62

stand being around them.

So I'm not always good around people my own age, but, that aside, I work hard to remain level-headed and openminded, and you saw from the letters of recommendation. Those are all real, and I conduct very level-headed board meetings, very open. Everybody walks away feeling they at least were fairly heard. Now, they may not agree with the

8 decision. They were at least fairly heard. And I think --

MS. PELLMAN: That's 90 minutes.

MR. NEWTON: Okay. That's it? Thank you.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you for being with

13 us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

14

15

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

MR. NEWTON: Everybody stay safe.

(A recess was held from 10:30 a.m. to 10:44 a.m.)

18 CHAIR BELNAP: I'm going to call this meeting back
19 out of recess. I want to welcome Ms. Jane Andersen.

Ms. Andersen, can you hear us?

MS. ANDERSEN: Yes, I can.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Well, we're going to jump into the standard questions, and turn the time over to Mr. Dawson.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Belnap.

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

MS. ANDERSEN: Yes, I am. Thank you.

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. ANDERSEN: Well, good morning, and thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak with you today.

This question is basically "What makes a good Commissioner?" Well, each Commissioner must come to this job realizing how incredibly important this task is, how difficult it's going to be at times, and how much it's going to take, the amazing amount the Commission will learn, and how rewarding it will be. Personally, I think it's going to be a lot of fun.

To get this job done, each Commissioner must possess three required attributes. They must be impartial, they must have an appreciation for the demographics and geographic diversity of California. They must have the relevant analytical skills to complete the work, and more.

I believe all Commissioners need to be openminded. They must have good communication skills, and they must enjoy working on a team. They have to be active listeners, looking for the meaning behind the words, trying to understand what it is that people are saying.

They must respect each other and the public, and believe that other people's opinions are just as valuable as their own. They must be polite and considerate. They must be patient, and I believe they should have a sense of duty.

I believe Commissioners should be curious about the different regions of our state, its varied people, and how this redistricting will actually affect them. They need to be truth-seekers, be willing to put in the time and the work to find out what information that we have, and what information that we still need.

The task of redistricting, actually drawing the maps, the details of it, is very technical. All the information that is brought in must be converted to two-dimensional maps that will meet all the legal requirements. To do this, all Commissioners must understand the legal rules of this task.

They have to be comfortable and confident with data and mapping, and the many revisions and iterations that will happen. They need to be critical thinkers, and they

need to be able to prioritize data.

They also need to be flexible thinkers. They have to be able to change their views with new information.

They need to be comfortable working under pressure and when challenged. Additionally, they can't be naive. They have to be aware of politics, and they should be self-aware.

What particular skills or competencies do you bring to the Commission, and what do others have?

Collectively, I believe the Commission as a group needs to have the administrative skills to hire a staff, experts, schedule meetings, public communications, and execute the Commission's plans. It must have the experience and connections with community groups that are typically underrepresented in our state to help bring these communities into the process.

The Commission must have the technical expertise in analysis and mapping to work both very technically with our experts and, in plainer terms, with those people I call "data users," to quickly digest, create, and explain the maps so that they accurately reflect the entire group's intentions.

The group needs to have the legal expertise to work through the very difficult nuances of the Voters' Rights

Act and the criteria of the Voters First Act to keep the Commission on task, with an eye on defending the maps and

the Commission's actions in court, if needed.

The group also has to have the political awareness to keep the Commission from accidentally creating political problems and minimizing outside political influence.

These skills and attributes that each Commissioner should have, I possess all of them. I actually do approach each job with an open mind and a positive attitude. I consciously try not to have any preconceived ideas. I have good communication skills, and I really enjoy working on a team, which I basically do on every job.

I'm a good listener, and I really try to understand what people are trying to tell me, particularly in technical areas where people are trying to explain themselves, but they don't have the right terms or words.

I'm very good at empathizing, and trying to pull that out of them, "What are you actually saying now? Do you mean this? Do you mean that?"

I think that's something I will bring to the Commission, which are -- things that I bring to the Commission is, I'm a registered civil and structural engineer in the state of California. So what I typically do in all my work is I take information, ideas, three-dimensional things, sort out what's important, what isn't important, and make them into two-dimensional drawings, construction documents. This is virtually what

the Commission will be doing. We'll be making, taking lots of information, and making it on a two-dimensional drawing.

I'm very good at spatial relations. I can quickly see how drawing a line here, drawing a line there is going to affect the rest of what the work is doing. You know, if we make a change over here, now it immediately affects what we did three sections over. I'm used to doing this as a matter of course. This is what I do in my work. While I used to work with new construction a bit, I primarily work on existing structures, alterations, seismic retrofits, and failure investigations and repair.

Typically, in that, you figure out what is there to the best of your ability, and then you make a design based on that, knowing that, as construction starts, what we find is going to be different, and you'll have to make changes on it. You have to quickly evaluate that in the field, on the construction sites, and come up with changes.

So I am very used to working up, coming up with multiple solutions, quickly evaluating them, and then repeating until a final solution is found. In my work, this process usually happens during construction or after a failure, when a solution is needed now. So conflict and result, working through that, is just part of the job. I expect that to happen, and it's not something I shy away from. You work through that as a team. That's just what

you do. With this experience and multiple reiterations under pressure, I think I could help the Commission work through the same process with the maps, faster and more productively.

Additionally, structural work must conform to building codes and local ordinances, and it's then reviewed for compliance with all these codes. Now, you probably realize building codes are legal documents, and while many designers use building codes, I have extensive experience in writing the buildings codes.

As members of the Structural Engineers Association, which I've been on the board of directors of, and the largest society of engineers, we actually write the building codes for anything structural, forces, and that become legal documents. So this perspective will be very useful in keeping the Commission following the details of the legal requirements as it pertains to the technical aspects.

My experience in investigating and repairing structural failures has taught me to always look at the bigger picture before you take action, and follow the effects of that action on the whole rest of the system, to make sure we're not doing damage elsewhere. I believe this mind set will help the Commission to consider multiple solutions faster and prevent mistakes.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

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

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

MS. ANDERSEN: Hyper-partisanship is all too common today, and it breeds distrust and hopelessness in our democracy. This is one of the reasons I think it's so important for the Commission to do its work in an open, inclusive, and non-political manner. The Commissioners must be polite and respectful of each other. They have to have open minds and really want to work together. They cannot have a political agenda, and they need to be able to leave whatever politics you have at the door.

One of the rules of the Voters First Act is that politics cannot be used as a criteria in redistricting.

When the group needs to consider a political implication of

any of its actions, we should be as objective as possible, and we have to talk very civilly when politics comes up, and I believe all political discussions, if they are needed or happen to come up, we need to be very civil and objective, also that, if discussions get too political, the group should address it right away, but this is not the time and place for that.

You know, we can talk politics after we're done, and, additionally, we have to worry about politics on the Commission, coming into it, and outside influences. So we have to be -- you can't divorce yourself from politics, because it's very real. I did read the <u>Politico</u> article about how the 2010 Commission was influenced, and we have to be aware of that, to avoid it. As a group, we should get them to stay on task. I believe humor is always something I use to keep people in tense situations very technical, lighten it up, brevity, start the task again.

We have more in common than we do apart, and we have one shared goal. We're all working on this together. You know, you can deal with politics later. Let's, you know, come -- I want the group to come to a consensus. If someone has a concern, it should never be belittled. It needs to be explored. We need to find out what that concern is, and I believe the Commission should actually behave as the Applicant Panel has done. You are all

different politics, from political parties, and you're working together seamlessly. That's what the Commission needs to do.

To make sure that the group is not seen as polarized or hyperpartisan, the first thing I would do is try to get to know each other. It's harder to put someone in a buttonhole and say, "They're a Republican, they're a Democrat, they think this" if you know the person, as, again, we have more in common than we do separate, and I think, you know, getting together, finding out what we share is one of the first steps.

We should also go over the reports of the 2010 Commission, particularly the ideas they have about being manipulated, and address what we think about that. The other idea that I believe would really help avoid partisanship is to have the technical and the legal expertise in all three political divisions.

If the people in the group that are sort of leading the legal interpretations and mapping the proposals are from different political groups, when those technical experts, you know, the ones that have stronger skills in those areas — when they agree, the other Commissioners won't necessarily feel that they're being — "That's coming from the political point of view."

Also, all tasks that are seeking and contacting the

communities of interest and underrepresented groups should be represented by all three political divisions, to both maximize the camaraderie and participation. Throughout this whole process, I will try to work to keep the group together, on task, and with a positive attitude.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Question three.

MS. PELLMAN: Quick time check. We have 15 minutes, 25 seconds.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

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

MS. ANDERSEN: I'd say two problems. One we sort of addressed, the issue of whether it's, you know, political, coming internally in the group or from external pressure. I believe the greatest problem, and a real fear I have, is that the data that we get from the census will be not even close to correct.

We already know that California typically undercounts, and we're in danger of possibly losing a representative. This is the first time this census is also going on line, and with that, just as trying to connect in today, people who are very good at -- you know, are very comfortable with on-line work -- there are a lot of people who aren't, particularly all the people who are older.

They're usually the ones who fill out the census all the time. Now they're going to have trouble, and they think they might do it right, and they won't.

As an engineer, one of the first things I do on a job is I collect information that I need, and I check and verify anything that's given to me, "How valid is this?" So, when I first approached this group, I thought, "Well, okay. What's the census data made of? How does it get there?"

And I got involved in my county, and I live in Alameda County, and so I first got involved with looking into it, and it turns out that all the county supervisors are all over this matter. They already know what areas in their community that are hard to reach. They already are aware of the ones we sort of think of right away, the homeless people.

I live in Berkeley, and so college students are notoriously hard to count. They all think "I either come here from out of state, so I don't do that. I will do that back home," but the emergency services that you need are here, and so that's a particular group, and I already mentioned the older people who are hard to count.

Turns out that the county had put together groups to specifically deal with this, and they went out into the communities and had town meetings to say, "Hey. What are

the people that we might, or other groups that you think we might miss?" and took all that into consideration, and put plans together.

I was involved in part of that. I'm a census ambassador, and I was assigned just to work at libraries and things like this. There was also a thing called Sabbath Sunday, where they would have all the churches have "Bring your census in, and we'll have people there to help you." And then the coronavirus hits, and all of that has stopped.

Now it turns out -- as I said, I'm a census ambassador -- we're down to phone banks, and you know how that's not working. They put special plans together to deal with the homeless when we're getting the homeless tested for COVID-19, and in doing so, they're actually trying to say, "And, by the way, can we count you?" That's only going so well, and now, of course, in senior citizen's homes, no one is allowed in.

So I'm very concerned about how this is going to affect the numbers, and I understand that that could have a very significant impact on the Commission. I know the date has already been kicked back two weeks. Who knows how much longer that would happen?

But, on a positive note in this, one thing I found is a way to contact communities of interest. The census

outreach managers, which virtually all, every district has, they know who is hard to reach. They know who these hidden communities — they found them, and we should contact these people first, and use their connections to bring people in that the city council people don't necessarily know about, and they have connections with social workers, people who are on the margin.

These, I think, would be a very, very valuable source of information for communities of interest which often get overlooked, particularly if you say, "Well, let's look for the leaders of the community." These aren't necessarily the leaders, and these are the people who know the facts on the ground, and I think this would really, really help the Commission, whether I'm on the Commission or not.

Additionally, because these people are sort of -- they're in the shadows -- we might have to think of different types of meetings. The big public meeting, where you come and present, tend to be the people who are represented come and speak at these meetings. Now, that's not to say -- we definitely want those people, but we also want other people.

So we should think about other kinds of meetings to help bring these people in, where they'll feel comfortable, maybe specific invitations to particular groups, rather

than just say a general "Please come in," say, you know,
"We really -- and we've set aside time for you. Please
come and speak with us." That's one idea I had for solving
these problems.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

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

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

MS. ANDERSEN: I had to think about this, because I was coming up with different ideas. I ran it by my husband, and he said, "Well, basically, that's what you do." And I said yes.

As an engineer, every project I do, I'm working collaboratively. I've never been -- well, I've been a designer a little bit, who sits in their office and just designs.

My specialty is out in the field. I do mostly fieldwork and failure investigations. So I'm always

working with owners, with contractors, with the people who witnessed it, who may know more about what happened than they realize, and so I'm always working collaboratively to achieve a common goal.

You know, my role, typically, in that group is to figure out what has happened, come up with a structural design, get it presented, presented to the inspector, or, on repair jobs, I'm usually the inspector myself. I have to say yes to what we did, and document it out to the fact, "Does comply with the rules and regulations." When conflicts arise, which they always do -- it's just part of the job, so we're always coming up with solutions, proposing it.

So I've been trying to choose an example of one of these, and it's actually the crane accident in San Francisco in 1989. It was a month after the Loma Prieta earthquake. I actually have a picture of it behind me. I don't know if you can see that. This was a -- basically, there was a huge crane.

They were building a 20-story building, and they tried to lift -- it was lifting a boom crane, and they tried to lift it, and it came loose, swung around, and launched itself, dropping the block, came flying across the street, and hit this building, and actually what's behind me is a 24-inch-deep wide flange twisted like a piece of

spaghetti.

The block same sailing off the hook, came sailing off, landed in the elevator shaft, ripped the cables off.

They were like a cat o' nine tails, left a print across the front of this building, and then the boom proceeded to crash into this, bounced up, and crashed down the side of the building, taking it out as it went.

Thank God there were only five people killed, the crane operator, four of the crane people, and it landed -- did crush a school bus below, which, thankfully, only had the driver in it, and she was killed, but her 24, 22 people -- but it was obviously a tragedy, and it happened right a month after the earthquake, so everyone thought, "My God. Here we go again."

You know, the accident was very dramatic, and everyone was on heightened awareness, and it was a scary situation. I was called in. I had actually looked at this building right after the earthquake to evaluate it, and it did really well, the steel frame, had a reinforced concrete core, had no damage.

So the owner -- actually, the building manager -- called me up and said, "Hey. Please come and help us." So I zipped over there, and actually was working clearing off desks, because the firefighters were coming through and knocking all the glass out of the remaining

open areas of the building so it wouldn't fall on people below them.

So I was right there, and I was able to talk to witnesses. Obviously, it was pretty obvious what happened, and the repair is pretty straightforward. You replace in kind. It was a very old building. It was all riveted, so you had to come up with different connections. It's more standard. The conflict that happened, though, which we ran into --

MS. PELLMAN: You have four minutes remaining.

MS. ANDERSEN: -- sorry -- is trying to put it together on the panels themselves. The exterior panels, what was there, you couldn't do any more. It doesn't meet code today. So we had to come up with something, and there had been some conflicts on it, and on this, the contractor said, "Well, what am I going to do?"

I just said, "Okay. Look. This is what I need. We've got to make it safe. This is what we have. What do you think?" And the two of us worked together in the field, drawing up sketches, coming up with plans, and I said, "Great. Let's try that." It kind of had to be adjusted once they put it in place, but it worked.

What I was going to bring to the Commission about that, the best jobs happen when you're open and honest. As a group, you need to prioritize the requirements that you

need, so you consider all information in a sequential order, addressing most important things first.

You're going to have a lot of authority. As an engineer, I have that. You have to be very careful with that authority. What you do affects others, and that's a responsibility that is true of the Commission, and we have to be very careful about what we're doing and how it's going to affect Californians.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

MS. ANDERSEN: I'm sorry. I've gone too long, here.

MR. DAWSON: Madame Secretary, how much time do we have left?

MS. PELLMAN: Two minutes, 30 seconds remaining.

MR. DAWSON: All right. 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. ANDERSEN: I'm going to go through this quickly. As to skills, I'm a people person. I really enjoy meeting and talking to people that are different than me. I often seek them out, because I'm interested. I'm actually genuinely interested in other people.

In a management review, I was told that I'm very approachable, and my employees would be very comfortable bringing their problems to me. I took that as a huge compliment. I'm respectful, and I try to learn about other people's backgrounds and cultures and approach them accordingly.

As far as my experiences, I mentioned in my demographic and geographic essay, my father was in the Air Force, and I traveled all over. I've actually, on my own, traveled around the world. I've traveled extensively through the United States, all of California, by car, train, and air. I've met a lot of different people of different cultural backgrounds.

One thing that I think would give me a different perspective is, I've often been the outsider. I was an American starting school in England, in almost a British convent.

MS. PELLMAN: Forty-five seconds remaining.

MS. ANDERSEN: I was the British kid who went to school in Oklahoma. I was the Oklahoman up at college. My college had only a few -- and only allowed women in shortly after I got there, and I was a woman in engineering. I can relate to people who feel apart.

I've used this experience to talk to people who are reticent and quiet, and I'm often told ideas that people don't feel comfortable bringing forward. I am usually the messenger if -- I try to encourage them, but then I'm often the messenger who brings these quiet ideas to the forefront. I've actually --

MS. PELLMAN: That is 30 minutes.

MS. ANDERSEN: -- been the representative.

MR. DAWSON: All right.

MS. ANDERSEN: So I feel that that's one thing I would --

MR. DAWSON: I'm sorry. I'm going to have to take this time now to go to Panel questions. Each Panel Member will have 20 minutes to ask his or questions.

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

CHAIR BELNAP: Ms. Andersen, where you were answering question five, what I'd like to do is use some of my time to have you finish that answer, because that was where I wanted to go from the beginning of my questions, anyway. So please finish the rest of question five, if you

have more to say.

MS. ANDERSEN: Okay. Well, I was going to go into, you know, I've sort of been an outsider. You know, the woman in engineering, that's been me. You know, I'm usually the only woman in the room. That's very often.

I've also -- I've been the professional bringing information to other -- working with other professionals, which is one experience. I've also been the professional who's out -- as I call them, "failures." I'm working with the public, "What did you see?" you know, "How did you see this?" I've had to be the person talking to people who -- getting information out of them they don't even know they have.

But then I've also -- I end up stepping back and basically staying at home, and I've been then the person who brings my professional experience to people who have no idea about the built environment, and taught them how to manage through that.

I did that, and one of the essays is about the play yards at preschools, which I got into helping at preschools, and then I've been the person who "You are not supposed to tell us what to do. You are supposed to sit there and listen to what we say," and that perspective is very different, and that's one that I think I would make the Commission aware of. All too often, I have relatives

in the Gold Country in Sacramento, and they often go, "Yes. You guys from, you know, the big cities always want to come and tell us what to do," and that's something I'd be very sensitive of, and that's a perspective that I think I would bring to the group.

I've met many people in different environments, and, as building codes are different for different parts of the country, we need to expect that what people in different parts of the country -- that's different parts of the state, I actually mean -- what they're going to want, and what they're looking for in representatives.

How they want to be approached is going to be different, and we need to be very considerate of that, and don't be in a process of "Guess what we're doing for you." It's "How can we help you? What would you like?" is the perspective that I would like to bring on this. I think I might just end it there, if you're to ask some questions.

CHAIR BELNAP: Yes, I'll ask some questions. So you mentioned in your application and also just now that your father was in the Air Force and you moved around quite a bit. In the early '80s, you received your bachelor's from Notre Dame, and also then went on to get a master's from UC Berkeley in structural engineering, and that's where it looks like your travels ended. I mean, it seems like you stayed in Berkeley. So were you native to

California, and then moved here to get your master's, and then stayed? Can you confirm that for me?

MS. ANDERSEN: No. I was actually born outside of D.C., and we lived there and then went to England, and I started school in England, and we traveled a bit in Europe, and then we ended up going to Oklahoma, and lived there for quite a while, but we would always drive -- you know, we would take road trips, and we'd drive across the country a lot. I ended up going to, you know, high school in Oklahoma, and then went up to Notre Dame.

So I didn't come out -- I visited California. As I said, I have -- my grandmother -- I have an aunt who lived in Lincoln, who married someone, moved out here, and moved out, and then, one by one, my grandmother and then her relatives moved to Sacramento. So I have cousins in that area, in the Gold Country.

So I came out to California in '75 for a trip, and then I didn't come out again until I came out for the master's, but I ended up, despite -- because I would travel, and we went places all the time. I've lived within five miles of that virtually ever since.

Now, I've traveled around the world. Between that -- between -- I took my structural engineering exam, and my husband and I got married like a year before that, and I said, "Okay. We're not having children until we

travel." And we took off, left jobs, and took all our money, and traveled around the world for a year, and then came back, and I've been here ever since.

We travel to the East Coast. We travel up and down. We've taken road trips, train trips through our state, you know, and I've actually -- I did -- I was working in engineering. I actually had to give -- I was doing a huge job in L.A., so I had to move down there for a couple of months, mostly travel, in terms of -- I hope that explains.

CHAIR BELNAP: So how did these experiences while you were traveling -- and I'm not just talking about your adult life. How did these experiences increase your understanding of and appreciation of diversity?

MS. ANDERSEN: Well, what I discovered is people are -- there's -- well, okay. One difference between -- well, we have more in common than we do apart. In every different place, family is close, is more important than most people realize.

There are -- how we treat each other -- it's kind of like, the East Coast is more -- it's more conservative. Like, when I -- it's more conservative. They're a little -- you know, when you give them the chance to say something, they're going to say something, where, as you move, they're more sort of rigid in what you wear and how

you answer things. As you travel a little further west, it gets a little more lenient. As you go west further and further and further, it becomes more tolerant, more appreciative of diversity, I found.

There are areas -- these are gross generalizations, obviously, but, you know, I mentioned that I felt an outsider in areas. From the day I drove into Berkeley, I felt, "Wow. This is home," even though, you know, I'm a Republican, and they say, you know, "In Berkeley? How did that fit?" It's a very tolerant group. You know, we have people of all types, and, you know, they don't look at, you know, who -- you know, on the East Coast, it's "Well, where did you come from?" In California, it's "Where are you going?" And it's a very different tone.

My travels have -- you know, I've been able to sort of compare and contrast. You know, as an engineer, I've sort of -- I've often looked at things, and I look for signals and signs, and I feel that's helped me to relate to other people, and wait for the -- I also wait for them to say things. You know, do they want to be approached? You know, I never assume that I know more than they do. It's taught me humility, almost, the traveling.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you. So now I want to talk about -- focus on impartiality. In your impartiality essay, you described the importance of having outside

review of your engineering designs. Should the Commission seek outside input on its proposed districts? And, if so, by whom should this -- who should this input come from?

MS. ANDERSEN: Let me just -- and I do want to mention, on my impartiality essay, I felt wholly chagrined when you were saying that "Oh, boy. It doesn't come across as she's being very impartial. It's more like she's talking to people into what she wants."

I read through my essay, and I went, "It read like that," and I just wanted do just a quick (sic) on -- what I was trying to say on that one is -- I brought my element in because it was flexible, flexible thinking -- the other engineer who came in, I went from a -- and this will help in answering the question.

I went from a perspective of, you know, "Look.

I've got a good design, you know. Why are you critiquing it?," to -- the other engineer that came in pointed out I was looking at forces, and I had done a change in the rest of the building just to replace something, but it was very strong, and I'm talking about seismic upgrade, so if you can imagine like an oak tree versus grass. An oak tree is very stiff, and it doesn't move much, but grass bends.

Well, by putting in a very stiff element, I had created more force that basically everything else, that flexible stuff, had to take more force, and he pointed out,

"You know, if we don't put that in, if we put in something more flexible, everything can flex," and it was a completely different mind set. It was a much better design, and that's what we went forward with, and I went from, you know, "Who are you, critiquing my stuff?" to "Whoa. I am never going to assume that I have done the best design. I am always going to take what I've done and have it evaluated." And with that in mind, we do have to look at the designs that we draw, and we need to overlay it.

Now, who we compare this with, we have to be very careful, because, in -- I was able to pick, in my -- you know, I was able to pick engineers. Like, I wanted to pick the guy who was going to tear -- this one particular example I'm thinking of, I had to do a very tricky design, and I went to the guy who was tough, and I thought, "I want him to tear this design apart. If there's an error, I have to find it," because, again, what I do, you can't make mistakes. People could die. It's very important.

Now, while I bring that seriousness, it's not quite as serious to this, but it really does affect everybody. So we should have our lines reviewed. We have to be very careful about by whom, because, as again being from the outside, the political influences, there would be a lot of people that would say, "We'd be happy to help you review

that," and might change it so it benefits one political party versus another political party. So I would look to, probably, the census people themselves, the experts, to critique this design, but yes, I do think it should be reviewed.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

Madame Secretary, can I get a time check?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. Seven minutes, 18 seconds remaining.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

So I want to go to a part of your application, and you weren't necessarily talking here about the Commission, but I want -- my question is going to be how to apply it to the Commission, and it's from your analytical essay. You say:

"My design engineering experience requires getting building criteria from building owners or architects, gathering and comprehending technical information, and synthesizing that material into a work product that ensures public safety, meets the criteria, can be constructed, and can be defended in court. This experience allows me to distinguish genuine concerns from disingenuous

assertions."

I think, from your testimony today, you're already aware of the concerns from the previous Commission. So what I want to know is, as a Commissioner, how would you distinguish genuine concerns from disingenuous assertions?

MS. ANDERSEN: Well, part of that is, I thought -- I was thinking about, you know, when people present, and we should actually -- because it's an open situation, and it should be an open situation, but we should say, you know, "Who are the people presenting?" you know, "Who are you? What do you represent, and, additionally, do you have other connections, political connections, you know, that you have not disclosed?" And if people -- and then we need to investigate where these comments are coming from.

Now, I don't mean, you know, attack them and, you know, "I don't believe you," and that kind of stuff. I have been to city meetings where, basically, the panel, the commission, treats anyone who walks up in front of them like dirt, quite frankly, and I was horrified, and we have to be respectful, but we need to find out, who are the people presenting in front of us?

Now, given our criteria of the rules that we need to follow, and the Voters' Rights Act, I think we should have a very good idea of, you know, what -- I believe I

mentioned, we need to prioritize what the criteria are, in order as much as possible, so we know what we have flexibility with, and when people bring comments forward, we need to, you know, essentially fact-check it, and, we basically, there will be pertinent things.

People who bring maps in, I would suggest that chances are they've had a lot of help, and say, you know, "Who helped you with this?," because, you know, the average person -- like I say, the quiet person of communities of interest that are hard to represent, I would think they probably would not be bringing a map in. They would say, "This affects me."

One thing I think is, if we have a tentative map that we bring to the group, so we can actually talk about it in a meeting, that might help people address that, if they're really trying to say, "Well, you see, my community is here, here, and here," versus "Well, I want the line drawn over here."

Just the way they handle themselves would be a very telling tale, and this is what I talked about a little bit, maybe slight different meeting styles, to actually have it maybe almost like a working drawing, kind of "Now, where do you feel that you" -- you know, "Look. I live here." Then you know that person is really -- you know, what he's saying is valid, and he's actually trying to work through a

situation.

I believe that those techniques might help. I would be very open to other Commissioners' ideas on this, too, because I certainly don't have all the answers, and I think the Commission, as a group, should go through all the different ideas that everyone brings to the group.

CHAIR BELNAP: So I want to tease out a little more what you mean by a "working meeting." Are you thinking of a meeting where it's not just a public hearing, but, actually, there are maps --

MS. ANDERSEN: Yes.

CHAIR BELNAP: -- available to people in the audience, maps available on the screen? That's what you're talking about?

MS. ANDERSEN: Correct, even like a -- you know, when you have -- you know, "And here we've got a white board, and you'll see now" -- "So where" -- "Can you tell me" -- "Can you come up here, sir, and show where you actually live?," because, one, when you get people involved, immediately they become -- what their real message is comes through.

You know, I do a lot of fieldwork, and often you find, "Yes, you know, it turns out" -- basically, all the pretenses fall away when you actually start doing some, you know, working on it, "Now, we're thinking this," and,

visually, there are sort of different types of learners, people who -- they are visual. They listen. They are, you know, learning.

I find, if you try to approach people in different manners, not just verbally, but actually visually, you find the real message comes through. They drop away pretenses, and you get to the truth of the matter. So I think that might actually really help, and I understand we're actually supposed to be — the Commission is supposed to be presenting maps to the public as well. So this would kind of — may do two stones at once — two birds at once.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

Madame Secretary, time check?

MS. PELLMAN: One minute, five seconds.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. I'll end my questions now, and turn the time over to Mr. Coe.

VICE CHAIR COE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Andersen, good morning to you. Thank you for speaking with us today, and thank you for being flexible to reschedule your interview in light of the current situation.

MS. ANDERSEN: Yes. Thank you for allowing this to happen and being so flexible.

VICE CHAIR COE: I want to talk about something that you mentioned in your essays, and something you

mentioned earlier during the interview. You talked about, in your field of structural engineering, how you, as a woman, are essentially a minority in that field. In fact, you give an example in your essays that you've had construction workers ask you engineering questions that they told you they would never have asked a man. I'm wondering what you've taken from this experience that you think will help make you a more effective Commissioner.

MS. ANDERSEN: I have had that happen, you know, quite a bit. I've found that -- and engineering has changed a bit. When I first was in, you know, there would be handful of women. At engineering meetings, the lines to the men's room would be out the door, around the corner, and we'd walk in. We'd go, "Ha, ha, ha. Isn't this nice?"

What I've found, though, on job sites and in the work environment, adding a different perspective really helped. It actually broke through on construction sites. It threw people off. It was "Whoa. I'm not used to my standard 'I don't like what the engineer is going to say,' and my usual posturing." It was enough to break the ice and get to the task at hand.

I find, by adding diversity and adding different perspectives, that really helps move a job along, particularly because it gives more opportunity to look at things in a different manner, and I bring that to the

group, just having lived it, and I expect -- like, that's part of -- you know, I don't come in with preconceived ideas, and I sort of don't allow other people to put preconceived ideas on me. I'm like, "No, that's not going to happen," in a very polite, respectful manner, but "This is what we're doing, and this is the task, and we're going to move on with the task."

I think, because I'm so used to being, you know,
"Who is she? What's going on here?" that I respect other
people who are also in the same situation. You know, I
would really like this Commission to look as diverse as our
state. It helps other people, you know, the public.

It helps them feel more comfortable in approaching the group, which, as we're figures of authority, that's a little hard, which is why I'm thinking we might try different types of meetings, because people who are well represented feel more comfortable approaching a Commission in a public setting, where people who are not usually represented, if they see someone that looks like them, it's "I might talk to that person," and it helps change your manner and how you approach things. So that's something I think I would bring to the Commission.

VICE CHAIR COE: So thank you for that. You've kind of touched on this next question a little bit already, but, in your experiences and your travels, and the

encounters you've had with people of diverse backgrounds, what is it that you've learned from them about their concerns and their desires, their perspectives, that you think would make you an effective representative for them on this Commission?

MS. ANDERSEN: Well, okay. You know, thinking of, say, like, you know, my cousins in the Gold Country, you know, people who are, you know, more rural are more independent. They have to -- you know, they're a little more reticent at first, and then they open up more than -- actually, I think city people are a bit more -- you're kind of casual, quickly, on the surface, but you never get beyond that.

I find rural people are more "Wait a sec. Who are you? What are you doing?" And then, when they do open up, they really open up, and, you know, they have a very different community, and their concerns are -- how would you say this? Their concerns are -- they distrust the government, initially.

People who are -- they're used to being, "Oh, great," told things, quite frankly, and they don't really like it, and that's true whether it's in parts of, you know, our northern states, through the agricultural area, through the whole delta system. Their local concerns are very -- you know, their priority.

You know, they aren't worried about, you know, the -- they're worried about who the neighbors are.

They're not worried about "And what's going to happen to my neighbors?" as opposed to "What are we trying to change?" and things like that. It's more of an immediate concern, and what things are actually affecting their lives.

They're not sort of looking for direction, I should say.

In representing different people of different backgrounds, I think we can't -- you can't assume, "I know what they want." You have to politely, respectfully, find out from them what they want, and my travels have shown that we can't pre-guess that. You know, you have an idea, but you need to have the different perspectives to approach them on their basis, and don't come in with a preconceived idea. I don't know if that helped.

VICE CHAIR COE: Yes, and you actually started to touch on the next idea I want to talk about, which is communities of interest, the task in front of the Commission, a rather challenging one, of trying to identify communities of interest all across the state, and some of those communities being more accessible, easier to identify -- they're more likely to engage and bring forward their perspectives -- and some of them are harder to identify, for one reason or another.

So, as a Commission and as a Commissioner, what do

you think the Commission could do to identify communities of interest across the state as thoroughly as possible, and avoid kind of inadvertently missing some of these communities of interest that are harder to identify?

MS. ANDERSEN: Well, as I sort of said on the one issue, I would contact the census outreach managers in each county, because they tend to know the districts. Like, in Oakland, it turns out there's a group that I'd never heard of, ever, and the name, it sounds like the Hong, you know, the Hong Chinese, but it's more like -- it's like "Hmong" or something.

I didn't quite -- and then the fellow left the meeting, and I didn't get to talk to him after that, but they're from Central America, and they bristle, I mean, just bristle at the idea of -- on the census form, there's, you know, "Are you Latino?" And they're like, "We're not Latino. We're indigenous, and don't ever call us that, because they oppressed us."

It is a very small group, but this outreach manager has found that group, and she had made contacts with people who -- virtually everyone in the room kind of went, "Wow. I had never heard of that." And in a diversity as Oakland (sic), that's unusual, because, you know, you have virtually every other group represented.

So I would go to -- in each county, I'd look for

those outreach managers first, because they're trying to count everyone in their county who is hard to count. Now, I know we would also use -- you talk to -- I've heard people say, "Try and talk to, like, the school districts, you know, but not necessarily the" -- basically, we need to go to -- not just say, "I'll go to the city mayor," or that sort of stuff. They're politically connected already, and while they might know, I think we need to look for other sources, at people who -- like, talk to the social workers, and, you know, "Where are cases coming from that might not" -- and then find out who those contacts are.

I know this is not -- I know there are people on the Commission, who applied for the Commission, who have much stronger skills in this area, and I would look to -- I'd throw different ideas out. I would be happy to -- I'd love to be one of the foot soldiers trying to do some of this, but I would really look for other people's ideas on this as well. So those are a couple of things I've thought.

VICE CHAIR COE: Thank you. So, even if you're successful in finding public groups, some groups are less comfortable engaging, coming forward, sharing their perspectives, and that can be for a number of different reasons that they're uncomfortable in engaging the government or government bodies like this, but, since

getting as many perspectives as possible is as important for the Commission to be able to do their job in the best way, how do you think the Commission could make these types of communities, these groups, feel comfortable to come forward, share their perspective, in order to better inform the Commission?

MS. ANDERSEN: Well, you know, I know that we have to follow, you know, the Bagley-Keene Act in what we do, but I would think trying to actually approach the people in this group, like in as small a setting as we can, you know, legally, that we can, to ask them, you know, "How can we help you? Is there another type of way you would like to speak with us, to give us information?" you know, whatever that might be, and see, you know, how they feel. You know, can we -- you know, "What are your concerns?"

We need to -- I think the Commission can't just go,
"Okay. Here are meetings. Come and talk to us." We have
to go out and find these groups, and ask, you know, "How
can we get you to talk to us? What can we do? We're
trying to draw maps, and we'd really like to do this for
you," which is one thing I believe we need to come across
as. We're not trying to take information from them. "We
want to make sure that you are considered. Your input is
very valuable and very needed."

I think that different perspective, different

angle, is what we really need to do in possibly smaller groups, so it's not as daunting, doesn't seem like "I don't want to come and talk to" -- you know, and particularly some areas where they feel like they might get in trouble for doing things like that, and so we have to be very culturally aware whether even -- sometimes it's like, "Okay. We can't send the women to that particular group, because the men do the talking." You know, we have to be sensitive to what the cultural aspects of particular groups are as we approach them.

VICE CHAIR COE: Thank you. If you were to be appointed to the Commission, what part of that role of Commissioner do you think you would enjoy the most, and what part of the role of Commissioner do you think might cause you to struggle a little bit?

MS. ANDERSEN: Well, I like talking to people. I would really enjoy, you know, meeting the people in the state. You know, I'd love to be on some of the small groups that we go out and talk to people, because I feel, that way, you really see, you know, who is in the state, and it would give you a much better idea of how to do the job well.

Then, of course, I would love drawing maps. I mean, I think, you know, when I first listened to the training program, I actually looked at -- it was talking

about, you know, the packing, the cracking, and how, you know, "But sometimes communities of interest" -- and he, you know, had that one drawing when you say, "Okay. But communities here and communities here," and my first thought was "Well, you draw it around like that and make a C shape." That made perfect sense to me.

You know, I noticed that, you know, the compactness, that's a criteria that I would want to explain thoroughly to everybody, because it doesn't mean it's just a perfect box. That's a rule we'd work with, you know, communities of interest. So drawing the maps and working with those experts I would love, as well as, you know, working with all the people involved. I'd really enjoy that.

The part that I think I'm not so good at is then we have to end up writing the report. As an engineer, virtually every word I write down, I have to write it from the perspective not of -- it can be understood, but I have to write it from the perspective of "There's no way it can be misunderstood," because, on drawings, what you write is reviewed and analyzed, and it has to be 100 percent. So I'm slow at writing.

I am very good at editing and getting the concepts down, but, at the administrative part of stuff, I actually have hired -- well, you know, hiring staff and things like

that -- I would look for other people to do that part, to step up. I mean, I've done all of it, but that's not my forte.

> VICE CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you.

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Chair, no further questions at this time. 6 Thank you.

CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. We would turn the time over to Ms. Dickison, then.

> PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

Good morning, Ms. Andersen.

MS. ANDERSEN: Good morning.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: So I want to go to some writings on your activities. So you mentioned that you were an early contributor to anti-bullying and inclusion curriculum. What was your role in that?

MS. ANDERSEN: Well, okay. You know, we've all been talking about biases and things, and, you know, I didn't think I had many until my children went to a preschool, and they actually teach anti-bias.

I learned so much from that preschool, but one thing I've never been able to tolerate are bullies. The way I was raised is, my mother, she was from Australia, and she was very blunt. She said, you know, "It's not a question of don't you bully someone. It's don't you let anybody else bully anybody." So it was a different

perspective, and I am quick to react when other people are being pushed around. That's just not okay.

It turned out, in school, my oldest son, something happened when he was in first grade, and there were some bullying situations that happened, and this was a school where, you know, they, you know, practice anti-bias, things like this, and it was staggering. I won't get into the details of what happened, but little kids, and the parents were starting to talk, and I immediately went in to the lower school head and said, "Do you know what's going on here? You know, what are you going to do about it?" And I've often been the person who would pop in and say, "You know, this is what's going on."

She said, "You know, it has been a very long time since we've had" -- you know, first call, she said, "Right. I'm going to talk to parents. I'm going to do this about the situation," and said, "But it's been a very long time since we've actually had anti-bullying training in the faculty, and I think it's time to revise all of that."

So the school, as a whole, started up the plan, you know, and said -- and so I sort of stayed with it in terms of, you know, following through and helping teachers, you know, make sure that -- you know, I was part of, like, the parent committee to make sure that every teacher got trained, that sort of stuff, but it was very light.

It was like, it was a very, you know, "Of course you're getting trained, and of course you're doing it this way now," because the school was pretty heavy-handed once they realized what was going on, but that sort of dovetailed into a few things at the school.

You know, bullying and prejudice things can creep in if you don't stay up with the training and keep it going. There is a -- well, I could go into another example of that, if you want, but I've sort of answered the questions. Sorry.

Ms. Dickison, your microphone is off.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Sorry about that. It looks like you volunteered for a scholarship and mentoring program for low-income high school students?

MS. ANDERSEN: Yes. This is something that, you know -- okay. This is at Berkeley High. There are a lot of students who come to the school and, you know, no one in the family has gone to college, and this is a program that -- it not only gives money -- you have to -- the students have to fill out applications. They have to apply, and the school gives -- this group gives money to the students, but not just, you know, "Okay. You know, here's a scholarship to go to college."

They actually -- you are assigned a mentor that helps you go through, you know, how do you apply? What

happens when you're in school? You know, who can you talk to? Because children come from backgrounds who, you know, you're the only one in college in your whole family.

You know, there are a lot of things in college that you can't relate to unless you've been to college, and they've also moved away. So this is a mentoring program that follows the children all the way through the four years of undergrad, and it's an amazing program. We've only gotten into that recently, so I haven't personally had a -- haven't been assigned a student. So I don't have personal experience with that.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: All right. In your diversity essay -- and you kind of talked about it a little bit today, about that it's necessary to create opportunities to make people feel comfortable to lend their own voice. What steps do you think the Commission could take to incorporate that type of thing into their work?

MS. ANDERSEN: In a public hearing, that's very difficult, when you say, "Well, you're supposed to come and talk to us," and that's why I was thinking of other styles of meetings, or, actually, I can give a quick example of that.

At the preschool that my children went to, when I got involved in working on the playground, they have this huge play yard, and the idea was that -- I told them,

"Look. You should put a master plan together. Get every idea that you want, so then -- you can't afford to do it all now, but you'll have the spots and places where you can build that, or you can do that later," and, actually, you know, many years later, I must admit it's worked beautifully. It's amazing.

But during that process, trying to get the teachers -- who are really, you know, excellent at what they do, but trying to get them to come forward with their ideas was difficult, because, as I realized, there's the administration, and there are the teachers, and they did not always feeling comfortable talking to them, but what I noticed is -- because, on this preschool, again, it's worked with anti-bias. It's very diverse.

The administrators, they would sort of

say -- they'd say, like, "You know, well, you know, I'm

wondering about this," and they'd kind of say, you know,

"Maria, I understand that you had this idea about this,"

and they would pause, and Maria, who was this wonderful,

kind woman, Hispanic, who actually later said, "You know, I

never felt it was my place to speak up," she felt

comfortable speaking up, because you created that pause,

and invited them.

You know, I think that's something that we could probably bring to the Commission by addressing it, and

actually requesting people to come and talk, not just waiting, not just sitting back. So, again, I'm saying this Commission needs to go out and find this information.

We need to go and search for people who are underrepresented, because -- and I know that it's a little tough, because I understand there's lots of information that comes to us, but I think it's kind of -- it might be easier to sort through lots of information coming at us if we just do a quick back-check on some of that, going -- and, also, I'm also good at categorizing, "Okay. Right. We've gotten this. It's all the same, dealing with the same issues, same spot. This is different."

I think trying to approach people, and be creative in how we get them to come to the meeting, is what we need to do. It's where I'd try to -- that's where I would try if I was on the Commission, try to get the Commission to do.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you. Just looking at my notes. Many of my questions get asked when I'm the last.

You mentioned earlier being a census ambassador, and some of the concerns that you had pertaining to the census, in maybe how accurate it will be, and the timing of it, and I'll just ask you a question to address timing.

So, given the role the Commission has to play, and the time

that it needs to get its job done, and the possible delay in the census, what skillset can you bring forward that would help the Commission in planning its work and staying on schedule?

MS. ANDERSEN: Well, you know, as an engineer, you know, everything has to be done yesterday, you know, "Why don't we have that design done?" So I'm very used to working under pressure, and when we know we have a deadline here, and we need to do this, I'm good at, you know, creating a timeline of, you know, "We have to" -- you know, and milestones along the way.

One thing, you know, I was kind of considering, even, on the Commission, just in terms of often working with -- work with the hardest parts first, because they take longer, and a lot of the other parts will fall in once you've worked out some of those details in the tougher areas. That's an idea I would certainly bring to the Commission.

In terms of the time frame, you know, we do have -- I would venture forth with numbers and tentative ideas, even, and, you know, stamp all of them "Draft, draft," but to get people to come in, and, you know, try to collect information as much as possible, giving -- you know, we'll get the American -- what's -- the ACS survey.

You know, we have information from a couple of years ago from the census, and if we just did kind of rough things with that information, just to kind of ball-park stuff, to try to get -- as the Commission itself, to try to work through the whole process of "This is how we actually apply those rules to it," because, often, you know, I think, you know, when you list things, that's "Nice, nice, nice," but, until you actually start doing some of the work, you don't realize how much you need to work on it.

So I would sort of try to get us to essentially jump right in as soon as possible, knowing that we're going to change these maps later, and they will change, and that's one thing I believe everyone on the Commission must realize. They have to be comfortable with the idea that we'll be making revisions.

This is not going to be "We make a map, done."

That's not going to happen. This will be modifying,

adjusting, modifying, adjusting, modifying, adjusting.

It's kind of like, you know, when you're working on a

puzzle. Only until the last piece is in are you done.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Yes. So, if you were selected as one of the first eight Commissioners, who are all selected randomly, you would be tasked with selecting the remaining six. What would you be looking for in those remaining six Commissioners?

MS. ANDERSEN: Well, first of all, if I was one of those eight Commissioners, I would be like, "Yes, yes." I would be very excited. And then I would say, "Okay. Who are we? You know, what do we look like? Where are we from? What skills do we have? What do we need?"

Hopefully, there's still -- you know, I know there's a possibility that there might be just a total of 36 left, and so we have to be very careful of "Okay. You know, we have" -- and make kind of like a whole -- again, like a picture puzzle, you know, "We have this category here. We've got one of those, we've got one of those."

I would like to see skill sets spread over the whole group, but we need as much diversity in geography and, you know, ethnicity as possible, also gender, because we have to look like California as much as possible, but we have to be able to do the job. So there will be some trade-offs. You know, like it or not, there will be trade-offs.

But I think, you know, we need to be able to get the job done, and we need to be able to work together, too. So I would hope that, if I was one of those eight, we could use all the information that you three have been going through, you know, these interviews, to review, you know, who the people are that are left, and who we can pick to

make it a full Commission.

PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: Thank you.

Mr. Chair, I have no further questions.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

We'll now turn the time over to Mr. Dawson.

MS. ANDERSEN: Thank you.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Andersen, I just wanted to follow up on a couple of your responses to the standard questions. I took your response to the question about hyper-partisanship in that you said you can't be governed by partisan concerns, but you have to be sufficiently politically aware to guard against -- I kind of lost you there. So the group needs to be politically aware enough to basically understand when they're not being political?

MS. ANDERSEN: No, no. I'm sorry. They need to be politically aware to make sure that, you know, if we say, you know, "I want to draw the line over here, and I think that works," and say, "Uh-oh. We accidentally cut" -- you know, "We created a political situation," you know, "We've kind of played into" -- "We've sort of played into creating, you know, eliminating political" -- well, not necessarily political seats, because we're not really supposed to consider that.

We don't want to create a political conundrum of

something that's like, by doing that, you very conveniently have either eliminated a political party, or you've actually kind of -- you've essentially done, you know, "pack it and crack it," essentially, without intentionally doing that, you know, because, I mean, we have -- that's what I mean.

We have to be careful of internally not accidentally doing that, and we need to be aware, to evaluate the information that's being presented to us, to make sure that we're not going, "Well, that map looks good to me. We'll just use it," when it was put together for political purposes.

MR. DAWSON: I see. All right. Thank you. I wanted to follow up on a response you had about your concern about the census data, particularly in light of the COVID-19 situation, but your concern was a bit lessened because of the response that Alameda County is taking?

MS. ANDERSEN: I'm --

MR. DAWSON: No, please.

MS. ANDERSEN: No. My initial concern was "Wow. What is going to happen?" But I was very pleased that -- and, sort of like this whole group, I'd say it's, you know, how well things in government can work -- is that they were all over this issue. Excuse me. I'm not used to talking this long a time. They had the issue well at hand.

They hadn't just thrown up their hands, go, "I have no idea what to do now."

They had been working on it, and had come up with good ideas, and were busy implementing those ideas. That made me feel very good that, eventually, we might get -- actually, they did, say, as part of the ambassador training this last time -- is that Alameda County actually is one of the people who has the higher, you know, responding rates. They're also low, of course, across the area.

I did try to goof around with that map, the mapping, but I didn't have the proper sign-in authority, so I couldn't do it, to see, you know, how the whole state looked, but I'm pleased to feel that there are people who are really actively working on the situation. It hasn't just gone, you know, "Too bad."

MR. DAWSON: Right. Okay. Thank you. That answers my question.

Mr. Chair, I have no further follow-ups.

CHAIR BELNAP: All right. I also have no further follow-ups.

Mr. Coe?

VICE CHAIR COE: No follow-up questions.

CHAIR BELNAP: Ms. Dickison?

25 PANEL MEMBER DICKISON: No follow-ups.

MR. DAWSON: Okay. It's allergy season.

Ms. Andersen, with the time remaining --

Madame Secretary, how much time is remaining?

MS. PELLMAN: Three minutes, 40 seconds.

MR. DAWSON: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Andersen, with the time remaining, I'd like to give you the opportunity to make some closing remarks to the Panel, if you wish.

MS. ANDERSEN: Well, thank you very much for allowing me to be involved in this whole process. It's been an honor, and I want to thank all of you for your thoughtful and your careful work on this really important job, and I don't mean this lightly. You actually are a shining example of good government, and it really makes me proud to be a Californian, with the way you've handed this entire process.

I believe, you know, that I offer the experience and perspective of a registered professional engineer, representing the built environment, as well as a stay-at-home parent. I'd love to be on this Commission, and would serve it well.

Thank you very much for this opportunity, and please, I hope you and your families are well and stay safe in this crisis. Thank you.

CHAIR BELNAP: And thank you.