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PROCEEDINGS

(Whereupon, the public session commences.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Good morning. This meeting of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission will now come to order.

Today is Friday, January 13th, and the time is 9:39 a.m.

Let's begin with the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We'll start with roll call.

Vice-Chair Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Vice-Chair Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner Stertz.

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We have a quorum.

Other folks at the table include legal counsel,
Joe Kanefield and Mary O'Grady.

Our mapping consultants, Willie Desmond and Ken Strasma.

And then our staff around the room include chief technology officer Buck Forst, our executive director Ray Bladine, our deputy executive director Kristina Gomez, and Marty Herder who is our transcriber today.

So, with that, I think we've got everybody covered.

Our next item on the agenda is discussion and possible action regarding technical changes to congressional map.

And I see in front of us we just received a big list of technical changes, and I'm hoping that it's a change log and I'm hoping that Mr. Strasma or Mr. Desmond will be talking us through them.

KENNETH STRASMA: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll give the big picture overview and then turn it over to Mr. Desmond to talk you all through the details of the changes.

It is a fairly large list of change logs. However, you'll notice the changes by and large are zero population or very minor population, so I hope it's not -- there's nothing either substantive or controversial.

There were two main types of changes that we were
looking at. One was to balance population, and the second was to do our best to accommodate new county precinct lines. The counties have been redrawing their precincts at the same time that we've been finalizing our maps.

So we -- we're attempting to move our lines to match their precincts as much as possible to avoid them having separate ballots for the voters in the same precinct.

There were some cases where we weren't able to accommodate the lines.

The smallest we can go -- unit of geography we can go down to is the census block. There are some census blocks that slice through houses. You'll see on Google Earth a line will go right through the roof of a series of houses that were built on that line, or a census line is off by 50 feet or so.

We have been working with Maricopa County for three months, and meeting with them last night, just to make sure that they are able to correctly assign those voters to precincts.

They were going through and testing with the census TIGER up tool, which lets you enter an address, the census block it's in, found that all of those were correctly assigned.

They had a number of requests for us in terms of
moving lines slightly to match precincts. Most of those
were zero population changes that we were able to make. And
their request relating to areas where the census line goes
through the middle of a house, they just asked for our
guidance in terms of what district those people should be
in, if they find any where it's ambiguous.

And thus far they have been able to make a
commonsense determination on all of those.

With that, I thought I should turn it over to
Mr. Desmond. He can show you a couple examples.

I don't -- doubt if anyone wants to go through
every single one of these, but we can show you examples of
the types and then respond to questions if anyone has
questions on any of the specifics.

One of the things we do want to highlight on the
change report, almost all of these changes are zero
population. They're changes -- or, I'm sorry, almost all
district changes don't change more than a tenth of a
percent, so they are within the level -- precision we have
on these reports, they don't show up.

Mr. Desmond can talk about one very minor change
between two voting rights districts, that is hard to show up
here, but not substantive.

And with that, I'll turn it over to Mr. Desmond.

WILLIE DESMOND: Thank you.
I was thinking I can just first describe the process we went through and provide some examples of these changes, as Ken said, and also to show you some areas where we can split houses, so you're made aware of that. And go through all those.

But just to start, for the congressional map, the way I started this was first thing I did was balance population.

So if you look at the change log I gave, the first changes on there are all designed to balance population between the districts.

Because we have a zero population deviation with congressional, that was the first step. And then any subsequent changes that affected any population, I needed to balance out.

If you do look at your packet, with the map on front, look at the data table on the second page that has the population breakdown, you will see there is a zero person population deviation across the districts.

The next step I did is I went through the counties one by one and looked at the precincts that they had hoped to use for the next ten years, and where possible tried to match our lines to accommodate theirs so that they have as few split precincts as possible.

There was different, different tradeoffs there.
In some cases we ended up taking small tiny slivers of census places that might introduce new splits. Those are typically zero population.

In working with the counties, particularly Maricopa, we learned that the census geography is slightly off in areas, and they had tried to go right to the city border.

And so that was, I guess, working with them.

In other cases where it was a little more nebulous we always defaulted to the other constitutional criteria, so not splitting census tracts, not splitting municipalities and things.

So if you look at the screen now, you can see this is the congressional district.

The green line is the line -- and I'll make it red to see if it's a little easier to see on the projector.

The red line is the tentative final congressional lines.

The black line is after the technical adjustments.

Now, if we get very close, you'll see many of these technical adjustments are just a census block here or there.

So zero population, just moving one census block.

There are some that are bigger changes.

Between six and eight, for instance, you see that
there is some larger splits.

And the reason for this is when you look at the Maricopa County precincts, you can see that by doing -- changing the lines like this, we were able to accommodate one, two, three, four of their VTDs. There is still one that is split up here, and the ones that remain split are where we balanced the population typically.

So this is about as extreme a change as you'll see. It's probably moved a couple hundred people from one district to the next.

Again, as Ken pointed out, if you look at your change report, you'll notice there isn't any changes to the population breakdowns by racial category, by competitiveness measures, by compactness.

So although I did move things, it's not a large impact on either one of the two districts. So those are basically the types of changes we made.

As Ken had mentioned, there are places where we've been working with, particularly here in Maricopa County, in dealing with some of the splits of houses. And what happens there is that the census geography is just a little bit off.

I'll try to show you one of those real quickly just so you can kind of better understand the issue and how we've been dealing with it and what still needs to be done.

Sorry. Bear with me for one second.
Okay. So, this green line represents the Maricopa County VTD that they'll be submitting to the Department of Justice. They did not draw their new precincts lines on census geography. They just drew them where they needed to be.

The black line is our line.

So, as you can see we split these two houses in half and come back through the backyards of these houses.

The reason for that is because this is as far as we can go on this side of South Mountain.

If we take just the next census block over, and we select here, you'll notice it takes quite a bit of land and goes all the way across the mountain.

The same issue exists on the other side of the census block.

So what we're really doing there is instead of, you know, part of these people's houses being in the district, on the north side of the same issue exists.

So there's no way of drawing a line that does not split a house somewhere.

And, Ken or Mary, if you guys want to talk more a little bit about how to deal with this going forward, I just kind of wanted to explain the situation and make you aware.

KENNETH STRASMA: I did allude to this before. We've been working with Maricopa County, and they have been
able to look up the addresses for these houses and determine what district they're supposed to be in, even though the house is split.

Their policy is going to be based on the census TIGER conceptual, census block that that puts the house in, to determine what district they're in. And thus far they've made a determination for everyone. If they have any that they're not able to determine, they will look for guidance from the Commission.

This is something that's going to probably only affect a dozen or so individuals. And I think they're going to be able to figure it out, and they are aware of this issue, and they've been working with us on it for about three months actually.

MARY O'GRADY: And, Madam Chair, commissioners, from a legal perspective, what we advised was we can't deviate from the census geography. We do have to rely on the census, because we have to be so precise with our populations for our congressional maps.

And so whereas the counties may have more flexibility to draw a line that deviates from the census geography, we really don't. We need to make sure that we're relying on that.

But as Ken said, when we went and tested some of those houses that Willie showed, okay, where does the census
assign those people, they were to the logical place that you would want them to be.

They were with the -- they were assigned to the census geography on the appropriate side of the mountain. And -- in every one that we tested.

And so, so that's good, because that's where the Commission intends for those people to be.

We didn't see anything that deviated from that.

(Phone interruption.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, did someone join the meeting?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yes, it's Rick Stertz.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, great,

Commissioner Stertz.

Okay.

Mr. Desmond, we're still on agenda item two, just going through technical changes on the congressional map.

WILLIE DESMOND: So the other way we've helped alleviate this problem is -- and there are instances where moving one census block can unsplit. We've done that and worked with the county to make sure we've got all those.

And the last thing is that just sharing of the congressional lines, that when they're close, they share the same boundary, it does kind of alleviate little pockets where a few houses would be in a different, in a different
legislative district than the neighbors and a different congressional district than the neighbors on the other side.

So that's another one of the technical changes.

With that, are there questions right away, or how would the Commission like to proceed? Would you like to just kind of walk around these lines to see where the changes are, or would you like to just kind of study the change reports for a little while?

MARY O'GRADY: And, Madam Chair, I have one more legal point to make.

The official action that the Commission will take when it certifies to the secretary of state, what you'll be certifying is a report that includes the census geography district by district.

It's not, you know, the picture.

And so that's the official list of districts.

And that's consistent with what we've described, where it's the census geography that you're assigned to that governs where the districts fall.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Do commissioners have a preference? Would you like Mr. Desmond to walk through the changes one by one, or are you wanting to study the change report more? Or questions, comments?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'd like him to walk us
through the change report and tell us what has changed first.

WILLIE DESMOND: So with the congressional change report, you'll notice there is some population change, that is all taking it down to a zero person population deviation in all the districts.

If you look at the last column of the right side of the first section, you'll see that all the changes have been -- not been great enough to affect the districts by more than --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Desmond, could you tell us which chart you're look at?

WILLIE DESMOND: Excuse me, I'm sorry. I'm looking at the change report, on top it says change report tentative final congressional with technical adjustments.

I do have all these files available on a thumb drive, if anybody needs them, here.

And what this is, this is the tentative final maps that you guys passed right before the holidays compared to the maps with the slight technical adjustments.

So you'll be able to see how different the maps are with the technical adjustments compared to the maps that the Commission tentatively approved.

The only instance where a metric has changed by a tenth of a percentage point is in District No. 3. If you
Look at the bottom two rows of District No. 3 on the second page, you'll see that both the 2008 presidential Dem and 2010 mine inspector Dem have gone up by a tenth of a percentage.

That is a positive change since District 3 is a voting rights district. So it's a slight improvement there.

All the other changes to the other districts have been minor enough to not, not bump the percentages more than a tenth of a percent or even to a tenth of a percent.

One thing you'll notice when you look at the splits report is there are several more splits to census tracts and census block groups.

I think that makes sense. These maps were largely created at the block group and tract level. When you get down to real fine detail and slight technical adjustments moving a block from one side to the other, it's likely that you would start splitting those a little more.

So I don't think there's anything to be too concerned about there.

You'll notice for the congressional there's one fewer census place split and three fewer census place that are split into more than two districts.

The changes to the competitiveness indexes are largely unchanged. A tenth of a percent either way in a few districts, Districts 2 and Districts 3. District 2 using...
index seven -- excuse me, index eight became a tenth of a percent more Republican, a tenth of a percent less Democratic.

Index three, using indexes four, five, six, and nine, became a tenth of a percent more Democratic.

So, again, these changes aren't major. Relatively minor changes.

(Phone interruption.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is that Mr. Stertz?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yeah, I just got dropped. I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. No problem.

WILLIE DESMOND: The changes are also relatively small with registration. The only, the only district that saw any change was the two-way registration in District 3 became a tenth of a percent more Democratic.

And the final chart has really been more for the legislative districts. It gives the comparison to the old legislative district. So you can pretty much ignore that for the congressional.

We've also prepared for you the full sets of reports that you're used to getting, the population data tables, the splits plan components, and competitiveness data tables, so you have that available in your other packet if you have any questions about where these districts are.
Again, from the change report, you can tell things haven't moved too much, but just in case you wanted to reference something.

Are there any questions?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Mr. Desmond, since my property is right on a line, I'm particularly interested in this. I'm right on the Phoenix, Paradise Valley border, and so that line kind of cuts through a number of communities.

And I just noticed that, you know, in some places it looks like Paradise Valley is split, in some places Phoenix is split.

There's zero population blocks, but -- and I've been noticing when you've been sending out the updates to the technical changes that some of those corrections were made, but others apparently were not.

Any reason behind that?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, absolutely.

That was -- so looking at the Maricopa County VTDs, these are drawn to the -- to the municipal boundaries. When they look at them on Google earth and using satellite imagery of the actual streets, they have a slight difference than us.

For instance, as you mentioned, right here is an
instance where the boundary comes one block into Phoenix.

If we look around, there will be cases where the boundary comes one block into Paradise Valley.

The reason for this is because Maricopa County asked us to move some specific blocks when working with Paradise Valley.

Initially we had taken it back to the census municipal boundary everywhere.

This was one of the last things we heard from them last night, asking us to move a few border blocks, you know, one way or the other, in order to avoid splits to their VTDs and also some splits to houses like we just showed.

All the blocks they had us move were zero population, but we were responding to the County's request to do that.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Desmond, we've now heard from all of the counties; we've gotten all of their input?

WILLIE DESMOND: Correct. All the counties with the splits, so...

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And how many counties is that? How many counties had splits?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, for the congressional map,
for our purposes, we received VTD lines from Maricopa, Pima, Pinal, Yavapai, and Gila Counties.

For legislative it was those counties with Coconino and Navajo as well.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: Oh, and Yuma.

Excuse me.

MARY O'GRADY: And, Madam Chair, when Willie is referring to VTDs, which is the census geography, these are precincts, the county precinct lines, that we're adjusting to. Right?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, the VTD is voter tabulation district. It's just kind of a standard way of calling precincts or wards or whatever level of geography that a particular state or municipality calls that. In the -- in census terminology they use VTD, and that's why I've been referring to them as that.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, Mr. Desmond, so it sounds like there wasn't anything that's controversial that you think should be brought to our attention. It sounds pretty straightforward.

Are there any particular lines that the counties were concerned about that you think we need to look at, or . . .

WILLIE DESMOND: I think it's relatively -- I
mean, I wouldn't have done anything too controversial without asking you guys first or being directed to do so.

So I think most of these changes, the vast majority are zero population changes, just moving a block here or a block there to match up with some of their lines.

There are cases where there is population moved. And all of those, in every case, was in order to try to remove splits to their VTDs or precincts.

And, again, the reason that it's important to try to remove splits to their precincts is because as they hold elections for the next ten years, any time we can remove a split, it saves them from having to print two different ballots for that precincts, having two different -- you know, like two different elections actually in the same location.

There's several cases where that's not possible.

There's a good faith effort on our part to try to remove as many of those headaches as possible.

Perhaps it would be helpful if I just kind of showed you the counties, county by county, to see where the lines changed, and see how it didn't match their VTDs.

If it's okay, I'll do that. I'll just start with Yuma.

So in Yuma, again, the green is their, is their precincts that they're planning to use for the next
ten years.

   The red is our line.

   You can see, for instance, we moved the line right here. It went -- the line used to run right here. Now it runs up here.

   This was a change. It's a lot of land. There's nobody that lives there though.

   So it was just to accommodate not splitting this VTD as much.

   When we zoom into the city, we can see that this line right here was moved to match their VTD. That moves 23 people. So this -- all this area was then moved to rebalance the population.

   So it's just 23 people that live down here.

   Since this VTD was already split, that's why the population was balanced there and not balanced somewhere else that doesn't split a VTD.

   MARY O'GRADY: And, just so our transcript is clear, could you -- instead of saying here and there, could you say -- give some street identifiers?

   WILLIE DESMOND: Sure. If you look in the change -- change logs, these changes will be identified in Yuma, but this is the area north of I-8 between South Avenue 2E essentially.

   And the population is balanced north of
East County 19th Street and east of South AF.

So there is still splits in Yuma.

Like I said, we did what we could, but all the other changes would have moved thousands of people, and I felt like that was a little bit more than we had been asked to do, so . . .

Moving on to Pima County, I have to add that layer.

Okay. In western Pima County, there's nothing changed because there were no lines that ran through there.

There's cases like this where in the unincorporated area west of Tucson, so the lines were moved to match precincts. And these changes by and large were zero population.

So, again, the red lines, you can see where the tentative final congressional map was, the black line is where it went to, and the green line is where their precincts are.

So just, for instance, if you look at this area. This was 605 people, so one of our bigger, our bigger moves. So it did keep one of the VTDs whole, it was also an area that was already split, and the population was balanced in other places that also were split.

I mean, it would have been possible to remove splits here on the border between Marana and the
Casas Adobes, but that would have been splitting a census place.

So the thinking being that even if, even if a precinct does go over two census places for things like mayor and other local municipal elections, they will have to print two ballots, and it's also a constitutional criteria not to split census, census places, municipalities, so we kind of made a judgment call in places like this to leave the line where it was.

But by and large most of the changes were minor and did result in unsplit census or voter precincts.

If you look at right here, for instance, between Catalina and Oro Valley, the line used to run right along municipal borders. It's been moved out.

This looks like it moved maybe -- moved 38 people. So not a major, major change, but it does save them from having to print two ballots, for all their elections.

So those are the types of changes that happened in Pima County.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Desmond, can you show us the change that was 866 people, between Marana and Casas Adobes?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

So that was this change right here. It's in the
unincorporated area between.

So the border ran on Lambert, and then south on --
Camino De Oeste.

It did bump out to north Carolanne Drive, and went
north to Potvin Lane, except for this block where it went to
west Turkey Lane, north on Paisano, and Cam Del Norte. Runs
north on Pegasus.

And that change was, I believe, a population
balance. And it also helped, I think, remove two different,
two different VTD splits.

Let me turn back on the. . .

So, move this, this VTD split over here, next to
Tucson, and also this one up here between Oro Valley and
Catalina.

Are there questions about that change?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No, I was just curious,
because it seemed like it was the one that had the highest
population impact of all the technical changes.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, there was a balance between
the border -- oh, also, I should mention, the border
between -- between like two and three down here by Sahuarita
and Green Valley was moved, was also -- yeah, here by
Green Valley to keep, to keep two more VTDs whole.

That left District 3 underpopulated.

So then District 3 ended up trading with
District 1 to keep more VTDs whole between the border between three and one. And then one made up the population from Green Valley and Sahuarita with District 2 and also kept VTDs whole up here.

So, all of these changes are kind of interdependent and things like that.

Are there other questions about Pima County?

(No oral response.)

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. If not, I'll go to Pinal County.

All right. So in Pinal County, the border between four and one was adjusted in some places to remove some splits.

Specifically here around the area between Florence and Coolidge. You can see the red line is where we were. By moving it over, we were able to remove two splits.

These areas in here, where the line differs from the tentative final, for both population balance areas, in order to accomplish those two removal of splits, additionally, the line between one and four in the unincorporated area in western Pinal County is moved. And you can see that does follow their county's precinct lines as best we could.

There is an area here where we weren't able to totally follow, so there is a split here to their precincts,
but it followed our line a little bit more carefully.

This would be a population balance here, just south of Superior, to make up for the removal of this, this split, this VTD in the upper right-hand corner of the county, the northeastern corner.

Are there questions about Pinal?

(No oral response.)

WILLIE DESMOND: If not, I'll just keep going.

There's not as many.

So Gila County, it's a relatively large change here going from one district to the other. I believe this change only had 11 people though, so, because it is a very lightly populated area.

I turn on their proposed districts -- the proposed precincts, excuse me, you see that we were able to follow those exactly. And so they won't have to adjust their precinct lines at all or resubmit them to Justice or anything.

So there we'll accommodate both the -- both of their lines at Gila County.

And in Yavapai County, there was a few places the lines changed, but mostly what they asked for was just that we matched the census -- or, I mean, the congressional line to the legislative line when they ran close to each other.
That prevents having a little pocket that would be different and be its own, its own voting precinct. So we were able to do that relatively easily.

So they didn't send all their lines. They just sent little areas that they wanted changed.

For instance, they asked that we remove this block from District 1 and add it to District 4 just to kind of clean up the line.

And they asked things like this block, south of Camp Verde, be taken out of District 1 and added to District 4 for the congressional to match the legislative.

So we were able to accommodate all those changes, and those lines do match up except for the area where they go around different census places.

And I believe that's it for the congressional changes of the counties.

Are there questions on the plan as a whole?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, if any -- I did have one question. On the split reservations, there seems to be some. I was wondering if you could explain those.

Like, the splits report for the congressional seems to show four splits of Salt River?

And I'm wondering about any changes that affected the reservation splits.

WILLIE DESMOND: Those were all zero population
splits that Maricopa County had asked for.

It's areas that they think the -- like, the census has a slightly wrong definition of where the border is.

So if you look carefully, you can see it's areas like this.

It also accommodates their VTDs.

If I turn on the census blocks, all these areas are zero population. So there's no, there's no splits of people that live on the reservation.

And it's just kind of areas along the fringe, primarily on the border between the reservation and Mesa.

So, like, for instance, there's this split now where they wanted to go at the Mesa municipal border line, but the reservation is also in that portion of Mesa. So we did move it up to accommodate, accommodate them.

If that's something the Commission's uncomfortable with, you know, we could always change that back, but there was zero population areas.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Ms. O'Grady, I think that's a good point. I wonder if we're assured that they will continue to be zero population areas.

I don't think there's any way to know that.

Have we discussed those changes with the tribes
MARY O'GRADY: My thinking is -- well, part of the presentation, this will let people respond to that, so if people have concerns we'll hear them. And I'm not sure where they vote now. So if this maintains where they vote now, that's probably a good thing, rather than changing where they're accustomed to voting. I think.

And Maricopa County has to get their precinct lines, so they're very sensitive to the tribal issues too typically, because they have to, they have to get those precleared.

So, and I know we have a meeting scheduled next week, so then we'll focus on this. And if we have any concerns, we'll advise the Commission.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: Also, just show, the blue line is the current legislative districts.

So a lot of these area are places where the legislative district, I guess, splits the reservation too, so I think, I think it's possible that there's some combination of the census reservation line might be, might be off.

I'm not sure.

Are there other questions?

(No oral response.)
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz, just checking, are you on the line?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We'll check back with him.

Any other questions or --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I am.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, yes, Mr. Stertz?

Okay. Got it.

Any other questions or comments on these technical changes to the congressional map that Mr. Desmond just walked us through?

(No oral response.)


So our next item is number three, discussion of possible action regarding technical changes on legislative maps.

Do you want to walk through those?

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

All right. For the legislative maps, we prepared the same information. You have a change report comparing the original legislative map that was approved before the holidays, the tentative final and the tentative final with technical adjustments.
You also have the full packet of information with all the standard reports, splits, components, competitiveness, and population tables.

In addition to the changes in the counties we just looked at, there was also Navajo and Coconino Counties here. Coconino had just two very minor changes, one census block between six and seven. And then I believe this was 13 people, going into seven from six -- or to not split their, their new precincts.

Are there questions on the whole or should we go through the change report first?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I do have one question. Did you do population balancing on the legislative map and will you talk about that if you did?

WILLIE DESMOND: I did not do population balancing to a zero percent deviation. It was something that I kept in mind making these changes.

When I was evaluating whether or not to try to keep a VTD whole or not or the line should be moved, I was slightly more in favor of making that change if it was something that had broader deviations down across the board.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Is there one of these charts that you've given us this morning that shows us what our deviations are on the leg map by district?
WILLIE DESMOND: Yes. If you go to the second page of your packet with the map on it, the population table, that has your population and your deviation from ideal population are the second, third, and fourth columns, left.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: So if you look at some of the areas with the highest population deviation that aren't voting rights districts, I think many of the changes have been, have been positive.

District 12 the deviation came down a little bit.

District -- let's see.

Some of them got a little worse.

District 25, for instance, had 600 more people in it.

But it was something I paid attention to and did endeavor to minimize. But that's something that wasn't an expressed consideration.

So looking through the change report, there are more instances of changes that have been enough to impact the percentage columns, so changes that are a tenth of a percent or more.

I don't believe that there are any changes that are more than a half percent anywhere.

By and large the changes happened that show up in
our voting rights districts, and they were, I believe, all positive. I was careful not to make any changes that did harm to any of our voting rights districts, particularly any of the ones that were concerned about.

Just going through, you'll notice District 4, it's a tenth of a percent less White, tenth of a percent higher total minority.

Hispanic registration went up by a tenth of a percent.

Mine inspector went up by a tenth of a percent, things like that.

Districts 2 and 3 didn't really have any changes that were big enough to show up.

District 7 did -- didn't have any changes, except for that one to Coconino County. So it just, it just lost 18 people.

Continuing with our voting rights districts.

District 8 wasn't impacted, except for the deviation from ideal population went from negative 2.3 percent to negative 2.2.

District 19 didn't see a drop in several of the indicators that we like to see increased.

It lost two tenths of a percent in Hispanic.

It lost half a point in CVAP. I believe that was our biggest change in the whole report.
And it lost about a tenth of a percent in some of the key indicators.

That population, though, did go to a different voting rights district. You'll notice District 29, those drops in 19 are increases in 29. So it went up their CVAP four tenths of a percent, things like that.

That was the largest of the changes in any of the districts.

Continuing with the voting rights districts, District 24 has a tenth of a percent higher Hispanic percentage, a tenth of a percent higher CVAP total minority, things like that. Positive changes.

That's similar to District 26, which saw many of its election indicators go up as well as its total minority percentage and total voting age minority.

District 27 lost about a tenth of a percent, some of the things, some of the Voting Rights Act indicators. Nothing too serious. That was a very solid district to begin with.

And District 30 wasn't really impacted much at all.

If you look at the splits report, or the splits and the change report, you'll notice, again, there are several more split census tracts and split census blocks.

That's the result of us having initially drawn at those
levels because that is a constitutional criteria. Adjusting these lines happened primarily block by block -- or exclusively block by block, so moving a block from one district to another to accommodate the county precinct line is what did a lot of those splits, I believe.

And then looking at the competitiveness tables, by and large the percentages are exactly the same. The places where they're not usually are voting rights districts where they're in most cases slightly better, in some cases slightly worse.

In the cases where it's worse, I don't think there's anything that we would be concerned about.

That holds true also with the registration indicators.

And, again, the table at the end shows you the population, where it comes from. So if you go to the final table where it says population from existing 2010 districts, towards the back you'll see that District 1, for instance, the existing district is District 30. That makes up 41.9 percent of this new district. So you can tell where, where these districts came from in the current legislative map.

Are there any questions on the change report?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: For me, just that we didn't make the district numbering change yet between 1 and 14.
WILLIE DESMOND: That's correct. That's something we'll have for Tucson's meeting, or I can probably --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I do like the smaller labels that you've incorporated into these maps.

You can actually see every district this time.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Just on the issue of district numbering, which I couldn't really hear most of the discussion on Tuesday. And I apologize, I was not able to attend in person on Monday and Tuesday.

But just as an aside, I received less actual notice of those hearings than the public received, constructive notice of them.

While today I gave the Commission notice on November 21st that I had a conflict with today, could not make it, and now we have a hearing today, which is in a way sort of illustrative, I think, of how much sort of window dressing the Republican commissioners have been on this Commission.

But putting that aside, on the issue of the numbering of the districts, I would like to speak out again in favor of numbering them in some sort of systematic way that when the voters here in the state hear of a certain number of a district, they may not know exactly where it
lies in the state, but they may develop sort of an intuitive sense of that's a high number, that's probably in southern Arizona, or that's a number in the teens, that probably falls in Maricopa County.

And in a way, to sort of -- I know we are to start with a clean slate and draw the districts anew, but to the extent those numbers could line up with the old districts, I think that makes a lot of sense.

It avoids confusion with the public.

It probably in some small way saves people in the state money for having to renumber everything.

Even you go down to campaign signs. I know a lot of candidates don't put the numbers on their signs, but some of them do.

And they have to either buy new signs, I guess, now or put stickers on them or something.

And, you know, I think the function of government should be -- you know, the core function is to protect liberty, of course, but it's not to create unnecessary busy work for everybody.

And right now we've got -- and I know we're well intended, and, you know, these numbers kind of shook out the way -- after the grid map was developed, and we started in the southeast corner of the state.

And maybe in hindsight we should have started out
with letters or something like that so we wouldn't be sort of -- think that we're committed to a numbering scheme.

But I would just -- right now we've got 14 in the southeast corner, which is bordered by two and nine and seven, and then we've got 11 next to eight, and, you know, in some places the numbers are grouped in a systematic way, but in a lot of areas they're not.

And I would just favor, you know, give Prescott No. 1. That's a hat tip to Arizona history. I think it's appropriate.

And then perhaps proceed in a systematic way, maybe left to right across the state, and then up and down, something like that. And that probably would give us districts that by and large we would end up with numbering that kind of -- because I think that's the way the last Commission did it.

And so we'd probably end up with districts that kind of sort of -- you know, I know they're different districts and there's going to be probably in some areas really significant differences in where the districts lie, but, you know, I might -- right now I'm going to be in 28. I was in 11. You know, maybe I end up in 11 again.

And that, I think, would save a lot of people some bother.

As for the voting rights issue, which I know I
I couldn't hear all of that, but I know that was raised as a concern. You know, I think, I don't know this for sure, but I think whoever looks at this, whether it's the DOJ or a court, they're going to look at the old maps and those numbers versus what maps this Commission produces. And probably not delve into what's in between, but if they do have to delve into what's in between, you know, I think the people in Washington, D.C., can probably figure it out.

And, you know, we're -- you know, I want to look -- try to -- I think we should try to look after the people here and we can expect the smart people back there to know, you know, that -- to figure out that the numbering got changed here at the end.

So that being said, I guess I would favor if we're going to -- if there's going to be any more changes on the numbering scheme for the legislative map, you know, I would be in favor, still be in favor of starting with Prescott as No. 1 and then move, like I said, left to right and up and down, and, and put out a just sort of coherent, logical numbering scheme for the legislative districts. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other thoughts from other commissioners?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, I'm assuming that Mr. Freeman is talking about the congressional map. I may have not understood him, but if he is -- is that
correct, the congressional map?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: No, that's incorrect. I was talking about the legislative map.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Oh, I apologize.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I would support something like that on the congressional too, but I think we were just talking about legislative.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments on that?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Hindsight being 20/20, I wish we had actually used letters or something, because I think it does -- it would have been probably a better way to approach this so that people didn't get wedded to certain numbers early on.

And you're right. This came from the grid map. It came -- this numbering that's on there now is very reflective of our grid map and how that shook out.

So, I think it is confusing.

It's just my personal opinion that to go and change these now would be confusing. And, you know, from a cost perspective for each of the districts, I don't know enough about how much of an impact that is for them.

But just from a sanity factor, it seems like it's confusing to change these.

And not just for the folks in Washington, but for
people here on the ground that have been following the process, and -- but, that's my perspective.

So, I'm one commissioner.

Any other commissioners got -- have any input on that one?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I think I, I gave my input at the last hearing, and I still feel the same way.

I think it's, I think it's reflective of the grid map.

I think we start fresh every time.

I think folks will learn the new numbers quickly, as they already have as they've been following the process.

I don't think it would be a simple task to try and equate the current districts with the old districts, and I don't think that's something that we should do because the constitution requires us to start anew.

And I also am concerned about the cost in terms of time and the potential for human error in requiring the Justice Department to have to use a key to understand the thousands of pages of transcript and hundreds of thousands of pages of charts that we've done.

So I like the way that we've approached it.

Those are my thoughts.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz, if you have any
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I understand the task of the DOJ, and I understand the task of putting together this package, but I also understand that what we're doing is really disenfranchising a lot of voters who have history.

And, Madam Chair, just three days ago you were talking about you respected history in regards to the Prescott district.

There's no less history in the other parts of the state where residents and voters have become connected to their district by number. And by doing -- by renumbering this, it might be very inconvenient for DOJ, it might be inconvenient for dat, it might be inconvenient for consultants and attorneys, but we are really disfranchising our voters, and that's what we took the heat as a Commission to not do.

So I think Mr. Freeman is right on. We need to start looking back a little over our shoulders and say, let's make these -- let's not disfranchise our voters, let's not disfranchise the people that have been living in certain districts for 20 years that recognize them by number, let's take an evaluation of that.

I'm all in favor of making a change in the
numbering system to get them closer to the district numbering as they currently lie.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: You know, I agree with Commissioner McNulty. I think, you know, we started this whole process, we started with a brand-new slate, a clean slate, and we're following, you know, the guidelines that were set for us.

But I think the issue of disenfranchisement is really, you know, not with the numbering of the districts. I would guess that probably most people don't even know who their congressmen, especially their legislators are.

But I think the issue of disenfranchisement to me goes with not creating as many competitive districts. To me that's disenfranchising voters where they feel that their voices are not being heard, not with the numbering of the districts.

So thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I have a question. I have a question for Mr. Kanefield, just as former state elections director.

Do you have any comment on costs associated with renumbering or just things around this issue that we might
want to consider?

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, I really don't. It's not a legal issue. It's a policy decision for the Commission.

And as former state election director, I just can't see what the legal issues would be. Whether the Commission decides to renumber or making numbers consistent, I think that's a decision to be left to the Commission.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Can you take your counsel hat off and just answer as... 

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, Commissioner Freeman, taking my counsel hat off, it would create less confusion, in my humble opinion, if the numbers were somewhat consistent.

And that was certainly the case with the last Commission, when they chose not to align the numbers with the numbers as they had been for I don't know how many decades before.

But I grew up in District 18, which became District 11, but I still think of it as the old guard District 18 district.

So, but everybody learned to adjust, and it didn't create any issues, as I can recall as election officials, other than, you know, dealing with some voter confusion at the front end.
But that was obviously as time went on voters learned where their districts were.

So, again, it's not, it's not a legal question. It's a policy question.

And administratively, it certainly can -- the election officials will accommodate whatever numbering system the Commission decides to put in place.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Sorry, I'm locating my agenda.

(Brief pause.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, other than the numbering issue, is -- are there any other technical changes for either of the maps that need to -- any issues or things that are outstanding that we need to still address? Or is it all, all ready?

WILLIE DESMOND: I think other than the numbering, I don't think there's anything else that needs to be done.

Obviously Ms. O'Grady has mentioned these maps will be out there for a while, over the weekend, so if anybody has anything that causes any big red flags we can address that the next time the Commission meets.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, on that point, I know Maricopa County is still -- their, their verification is an ongoing process, and they'll look at what we do today and continue to verify.
And so we might have some more technical changes recommended Tuesday.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: With the splits of the Native American reservation in the Salt River, should we reach out to them just to make sure they -- that they're aware of this, in case they're not -- most people think that we're not -- so I think it might be a good idea.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I agree. That's something that we'll do. Staff and legal will reach out and make sure those are okay, those technical changes.

Okay. Well, it's 10:53, and why don't we just take a ten-minute break and come back.

And -- let me make sure.

Oh, we have public comment too, so -- I have one request to speak form. I don't know if others are going to want to speak, but maybe we can do that, but we'll take a just a short ten-minute break and then come back and finish up.

(Brief recess taken.)

(Whereupon, Mr. Kanefield left the meeting.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We'll enter back into public session.

The time is 11:11.
And I now have two request to speak forms.

And we were in the midst of discussing technical changes for both the congressional and legislative maps, and possible renumbering of the districts that was requested by Commissioners Freeman and Stertz.

Any other comments on anything with technical changes, whether numbering or anything?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I have a question for legal counsel.

Would we -- we need to wait until Maricopa County gives us more feedback before we approve the technical changes?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, Commissioner McNulty, my recommendation would be to adopt the technical changes that Mr. Desmond presented today. And I just wanted to let the Commission know there may be more, there may be a few more.

But I think it would be good to adopt those we've been presented with today, so that those are then out there and people can see what the map looks like, you know, with those technical changes included.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And what if -- if we were to do that, if there were to be an issue raised by one of the Indian nations, one of the tribes, we could address that if we felt it was necessary next week, notwithstanding that
we'd adopted these today.

    MARY O'GRADY: That's right.

    I would say just adopt the technical changes.

    We had another agenda item for adoption of the final map. I would say let's not to do that today. Let's adopt -- just I would recommend that you just adopt the technical changes and there might be further technical changes Tuesday, but hopefully not as many as we had presented today.

    COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And would we need separate motions for the two maps?

    MARY O'GRADY: I would recommend, yeah, separate motions, one for congressional technical changes and one for the legislative technical changes.

    COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Is that a separate agenda item?

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, I would entertain a motion to accept the technical changes as Mr. Desmond presented on both the legislative and congressional maps.

    Any other comments?

    COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I would move that we adopt the technical changes recommended by our mapping consultant on the congressional map.

    VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I second that motion.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any discussion?
And I should check in on Mr. Stertz.

Are you on the line?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Actually is anyone on the line? Is Mr. Kanefield on the line?

He is going to try dialing in possibly.

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It doesn't sound like Mr. Stertz is available --

(Phone interruption.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Who is this on the line?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Rick Stertz.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, great. Sorry, Mr. Stertz.

We were just talking about the technical changes and --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes. Can you hear us?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I am following online, and somehow I was disconnected, so I am aware of the motion and second.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, great. Okay. Thank you.

Any discussion for anyone?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. All in favor?
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Aye.

Any opposed?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. And I think -- does that mean we have two abstentions?

Mr. Stertz?

I got a yes from Mr. Freeman.

He'll dial back in, I'm sure.

(Phone interruption.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Sorry, Madam Chair, I was disconnected again.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No problem.

So we were just in the middle of voting. There were three ayes, one abstention from Mr. Freeman. And your vote is?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I would have to abstain.

I got the maps last night and haven't had a chance to look at them, so I'd have to abstain.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So the motion carries, three ayes and two abstentions.

And that was for the congressional map in terms of accepting the technical changes that were presented today by
Mr. Desmond.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I would move that we accept the technical changes recommended by our mapping consultant on the tentative final legislative map.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is there a second?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yes, ma'am. I would second the motion.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any discussion?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: All in favor?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Aye.

Any opposed? Any abstentions?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Unfortunately again I have to abstain because I haven't had the opportunity to review these thoroughly.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

So the motion carries, three ayes and two abstentions.
WILLIE DESMOND: Could I just mention that the maps are all available on the website now, the maps tab, and the reports as well.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great. Thank you. All the maps and the change reports are on the website.

And the change log as well?

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe so.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That would be helpful.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, yes, it is.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

Okay. So in terms of the next steps on these maps, it sounds like we're going to do some outreach and make sure the tribes are okay with the technical changes. And there's some ongoing work with Maricopa County.

MARY O'GRADY: Yes. We're doing both the outreach with the Salt River, and we'll be hearing more from Maricopa County.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Anything else?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I think we're meeting next week.

I don't know if it's something that will be an
agenda item that we discuss later on. If we were to meet on
Tuesday and we were to adopt the final map, what happens
after this?

MARY O'GRADY: Procedurally, you adopt the final
map and then you need to vote to certify whatever is adopted
to the secretary of state.

And for the certification, the mapping consultants
will generate a list that describes -- that includes the
census geography district by district, and then we'll give
that information to the secretary of state, and then we will
work on the submission. And, for both congressional and
legislative. And so that would be the next step.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, one more
question for Mary O'Grady.

How long does the submission take for you to work
on it and to actually sent it out to the Department of
Justice?

MARY O'GRADY: Well, we are working on them now,
and staff has been working on them now.

And so our hope is we'd probably get -- and we're
following up with Dr. King also for the preparation of his
final report. He'll need the final numbers.

So, you know, that will happen after, after the
final adoption is done Tuesday.

And we're hoping that last week of January for the
congressional, and probably realistically it'll take a little longer for the legislative to get in. But that's -- those are our targets.

A couple weeks for congressional and then a couple more weeks for legislative.

And if we can get it done faster, we'll get it done faster.

And we are planning on submitting a request for expedited consideration, expedited review, and we'll let them know about our election timetable that we have here in Arizona so they're aware of the time constraints that folks are under.

And along those lines, in terms of the election calendar, as I think Joe Kanefield mentioned at the earlier meeting, one of the issues in the past has been candidate signatures. They need to know where to collect the signatures, but that was dealt with legislatively last session for legislative candidates where they can collect from either the old lines or the new lines and all those signatures will be valid.

And there's legislation moving through the process now to make the same change for congressional candidates, which takes some of the pressure off. And that certainly needs to be done so they know -- they also need to know where to new lines are so they know how to calculate the
number of signatures that they need for the candidate filing deadline that's the end of May.

So, hopefully that's within an acceptable time frame for the Commission.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Ms. O'Grady, if the congressional submittal is put together first, can that be sent to the Department of Justice independently so they can begin working on that?

MARY O'GRADY: Yes. That's our, that's our plan.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any comments from commissioners on the timing proposed?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: My only comment would be I would like to see the legislative map done in less than two weeks after the congressional map.

And anything that we can do to help with that, I hope you'll let us know.

I view this like a construction project. You know, we just need to put people on it to get it done.

MARY O'GRADY: Okay. And part of it also we are working with Dr. King to get the expert report done and then trying to save all that time and work.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: You're working on the narrative, will you be providing that to us to review as far
in advance of the date on which you want to send everything off as possible?

MARY O'GRADY: Sure. We'll do that. When we get something that's comfortable worth your time reviewing, we will send it to you. And we are -- you know, we'll see the final numbers plugged in so that we can construct the tables and that sort of thing.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I agree that we should be getting the information, especially the narrative, before final submittal. But I also agree that we -- that giving us this information, that there should be nothing that we do in our end, the commissioners, that delay the process. So you would give us a date when you would submit the information to us and also a deadline of when we would get back to you on comments so we aren't delaying anything at all.

And also if the -- if it would help if the staff, Mr. Bladine or Ms. Gomez, to hire more staff to -- if that helps at all, to speed up the process, to do any of the dirty work, that I would recommend we do that.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, and I think we're good in terms of staffing levels.

And staff has been great in terms of their
support.

   And we're -- one of the things we're doing is picking a date when the record is closed in terms of the meeting articles and public input that we've been collecting.

   But that will be after final adoption is done. We'll leave the record open for a day or two, and then shut that also so we can start putting those exhibits together.

   CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments from commissioners?

   (No oral response.)

   CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

   Thank you.

   That takes us to review and discussion of possible future agenda items.

   The Commission is again meeting next week on Tuesday at 9:00 a.m., at the Fiesta Inn.

   VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: No.

   CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Where are we meeting?

   VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Not here.

   CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We're not meeting at the Fiesta Inn.

   Mr. Bladine's coming up. I'm so used to meeting here that I just assume it's here.
RAY BLADINE: Madam Chair, it is at the Sheraton just right down the block where we met once before. There wasn't room here to accommodate us on Tuesday at 9:00.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. And it's at 9:00 a.m. Okay.

And any agenda items that anyone wanted to add?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: If we do indeed approve final map that day, I would recommend -- you know, I'm happy to bring a cake, because I think that will be a big day for all of us, considering all the time that we've put in, the staff, the attorneys, and also for the rest of the Commission.

It doesn't have to be agenda item.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It's on the record now though.

RAY BLADINE: Is he telling me to go eat cake?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Do we need to have the DOJ submittal as a separate agenda item for any reason, or is that something that we can discuss in conjunction with approving the maps if we do so?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, I think -- and, Commissioner McNulty, I think that's part of the discussion,
approval of maps. But we can add it. If there's time, we can -- there's not time. I think that's part and parcel of our work on the final maps.

RAY BLADINE: Madam Chair, I was shaking my head no. And I guess we do have -- we could -- if we were to change it, we have to use Sunday and Saturday again for the 48 hours.

But if it's a part of the approval, it would seem to me to be better.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Oh, I'm sorry, you already did the agenda.

RAY BLADINE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Oh, okay. I don't care. Thanks.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, I do have one agenda item.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Go ahead.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: The -- and, Mr. Bladine, if you can on Tuesday at that meeting give us a final wrap-up of the number of people that, you know, we've have reached out to, whether it be watching the meetings by streaming, the people -- anybody that has sent us e-mails, the number of organizations that have sent correspondence to us, anything like that, that will give us at least a close to final picture as possible on the number of people that we
have reached out to, just give us a nice summary.

RAY BLADINE: Madam Chair, we're -- and
councilman -- councilman, boy, am I going back --
Commissioner Herrera, we have started to pull that together,
and thought we would try to get a press release right after
your final meeting.

But we can certainly pull together what we have at
this point, which would be like you said most of it.

I can't resist. I saw a statistic just this
morning that during the hearings we traveled 28,000 miles on
state vehicles. The last Commission traveled around
10,000 miles.

No wonder we're all worn out.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Especially, you know, as much
information as you can give us on majority-minority
districts, congressional and also the legislative. What I
want to do is put as much on the record as possible.

RAY BLADINE: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Bladine, did you just
say state vehicles?

RAY BLADINE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That doesn't count, our own
personal vehicles?

RAY BLADINE: No.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Well, then we've been to the moon and back.

RAY BLADINE: Amen.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments?
(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

RAY BLADINE: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

So we'll go to public comment now. I have two request to speak forms.

Our first speaker is Steve Muratore, publisher Arizona Eagletarian.

STEVE MURATORE: Madam Chair, commissioners, my name is Steve Muratore, M-U-R-A-T-O-R-E.

And I just wanted to speak briefly to the issue of renumbering districts.

The thing that occurs to me is that during the discussion earlier I don't recall that, that you had asked Strategic Telemetry for their input on that discussion and that decision.

I think that if the -- if there is no material obstacle that making the changes would present, it seems like it would be advantageous for people feeling inclusive to accommodate as much as possible.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.
And our next speaker is Bill Roe, representing self, from Tuesday.

BILL ROE: Madam Chair and commissioners, I'm Bill Roe, R-O-E. From Tucson.

And, I just wanted a comment for a minute or two on the history of this saga.

For me it began 27 months ago in the fall of 2009 at the meeting of the Commission of Appellate Court Appointments where they dusted off their rules from ten years ago.

And they talked about how are we going to do this next redistricting process from their role in choosing Commission nominees.

And I would just reflect some changes in how we operated as a society.

There were three points of discussion. They didn't think they needed to change their rules very much.

One was they had concern in that first Commission about public awareness of the process and how were they going to get enough people to apply to be commissioners. And this is for ten years ago.

And so they actively on the Commission on Judicial Court Appointments, they actively had the Commission members solicit people to apply.

They had 380 applications in that first cycle.
This cycle, they did not do that. They decided it was well covered in the press and they would not. And we ended up with 79 applicants.

California had 38,000 applicants this go-around and their first go at it.

So that was one, one change.

Then they talked about at some length what's the relationship of the commissioners and the Commission of Appellant Court Appointment to people who talked to them about applying.

And they set the same rules. Clearly the deal with judge -- judicial applicants, where every single contact is reported at the beginning of a meeting.

And I think those of you who were all at those meetings when you were interviewed you will remember at the beginning of each meeting they identified who they had spoken to, even if it was a really remote connection.

And the third item of interest was in their discussion of their rules from ten years ago, ten years ago there was absolutely no mention of internet in the rules.

The internet was not utilized at all, and it wasn't discussed in the rules for the Commission of Appellate Court Appointment.

I think that's a dramatic difference in the world from ten years ago and now.
I just wanted to thank all of you. I often thank my lucky stars that I ended up not being appointed. I can sit back and observe this process. But it has been extraordinarily instructive over the last 27 months. It has been interesting.

And I -- all of you, both staff, lawyers, Strategic Telemetry, and commissioners, you deserve our thanks of the state for persevering through to a conclusion that we have now.

And just two sartorial notes. Last summer when we were in the third floor of the executive tower and the air circulation did not work well and the air conditioning did not work well, we were in a packed room, Mr. Strasma looked so uncomfortable that day in his tie and his suit, and today he looks far more comfortable.

And then, likewise, just an award for I think the best dressed person goes to Mr. Herrera, who I often felt strongly had the best choice of shirts and neck ties. And when I complimented him on them, he said, oh, he didn't choose them, it was his twin brother in New York.

But, anyways, thank you very much for your perseverance.

I've learned a lot.

I think many of us have learned a lot, and the state of Arizona should be extremely grateful for all of
your hard work.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wanted to address the Commission?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Well, seeing, hearing none, I want to thank Mr. Strasma. He won't be here on Tuesday when we meet again, so thank you very much for all your assistance and for being here this week, and of course all previous weeks.

And anything else from other commissioners before I hang it up?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. The time is 11:38 a.m., and we will adjourn this meeting.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned.)
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