2:59, I want to call the meeting of the Applicant Review
Panel back to order. I'd like to welcome Dr. Sadhwani to
her interview today. Thank you for taking the time to meet
with us.

DR. SADHWANI: Thank you. Thank you for having me.

CHAIR DICKISON: You're welcome. I'm going to turn
this meeting over to Mr. Dawson, and he will read you the
five standard questions.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.

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

DR. SADHWANI: Yes.

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

DR. SADHWANI: Thank you. Great. First I just wanted to say thank you so much for the opportunity to speak with you all today. I am honored to have made it this far in the process, and I'd like to thank the auditors and all of the staff members for the, I'm sure, tireless

hours that you've put into this review process, particularly given the circumstances that we're all living under right now.

In terms of the first question, I think the mandate for the Redistricting Commission lays out quite clearly the three criteria, impartiality, commitment to diversity, as well as technical skills and competencies for all Commissioners. So I wanted to talk a little bit about what those, what those mean to me, and also how I see myself contributing to these.

In general, the Commission should be comprised of a body of individuals with a variety of these skills, right. So impartiality is something that should be shared by all the Commissioners. And for me to be impartial is to really leave your preconceived notions at the door. And it's really about being open-minded. And to me, that's being an active listener and listening to the others. Listening to the community members who will come before the Commission, as well as to the other Commissioners. It's a body of 14 members, and so I think coming with the approach of really being willing and able to listen to one another will be an extraordinarily important component to impartiality. In addition, having leadership and interpersonal skills that are required to reach across partisan divides, working calmly and finding solutions.

For myself, you know, I think I would like to think of myself as a unique case in terms of impartiality. We all bring with us our own identities and certain characteristics from our upbringings and from our professions and from our everyday lives. For myself, in terms of socioeconomics, for example, I've been working since I was a teenager. I was a grocery store worker and I waited tables in the service industry to put myself through college and to earn a Master's Degree.

In my professional capacity I have always worked in non-profit organizations, whether institutions of higher education and learning, or advocacy organizations.

My spouse, however, of nearly 15 years, on the other hand, is a CEO and a small business owner. We certainly look at the world differently from time to time, and yet we've always been able to find a common ground. So I think that that ability to be team-oriented, despite our differences, is something that I can bring to the table and will help me in terms of being impartial.

In terms of race, I'm biracial. I'm the daughter of immigrants. My mother is from England, my father was from India. What that means for me is that I identify as a woman of color, but that I've never really felt like I belonged to any one community in particular. My best guess is that the 2020 Census is actually going to show that

there are more and more Americans and Californians who, like me, come from a mixed heritage.

So, for me, I think that this background really gave me a footing in different communities and in different worlds, and has made me a bridge builder over time, being able to kind of cross between different communities and really understand, understand them.

In terms of the commitment to diversity, and in particular California's diversity, California has for a long time been an immigrant receiving state, with a large immigrant -- with large immigrant communities from Mexico, Central America and Latin America, Asia, South Asia, Middle Eastern countries. We have mountains, we have oceans, we have deserts, farmland and urban centers. A part of a commitment to diversity I think is the humbleness to recognize that no one person can possibly know all of the different forms of diversity that we have in California. No one can claim to say that they are an expert in every corner of our great state.

And so, again, I think coming back to this willingness and ability to be an active listener. To listen to the communities that are on the ground, and learning more about other people's perspectives I think will be a crucial skill and capacity for Commissioners to have.

In many ways my research agenda is a demonstration of my commitment to California's diversity. I'm a political science professor and researcher. My research particularly examines Asian American and Latino voting behavior. I've written about Latino Republicans and explored variations in voting behavior of Asian Americans of differing national origin backgrounds.

I'm a part of research collaboration that identifies the racial and gender identities of state legislative candidates nationwide, and I'm a part of numerous survey efforts specifically aimed at low incidence and difficult-to-reach populations, such as Muslim Americans and the limited English proficient.

Finally, in terms of technical skills and capacities, you know, I think that this really comes down to critical thinking and problem solving. I would imagine that in a body of 14, the Commissioners will bring a host of technical skills with them, and the capacity -- for myself, you know, I'll bring the capacity to understand data, as well as legal requirements. I'm not a legal scholar, per se, but certainly have a long background working in public policy and analyzing and teaching issues on public policy.

In addition, I think there's also the ability to manage a public-facing process that's inclusive for all

Californians. So really that ability to, you know, to have a public face. To participate broadly across the State and in a public way.

For my research, I'm getting into some of those specifics. I have extensive knowledge and experience using Census data and using the statewide database, the official redistricting database of the state. My training includes the use of various relevant statistical and analytic software, as well -- such as Stata or ArcGIS, as well as various methodologies. I teach research methods for political science. I feel like that would -- is something that I could bring, you know, bring to bear as a Commissioner.

In addition, I think critical thinking and problem solving is of course much broader. Given my background in teaching research methods, I think I would be able to assist other Commissioners, you know, understanding data, understanding, you know, the mapping components, where others might have other technical skills and capacities that they could be bringing to the table.

And yet, as a modern-day academic, I certainly am very much engaged in a, kind of public facing activities, which I think would be necessary for the Commission. I regularly present at academic conferences. I teach, I engage with students and listen and respond to their

concerns on a regular basis. I regularly am engaging in faculty discussions and scholarly roundtables, that from time to time can be heated, and having to navigate that process. So I think those are all of the ways in which I would bring technical skills, capacities to the Commission.

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?

DR. SADHWANI: This is such an important question, and I want to talk a little bit about being a professor of political science during this era of hyperpartisanship.

Because this is certainly something that I deal with kind of on a daily basis. But before I get into the professional, I want to share a little bit about my own personal background.

I come from a mixed-partisan family. Politics

means a lot to me. It's been a big part of life since I was a kid, but it isn't the only thing. My father, who passed away unfortunately this fall, was a naturalized citizen, and he was also a registered Republican. I'm, of course, a registered Democrat. One of my sisters is a staunch conservative raising her four children with strict religious values. But, you know, for us, that was never the, that was never a piece that divided us, even though we approached the world quite differently.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

My years in community organizing and advocacy taught me many important lessons, but one of the key takeaways from that experience was that the foundation of organizing is listening. To meet people where they are at, right. To sit down, to share a cup of coffee and learn about their life experiences, and how that has shaped their beliefs about the world. I actually incorporate this process into my smaller classes. When I've taught smaller versions of American politics courses, at the end of a semester I'll bring in coffee and snacks in our final session, and we'll have a call a coffee shop class. And I make students shut off their cell phones, and we'll take on big questions about the path forward in American politics by just having simple conversations. By having people get to know one another, and better understand one another's perspectives. So I think that that's really kind of the,

one of the baselines for moving beyond this era of hyperpartisanship.

As a professor of political science, I've taught at a range of institutions. You know, from the University of Pittsburgh, which is a large, public institution in Pennsylvania. At community college level at Glendale Community College, where I had a number of students, many of whom are immigrants and refugees who had recently left war-torn countries and didn't exactly have a lot of trust in government. To Pomona College and USC, private institutions with a range of different students. And currently I'm at Cal Lutheran University. It's a small, religious liberal arts institution on the Central Coast, located in Ventura County. We have student from a broad spectrums -- excuse me, spectrum of backgrounds and political persuasions.

Cal Lutheran has a number of students who come from affluent backgrounds in Westlake, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, and other neighboring areas in the Central Coast, from families who are seeking a private institution with a religious approach, and Cal Lutheran provides that. At the same time, the university is a federally recognized Hispanic Serving Institution, an HSI, with a large number of first-generation students from working families in Oxnard and Moorpark.

As a professor, my challenge each day is to create a classroom environment where all of my students can engage and think critically. For example, when we're studying executive powers, right, it's an issue that's in the news a lot, we'll take examples from both Democrats and Republicans. We'll look at Trump's travel ban, we'll look at Obama's drone strikes, and try to use the standard of democracy to evaluate the use of the executive power in either of those circumstances. And I think doing so allows me to -- allows students, regardless of their political persuasions coming into the classroom, and many of them don't yet know what their political persuasions might even be, to really engage and think critically about, you know, across both sides of the political spectrum.

Finally, my former work in non-profit organizations I think also influences my understanding of impartiality. I worked on immigration reform back in 2006 and 2007. And in that capacity and during that time, I was working with both Senator Ted Kennedy and John McCain's offices. These were two giants of the Senate who saw the world admittedly from very different perspectives, and yet they were both very much committed to moving forward and advancing fair and sensible immigration reform, comprehensive immigration reform. And I think that influenced my perspective in so many ways. Knowing that we can be solutions-oriented.

That compromises will from time to time have to be made.

So some of the characteristics Commissioners should possess to protect against hyperpartisanship should include a deep commitment to the process, such that Commissioners are both team-oriented and solutions-oriented. They should have that skill of active listening, to listen to communities on the ground, but also to listen to other Commissioners and to really hear what people are saying. And what I will do, what I can commit to, is getting to know other Commissioners on an individual labor -- excuse - level, to the greatest extent possible.

You know, I always like to tell my students about the example of Justice Ginsberg and Scalia, when Justice Scalia was still alive. They came from very different political and ideological, legal-theoretical backgrounds, and yet they were very close friends. They would attend the opera together. And yet they certainly did not often see eye to eye on legal cases. And so, I think I would bring that kind of approach to the Commission.

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

DR. SADHWANI: Yeah. Absolutely. Thank you. I think one of the largest problems that the Commission could encounter would be legitimacy, right, whether that's with

State legislators, the Governor, with the people of California, I think this requires upholding the spirit of the law, ensuring that the Commissioners uphold the spirit of the law. Losing legitimacy, you know, I think would be a real problem for the path forward, in terms of actually setting the boundaries of the districts, of engaging in the redistricting process. And I see three components as really being critical to the success of the Commission. Transparency, a commitment to professionalism, and the ability to make compromises.

So, in terms of transparency and ensuring a broad and inclusive process, I think that's kind of one of the key pieces of a Citizens Redistricting Commission. It's unique that California is in -- has a Citizens

Redistricting Commission, rather than vesting that power with the State legislature. So ensuring a broad and inclusive process will be paramount to the work of the Commission.

Steps to take would include things like ensuring that the notice of hearings is given to communities in advance, in advance, much as the auditors have done with this entire process. That minutes are kept. That they're made available. That people receive an equal amount of time to be heard. I think maintaining all of those components would be absolutely essential to the business

and legitimacy of the Commission.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think maintaining professionalism is also a key component for the Commission, especially in terms of the public appearance. Having Commissioners -- certainly the Commission is made up of people of different political backgrounds. That is the whole point. But having Commissioners publicly bickering, taking to social media to air grievances, none of that would be helpful to the legitimacy of the Commission in my opinion. So I think some steps to take in that regard. I don't know if any of this is already planned, but, you know, in advance, or in the very early stages with the Commissioners, establishing a set of formal or informal expectations of how matters will be communicated, including the extent to which Commissioners themselves might want to put together guidelines for personally taking to social media, their own personal social media, talking with legislators or others who might influence their decision making.

In addition, I think being able and ready to resolve conflicts, being solution-oriented, I think all of those components are a part of maintaining a sense of professionalism within the Commission. And, finally, I think making compromises. And I've talked, I talked about this a little bit in the last question. You know, the ability and willingness to communicate and communicate the

justifications for compromises. I think the Commissioners themselves will have to make significant compromises.

I think thinking through things like identifying communities of interest that need to be held together within a single district will be difficult. There will be challenges. I think communities of interest tend to overlap from time to time. Being able to use both data and incorporate the needs and concerns that we hear from communities on the ground will ultimately require a hybrid approach from the Commissioners. And so, ultimately, I think making — the ability to make compromises and that willingness to communicate them and the justification for them.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

May I have a time check, Madam Secretary?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. We have 10 minutes, 44 seconds.

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?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. SADHWANI: Great. Thank you. collaboration is kind of the name of the game for me. work on collaborative projects quite often in terms of research projects, and I'm going to share a little bit about one that I've -- I'm a part of currently. But as a professor, I also require collaborative projects of my students on a regular basis. Before engaging in a project, I typically will have my students brainstorm a short list of what we call, critical success factors of collaboration. Really setting those ground rules for collaboration. usually come up with a list of items that include things like -- and which I agree with, things like having great communication skills, which means sharing one another's contact information and actually using it. Holding a brainstorming session early on, so that everyone's ideas for the project can be heard. Equally dividing up the work to draw on people's strengths, and respecting on another's perspectives, even when they don't agree. And I think that students are right, that those are a lot of the keys to collaboration.

For myself, in terms of sharing a project just recently, I'm a part of a research team. There was a request for proposals from the Russell Sage Foundation to analyze some aspect of a 2016 national Asian American

survey, and propose a journal article for a special edition. The research team that I was a part of, we put together a proposal. Our proposal was actually selected and we received a small mini-grant to participate and present our findings at a conference in New York City. We have written the article and it's currently under review at the Journal of Social Sciences.

Some of the key components though. We were all in different cities, so in that instance, it really required - - as well as in different time zones. So it really required flexibility and respect of one another's time. We didn't know each other well going into the research group. We knew each other by reputation. We knew one another's graduate school advisors. So we had to take some time to break the ice. When we were able to get together in New York, we took time and went and had, you know, slices of New York style pizza in order to get to know each other and share a little bit more about our backgrounds and families. And I think doing so really allowed us to work, work better as a team.

We had to split the project up. One person did the data crunching and the visualizations, another person wrote up the results and the implications, and another focused on the front end of the paper, the framing of the findings, the situating of the study within the existing literature.

My formal role in this project was writing the front end, but my unspoken role was really as task keeper. I'm the mom of three children. I'd like to think that I'm a highly productive person. Because I have a number of responsibilities in my life, when I commit to something, I make sure that I break the tasks into manageable pieces that I'm -- we're hitting benchmarks along the way. I recognize that life happens. I think we're all recognizing that in living through this pandemic. Kids get sick, cars break down, and for professors, we have mid-terms and final seasons that usually equate to a lot of time needed for grading.

So when we had phone meetings I made sure that there was an agenda, and that everyone had a chance to add or change it. Research meetings for us are often exploratory brainstorms. We're thinking about the kinds of data that we have access to, and what hypotheses we might form from them. But I always made sure that one of us was taking notes. We would share that responsibility, and that we came away from our conversations with concrete action items for each person, as well as deadlines in which they would be due, to ensure that we were staying on task.

After receiving feedback on our initial draft, I ensured that we took time to debrief and make plans to incorporate those changes. Throughout the process we split

the work evenly, and we were communicating with each other on a regular basis if things came up. And most importantly, we were -- we held on another accountable.

So I think all of those components to working in a team are extraordinarily important. Especially, you know, in a Commission with 14 members, I think having people that are task-oriented, who can really see what the goal is, and understand what the key steps will be along the way to get us there, will be extraordinarily important, and also having that flexibility, right. I'm sure that in a body of 14, there will ultimately be a lot of task keepers on that, on the Commission. And so, having that flexibility to, you know, make changes when necessary to respond to other people's needs, I think all of those components would be really important.

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 in communities of different backgrounds

and who have a variety of perspectives?

DR. SADHWANI: So, some of the things here I feel like I've already discussed, so I don't want to go into too great of detail, and I'm sure there will be additional questions afterwards. Right, my professional career is dedicated to the study of racial and ethnic diversity. In addition to my research, I teach courses in racial and ethnic politics and immigration policy. I come from a mixed partisan background, and despite our differences in perspective, we have a very strong base as a family, including my husband, who's a small business owner. I myself am biracial. And being racially ambiguous has allowed me to really have a foot in many different communities and build bridges between them.

The piece that I perhaps haven't discussed too much about is that -- is where I grew up. And I grew up in the Rust Belt in Western New York. I went to the University of Pittsburgh for my undergraduate, and really spent my formative years in that environment. I'm from a small, rural neighborhood where the community relies on farming, and is based on working-class families. Not unlike many of the regions in the Central Valley or the Inland Empire.

In many ways my upbringing has shaped who I am.

Though I've had the chance in my lifetime to spend plenty of time in the cities, and now I live in the suburbs,

growing up in that environment, we were a church-on-Sunday family even though my father was Hindu. I grew up in a world in which you take care of your neighbors. Where you welcome newcomers, and it's usually with homemade pie. Community is based upon a common set of shared values. so, you know, I think that there are many different forms of diversity that are out there. I think there's many different kinds of folks who live in California. And, you know, I would like to think that I've had a great opportunity throughout my career to spend time in different places throughout the state to conduct research in different areas. Studying voting communities in the Central Valley and San Diego, in Orange County and Los Angeles and San Jose. And in my former work in the nonprofit world, having a chance to really build bridges across communities, and building statewide coalitions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, I think all of those experiences informed my understanding of California and my appreciation for its broad diversity.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you. We'll now to go to Panel questions. Each of our Panel Members will have 20 minutes to ask his or her questions.

We will start with the Chair, Ms. Dickison.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you, Mr. Dawson.

Good afternoon. Thank you again for coming. I

lost my voice there for a moment. You answered some of my questions as you went through. But --

DR. SADHWANI: I'm always happy to elaborate.

CHAIR DICKISON: In your application you identified yourself as an advocate in the social justice community of California. And in your diversity essay you discuss your - as part of your work with the Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles and Asian Americans Advancing Justice, Los Angeles --

DR. SADHWANI: Uh-huh.

CHAIR DICKISON: -- that you organize large-scale nationalization drives and prepared to mobilize immigrants to speak to legislators and built coalitions?

DR. SADHWANI: Correct.

CHAIR DICKISON: Can you talk about what you've learned through these activities about communities of interest that will assist you in the work of the Commission should you be selected?

DR. SADHWANI: Yes. So all of that is true. I can talk a little bit about naturalization drives and organizing as well. I came to California right at the end of 2005, and during that time that was when immigration reform was really -- when people were really taking to the streets. And I was fortunate enough to have the opportunity to work at CHIRLA, the Coalition for Human

Rights of Los Angeles at that time. I think they've dropped the L.A. part now.

During that time I worked in collaboration with a number of different organizations. When I was at CHIRLA I was working in collaboration with Asian Americans Advancing Justice. At that time it was known as the Asian Pacific American Legal Center, APALC. So, excuse me if I go back and forth between the names, because they've changed over time. And we worked with NALEO as well, the National Association of Elected Latino Officials, I believe it's —it is. And we were organizing large—scale naturalization, naturalization drives.

There were a number of immigrants who are legal, permanent residents, who had lived in the country for five years, who were eligible to naturalize but hadn't do so for a number of reasons, right. Maybe these people are committed to their home countries. Maybe they just didn't have the money to fill out, to complete the forms, or the forms were a little daunting, right. If English is your second language, sometimes — even though you might speak English, filling out those forms for taking the citizenship test can be a really big challenge for an individual who might be working, raising their children, et cetera.

So in those drives we were really trying to match the resources needed by those communities of legal,

permanent residents who were eligible to naturalize, so that they could do it. So if people needed attorneys, we would -- we were identifying pro bono attorneys. We were having people trained to complete the naturalization forms themselves. Conducting trainings for people to prepare them for their naturalization exam and for their interviews. Those are things that people were really concerned about. And so that was a lot of my work. I was more so on the policy side. So I worked on the naturalization piece, and then I worked on comprehensive immigration reform.

So there were other organizers at CHIRLA that specifically were working with household workers, undocumented students, undocumented day laborers. And one of the pieces that we thought was so important was the ability for the communities themselves to share their story. And that is something, that is most definitely a lesson that I have learned from that time period. That hearing, you know, hearing from the people who are impacted themselves, nothing can replace that. They are the communities of interest that we're talking about. And those communities of interest will come in many different forms, of course, but that ability for people to come forward and share their stories, share their experience and share their concerns about — whether it's about policy or

whether it's about redistricting, I think it's an absolutely essential component.

And so that was a large part of what I would do. The organizers themselves would, you know, identify people, be working with them. There was a lot of different kinds of service provision that was going on. I was working on the policy end. As I mentioned in my comments, you know, I was a part of a nationwide coalition of advocates that were working with -- at that time, the kind of key legislatures heading it up were John McCain and Ted Kennedy. Of course, both have passed since then. But we were working with their campaigns to learn more about what their policy priorities were, and then to mobilize the people on the ground.

So the organizers bring the day laborers, the undocumented students, and I would conduct advocacy trainings, right, so that they know what they're getting themselves into when they go to Washington, D.C., or go to Senator Feinstein's office, you know, in West L.A., to go and share their story and prepare them, you know, to share what their needs were in a comprehensive immigration reform bill.

And so, really, that piece around putting communities first, allowing people to speak for themselves, was something that I brought away with me. It's something I

feel like I continue to incorporate with my students, ensuring that they have that time and ability to make their own voices heard, to put -- you know, to articulate and elaborate their needs, not only as students, but hopefully in the long run, so that they have be active participants in our California State politics, but also in our American democracy as well.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. So one of the things the Commission's going to need to do is identify communities of interest. And you talked about policy and preparing immigrants to speak with legislators.

DR. SADHWANI: Uh-huh.

CHAIR DICKISON: Based on the work that you've done, how -- what methods do you think that the Commission should take to identify communities of interest, and what types of communities of interest do you think that they'll be able to identify in the various regions throughout the state?

DR. SADHWANI: Yeah. You know, some of my scholarly work, though I, you know, it involves using the method of ecological inference, which is the statistical, Bayesian statistical method required in Voting Rights Act cases. So, this kind of goes a step beyond communities of interest, thinking about vote dilution and racially polarized voting. So certainly, I think, identifying those

areas in which you can find communities that are racially polarized would be one step to identifying those communities of interest.

In addition, however, you know, I think that there are forms of communities of interest. You know, we don't have enough data on, for example, Muslim Americans, or even identifying racially polar -- well, it wouldn't be racially polarized, but I think polarized voting amongst, for example, rural voters versus urban voters. Voters that are, you know, that might be aligned based on some sort of socioeconomic needs or transportation needs. So I think that there could be a number of different ways of going about doing that.

Certainly, knowing the communities themselves, having Commissioners from a broad array of the different areas of the State of California would be, of course, important. But then doing our due diligence to really understand the communities of interest that exist currently in the current -- from the current, you know, districting process, and how that might have changed from 2010 to 2020, and looking at kind of that change over time and that Census data.

Of course, as I mentioned before, I think a key piece will be having those public hearings, ensuring that communities know about them. Perhaps having -- you know,

I'm curious to learn more about how the, you know, the 2010 Redistricting Commission, or the prior Redistricting Commission, engaged perhaps with organizations on the ground, or local legislators or officials even to, just to do outreach to the communities, so that people are aware that the Commission hearings are going on.

So, you know, I don't have enough information, I think, about what the process looked like in the past, but I think pulling all of that together to better understand and, you know, if need be, improve the process or make changes to the process moving forward would be important.

Certainly, if the pandemic continues, that would make it difficult to hold hearings. I think we would have to, of course, come up with new and innovative ways of engaging with communities around the state, just as you all have done for these interviews.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. Thinking of the data, the Census data, one of the concerns is the Census data is going to come later than has originally been expected --

DR. SADHWANI: Yeah.

CHAIR DICKISON: -- or than was originally supposed to come. What steps can the Commission take to prepare for the lateness of the data, given the deadlines that the Commission's going to have and the tightening of its own deadlines?

Uh-huh. I think ensuring that all DR. SADHWANI: of knowledge building is already done and in place and ready to go, right. So, I don't know to what extent all Commissioners receive training, for example, on the legalities of the VRA or knowing the prior districts already, but I would assume all of that has to take place in advance of the data being released in any case. Knowing more about what kinds of -- if any lawsuits have occurred based on the redistricting from the past, or if there were issues that communities raised during that time. I think all -- you know, doing our due diligence in the beginning with any of the components that can kind of be done before we actually have the data, to ensure that Commissioners are prepped and ready to go when that data is there, I think would be absolutely essential.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In addition, I mean, there is ACS data. There's, you know, the yearly and five-year estimates that are available from the Census Bureau. It's not perfect, but it could be possible to begin some thinking about redistricting using some of that data, although, of course, you know, it's not going to be as precise as the Census data. But it is -- you know, I use ACS data in some of my research, particularly, you know, for Asian Americans by national origin. They do a pretty good job of capturing that in the one year and five-year estimates.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. You talked earlier about being able to use data and incorporate what the Commission hears from communities on the ground.

DR. SADHWANI: Uh-huh.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIR DICKISON: Can you describe an analysis you've done using data, such as Census data, and other information, such as the public comment?

DR. SADHWANI: Sure. I'm sorry. The first part of that question was, describe a project using that data?

CHAIR DICKISON: Yes.

DR. SADHWANI: Okay. So the main thrust of my dissertation -- actually, my entire dissertation, which I completed at USC, was using the statewide database. So the key component of my project, sort of the main, exciting finding for scholarly research, which is hopefully I'm waiting on the final acceptance from the Journal of Political Behavior. It should be forthcoming there. Is the, is turnout of Asian Americans by national origin. So prior literature has, since the late 90's, thought about the role of a co-ethnic candidate. So for African American voters, does an African American or Black candidate stimulate voters, right. And since the late 80's, early 90's, within the academic literature, there was this sense that a co-ethnic candidate will empower voters to come out and vote. That never exactly was borne out in the data,

however.

Instead, where the literature has kind of landed, is that it's not simply a co-ethnic candidate that will stimulate turnout, but it's also contingent upon the proportion of a minority community in a district, right. So, when you have majority-minority districts, or at least districts where there is a larger percentage of a minority community, that's where you see increases in turnout with a co-ethnic candidate, right, in comparison to other situations. Those findings held for African Americans and Latinos. There was a big study done by one of my colleagues, Bernard Fraga, in 2016 in the American Journal of Political Science. But his findings were relatively inconclusive for Asian Americans.

And so in my work I argue that the problem with his study was that he was looking at Asian Americans as one heterogenous group, and only at the Congressional District level. That's a problem, because Asian Americans are not - you know, can be lumped as a heterogenous group, but there's so many different national origin backgrounds. So who is a co-ethnic candidate even for an Asian American?

So, I take his research question, but apply to the State of California, and look at Asian Americans using the surname match data from the statewide database for six different Asian American national origins. What I find is

largely, if we're looking at Asian Americans in that panethnic group, in which we aggregate everyone together, his finding holds, that it is contingent, a turnout is contingent -- excuse me, a stimulation of turnout is contingent on district demographics, okay. However, when I disaggregate based on national origin, I find distinct differences between Korean Americans and Filipino Americans, Japanese and Indian Americans and Chinese Americans. They do not behave the same, at least at this point in time. That's not to say that, you know, 10 years from now that might be different. This is, of course, the study of California, so that -- you know, hopefully, I'll be -- have the chance to do additional work in the future in other states, in other contexts, but at this point in time, what we see is variation between these different communities. And I think that's an important piece to kind of think about in terms of -- not necessarily in terms of redistricting, but certainly just to note that there are these kinds of differences in voting behavior of various minority groups. CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. You talked about your

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you. You talked about your professional, volunteer activities and your personal commitments.

DR. SADHWANI: Uh-huh.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 CHAIR DICKISON: How will be balance those with the

work of the Commission, should you be selected?

MS. PELLMAN: Just a quick time check. We have three minutes, 45 seconds.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

DR. SADHWANI: Sure. Well, as I mentioned before, I'm a working mom, and I take my commitments very seriously. So if I'm going to take something on, I do it wholeheartedly. I am a very task-oriented person.

Certainly there were times and moments when people told me, you're crazy to do a PhD with kids, you know, while you already have kids. How would you ever finish that? But I'm very proud of the fact that I am one of the very few women, not only to complete my dissertation from USC's Political Science Program, but also to get multiple tenure tract job offers.

So, you know, I think if I were selected to be on the Commission, I would think long and hard about what my other commitments already are. If there are places where I can scale back on some things. You know, if I scale back on my daughter's Girls Scouts in order to be available for the Commission during that time period, I okay making those kinds of, those kinds of adjustments. And I think my family is certainly okay with it as well. And I know that

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

DR. SADHWANI: Thank you.

CHAIR DICKISON: Real quick, is there a role for advocacy within the Commission?

DR. SADHWANI: I would be cautious about it. I think that certainly -- I mean, advocacy comes in many forms, right. I mean, maintaining legal standards could be considered a form of advocacy, and certainly we would want to think about the expectations of the Voting Rights Act, et cetera. Though Section V may be -- is in many ways dismantled under the Shelby ruling, Section II is still there. And so I don't think that we want to end up, you know, in a situation in which we -- the lines drawn are challenged in the courts. That being said, I think that advocacy can really stand in the way of impartiality, so I think it would have to be a very fine balance.

CHAIR DICKISON: All right. Thank you very much. I don't have any further questions at this moment.

Mr. Belnap, the time is yours.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Good afternoon, Dr. Sadhwani. You mentioned that you came to California in 2005. What brought you to California?

DR. SADHWANI: A love interest. I was on the East Coast. My husband actually is originally from the East Coast as well. We had met back there, and he was out here starting this business. And so when I had finished my

Master's Degree at the University of Pittsburgh, we made the decision, we had made the decision to get married, and I had moved out here. So that's what had originally brought me here. It just so happened that at that time immigration reform was really taking off. My Master's Degree was in International Development. There are not a lot of international organizations in terms of development aid organizations here in Los Angeles. They tend to be more centrally located in Washington, D.C., New York, maybe in San Francisco. So when I came at the end of 2005, early 2006, I was looking at a host of opportunities, and immigration reform made a lot of sense. Immigration cuts across development issues, particularly if we're thinking about the economic situation that people face in their home countries, and the reasons why they come. So, it made a lot of sense for me to kind of move into immigration reform policy work, given my interest and background.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you. I see from your application that you're from Los Angeles County. What experiences have you had outside of Los Angeles County but in California, that would give you an understanding and appreciation for people from other areas in California?

DR. SADHWANI: Yeah, sure. So, I've actually in my non-profit work from the past, much of it was building coalitions from across the state. And so, particularly

when I worked for the California Immigrant Policy Center, I was the strategy director there, the organization was undergoing a change. It had previously been a collaboration of four organizations, and it was becoming — in the process of becoming its own 501(c)(3). And so, at that time we were working to develop a network of organizations that were either serving or involved in immigrant rights advocacy. And so I, much of my time was actually spent going and visiting organizations in the Central Valley, spending time out in the Inland Empire with organizations that were out there. At that time there was only a handful of organizations that were serving, serving communities that were out there.

I spent a significant amount of time in Orange County and Long Beach. So I've -- Long Beach is of course still a part of L.A. County. I used to spend time going down to San Diego to work with ACLU of San Diego. And our office, we had another office in Oakland, as well as Sacramento. So I spent a lot of time going to Sacramento, engaging in, you know, in legislative advocacy in Sacramento, as well as working with our partners in the Bay Area. So, over the years I've had a number of times in which I've worked in various areas. I was always based out of the Los Angeles area, but I spent a lot of time in other places.

Similarly, when I was at the Asian Pacific American Legal Center, we were at that point building a statewide network, also. This is a common theme of my work. Of Asian American organizations specifically serving health-related needs. So for Asian Americans language access is a key issue for many people in trying to access healthcare services. Even for folks who have health insurance, et cetera, if they -- if they're limited English proficient, it can be very difficult for them to go in and talk with a doctor. And so we used to hear numerous stories of, you know, mothers being told, and having to have their daughters in the room and translating for them, that, you know, that their mother had cervical cancer or some other kind of life-threatening illness. So that was a major part of our work.

And so we were working with Hmong in the Central Valley. We worked with the Chinese American communities in San Francisco. We worked very closely with the Vietnamese community in Westminster/Santa Ana Area in Orange County, with the Cambodian American community in Long Beach. So we really took a broad perspective. I think it's particularly for the Asian Pacific American Legal Center, they have fallen on tougher times now, but at that point in time it was one of the few organizations that was serving the needs of Asian Americans and had the infrastructure. They had a

hotline system running in multiple languages. So when people had issues, whether they were legal issues, healthcare issues, et cetera, they would -- we would get calls in the Los Angeles office. We were involved at that point in opening an Orange County office. Of course, since that time, APALC has merged with other partners around the country, and it has become a much, much larger enterprise and is supporting organizations across the state. So certainly I was a part of the development of much of that work.

From my research perspective, I've -- I haven't traveled as much for my research yet. Much of it is data-oriented, and so a lot of it I've been able to do from home, but I've spent a lot of time. I had written a piece that was published at Vox, looking at a San Jose Congressional District, particularly the race between Mike Honda and Ro Khanna. You know, it's a very interesting sort of race between two Asian American Democrats in the only Asian American majority-minority district in continental U.S. outside of Hawaii. So, I have spent time doing research in other areas from a data perspective as well.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you. You describe in your application how you've exercised impartiality as a professor. How have you had to exercise

impartiality as a researcher?

DR. SADHWANI: That's a great question. You know, I think as a researcher, that's one of the first things, if you're bringing your partisan lens, it's one of the first things that is truly beaten out of you in graduate school. In fact, my dissertation advisor, I can very clearly remember, she used to be very hard on me in the early years of my program, would literally tear up my papers and say, this sounds like an advocate, and you will not write this - if you write this way, you will not finish the program.

So, you know, they are definitely two very different skill sets. And the approach of a social scientist cannot be partisan. We are looking at -- we are looking for patterns that are generalizable. So we might look for generalizable patterns of voting behavior between Democrats or Republicans, but ultimately we're looking for something that is generalizable beyond just one individual question.

So, for example, in the project that I had mentioned around voter turnout of Asian Americans, I parsed the data and look at it. I look at turnout for Asian American Republicans, Asian American Democrats, as well as Independents. One of the unique things about studying Asian American voters, is that about a third of them identify with no -- without -- do not -- excuse me, do not

identify with one of the major parties. They are independents.

And so it's a particularly interesting community to be studying, because, you know, there are districts in which Asian Americans are a large portion of the voting populous of the electorates. And, you know, particularly in the 2016 election, there were districts, particularly in Orange County, that went to Hilary Clinton, but also sent back Republican legislators to Congress, to the House.

So, a part of my research has been to look at, you know, what role did Asian Americans play in that? And what I found is that, using ecological inference, the method of the Voting Rights Act, is that Asian Americans were supporting Clinton, and yet at the same time, supporting Republican incumbents. That's an interesting finding, right. And I think that that cuts beyond just kind of any partisan approach that I would potentially bring to it. Instead, it's kind of an interesting pattern that we -- what I'm finding amongst Asian American voters.

So I really think that the -- if you -- you know, scholars who bring a partisan approach to social science I don't think actually make it very far the (indiscernible). You know, I think as professors we're all aware that at any point in time a student could be recording us or, you know, we've all kind of heard those stories. So it is most

certainly something that we avoid in the classroom, but also in our research, because our focus really is on generalizable patterns of human behavior or institutions.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you. You mention in your application that you and your husband are small business owners, and that you have to set aside your personal views and be objective in that business.

DR. SADHWANI: Uh-huh.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Can you further describe that experience and how you have had to exercise impartiality as a small business owner?

DR. SADHWANI: Sure. You know, my role in the business is fairly limited at this point, though, you know, I've certainly been with him every step of the way of building that business. He's and importer and wholesaler. It's -- you know, we deal with a lot of different people, from Chinese manufacturers and factories to staff members who work in the company, to other business owners that we're -- and, you know, vendors that we are trying to sell the product to. They all come from various backgrounds and perspectives. And I think the way that we have found to be most successful in business is to -- you know, again, you know, I hate to come back to this again, but kind of a similar, similar lesson learned from organizing that I mentioned before, is meeting people where they're at and

being active listeners, right. You know, the folks that work in the warehouse for us, the folks that are, you know, work in sales or work in the administrative office, might have a very different view than the owner of some of the companies that are buying our products that we also have to entertain. That's okay. It's really important that we can, that we can kind of move from one group of people to another and take a similar approach, and really kind of leave the politics out of it. Certainly my husband I think gets a little bit more of that from other business owners, but, you know, but I think it's something that we navigate kind of carefully, and that we have to bring that level of impartiality to, given the host of different people that we're interacting with on a regular basis.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

Madam Secretary, can I get a time check?

MS. PELLMAN: Yes. Eight minutes remaining.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Okay.

So you mentioned something in your analytical skills essay. It's a sentence I'll read --

DR. SADHWANI: Okay.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: -- then I want to ask you a question about it. So, in a 2018 article in a peer review journal -- you name the journal but I won't, "my co-author and I contend that how -- contend that how electoral

institutions are designed, including how district lines are drawn, may create both constraints and opportunities for representational diversity." So, what I'd like you to do is expand on that --

DR. SADHWANI: Sure.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: -- finding that you had, and talk about its implications for the Commission's work.

DR. SADHWANI: Sure. So, in that study we were looking at two, two state assembly districts in particular, in which the top two primary resulted in two Republicans who were, you know, who were competing in the general election. And in particular, one of the things that we were kind of interested in is a prior study, not in our study, a prior study, that had studied Latino desire for descriptive representation. So what that means in kind of layman's terms, is a desire to see one of your own elected to office. That Latino Democrats exhibited in survey data a greater desire to see other Latinos voted into office than Latino Republicans, right. So there was this difference between Latino Democrats and Republicans that was found in this other study in terms of what they would want. So we wanted to test that.

And so, what's unique about the California system, the top two primary system, is that you get these general elections in which you'll have Democrats versus Democrats

and Republicans versus Republicans. And so I like to exploit that to understand better how under that kind of constraint, right, when you are -- when you only in a general election have two Republicans or two Democrats, and in this instance of the article you mentioned, it's two Republicans, who do you vote for?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And so we used ecological inference. Again, it's the method of the Voting Rights Act, to estimate Latino Democrats vote choice. Okay. And so what we find is that the Latino Democrats overwhelmingly supported the Latino Republican candidate, right. And this is a small paper and a small finding, but it gives a little bit of credence to this idea that Latino Democrats might have more of this preference to support one of their own. They had an option between two, two Republican candidates, and they chose the Latino candidate. And that's really all that that paper can say. Because we can't say why they went out and supported them, but what we can say is, we can demonstrate the fact that Latino -- excuse me, Latino Democrats as a majority supported the Latino Republican under this constraint. Okay. That could matter to redistricting, it could not, right. I mean, I think it kind of comes back down to the communities of interest. There are already a number of majority-minority Latino State Assembly Districts in the State of California. Given some of the areas and

the extent to which the Latino community may have grown, in particular, this was in San Diego and the Central Valley, you know, it's possible that those would ultimately become areas where, you know, greater representation for Latinos might make sense. But without seeing the data, I think it's -- you know, the 2020 data, I think it's hard to say exactly, you know, how that would influence redistricting decisions.

VICE CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

Madam Chair, no further questions.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you, Mr. Belnap.

Mr. Coe, the time is yours now.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Good afternoon to you, Dr. Sadhwani. Thank you for taking the time to speak with us today.

DR. SADHWANI: Yes. Thank you.

PANEL MEMBER COE: In your first essay, you describe yourself having a deep commitment to upholding the values of representative democracy. And many of the activities you're involved in, professional or otherwise, and some of the discussion we've had this afternoon has demonstrated that commitment. And my question is, where do you think that this commitment comes from?

DR. SADHWANI: That's such a great question. Not one that I had thought too much about, but I do think, you

know, I -- boy. This kind of feels like a psychoanalysis at this point. But I, you know, I think that as an immigrant family, while we were to some extent seen as outsiders in our community, I suppose. I mean, certainly, I always got the questions of, where are you really from? Gosh, well how come your parents have such funny accents? But at the same time, as I mentioned before, it was a small-knit community that believed in welcoming outsiders. And so despite those kinds of questions, you know, it was a patriotic community. One in which, you know, I have very vivid memories as a child of, you know, reciting the Pledge of Allegiance every day and singing, you know, songs from Sea to Shining Sea, and thinking about the Statute of Liberty and how there's a place for all of us here in the United States.

And I do think, and my father, also, who was a naturalized citizen, you know, took a lot of pride in being in the United States, and being able to provide this opportunity to be here to our family. So I think that that dedication comes from pretty early on. That's, that democracy is, you know, is a fairly good thing. I mean, I think one of the prior questions was, you know, being biased in your research. I'm fortunate in that I study American politics and I'm largely dealing in democracies. Others will study democracies versus authoritarian rule,

and think about, you know, the differentiation between, you know, single-member districts and other forms of representation. You know, for me I'm kind of wholly focused on the United States system, and they -- you know, I think that that interest in democratic governance was formed fairly early on. When I was young I thought I would be a lawyer. As I, you know, went through my undergraduate I realized that that wasn't really the path for me, though I still, did still end up kind of in public policy and research and things like that. That was kind of the right approach for me.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you for that insight. I wanted to read something from the impartiality essay and ask you about it.

DR. SADHWANI: Sure.

PANEL MEMBER COE: In that essay you say,
"impartiality may be the most important quality needed in a
redistricting Commissioner, and yet may be the most
difficult to establish." I think you're probably right. I
think impartiality is very difficult to demonstrate. And I
know that you've been asked about it a couple of times from
my colleagues, but I'm wondering if you could pick one,
what do you think is a personal example that best
establishes or demonstrates your ability to make impartial
decisions for your self-interest?

DR. SADHWANI: I'm sorry. I missed that last part. For my self-interest?

PANEL MEMBER COE: If you could pick one, one example from your experience, which one would you pick to fully demonstrate your ability to make impartial decisions free of your self-interests?

DR. SADHWANI: Free of my self-interest. I really think the classroom is where that comes into play. I mean, typically my students -- actually, I'll get to the end of the semester and students have no idea sometimes what my own partisan background is. Because the examples that we'll use in class, you know, will -- we use -- you know, in my class, is because there is American politics focus, we tend to use democracy as the standard by which we're evaluating a whole host of institutions and actors.

And so, we can use democracy and a democratic standard of, you know, engagement of the people, to critique or think critically about both Democrats and Republicans. Neither one are perfect, quite frankly. And so, you know, I really think that in the classroom I have had to kind of stretch, stretch myself in many ways to leave my own beliefs at the door. There's really no place for it in a classroom. You know, I have had a whole range of students.

Certainly I think after the election, the 2016

Presidential Election, was particularly an interesting time to be teaching. At the time I was teaching both at USC and at Glendale Community College, in which I've had a number of Armenian students, a number of Latino undocumented students, as well as GCC also has a number of students who have come from Iraq and the Middle East, and from war-torn countries, from Syria, et cetera. It was fascinating to just to kind of see the range of responses. Because there were students who devasted, undocumented students were terrified by a Trump administration. And yet at the other — on the other spectrum, there are a lot of students who were very excited about a Trump presidency. In — as the head of the classroom, I have to create a space for both of them to be heard, but also to be able to kind of minimize some of the raw emotion of that point in time, right.

At that point we had several conversations in classes, allowing students to kind of unpack that. Many students actually did additional kind of counseling and services, particularly undocumented students. You know, but we did a lot of reflective essays. We -- in my classes we usually -- because I study elections, I usually leading up to an election, have students analyzing various elections from around the country. So, being able to debrief from them, and thinking about how, you know, a turnout for Trump might have influenced congressional

elections or state legislative elections around the country, or various propositions that were on the ballot.

So, I really think that in the classroom is where I've had, I've had to learn how to be impartial.

Especially when you're first starting out and in your early years of teaching, the only way to advance is to have -- you know, I hate to say it, but is to have decent teaching reviews. And if you come in and you're completely one-sided, one, you're not, you're not really teaching anything about American politics and institutions. But, two, you're not going to end up with very good, very good reviews, because students will see right through that.

So, I think in the classroom, you know, you really have to leave your, leave your perspective at the door and create a space where students can be who they are, but also explore who they might want to become. Many of them are 17, 18 years old and don't have a partisan affiliation yet, and it's, you know, for them to find certainly.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you. I'd like to switch to something you talked about. Well, you talked about it today. You talked about it in your appreciation for diversity essay.

DR. SADHWANI: Yeah.

PANEL MEMBER COE: And that's your work as a scholar examining voting behavior of diverse groups, and

your years working within the immigrants' rights advocacy.

And I'm curious how you think these experiences would help

make you an effective representative for the diverse

population of California on this Commission.

DR. SADHWANI: Yeah. I think I have an intimate knowledge of many diverse communities in California. I think my study of Asian Americans alone is quite unique. Asian Americans do certainly tend to be kind of lumped together as a group. They are not. Certainly, even in terms of their geographic spread across the State of California, there is a lot of diversity.

You know, for example, right, looking at -- I had written a piece for the <u>Washington Post</u> in 2018, yes, 2018, that examined the 39<sup>th</sup> Congressional District, for example. In that race, it was Korean American Young Kim against Latino Democrat Gil Cisneros. Many people thought that because there was so many Asian Americans in the 39<sup>th</sup> Congressional District, about a third of the -- of the residents, excuse me, are Asian American, that that would necessarily mean that that support for Young Kim.

And what -- every time I got interviewed after the piece in the <u>Washington Post</u>, I had to remind people, yes, but Young Kim is Korean American, and the majority of the people in that district, of the Asian Americans in that district, are Chinese American, right. And so that does

not necessarily mean that they are going to come and turn out for Young Kim. She's still going to have to do the work that any other candidate is going to have to do to reach out to that community. She doesn't speak the same language necessarily.

So, you know, I think having that knowledge, particularly of the Asian American community, but also of many other communities, right. I mean, I've done work over the years thinking -- looking at Muslim Americans. The statewide database, though I haven't done a project, actually identifies Jewish voters as well.

You know, I think that there are many, there's many different forms of diversity across the state. And I can bring that kind of sensitivity towards it. Even in places where I, where I'm less familiar, right. I'm sure that there are newer communities that I know less about. But having this background, having worked in communities, as well as studying them kind of from the data perspective, you know, I think that that gives me that openness to listen and hear from them, and give them a chance for me to better understand and get to know them and learn.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you. I'd like to go back now to the topic communities of interest. You had some discussion with that with Ms. Dickison earlier, and discussed how to identify communities of interest across

the State. In my question I want to piggyback off of that and ask, how can the Commission kind of avoid inadvertently overlooking some communities that may be less obvious, harder to find or more hidden in its work?

DR. SADHWANI: You know, I think what's so great about the Census data is the granularity of it, right, in comparison to, say, for example, the voting, the voting data alone, which is a surname matching. The Census data really allows us to understand so many different kinds of racial and ethnic groups, right. When we look at surname matching, we tend to identify the top six Asian American, for example, but there's also, there's over 20 different kinds of national origins of Asian Americans.

And so we can, you know, we can certainly use the Census data in that way to better understand kind of that racial and ethnic diversity. But I think communities of interest can come in many different shapes and forms, right. So, knowing, knowing more about the unique ways in which communities might be landlocked, for example, right, in certain areas, in which there might only be one freeway that gets to parts of, you know, the Inland Empire or the Antelope Valley, for example, or the northern parts of the State, right, and thinking about what kinds of communities of interest might also come out of, of those kinds of areas.

You know, I'd love to hear more about -- I don't know that we have time for that here, or that that's really -- this is really the place for it. But I'd love to hear more about how the previous Commission kind of went about doing that work. So, for example, the Census in years past has worked very closely with organizations on the ground to ensure that a broad count is actually heard -- is actually conducted.

You know, I'm curious if the Commission previously was working with various organizations on the ground to do that kind of outreach or not. You know, whether its conversations, you know, kind of a qualitative conversation with various stakeholders in different parts of the State to learn more about communities. Using the Census data to, perhaps, identify regions in which there might be specific, specific communities of interest that we might want to look out for, and then going out and engaging in conversations.

Maybe they have -- they don't come to us, but maybe we need to make sure that we're going out and trying to find them, to the extent that that's necessary or feasible to do so given the amount of resources.

PANEL MEMBER COE: In the Commission's efforts to find communities, they may locate or identify some that are less engaged or concerned about coming forward with their perspectives or their opinions. And there could be a

number of reasons why certain communities may feel that way, engaging Government or Government bodies. But since the perspective of as many citizens of California is so important to the work of this Commission to do its best job and its work, how do you think the Commission should engage these communities that may be concerned about coming forward, sharing your perspective, to actually make them feel comfortable coming forward, sharing their concerns, their thoughts, to better inform the Commission in its work?

DR. SADHWANI: Yeah. I think that there's a number of ways of doing that. Certainly I've worked with a number of communities in the past that meet that kind of criteria that you're describing, right. Cambodian Americans who have come from regimes where they do not feel comfortable talking with government officials. Vietnamese Americans as well. The Hmong. Undocumented immigrants, right, people from Central American who have perhaps left very violent situations, and have a lot of concerns about talking to someone, you know, who's seen as a part of the Government, or who -- you know, the undocumented generally, who might fear deportation.

You know, I do think that meeting communities in their neighborhoods, in their communities, can be extraordinarily important. You know, whether it's holding

the -- holding hearings or actually going out and talking with folks in neighborhoods and their churches, at their community centers. You know, certainly that's something that I'm, you know, very comfortable doing.

And like I said before, if there are organizations or religious organizations or educational, you know, public schools, you know, where folks are located, and where there might be kind of intermediaries, people that are trusted members of the community, maybe the school teacher or, you know, the local pastor, who might be, might be kind of trusted within the community and might be able to provide a bridge for Commissioners to hear more from the members themselves I think would be absolutely crucial.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

Madam Secretary, time check, please?

MS. PELLMAN: Three minutes, 30 seconds.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you.

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

DR. SADHWANI: I'm a people person actually, so I think I would really enjoy being a part of the Commission, working with other Commissioners, working with the

communities themselves. That being said, I'm also, you know, a total data geek, so I enjoy the data side of it. You know, I don't know the extent to which Commissioners are using GIS themselves, or is it -- or is there typically someone who does it, like on behalf of the Commission? I'm not sure. You know, GIS I have been trained in. I know how to use it. It's not my favorite thing, but I, you know, I -- it's certainly something I am capable of doing. But probably, you know, would be my least favorite -- or less of a favorite part. The data analysis side I enjoy more so, and certainly talking with people, being a part of the Commission, getting to know the other Commissioners as well.

You know, I think one of the things I talked about in some of the other questions, I think especially when it comes to reaching across partisan divides, I think so much of that is done over a cup of coffee, over a slice of pizza, you know, whatever. You know, I think that those are things, if there's opportunity to do that, I think that that's a really exciting thing, to get to learn more about our great state, to learn more about the diversity that exists across all of the different regions of California I think would be very exciting for me. So, you know, there were a number of reasons why I applied to begin with. It's for all of these pieces. You know, and I think also just

to fine-tune some of my own skills and knowledge set I think would be really exciting.

PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay. Thank you very much, Dr. Sadhwani.

Madam Chair, no additional questions at this time.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you, Mr. Coe.

At this time I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Dawson for any follow-up questions.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Professor Sadhwani, thank you for being here. I wanted to follow-up on the question about the Census data, and I'll give you a hypothetical, which is not that hypothetical. The Census Bureau has -- is planning to ask Congress to push back the deadlines by 120 days, which would then really put the squeeze on the Commission in getting out the -- in the deadline to get out the maps.

Based on your work, working with Census data and all that, is it -- can -- do you think the Commission can do enough work ahead of time before getting the Census data, that it could maybe draw preliminary maps, and then drop in the Census data and tweak it?

DR. SADHWANI: Do you mean using ACS data, the American Community Survey data?

MR. DAWSON: No. I mean the actual redistricting data that is required to be sent to the states.

DR. SADHWANI: I mean --

MR. DAWSON: I don't know about the ACS.

DR. SADHWANI: Okay. And I think it would be a challenge to fully -- I mean, I think it's entirely possible to begin drafting the, you know, a rough draft of what the districts would look like, and certainly thinking about communities of interest is something that can be started earlier on. I do think that ACS data, the American Community Survey data is a possible workaround, at least to get started.

So, the Census Bureau puts out estimates annually, but really it's based on a five-year kind of timeframe for the kind of change that we anticipate seeing based on survey data, right. So they'll do a large, a large survey to kind of get that sense. You don't, however, in the ACS data get fine-grained CVAP data, the Citizen Voting Age Population, so I think that would be a little bit of a --well, it doesn't necessarily matter for the redistricting though, because you're using residents in any case. So, you know, you miss out on some of those components, but I think it's certainly something to get started.

I don't think that there's a reason to wait, because time is of the essence, and I think this has to get done. It has to get done before the 2022 election of course, and be in place. So, yeah, I think that's entirely

possible, but, you know, obviously, the best-case scenario is getting the Census data of course, and having that fine-grain change.

I think one of the other challenges, right, is California is projected to potentially lose a congressional seat, right. And so without that final count, it will be hard to know exactly, you know, what that would look like, if reapportionment, if we end of losing a congressional seat due to reapportionment. But, certainly, you know, state legislative districts could be started now. Yeah.

MR. DAWSON: All right. Thank you. Do you think that's likely to be in the L.A. area if the -- if we lost a congressional seat?

DR. SADHWANI: Well, I think that would be up to the Redistricting Commission, right. I mean, I think it's hard to know. It's statewide, and the districts have to be about the same, you know, the same number of residents. So I -- potentially, yeah.

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

DR. SADHWANI: Certainly Los Angeles has a high

concentration of congressional seats.

MR. DAWSON: I wanted to ask you about a statement that you had in essay four. It was similar to one I think that Mr. Coe was asking you about. But you said, "furthermore, my research emphasizes how electoral

institutions like the Voting Rights Act, California's top two primary and citizen redistricting influence voter participation and representation." Does that mean that when a state has a citizen commission, that they tend to have better turnout?

DR. SADHWANI: Well, not exactly for turnout. So, I'm not aware of studies that have looked at turnover, per se, but I am a part of -- I was a part of a research team for the Schwarzenegger Institute as USC looking at partisan gerrymandering of state legislative districts. And so, certainly, the State of California did far better than states that hold their redistricting with the state legislature, when that power is with the state legislature.

Not necessarily in terms of turnout. Instead, you know, we're thinking more so about -- the article that that was referencing was a piece specifically written about descriptive representation. It was written for a symposia on this idea of electing more, or an equal number of -- a proportional number of men, women, minorities, et cetera, to the legislature. In general, when we talk about descriptive representation, that is what we're talking about. It's a theory of people supporting candidates and being represented by someone who resembles them, right. And so it was this theoretical symposia.

And our -- you know, my contribution to that with my co-

229

author was, hey, descriptive representation is great, however, right, we have to think about these electoral institutions and the roles that they play. Whereas in some instances, it might constrain women or people of color from actually being elected to office. In other instances, it might create opportunities where people -- where you can have a more proportional representation actually occur. So that was kind of the framework for that particular article that I had mentioned.

MR. DAWSON: Okay. Thank you.

I have no further follow-up questions. If the -- Madam Chair, if the Panel has any additional follow-ups.

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

Mr. Belnap?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

 $\label{thm:policy} \mbox{VICE CHAIR BELNAP: I don't have any further} \\ \mbox{questions.}$ 

17 CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. Mr. Coe?

PANEL MEMBER COE: No follow-up questions.

MR. DAWSON: Madam Secretary --

20 CHAIR DICKISON: No further follow-up.

MR. DAWSON: Thank you.

How much time is remaining, Madam Secretary?

MS. PELLMAN: We have one minute, two seconds.

MR. DAWSON: All right. Thank you.

With the minute remaining, Dr. Sadhwani, I'd like

to give you the opportunity to make some closing remarks, if you wish.

DR. SADHWANI: Sure. Well, I would just like to thank you all so much for this opportunity, and, you know, for taking the time to speak with me today, and for all of our work, actually, to establish this Commission. I imagine it is an enormous process and job. Certainly, there was over 20,000 candidates, so you've had your work cut out for you. So, I just truly want to thank you, you know, as a Californian, for all of the work that you have done to establish this Commission. Thank you.

MR. DAWSON: Okay.

CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you, miss -- or Dr. Sadhwani for taking the time to meet with us today.

DR. SADHWANI: Thanks.

CHAIR DICKISON: Our next interview is tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock. So we are going to recess now until 8:59 tomorrow morning.

DR. SADHWANI: Thank you.

(Recess at 4:30 p.m.)