

1 MR. SERRA: Thank you.

2 MR. DAWSON: Oh, I'm sorry. We would like to give
3 Mr. Serra an opportunity to close.

4 CHAIR DICKISON: That's true.

5 MR. DAWSON: I'm sure a lawyer might appreciate a
6 chance to make a closing argument.

7 MR. SERRA: I think I've said enough. (Laughter.)

8 CHAIR DICKISON: Would you like to make a closing
9 statement?

10 MR. SERRA: No ma'am, not necessary.

11 CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. All right, our next
12 interview starts at 10:45, so we're going to recess until
13 10:44.

14 Thank you.

15 MR. SERRA: Thank you.

16 (Off the record 10:05 a.m.)

17 (On the record at 10:44 a.m.)

18 CHAIR DICKISON: 10:44, calling the Application
19 Review Panel back to order. Seeing that all the panel
20 members are present I'd like to welcome Mr. Neal Fornachi.
21 (phonetic) No?

22 MR. FORNACIARI: Fornaciari.

23 CHAIR DICKISON: Fornaciari, thank you.

24 I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Dawson to read
25 the five standard questions.

1 MR. DAWSON: Good morning, Mr. Fornaciari. I'm
2 going to read you five standard questions that the
3 Applicant Review Panel is posing to each of our applicants.
4 Are you ready?

5 MR. FORNACIARI: Yes, I am. Thank you.

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

13 MR. FORNACIARI: Well thank you for this
14 opportunity to meet with you and speak with you about this
15 topic. My experience on the grand jury, I made a whole
16 list of things, but I'm just going to hit a few high points
17 here.

18 And I think first and foremost the Commissioners
19 need to recognize the importance of what we're doing here,
20 right? I mean, we're trying to ensure everyone has the
21 chance to vote and be represented by people who represent
22 their interests. So that's first and foremost. We have to
23 remember that as Commissioners.

24 I think a willingness to listen and learn with an
25 open mind from each other, from the staff, from the

1 consultants and from the public.

2 You know, I think there's been a lot of
3 discussion about analytical skills. And I think all
4 Commissioners need to have a minimum set of basic
5 analytical skills. I think the Commission as a whole needs
6 to have a broad skill set. Some of the Commissioners need
7 to have I think exceptional analytical skills to truly
8 understand what's going on here. But all of them have to
9 have a basic set of analytical skills.

10 And I think Commissioner Barabba made an
11 excellent point is the ability to synthesize information,
12 not just analyze data. Because you're getting a lot of
13 data from emergent different datasets, quantitative data,
14 but you're also getting qualitative data and feedback from
15 the public. And you need to be able to synthesize that
16 data in a way to make some decisions.

17 I think that the panel members need to have
18 comfort with ambiguity in the data, in the criteria, in the
19 process. And ultimately be able to make decisions in the
20 face of that ambiguity.

21 And then finally they have to have the ability to
22 work as part of a team.

23 So what are my -- what skills do I possess?
24 Certainly deep analytical skills and the ability to
25 synthesize information, ability to present analytical data

1 in a way that's understandable and actionable. I've done a
2 lot of leadership coaching and mentoring, so actively
3 listening and seeking to understand. Team building,
4 project management skills to keep things on track and a
5 lifelong desire to learn, and learn more about the state of
6 California and the people.

7 So what am I going to contribute to the success
8 of the Commission? I think beyond the skills that I've
9 talked about I mean it's a willingness to think beyond
10 myself, seek the best possible outcome that gives all
11 Californians the ability to be represented by people who
12 represent their interests.

13 MR. DAWSON: Question 2. Work on the Commission
14 requires members of different political backgrounds to work
15 together. Since the 2010 Commission was selected and
16 formed the American political conversation has become
17 increasingly polarized, whether in the press, on social
18 media and even in our own families.

19 What characteristics do you possess, and what
20 characteristics should your fellow Commissioners possess,
21 that will protect against hyper-partisanship?

22 What will you do to ensure that the work of the
23 Commission is not seen as polarized or hyper-partisan and
24 avoid perceptions of political bias and conflict?

25 MR. FORNACIARI: Right. Well, I think we all

1 recognize the hyper-partisanship going on, so first and
2 foremost keep the goal of the Commission in mind. That's
3 the most important thing. It's way more important than any
4 one of us or our viewpoints. Be open-minded in a
5 recognition that any individual doesn't know everything.
6 But and other perspectives are equally valid. I think the
7 Commissioners need to develop strong and trusting
8 relationships so that if something does come up they can
9 work through it.

10 And for me, what would I do if I thought there
11 was polarization on the Commission? You know, I'd try to
12 address it in a non-accusatory way, but just ask questions
13 to seek, to clarify what my fellow Commissioner meant by
14 what they said again in working to resolve conflicts using
15 some of the tools that I've developed over the years.

16 MR. DAWSON: Question 3: What is the greatest
17 problem the Commission could encounter? And what actions
18 would you take to avoid or respond to this problem?

19 MR. FORNACIARI: Yeah. So I actually had picked
20 two, I kind of color outside the lines sometimes. I think
21 the first thing if I put on my leadership and mentoring
22 hat, is the Commission needs to spend time up front to
23 become a cohesive team based on trust, mutual
24 understanding, open-mindedness and willingness to learn.
25 They need to set a set of ground rules upfront on how to

1 work together, because when the pressure is on and you have
2 to make a decision, you know, and there is conflict you
3 have to have a foundation of trust and understanding to
4 fall back on in order to work through those things.

5 The second thing is I put on my project
6 management hat. And I think upfront they need to come to
7 an agreement as best they can ahead of time, what the
8 approach they're going to take for making decisions about
9 drawing lines.

10 And there's a lot of ambiguity there. But based
11 on experience of past Commissions in California and in
12 other states the feedback, the lessons learned from the
13 past Commission, do your best up front to kind of figure
14 out where you're going to go. And so again when it comes
15 crunch time and the pressure is on to make some difficult
16 decisions you have a basis up front on which you're going
17 to use to guide yourself to make those decisions.

18 And also, a decision on managing the vast amount
19 of testimony and submissions that you're going to get, how
20 are we going to handle it up front? And how are we going
21 to use that information in our decision-making process?

22 MR. DAWSON: Question 4: If you are selected you
23 will be one of 14 members of the Commission, which is
24 charged with working together to create maps of the new
25 districts. Please describe a situation where you had to

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

6 MR. FORNACIARI: Right. So I was the foreperson
7 for the 2018-19 Civil Grand Jury in San Joaquin County.
8 The goal of the grand jury is to conduct investigations in
9 the function of county and local government. And write
10 reports with findings and recommendations for rectifying
11 those findings.

12 It was a really interesting challenge in
13 leadership. You have 19 volunteers who -- you have 19
14 volunteers or 18 other volunteers and no real position or
15 authority other than just notion of assignment as
16 Chairperson. You know, I don't provide feedback or raises
17 and so it was a bit of a challenge. There were some
18 exceptionally strong personalities to work with and manage.
19 So the approach I took was, very early is to make space for
20 conversation to make sure everyone had space to be heard
21 and felt heard.

22 In the beginning when we started we were trying
23 to figure out what investigations to conduct. And there's
24 a lot of disagreement among the group, but I try to keep
25 that, leave some space for folks to work through that and

1 allow a certain amount of tension among the group and the
2 group to become comfortable with it. Because I knew at the
3 end when we were making final decisions that we had to make
4 about the reports, we had to be comfortable with tension.

5 I mean, if there were more significant conflicts I kind of
6 handled them one-on-one or pulled pairs of people together.

7 And then there were some behavioral issues that I
8 had to take folks aside and talk with them about. You
9 know, "This is the impact of your behavior on others. And,
10 you know, we need to work on that," and ideas of how to
11 behave differently in a group to get along a little bit
12 better with the group.

13 And again what lessons would I learn? Well I
14 kind of already shared that. Take time up front to build
15 cohesion in the group, get to know each other beyond the
16 resume. Conflict and disagreement are inevitable, but just
17 get comfortable with that as a group.

18 And then the final thing is begin writing much
19 sooner than you think you should, because it takes a lot
20 longer to write the reports.

21 MR. DAWSON: Question 5: A considerable amount of
22 the Commission's work will involve meeting with people from
23 all over California who have come from very different
24 backgrounds and a wide variety of perspectives. If you are
25 selected as a Commissioner what skills and attributes will

1 make you effective at interacting with people from
2 different backgrounds and who have a variety of
3 perspectives? What experiences have you had that will help
4 you be effective at understanding and appreciating people
5 in communities of different backgrounds and who have a
6 variety of perspectives?

7 MR. FORNACIARI: Okay, so I'll just share with
8 you a little bit about my background beyond what was in the
9 write-up and I think that will provide some clarity.

10 So I grew up in a small town. My dad was a
11 mechanic, my mom was a secretary. They had no college
12 experience. I started as a shoeshine boy when I was 12 in
13 a little barber shop in town to make a little money and
14 mowed lawns. In high school I worked at a pizza joint to
15 make some money to buy a car and that kind of thing.

16 After I got out of high school I went off to
17 Chico State, kind of had a little too much fun, a little
18 not enough time in classes, so that didn't work out. So I
19 ended up going back and worked at the pizza parlor.

20 When I was 22, I dove into the swimming pool and
21 hit my head on the bottom and broke my neck and spent some
22 time in the hospital. I realized at that time my career in
23 the pizza business is probably over and I need to do
24 something different. So I went to the local community
25 college in Livermore, spent a couple of years there and was

1 able to transfer to Berkeley. I was able to take advantage
2 of a pipeline program that they have for junior transfers
3 from community colleges directly to the University of
4 California. I never would have had a chance to go to UC
5 Berkeley without that program, but I got my Bachelor's in
6 Mechanical Engineering there.

7 I got hired by Sandia National Labs and they sent
8 me back for my Master's in Mechanical Engineering. Yeah,
9 so working in Sandia was interesting. The organization I
10 worked in, there are about 100 or so staff members and
11 managers. I was one of those staff members there. About
12 98 had PhD's, 2 of us had Master's. And you know, I had
13 never worked in an organization, I never had experience
14 growing up or working with people at that level of
15 education or working in an environment like that. But I
16 quickly found out there was a very strong hierarchy. You
17 had a PhD, or you had a Master's. And I was treated quite
18 differently than the folks with the PhD's. And you know, I
19 mean it impacted me on my performance reviews and my
20 salary. I loved the job and I stayed there for eight
21 years, but it really being a second-class citizen in there
22 at work was -- it really impacted my career at that point.
23 So I moved on.

24 My first management job I was hired into an IT
25 organization, and I had zero experience with IT. And to

1 further exacerbate the problem I was hired over a few folks
2 in the Department who had been in the Department for a long
3 time and were expecting to get promoted into the management
4 position. So there was some distrust.

5 MS. MOLINO: Fifteen minutes.

6 MR. FORNACIARI: Okay. Some distrust between me
7 and those folks. And so what did I have to do to handle
8 that, right? So I had to learn the technical part of the
9 work to a point where I could be credible. I had to
10 understand it and be credible, but I had to work with all
11 the folks to understand the work they were doing. But I
12 especially had to work with those folks who had resentment
13 and distrust towards me. And work closely with them and
14 figure out how to build bonds and relationships with those
15 folks. And that was important.

16 So later in my management career I went into an
17 operations organization. So at Sandia I mean, the PhD's
18 are up here, the Master's-level folks are down here. And
19 the operations folks are really at the bottom of the barrel
20 of the hierarchy. And in a lot of ways they're treated
21 very, very poorly.

22 And I was able to build strong relationships,
23 strong working relationships with the folks in operations
24 it was really successful. But the way these folks were
25 treated, and frankly in some ways I was treated too even

1 though I had come from the technical side, it was really,
2 really appalling. And that is what led me to jump in with
3 both feet into the diversity inclusion efforts that I
4 talked about in my write-up. Just seeing how people were
5 being just treated appallingly.

6 And so what's my point of this story, right? I
7 think there's a couple of points I'm trying to make. You
8 know, I have some experience, you know, being in situations
9 where it's difficult where you're in a lower rung of the
10 hierarchy. Not in any way saying that I truly, deeply
11 understand what the minorities in the state are faced with,
12 but at least my experiences can give me some empathy.

13 I've also put together some tools and have been
14 successful in building relationships with people at all
15 levels in the hierarchy. And I can bring those tools to
16 bear in this endeavor to really try to understand what, you
17 know, folks in this state are going through.

18 So that's it.

19 MR. DAWSON: Okay. Thank you. Well the panel
20 will each now have 20 minutes each to pose their questions.
21 We'll begin with the Chair, Ms. Dickison.

22 CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. So I just want to start
23 looking at your career. You spent a large majority of your
24 career with Sandia National Laboratories, mostly in
25 management positions in the last piece?

1 MR. FORNACIARI: Uh-huh.

2 CHAIR DICKISON: Is that correct? Okay. And then
3 you also served as the grand jury foreperson.

4 MR. FORNACIARI: Uh-huh.

5 CHAIR DICKISON: What did you learn from those
6 experiences that will assist you with the Commission?

7 MR. FORNACIARI: Well I've talked about a lot of
8 it already, learning how to work closely with a variety of
9 different people. You know, my 27 years at Sandia I held
10 about 10 different positions, so I worked in a number of
11 different technical and managerial areas with lots and lots
12 of different people coming from different places and
13 different perspectives. And so that broad, diverse range
14 of experiences there helped me get to appreciate and value
15 the differences in people.

16 One of the things I mentioned in my write-up is
17 me bugging my team with the saying that all of us are
18 better than any one of us. And I learned for sure that you
19 really want a -- getting a set of a diverse perspectives
20 and opinions on any given topic makes the outcome better.
21 And working hard to get that diverse set of perspectives is
22 important.

23 The grand jury was really a fun and interesting
24 experience. You have 19 people come together, a really
25 diverse set of people with very different perspectives and

1 life experiences. And it's just really interesting to hear
2 those different perspectives in a different way. That
3 people look at the world very different than I do in a lot
4 of cases, but it's enabled me to open my mind to different
5 ways of looking at things. And different outcomes that
6 might come to with regard two recommendations and findings
7 in our reports.

8 CHAIR DICKISON: Talking about those just
9 different perspectives, you kind of talk about how you try
10 to recognize and appreciate the differences in people's
11 viewpoints and include those in decision-making processes.
12 What did you do to ensure you were getting to the point of
13 everyone, especially those who might not be comfortable
14 providing it?

15 MR. FORNACIARI: Yeah, so I made sure I left a
16 lot of space for conversation. I allowed silence in the,
17 the -- I'm referring to grand jury in particular, allowing
18 silence. You know, in some cases I would ask if people
19 weren't sharing, if it appeared that they had something
20 they wanted to share but were a little reluctant I would
21 ask.

22 And if I felt people were -- well none of the
23 folks on the grand jury was too shy to speak up, but at
24 work in different environments there are people that are
25 reluctant to speak up. So just take them aside and you

1 know, one-on-one conversation and try to get their input;
2 you know, open-ended questions. I think seeking -- having
3 a genuine interest in somebody and genuinely having them
4 see you're genuine and you're seeking to understand goes a
5 long way too.

6 CHAIR DICKISON: As you mentioned before that you
7 had spent a lot of time in management leadership roles.
8 How will you adjust to being a team member, not necessarily
9 be a leader?

10 MR. FORNACIARI: Yeah, I don't think that will be
11 a tough adjustment for me. I think, you know I've always -
12 - even though I was in a management and leadership role I
13 really took a very consensus approach to leadership. I
14 mean, it was rare when I was the final decision maker.
15 Especially for my team of managers, we would just sit
16 around the table and talk about issues that came up and
17 really work to try to come to a consensus solution, so
18 that's been my approach in management, tried to be my
19 approach in management and in leading the grand jury. And
20 so being part of a team, yes I just don't think it's going
21 to be a problem at all.

22 Plus being in a leadership role on the grand jury
23 was also constraining in a way that it didn't enable me to
24 dig in as deeply into the reports and the research as I
25 would like to have done.

1 CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. So you mentioned that you
2 were involved in diversity initiatives in your workplace?

3 MR. FORNACIARI: Uh-huh.

4 CHAIR DICKISON: And you discussed attending a
5 White Men as Full Diversity Partners workshop?

6 MR. FORNACIARI: Uh-huh.

7 CHAIR DICKISON: And then securing funding so that
8 you could provide some workshops where you were working?

9 MR. FORNACIARI: Uh-huh.

10 CHAIR DICKISON: What did you learn as the result
11 of those workshops? And how will that information assist
12 you in working with the Commission in general or the work
13 of the Commission in general and with the group dynamics
14 within the Commission?

15 MR. FORNACIARI: Yeah, so I thought that White
16 Men as Full Diversity Partners was really interesting. You
17 know, the kind of gist of it is that the dominant culture
18 in the U.S. is a white male culture and the country was
19 founded and built mostly by white males. And so therefore
20 white males don't recognize that there is a dominant
21 culture that they are part of, and that they benefit from
22 in ways that they don't understand. And that, you know,
23 other groups that aren't white males, the bar is higher for
24 them in a number of ways. And for me to kind of recognize
25 that and recognize in a different way the challenges that

1 women and minorities face was really, really eye opening.

2 And so I pushed to bring that up to our site,
3 because the organization was really white male dominated as
4 most engineering organizations are. And it was just
5 fascinating to watch colleagues in these meetings start off
6 with, "This is nonsense. I don't have any advantage in
7 this culture," to after a few days come to a point where
8 they realize, "Huh. Yeah, okay. I can see now maybe I do.
9 And I can change my approach to working with people and my
10 perspective."

11 I mean, it's especially profound when an African
12 American that you work with shares a story of being
13 successful and buying a Hummer and having to sell that
14 Hummer, because he got pulled over time and time again just
15 because he's an African American guy. And then having
16 another one of your colleagues tell a story about getting
17 pulled over in his town that he's lived in for 20 years
18 because he's driving past cops who had pulled over another
19 couple of African American guys. And they chased him down
20 and pulled him over too, wondering what he's doing there.

21 And I didn't have a recognition of those kinds of
22 challenges that minorities and women face in -- I mean I
23 had an abstract, I guess, idea but that made it so
24 profoundly real for me and for the others. And so it
25 really, really changed my perspective on that and my role

1 in the culture of this country.

2 So what would I bring to the table as the group?
3 I mean that perspective and would share that perspective in
4 open mindedness of other cultures and groups. Does that
5 answer your question?

6 CHAIR DICKISON: Yes. You also talked about the
7 outcomes of the City of Tracy as a result of the 2002
8 redistricting you referred to as a gerrymandered mess.

9 MR. FORNACIARI: Uh-huh.

10 CHAIR DICKISON: So in your opinion was this issue
11 addressed in the last redistricting?

12 MR. FORNACIARI: Yeah. I read the report. Well
13 yes, okay. I mean yes it was, because that district was
14 drawn solely for our representative to get reelected. And
15 you know what, it backfired on him, which is poetic justice
16 if you will.

17 I mean I think the 2000 -- the last Commission
18 did a fine job. I mean, I don't really like the fact that
19 they split up my county. And I don't really like the fact
20 that they put my city with a city in Stanislaus County that
21 I don't feel we have the connection with. But I didn't go
22 through those deliberations and in detail. I just read a
23 report and with some justifications as to why they did
24 that. You know, I don't understand exactly why they -- so
25 I don't understand deeply why they did that. And I mean I

1 think they maybe didn't get that quite right. I don't
2 think their justification was quite right, but in the end
3 you've got to make some hard decisions. It's a really,
4 really challenging problem and you have to make a hard
5 decision. And sometimes you just have to do the best you
6 can.

7 CHAIR DICKISON: So in determining district lines
8 the Commission is going to need to identify communities of
9 interest. What methods do you think the Commission should
10 employ to identify those communities?

11 MR. FORNACIARI: Well, I think that the public
12 hearings that the last Commission employed is a good way.
13 Maybe there were some lessons learned that we can take from
14 the last Commission and maybe there's some -- I don't know
15 exactly the details of what they did, but maybe there is
16 some direct outreach we can have to known community groups
17 to begin to get some feedback early and identify what those
18 communities of interest are.

19 But I think ultimately it's get out there and
20 boots on the ground and talk to the public and give the
21 public a chance to provide their input.

22 CHAIR DICKISON: How much time do I have?

23 MR. DAWSON: 6:50.

24 CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

25 What do you see as some of the factors that might

1 drive the preferences individuals may have for
2 representation within the different regions of California?

3 MR. FORNACIARI: Well, I can imagine the
4 agricultural areas. You know, I guess so you said, "What
5 are the factors?" I would guess for me and my area is
6 transportation, right? How do we get bodies to the Bay
7 Area? And I think that's a big issue throughout the Bay
8 Area and throughout Southern California. I think industry,
9 economic opportunities. I think education is a big factor,
10 and access to education. And I think yeah, I mean, yeah
11 economics, work opportunities, things like that.

12 I guess also, you know, experiences with the --
13 with the electoral process, right, that these communities
14 of interest have had in the past and their sense of and
15 their ability to be represented.

16 CHAIR DICKISON: Okay. So as you may know that
17 the first eight Commissioners are selected by lottery and
18 then they are tasked with selecting the remaining six
19 Commissioners. What would you look for in selecting those
20 six?

21 MR. FORNACIARI: Well, I think there's a set of
22 demographics that we want to look at that you all have been
23 looking at. I think that those demographics are important.
24 I think also though the first eight have to keep in mind
25 capabilities of the individual, of the first eight. And

1 what capabilities set do they need out of the fourteen? I
2 think that that's an important driver that can't be
3 overlooked.

4 I would go back and look at the interviews and
5 look at the -- I don't know if we get access to your notes
6 -- but look at the interviews and read the thing. But I
7 think fair, try to be -- fourteen people can't represent
8 all of the different demographics in the state right, but
9 be as fair as I can. I think to some extent also,
10 capability to do the job is an important factor.

11 CHAIR DICKISON: I don't have any additional
12 questions.

13 Mr. Belnap?

14 VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Okay, thank you for being
15 here.

16 MR. FORNACIARI: Thank you.

17 VICE CHAIR BELNAP: I've got a few questions for
18 you. I'm going to start with a portion of your application
19 and reading it only to lay the groundwork for those who
20 might not have read your application already.

21 MR. FORNACIARI: Okay.

22 VICE CHAIR BELNAP: And you said, "I spent my
23 entire working career at Sandia National Laboratories. The
24 first half of my career I conducted research in several
25 leading-edge technical areas. Some of the tools required

1 for this research included expertise with spreadsheets,
2 databases, mapping software, and computer programming."

3 I want to ask you what your experience has been
4 using mapping software in particular.

5 MR. FORNACIARI: Okay, so in 2003 I was -- let me
6 see, would it -- it might help if I kind of -- are you all
7 familiar with Sandia at all and what Sandia does? Would it
8 help? I think it would help (indiscernible).

9 VICE CHAIR BELNAP: It would help me, yes.

10 MR. FORNACIARI: Okay.

11 VICE CHAIR BELNAP: If you want to go back up to
12 there.

13 MR. FORNACIARI: Okay. So Sandia is a national
14 laboratory here. It's a government-owned laboratory. It's
15 operated by a contractor, but the government owns it. And
16 we do, or Sandia does research and development in a wide
17 range of national security-related topics. The reason
18 Sandia was founded, and the main mission of Sandia is to
19 provide systems engineering and maintenance of our nuclear
20 weapons stockpile, the country's nuclear weapons stockpile.

21 But in addition to that work there is a lot of
22 work going on in a broad range of national security areas.
23 We have a huge energy program. We're looking at renewable
24 energy and other energy security issues, cyber security,
25 Homeland Security, lots of other kind of top-secret

1 security kind of stuff. But it's all the work is really
2 focused on national security-related issues. And it's not
3 a business. We get funding from various entities. And we
4 spend that funding. So we're funded to do specific types
5 of work.

6 So in 2003, not long after 9/11, there was a big
7 concern in the country about radiological and nuclear
8 terrorism. And I was working with the Department of
9 Homeland Security on a project to look at that. And so
10 I'll share a couple of examples I think that will help.

11 One example is venue protection. So we're
12 assigned, so say the Super Bowl is coming up and there's a
13 concern about an attack with a nuclear weapon or a dirty
14 bomb. A dirty bomb is just basically an explosive that
15 disperses nuclear material. So this is the threat. How do
16 we protect this venue? So we used some new mapping
17 software at the time called Keyhole PRO. It's now called,
18 Google Maps. But it had a lot more capability back then or
19 available at the time.

20 And so you draw a circle around your venue, the
21 radius of the distance you want to keep these bombs away.
22 And then in detail, street by street, neighborhood by
23 neighborhood, figure out how you are going to close off the
24 neighborhood from anybody getting into the neighborhood.
25 But allow -- but deploy your detection systems to allow

1 people to come into the venue.

2 And I mean it was super detailed down to the
3 street level and neighborhood level and how we were going
4 to develop strategies on blocking off those neighborhoods
5 and preventing attack.

6 The second thing that we did was every Thursday
7 the Office of the Vice President would meet with our
8 sponsor from Department from Homeland Security and come up
9 with a scenario. "Okay, this week what if we give all of
10 the cops in New York City a little radiation detector. And
11 then deploy more sophisticated detectors around the city to
12 respond if one of the small detectors goes off. So what
13 would that look like? How would you deploy these
14 detectors, right?"

15 So we used this mapping software to look at,
16 well, where are the fire stations, where are the police
17 stations, where are the areas that we could deploy the most
18 sophisticated detectors and get the kind of response that
19 we needed. And it was all about mapping, all about
20 distances, all about neighborhoods and all about tradeoffs,
21 right?

22 And this is where I think the similarity is,
23 right? You're doing a systematic study of tradeoffs, of
24 "How many of these things are we going to deploy? What are
25 the costs?" I mean, it's different variables than we're

1 doing now. But it's really neighborhood by neighborhood
2 looking at the city and the characteristics of the city and
3 how would we make decisions based on the constraints that
4 we have.

5 VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Okay. Thank you.

6 So I want to return to your work at Sandia and
7 also your time as jury foreman. In your essay for in
8 regards to your ability to be impartial, you bring up three
9 things. One is your time as a grand jury foreman. I think
10 you've already talked about that. But the other two were
11 your time as a researcher at Sandia and then your time as a
12 manager.

13 So I'd like you to talk first about how does your
14 time as a researcher and the things that you did in that
15 role show that you have an ability to be impartial?

16 MR. FORNACIARI: I mean, so in order to be
17 successful at doing research you have to be impartial. You
18 conduct experiments. I mean, you have an idea about how
19 these experiments might turn out, but you look at the
20 results. And the results guide you as to what's going on
21 and that results are not always what you think they're
22 going to be, right? The feedback, the input that you're
23 getting is not always what you expect. So you have to be
24 open minded enough to kind of rethink your initial
25 assumptions on what is the physics and happening in the

1 problem that we're looking at.

2 And so, you know, as a researcher I had to do
3 that quite a lot. Just you'd be surprised how much you're
4 surprised in the results and the outcome and the feedback
5 you're getting.

6 So as a manager the example I gave was there were
7 times when -- so I was a manager of managers at the time,
8 right? And so the staff didn't feel that the performance
9 review or the feedback that they were getting from their
10 manager was accurate. And I've had to be the mediator.
11 And I really took the effort to be impartial, to hear both
12 sides of the story and take that in and come back with my
13 decision based on the input. And I took great pains to
14 ensure that both sides felt they were heard. I didn't --
15 wasn't always able to side with the employee or side with
16 the manager. But both sides were heard and that I
17 explained, and they could understand what the decision that
18 I came to -- why I came to that decision based on that
19 input.

20 VICE CHAIR BELNAP: All right. Thank you.

21 So you answered one of my questions about how you
22 -- so you went from Sandia and they paid for you and
23 directed you, or offered you the opportunity to get a
24 Master's from UC Berkeley?

25 MR. FORNACIARI: Right.

1 VICE CHAIR BELNAP: But I also saw that you later
2 went on to get an MBA from UC Berkeley. How did that come
3 about and how are you able to manage doing that while at
4 the same time working at Sandia?

5 MR. FORNACIARI: Yeah, it was kind of insane. So
6 when I was promoted to senior manager, I was promoted into
7 an operations organization that was responsible for budget
8 and finance and project management and business
9 development, a lot of different areas, all in business-
10 related. And we require the staff, even the operations
11 staff in those areas to have Master's Degrees and have
12 MBAs. So hey, we if require them to have an MBA I better
13 have an MBA too. I mean it's kind of hypocritical for me
14 to not. Plus I felt it would help me understand what we're
15 doing better.

16 So Sandia has a program to send folks to get
17 advanced degrees. They don't often like to send people to
18 business school. They really like to send people to
19 engineering school and so it was a little bit of a
20 challenge working the system to get them to support that,
21 but they did. And I went, I got an Executive MBA from
22 Berkeley. So I went all day, it was all day Thursday, all
23 day Friday and all day Saturday every three weeks. And so
24 it was a challenge, it was a lot of work. I mean, I was
25 basically going to school full time and working full time.

1 But I have a lovely supportive wife here that really,
2 really helped me get through it.

3 VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Thank you. No further
4 questions.

5 CHAIR DICKISON: Mr. Coe?

6 PANEL MEMBER COE: Good morning, Mr. Fornaciari.
7 Thank you for being here. Through your testimony or some
8 of the questions my colleagues have asked, a lot of my
9 questions that I had prepared for you have already been
10 answered. Such is the plight of the panelist who goes last
11 here. But I wanted to go back to your work on the grand
12 jury as the foreperson. Was that role as foreperson
13 something that you sought out? Or how did that come about,
14 your falling into that role?

15 MR. FORNACIARI: Yeah, no. We all showed up the
16 day that the names were going to be drawn. And I was
17 pulled back to the Judge's chambers and he asked, "If you
18 get picked would you be willing to be a foreperson?" He
19 didn't tell me why, he didn't. You know, I didn't ask. I
20 in no way asked to be foreperson. He just, I think, what
21 he saw was my consensus approach to leadership and felt
22 that I would have a good approach to becoming foreperson.

23 PANEL MEMBER COE: In some of the questions like
24 Mr. Belnap was asking about how your time at the laboratory
25 and as a researcher specifically showed an ability to be

1 impartial. Is there a specific example of a time that you
2 think would best illustrate the things you've already
3 discussed at a more high level?

4 MR. FORNACIARI: Well, that was a while ago as a
5 researcher. Yeah, I mean nothing specific is coming to
6 mind. I will just say, you know, a lot of our job as a
7 researcher is peer review and reviewing peers' papers
8 and/or peers' work and providing feedback. And when you're
9 doing that you really have to kind of step back and sort of
10 understand where they're coming from and what they're
11 doing. You have to be -- You want to provide some critical
12 feedback, but try not to do it in a critical way, right?
13 But provide feedback. And we had to do that a lot.

14 And in order to be effective I think you have to
15 really be kind of be impartial, try to understand where
16 that researcher was coming from and what they were doing.
17 And evaluate based on your experience, but also based on
18 the scientific data whether or not what their conclusions
19 were, were valid. Sorry, it's not the best example, but
20 it's the best I can think of right now.

21 PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay. I will ask another
22 question for another example.

23 MR. FORNACIARI: Okay.

24 PANEL MEMBER COE: Hopefully this one's a little
25 easier. You spoke in Question 1 about what you could bring

1 to the Commission. And one thing you said was a
2 willingness to think beyond yourself. And I'm wondering if
3 you could illustrate that for us with an example
4 potentially?

5 MR. FORNACIARI: Yeah. So see I had a Department
6 that had sort of two sides to the Department. One side was
7 folks who were doing computer modeling on physical
8 phenomenon and on one side folks were doing engineering
9 work in the lab developing design and testing, that kind of
10 thing. And the group had gotten pretty big. It was about
11 12 on each side of the group. It was getting a little
12 tough for me to manage both sides. The one side with
13 modeling was flush with money, bunch of money, lots of
14 money. The other side, really tough to keep these guys
15 employed. When their Department was together it was easy,
16 because I had so much money over here I could put these
17 folks on this work if they didn't have engineering work.

18 It got to the point where I felt we really needed
19 to split the group. And I had a choice, which side do I
20 want to go on? And I felt that getting someone else to
21 manage the modeling group was the better answer, because
22 there were other folks who could manage that group who had
23 more experience.

24 I felt the engineering group was the right group
25 for me to manage, because I had a deep understanding of

1 what they were doing. And I saw some opportunities for
2 that group to do better. But it was hard. I mean, that
3 was the hardest job I ever had, and I knew it was going to
4 be the hardest job I ever had. But I thought it was the
5 right thing for the organization as a whole and for that
6 group in particular for me to take that job.

7 PANEL MEMBER COE: So you knew it was going to be
8 a difficult experience before you chose to take that on?

9 MR. FORNACIARI: Oh absolutely. Yeah,
10 absolutely, because I had to spend my time -- most of my
11 time trying to drum up work for the folks in that group.
12 And that meant working with my colleagues within Sandia,
13 getting on the road and traveling back to Washington to
14 work to try to develop new programs, travel around the
15 country to other universities and businesses. And try to
16 work in developing funding.

17 So all the funding for Sandia comes in
18 externally. There's no -- it's not like a business that
19 has internal discretionary funding, so all the programs are
20 coming in from the outside. And developing programs is a
21 ton of work. And I knew that was what the job is going to
22 be. But I thought that was the right answer for the
23 company.

24 And so at Sandia, I mean it sounds a little
25 corny, but we had a saying we used to make decisions and it

1 was, "Country, Sandia, Self." And that was the approach we
2 used to make decisions. I mean is it the best thing for
3 the country? Is it the best thing for Sandia? And last,
4 is it the best thing for the individual?

5 PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay. Thank you.

6 I wanted to kind of extend a question that Ms.
7 Dickison asked earlier. When she asked about your
8 experience working with the diversity inclusion program
9 with your -- it was at Sandia, right? I believe.

10 MR. FORNACIARI: Uh-huh.

11 PANEL MEMBER COE: In your response to that you
12 discussed gaining a deep understanding of societal
13 privileges that certain people or groups of people may or
14 may not have. From that perspective, from what you learned
15 there, how do you think those different groups that may or
16 may not have different levels of that privilege, how do you
17 think that affects those groups' desires for political
18 representation?

19 MR. FORNACIARI: Well I think that the groups
20 that feel under-represented and feel like that they don't
21 get the voice that they deserve, I mean I feel like they
22 deserve that, right? And I mean, to me that's a big part
23 of and an important part of this process, is to hear those
24 voices and to understand their perspectives and their
25 feelings. And you know, in a historical context of what

1 these groups feel like, they've been going through and how
2 they've been disenfranchised.

3 And then do number 1, make sure they feel heard;
4 and number 2, figure out what we can do as a Commission to
5 give them a voice. You know, it's a tough problem. It's
6 not going to work out for everyone, not everyone is going
7 to get what they want. But at least folks will have been
8 heard and/or feel heard and have their concerns and
9 considerations taken into account.

10 PANEL MEMBER COE: Thank you, one final question.
11 In the role as a Commissioner if you were selected, which
12 aspects of that role do you think that you would enjoy the
13 most or bring the most value to the group? And conversely,
14 which aspects of that do you think you might perhaps
15 struggle with a little bit?

16 MR. FORNACIARI: Yeah, I think it's kind of two
17 sides of the same coin. I think for me the opportunity to
18 learn about, more about California and more about the
19 people of California and more about their concerns is --
20 I'm a lifelong learner. I'm really excited about that
21 opportunity to get to know more about California and
22 learning.

23 The thing I have to remember is I imagine in
24 public testimony that testimony can get a bit redundant and
25 get a bit long. And I just have to remember to be patient.

1 And remember that everyone deserves to have a say and to
2 have their voice and be heard. So I think that's where I'd
3 be.

4 PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay. Thank you. No more
5 questions.

6 CHAIR DICKISON: Mr. Dawson?

7 MR. DAWSON: Thank you. Thank you Ms. Dickison.

8 I have a couple of follow up questions. A couple
9 of them have to do with things that you'd said in your
10 essay. And let me see, oh on Question 3 about
11 demonstrating an appreciation for California's diverse
12 demographics and geography, you said that in your work you
13 would say to your management team all of us are better than
14 any one of us. What did you mean by that?

15 MR. FORNACIARI: I mean that it's important to
16 get -- for my managers it was important for them to seek
17 out input from all of their staff and get perspectives. A
18 part of that, you know, was also a push to get them to
19 think and work really hard to think about diversity when
20 they're hiring. Because again, I believe that a group of
21 diverse perspectives generates a better outcome than a few
22 individuals doing the same thing that they've always done.

23 MR. DAWSON: So would it be fair to say that this
24 has multiple aspects? One is getting input from the whole
25 team. But then does it also inform your perspective on who

1 should be on the team?

2 MR. FORNACIARI: Well, yeah I mean yes. Yeah, I
3 mean in a context like this right, we need a team with
4 diverse perspectives and inverse. So for example, I'll
5 give you a specific example that's on my mind. I have zero
6 experience working with community groups. I just haven't
7 done that. But this Commission needs folks who have
8 experience doing that, to have credibility with -- to have
9 coming-in credibility with community groups. I mean, I
10 would work to gain credibility with groups by really
11 earnestly seeking to understand and learn about their
12 concerns. But I think there's a diverse set of
13 requirements for skills within the Commission.

14 MR. DAWSON: I'm going to return to something that
15 you'd said about I believe this was a group at Sandia where
16 members of the dominant culture don't recognize that they
17 benefit from the dominant culture. It seems to me that's
18 something that you don't know what you don't know.

19 MR. FORNACIARI: Right.

20 MR. DAWSON: What don't you know? And how would
21 that be relevant --

22 MR. FORNACIARI: Well, I mean --

23 MR. DAWSON: -- in this context?

24 MR. FORNACIARI: In this context? I mean, I
25 don't know what people of color have gone through in the

1 context of voting. No, I mean I guess I have a notion. I
2 mean I can guess, but I don't know. I mean, I don't know.
3 There's a lot I don't know. There's a lot I don't know
4 about California.

5 And it was interesting to me to read the report,
6 the final report that there was some -- the African
7 American community in LA did not want a single focus
8 district, right? They had developed coalitions and were
9 effective in getting their representation through
10 coalitions. So they didn't want a single district, whereas
11 other communities wanted them. I would never have guessed
12 that.

13 And then there was something about in the North
14 state there were Sikh communities and other communities and
15 agriculture that wanted to be all together. Well, I had no
16 idea. But I mean, that's part of this opportunity, why
17 this opportunity is so interesting, the opportunity to
18 learn and understand more about the state and the people of
19 the state.

20 MR. DAWSON: I have about five minutes. I do have
21 one more thing that you had said in your response to the
22 first question, first standard question. That it is
23 important to be comfortable with ambiguity.

24 MR. FORNACIARI: Uh-huh.

25 MR. DAWSON: Can you expand on that? What did you

1 mean by that?

2 MR. FORNACIARI: Well, you know, I mean if you
3 look at the criteria here that we use there's the decennial
4 census, there's statements of voter registration. I mean,
5 these are all databases, consensus, geography, right?
6 These are kind of databases, but there's uncertainty in
7 those databases, right? And we have to recognize that
8 there's uncertainty and ambiguity in those databases.

9 And then respect for communities or respect for
10 neighborhoods, respect for communities of interest, I mean
11 that's all about testimony and that there's going to be a
12 lot of ambiguity in that testimony. And how do you work
13 through that ambiguity to come to a decision? It's
14 definitely going to be a challenge to work through that
15 ambiguity. And, you know, some people just aren't
16 comfortable with that in making a decision in the face of
17 that ambiguity, but you have to do that.

18 So on the grand jury for instance we get all this
19 testimony and somebody says, "This person is a jerk."
20 Someone says, "This person is not a jerk." And we have to
21 figure out what the truth is and somehow, and sometimes you
22 can't. And so you can't include that in your ultimate
23 deliberation, so you have to be able to work through that.

24 MR. DAWSON: I don't have anything further.

25 CHAIR DICKISON: I don't have any follow-up

1 questions.

2 Mr. Belnap?

3 VICE CHAIR BELNAP: I don't either.

4 CHAIR DICKISON: Mr. Coe?

5 PANEL MEMBER COE: I have one. I want to
6 springboard off of the last question Mr. Dawson asked
7 regarding decision making in the face of ambiguity. I
8 understand about what you're saying. And I think you're
9 right in that there are very few situations you're ever
10 going to go into it and have 100 percent of the
11 information. To be able to make the best-informed decision
12 there's always going to be blind spots somewhere. Knowing
13 that you're probably going to have to make decisions in the
14 face of ambiguity like you've mentioned, I'm curious if you
15 have any strategies for making decisions in with those,
16 with some level of ambiguity, any strategies that the
17 Commission could follow to make their decisions with some
18 ambiguity being present?

19 MR. FORNACIARI: Right. So if you go back to my
20 thoughts about what the committee needs to do up front,
21 right? One of those things is develop a set of criteria to
22 the best that they can up front and understand what -- you
23 know, come to some agreement where they can on that
24 criteria and understand there's going to be some ambiguity
25 or some uncertainty in the outcome.

1 But having gone through that exercise up front,
2 and work through it and understand where the trade space
3 may be and understand where they're going to have to do
4 some give-and-take, then when it comes to the end when you
5 have to make decisions you have a basis that you've already
6 agreed to for making those decisions.

7 PANEL MEMBER COE: I want to tell you what I think
8 I heard. I want to see, to make sure that I am
9 understanding.

10 MR. FORNACIARI: Oh, okay.

11 PANEL MEMBER COE: So with ambiguity present,
12 you're making decisions. The people making those decisions
13 are going to have some level of discomfort.

14 MR. FORNACIARI: Uh-huh.

15 PANEL MEMBER COE: I think what you're saying is,
16 and this is what I want to confirm, is that if you have
17 discussions up front about how to put together a general
18 decision making matrix or process, it removes some of that
19 discomfort. And some of the negative aspects that can come
20 with discomfort, in terms of decision making, if we remove
21 some of that, we remove some of that discomfort we might
22 have the ability to make better decisions, more streamlined
23 decisions and more consistent decisions. Is that what
24 you're saying?

25 MR. FORNACIARI: Yeah, it is. I mean, yes. And

1 it also will help us understand the impact of decisions
2 that we're making or if we want to try to change a
3 criteria. I know that the last Commission changed their
4 percentages, for instance, a number of times as they went
5 through. But as you change those things you may be
6 impacting one of the other criteria. So if you spend some
7 time up front thinking those sorts of things through, maybe
8 doing some scenario planning or that kind of thing, then
9 you can have a better understanding of what the impact of
10 the decisions you're making are.

11 I guess if that's any clearer? I'm not sure
12 that's any clearer, but --

13 PANEL MEMBER COE: I think so.

14 MR. FORNACIARI: -- just for your response, yes.

15 PANEL MEMBER COE: Okay. No further questions.

16 VICE CHAIR BELNAP: Madam Chair, how much time do
17 we have?

18 CHAIR DICKISON: How much time?

19 MR. DAWSON: 24 minutes, 50 seconds.

20 CHAIR DICKISON: Do you have a follow-up question?

21 VICE CHAIR BELNAP: I do. So it's taken me awhile
22 to formulate this, so that's why I skipped. So as I've
23 read your application and heard you today, I was struck by
24 how the injury that you sustained at 22 changed your life.
25 You said you were planning to go work in a pizza parlor.

1 And then you said that's not going to work out. And then
2 what you did with it to go to UC Berkeley to get your
3 Bachelor's and then two Masters, I can see that that was an
4 inflection point in your life. How do you feel the
5 injuries that you sustained at 22 changed you as a person?
6 And if you would address whether you feel like that change
7 would make you a better Commissioner?

8 MR. FORNACIARI: Well, I mean first of all, you
9 know I recognized I had to get my act together to make
10 something of my life.

11 Yeah, so yeah I'll just -- that's a big part of
12 it. I'd always wanted to be an engineer, you know? And so
13 I decided I really wanted to focus on going down that road.
14 You know, I knew, I mean in my life there -- clearly
15 there's been challenges in my life, right?

16 When I first -- after I first got hurt the access
17 -- so it was 30 something years ago, right -- access wasn't
18 available that is now. My wife and I would call a
19 restaurant, "Are you wheelchair accessible?" "Sure, we only
20 have three steps in the front," kind of thing. And so I
21 had to go through a lot of kind of access-related
22 challenges.

23 And then there's challenges with people and their
24 reaction to me. A lot of times kids will come up and want
25 to find out what the deal is, and parents will freak out.

1 And you know, I understand it's a little tough to take
2 sometimes, but I understand.

3 To some extent I've gone through some of the
4 things that some of the folks that have been
5 underrepresented are going through. So I think it'd give
6 me a basis for empathy and understanding. Yeah.

7 CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

8 Mr. Dawson?

9 MR. DAWSON: Yeah. We have roughly 22 minutes if
10 you'd like to make a closing statement to the Panel?

11 MR. FORNACIARI: I have 22 minutes? Awesome.
12 No, I want to make a comment. You guys asked a question to
13 the other engineer the other day that you didn't ask me.
14 And that's if I'd be comfortable with odd-shaped districts.
15 And I want to answer that question, because I think it's
16 important.

17 And the answer is yes. I watched the training
18 that you all went through. And the guy showed the
19 headphone-shaped district or something in Chicago to
20 represent the Hispanic community. And they were struggling
21 with a group of African -- the African American community
22 surrounded by the Hispanic community.

23 And in my mind that district is elegant. And it
24 shows a deep understanding of the rules and the underlying
25 intent of what we're trying to do here. I mean, it's

1 beautiful and thoughtful. And it's really higher-level
2 thinking to come up with an answer like that I think.

3 In the line-drawing exercise that was presented
4 to you, the woman was talking about Santa Clara County and
5 coming up with different scenarios for either splitting
6 this fictitious Silicon Valley community of interest or
7 not. And my question that came to my mind is well do they
8 want to be split? Would they benefit by being split? We
9 should ask them that question, because maybe having two
10 representatives for the Silicon Valley district is better
11 than one.

12 And then she talked about the prong-shaped
13 district that they had drawn. And again, another not
14 intuitively obvious outcome, but there was a meaning and a
15 purpose behind it that I thought was valid and really
16 thoughtful. So I just wanted to say that.

17 And then finally, let's see, I want to thank you
18 for all your hard work. I mean this is just an amazing
19 process that you guys are going through. It's really,
20 really difficult and challenging. And you are doing a
21 fabulous job. And thank you for considering me for this
22 role.

23 CHAIR DICKISON: Thank you.

24 So our next interview is at 1:15, so we will --
25 we're going to recess now until 1:14.