CHAIR COE: And thank you, Mr. Reader, for taking the time this morning to speak with us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Our next interview is scheduled at 10:45, so we will be in recess until 10:44.

(A recess was held from 10:05 a.m. to 10:44 a.m.) CHAIR COE: The time is 10:44. I'd like to come out 7 of recess.

I'd like to verify, Ms. Dickison, you're with us.

VICE CHAIR DICKISON: Yes, I am.

CHAIR COE: We'd like to welcome Mr. Derric Taylor for his interview this morning.

Mr. Taylor, can you hear us okay?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I can. Thank you.

CHAIR COE: Great. I'd like to turn the time over to Mr. Dawson to ask the five standard questions, please.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Sir, I'm going to read you the five standard questions that the Panel has asked each Applicant to respond to. Are you ready, sir?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, I am.

First question: What skills and MR. DAWSON: 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?

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

MR. TAYLOR: Great question. I think this is one of the tantamount issues of the Commission. So, to a certain degree, all of the Commissioners should be individuals that have a desire to serve as individuals that are analytical, have a respect for the diversity of California, which are the prescriptions of the Commissioner role.

I feel overwhelmingly, though, that each
Commissioner should have a distinct desire to be fair and
impartial, and within that desire to be fair and impartial,
everything else will come into play. So, if you have a
desire to be fair and impartial, and you're deliberate in
your attempts to do that, you'll respect other individuals.
You'll seek out information. You will analyze and
synthesize the information that you're given to come to
sound decisions.

I feel that I possess those qualities. My job as an investigator with the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department enables me to function in that manner. It is my job to be fair and impartial on an everyday platform.

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. TAYLOR: Those characteristics that were asked, of what will make a Commissioner goes hand in hand with this second question. If we're fair and impartial, we look for those common grounds, so that we can come to a consensus or to a sound conclusion. When you're able to do that, you can steer away from the hyperpartisanship.

What happens is that you can -- in an effort to be fair and impartial, you put systems or processes in place that can lead to evidence-based conclusions. You look for empirical evidence so that you can make sound decisions.

We also look for -- what I would think in the Commissioner, we would look for ways to be transparent in our processes, in our dealings, and we would encourage participation. So maximum participation from the public lends itself to transparency, which lends itself to empirical evidence, so that we can make sound decisions

based on that evidence going forward.

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

MR. TAYLOR: The greatest challenge is probably coming to consensus. With a Commission of 14, there could be a lot of different opinions, a lot of strong views. We're assuming that these Commissioners will be strong-willed individuals. They all have courage of their convictions, and they would like to get their points across.

So I think consensus is the hardest obstacle for the Commission. However, I believe, when you seek the common ground, and we look for conclusions that are based on evidence that we can find, then we have a road map to consensus, and once we are able to break down our arguments or the positions of the Commissioners, we would be able to go forward on our decisions.

My job as an investigator, I have often had to break down those arguments in that form. So I have to look at my cases as they're presented, look at the evidence that's before me, and I have to make a conclusion based on the evidence. So we find the common grounds on what evidence exists.

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

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

MR. TAYLOR: Continuing to use my job as an example, a few years ago, I was fortunate enough to be on a multiagency taskforce, and in that taskforce, we were charged with reducing violent crime within the San Gabriel Valley area, and in doing so, we brought people from different agencies, with different practices or modes of operation, and we would have to construct investigations to reduce violent crime, and during those meetings, or each investigation of a case, you have various levels of responsibilities.

So, for one case, you might be the head investigating officer, and you're responsible for doling out or delegating the responsibilities of the other investigators, and so you're responsible for the direction of that investigation and its impact on the community

immediately around you, and so there would be debate or disagreements between the direction an investigation should go, or how it should be handled, or how an informant should be used.

So, again, we would try to, in those moments when there's disagreements -- and I would, also -- we would try to reduce it down to what our purpose is, and the purpose is, for that taskforce, was to reduce violence, and how would this, or this action, or this procedure, or this process -- how would that take us to our common goal?

So we would explain, "Well, given this action, this would probably be the circumstances, and this would be the affect on the community." And so we're able to look at the outcomes, the probable outcomes, to see if that fit into our overall goals, and then to go forward from there.

So my role at any given time, at any given responsibility, would be to present outcomes, and we would debate and discuss those given circumstances, debate the outcomes, to achieve our goals, and I think that ultimately worked to our advantage. The taskforce, while I was present or seated in our city, was highly effective. We were able to reduce crime at a level not seen in recent years, and so that was a very positive outcome.

So you take from that, or those meetings, especially, when we debate that, that you have to listen to

your fellow officers, your fellow investigators, which would be your fellow Commissioners. You have to objectively look at what they present, and then move forward to see if it reaches the common goal. On the Commission, it's the same thing. We lay out what is our -- what are we trying to accomplish, and will this process or act help us to reach that goal?

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. TAYLOR: Another great question. One of the best things or one of the things that I enjoy about law enforcement is that you meet everyone. You meet individuals from every background. You meet the young, you meet the old. You meet every ethnicity. You meet every demographic. You meet individuals that like you, that don't.

So you interact with every segment that California has to offer, and you do it in different forms. You not only do it when they're requesting help, but you do it as you're getting lunch, because people like to interact with police officers, in uniform and out of uniform, when they find out who you are.

So I think those interactions throughout my career has caused me to appreciate everyone for who they are.

Everyone, there's commonality, and it's all -- the human race, the human animal, is a lot more similar than we are dissimilar. So that has brought me to the belief that we are all looking for the same thing, and that's representation. We're all looking for that American Dream. So I think that point of view helps ground me, and that we all have some of the same issues.

Now, if I take that to a personal level, I'm a Southern California kid. I was born in Los Angeles. I moved to the San Gabriel Valley, Altadena, Pasadena, when I was young. I went to schools throughout the city and through the neighboring cities, and I always tell my children, as we're talking about some of my elementary school, is that I traveled from what would be the foothills of the San Gabriel, Altadena, all the way to Alhambra to go to school.

I rode the public transit, the RTD, as it was

called then, and in traveling, I would pass through every community there was, the Asian community that is Alhambra, the African-American and Caucasian community that is Pasadena, the working-class community, would pass through the Latino community, and so I think that I sucked up or I became a part of all those places as I traveled, just going back and forth to school.

I was fortunate enough to go to high school in Pasadena at a time when the high school was very diverse, and so I had friends from every segment, and I think that made me a more appreciative person, and I actually think it made me a better police officer when I eventually joined the Sheriff's Department, and I compound that with the fact that I went away to school.

So I didn't go to undergrad, I didn't go to college in California. I went away to Morehouse College in Georgia, and I was confronted with a different culture, and not so much as these are different people, but just a different way of life, and that was also added with the fact that, at Morehouse, there were so many students from other parts of the country.

So I got to learn the perspective of other people.

I got to know the perspective of people in a rural

community. I got to learn the perspective of people in

more densely populated communities. I got to learn the

perspective of people down south, and people north, and you get to see how their perspective is shaped, and why different issues are important to them.

My love for California brought me back home again.

I'm a California kid, so I came back home, and, as those of us that are here, have been here for a while, one of the benefits of Southern California is, I think, we have every community represented in what's around us.

So I enjoy snow skiing. So, if you go snow skiing, the people that you meet snow skiing are different than the people that you meet at the beach. I enjoy going to the beach, but those individuals from Manhattan Beach, a little different than those individuals in Wrightwood, and their concerns are different. I enjoy hiking trails. So, when you're on a trail, you meet a different individual. His concerns, his perspective, is different than those individuals.

It was some years ago, but I took my wife and my brother and we went winetasting. So we went to Santa Barbara, and we were speaking to some of the people in Santa Barbara. We were speaking to some of the business owners, some of the vineyards, people that worked in vineyards, and their concerns are different. Of course, all these individuals share a commonality, but their concerns may be different.

Now, my enjoyment of all these things has led me to bond with their perspective, and I acknowledge their concern, and I can see their point, especially in a political environment. I wouldn't want to vineyards to be gone. I wouldn't want the beach to be gone. I wouldn't want the mountains to be gone. So I think, if we're respective (sic) of those levels on a micro and a macro level, we can make sound decisions that are good for communities and good for us all.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

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

CHAIR COE: Good morning, Mr. Taylor. Thank you for taking the time to speak with us today.

MR. TAYLOR: Good morning. How are you?

CHAIR COE: I'm well. Just out of curiosity, what's the significance of the movie poster behind you?

MR. TAYLOR: So my wife -- Bonnie and Clyde. I've been married for 20-plus years, and I think that my wife and I are going to stick it out.

CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you. In your application, and as you discussed already this morning, you're a graduate of Morehouse College in Georgia, you mentioned.

25 Obviously, one of the most notable alumni at Morehouse is

one of the most influential figures in modern history, and that's Doctor Martin Luther King, Junior. What was it like attending the same university as Doctor King, and what effect did that have on you personally?

MR. TAYLOR: Wow. He was, him and among other notable alumni, you know, Spike Lee, Samuel Jackson, Edwin Moses, their social impact -- they are men of action. You walk around with the weight. You're expected, or the hope is, that you become a man of substance, a man of purpose.

The underlying thought at Morehouse is that "We will train you to be a man of substance, a man of action."

The saying is that Morehouse holds a crown above your head, and they want you to grow into that crown. So, when you're on campus, before you become a Morehouse man and you're man of Morehouse, you're groomed to be a man of action, to take stock in who you are, to try to affect your realm of influence, to be a man of purpose.

CHAIR COE: And how much does that ideal that was kind of ingrained in you at Morehouse -- how much did that idea, do you think, affect the course of your life, the trajectory of your -- do you think you would have ended up in the same place had you not had that kind of ideal kind of instilled in you with your experience at Morehouse, or do you think that it changed the trajectory of where your life went?

MR. TAYLOR: So we're influenced by our surroundings, so I would be remiss if I didn't say I didn't learn a strong work ethic from my father. I would be remiss if I didn't say that my mom didn't put a sense of responsibility in who I am. At the basis of my desire to serve was my mom being the leader of my Cub Scout troop, and the president of my Little League, and on the PTA. So there's an element of service that my mom instilled in me. There's an element of work ethic that my dad instilled in me.

For a year before I went off to Morehouse, I went to Mt. SAC, Mt. San Antonio College, a junior college close to us, and I took a logic class, and in the logic class, the individual that wrote my recommendation to go to Morehouse -- I only went to junior college for a year -- he stated that Morehouse College and myself -- "Morehouse and Derric would be a great meeting of the minds."

So I think he saw that desire to service, to elevating myself, to elevate those around me at the time, and thought that this was a good place for me to land, and that it would serve me well. I think that continued as I got older. So Morehouse helps to shape the person that you are, but, of course, those seeds have to be in the individual that you are.

CHAIR COE: Thank you for that, and some of your

discussion this morning already in relation to standard question five about all the different communities that you've interacted with throughout your life, and I'm wondering what it is, if you could pick one thing, that you have learned from your interaction with those diverse groups of people that you think would make you a particularly effective representative for them on this Commission.

MR. TAYLOR: I think all of -- and it might even lend itself to my recommenders, who are diverse, the people who I spoke to about attempting to obtain this position, is they said that the thought is that I am sober-minded or sound in my views. In other words, I try to make good, sound decisions.

I think my decision making and judgment is respected amongst my peers, and so, if I extrapolate that onto the Commission, I think I would do the same. I would take the evidence as presented, look at the needs of a given community, look at it both on a micro and a macro level, and make a sound decision within the context of our group.

CHAIR COE: So kind of a similar question, but, as you mentioned, you were born and raised in Southern California, and aside from your time, I think, at Morehouse, you've been generally in that region for your

entire life. Is that right?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes. I've lived in Southern California my entire life.

CHAIR COE: So what about interactions with people in other regions of the state, outside of your home region, and what experiences have you had with people outside your home region? What did you learn from those individuals about their perspectives and their concerns regionally that may be different from Los Angeles? What have you learned from those folks that would make you an effective representative for them on this Commission?

MR. TAYLOR: Again, it all falls back to the common bond that we all share. So, just in my life experience, in my time on the Sheriff's Department, and people that I've interacted with, I've met people from every part of the state. So I have friends that live up north.

I have friends that have moved up north and that, when we talk, we discuss what's going on in those places.

I have friends that have moved further south, San Diego, so friends in Oakland, friends in San Francisco, friends that commute back and forth. They live in both places as a course of their business. So, in my interaction with them, I still see what is common, common to us.

So someone from an agricultural or rural environment, I understand that they have issues surrounding

water, development, and immigration, and those are relevant issues because that's what sustains life, and those points. People from the city, from where I live, I understand that they have issues surrounding redevelopment, gentrification, attracting business, to housing. Those are all relevant issues.

So, although I've been centered here, I have friends, my wife has friends. I have a number of friends that have attended college in those cities. So I again think that the commonality, the issues that are relevant to those places, still ties us all together, so that I can fairly represent those individuals as well.

CHAIR COE: Thank you for that. I'd like to switch topics a little bit to the topic of impartiality, and I'm wondering if you can give us an example of a time where -- maybe an example of work experience in law enforcement where you had made a decision about something that you thought was the right course of action, then you maybe received some additional information that perhaps maybe caused you to change your mind. Is there an example of something like that that you've experienced?

MR. TAYLOR: So I think, still in general, since it's one of the best ways to look at your issues, you are often faced with a given set of facts when a case is presented to you, and it can look as if -- and now that

we're -- what we're speaking, yes (sic).

So I had a particular case where it looked as if this individual had committed a particular crime, and even some of my fellow investigators thought that this was for certain the individual that did it, but the case still must run its course. You know, it's our job to follow all the information that's given to us.

Over the course of a month or two, and piecemeal, we started getting additional information, and in that particular case, it switched from that individual to the person that actually had committed this particular crime, and it was fascinating that -- and, you know, we always tell each other truth is stranger than fiction, but it was fascinating to follow the evidence as it moved from what definitively looked like the individual to a whole different person that was sort of on the periphery of what was happening.

It also stood as a -- it can stand as the standard bearer, is that we have to be fair and impartial. We have to follow evidence as it comes. We would be remiss and we would be negligent in our duties if we didn't follow our steps and processes.

CHAIR COE: Thank you. One of the biggest jobs the Commission is going to have is to identify communities of interest throughout the state. Some of those may be easier

to identify than others. Some are harder to identify. They're less engaged, and they're not as easily identifiable. Do you think that your extensive experience being engaged with communities in your role as a law enforcement officer would be an asset to the Commission in regards to identifying communities of interest?

MR. TAYLOR: I do. I almost view these

Commissioners as investigators, much the same as I view
auditors as investigators. I've, throughout my career,
been able to talk with people. Having a team of
individuals, of course, is good, because individuals choose
the people that they want to talk to, but I've been able to
talk. That's been one of my strengths throughout my
career, and so being able to talk to people, to engage them
in conversation, would be an asset when trying to find
those communities of interest that aren't as visible or
easily seen.

So yes, I do think that my law enforcement experience would be of benefit, and that's compounded with the data and the information that we also have available to us. So those conversations, in conjunction with data, would be a strength.

CHAIR COE: Okay. So some communities, as you may have experienced in your role as a law enforcement officer, are less comfortable coming forward and speaking with

organizations or with government sometimes, for various reasons.

How would you, as a Commissioner, or how did you, as a law enforcement officer, make some of those communities that may have been less engaged or concerned about engaging -- how would you go through a process of making them feel comfortable to engage with the Commission and provide their perspectives to help inform the Commission in its work?

MR. TAYLOR: Sometimes, when good old-fashioned persistence doesn't work, you just choose a different route, a different avenue, and in today's modern age -- and who would have thought it when I entered law enforcement some years ago? So, if I have an individual that doesn't want to speak to me, they don't answer their phone when I come by -- they don't answer the phone when I call, they don't answer the door when I come by -- sometimes a text message will do, and that's a different way to reach out to someone, for whatever reason, might be hesitant to talk to law enforcement.

I've made contacts with individuals I needed to speak with on Facebook, on Instagram, through social media, through community leaders, through their friends, through the periphery. So I think you just try to find an avenue that's comfortable for them, and I've even had to use other

people, if someone wasn't comfortable speaking with me, to send another investigator they might be comfortable with. So you try to find where that individual is, so that you can make the contact necessary, and so, given the role as a Commissioner, you try to meet the people where they are, so that they can be fairly represented and so that their issues can come forward.

CHAIR COE: Thank you.

Madame Secretary, can I get a time check, please.

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

CHAIR COE: Thank you.

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

MR. TAYLOR: I would find this whole endeavor to be enjoyable. My undergraduate degree is in accounting, so the data and the numbers of it I find fascinating. Even though I'm not practicing accounting, that still seems to be where my heart lies. The social science of it all is fascinating. I would find the interaction, the learning -- it would all be -- I find this to be a worthwhile endeavor.

The only drawback to this is I'm a family man, so, of course, time away from your family is time lost, but I think, with my family's belief in service, it's what we expect. My family is willing to sacrifice some time so that you can contribute to a worthwhile endeavor. So I find this to be fascinating. I'm not sure what I wouldn't enjoy about it, and the time away would be the most regrettable, but that's what we've been bred to do.

CHAIR COE: Thank you, Mr. Taylor. I don't have any further questions.

Ms. Dickison, the time is now yours.

VICE CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you, Mr. Coe.

Good morning, Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: Good morning.

VICE CHAIR DICKISON: So you mentioned that you have your degree in accounting. So what prompted the career in law enforcement after getting your degree in accounting?

MR. TAYLOR: So, as I mentioned before, my mom believes in service, and she showed that service by engaging in the things that I've done throughout my life.

I've played baseball throughout my college career, and even recreationally as an adult, and my mom was always the biggest cheerleader. She always played a role in my extracurriculars.

There was a time when I thought that law enforcement was uneven in its application towards minorities, and, while it's not a perfect profession, I didn't quite understand some of the inner workings of the profession, of law enforcement, and my mom's challenge to me was "Don't complain about a problem. Go become the solution." And so, being challenged by my mom, I went and I applied, and, 20-some-odd years later, I find it to be a very rewarding career.

VICE CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. So, in your diversity essay, you talked about coming into contact with people of different backgrounds, and you stated that you've been able to see the needs of various family units and communities.

What have you learned of the needs of communities you've interacted with that could bind them together as a community of interest?

MR. TAYLOR: So the city where I worked is often divided into north, south, east, and west, and traveling back and forth between the cities and talking to the individuals, you may see a need for job training among the young people on every side of the city, a place for them to congregate, socialize, to have a central place to study, to have a place where resources are available to all, tutoring.

So you can speak to the parents on one side of the city, and speak to the parents on another side of the city, and see that particular need, and so that can marry together, those two, that community. That could be a community of interest based on the needs of that demographic, that group.

Now, another side of the city, there may be more of a need for government resources. So there might be a need to bring in business development, and so this community possibly needs someone that can push or support that business development or redevelopment for that particular community.

So, in conversation with the people, I would say you start to see the needs. You start to see what is common from one part of the city to another part of the city, and how they have a shared interest in what happens in this particular tract or radius.

VICE CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. How much knowledge do you have of the other regions of the state?

MR. TAYLOR: So I would say it's a cursory knowledge. I haven't lived up north, so I understand that it's a different community. I've spoken with many people up north, that came from up north or currently work for the Sheriff's Department that were formerly up in Tulare County.

So I understand some of the issues that they talk about, but it's a cursory knowledge, just in visiting San Francisco or visiting Oakland, or traveling down to San Diego, or traveling to Temecula. So it's cursory knowledge.

VICE CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. But, thinking of what you've learned about the needs of the communities that you've worked with, how can you use that knowledge to help you identify communities of interest or community needs in other areas of the state?

MR. TAYLOR: So you research those. You research those areas. So, given what the agenda would be, given what the Commission is working on at the moment, you research those areas. That's one of the wonderful things about the Internet, is that so much information is available to us now, and then you compound that with the meetings. You combine that with social media. You combine those with other avenues of contact, and you can get a working knowledge of what's happening, and it can go beyond the cursory information.

It's funny because I've worked station detectives, but, at any given time, you specialize in a particular element, so you can specialize in robberies for a period of time, or assaults, or white collar crimes, or identity theft, and sometimes, when you move from case to case, you

don't have any experience in that area. Sometimes this is the first time or the second time you have a case, and you have to dive into what that case consists of. So you have to fill yourself with the background, and then you can go forward to make a sound decision.

So, for the regions that I'm not as familiar with, or have a cursory knowledge of, I would fill myself with the backgrounds, and I would dive into what that area consists of, and I'd review some of the resources that are available to me. So my friends that are from those regions, I get to reach out and I get to talk to them more, and combine that with learning more about those regions, and I think that information would make me -- could bring me up to speed to be an effective representative.

VICE CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. So, in your activities, you talked about that you've been involved in a number of professional, social, and volunteer activities whose premise has been for the betterment of surrounding community. What caused you to seek those types of activities?

MR. TAYLOR: It has always been my goal to leave the world in a better place, and I like to even bring that in the micro, even smaller. I would like anyone that comes in contact with me to be a better person because of it. So I've sought organizations that have that same purpose, "How

can we leave our community, how can we leave our surrounding area, better than what we found it?" And I think I will always be of that mind set. I want to make the world a better place. That's one of the things I'm trying to instill in my children, to leave this world in a better place than you found it.

VICE CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. So you've engaged in mentoring youth, fundraising for scholarships, and voter registration. What did you learn from your engagements in mentoring youth that will help you in reaching out and connecting with diverse groups of people in other regions?

MR. TAYLOR: So I think, with young people, they really want you to listen, and I think that's a skill that would translate up and down, up and down the ladder, whether talking with young people or talking with old people. I'm often in contact with seniors, and they want someone to listen, and so I think that's one of the biggest qualities I can learn with them.

If you listen, and you can hear what individuals are saying, you'll find what the commonality would be within that community of interest. So you have to be engaged, you have to be participatory, and you have to listen to what people are saying, so that you can identify their need.

VICE CHAIR DICKISON: What steps do you think the

Commission can take to ensure that communities know that the Commission not only listened, but heard what they said and considered their comments?

MR. TAYLOR: You know, I think the Commission should encourage as much participation as it can. It should inspire the public to contribute. I think it should be redundant in its efforts. I don't believe, if you do some things once and only once -- and given the logistics sometimes, that's all you can do, but I think efforts should be to do things on multiple fronts.

So a community meeting is nice, but sometimes two community meetings may be better, to give everyone an opportunity to be heard. Reaching people on one platform is nice. Multiple platforms is better. I think about my application for the Commission. I'm fairly computer-savvy. At least, I'm able to use a computer. But, if there was a venue where it was only publicized, I may never have heard it or saw this opportunity.

So I think multiple platforms, reaching out to the public, when given the opportunity, being redundant in your processes will enable everyone to participate. The more participation, the better. That would fight the hyperpartisanship, it would be transparent, and it would help us to be an effective Commission.

VICE CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

Secretary, can I get a time check?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. We have six minutes, 33 seconds.

VICE CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

In your work as an investigator, I'm sure you had to look at various types of information or evidence and determine the reliability or validity of that information. How can you use that when you're looking -- those skills when you're looking at information or data that the Commission will be using to draw the lines?

MR. TAYLOR: It's always helpful when you can corroborate information, and that's what we attempt to do. So we'll get information from a source, and you want something that you can corroborate that source with. So, as a Commission, we would take in that information, and, hopefully, we can corroborate that information with data, another source, or some other piece of evidence. You want to be able to -- even though it's coming from one point, you want to be able to hold it as somewhat objective, that this person said it, but this seems to be the pattern, and this is the empirical evidence.

So, as an investigator, you always want to try to corroborate, and we would do the same on the Commission.

We'd want to try to validate the information that comes in, because often people speak in superlatives, and often

people speak from an emotional standpoint. So you want to try to filter that information, and stream from it what is objective, what is subjective, and to move forward to make sound decisions.

VICE CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. The way the Commission is selected, the first eight are selected randomly, and then they are tasked with selecting the final six Commissioners to round out the Commission. If you are selected as one of the first eight, what would you be looking for in those final six Commissioners?

MR. TAYLOR: I would be looking for individuals that can supplement that team environment. So I'm viewing the Commission as a team, in parlance, as a colloquialism, a bureau, as we would think of it in my profession, and so we have to function well as a bureau.

If there's individuals that have good interpersonal skills on the team, as constituted with the initial Commissioners, then we might look for someone that is strong on the admin side, or someone who has that strong structural (sic), while still possessing those other qualities that make a good Commissioner. So I would be looking for people that can round out the team, so to speak, and again using one of my extracurricular activities, I don't want a baseball team full of batters. We need some pitchers.

VICE CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. Thank you. I have no further questions at this time.

CHAIR COE: Thank you, Ms. Dickison.

Mr. Belnap.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Thank you, Mr. Taylor, for taking the time to interview with us today. In your answers today, you talked about evidence, and evidence-based decision making. As it relates to the work of the Commission, what are the types of evidence that the Commissioners would be gathering, evaluating, and using?

MR. TAYLOR: So evidence is testimony as well, so I don't want people to think that word of mouth or statements from individuals aren't evidence. Evidence is also testimony, but we're looking at past maps. We're looking at census data. We're looking at election data. We're looking at the evidence or the testimony at open meetings. We're looking at speaking to community leaders. So we're looking at social media. We're trying to find those patterns. All those items exist as evidence and can help you make a decision.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Thank you. Do you believe that, as a Commissioner, you will encounter people who are wary of or even have a bias against law enforcement, and, if so, how will you respond to these individuals?

MR. TAYLOR: Actually, at times, law enforcement

has a love/hate relationship with the community. My mechanism has always been to inspire a conversation. When given an opportunity, I challenge and I ask people, "Why? What is your issue?" So I try to engage in conversation. I try to find what their issue is, where the problems lie, and see if there's a common ground within there.

I am self-critical. I am open to criticism. I'm ready to admit when law enforcement as a whole, myself in particular, have done something wrong, for lack of a better word, and I am always explaining why the processes are this way and what the purpose of it is. I think, when people see what the purpose is, then they can see the common ground.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: All right. Thank you. So I'd like you to describe an experience or an example that demonstrates that, as your time as an investigator, you were able to put aside your own belief, maybe even your own biases, to come to an appropriate conclusion to an investigation.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes. I used an example in my essay where I had a particular case, and most people sort of automatically turn on a switch when it comes to domestic violence, and I had a case that involved a domestic violence incident, and often those domestic violence incidents lean towards, and the data shows, and the

literature shows how often males are arrested.

So I'm investigating this case, and you're fighting that natural -- you're fighting that desire to say that this is a male's crime, and you sift through it, and you see that this individual didn't precipitate this set of events, and the evidence shows that this was a case where the female was the dominant aggressor, and you shift, based on the evidence, to arrest the appropriate person. I think that's an instance where you fight what might be your natural direction, your own biases, to make an effective decision.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Okay. Thank you. In the activity section of your application, you indicate that you've had the privilege to work on several committees and with various groups, but you didn't name all those committees and groups. Can you provide a few examples, in particular, where you worked with people of a variety of backgrounds to come to a common objective?

MR. TAYLOR: So I'm a member of Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity. We have several committees. We have our mentoring, our voters' registration, and we work in those committees to try to find what's the most effective way to connect with the committee (sic) to make our mentoringships available.

I'm a member of the Manly Deeds Scholarship

Foundation, so we're working to effectively fundraise, put on our golf tournament, to connect with kids to offer our scholarships, and to connect with the community so that they are aware of our scholarships, so that they can make use of those funds.

So it's primarily been in that context, and on those committees, you have people of different opinions. They want to engage the public in different ways, and you just have to come to a consensus of how best to affect those goals.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Okay. Thank you. I don't have any further questions.

CHAIR COE: Okay. Mr. Dawson.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Coe.

Mr. Taylor, I'd like to just follow up on a couple of questions, some responses that you'd made to the standard questions. Standard question two, I understood you to say that, in your opinion, maximum public participation promotes transparency, which promotes a successful process. Can you expand on your thought on that? I'm interested to hear what you were getting at.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes. So, under the belief that decisions are made behind closed doors, or decisions are made that affect individuals without their input, and especially if there's an adverse effect to it, that leads

itself to the thought that these individuals did something in their own best interest. So the idea is, is that I want to show the public that I'm working for them.

In my cases, I want to show the public that I'm working for them as far as it is -- as far as I'm legally able, I will show you the steps. I will show the suspect the steps I took in an investigation, because this is their process as well. Due process belongs to us all. It's not for a victim. Due process belongs to us all. So transparency in that context, in that parlance, is due process.

I want due process to be obvious. If I get maximum participation from the public, they see the due process, and it lends itself to a transparent process, and they can see that we were working for them, that this was not something that was working against them.

PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: Thank you. So, sort of along the same vein of thought, in 2010, the Commission went out and they did a series of public meetings up and down the state, trying to get input from the public about communities of interest, and in one of their reports, they indicated that they found that some of the folks who were coming up purporting to be representing grassroots interests really weren't who they said they were, that they might have been there for a political or a partisan

purpose.

Do you think that your experience as a law enforcement officer could help you sort of suss out who is honest and who is who they say they are?

MR. TAYLOR: So, again, truth is often stranger than fiction, and you meet -- in the course of my business, I meet people from every angle that there are, so that's when the importance of trying to corroborate what an individual says. So you might get a leaning, and it helps you to seek out the information to corroborate what an individual says. So something, your intuition, which is a form of perception -- your intuition leads you to seek information, and as long as you have processes around that, you try to corroborate the information that's given.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. In your response to standard question four, which was about your group experience, you talked about working on an interagency taskforce. What jurisdictions were those?

MR. TAYLOR: So it's the San Gabriel Valley Safe
Streets Taskforce. It was the FBI, Pasadena Police
Department, Pomona Police Department, various sheriff
stations. There are a number of sheriff stations, because
it's a county area and contract cities. So all those
agencies worked together.

When we would have a case that would sort of lead

to a neighboring agency, LAPD would come in. So all of the -- Alhambra PD or Temple City, Temple City

Sheriff -- so all those agencies that would have been affected by violent crime in the San Gabriel Valley were at the nexus of that taskforce.

MR. DAWSON: Did that involve public participation as well? Was there public input?

MR. TAYLOR: No. That was strictly -- I guess the underpinnings of it were law enforcement. Public always comments on our interactions within the city. So you would have people that would contact the various stations, or the board of supervisors, or the city manager of Pasadena, or the chief of police of Pasadena, and they would comment on our actions within the city, and those filter down to us on the taskforce, and we have to adjust accordingly, or justify our actions. So, from that extent, there's always public comment on what law enforcement does.

MR. DAWSON: But there were no public meetings?

MR. TAYLOR: No public meetings, no.

MR. DAWSON: What kind of data did the taskforce use? Was it mapping data, census data, that sort of stuff?

MR. TAYLOR: We used some mapping data, but it was all relative to where crime is happening in the city, and it's judged against populations, and populations of neighboring areas.

MR. DAWSON: Were there expert geographers or demographers called in help you analyze this data, or was it sort of at the police officer level?

MR. TAYLOR: No. We would synthesize the information on our own or through our crime analysis.

MR. DAWSON: I see. I wanted to follow up on a question that Ms. Dickison asked about how the first eight are selected at random, and then the second six are selected by the first eight, and you were indicating that the second six really needed to have those sort of attributes of fairness and analytical ability, but my question is about -- the entire makeup of the Commission is intended to reflect the diversity of California's demographics and geography. So I'm curious as to how much weight you would put onto having geographic balance.

MR. TAYLOR: I think geographic balance is important. As we talked about, being a subject matter expert, it helps to have someone there. Oftentimes we think of diversity as in placing an individual that is constructed or represents a specific demographic, and I think what literature has shown is that, when we have people of various backgrounds, they bring that knowledge to the table.

So having people that are represented geographically, having people that are represented

85

1 economically, demographically, ethnically, you bring that

2 body of knowledge to the board, so the board, the

3 Commission, it will be better for its diversification.

4 That will be one of the benefits of it, because they bring

5 that knowledge base with them. So, although I can become a

6 subject expert for Tulare County, if I have someone from

that region, we together can identify those communities of

interest, in that we, as a team, can function at a higher

9 level.

7

8

10

11

12

17

18

25

MR. DAWSON: I see. Thank you. I noticed that you recently just returned to school to earn your master's.

What brought that about?

MR. TAYLOR: I believe that you should continually be learning, and we should always want to know the "whys" of why we're doing things, and so, as a check and balance

of why we're doing things, and so, as a check and balance

16 for myself, I thought it necessary to go to school, to

return to school, to continue to hone my skills, as a form

of professional advancement, as a way to hone my skills

19 even better.

20 MR. DAWSON: And that was while you were still

21 working full-time?

22 MR. TAYLOR: Absolutely.

MR. DAWSON: And did you have to drive down to

24 Irvine every day or so?

MR. TAYLOR: No. There's an online function to the

86

degree. So there were times when I could go on campus, but the world of the Internet is amazing, and I think we're all experiencing that now with the pandemic. My child's high school especially did not miss a beat. My brother-in-law and my sister-in-law are currently in college, so they show me how, on line, it's just a part of their lexicon. It's a part of their learning environment.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Those were all of my follow-up questions, Mr.

Chair. If there are any additional follow-ups from the Penal?

12 CHAIR COE: Ms. Dickison, do you have any follow-up 13 questions?

VICE CHAIR DICKISON: I do not have any follow-up questions.

16 CHAIR COE: Mr. Belnap?

17 PANEL MEMBER BELNAP: I do not.

CHAIR COE: I have no follow-up questions.

19 Counsel?

8

9

10

11

14

15

25

20 MR. DAWSON: Madame Secretary, could I have a time 21 check, please.

MS. PELLMAN: We have 16 minutes and 37 seconds remaining.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

Mr. Taylor, at this point, I think we're all done

with Panel questions. I would like to offer you the opportunity to make a closing statement to the Panel, if you wish.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you. Just in short, again, I thank you for the opportunity. I would love to be of service if given the chance. I think that this Commission has done something that is revolutionary in seeking its diversity and enabling or empowering the vote of each and every citizen throughout California. I full believe that that's what it's doing. So I am thankful for this opportunity. I think it would be best served by the diversity. Thank you.

CHAIR COE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Taylor, for speaking with us today.

Our next interview is scheduled for 1:15 p.m. So we'll be in recess until 1:14.

(A recess was held from 11:50 a.m. to 1:14 p.m.)

CHAIR COE: Okay. I'd like to go ahead and bring this meeting back to order. I'd like to welcome Ms. Judith Francis for her interview today.

Ms. Francis, can you hear us okay?

MS. FRANCIS: Yes, I can.

CHAIR COE: Great.

MS. FRANCIS: Can you hear me?

CHAIR COE: I can, indeed. Thank you.