the Commission is not seen as polarized or hyperpartisan and avoid perceptions of political bias and conflict?

MR. MCCARTY: I think that hyperpartisanship comes about because of a failure to be aware of and have an appreciation for the perspectives of other people. I think a characteristic that I possess, and that other

Commissioners should possess, is a tolerance for opposing viewpoints, and a willingness to engage with people who may hold opposing viewpoints. And by engage, I don't mean in a confrontational way, but rather in a manner just to understand.

Another characteristic that is important in this regard is being fact-driven. I consider myself fact-driven. If there's something -- if there's a question about something being presented as to whether or not it's a fact or an opinion, I always like to actually discern which it is. And the way I do that is to kind of move backward or go to the source of the information to determine whether something is opinion or fact. So I think to protect against hyperpartisanship, a tolerance for opposing viewpoints and base, base your opinions on fact.

How could the Commission guard against hyperpartisanship? I think so that the Commission is not viewed at partisan by its stakeholders, by the public, the Commission needs to have procedures in place that allow for a great deal of transparency in its deliberations as a body, and also transparency in its output and its deliverables. I think the Commission needs to stick to an agreed upon set of principles to guide its work, and part of that includes rules laid down for the deliberative process.

Also, any of the Commission's decisions I think need to be well documented in writing. And any public statements from the Commission need to be clear, coordinated and represent the position of the Commission as a unified body.

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?

MR. MCCARTY: I view this question through the lens of my risk management experience. And risk manifests itself across a spectrum. There are high-impact events that typically occur with low probability, whereas low-impact events may occur on a much more frequent basis. And the overall severity of a risk is equal to the probability of an event happening times the impact of that event.

I think the greatest risk to the Commission would be something that would jeopardize the ability of the Commission to complete its mission, and also compromise the integrity of the Commission. So that being so, I think the greatest problem that the Commission would encounter would be a rogue actor who acts counter to the mission of the Commission.

For instance, somebody who may be vulnerable to bribery, or who may advocate on behalf of false or misleading input from a group or an individual. I think,

fortunately, I think the process that you're -- the screening process you're going through right now makes the probability of such an event very, very small. But how can the Commission, minimize the probability of that happening?

Ι

think it behooves each of Commission members to create a relationship with each of the other Commission members, so that there's kind of an ongoing awareness of both the physical and mental state of the Commissioners as they meet as a body. I think that building those close, personal relationships would be a good defense against any improper motives of a particular Commissioner going undetected. But in the event of something like that actually happening, I think it would be extremely serious, and my response to it would be, I would escalate the issue to the appropriate authority, and at which time it would probably become a legal or even a criminal matter. So -- but that would be, essentially, a worst-case scenario.

So, essentially, I think the worst thing that could happen to the Commission is a rogue actor who jeopardizes the ability of the Commission to do its work, and also compromises the Commission's integrity.

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

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

MR. MCCARTY: At the biotechnology company that I worked for I was the leader of what was called a commercial product launch team. And the goal of that team was to take a drug which had successfully completed clinical trials, and take all the steps necessary to move it into the commercial marketplace. Essentially to take the drug from the clinic and get it onto the shelves for our patients.

The team consisted of about two dozen members of different sites and functional areas from across company, including both in the U.S. and Europe. Some of the functional areas included were manufacturing, distribution, regulatory affairs, supply chain, quality assurance, customer support and marketing, among others.

One of the challenges that we had to deal with was that even though we were a single company, each of the different geographical sites was its own autonomous, independent financial unit. So, the issue that came up was, it was in the best interest for each of those different sites to try and grab as big a piece of the pie

as they could of the manufacturing and distribution operations during the product launch. So, naturally, that was, that kind of became a source of some conflict.

Things we did to try and mitigate any conflicts.

First of all, the team was formed and actually started its meetings about two years before the expected FDA approval of the drug. And one of the things we decided to do was to rotate the team's face-to-face meetings among all the different sites, both in Europe and the United States. And what this did was, it really minimized the probability of any particular site or function feeling like their input was -- or their input or their participation was not valuable. So we kind of made everybody feel welcome and part of the team by having of the different sites host the team meetings.

Another thing we did was we set down clear ground rules for deliberation during our team meetings, one of which we found pretty effective, and that was, prior to any important team decision being made, we would individually canvass each and every one of the members of the team to get his or her input on the decision. And, once again, I think this got people very involved. They felt like they were a part of every decision that was made. And also it completely eliminated any post-decision griping about, oh, I didn't get my input heard, or my site didn't -- wasn't

involved. There was no excuse for not having your input heard.

And there was one other thing that we did that we found extremely effective in generating team cohesiveness. We had the luxury, if I may call it that, of being able to invite patients who had taken the drug in the clinical trials to our team meetings. So, on occasion, we would invite one of the patients to either address the team in person or via live video feed.

And the testimonials that those patients gave when they talked about what positive effects that drug had on their lives and the lives of their family, was a, a surprisingly and very effective way to invigorate the team and really get the team sharply focused back on the mission.

So, things, lessons that I would take from this, I think -- with regard to the Redistricting Commission, rally the team around a common goal and have a clear timeline.

Keep a focus on the big issues and an eye, keep an eye on the mission.

Also, allow every team member to express his or her thoughts. And as I alluded to before, perhaps at times even insist upon it. Encourage an environment in which people feel like that they can provide their personal opinions and even objections freely and without fear of

recrimination.

And I think something personal to me as the team leader that I learned, was to be humble and surround yourself with experts, and then listen to those experts.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question five. A considerable amount of the Commission's work will involve meeting with people from all over California who come from very different backgrounds and a wide variety of perspectives. If you are selected as a Commissioner, what skills and attributes will make you effective at interacting with people from different backgrounds and who 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. MCCARTY: Well, first of all, I think I -- I believe I have good observational skills. I like to approach new situations with my eyes and ears open and my mouth closed, so as to gain as much information as possible before I make any decisions or take any actions. Also, as part of being aware, I like to get to know my audience up front, and I think that helps me know where to start a conversation or a relationship.

I try to practice engaged listening, which includes maintaining eye contact, and also trying to ensure that my

body language that I'm open to conversation. I initiate interactions with new people with an awareness that there are going to be differences between us. We do have differences. But my mindset is always that I will try to appreciate those differences.

I've had a number of experiences that I think would help me in this regard and -- with regard to my work on the Commission, and I'll mention a few of those. In the -- when I was in the Navy, I was able to travel around the world a lot. I traveled to many places, including a lot of third-world areas. I was able to interact with people in countries around the Mediterranean, both European and North African, and also in East Africa, Asia and Australia.

Closer to home, as part of either sponsored or unsponsored educational efforts, I've given presentations to a number of audiences of varying kinds. They include elementary schools, secondary schools, university groups in a wide variety of locations. I've given presentations to majority Black and Hispanic schools in the urban Los Angeles area, and also to service organizations and community groups.

I've acted as a mentor in the field of biotechnology to minority undergraduate and graduate students as part of a formal program that was co-sponsored by my biotechnology company and an organization called,

BIO, Biotechnology Innovation Organization.

I have been involved in volunteer work in adult literacy training, in which I engaged in one-on-one instruction with an English speaking adult who had dropped out of school at a very early age and had never learned to read. I'm still involved as a volunteer with an organization called, Be My Eyes, which connects blind and low-vision people with sighted volunteers for visual assistance over a live video call.

And, finally, I've -- in both my Navy career and at the biotech company that I work for, I've acted as an informal and formal recruiter, in the Navy as a goodwill ambassador for naval aviation. I had the opportunity to meet and interact with people in rural and urban areas across the United States, on both coasts and in the heartland.

And for my biotech company, I was engaged in a formal recruiting process in which we were hiring graduate students for the company. The students came from various regions in the United States, and were of varied racial, ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds. So the experiences that I've had that I think would help me in this regard are travel, presentations to groups, mentoring, volunteering and recruiting.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. We will now go to Panel

questions. Each of our Panel Members will have 20 minutes to ask or his or her questions.

We'll start with the Chair, Mr. Coe.

CHAIR COE: Thank you, Mr. Dawson.

Mr. McCarty, good afternoon again to you. Thank you for speaking with us today.

MR. MCCARTY: Good afternoon.

CHAIR COE: So in a letter of recommendation, I think in a couple of your public comments, it mentioned that you were finalist in NASA's astronaut program, is that right?

MR. MCCARTY: Yes, that's true.

CHAIR COE: So, could you tell us -- I know this is probably a lot of information, but an abridged version of your career and how someone becomes an astronaut finalist.

MR. MCCARTY: A briefest version of my career was, I took an interest in flying in my college days. I actually got a private pilot's license while I was in college. And by the time I graduated had decided that that's what I want to do for a living. It was a little bit too expensive to pay for my own certification to become a 747 pilot for United like I wanted to, so I looked into military aviation, and I ended up joining the Navy, went through flight training, and because a fighter pilot. I flew F-4 Phantoms and F-14 Tomcats off of aircraft

carriers. And at one point the opportunity arose. I saw that my friends and colleagues, my fellow aviators were applying for the astronaut program, and a good number of them were getting selected. So, I viewed myself as competitive, and ended up actually applying at one point and did -- I was invited down to Houston for a week-long interview to go through the process.

Just as an aside, I think your -- you, the Panel, would be very interested to know that this selection process that you're conducting is in certain ways no less rigorous than the astronaut selection process.

The year I went through the selection process there were approximately 2,000 qualified applicants of whom 101 were invited to Houston for face-to-face interviews. And of those 101, 15 were selected. So, I think you should be happy to know that this process is just as rigorous, although I must say, I -- for this, for the -- for this Commission, I don't have to take a test for claustrophobia, I don't have to take a psychological screening, and I don't have to go through a week-long physical exam, which I'm very happy about.

CHAIR COE: That's a good perspective to have. I did not realize that it was, the numbers were that comparable.

MR. MCCARTY: Yes.

CHAIR COE: So I don't believe that you yourself discussed your role in the astronaut program in the essays that you wrote. And that that information was only disclosed to us via letters of recommendation or public comments. I'm curious as to why you chose not to discuss this yourself.

MR. MCCARTY: Well, actually, I was not -- I made it as a finalist. I was not, I was not selected, obviously. I made it to that final group. So, I was -- so, I did not become an astronaut. Does that answer your question? I -- why I didn't discuss it? It's a --

CHAIR COE: I think so, yes. Changing topics a little bit to your -- or a lot really, to your essay on impartiality. In that essay you gave an example from your time as a youth basketball coach of how you used a random number generator to ensure that all of your players, regardless of skill level, received equal playing time, often at the expense of winning the game. As a sports fan myself, I can certainly appreciate this as an example of a demonstration of impartiality, but I'm wondering if you can provide us with another non-sports-related example of a time you had to make a difficult, impartial decision that involved setting aside your preference or self-interest.

MR. MCCARTY: Okay. So, one of my Navy assignments was as an F-14 test pilot here in Ventura County at Point

Mugu Naval Air Station. And the mission of that command was to provide aircraft support for testing new systems. So, other Navy commands in different parts of the United States would contract our services. They would contract or pay for aircraft and pilots to do testing for them. So — and at Point Mugu we had a number of different aircraft types, fighter aircraft, attack aircraft, patrol aircraft. And our — the customers would come to us and pay for flight time and pilots to test their systems.

One of the gripes that some of the pilots of the different types of airplane had was, they were getting as much time as the other pilots. So that different pilots are qualified in different aircraft, and can only fly that type of aircraft typically. And the rates that our customers would pay were kind of set arbitrarily, so that they would come and pay \$1,000 for an hour of F-14 flight time, and \$500 an hour for an hour of A-7 flight time.

The pilots perceived there was some injustice being done, in that the flight rates were being set arbitrarily, and that affected how much flight time that each of them was getting. In a particular, they had kind of a grudge against the fighter pilots because we seemed to get getting all the flight time. And I think they had a pretty good case.

What I did, I took it upon myself to actually kind

of do an investigation as to whether or not the flight, the aircraft costs per hour of flight time for the different aircraft were in fact equitable. Because if they weren't equitable, then certain aircraft would be in demand more than the others, and that would mean certain pilots would get more flight time than the others. I'll try and make this story short.

I set up -- I did -- I set up a programmed spreadsheet using a certain add-in for the Excel application, which took all of the actual costs of each of the different kinds of aircraft, and all of the costs to provide flight hours for each of the pilots. And ran this through the, through the application, and actually came up with a set of flight-hour costs that were equitable and transparent to our customers, and which also made it fair for the pilots of each of the different kinds of aircraft in the amount of flight hours they were getting.

So, what made me impartial about this, well, I was one of the guys getting more than his fair share of the flight time, but I wanted to ensure that what we were doing was fair for the entire command. So I presented, I presented my analysis to the commander, the admiral, and it was very well received. And what we did is we ended up resetting all of our flight-hour costs, so that those costs were equitable to our customers. And the result was, the

pilots in my command -- in this command, were all getting a fair amount of flight time.

So, at the outset I kind of thought at the end of it all I would be getting less flight time, but we did what was fair, it worked. And I was -- I'm proud to say, that that methodology that I used was incorporated by the command and used in subsequent years for setting flight time costs.

CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you. In your essay on appreciation for diversity and in some of your responses to standard question five this afternoon, you discussed the opportunities you've had to interact or meet or work with or on behalf of diverse groups from a variety of backgrounds. And I'd like to know from those interactions, what have you most learned from people of diverse backgrounds about their perspectives and their concerns that you think would make you an effective representative for the broadly diverse population of California on this Commission?

MR. MCCARTY: I think what I've learned from my interactions with people throughout the State of California is, each person on an individual level has pride in something. Pride in place, their community, pride in their livelihood, pride in their family. And I think those translate into how their perspectives are formed. So that

perspectives become based on, say, geography and livelihood and culture.

I think there's another factor that goes into how diverse people form their perspectives, and that's what resources do you have at hand and how can you use those? I'll give kind of a narrow example, but maybe it will help show what I'm trying to say. Consider for, say, a farmer from the Central Valley, whose livelihood may, to a certain extent, be dependent on the vagaries of nature, how much sun or rain his farm gets in a growing season.

So, in his perspective, his concerns, his day-to-day thoughts, thoughts on a day to day or weekly or monthly basis might be something along the lines of, how can I take these resources I have, the sun and the rain and the wind and the soil, and translate those into something that is, what will make my life better? So he has a perspective, and it's a completely valid and understandable perspective.

So, in contrast, consider, say, somebody else, somebody, a young worker at a high-tech firm in Silicon Valley. For that person, her day to day or daily or weekly or monthly concern or thought process might be, how can I take advantage of my advanced degree in engineering to make a better life for myself? So -- and that's a completely valid and understandable perspective. Two widely different perspectives, but each is kind of aiming toward the same

thing, bettering one's life.

So, I guess another thing I've learned is, whereas perspectives can vary to a great degree, they're also common interests or common concerns that everybody has. And some of those would be, for instance, stability of livelihood, stability of housing costs, opportunity for good education for myself or for my children, availability of medical care. So, I think the takeaways from all of this is that different perspectives are kind of like feelings that are all valid, and you really can't discount any perspectives.

Also, I've learned that people like to be, they need to be respected, they need to be heard. They need to feel like they're represented. And I think another lesson for me personally that I think would be valuable, were I to be selected on the Commission is, not to project my own notions or conceptions from one group or one area on to another, because everything's different. Perspectives are different, depending upon those factors I mentioned, geography, livelihood, culture, et cetera.

CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you. I'd like to ask you about something you mentioned in your response to standard question one. You were talking about communities of interest and gathering input from those communities. And that's clearly going to be one of the biggest challenges in

front of Commission is to identify as many communities of interest as they can across the State. So of those will be easier to find than others. They're more engaged. They're more willing to come forward. Others will be less so. They're a little more hidden or less obvious, harder to find.

As a Commissioner, how could you, or how could you help the Commission identify communities of interest across the State, and kind of avoid the pitfall of inadvertently overlooking some of those communities that are harder to locate?

MR. MCCARTY: I think the way to go about identifying communities of interest -- well, first of all, there's the hard data that the Commission will receive. You may be able to identify certain communities of interest simply from the hard data. But then -- but that doesn't tell the whole story, naturally.

I think the way to identify communities of interest is to reach out to liaisons or intermediaries who have kind of their fingers on the pulse of a region, and that would include school groups, say school organizations or a school superintendent. Service organizations that are active in the community. I think religious leaders would be good people to reach out to, to try and find communities of interest. And also such things as, maybe even food banks,

ethnic leaders in the community. And even if your first round of trying to identify all the communities of interest doesn't work, the first people you reach out to I think themselves will have contacts or know of ways to reach even deeper into the community.

And then I think -- was part of your question, how to engage ones that may be hard to engage?

CHAIR COE: It was similar to that. It was how do you avoid inadvertently overlooking some of those that are harder to find. But what you say actually leads into a follow-up question I had, which is, some of those communities that you identify in the work may be harder to engage, or may feel less comfortable engaging with the Commission. They may have concerns about engaging with Government for one reason or other, but their perspectives are just as valid and just as important to inform the Commission in its work.

So, how could the Commission go about making those communities feel comfortable to come forward and share their perspectives with the Commission to better inform it in its work?

MR. MCCARTY: Uh-huh.

MS. PELLMAN: Time check. We have three minutes, 30 seconds remaining.

CHAIR COE: Thank you.

MR. MCCARTY: I think that's where it's important to actually use the, what I would call, liaisons or intermediaries to those communities. I think for the Commission to gain credibility with those types of communities of interest, we have to make ourselves credible to the leaders of those communities.

So, if we're able to explain to somebody that those communities respect what our mission is, and how it will benefit those communities, in my ideal world, it would nice to have those kind of people standing right next to us as we engage with these smaller or tougher to engage with communities of interest.

And partly another way to do that is, take our message to them. Make -- ensure that we schedule Commission meetings in places that are accessible to the people we want to engage with. Make it, make the time and the location accessible to those people. Also, don't come across, perhaps, as a regimented representative of the Government. Take off the coats and ties, and use some level of formality that would work in those, in those smaller communities of interest or harder to find ones. But the main thing I think would be use, use respected people as our liaison or intermediaries with those communities. That would be the way I would try to go about it.

CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. McCarty. I think I'm just about out of time, so I'm going to go ahead and turn the time over to Ms. Dickison for her questions.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you, Mr. Coe.

Good afternoon, Mr. McCartney (sic).

MR. MCCARTY: Good afternoon.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you for meeting with us this afternoon. So, you talked in your essay about your presentations, and one of them was a day in the life of a carrier pilot.

MR. MCCARTY: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: And one of the things you took away from those presentations was that no matter the age, education or background, the audience seemed to have the same questions, have the same concerns, and shared the same sense of wonder about the subject matter that might be unusual to them. My question is, what concerns did the audience members share, and how would this knowledge assist you in the work of the Commission?

MR. MCCARTY: The question is, what concerns did they share?

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Yes.

MR. MCCARTY: The answer that pops into my mind when you asked that question is, they were concerned about my safety when I described carrier operation. A lot of the

questions were, what would you do if this happened, if this emergency happened, what would you do if that happened?

How would you react to this or how would you react to that.

So, it kind of tickled me that people were concerned about me when I was telling them about what my job position was.

But I don't know, I think that, the second part of your question, I think what did I learn or how did that -- how would that help me. I think that goes back to, there's a lot more that brings up together than separates us. So -- and I, that's what I tried to express as part of that response in my essay. But everybody kind of had the same thoughts, they were all in the same wavelength.

And what I was impressed with was that they're all thinking the same way, and they're all alike, no matter what their age or ethnic background or educational level. So that I think impressed me.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. You were also on the -- are you currently on the City of Ventura Planning Commission?

MR. MCCARTY: Yes, I am.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Okay. What is your role on that Commission?

MR. MCCARTY: Simply one of seven members. Each of the members was chosen by one of Ventura's city council members. So I am a representative for one of Ventura's

city council members. And the role, along with the other planning commissioners -- excuse me, is to really take a look -- well, a good example of what we're doing right now is, when the Thomas Fire rolled through Ventura a little over two years ago now, the city lost over 500 homes. And we're now in the process, it's been a couple of years, but we're in a big rebuilding process right now.

And so a lot of the work the commission's doing is taking a look at the plans for the homes that are being rebuilt, and any variances from the design of the homes that were previously on those sites, to see if they're in accordance with the city's overall plan. So that's -- a lot of our work has been along those lines recently.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: So, in the work you do on the commission, are you -- do you take looks at the -- look at the different communities within the area and how those communities fit into the plans of the area?

MR. MCCARTY: Absolutely. So, one of the other items that we have on our plate right now, is a plan for a, kind of a major development of, it's a combination of apartment spaces, shop spaces and open spaces right close by me in my very neighborhood. And so, the -- we do look at, you know, trying to attract more people to this area, to this particular neighborhood, but we take a look at, you know, how it will fit in with the kind of community that is

already here. It's kind of a beach community, so it's got to fit in. So, that's one of the things we're looking at, but we have to take a look at the open space to see if it is appropriate to the neighborhood it's in. Does it invite people to come in? I'm not sure if I've answered your question specifically or not.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: You did. You did. So, in developing those plans and taking that into consideration, I'm guessing that you invite community inputs on that?

MR. MCCARTY: Yes, absolutely. In fact, that's been a very interesting part of being on the planning commission. In fact, in respect to communities of interest, I have found that being on the planning commission, and previously when I was a member of Ventura's Water Commission, in a lot of cases community of interest tend to self-identify when they come and present their views to either of those commissions.

So, you know, yes. So, it's very interesting to me to -- in fact, I think something that would be valuable to me if I were to get on the Redistricting Commission, is I do have that experience with taking public input in a commission-like setting. Listening to both sides of arguments, and then coming to consensus with the fellow commission members, and making evidence-based or fact-based decisions.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: So, in your work on the planning commission or the water commission, either one, or any other work, have you ever had to do an analysis where you took hard data and matched -- and you've - then used softer data, such as the public comment, and merged the two to make a decision?

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Yes. Let's see. Let me - if I may, can I give you an example not commission related, but work related?

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Of course.

MR. MCCARTY: Okay. In the biotech company that I work for, one of the things -- I worked in supply chain and the risk management area, and one of the things that I took upon, again, I kind of took upon myself as I was part of the supply chain, was -- one of the missions of supply chain is to reduce the perturbations in the supply chain and make sure that our supply of drugs is as smooth as humanly possible. And to do that, we have to have the correct drug manufacturing assumptions to do our planning, to do all of our supply-chain planning.

And it came to -- my group's attention that things weren't going as smoothly as they could have. So I did an analysis of -- a statistical analysis of the, our drug substance manufacturing plants, and what the output from each manufacturing run was. So, in biotechnology, each

manufacturing run is not necessarily the same size. It's not like a normal pharmaceutical company where you combine chemicals and the -- you always get the same size batch coming out. In biotech we're using living cells under growth, different growth conditions, and you don't always get the same batch size, and that's what causes the perturbations in the supply chain.

So I did an analysis of all of our products, there were about a dozen products at the time, and what those batch sizes were at each of the plants. And I found that most of the planning assumptions we were using were not very accurate, and that was causing some of the problem in the supply chain.

So, what I did was, I, in conjunction with all of the manufacturing plant managers, I presented this evidence, and I suggested that we change our assumptions about the batch outputs based upon my statistical analysis. And, lo and behold, they thought that was a good idea. So we implemented that plan, and it seemed to work very well. So we went from kind of plant managers guessing as what the batch sizes were, to a good knowledge of what they were based on statistics. And that worked just fine, and we were able to set the number of manufacturing runs appropriately.

Well, at one point in time, I got some pushback

from one of the plant managers, who said, you know, Scott, we've just adjusted our manufacturing assumptions by this little bit, as you suggested, but what it did is it caused us to have to change the number of manufacturing runs over the next year by a very tiny amount, say maybe they went from 33 manufacturing runs down to 32. And he said, for such a small change, you know, that causes a big disruption to our plant personnel, all of the people who work in the manufacturing plants, and it's a big human disruption. And he suggested, how about if we don't make the statistically appropriate change on behalf of the people's whose lives it would disrupt? And to make this long story short, we ended up using his suggestion.

So what we had put in place was good in accordance with all of the analytics, but we kind of left the human aspect out of it. And we thought -- we forgot what impact these small changes would make on the people actually running the plants and doing the manufacturing. So, that's an instance where I think taking the human input changed the way we looked at things.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. Thank you. What do you see -- what role do you think you would fill on the Commission?

MR. MCCARTY: Again, kind of -- as I mentioned before, I'm -- wherever the Commission needs me, I would be

happy to, happy to be a team player. But I think my data analysis skills are good. I believe I have good editing skills. In the jobs that I've had, I've many times been called upon to edit documents prior to publication. I also think I might be kind of a good sanity checker. I'm good at kind of taking a broad look, and taking a look from, you know, a bird's-eye-view of the whole process. Is everything fitting together, to make sure things, things on a big scale are going well. So, what role? Data analysis, editing of documents and kind of maybe a jack of all trades sanity checker on the entire process.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: If you were selected as one of the first eight Commissioners, which are selected randomly, you would be tasked with selecting the next six to round out the Commission. What would you be looking for in those individuals?

MR. MCCARTY: Actually, I think this one has a fairly straightforward answer. To the greatest extent practicable, the Commission as whole needs to reflect the diversity of the State with regard to race, ethnicity, geography, gender. So, the final six Commissioners I think need to be chosen to ensure that the diversity of the Commission best reflects the diversity of the State.

That being said, I think as a secondary factor, the final six should be chosen with skills that complement the

skills of the first eight. For instance, in the competencies that I mentioned earlier, legal expertise, analytical skills, public communication skills, I think, if possible, to choose people who would round out the Commission in that manner. But, basically, I think the credibility of the Commission is dependent upon its diversity. The more diverse the Commission is, the greater credibility it will have in the job that it has to do.

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

MR. MCCARTY: I think that's another kind of straightforward answer to that one. And that would be, the Commission needs to come up with maps that ensure effective and fair representation of all voters throughout the State. So that's the primary goal. But I also believe it's the process by which that is done is important. I think that the Commission needs to come up with maps that are -- in a manner that is as transparent and unambiguous and defensible as possible. The Commission needs to deliver to the State maps that can withstand legal scrutiny.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. What can the Commission do as part of its process to ensure that its maps are defensible legally?

MS. PELLMAN: Time check. We have three minutes, 35 seconds.

MR. MCCARTY: What can it do? Well, one of the things it needs to do, the maps -- the districts have to be drawn with equal numbers of voters in each district, and that ensures that each person's vote carries the same weight in each district. I think that fair -- maps need to be drawn that don't dilute minority interests. So there can't be any splitting of minority groups or cracking of groups to dilute voting power by minorities. And the same thing goes for other communities of interest. I think to be defensible the maps have to show that we haven't split communities of interest across boundary lines.

BOARD MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

Mr. Coe, I don't have any additional questions at this moment. Thank you, Mr. McCartney (sic).

MR. MCCARTY: Thank you.

CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Dickison.

We'll go ahead and turn the time over to Mr.

18 Belnap.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: All right. Good afternoon,

Mr. Carty.

MR. MCCARTY: Good afternoon.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: In your essay on appreciation for diversity, you described your work on the City of Ventura's Water and Planning Commissions, and how these experiences required that you learned and took into account

the interests and concerns of your diverse community. I thought these experiences would also be applicable to impartiality, and I was going to give you the opportunity to draw that connection, but I -- in Ms. Dickison's questions I think you already drew that connection. But what I'd like to hear is an example of a difficult decision you had to make on one of these commissions where you had to exercise impartiality.

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

MR. MCCARTY: Let's see. That's a good question. Well, it might not be a specific decision that was made, I feel that maybe this example would work. commission is very well supported by the City of Ventura water staff, and a lot of the meeting preparation for the items on the agenda are prepared by the water department staff. However, sometimes those are -- sometimes the data provided by the department staff is in conflict with some of the data are represented by members of the public when they come to address the commission on particular agenda items. And I demonstrate impartiality I think by listening to both sides. It would, for some people it would be natural to assume that the data and information you're getting from your own staff are accurate and the gold standard. However, sometimes the public brings their own information and their own data, which are very compelling, but in conflict with what we're being presented by the

staff.

And, again, some commissioners may outright poo-poo the data that's coming from the public, because they think what's coming from the staff is not questionable. But in my, what I like to believe my impartial scrutiny of the public from the data, I have found things that are very compelling, and need to be presented and brought to the attention of the greater -- of the commission as a whole.

So that is kind of an attempt for me to be impartial. To really listen to both sides and to dig in, dig into the -- dig into both sides, dig into the arguments on both sides, and stand up for the side that I think is presenting a compelling argument.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: All right. Thank you. How would your experience as a jet pilot and your assignment in the military's GPS Joint Program Office prepare you for the technical aspects of being a Commissioner?

MR. MCCARTY: Experience in the military and at the GPS Program Office applicable to being a Commissioner. I think my experience as a fighter pilot has, number one, I think I'm able to present a calm demeanor and calm response in high-stress, high-paced environments. That's something that I think has come about as, via as being my experience as a pilot.

Also, I have learned to, I have the ability to I

think assimilate a lot of information in a short period of time. And I'm also I think good at making decisions with less-than-perfect data. I think another aspect of what I can take from the military is, is has to do with the tools, the tools required to do a job at hand. Not one tool works for every problem that you're working on.

In fact, it kind of reminds of something that was said by a calculus professor that I had back in school. He said the more problems I know how to solve more than one way, the better my chances of success. And I think it's been very true in a lot of the things that I've experienced in my careers.

With regard to the GPS Joint Program Office, it was -- when I first arrived -- I arrived at a time when there were no -- GPS was still a dream. There were no -- the GPS satellite constellation had just started to be launched into space. The -- what I was working on was the military rollout of GPS sets, so there were no commercial applications of GPS at that time. And when I first arrived I -- it was kind of like taking a drink from a fire hose, and learning all of the technical aspects of the GPS satellites themselves, how the GPS system works. It's kind of like magic now. You turn it on and you know where you are. But there's a -- I'm pretty versed in exactly how the system works and how it calculates where you are. So, I

did get a good technical background in the GPS system while I was there.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: All right. Thank you. Do you think that background in the GPS system helps you at all in spatial awareness and understanding maps, understanding geography?

MR. MCCARTY: Yes. Yes, I do. Although I have -something popped into my mind as you were articulating that
question and it kind of made me smile. What's interesting
to me is that I think a generation ago people were much
better map readers than they are now. Because GPS allows
people to put their faith in just system that tells them
where to go and when they're going to get there.

I remember as a kid, I was in charge of the maps when we went on trips. And I'd have to figure out where we were, where we were going, and what the best way to get there was. So, yes, GPS is a real boon. I think it gets people interested in maps, in GIS applications. People use it all the time on-line. It's extremely valuable. But there's also something to be said for people who pull out the paper maps and use them occasionally.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: All right. Thank you. So for 17 years you were the director of operations and risk Management at Amgen. You've touched on some of the types of analysis that you performed there, but can you walk us

through an analysis, or a typical analysis you would perform in your role that would demonstrate the strength of your analytical skills?

MR. MCCARTY: Sure. There was -- so, the company I -- and so the biotech company I work for had about 12 or 13 drugs on the market at the time that I worked there -- excuse me. And most of the drugs were being delivered to very stable, large markets where the demand was consistent and high. However, there were certain few markets where demand was low and not very stable. And that caused problems within the splicing. The splicing, it was very heard to predict and to manufacture the right amount of drug to supply those low-demand markets. So I was called upon to do an analysis of those markets to try and smooth out the supply chain. So what I had to do was take a look at the historical demand in those markets, and statistically analyze that demand, and make some assumptions about future demand or forward-looking demand.

And what I did was, I set up a Monte Carlo analysis within Excel to -- well, let me back up a little bit. I would utilize a certain set of assumptions about the distribution of the demand. And then set up a Monte Carlo analysis which would run the simulations of future demand over a good number of times, 1,000 simulations, and then take the data from that output and plot it.

And what it would show is a very nice chart of what the probability would be of us being unable to supply the market at any particular probability level. So if we wanted to have a 95-percent probability of being able to supply the market in these low-demand regions we'd be able to do it, or we could choose a 99-percent probability of being able to supply the demand. And depending upon which you chose, that would inform the manufacturing department of how much of that particular drug to make for that particular region. So Monte Carlo analysis is a very powerful tool to do forward-looking, probabilistic planning.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: Thank you. My next question you've answered a part of it already with an experience that you shared with a Panel Member. So, I was going to ask you, from your career at Amgen something you were proud of, a project that you were successful in, and I believe you've already shared that. So now I want to ask, can you think of a time that you made a mistake and what you learned from that mistake?

MR. MCCARTY: Yes. It had to do with another analysis at my biotech company. In this case, my boss — what we were looking at was an option to install new manufacturing lines at one of our manufacturing plants in the Bay Area, and I was working at our headquarters in

Thousand Oaks at the time. And for this analysis we had to look at what the options were for the number of manufacturing lines, what their output would be, what their maintenance and upkeep would be, things like that.

And so my boss put me in touch with the plant manager up in the Bay Area. And so I worked with the plant manager to gather all of the assumptions that I needed to run my analysis. Ended up running the analysis, which I thought was pretty good. And then delivered it for review to the plant manager up in the Bay Area.

What happened was, she kind of -- she shared that analysis and ran it up the line to her bosses. My mistake was I did not keep my boss in the loop or informed that I'd given my analysis to the plant manager up in the Bay Area. So, there was a disconnect and there was some blowback about the fact that I delivered an analysis not to my boss, but to the plant manager. And my lesson learned was, you better keep the boss in the loop with everything you're doing. Even if you think she's given you the reins to do otherwise, keep your boss in the loop.

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

All my other questions that I've prepared have been either answered or have been resolved. So, I'll yield the rest of my time.

CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Belnap. I'll go

ahead and turn the time over to Mr. Dawson.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Madam Secretary, how much time do we have left of the 90 minutes?

MS. PELLMAN: We have 14 minutes, 50 seconds.

MR. DAWSON: All right. Thank you.

Mr. McCarty, thanks again for being here. I appreciate you being here this afternoon. I'm -- you may have said this, but I may have also missed it. Did you grow up in California?

MR. MCCARTY: Yes. I'm a native of Santa Barbara. Left California post-college when I joined the Navy. And then worked it out to return home to my favorite State late in my Navy career, and have been here ever since.

MR. DAWSON: And then I see that you went to -- did you get your B.A. at Stanford, and then you were at Monterey and then --

MR. MCCARTY: Yes.

MR. DAWSON: -- and then USC. So you've hit all the big coastal areas.

MR. MCCARTY: Yup.

MR. DAWSON: When you were -- I want to ask you to put your operational -- operations-risk management hat on.

And can you walk me through what in your mind the risk to this redistricting process that the Covid-19 situation

might pose?

MR. MCCARTY: Yes. I've thought about it a little bit. It will certainly -- in my mind, in my opinion, it will certainly make the process more difficult. Number one, getting the Census Bureau, the Census takers boots on the ground may be delayed or difficult. So that may cause a ripple into, into the Census data collection itself.

With regard to the Census data, there may be pros and cons to what Covid-19 does. With people -- but it depends on what group you're in. There are people staying home more, so they may be more apt to respond electronically, if they have broadband access, to the Census questions. So, we may see from people who have computers, a better response to the Census. However, it works just the opposite for other communities and other groups we want to capture who may not have internet access, and we may get less of a response from them. So, it kind of works both ways there.

What else? What other risks? There are others, I just can't come up with something right now. It's not a good situation, that's for sure.

MR. DAWSON: Well, and I think you touched on it a little bit. We know for a fact, historically there are some groups who are more likely to be undercounted than others. And as you've said, they might be folks who are

less likely to have access to electronic communications. But there are other folks, like the homeless or recent immigrants, where I imagine that the situation could be exacerbated. And so I was wondering if you had any thoughts about how the Commission might be able to compensate, if you will?

MR. MCCARTY: That is a question that I would probably have to defer to the Commission's legal counsel. To my knowledge, I don't think the Redistricting Commission would be allowed to make any adjustments to the Census data that are provided from the Bureau. I think -- no. I talked earlier about your sphere of influence. I think the Census data as a whole that will be delivered by the Census Bureau is outside of the Commission's sphere of influence. And I think once it crosses that boundary and comes to us, we're not allowed to do, make any adjustments. We'll have to do the best job we can with the data that we're given. Make the best decisions we can with the information that we have. I could be wrong on that, but that's my belief, but I'd have to -- I think it's a legal call.

MR. DAWSON: All right. Thank you. You talked a little bit about your work on both the planning commission and the water commission. And I wanted to ask you. So, these are -- you were appointed by your council member, did I understand that correctly?

1 MR. MCCARTY: Different cases for each commission. 2 For the water commission it was, I was a member -- the city 3 did not have a water commission and was standing one up. 4 So they took applications for a seven-person water 5 commission, of which four of those spots were reserved for 6 people with, with water, professional water expertise, 7 hydrogeologists, et cetera, scientists. And three were at-8 large members of, members of the community, who did not 9 necessarily have professional water experience, which I did 10 not. So I applied as a member at large. And that process 11 was simply an interview with a subset of city council. And 12 then we were chosen, chosen by city council for the water 13 commission.

The planning commission works a little bit differently, as I think I alluded to before. Each of the seven planning commissioner -- commission members is chosen by a city council member, and serves through the term of that city council member's term.

MR. DAWSON: I see. So, were you responsible only to that district?

MR. MCCARTY: No. No, I'm not.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. DAWSON: I see. It's sort of an at large situation?

MR. MCCARTY: Yes. Yeah. Even though, even though
you're chosen by a -- in fact, Ventura's going through a

transition right now. So part of their city council is at large and part of it is voted in by district. We're moving to district-wide elections in the near term.

MR. DAWSON: I see. And then the planning commission meetings, they're under the Brown Act, all that?

MR. MCCARTY: Yes. Yeah.

MR. DAWSON: Is there something about having to deliberate in public that you can find useful in your work on the Commission, if selected?

MR. MCCARTY: I think there's a very natural connection. Yes, deliberating in public is what I've done on both the water commission and the planning commission. I'm not afraid to speak up and -- sometimes I was kind of known as somebody who would, you know -- I don't know, say my mind more than I should have, perhaps. But, yeah, I think -- because I like to stand up for the public, the public input. You know, I think a lot of commissions may experience gadflies coming in and talking about things that may not be appropriate or germane. And you have to kind of learn how to get through that. But I think the experience I've had listening to the public, engaging with the public, asking questions of the public, would be a, would translate well to work on the Commission.

MR. DAWSON: All right. Thank you.

I have no further questions, Mr. Chair.

1 CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Dawson.

Any follow-up questions from the Panel? Ms.

Dickison, any follow-up questions?

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

CHAIR COE: Mr. Belnap?

BOARD MEMBER BELNAP: I do not have any follow-up questions.

CHAIR COE: Counsel, I also have no follow-up questions.

MR. DAWSON: All right. Thank you.

Madam Secretary, how much time is remaining in the 90 minutes?

MS. PELLMAN: Six minutes, five seconds.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Mr. McCarty, with the six minutes remaining, I'd like offer you the opportunity to make some closing remarks to the Panel, if you wish.

MR. MCCARTY: Sure. But before I do make a closing remark, I'd like to say thank you for the tremendous amount of effort that you have all put in. The three members of the Applicant Review Panel, counsel and your staff -- staffs, have all done a great job with -- on a long timeline with a lot of work. And now that you're down to the last couple of interviews, you must be breathing a sigh

of relief, which is nice.

I would also like to say thank you to some of those who have been seen and not heard or heard and not seen.

And that includes the Panel Secretary, the court reporters, your IT experts, the captioners, and also the ASL interpreters. Thank you.

As a closing statement, what I'd like to say is this. My oldest son, Connor, is now 31 years old. When he was 12, he said something to me that I thought was very profound for a 12 year old. He said, if you know a lot and you don't tell anybody, then it's just kind of wasted. I believe there are things that I know that would be helpful to the Panel, to the Commission. I believe there are things I know how to do that would be helpful to the Commission.

And one of the reasons I applied is because I didn't want to waste an opportunity to do something good for the people of California. And with that, I'd like to thank you very much for your consideration of my application.

CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you very much for being with us today, Mr. McCarty. We appreciate your time.

We have one final interview, rescheduled interview for tomorrow at 10:45 a.m. So we will be in recess -- we don't have any business before that, is that right? Okay.

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 5th day of May, 2020.

PETER PETTY CER**D-493 Notary Public

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were 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.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 5th day of May, 2020.



Myra Severtson Certified Transcriber AAERT No. CET**D-852