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CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Good afternoon.

This meeting of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission will now come to order.

The time is 12:22 p.m., and the date is Monday, September 26th. Let's start with the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge was recited.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We'll begin with call to order.

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.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We have a quorum.

Around the table today we have Michelle acting as court reporter. So be sure to speak very clearly and directly into the microphone if you
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should come up and address us today. And spell your
name for the record so that we get an accurate
accounting.

Our legal counsel, Joe Kanefield and Mary
O'Grady. Our mapping consultant, Ken Strasma and
Mr. Willie Desmond. And it is his birthday today.
Happy birthday, Willie.

And Mr. Strasma.

KEN STRASMA: And Karin's birthday as
well.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, wonderful.

Happy birthday to, to Karin, too.

And other folks around the room is our
staff. Ray Bladine is our executive director. We
have -- Kristi Olson is a public outreach
coordinator for us, Stu Robinson is our public
information officer, and then Buck Forst is our
chief technology officer.

So I think that's everybody.

With that, we will move into the next
item on the agenda, which is map presentations. And
I think I have been told we have a few folks who
would like to come and actually present maps to us.

Our first one is from Tommie Martin,
Supervisor for District 1, Gila County.
TOMMIE MARTIN: I'm rolling today.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, I'm sorry. I hate to see that because we saw you last week.

TOMMIE MARTIN: I can't rock; I roll. I have a cranky knee.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sorry, about that. We'll help you get that microphone.

TOMMIE MARTIN: Oh, I can stand. I just can't walk.

Thank you, Ray.

TOMMIE MARTIN: And I've handed you all a copy of my comments and we're going to have a map up here on the wall, one side or the other.

I was here last week with Richard Lunt, who calls himself a low-tech redneck. He would be proud of me today. I brought a little cat toy that has a pointer on it to point.

So in keeping with Richard's low-tech redneck conversation -- see, it makes a little -- I'm going to read to you this presentation so that I don't miss any points.

I came before you last Thursday with Richard Lunt from Greenlee County to ask you to consider --

(Interruption by the court reporter.)
TOMMIE MARTIN: Tommie Martin,
T-o-m-m-i-e, Martin, M-a-r-t-i-n.

I came before you last Thursday with
Richard Lunt of Greenlee County to ask you to
consider the concept of a map that offers rural
metro equity in the new congressional district
layout.

We discussed the fact that one in five
people in Arizona live in the rural areas of this
state. And we feel we need, as well as deserve, two
rural congressmen devoted to our rural issues
without them being clouded by metro issues.

As we discussed, people in Douglas or
Window Rock or Kingman, Show Low or Wickenburg share
the same basic rural issues, needs, and perspectives
and they are very different than the metro's issues,
needs, and perspectives.

We talked to you guys about metro and
rural looking at land together and the metro folks
will look at the open land as places to play and the
rural folks look at those same lands as places to
work, make a living, and live.

Also we look at water -- the metro folks
as a commodity and we look at it as a resource. As
to that point, for instance, in Payson we us 79
gallons of water per person per day. Metro Phoenix uses 190 gallons of water per day.

We don't approach anything like that usage. Payson is quite slim on usage, but you'll find that rural town to rural town.

We are sending you back with our finalized effort, and here it is. It doesn't look exactly like the concept map we came with last week because after listening to the heartfelt concerns of the Hispanic and Tohono O'odham ask for a Yuma/Tucson/West Phoenix footprint, we decided we could accommodate that and still get two rural districts, and we did.

The two rural districts, numbered 4 and 5, are rural, and number 4 basically answers the Navajo Human Rights Commission Act as well.

The Yuma/Tucson/West Phoenix, number 2 footprint, goes along with what the Hispanic Coalition/Tohono O'odham asked and gives us one of the two mandatory Hispanic majority districts in Arizona.

Our other one is around Maryvale, number 7. And you won't see number 7 there because the numbers are too close, but number 7 is there and the other one.
We also heard concerns about the complexities of each of the three major border crossings, particularly what we thought was a NAFTA international border corridor extending out of Nogales.

We think our District Number 1 helps to accommodate this, giving a total of three border districts, each with their similar but different crossing concerns.

As a result, we have seven distinct metro districts: Numbers 1; 2, Hispanic majority; 3; 6; 7, Hispanic majority; 8 and 9; and two rural districts, 4 and 5. They all have less than a 1 percent total population deviation.

Arizona is a large and diverse state with much of rural Arizona owned or controlled by the federal government. It's imperative that we have representatives who are familiar with the myriad of federal lands issues as well as private lands issues, rural water, road transportation, rural communications, rural health, and so on issues.

We acknowledge that these two rural districts are geographically large for one person to cover.

That's just part of our constitutional
system. For example, our largest state, Alaska, has over 663,000 square miles and a single representative. Wyoming has 97,000 square miles with one and Montana over 147,000 with one.

By comparison, our proposed CD 4 has less than 40,000 square miles and CD 5 has 60,000 square miles. Arizonans are living in the sixth largest state.

The size and scope may very well swamp someone more used to compact city life, but this is the reality of rural living in Arizona, vast tracts of federal lands with pockets of civilization many miles apart.

We need congressmen from these areas who understand and speak rural issues because they live them. It's also very hard to understand the scale of rural projects, transportation, energy development, watershed management, and so forth unless you live there.

Over one-fifth of the people in Arizona have chosen to live outside the major metro areas. They deserve equal representation with those folks who choose to live in the metro areas. We don't want the rural interests diluted, clouded, or overwhelmed by the metro interests or vice versa.
The great concentration of population in Arizona is in the south corridor between the Phoenix and Tucson metro area. Our map recognizes this and depicts how seven basically metro-based CDs could be distributed within this area.

Our map is not dissimilar to the map submitted by the Navajo Human Rights commissioner, option C to the grid, as others are attempting to provide rural representation in the state, especially the mostly rural reservations.

As to diversity, our District 5 is nearly 41 percent minority, almost evenly split between Native American and Hispanic. District 4 is a little over 18 percent.

In summary, we believe we need three representatives in D.C. who are intimately familiar with our border issues and focused on the different facets such as Native American homeland splits, international goods corridor, backcountry clashes so on.

We need at least two representatives who can speak to the rural issues of large reservations, transportation, national forests, federal lands, biomass, wildfire, water quality and quantity, agriculture, mining, and ranching, just to name a
few, because these issues are viewed very
differently from a rural perspective.

We also need representatives who can work
on the metro issues without rural issue
distractions.

In conclusion, we would like to urge the
Independent Redistricting Commission to think
differently about how Arizona could be configured to
protect the interests of those who have chosen not
to live in the metro areas while simultaneously
ensuring equal representation.

We appeal to you to give serious
consideration to the rural metro equity map. We are
not asking for more than we deserve and we feel we
shouldn't have to settle for less either.

I also have a bullet point, again, to go
with this just as reiteration.

This map provides for two rural districts
and seven metro districts. It respects the Hispanic
Coalition/Tohono O'odham request for a Yuma/Tucson.
It has two Hispanic majority districts.

District 2 is 51.59 percent Hispanic and
61.83 percent total minority.

District 7, the one you can't see up
there, is 58.40 percent Hispanic and 71.89 percent
It basically follows a Navajo Human Rights Commission map concept.

Rural District 5 is nearly 41 percent minority, almost evenly split between Native American and Hispanic. Rural District 4 is a little over 18 percent minority.

The plan provides for three congressmen along the Arizona/Mexico border. Less than 1 percent total population deviation among all of the districts.

Rural district sizing should not be a problem. District 4 is less than 40,000 square miles and 5 is about 60,000 square miles. The area of these districts are one-tenth the size of Alaska, one-third the size of Montana, and one-half the size of Wyoming, all having one representative. It also provides your congressional representative equity for both rural and metro areas of Arizona.

And the map that I have provided you is not only the total map that you are looking at there, you can see that one of the things we did do on the -- up here, it's not quite the same configuration that they had because we have taken all of the rural that we could.
We realize that we have left in Pinal County -- we split Pinal County with what we think is the rural from the metro. We have taken some of Apache Junction, we have taken Fountain Hills, we have left Anthem in. We have left Buckeye and White Tanks and that crowd in.

We realize that there is -- there is urban in those two maps, but we think Prescott is somewhat urban and Flagstaff is somewhat urban. The concern with us is the metro conversation.

We think that transportation -- that the metro needs to be looking at some high-speed traffic -- some high-speed transportation issues. Issues that I have, transportation in Gila County is 20 miles of getting a dirt road paved. Totally different conversation and doesn't carry the same weight. When I'm talking to somebody that says, you know, I've got how many umpteen thousand people needing some high-traffic, high-speed transportation.

I also have given you a map with the detail, you'll see there, of the -- both the metro and the Tucson configuration and then the figures.

I cannot speak to the competitiveness of this. We just this morning submitted it to John
Mills and he might be able to -- I don't know if he's had time to even look at it to get to give us competitiveness figures, but if he does, you can hear it from him.

Do you guys have any questions?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: From who again?

TOMMIE MARTIN: John Mills. We submitted it to him this morning. And I also sent it to Forst yesterday. So you guys have the actual data files to go along with this.

Larry Stephenson may want to talk to some of this, but while I'm standing here, I wonder if you all had any questions of me.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any questions for Supervisor Martin?

Okay.

TOMMIE MARTIN: Madame Chair, I sure thank you for the opportunity to present this and you may see Richard tomorrow.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great. Well, we appreciate all of the hard work that went into it and thank you for coming to present the data at another time.

TOMMIE MARTIN: You bet. We did our level best to try to make it not a single-issue map
and, in fact, fit all of the issues in that we knew about that we had heard about and are thinking about.

Larry?
Thank you again.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you, ma'am.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So our next speaker is David Snider, Pinal County Supervisor representing Pinal County -- Pinal Urban Alliance.

Excuse me, I'm sorry, that's the order I was given. Was there somebody that I was supposed to --

Did you want to speak?

DAVID SNIDER: Madame Chairman, I'm more than happy to let him finish the eastern county.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I appreciate that.

Thank you.

I don't have --

LARRY STEPHENSON: My name is Larry Stephenson. I am the executive director of Eastern Arizona Counties Organization, a rural group of counties, Graham, Greenlee, Gila, Apache, and Navajo Counties.

That's Stephenson, S-t-e-p-h-e-n-s-o-n.
We presented something, as Supervisor Martin said, last Thursday and this is a refinement of that, as the term "modification" says.

She said -- I just want to reinforce, we tried to listen to the different concerns, but basically showed that there can still be two rural districts without carving kind of a pie-shape district going into the urban area and then out to the rural areas, but two distinct rural districts.

Within the metro areas, as you folks well know, there's a variety of ways -- myriad of ways to carve it up, and we don't claim to be the experts in the metro area. There may be a different way that would be better. We don't claim that the metro districts are perfect, but we do say that they meet the criteria of balance and so on. So I want to reiterate that.

We would be happy to answer any questions about how we arrived at this map or didn't. And I know that the challenge before the Commission is how to carve up the state into the nine congressional districts, and we're suggesting one way that's a little different way to do it while respecting the wishes of the people that live in the rural areas as well as the metro areas and all of the various other
criteria you have to fit districts into.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any questions?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I had a couple sort of just practical questions that I have that either one of you could answer.

In regards to the concept of rural districts, as they have taken place in the past, rural districts have needed to have -- to touch into the urban areas to be able to get population to be able to fit out the first criteria -- the second criteria on our list, which is that we've got equal population in all of our districts.

Tell me in your opinion what that does to, one, the electability of someone from the rural area being able to represent rural areas by having a population center that is touching into it, and second, what representation that may not be taking place of the concerns of the rural parts of the state because of that -- of where that representative may be from.

I'll defer to Supervisor Martin, although
I have my opinions.

TOMMIE MARTIN: Let me see if I can bring it to me.

You're wondering about -- when we touch the urban areas, how -- would you repeat that again?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Well, it's a two-point question.

In some of the map discussions that we currently have that we've been reviewing, the large rural masses -- mass of land have to pick up population off of the urban areas to be able to meet the constitutional requirements of equal population.

My question was, was that -- where do you see someone being elected from? And if they are elected from the urban mass area, do you see that that negatively impacts the desires and the needs of those living in the rural areas?

TOMMIE MARTIN: Right now we have someone elected -- we have a rural district that is fairly large and right now we have someone out in Flagstaff. Before that we had that -- we're thinking that Prescott may be another urbanized area that somebody would run from.

We realize that probably you're going to peel people out of those urban places, very likely,
but we also believe that the place -- what we picked up -- we picked up Fountain Hills, we picked up Carefree. There could be someone there, but they still are basically -- they are not in the metro-concerned areas. They are still living out because they like to live out, which is very similar to the rest of us wanting to live out.

I think they could be very well-represented. I think they would not be elected if they didn't have something in common with that electorate.

But right now we can get someone elected except for the one district that we have that has nothing in common with that metro core and therefore come out of the metro core.

And I know personally, when I go and talk to them, we have -- we have a bridge in Gila County that is halfway built and needs finished. And when I talked to our guy, he says, you know, I'm not on the transportation committee. I can get you to talk to the guy on the transportation committee. So I'll go talk to him. He'll say, you know your folks don't elect me.

It's a huge catch 22 all the way down the line.
We just felt like if we could have two rural congressmen, both focused rural, both being able to work together, we could reach into twice as many committees, we could reach into -- the two of them are greater than the sum of one and one at that level.

We would have far more help at that level, and the folks would not be coming out of downtown Phoenix. We wouldn't be listening to, well, you know what, Glendale elects me. You know what, Tucson elects me. You know what -- at least they would be talking about folks that are on the edge.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

TOMMIE MARTIN: Does that answer --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: It does.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Supervisor, the issue of, you know, having a representative that listens to his or her constituents is really an important one.

As you know, we have nine congressional districts and not everyone can have their ideal representative.

But do you think the issue of competitiveness might help that issue out with a
particular legislator not listening to everyone in his or her district?

    TOMMIE MARTIN: No, because I still think if you have -- it's like a piece of pie. If it narrows down into the metro area, just like you eat pie, you're going to start at that tip and eat your way back. By the time you get to us, we're crust. I really think that we need people who live those issues, understand them from the bottom of their feet and can speak to them from a rural standpoint.

    I also think the same is true with the metro. And when we elect these guys, we have two years. It takes two years just to get them to understand our issues and then they are replaced. We would like to have them hit the ground running.

    VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Let me -- so your representative is currently is Flagstaff?

    TOMMIE MARTIN: Currently is. In fact, on the competitiveness area, in the last ten years in that large rural area that I'm in currently, we've had a Republican and then a Democrat and then a Republican.

    I think it's -- I think that district -- I think they both would be up for grabs, from a
competitive standpoint. It will be interesting to see what those figures look like.

I think it's very good. The more competitive, the better, but to me, more important than that is a rural human who understands rural issues.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair, one more question.

That particular -- where would Fountain Hills be, in which district?

TOMMIE MARTIN: Actually, it would be in 4.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: It would be in rural District 4?

TOMMIE MARTIN: It will.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: What if someone from Fountain Hills gets elected on your proposed map?

TOMMIE MARTIN: I think that they are more like the people in Prescott and in Kingman than they are in downtown Phoenix. I think they move out to Fountain Hills because they like that buffer. And that buffer area, the mores of a rural population are still there in that buffer, and we recognize that.

We also know that there's going to be
areas probably in Pinal County that we have thrown in with what we call metro that are still rural but they aren't going to be for long.

And a lot of the -- we didn't bring in Anthem because it feels far more metro, but we did bring in Fountain Hills.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: So you feel a representative from Fountain Hills would be able -- let's just say hypothetically your map was adopted and someone coming from Fountain Hills would represent you better than someone from Flagstaff? Is that what you're saying?

TOMMIE MARTIN: I don't mean in Flagstaff. I think maybe as well as someone in Prescott, because 4 has Prescott in it and that Colorado River corridor. I really do, because they don't have that mass of people lumped together that they have to answer to that absolutely overwhelms the rural population.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Sure. And I would love to see what the competitiveness in each of the districts is. What do you think the earliest is we could get that?

TOMMIE MARTIN: I think you need to talk to John Mills, because I don't have the -- I didn't
have the data to run that. I have the data to run everything up to that. And we just didn't put it in, and I'm very interested in that data.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: The reason I ask about competitiveness is it's one of six criteria, just as important as the other five. So I want to make sure that -- if you can submit that as soon as possible so we can review that.

TOMMIE MARTIN: As soon as we get it, you're going to have it. You may have it quicker than we do.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I look forward to talking to John.

TOMMIE MARTIN: Did you have a different take on that?

LARRY STEPHENSON: I was just going to reinforce the same thing.

Madame Chairman, members of the Commission, some of -- Fountain Hills in the hypothetical situation you addressed is limited in the amount of urban population that they would represent. It's not going all the way into Scottsdale to downtown Phoenix. It's more limited constituent and issues. And the rural-type issues are going to predominate, although, you know,
there's going to be some that are urban -- whatever you want to call the issues.

But I think the predominant emphasis would be answering to the rural-type issues, including those that are neighboring to Fountain Hills.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I've seen some great maps. It gets a little difficult creating a truly rural area getting away from Phoenix. So I just want to make the point it is -- I wouldn't consider Fountain Hills and Cave Creek rural, but I understand why you included it, because it is not easy to every community out of 4 and 5. So I can definitely see what you are guys are doing. So I just wanted to --

TOMMIE MARTIN: Especially when we put the Tucson/Yuma/West Phoenix quadrant in there to answer that task, that then began to push us farther into Phoenix. But it was worth it, we felt like, to allow that task. It looks like it's a reasonable task.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: All I was getting at is --
TOMMIE MARTIN: How hard it is --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: -- how hard it is and, you know, there's different versions of the map.

TOMMIE MARTIN: We've spent hours --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Sure. There's some areas -- rural areas that I wouldn't consider them rural. But again, it's not as simple as saying, oh, let's do this map because there's going to be areas that will be included.

TOMMIE MARTIN: You have a huge task.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you both.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much.

Sorry, Mr. Freeman has a question.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I would agree with Commissioner Herrera. It's a tough balancing act and not everyone is going to get what they want.

Just on the issue of Fountain Hills, I don't remember the last time I've been out there, but it's pretty closely tied to Scottsdale and Phoenix. A lot of people who live out there are actually, I know, commuting and working in midtown or downtown.

Putting that aside, I just had a question, and I don't mean to put you on the spot
about any of these lines, but it looks like your
District 1, which cuts through Tucson, I see that
it's splitting off the eastern portion of Pima
County.

I presume that's to add a little more
population to that District 5, and that area of Pima
County is essentially rural. Santa Cruz County is
split as well.

Do you know what the mind-set of the
driving force behind that split was?

LARRY STEPHENSON: Yes, Commissioner
Freeman, that is correct. Both eastern Pima County
and eastern Santa Cruz County are essentially rural,
as you stated, and we took in the area of Santa Cruz
County, for example, around Elgin, Sonoita, that
area on the eastern part -- that's different from
the Nogales part -- and similarly just north of
there the rural parts of Pima County.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: And you'll get the
shape files and the data files to our mapping
consultant?

LARRY STEPHENSON: Yes, uh-huh.
TOMMIE MARTIN: Yes.
LARRY STEPHENSON: Yes, they have been
submitted.
TOMMIE MARTIN: I just sent them to Forst.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any other comments or questions?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I do have a question.

I'm looking at the map of the current congressional districts. Could you just -- I think you mentioned this earlier, but what are the metropolitan areas that are within the congressional district now that concern you? What part of the urban areas?

TOMMIE MARTIN: In the current one, we don't. We were looking to see if we could get two that were truly -- there's quite a bit of developing rural that's developing metro that we simply wanted to back away from and see if we couldn't get to -- a fifth of the population is rural and we just felt like they deserve two congressmen. It's about the same percentage as the Hispanic.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So your concern was more with the --

TOMMIE MARTIN: Getting a --
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: -- a border
district because the east -- the east rural district
really is pretty rural at this point?

TOMMIE MARTIN: It is.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I imagine a
district could be more rural than this one is right
now.

Okay. I would just make one more
comment.

We hear a lot -- we have heard and we are
very diligently considering all of the issues that
are unique to rural areas. But having lived in the
state for many, many years and married to a boy who
grew up in Bisbee, who is a daughter of a woman who
grew up in Duncan when the Apaches used to steal all
of her stuff out of her kitchen, I know that we have
a lot more in common than we do that divide us, both
urban and rural people.

The urban folks spend a lot of time
enjoying the rural areas, rural folks buying goods
and services from the urban areas. Although that
isn't to say at all that I'm discounting your map or
any of this conversation, but it is to say that I
think it's critical that we recognize that we're a
state first and foremost for Arizona and that we
kind of fit together like a hand in glove. We each offer something to the other. And while we do have our differences, as I said, I believe we have more in common than not. I just wanted to make that point.

TOMMIE MARTIN: Madame Chair, this is not to isolate us, it's to strenuous us, both the metro and the rural.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I understand, and I -- I understand your point, that if you have a percentage of the population, a rural district that is decisive and it is from a metro area, that maybe the voices of the rural folks aren't heard because that representative is speaking so much -- spends so much of his or her time on the metro issues. I understand that completely. I do. I'm not discounting that at all.

I also do think that Mr. Herrera's point is a very important one. I think if -- and that's part of what this exercise is all about.

If representatives know that in order to get reelected they have to pay attention to all of their constituents, because if they don't, there's a good likelihood that they will get thrown out in the next election, I think they are much more likely to
be responsive. So I do think that's part of it also.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Thank you very much, again, both of you for coming.

TOMMIE MARTIN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is David Snider, Pinal County Supervisor, representing Pinal Government Alliance.

DAVID SNIDER: Good afternoon, Madame Chair, members of the Commission. Welcome to Pinal County. It's good to have you back.

I remember one of your very early Commission meetings, which was held in the Casa Grande City Council chambers, and I remember remarking at the time that you really have the unenviable task of not only dealing with bathwater and babies but pushing in balloons to make them all come out symmetrically, which is pretty tough to do.

And inasmuch as Pinal County is now going from a three-member board to a five-member board, I feel your pain. And I know that we collectively all wish this was going to be over soon and successfully and then we'll be done with it and move on to real life.
At any rate, I'm here to re-present the Pinal County Governmental Alliance maps. If the mapping man over there behind the curtain can bring that back up again, I would appreciate that.

I have a couple of points that I would like to -- that's not the one.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Pinal County --

DAVID SNIDER: Pinal County Governmental Alliance.

While we're retrieving that, I would like to make a couple of quick observations.

First of all, the Alliance map is, in fact, constitutional. It meets every single criteria that is called for by the Constitution.

It does a number of things. It does create two rural districts, as you can see. The yellow one on our right is District 9, and that is rural. And on your left, District 1, is the river district, and it is rural as well.

At this point -- Supervisor Martin and I are good friends. We've worked closely together over the last couple of terms in the County Supervisor's Association and legislative issues.

And there comes a time when the definition of rural is in the eye of the beholder,
and certainly we feel that the Alliance map does just that, it creates two rural districts.

I will tell you that western Pinal County is very agrarian. We have pockets of high residential concentration, but by and large, agriculture is still 25 percent of our county's economy. And we have mining interests, we have agricultural interests, a great deal of that. And so we have and will continue to have a close alignment and association with the eastern counties.

And if you will look, with the exception of this -- the Santa Cruz -- excuse me, Cochise County, which is in this -- our District 8, we do a lot of what the eastern county map does.

There were some comments made last week at one of your hearings about the Alliance map being a Republican map. And, quite frankly, I disagree. It is a map of Arizona that meets all of the criteria. It meets the requirements of the Voter's Rights Act and we have two minority-majority districts, CD 4 and CD 7, on our map.

CD 4 was at 51.8 percent Hispanic voting age. And with our map, it now at 57 percent. CD 7 was at 44.74 percent Hispanic voters, and in our map is at 54 percent.
We feel that we have more than met the criteria and the challenge to create two minority-majority districts.

Equal population, quite frankly, our map shows that each district has over 7,010 -- I'm bad with those -- 710,200 people per district. And the breakdown will show you that each district is within 29 people of meeting that criteria of equal population. And, in fact, our CD 7 is right on the money, unless somebody got married and had a kid between now and when we put the map together.

Geographically compact and contiguous, I think you can see we have met that challenge. The only place where you might want to challenge us is, obviously, we've left -- we left an offset for the Hopi Nation. And if, as I understand, the Hopi Nation is steadfast in its intent to be included with the Navajo Nation, the Alliance map could very easily accommodate that.

And we would propose to move the northwestern -- excuse me, the southwestern border of our region 9 -- or our District 9 above the I-40 to accommodate the change in population.

Communities of interest, as I said, two rural districts. It does not split any Indian
reservations. CD 1, the western district, is, in fact, a river district.

Yuma, it puts agricultural and irrigation districts in the river district and the Verde Valley keeps those cities with Flagstaff, as they themselves see themselves as a community of interest.

County boundary lines, I know that's a charge and an issue of concern for you.

The Pinal County Alliance map keeps eight counties whole: Graham, Greenlee, Gila, Apache, Mohave, La Paz, and Santa Cruz. And it divides five counties only once: Yuma, Pima, Cochise, Pinal, and Navajo.

And as I said, if Hopi chooses to merge with the Navajos for the purposes of a congressional representative, then Navajo County would be whole.

City boundary lines, it is your intent, as well as ours, to keep all cities whole. And with the exception of the Greater Phoenix area, the Greater Tucson area and the city of Yuma, we have done so in the Alliance map.

In terms of competitiveness, both are strictly off the voter registration numbers, and a registration advantage of 4 percent between
Republicans and Democrats. Five districts in the Alliance map are leaning Republican, three are leaning Democrat, and one is a swing district. Again, meeting the challenges that you set for all of us and yourselves as you consider.

Our differences with the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government and the river district what-if maps is that their CD 7, which is called CD 2 on the river district what-if, is 46.5 percent Hispanic voting age. The Alliance map shows a very similarly drawn district with 54 percent HVAP. It takes more than 56,000 in total population from Pinal County, 14 percent, to make up their 6 percent for river districts what-if.

At any rate, not to go on, because you do have this information from our prior presentation, we feel that, quite frankly, the Alliance map, although entered early, is consistently constitutional, compact, competitive, and, quite frankly, meets all of the tests that you are administering to any map presentation.

I thank you for your time and would be happy to answer questions.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: A quick question. You have -- currently you have three supervisors in Pinal?

DAVID SNIDER: Thank is correct.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: How many of these supervisors are in favor of this particular map?

DAVID SNIDER: Well, I know what you are referring to, and the Pinal County Board of Supervisors has not taken a formal position with regard to any of -- any map that has come before the Commission.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: We had Pete Rios address the Commission.

DAVID SNIDER: And you had Bryan Martin do the same.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: But they haven't come out in favor of the map.

DAVID SNIDER: And neither have they come out in opposition, aside from the fact that each one of those individuals has expressed a personal opinion, as I am doing today, in favor of now three maps.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Who makes up your organization?

DAVID SNIDER: The Pinal County
Governmental Alliance is a consortium, if you will, of seven or eight Pinal County cities, excluding Mammoth and Superior; the Pinal County Community College district, also known as Central Arizona College; the county government; three irrigation and drainage districts; and the Salt River Project.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

DAVID SNIDER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I do have a question.

What's been the population increase in Pinal County in the last ten years?

DAVID SNIDER: Oh, it's close to a hundred percent. In the 2000 census, I believe we were at 178,000 and change. In the 2010 census, we came in at 378,000.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Is that continuing, albeit at a slower rate?

DAVID SNIDER: We do continue to add population but not nearly at the same rate. It's probably in the area of less than 5 percent. It really has slowed down a great deal.
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Where has most of that been?

DAVID SNIDER: It's been in a couple of places. It's been in what is now termed the San Tan Valley area, which is near Queen Creek south of Apache Junction and north of Florence; the city of Maricopa, which is in the western -- northwestern quadrant; the city of Casa Grande, which is where we are today. Those are most of the areas that are -- that have collected growth.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And once the recession turns around, I'm sure your local governments are planning for that.

Where are they anticipating that the growth will continue -- or where will it be?

DAVID SNIDER: Everybody is anticipating it will happen in their backyard. I'm not trying to be cute, but Pinal County is optimistic about itself. The cities of Coolidge and Eloy, Florence, Apache Junction, all of those communities see themselves as growth areas.

And so -- and I will tell you that, quite frankly, the river areas -- the San Pedro River areas of Kearny and San Manuel and Oracle and Mammoth and Superior all see themselves as growth
areas, too. Superior is looking at the Resolution Copper Mining Project to add significant benefit, et cetera, et cetera.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: You mentioned just one split of Pinal County in this map. Where is that?

DAVID SNIDER: We have Queen Creek, I believe is the one split.

Let me ask a question of --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The Gila River Indian Reservation.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: The Gila River Indian Reservation.

DAVID SNIDER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Thank you.

DAVID SNIDER: Thank you.

And for the record, it's S-n-i-d-e-r. My apologies for not having done that first.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other questions or comments?

Thank you very much.

DAVID SNIDER: Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you for your presentation.

DAVID SNIDER: Good luck.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you. Our next presenter is Wes Harris, PC Captain LD 6-28.

WES HARRIS: Good afternoon.

It's Wes Harris, W-e-s, H-a, double r, i-s.

Thank you. This is a conceptual map, if you'll bring it up here momentarily, that gave rise from my attending numerous of these hearings.

And I'm not a map maker by any stretch of the imagination, nor do I have any access to drawing, but I'm just listening to the presentation of other people who have preceded me and came to the conclusion that perhaps by accepting the Hispanic Coalition's map without revision or alterations, you've kind of tied your hands behind your back when it comes to doing other things.

And one of those is -- if we ever get the map up.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm trying.

WES HARRIS: It was just there.

KEN STRASMA: The Internet went out just when you were about to start.

WES HARRIS: Basically what I tried to do was take a look at the map -- and it is conceptual because it's not exactly 710,000 on a couple of the
rural districts, but it does present a picture that
I think is beneficial and something that you should
consider.

For one thing, I mentioned earlier that
we don't have geographical, topographical issues on
the map, and the river district, as it exists up in
the upper -- it will be the northwest corner of the
state, is not accessible from the south in many
cases. So you might want to consider putting that
in District 1.

So basically I created a District 1 after
the county map 6d, and that wraps around the entire
upper portion of the state and comes down the south
and incorporates virtually every single Indian
reservation in it, and that gives you a population
of -- Native Americans of plus 18 of 107,220, as it
is right now.

The one portion that I could not extract
from the river district, which is the lower portion
of the, I guess, Navajo/Pai district reservation --
there it is.

If you look at the District 4, I would
propose, if I could technically do this, which I
haven't been able to do yet, is to pull that
reservation and actually include that little portion
that's in 4, push it back up into 1. That whole area -- pink area is District 1 and it wraps all the way around. And as you can see, it picks up every single Indian reservation and runs all the way down --

If we can get to the right-hand side, the east side. There it is. -- it comes all the way down incorporates Navajo and Apache Counties all the way down into La Paz and it goes in and picks up the reservation that, quite frankly, is undercut by the Hispanic Coalition. Because here is an Indian reservation that's sitting right in the middle of what is the Hispanic Coalition's map -- proposed map and it separates the east side of that from the west side, which would be Yuma.

So I have not split the city of Yuma. I kept Yuma in District 4 and I've created a District 3, redrawn, if you will, a majority-minority district, which is now 3, which would be 7 as it currently exists -- I believe it is 7. Is it 7?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

WES HARRIS: And we need to have some -- I need to pick up some more there, about 7,000 more residents to make District 3 710,000. Right now
it's sitting at 703.

I didn't touch District 2. I didn't touch any of the other districts that were on this map with the exception of 1, 4, and 3. And what this does is it gives the Native Americans 107. And I think another 10,000, if you can pick up that little portion of that, you can get it, which would give them a fairly good voice in the election, any representative from that particular rural district. And it's primarily all rural, as is District 4, with the exception of Yuma being included in it.

I think that will give them some representation and very strong voice. So I urge you to give this consideration. I have to go back to the drawing board and try to tweak it as soon as I can figure out how I can take little tiny segments, which I haven't been able to do.

But that's basically my idea. I hope you'll give it some consideration because I think it is viable and it accomplishes the things that we're trying to do all the way around.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much. Any questions for Mr. Harris? Thank you. Okay. I think I have one member of the
public who would like to comment on one of the map
presentations.

David Cantelme, representing FAIR Trust
from Cave Creek.

DAVID CANTELME: David Cantelme. It's
spelled C-a-n-t-e-l-m-e, from Cave Creek,
representing the FAIR Trust.

Madame Chairman, members of the
Commission, I rise to speak in support of the
concept articulated by Supervisor Tommie Martin that
we have two rural districts; however, I would
suggest that that map be refined so that the western
district is also wholly outside of Metro Phoenix.

And here is why I say that.

Three times in the history of Arizona, we
have had a basically rural district that nonetheless
took in part of the urban areas. In each of those
three instances, invariably the urban area came to
dominate the rural area.

That happened in 1984 when Congressman
McNulty was defeated by Congressman Kolbe who, of
course, as you know, is from the Tucson area.

It happened in 1994 when Karan English --
Congresswoman Karan English elected in northeastern
Arizona who came from Flagstaff lost two years later
to J.D. Hayworth, who was from Scottsdale.

The only time any hybrid rural metro
district has successfully elected someone from the
rural areas repeatedly happened beginning in 1962.

Actually, I have to correct that. That really wasn't a district that had an urban area. In 1962 before the advent of one person, one vote, we had three districts in Arizona, one entirely Maricopa County, which elected Congressman Rhodes; one from Southern Arizona, which elected Congressman Udall; and then one from the rest of the state, which in this -- initially elected Congressman Senner in 1962, defeated by Congressman Steiger in 1964. That district, however, changed to accommodation of urban/rural when the courts first drew the districts in 1966.

Congressman Steiger, you might remember, was a pretty colorful character, pretty forceful candidate, and he was able to continue representing that district on an urban/rural basis until he chose not to run in '76, and then it reverted to Congressman Stump who was from the Valley.

Repeatedly, when we have mixed rural and urban, the effect has been whenever a rural congressperson has been elected, eventually that
person loses out to the urban areas. That's been the history of Arizona. You can trace it back to statehood when the Valley elected -- when the first congressmen, Carl Hayden, came from the Valley, replaced in 1926 by Isabella Greenway, who came from Tucson, replaced in 1936 by John Murdock, who came from the Valley. Then in 1952 we got two congressmen for the first time. John Rhodes came from Maricopa County, Stewart Udall from Tucson. Again, Tucson, the urban area, dominated the rest of the state.

It split, we got the third congressman, as I've already outlined, in 1962. And then each decennial thereafter we've increased our representation.

But invariably when you mix rural with urban -- three times we've had an initial success by the rural areas, as I mentioned in 1982 when Congressman McNulty was elected from Bisbee only to lose the next election to Congressman Kolbe, again, with Karan English from Flagstaff in 1992 only to lose the next election to Hayworth.

It wasn't until the last decade when we had an entirely rural district in eastern Arizona -- northeastern Arizona that it's basically been
represented all that time, first by Congressman Renzi from Flagstaff and then by Congressman -- Congressmanwoman Kirkpatrick from Flagstaff and now Congressman Gosar from Flagstaff, but entirely outside urban Phoenix, urban Tucson.

So I would strongly suggest -- I know it's not all that easily done, but it can be done. You can draw two districts entirely outside of Maricopa -- outside of Metro Phoenix and Metro Tucson, and I think it should be done.

As I said on Friday, it's time for the rural areas to have their day. It can happen and I recommend it should happen.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I always appreciate Mr. Cantelme's history; however, I need to correct a couple of his statements because I was there in 1984 watching the results come in.

Congressman McNulty lost because of voting in Graham and Greenlee Counties. It was a rural vote and the reason he did was because he was running in a district that Congressman Kolbe had
drawn for himself two years earlier and spent two
years running it while Congressman McNulty was in
office.

DAVID CANTELME: I've got to disagree
with that, Madame Chairman, because I sat in a room
there in 1982 with John Frank and Paul Eckstein and
Congressman Udall and we begged Congressman Udall to
draw the districts so that that district, which
later elected McNulty, would be a stronger district.
Congressman Udall, however, would not consent.

The district lines were drawn as they
were, and it was not because of Congressman Kolbe.
I'm an eyewitness to the event. I heard it. I
watched it. I was shocked, that one of my heroes,
Congressman Udall, would feather his own nest.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: But Congressman
Kolbe did vie for two years in that district and I
watched the vote come in. And the deciding vote was
not from Tucson. It wasn't a rural or urban issue.
It was a -- it was just an election that was lost,
and it doesn't support your theory.

I understand that we'll disagree on that,
but I won't debate it with you. But that's the way
it was. I was there.

DAVID CANTELME: Well, we'll have to
differ on that, Commissioner McNulty, but I was there when -- I sat there when I saw Congressman Udall insisting the lines to benefit himself. And that is an absolute fact. It wasn't Kolbe; it was Udall that caused that.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And that's why this commission was formed instead of the legislature.

DAVID CANTELME: Absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We're only taking public comment on the maps that were presented. Okay?

So Jim March, second vice chair, Pima County Libertarian Party.

JIM MARCH: Yeah, I'll be brief. There appears to be a strong effort in several of these maps to take a lot of the first nations' territory and merge them together from Navajo/Hopi territory in the northeast all the way reaching around through Apache County and over through the Tohono O'odham. That's an okay idea. What I want you to consider as you look at these is -- are the voting trends and the political alliances between the first nations and the Latino populations actually lining
up together.

If you create districts that appear to be minority that are -- let's take round numbers here -- 45 percent white, the remainder a mixture of Latino and first nation, and you call that a minority coalition district, if the political trends, shall we say, between the first nations and the Latino votes in those areas are not really lined up with each other, then you still end up with, politically, a white-dominated district that looks on paper like a minority coalition.

I just want you to consider what you're doing as you consider a district which wraps that much of the first nation together and think about what you're really creating with those.

I'm not telling you to do one thing or another. I'm just saying think about what you're doing.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.
D.J. QUINLAN: Thank you.

Madame Chairwoman and fellow commissioners, my name is D.J. Quinlan. I'm with the Arizona Democratic Party.
My last name is spelled Q-u-i-n-l-a-n.

I will be brief. I just wanted to reference something that was just referenced.

Mr. Cantelme read into the record the home city of a current incumbent and you guys are forbidden from looking at that. And so I would just like you guys to take note of that, especially considering he has not disclosed who his clients are. Very well could be one of the incumbents.

That's it.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Daryl Melvin, from -- representing the City of Flagstaff.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: A quick question.

This issue, if there was something in the record that was put in regarding the incumbent, do we -- what happens to that if that is truly the case?

MARY O'GRADY: The Commission just can't regard in its decision-making process any knowledge it may have concerning the incumbent or candidate locations. So that should not -- you may have that
knowledge from some other source or -- and we will
do the best we can to keep it out of the record, but
this is -- certainly the Commission cannot consider
that information in making its decisions.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: So that needs to be
stricken from the record or is that removed if it is
in --

MARY O'GRADY: Commissioner Herrera, let
us confer in terms of whether we actually have to
have it stricken from the transcript or whether we
just redact it later. My sense is we might redact
it from what the Commission sees.

But we'll follow up on that procedure.

But certainly the Commission cannot consider
information of incumbents' locations.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Sorry about that.
DARYL MELVIN: Good afternoon, Madame
Chair, honorable Commission.

My name is Daryl Melvin, M-e-l-v-i-n,
from the City of Flagstaff. It's always a pleasure
to be here and testify before the Commission.

A couple of comments with regard to the
maps that were just discussed. The City remains
supportive of the rural district concepts, and it's something that the City would like the Commission to look favorably towards.

When it comes to addressing some of the comments and discussions on rural versus metro interfaces, the City believes in the value statement that retaining competitive districts are one of the means for addressing that interface in terms of ensuring that the district retains representation for the communities within. And as such, the City of Flagstaff would like to be retained within one of those districts that is being competitive.

With regard to the communities of interest, while the mapping configuration that shows an eastern district that interfaces an international border as one of the alternatives, the City considers the communities of interest to be the mountain areas, the rim areas, and would look at discussions on transportation, looking at forest health issues. And those are the areas that the City would like to consider when it comes to congressional districting on the eastern side of the state.

And so consideration at this point is not necessarily in alignment with the international
With regard to the northern part of the state, the City, again, offers its map configuration of the congressional district as the best alternative that meets the interests for Northern Arizona and would, again, resubmit that in terms of consideration for discussion.

So thank you very much, commissioners.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any questions?

Okay. Great. I believe that ends our mapping presentation agenda item.

Thank you all for taking time to put those together. It is a lot of hard work and we appreciate all of the ideas and efforts.

Our next item on the agenda is to do the review, discussion, and direction to mapping consultant on congressional draft maps.

The time is 1:30. Does anyone need a quick break?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We'll take a quick ten-minute break and come back at 1:40.

(A recess was taken from 1:30 p.m. to 1:44 p.m.)
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: The time is 1:44, and we'll go ahead and end recess and get back into the meeting.

We are on agenda item 3, review, discussion, and direction to mapping consultant regarding the development of a congressional draft map based on constitutional criteria.

This has been a recurring agenda item for weeks now and I wanted to check in with our mapping consultant to see what they were able to accomplish for us on this.

WILLIE DESMOND: Thank you.

So for today we have three maps, two legislative and one congressional. By and large these maps haven't been discussed in public. As far as the criteria, they have been a little bit.

So I think maybe for today the commissioners who have submitted their requests could kind of go through them a little bit and explain their thinking, if that works with everyone.

The two legislative maps have some population imbalance that would need to be definitely corrected and looked at. So I think it's probably best to think of them as a working map, you know, how far they've gone.
I think it might be helpful -- if the commissioners would like, they can either give me some direction today on how to make a later version or they can take what's here, study it, and then we can come back tomorrow and do it.

Also at some point I would like to discuss other maps that will be ready for tomorrow and make sure I have everything that the Commission needs.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great. Thank you.

Well, I think I will take over, then, because I see that the congressional grid map that got created was one that I was specifically requesting, and I very much appreciate you guys getting that done for me because I know I sent this to you late yesterday afternoon, so didn't have a lot of time.

But I think -- you know, I think all of the commissioners will agree that we've been hearing a lot of the same themes. And all of the what-if scenarios, the different maps that we've been creating, I think have been really great at exploring some of those public input while also trying to keep tribal lands whole and keeping two majority-minority districts and just some of the
standard things that we all agree we have to do.

So what I thought I would do is try to bring it all together into one map, which is a challenge, but there were great aspects in all of the maps that we've created, I think. And so I tried to take the best that I thought from those maps and try to put them into one, because my primary goal, really, is so that we can begin to work off of one map. And I'm hoping that I've captured most of -- I hope actually I've captured everything that we have talked about.

But you'll notice there's a spot in the middle that's blank. That's the unassigned area, which would ultimately have four districts drawn into it. So that's the hole, so to speak.

And we've been talking about the donut hole, but I was thinking since this is an everything map, this is everything bagel. If we could start affectionately referring to it as that, that's my thinking.

So starting with -- I had Mr. Desmond start with whole county map 6d because that seemed like the most closely aligned with what I had in mind in terms of trying to accomplish two rural districts and three border districts.
So start with number 1 -- and you can see it's pretty -- I think from 6d, the only difference was to capture the Kaibab and Pai tribes and keep Coconino County whole, per the Navajo Nation proposal, and that's what District 1 now is reflecting. And I have it going all the way down into Cochise County with Cochise County border -- or county line being the border.

Number two, I just had him adjust CD 2 down to the border. And on your maps you'll see there's a wayward 8 on there that shouldn't be there. That's just a tag left over from something else. So that's -- you can disregard that.

But I did split Santa Cruz County kind of along census tract lines and then followed up along I-19 and then into the Tucson area.

Once I got into the Tucson area, I went up I-10, pretty much. So you can see that pretty easily in your map.

And then I did include Saddlebrooke as part of that district since that's a community of interest, some input -- a lot of input that we've had.

And then over to District 3, which is a majority-minority district, and it's grabbing a few
places like Eloy, Arizona City, Picacho, Red Rock, and Stanfield, as well as into Maricopa County just Tolleson and Avondale to kind of maintain that majority-minority district, those levels.

I have the population of Goodyear and Buckeye in an unassigned area and then I preserved what the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government submitted where they have the Yuma split.

So the river district goes almost the whole length of the state, but, again, stops at that border where they had it.

7 on your map is just the other majority-minority district, preserving that.

And so that leaves the rest that's unassigned. And my hope is that we can -- that this is a start for one map that maybe we can start to adjust these lines from. And, you know, for this center area, there's a lot to figure out. But I know a lot of you have done a lot of thinking on other maps and some of that maybe can be incorporated into it.

And, of course, these edges are adjustable as necessary, but this is sort of what I thought made some sense, based on everything we've heard so far.
I would say that for that middle area -- you know, just as an Independent, I think it's -- it would be really worth checking into whether we could create a competitive district in that center unassigned area. You know, that's, of course, equally weighing all of the other criteria that we have to consider and, of course, following the very specific language that's in our Constitution where it can't be, you know, a significant detriment to other goals.

But I do think that it kind of makes sense, too, since we are creating a new district this time, I thought it would be interesting to explore the idea of maybe that CD 9, since that's the new district, and could that be a competitive district in Metro Phoenix area.

So I would just sort of challenge other commissioners to think about that and see if that's something that we could do. And granted, we're balancing all kinds of things here, but I did think that would be worth considering.

So given that, I would be open to anybody's thoughts and comments on this.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.
VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Just looking at the boundary of the unassigned area, it looks like it -- and I'm just asking this as a question, not to comment or really anything on it.

It looks like you've got Apache Junction and then Queen Creek, south Chandler. Does that go down into the San Tan Valley?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm not sure. I didn't give our mapping consultant specific discretion. It would have been whatever was on 6d for that area.

Can you comment?

WILLIE DESMOND: I will turn on the layer where you can see the different census places and make the --

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Yes, it does. And you've got Gold Canyon included in there as well. Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other questions or comments on this?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, this particular map keeps the majority-minority District 7 below -- or makes it below the current benchmark.
and then it increases District 3 substantially from the current benchmark.

So can you address those issues?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure.

I think that -- yeah, right now they are kind of very similar. I believe when I checked the numbers last, the HVAP number, both are in the 56 range now.

District 7's boundaries could be adjusted, you know, if those need to be increased at all. That is -- sort of the million-dollar question is what levels do those need to be at in order to achieve preclearance and not have a Section 5 violation.

So these aren't hard and fast boundaries and we can do some tweaking around the edges, but this is sort of the framework I was thinking that maybe we could all begin to do that adjustment and figure out what makes the most sense.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: And one last question.

When are we going to get the competitiveness model for this particular map? Because I would love to see it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, actually there
is -- they were able -- our mapping consultants were able to put something together. It's the last page of the splits report or close to that.

And so -- and again, we haven't decided really on our competitiveness measures.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: So which --

WILLIE DESMOND: I can --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, do you have it on -- no, that's compactness.

WILLIE DESMOND: I can speak to that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It's on here.

WILLIE DESMOND: Following Ken's presentation last week, he talked about some new measures of competitiveness. So as it -- I think moving forward what we'll be doing is running a wholly separate report that's now included towards the back. It will be off of that initial data table. There's a competitiveness report.

It might be useful just for this first time if I go through and explain what those numbers are.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That would be.

Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: And, Ken, feel free to come up here if you want me to clarify anything, but
I think I understand.

So the index 2 is the average Republican and statewide races in 2008 and 2010. That's very similar to the measure we have been using. The state average there is 54.3.

So what this tells you is not necessarily are these 50/50 districts, but how far are they from the statewide average.

In his last presentation, Ken showed that using the, you know, average election results, a difference of three either way seemed to make very competitive districts.

When we use the party registration number, a difference of five seemed to indicate competitive districts.

So index number 3 is those same numbers but with party registration also factored in.

This first report ran on to two pages, so if you go to the next page, you'll see the fourth column. We'll make sure we get that all on one page to make it easier in the future.

So in looking at that, you can kind of see the distance to the state average. I think Ken had, looking at this, maybe some other changes planned, so I'll let him speak to that.
KEN STRASMA: Thank you.

One of the other measures that we had talked about before is distance from 50/50, or another way of putting it, the distance between the two major party votes. And so that's another measure that we'll add to this report starting tomorrow.

And as the chairwoman, the Commission has not adopted an official measure of competitiveness, so we're trying to include, you know, many of the ones that have been requested or discussed. And if there are other measures that people would like to see, please let us know.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That would be great. Thanks.

So it's kind of interesting just in -- and obviously, these aren't final numbers, but just on this framework itself, it looks like we have a competitive rural, a competitive Metro Tucson, and then -- you know, that's why I'm saying I think having one competitive Metro Phoenix is reasonable and that's where I was sort of also going with this.

I do think having three border districts is also -- is a really compelling idea. I know Mr. Stertz mentioned this a long time ago, and I
don't see how, by having an additional voice in Washington representing border issues, is a detriment.

So I would like to see us preserve three border districts if it's -- you know, as long as we are able to also achieve all of the other criteria, too. But I thought that this map sort of might allow us to do that.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I think we can create more than one competitive district for Maricopa County. I think we can actually create two.

And if you look at the river district map, that's the intent of that particular map, as creating as many competitive districts as possible.

Again, I don't see -- the criteria for the -- it's only -- is missing a couple -- or am I not reading it correctly? One, two, three, four, five -- does it have all of them in here?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: All of the districts?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No. The unassigned
area doesn't have the -- isn't -- there aren't any numbers.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: So what I would like to do and what I intended to do on the river district is, again, create as many competitive districts as possible. And I would disagree with Commissioner Mathis that the one is enough. I think we can create more than one in the Maricopa County area. And I think that the river district map 7a did that. So I would like you to look at it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And I wouldn't -- I should say, you know, at least one. That's probably a better way to say that. I'm not saying -- you know, if you can create others, great, we can take a look at that, but I think one is reasonable.

Any other comments?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Just a question on the District 7. That was or was not adopted from Hispanic Coalition proposal? It sounds like the number has changed a little bit.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think it's got some taken out of the -- I don't know, maybe out of the southwest side to bring in more to District 3
because there were some adjustments on the border between 2 and 3. So I kind of went from 1, 2, 3, and 4. As it went, had to take things from 7 down into 3 down into 2.

So it may not be exactly what the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government presented. I don't know if Mr. Desmond can say.

WILLIE DESMOND: It's changed. The Hispanic Coalition for Good Government's HVAP number I believe was 60.2. In order to bring the HVAP number up in District Number 3, it was taken from 7.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Did you not want to rebalance 7 to meet the baseline?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, it's more, like, just kind of -- I just tried to get 3 up.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I understand.

It's certainly something that would be achievable, I would think.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair, I'm happy to take a run at applying that constitutional criteria to this unassigned area and see what we can come up with.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That would be great.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: This is apparent at
the very first, but you've got far western Maricopa County, which is, granted, lightly populated but very rural and agrarian and that's probably going to be going into an urban area to get the population, I would think.

But anyway, that's something I'll take a look at. I think we can all hopefully look at and see what we can come up with.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I don't think it was Commissioner Herrera's intent to say that he was going to work on competition before he worked on the other constitutional issues.

So as this develops -- by the way, thank you. I think the concept of three border districts is incredibly compelling and I appreciate that this compilation donut hole map that you created here takes a shot at doing so.

I think we heard some real compelling testimony regarding rural districts today that feed into this concept map that you've created, and looking forward over the next couple of days of exploring this.
I also wanted to give a special thanks to Strategic Telemetry. I had called them on Friday and made the suggestion about doing the dual presentations. And the reason I'm saying that is because as we are starting to get to the detail -- if you look at a map like this, which is at my right, which is blocks and lines and white and orange and yellow, that is interesting, but when we look at the map on my left, you can actually drill down and see streets and house -- and rooftops and how they line up.

As we are looking at traffic corridors and patterns by looking at the Google maps version of this, it's going to be able to allow us to really see how some of the communities of interest and traffic patterns, corridors, and relationships between communities, geographic features which don't show up on the map to my right -- you can't see mountains over here but you can certainly see mountain ranges over here. So I've asked them to do that.

I want to thank you guys for putting that up because I know technologically it took a little bit of effort so that it was able to work. And seems to be -- it will be a nice working tool for us
to be able to utilize over the next couple of days.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Good idea. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Can somebody tell me what the population is -- I think it's District 2, which is a border -- according to your map, what is the population of the people living in the border? Because it seems awfully small.

So I just want to see -- it was almost done to create a border district just for the sake of creating a border district. It looks like that population in that area would be minute compared to the rest of the -- the rest of the district.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: As Willie is looking up those numbers, I was actually looking at that doing the same thing. And in looking at I-19 as it goes down to the border, that it's probably worth, as we explore this, to be able to capture -- I understand the idea that there's a rural side to Santa Cruz County, which is the eastern side, and an urban side of Santa Cruz, which is the western side.
It probably is going to be worth an iteration of us grabbing the urban side to connect that to your -- essentially to Tucson urban district to be able to pick that up.

And I understand that that probably is going to impact some of the HVAP population that you have for that district, which will reduce it down to more -- it being more contemporary to where it currently is.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It does reduce it. And that's actually why I was trying to preserve it, was keep the urban side separate. And we had heard testimony, too, that Santa Cruz -- I would prefer to keep counties whole, actually, to the extent possible, but Santa Cruz had given us that input just Friday. And I was thinking, well, maybe there really is this rural/urban divide and they don't mind being split along it, which is why I used just census tracts -- or told Willie to use census tracts and then follow I-19 essentially up, keeping census places hole.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: But we might split it in the opposite direction, keeping the urban with the urban component and the rural with the rural component.
Just -- it's another way to explore this. But it also adds more logic to the concept of three border districts in that we got three large ports of entry, three distribution corridors, two most specifically, the Yuma port and the Nogales port, but we don't want to neglect the port coming through from Douglas.

So that would be able to allow three representatives having representation of three ports of entry, which I find extremely compelling as a concept.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: The border is handled administratively and there are two border sectors. So increasing the border district to three ports of entry doesn't have any bearing on the representation of the border or dealing with the border vis-a-vis the administrative process. I've said that before, so I won't belabor that.

I understand the symbolic notion of having three representatives along the border, but I don't think administratively that having three makes a difference, because you're dealing with -- any member of Congress can work on border issues.
I'm interested in seeing the changes in the majority-minority districts here, particularly as they move into South Phoenix. And as Mr. Freeman said, we'll be looking forward to exploring that.

I agree with Mr. Herrera that on the river district map, an effort was made to put together districts in Central Phoenix based on communities of interest with the goal of achieving two competitive districts in Central Phoenix.

There are over 3 million people in that area, and I think that they are entitled to two competitive districts if we can construct those consistent with communities of interest in Phoenix and the other criteria. And that's what I will be -- that's my goal.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I certainly respect the concept, but not to the detriment of any of the other items. And as I've been reviewing these maps, I can't -- I can find multiple areas, multiple locations where we are at the detriment of the other constitutional areas.

So I'm going to go back to -- I think that the idea of starting to merge these together to
a map for exploration is sound, it's prudent, and we
need to start looking at areas that -- and issues
that we know are true. And I know that if it flies
and quacks, it's a duck. We're going to be able to
know what a community of interest is, what a road
and accumulation is. We've had significant
testimony telling us that.

And, you know, it's very clear some of
these work and it's very clear some of them don't.
I just want to get to that place and start getting
to that area, because at the end of this week our
goal is to say we are moving a map forward.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I would agree with
Commissioner McNulty. The issue of the three border
districts -- well, let me go to the border
districts.

It is -- the border districts is a -- not
only a state level but a federal issue as well. You
can have ten -- you can divide the -- this
congressional up into nine border districts and just
going into nice little slivers going up and down and
it wouldn't matter. I don't think they would have
more representation or less.
I think the people on the borders -- the response was probably as great or probably greater that by creating more than two border districts dilutes the representation. And I concur with that because I don't really think that creating three, four, five border districts gives them a greater voice.

It is a federal issue that -- not only at the federal level, but I think every representative, whether they are at the border or not, should be paying attention to.

So creating a border district that looks like number 8 to me looks like creating a border district just for the sake of creating a border district.

I grew up on the border and it was an issue for everyone, not just people that lived on the border.

So I'm leery of this kind of breakdown where you see that the border is so tiny and -- and too -- I mean, I don't know if Willie Desmond has the population, but I'm curious to see -- especially comparing it to what the population on the border compared to the 3 compared to 1, I would love to know that. To me it just looks odd.
WILLIE DESMOND: And Santa Cruz County, District Number 2, has 5,085 people.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: That are on the border?

WILLIE DESMOND: In Santa Cruz County. So if you look up on that screen, the red part is about 5300 people.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: 5300 people?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: And we are considering that a border district?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Oh, Mr. Herrera, please.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: No, please. I actually have an opinion.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Not that you got --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Wait. Let me finish.

Whether you disagree with me or not, don't say "please." Some of the comments you make are ridiculous but I don't say "please" to you. I have an opinion to make, and I would consider myself a border rep. I lived on the border, I breathed border, and to me, this is not something just for the sake of, oh, let's create
another border district. I don't -- that's how I look at it. Whether you agree with me or not, I would want you to respect my opinion like I respect yours.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Herrera, unfortunately, what you just said does. But I was going to say to you that when you're talking about a border district, there are 710,000 people in that overall district. This was a first iteration that the chair has come up with for us to review.

And I appreciate the fact that she's making a view of looking at the compelling discussion regarding three borders, which I will intend to explore in great detail over the course of the next week.

And this is a -- it's -- it couldn't be any more of an important issue than it is today.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: It is an important issue. The border is an extremely important issue, but again, I have my opinion, and if you disagree, that's fine. I think we should all be able to create a what-if scenario and disagree.

And I happen to -- I mean, obviously -- hopefully this is the beginning stages of this particular what-if, because this is really the first
time I've seen this. And I have a right to say, you
know what, there's been plenty of public comment
opposing the three border districts. I'm sure you
acknowledge that it's probably just as much or the
same as creating three border districts.

So I want to make sure that the people
that are in favor of the two border districts are --
they are also being heard. And I think I would
represent them. And again, if you disagree with me,
that's fine, but I would respect -- I would ask for
you to respect my disagreement, as I do yours.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So this is the first
iteration of the everything map, and I would suggest
that if we could all at least agree to use this map
to move forward and make adjustments as we see fit,
that that would be a good way to move forward so
that we can actually have one draft map at the end
of this.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I would be happy to
look into that.

I did work on a further refinement to my
last what-if, but -- and I would like to go ahead
and give that to Willie just because one of the
things I was trying to explore was what could we do to satisfy -- how would a map look that would satisfy the criteria in the best way possible.

I think I would agree with Commissioner Herrera that the Constitution does not describe there shall be one, two, three or ten districts that touch the border.

Likewise, the Constitution does not prescribe that there shall be one, two, three competitive districts, however that's defined whether they be in the urban Metro Phoenix area or Tucson or wherever.

I think it's incumbent -- the Constitution makes it incumbent upon us to favor competitive districts, however we define that, when it does not cause a substantial detriment to the other goals.

In working on -- through the whole counties what-if approach, near the end there, and there -- was more refinement I was going to do to the urban areas so we don't lop off the tops of various cities and we keep them whole, but I was looking at ways to configure districts in the urban area that take compactness into consideration, that take municipal boundaries into consideration, that
take communities of interest into consideration,
which is where I was going with the last iteration,
and see how they can be configured to see which one
meets those goals and yields the more competitive
districts.

So what I'm going to do with this one is
just sort of make the process with this combo map
and see what we can do.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great. Thank you.
Other thoughts?

It sounded like, Mr. Stertz, you wanted
to see Santa Cruz becoming whole if this were
adjusted to a version -- see another what-if on it?
Was that -- is that accurate or is there something
else you had in mind?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair, there
are several things that I've got in mind. One, the
original three-border district that you had
proposed, which was the combo between the river
district, is also one that has got a lot of --
there's a lot of components of it that I want to see
if they can be rolled into the design that you have
just proposed as far as the combo or your bagel.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, can we begin
doing some of this now or at least tomorrow so that
we're actually, during these meetings, getting something done so we can actually get the draft map finished?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yes, positively.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I would like to at least get the congressional grid map done soon. And again, I want to stress it's a draft map. So I think we should either plan to work during the meetings to actually make the adjustments now or tomorrow, once you guys have some opportunity to look at that unassigned area.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair, I feel like I need an opportunity to look at this. I also would request that Strategic Telemetry complete the changes that we requested -- that Mr. Herrera requested to the river district map and provide that to us not later than tomorrow morning.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So we'll be moving forward on three maps now, this one and the one that Mr. Freeman has, and this one?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

So just to clarify, for tomorrow I'm going to have the river 8a and the whole counties 7 --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Madame Chair, it
won't be too much on mine because I think I can just
give it to Willie. I just would like to see him
generate the report on it.

And as for what we do with the bagel map
at this point, maybe for tomorrow -- I'm not going
to -- I would have to think about the -- maybe I
would defer to Commissioner Stertz on how District 2
touches the border.

But in terms of adjusting District 7 so
that it meets our baseline a little better,
perhaps -- maybe that's something that could be
looked at too.

WILLIE DESMOND: Could I just seek a
question from counsel legal on that?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Legal counsel.

WILLIE DESMOND: If one of the two
majority-minority reaches the old baseline, is --
I'm trying to -- is there an obligation to keep the
same area at the same baseline or does one have to
be at the same level and one has -- there has to be
one -- assuming that there's still the opportunity
to elect.

MARY O'GRADY: It's just on a statewide
basis. If we start out with two where there's an
opportunity to elect, we need to make sure that we
maintain two with an opportunity to elect. They can shift areas and they can shift numbers as long as they maintain that opportunity to elect.

So to the extent there's a lot of changes, you have a lot more analysis to do to make sure that you are preserving that opportunity.

And so it's really back to the whole, you know, what do you need to make sure that we maintain the opportunity to elect.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Well, then that means that I can adjust 7 up to meet the current benchmark in that district.

Are there other changes for tomorrow? I guess one question I would have would be District 4 needs to make up 200,000 people. I'm unclear on where that would be done right away.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: District 4 is short 200,000?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes. It's short I believe 211,000 people.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Another issue is going back to District 3 that has what I would consider too high of a concentration of HVAP. So I
would recommend that we look at that as well, not only bringing the other majority-minority district to at least a minimum -- what I've said before, the benchmark, but 3, I would consider to be -- my opinion to be too high and close to packing.

WILLIE DESMOND: Then if it's all right with the Commission, I will bring 7 up by taking a little from 3 so that they are both closer to their current benchmark. 7 can go up a little bit and 3 can come down.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: By moving all of the Santa Cruz County into your CD 2, you should effectively be able to reduce 3.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Are these things we want to pursue on parallel tracks, then, I guess, one with Santa Cruz whole and one without?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair, if we remove Santa Cruz County, what -- then we need to make up the population in District 2; is that correct?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes. Actually, if you remove Santa Cruz County --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: No, not remove
Santa Cruz County.

WILLIE DESMOND: -- you need to make it up in District 3. 2 will be overpopulated.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: You're going to add the urban portion into that district, then you're going to have to lose more population from that district; is that right?

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe if I understand -- correct. 2 would have all of Santa Cruz County so that 2 would be a third border district with all of Santa Cruz County. It would need to lose population somewhere else in Tucson or Pima County.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Well, I would be -- I would have a lot of concern about how that was done, so I wouldn't support just doing that willy-nilly, to use the phrase.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: As for the deficit in District 4, I would think we would have to cross into Maricopa County and just try to add as much rural population as we can out of the western Maricopa County, keeping it in sort of farming/agrarian/ranching area as best possible so
it's consistent with the rest of District 4.

WILLIE DESMOND: What about Pinal County also? Is that an area that should be included as higher priority or at a lower? There is the area of Apache Junction and Gold Canyon and San Tan Valley.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And the areas that all tie together in that part of the city are Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, San Tan Valley, Gilbert, Queen Creek. Those are all areas that one rolls right into the other.

Gold Canyon is out there by itself and Apache Junction is a developing community, but you talk about the San Tan Valley connecting to Gilbert and Queen Creek, they almost -- they roll one right into the other. So I would try to keep that area intact.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I would try to work diligently to keep the northern -- and you can probably pick Indian School or Thomas -- northern Scottsdale and Paradise Valley intact.

Probably in the San Tan/Gold Canyon/Fountain Hills/East Cave Creek, sort of that
area, intact.

The Anthem/Sun City/Surprise, that sort of grouping up there, all are areas that make sense and stay intact.

We've heard from commissioners one view and from the public and people different views on the 101.

Cities grow in age from the inside out. And the 101 loop, the 202, and now the west side 303 development -- over the next ten years the 303 is going to be something that's going to have impact.

So I'm looking to see to accumulate the areas in the western Valley, Avondale, Peoria, Glendale, Litchfield Park, and keeping those areas intact. Those are areas that have grown and developed together.

And again, when you start looking at Google maps and laying it on top of it, you'll start to see --

There's one other area I want you to look at as well. There are development areas throughout the state in the higher growth areas where there are large tracts. Johnson Ranch, for example, where it's projected to have 30,000 plus developed people and its continuing to grow.
You're down in Green Valley, you've actually, in a couple of your maps, split development areas because, obviously, there's no population there currently but there are actually areas that are master planned for growth. So we need to start looking at those so that they don't arbitrarily, as growth occurs, get split down the middle of a subdivision that doesn't show any population currently but the infrastructure and the design is coming in. So we'll be able to look at that both by looking at aerials and the maps simultaneously, if that makes sense to you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair, Mr. Desmond, my perspective would be a little different. I don't think we can balance population in 4 until we figure out what goes in the middle. I think that -- you know, that's what I think. I think that we need to leave open the flexibility that that will get balanced as we work on the districts that are left here. If what Madame Chair is suggesting is that this is kind of an arbitrary ironclad limit for
that district and that everything has to be within that -- I guess she can explain that, but I wouldn't -- just looking at this, I wouldn't view this that way any more than I looked at Commissioner Freeman's map that way.

I think what we are being invited to do is reach some sort of agreement on this, but I don't think that means it has to be within these boundaries.

I also just want to make the point -- we did this over and over again and we've been doing it for months. We have very different perspectives on what competitiveness -- what the role of competitiveness is.

And the whole reason this Commission was created was to foster fair and competitive districts. And 30 percent of this state is Republican, 30 percent is Democratic, 30 percent is Independent.

We need at least three truly competitive districts in this state. We have an opportunity to create four. We've been having kind of a petty dispute about whether the established neighborhoods that are south of the 101 are -- or we've been having a petty dispute about 101 to try and avoid
talking about the fact that the established neighborhoods south of it do, in fact, create an opportunity for a fourth competitive district to evolve over the next few years.

I'm still interested in that. I think it would be a lost opportunity not to do that. And I think the citizens -- the people in Phoenix deserve a truly competitive -- one or more truly competitive districts.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Unless we know how we can draw these maps in a way that meet the first five constitutional criteria, we are not going to be able to assess whether favoring competitive districts causes a substantial detriment to our constitutional charge to draw maps that meet those goals.

So I think we need to keep that in mind as we are filling in this urban area. I do think we've heard about rural versus urban. I think this map gives us an opportunity to further that rural/urban community of interest.

In terms of carving up the metro area, I think we need to, of course, favor a layout that
yields more competitive districts but we also need
to keep in mind how the cities fit together and how
they are laid out. We need to keep in mind at least
minimizing splits in those cities. We need to keep
in mind communities of interest.

We've heard lots of -- or at least I've
reviewed plenty of public comment about areas north
of the 101 and how they are tied intimately to North
and Central Phoenix. And that comports with my own
view of Phoenix, having grown up and lived most of
my life here.

There's a strong connection for me to
where I live with the North Valley and to areas like
Cave Creek and Anthem.

So I think those things -- types of
things need to be considered as we put this
together. And when we are all finished, I think we
need to look at whether we can -- what falls out of
that or depending on which ways we fit the pieces
together, whether we get districts that are
competitive.

When we talk about 30 percent,
30 percent, 30 percent in this state, it's not
really that way. It's actually, I think -- and
don't hold me to the numbers, but I think it's
35 percent Republican, 31 percent Democrat, and the remainder Independent. And after you create those two voting rights districts, actually that spread between Republicans and Democrat registration becomes much greater.

So it -- if we do get it, it looks like even with this map, as developed so far, we get a couple of districts that are competitive. I think that's very good.

If another competitive district falls out in the Phoenix Metro area, that would be great. But to start with the premise of I'm going to begin with street-level changes to a revision to a map to try to engineer a competitive district at the detriment of all of the other constitutional goals, I don't think is right.

I don't think it's right -- if the virtues of being in a competitive district are what they -- people say they are, then it applies to everyone in this state.

And while it may be that people living in CD 4 as constructed, it's a pretty heavily constructed -- heavily Republican district. It is on all of our maps that we've developed so far.

To say it's impossible to put those
people in a competitive district, not true. I think no one has explored that. But I think it's not going to happen because in order to place those people in a competitive or more competitive district, you're going to have to run roughshod over things like compactness over crossing municipal and city lines. It's going to be a very funny-looking map. So it may not be possible there.

But in urban areas, I think the population is denser, it's more evenly spread out, more or less, and it's possible, then, to construct districts that are compact, that respect municipal boundaries, or at least minimize splits to them, that respect communities of interest and to meet those constitutional goals and then to favor the configuration that yields the more competitive result.

So I'm looking forward to at least taking a crack at filling in the hole in the bagel here.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: We've had this discussion so many times and I apologize for having it again, but I disagree with everything Mr. Freeman just said.
Competitiveness is not last. The Supreme Court said it was not last. The purpose of Proposition 106 was to achieve it.

The six criteria need to be melded together to achieve a whole. Nobody is running roughshod over anything.

We have looked at competitiveness and developing competitive districts in the context, and after having considered and considering with all of the other criteria, and we'll continue to do that.

And as I said a couple minutes ago, we have fundamental agreement on this Commission about the importance of competitiveness and how it factors into the other criteria, and I don't think that's going to change.

 Doesn't make any of us wrong, I guess. Just means we have a very strong difference of opinion. And I expect that will continue.

But I will be looking for truly -- for true competitiveness for the citizens of Maricopa County. I don't think there's any reason that we cannot achieve that consistent with all of the other goals of the Constitution.

I think that's what we are charged with. I think that's the whole reason this Commission was
set up. And I don't intend to ignore that.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Every time we talk about competitiveness, we have a couple of commissioners accuse a couple of commissioners that we are ignoring the other criteria. And I listened to Commissioner McNulty. I don't think she ever said that she wanted to ignore the other criteria.

She understands the other criteria are important. And so when people say that they run roughshod or ignoring the other criteria, I -- again, they keep saying that and it kind of bothers me because it isn't true.

Commissioner McNulty knows the criteria well and she understands that the six criteria is equally -- although it was on the number six, it's equally as important as the other criteria. And we're taking all of the other criteria as seriously as competitiveness.

But this is not an easy process, you know, but again, when we talk about Prop 106, I think the people that voted for Prop 106 wanted -- and they stated it pretty clearly, they want to get this out of the legislators' hands. The legislators
were not creating competitive districts; they were creating districts that served their best interest. And typically that's not competitive districts.

And I think the people that voted for Prop 106 spoke very clearly. We want to get this away from the legislators and in the hands of an independent commission that will honor all of these criteria, including competition, which is, I think, key. It definitely is important. Because if you don't have competition, why vote. And I think there's a lot of people, the reason they don't vote is there is not competitive districts.

So again, when we are creating these maps, we're taking all of the criteria into account.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: You know, the last instructions on the so-called river district map, there was a district that started in the far West Valley in Buckeye and came over and grabbed Sun City, Sun City West, went over the top of the Phoenix Metro area, cutting off the top of Peoria, Phoenix, Cave Creek, I believe, and Anthem and got North Scottsdale and I believe -- well, then we had a river district, river district 4 that came over
Phoenix.

Now, granted, rural districts -- the notion of compactness is a little different in my mind, but it wraps around the north part of Phoenix and had two tendrils. One that cut through Apache Junction and went south to grab the San Tan Valley and another one that dove into the Phoenix Metro area and grabbed an area of North Scottsdale.

Today if we were still on that, I was going to recommend that you go ahead and extend that on and put Paradise Valley in the river district because if the goal is to pack as many Republicans in one district as possible, you'd probably find a few there. And you might want to even drop a couple tendrils -- a tendril down south of Paradise Valley and you'd get a house that had two more registered Republicans. I don't think we should be doing things like that.

I think one thing I agree with Commissioner McNulty on is she said earlier we need to put together a map that fits together the way Arizona fits together. And I agree with that. And I think that's something that we need to keep in mind.

We need to keep in mind that when we get
finished with these maps, they are going to get published in the paper. And when they appear on the front page of the paper, you know, they are not -- those maps aren't going to have all of the fine details that we see up on our screens. It's going to be a map of Arizona with color-coded districts. And when someone looks at it, if they see well-put together districts that are reasonably compact and sort of fit together in their mind the way Arizona fits together, I think they are going to think we did our job. If they see districts that are odd and peculiar looking, there's going to be questions as to whether something else was going on. So I think we need to sort of keep all of the constitutional goals in mind as we go forward on this.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner McNulty.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: The way that we are going to know whether we did our job is whether people care enough and think their vote counts enough to get out and vote. They are not going to care -- well, there will be a few people who care what it looks like in the paper, but what really
matters is whether people feel they have a voice and
whether people feel it makes a difference whether or
not they vote. That's what our job is, not to make
districts that look pretty.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm hearing this
and I understand that we've got a disagreement of
ideology, but what I just heard Commissioner McNulty
say is that competitive districts, no matter what
they look like, however they go in, whatever
direction that they go in is more important than
anything else.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Mr. Stertz, that
is not what I said. And as I said earlier, you can
say it as many times as you want to, and I know you
will, but that doesn't make it true.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: But that's what you
just said.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: No, it's not what
she said.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Would you please
read back the transcript?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Let's prove him
wrong.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: You don't have to do that, Michelle. You don't really need to. It's just Mr. Stertz reinterpreting what I said.

What I said is going to matter is whether people feel as though it makes a difference for them to get out and vote.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair, I'm just trying to describe that as you described it. You said that how the public is going to look at the maps as they appear in the paper, they are not going to care what they look like as long as they come out to vote.

And I know you have equated coming out to vote as being based on competition, the higher the level of competition there is, the more people that come out to vote.

And I wanted to go back to something that you said last Thursday about you and I living in competitive districts.

Legislative District 28 is not a competitive district. Congressional District 7 is not a competitive district. Neither one of those two are. And those are the districts that we reside in.

So it's clear to me that if we wanted to
look at 14th Amendment issues, I'm one of the
disenfranchised that live in Legislative District
28. But I don't feel that way because I live in an
area that I chose to live in because -- and I
understand it clearly. I live near the University
of Arizona. It's most particularly populated by
people that are very similar in the way that they
look at life. They are more -- there's a lot more
Democrats living there than Republicans. Almost
two-thirds to one-third. And I recognize that, but
that's a community that I choose to live in, but
it's a community of interest. That is by no means a
competitive district.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I would recommend
that we move on before we have commissioners putting
words in the mouth of commissioners that they didn't
say.

I find it -- it just bothers me -- you
have a commissioner who is pretty clear on what she
said and then you have a commissioner saying, no,
she said this. I think she should know what she
said.

So let's move on. Commissioner McNulty
has been pretty clear that she cares about all of the criteria, and I just -- we keep saying things that people don't say.

Again, let's move on.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. I have --

Go ahead.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: If we can move on to something a little more productive.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We can as soon as I have a chance to say something.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Of course you can say something.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Great. I would like to say that from the Constitution, our mission, it says: To oversee the mapping of fair and competitive congressional and legislative districts.

So I think Ms. McNulty is right.

I also think that Mr. Freeman is right. The way it's laid out and how we look at this, we equally weigh all of the other criteria. And if we can create a competitive congressional district that, you know, creates no significant detriment to the other goals in doing so, that we should do so.

And that's where I maintain that if we
can do that in Metro Phoenix, I think that would be
wonderful. It does --- if there's a way to do a
rural -- Metro Tucson and Metro Phoenix competitive
district that isn't, you know, detrimental to all of
the other criteria that we're dealing with, too,
that we should do so, and to meet competitiveness in
a district in which neither party has a built-in
advantage, and that's my definition of it. And I
know we haven't agreed on exactly the measurement
that we are going to use, but I just think that they
are both right and we need to work together to kind
of move forward.

And so I agree with Mr. Herrera on this,
too. Let's move on to the next thing if we can, but
I want to get some concrete advice from Mr. Desmond
on what we're doing on this congressional grid map,
because tomorrow we will be in Tucson at 9:00 a.m.
and I would like to have some kind of forward
progress on the everything map and then what
Mr. Freeman has done and then -- has suggested and I
guess if it's Mr. Herrera's river district, I'm not
sure, but -- whatever we have to do, but I would
like to see you guys attack the everything map and
make adjustments as you think would satisfy what you
believe you've heard from the public and what makes
the most sense given our constitutional criteria.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Is this on our website right now?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I don't know.

Buck, you don't have this one on the website yet, do you?

BUCK FORST: Yes, they are all up.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. It is.

So on the website it's called 3 border 2 rural.

WILLIE DESMOND: I think it's actually called 3 border 2 rural 1 donut.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, on the printout it just says 3 -- maybe we need to change that to bagel now.

So any thoughts on -- maybe you can -- I know you've just gotten this today. If you could look at it and provide some direction and guidance through Mr. Bladine to all of the commissioners as to what you're thinking and how you might carve up the center, too, that would be great. I would really appreciate it.

WILLIE DESMOND: Can I just clarify then for tomorrow, is there any changes to it? Do we want to adjust District 7 or should we wait until we
have further input before doing that?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think 7 -- I mean, this is just my opinion, but we want to ensure we maintain the majority-minority levels that we have to since it is a benchmark district. So whatever has to be done to do that, plus -- you know, I think it is -- all of this --

Everything touching that center is impacted in some way. So some of those are lines that are going to be tweaked in different ways.

I would hope that commissioners -- I know that they've on other maps suggested a different carve-up of the center. And if that can be, you know, kind of worked into this framework, I would think that would be a way to move forward.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: What I would like to do -- I gave my comments on this particular map that you are talking about, but I would like to take some more time. Because really this is the first time I've seen this particular map and although there's things that I do like, there's things I disagree on.

I would like to hopefully take today and tonight to look over and probably give Mr. Desmond
or Ray some of my comments and how we can improve
this map going forward.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's fine, and
thank you.

And I think that maybe the way to do it
since each of you may have different ideas on this
is we explore those in the session tomorrow,
since -- because I think that's the only way that we
can all talk about them and actually make some
decisions.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So for tomorrow
I'll leave this one just as it is but we are ready
to play around with it a little bit and explore
possibilities as a group.

Commissioner Herrera's river 8a will be
ready for you guys. I'll try to send the block
equivalency file tonight and then certainly tomorrow
morning we'll have it ready to go.

Commissioner Freeman's whole counties
maps, although I think he may need to provide me a
little bit further guidance. If you want to do that
off line or right now, either is fine with me.

We'll also be ready for tomorrow morning.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I can just give
you what I have.

WILLIE DESMOND: Let's do that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Any other comments on congressional?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Is it okay if we take a break?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It's 2:47. Do we want to take a quick break?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Well, I do. Whether you need to take a break or not, I do.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We'll take a quick break -- or how about five minutes?

It's 2:47 p.m.

(A recess was taken from 2:47 p.m. to 3:05 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We'll enter back into public session. Recess is over. The time is 3:05 p.m.

And we are on agenda item 4 now, review, discussion, and direction to mapping consultant regarding the development of the legislative district map.

And we've got two in front of us, so I will ask Mr. Desmond to tell us what he's done for us.
WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. There is two for today.

The legislative grid map what-if scenario 9 minority districts option 1 version 6b is something that Commissioner Freeman had asked for.

The e-mail where he kind of laid out what he wanted is included as part of the criteria, parts of it. So that kind of gives you the thought process.

There are some areas where we have to make up -- you know, there are population deviations that would need to be corrected in a later iteration, but I tried to respect kind of the direction I was given to the utmost. So I didn't balance anything that much beyond where it was mentioned to specifically do so.

So I will, I guess, bring that one up and if you want I'll just kind of walk through some of it.

Okay.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Just as a -- well, first of all, this is a very tough nut to crack because with congressional districts, we were dealing with 9 puzzle pieces, now we're dealing with 30. And every time you make an adjustment to one --
one legislative district, it causes a ripple effect that goes through the entire map, and all of a sudden it's 2:00 in the morning and you're still playing with the map.

But to try to chip away at the block, the approach taken -- I took was to sort of take the same sort of approach as with the whole counties approach I took on the congressional side, which is sort of to start with the outside of the state and work your way in and trying -- in working from the outside in, looking at trying not to split counties.

And that way you end up constructing -- my thought was you maximize the number of rural legislative districts that sort of ring -- go around the outer boundary of the state. You keep them rural and you end up respecting county lines.

So I actually started with the district that -- moving the lines that overlay sort of the Mohave County area and sort of adjusted those lines to follow -- and I don't want to zap Jose with my pointer, so don't look at me.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Sorry.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: So I created that one which includes Mohave County south of the Grand Canyon and picks up La Paz County, a nice-looking
river district actually -- legislative district that follows the Colorado River and then I worked my way around the state. And then where it got more challenging, sort moving up from Tucson into the Phoenix Metro area and building compact districts that sort of aligned with communities of interest.

One thing I see that jumps out at me is this district, which is District 5 -- and my laser pointer has died. Like everything with batteries we have.

Anyway, the instructions -- I think my instructions probably got garbled in this district.

This district was a product of our grid map. There was this -- or a subsequent iteration of our grid map when we included tribal lands and kept them whole and it was this U-shaped district. And that's not what I intended.

I think I had intended to take the southern part of Navajo and Apache County and work downward and include the San Carlos Apache tribe and the White Mountain tribe, including the part that goes into Pinal County as a district perhaps going -- having to cross over in this area to pick up more population.

That's going to leave this northern
district a little less, so I think -- I assume that's Flagstaff you grabbed there.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Then we're going to need to make up that population there and rebalance down here. So that's sort of -- one sort of initial adjustment.

Working in towards -- I think there was an issue, Mr. Desmond was telling me, with the Pinal County districts that sort of run from the north part of Pima County northward in terms of population balance; is that correct?

WILLIE DESMOND: Correct. So that District 8, which is the blue one, and District 11, which is the yellowish one below it, are both overpopulated.

District 8 is our most off of all of the districts. It's a full 138,000 people over. District 11 is 56,000.

So there is -- you know, looking at the table of where things need to get made up, it does look like a lot of the areas in Maricopa need to grab a little bit more of that perhaps.

I think if you look at this, it's clear that it was intended to go right up to the county
boundary. I didn't want to start splitting counties or anything like that.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: No, I appreciate that. And I'm surprised they are both overpopulated, but it is what it is. And I'll have to go back and look at that.

I don't think changes to District 5, those adjustments, would impact that area, perhaps it would, to make that area of the state -- the eastern area of the state work.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Also with District 5 and District 7, they do have about the same population imbalance. So District 7 is about 38 or 39,000 people overpopulated. District 5 is about that same number underpopulated. So that might be a logical place --

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Easy trade-off, yeah.

WILLIE DESMOND: -- to balance those. You know, you're going to lose some areas.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: But can you get that Eastern Arizona district that includes the southern portion of Navajo and Apache Counties and takes it down and includes Graham and Greenlee to eliminate that bottom part of the U, which is over here?
WILLIE DESMOND: I can certainly look at that. I mean, I know it's very tedious to go through these ledge maps in session, but it's either that or maybe you and I could schedule a time to sit down and work either before or after or over a lunch break or something on one of these over the week to kind of put together the next -- I can help you walk through, like, weighing things and making sure districts get equalized population, but it's tough for me to make adjustment calls without your express --

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I understand. It's tough for me also on the fly to make the call as we sit here.

Maybe can you zoom in on the Maricopa County area or the Phoenix Metro area?

WILLIE DESMOND: Is this what you're looking for or zoom in more?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: No, that's fine. I mean, I was trying to look at sort of the rural area to the west, keeping it together. And there is -- as this intrusion goes in, that's essentially agrarian area as well. So I was trying to keep that area of Buckeye/Goodyear together, trying to piece together other parts of the Valley sort of as they
are laid out on the map with the Phoenix -- the Phoenix -- well, the West Valley communities going in that direction, Phoenix going up there to the county line, and likewise with the East Valley/Scottsdale area going up to the top of that city. So that was the thought process there, trying to keep them compact.

Of course, there's some minority-majority districts in there that -- which we pretty much, I believe, have adopted from -- at least at this first cut -- from the Hispanic Coalition.

WILLIE DESMOND: I do want to say something about the minority-majority districts. In both -- this one version, option 1 version 6b and the other one we're going to look at today, option 2 version 7a, we do lose a majority-minority district.

Again, I didn't -- I didn't -- I allowed that to happen, I guess, just because I didn't know where -- which priorities should be cut.

But I think both of these are going to have to be -- are going to have to be adjusted at some point to, again, get back to at least the nine. And then pending, I guess, some further analysis by Ken and Dr. King, potentially look at the -- maybe getting a tenth coalition or something. I'm not
sure exactly where that stands.

So I think you guys -- the criteria -- Bruce has made it pretty clear that there is one that kind of supersedes everything else and so we need to make sure we have the correct number of majority-minority districts in order to get preclearance.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, I agree we need to make those adjustments in a further iteration. It wasn't -- although it's paramount, it's federal law, it must be complied with, it wasn't exactly on the forefront of my mind as I was just trying to get a map that fit together 30 districts that made sense to me in the way that Arizona is laid out. And I hoped that I would capture -- I hoped that I had captured nine, but it looks like I captured --

WILLIE DESMOND: I think it's eight.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: -- eight. Well, not too bad. So I guess that's something I'll have to work at. But it looks like there's perhaps a couple that are adjacent that can be adjusted and maybe create another one.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Any other comments?
And I would just say, too, that, you know, we have the time. This is why we're all here. If there are things we want to adjust to try out now, that we should. I know we have another map to go through, and I'm not sure how Ms. McNulty -- was this yours, the 7a?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And do you have things you want to walk through with it, too? I'm just trying to get a sense for the time.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: No, I don't, actually. This is -- this was my second set of revisions. And what I did was try to balance some of the wild, you know, population imbalances that resulted from the first revisions.

I built in the Arizona Minority Coalition majority-minority districts in Phoenix and then I worked out from there.

Since we did this, I've done a lot of additional work but I wasn't quite able to finish it up over the weekend. So I hope to finish it tonight. And I would want to get the hole -- and I've made a couple of changes to what I had done here.

So I'd also, since Mr. Freeman has given
us his map, like to look at that and see if we have
any areas in which we have commonality. I see some
pretty significant differences in Southern Arizona
already on the two maps. But in the interest of
trying to reach some sort of agreement, I would like
to look at what he's done and see if there's any
commonality with what my thoughts were and see if --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you. That is
music to my ears.

That was my concern is having these two
versions that we need to try to bring these
together. So if somebody can be -- more than one
person be looking at this and thinking about, you
know, how we might -- where the areas of difference
are and what we might do to combine, that might
help.

Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

What I would like to see -- can we focus
on some of the commonalities between these two?
Because I think that would help. There is quite a
few differences, so I want to see what commonalities
are between the two, version 7-- --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, we could talk
about that now.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I agree with that, but my map isn't -- it's only halfway done, so I don't think that works yet. All I did was --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It looks good.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I did that work in Southern Arizona and then I did the work in Central Arizona, but I need to finish. I think before we do that, we need to -- at least I need to have finished my map with all of my thoughts.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: And I think this question is probably directed at Mr. Desmond.

Do you think that the changes that Commissioner McNulty had proposed for the whole map would be done by tomorrow so that we can look at it so we can compare both option 1 version 6b and option 2 version 7a?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I haven't given them to him yet. I need to do that. That's what I'm planning on doing this afternoon and tonight, is finish those so I can give them to him. If I finish an actual map, I'll give you the map.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Yeah, that sounds
like a good plan.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Commissioner McNulty, I'm not sure if I heard correctly whether or not you said that you were using from the core of Maricopa County the Hispanic Coalition maps or the Arizona Minority Coalition map.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Arizona Minority Coalition. I don't believe we have state maps from the Hispanic Coalition. I could be wrong.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And do we have -- did we receive the maps on Friday from the Arizona Minority Coalition?

WILLIE DESMOND: No. For both -- both of these maps asked me to reference theirs. So using the, like, reports that they had generated, I was able to, I think, fairly, accurately reconstruct their districts. But I don't have, like, the actual shape files yet. We've asked for those on several occasions.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think what we have is a pdf with the pictures.

WILLIE DESMOND: So they had provided screen captures that had, like, the voting
tabulation districts that make up a lot of the
district and then they also had individual district
screen captures that had some of the major roads.

   In using those, I think I got fairly
close. I might have been a little bit farther off
on Commissioner McNulty's map. Commissioner
Freeman, I think you had kind of referenced how
things looked in there and asked me to use it. So
there's some areas where it might not be exact, but
I think Commissioner Freeman had said just take it
directly from there. So I worked a little bit more
at just taking it verbatim.

   COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. This is the
first time I've seen what you did, so I'll look at
it tonight. Thanks.

   VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: And, Madame Chair --

   CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Mr. Freeman.

   VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: -- I think one of
the difficulties was that right now we've got input
from one Hispanic group on just three legislative
districts and we've got to get up to nine
benchmarks. So the more input on that the better,
and I think that would make that easier for us.

   CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Desmond.

   WILLIE DESMOND: I was just going to say
the one district that -- the one majority-minority
district that everyone seems to pretty much agree on
is the Native American one. So I guess there will
be some discussion on whether or not Flagstaff is
included or where it goes through Coconino County
and stuff. But I think everyone at least is, in
principle, is agreeing that the Pai tribes should be
with the Navajo and Hopi and the Apache. So that's
a feature that's in both maps. So all of those
areas are linked together.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

I would ask legal counsel, too, and maybe
it's a question for staff, but I think we're doing
some outreach to some other groups, Hispanic groups
in particular, to get some more input on some of
this information. Is that true? I know we've had
offers from other -- from folks coming in and saying
they are happy to --

MARY O'GRADY: Staff may want to
supplement, but we have kind of ongoing outreach,
and we've been trying to expand that to reach more
Spanish language media. And to the extent that
we've had public maps submitted -- and I think there
was one for Tucson that looked like it was trying to
draw a minority district in Tucson and I forget the
name of the fellow who submitted it -- the person that submitted it, but they reached out to that person to see if they wanted to come and present. And so those are the additional efforts.

Then I did follow up with Mr. Miranda to see if there was going to be other -- like a statewide map presented. So we're trying to get more information on what might be presented to the Commission.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Okay. So that's ongoing.

Any other comments, then, on these legislative scenarios that anyone wants to talk about now?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Just like I said, I definitely would love to see both of them completed. I don't know if Commissioner Freeman has any more changes to that particular version of his map, but if he does, if he could make the changes and have them both ready as soon as possible so we can compare the commonalities between the two and see if we can come up with one version.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I agree.
VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I'll do my best, but I do need some sleep.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thanks.

Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Just a question.

The red, Mr. Desmond, on the data sheet --

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: -- is that where it falls below? What are those red things?

WILLIE DESMOND: Those are cases of either a coalition or a plurality minority district. So, again, plurality where Hispanics are the largest group and then plurality where Hispanics and other minorities make up a larger share than whites, who are the largest group.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. Thanks.

WILLIE DESMOND: And I believe in our current -- currently there's four majority-minority districts and then there's, like, three plurality coalitions and stuff.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Just for the benefit of the exhausted and sleepless commissioners, if you could highlight all of the figures that comprise the plurality on these, that would be helpful. Not right now --
WILLIE DESMOND: Oh, okay.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: -- but when you do these displays. I mean, I see them, but it would be really helpful just to have -- on the plurality districts for you to highlight all of them, the minority figures that make them up.

WILLIE DESMOND: I will.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Have we reached out to the groups that ended up suing the Commission ten years ago, basically the minority coalition groups to see if they could be involved in terms of what they are needing from us? If we haven't, then I would recommend doing that.

MARY O'GRADY: Madame Chair, Commissioner Herrera, we're happy to reach out with whomever. And they have a broad list of community groups in addition to the media contacts. I don't know precisely what individuals were associated with that group last decade. As Mr. Miranda said, the folks have evolved to some extent who have been working on redistricting issues.

So if there is specific individuals or groups that you have mind, we can add them to the
outreach list that we have ongoing.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Sure. And I guess I'm thinking MALDF comes to mind, but they may already be involved in some way.

MARY O'GRADY: Yeah, the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government noted that that MALDF is supporting their maps. MALDF is on our e-mail outreach list and they came to one of our meetings. They came to the meeting -- the public hearing in Central Phoenix, but we haven't heard from them on legislative maps either.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Along those lines, one of the things we also need to be telling them, and maybe we already did, but the whole scrambled precinct data issue, to ensure that everybody has, you know, got the right information. And I know now that Strategic is working on the '04, '06 data; is that correct? Because there's the same issues with that data and we need to ensure that they are aware of those correct precinct names.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah. For '04, '06, we had received a file that appeared to be, you know, matching the election results to the 2000 blocks file, which would have been a very good starting point and saved us a lot of time while we're doing
some validation renotice and a lot of the same types of problems and scrambled precincts and inconsistent congressional districts from 2004 to 2006. So we're going through the process of proving it all and making sure we have a match.

Once that information is ready to present, I'll probably do a similar presentation and make that available on the website so that everyone who is using election results has apples to apples to compare.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Do we have a sense of when that will be completed?

WILLIE DESMOND: I would have to defer to Ken on when '04 and '06 is going to be ready.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We'll ask him later.

WILLIE DESMOND: I think he's shaking his head. He doesn't know right now. It's on our --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: To-do list.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah. I did a lot of the last one and I've been pretty occupied with what-if maps. We're working on it continually.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Any other questions or comments we want to talk about on legislative?

Okay. You have your --
WILLIE DESMOND: For tomorrow, I guess we could just -- if commissioners who have asked for these maps or any other commissioners have a chance to study them, again, the block equivalency and the plan files are available on the website. We can open these back up again tomorrow. Maybe if there are some changes, work through those as a group. We should have time.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great. Thank you.
Okay. That takes us to agenda item 5, executive director's report.

RAY BLADINE: Madame Chair, Commission members, we're not going to let you get away today without more books. So we have two books for you, one that has all of the newspaper articles and media that have come in since the Commission started and the second is updating you with the public input that has also come in to us since your last book.

So please don't forget to go with the book. Otherwise, I have to carry them back. That is a personal reason in this, besides the fact that I know you'll use them.

The only other thing I would like to ask is Anna, I think this morning, sent out a request to all of you asking about availability for next week.
And my hope was that by perhaps Thursday we could take a look again at future meetings and agenda times and prepare a sheet for you that will talk about the week starting October 3rd -- so we are working on that.

Kristina is not here today because she has started working setting up round two activities and contacting people and trying to locate translators and all of the things that go with that.

So probably during this week, one or the other of us will stay back at the office and try to work on the things that we need to be getting done on the administrative end.

And I think that's all I have at this point to report.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any questions for Mr. Bladine?

I just have one comment on the scheduling, and it is the next agenda item, future meetings.

The week of October 3rd. So the 3rd and the 4th would need to be in Tucson due to some work meetings I have that are standard that I really need to be at. So -- but the rest of the week is open.

So to the extent commissioners can keep
things open for next week, we probably need to do
that.

So if anyone knows of any commitments
they have now, feel free to say them.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: You know my story.
RAY BLADINE: I beg your pardon?
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: You know my story.
RAY BLADINE: Yes, I do know your story
and we appreciate it very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair, the
only thing -- again, nothing has changed for me
other than those Monday, Wednesday, and Fridays
where I do have a prior commitment and I need to be
there by 6 o'clock. So I have no issue if we have
meetings in Tucson, of course, as long as I'm able
to leave by a certain time to get to Phoenix by
6:00.

RAY BLADINE: I think we have those as
regular meetings on the schedule, but we'll
double-check all of that and then give you a chance
to look at what Anna sent out and then come back to
you and do what we're doing now.
Anything you give us now we'll put on.
But certainly we'll have other shots at it.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thanks very much, Mr. Bladine.

The next item on the agenda we just covered, unless anyone has any future agenda items, anything we haven't covered that we need to in any of those future meetings that anyone wants to raise?

Otherwise, our agendas are pretty much looking the same at this point. We have a lot of recurring items that we need to address. But if anyone does think of anything, be sure to raise that for Mr. Bladine's spreadsheet.

That takes us to agenda item 7, report legal advice and direction to counsel regarding Attorney General inquiry.

I don't know if there is an update, but we can do public comment before or after, if there is one.

JOE KANEFIELD: Madame Chair, it might make sense to do public comment first.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So we'll go to agenda item 8. I've got a number of input sheets.

The first speaker is Shirley Dye, vice president, Northern Gila County Republicans.
So I don't think Shirley is here, so we'll go to the next.

Mohur Sidhwa, representing self.

MOHUR SIDHWA: Hi. Mohur Sarah Sidhwa.

You all know where I stand on various and sundry issues. Earlier today we were looking at maps, and I just want you to keep in mind that you did indicate that you would take into account the inmate populations.

I was not going to bring it up before -- I mean again, yet when we had the Commission hearing at -- I guess it was at the casino, somebody from Pinal County mentioned that there were only 9,000 prisoners in Pinal County. Florence alone has 11,000, then not to mention -- I mean, then there's Picacho and then there's 4,000 plus in Eloy.

So I think they had the data wrong. And because they mentioned it yet again made me realize that there is something perhaps that we have to be more careful about; otherwise, why would they be pushing the issue that much. So just kind of keep that in mind.

About a month and a half ago I gave you all a map with where all of the prisons were located. So just kind of keep that in mind also.
About two months ago, I gave you a graph showing competitiveness correlated to voter turnout. You all have it. Please look at it again and you will see the more competitive a district, the higher the voter turnout.

And because of the lack of functionality in governments, including Arizona, that tells me that competitiveness of the district is the most important issue.

Otherwise, a lack of competitiveness forces candidates from both sides of the aisle to cater to the ideological purity of the activists within the party to the exclusion of solving problems or engaging in critical thinking, "critical thinking" being the key words these days.

And this does lead to voter apathy and it hurts the very concept of democracy by making a mockery of the democratic process, and that is not American. I don't think any of you would disagree with that.

I would like to caution you on one thing. I have seen very decent people who are elected officials speaking for themselves or not speaking for themselves. They have a certain agenda. Keep that in mind. And keep in mind where they are
coming from so -- whereas they are all honorable people, both sides of the aisle, but I have seen some very interesting maps coming from them and interesting numbers coming from them.

We do not need a district to be 70 percent or 68 percent one particular -- say a minority for it to be competitive. Otherwise, it really does dilute their influence nearby. Just something to keep in mind. And that goes for all sides.

So once again, I would like to let -- to say -- really I'm pleading with you, do not discount where the inmates are. Otherwise, we have a problem -- a constitutional issue with the 14th and 15th Amendments of one person, one vote.

And I've gone over that before. I think I'm just reminding you of that and -- competitiveness -- and keep an eye on the prison issue.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Barry McCain, representing self.

BARRY MCCAIN: Good afternoon. My name is Barry McCain.
Do you want me to spell it?

B-a-r-r-y, M-c-C-a-i-n.

I've been watching and one thing is a lot of maps here that you're looking at and everybody has input here -- being ex-military, I can tell you about any kind of fighting you want to talk about. But when it comes to maps, one thing I've noticed that I think needs to be said, we should take what we agree with, put that down first and then what we don't agree on, we have a less -- we run down on time to where we should be concentrating on those differences, but the agreement stuff, just get it out of the way so you can get more done.

But one thing I also noticed that I think needs to be addressed, there's been a lot of work done here that I'm aware of and I don't know everything, but I really do appreciate each and every one of your inputs, from what I've seen, and I think you should applaud yourself.

So we are running down on time. First thing we got to do is reenergize and be thankful for what's already been done. And I appreciate it. I have full confidence that you will do well.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.
Our next speaker is Lynne St. Angelo, representing self.

LYNNE ST. ANGELO: Lynne, L-y-n-n-e, S-t, period, A-n-g-e-l-o.

My comment today is just one. It's on the -- putting the maps online. A lot of people are following the procedure online. They come home after work at night and have been actually able to watch what happened in the day.

Last week, though, that kind of got -- I don't know what happened. Probably late-night meetings and a lot of early morning meetings got on top of each other, but that's probably not going to get much better because that seems to be how it's going now.

So I would ask whoever is doing that, getting them online so that people can watch the meeting, we have Thursday, Friday, and now Monday that aren't up, so nobody can see what happened the last, now, three days.

I would just urge you to probably work on that so that we can maybe within 12 hours, or 24 hours at least, get the maps up so people can follow along at home.

Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Roberto Reveles, representing self from Gold Canyon.

ROBERTO REVELES: Thank you, Madame Chairman.

My name is Roberto Reveles, 10904 East Sleepy Hollow Trail, Gold Canyon.

I would like to bring a little bit of cultural sensitivity to the description that I've heard. Donuts, bagels. How about the churro? The churro can be twisted in a very fine delicate pastry.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm open to that.

ROBERTO REVELES: Good.

In fact, I personally worked in Congress at the time when there was a donut. There was one congressman who represented the city of Phoenix and its surrounding areas and I worked with a congressman who represented the rest of the state of Arizona.

Which leads me to observe that there isn't necessarily one geographic grouping that will be perfect.

I think that there is an opportunity for a hybrid of sorts so that natural resource dependent
communities that are producing a product for the
quality of life in the urban areas can benefit from
perhaps being in a comparable congressional or
legislative district, if you will.

But of the maps that have been
referenced, my inclination is to be supportive of
the so-called river district map and in opposition
to the whole counties map as almost -- the latter
being almost indicative of a protect-the-incumbent
line drawing.

So I want an opportunity to have my vote
be sought after. I want to be in a competitive
environment. I don't necessarily want to be packed
into a district where, because I'm a Reveles that I
will be supporting only a particular candidate. I
want my vote to be sought after.

And so I encourage that, yes, let's pay
attention to all of the constitutionally mandated
set of criteria, but underscoring it all is the
reason why we are even under Justice Department
clearance, that my community, the Latino community
needs competitive districts.

Thank you very much. And I'm encouraged
by what I see here. I think there's good give and
take. So you've got a tough job ahead of you. I
1 wish you well.
2
3 CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.
4
5 Our next speaker is Jim March, second vice chair, Pima Libertarian Party.
6
7 JIM MARCH: Hi, Jim March. Last name spelled the same as the month.
8
9 I'll be brief.
10
11 Regarding the prison issue, in the maps that I have seen the Commission generating and discussing, it looks like you're trying to pay some attention to the issue. You're trying to spread out the concentration in Pinal County, for example, among multiple districts. That's good. That's probably a start.
12
13 One of my concerns -- my remaining concerns, though, is that it's going to be very hard for the public to comment on it once the official draft release maps come out because we don't have good data available to us on exactly where the state and federal prisons are, in particular, and the INS detention facilities and the private prisons.
14
15 At one point your staff put a map up on the overhead at one of the meetings showing only two prisons in Pinal County. And, I'm sorry, I know that's wrong. I know that's wrong.
So I think there's bad information floating around. It's become very difficult to get good information on this. Best data I have is from 2000.

So what I would ask is you take one staffer and tell them, please, call the Census Bureau and get their data and publish it. Simple.

We need that information available on your website listed among the other data sources you've got online so that we know where these prisons are, what draft districts they are in, and what their populations are. From there, we can comment on the repercussions intelligently.

I simply ask that you direct staff to provide information on this subject. And it's all the more crucial because so far staff has provided at least one round of incorrect information.

So let's do that and let's all comment on what the draft is.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Legal counsel, can I ask staff about that or -- I believe our -- Strategic Telemetry gave a presentation that showed a map of Arizona with the prison populations in stars, and I don't know if we
can put that information up on our website and then also have the chart with backing data showing where it came from and also what the numbers are.

JOE KANEFIELD: Madame Chair, it's appropriate for you to direct staff to study a matter raised during public comment.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So Strategic Telemetry did make that presentation and maybe, Mr. Bladine, you could get from that that particular chart that has the information.

I see Mr. Strasma approaching, so he might have a few words to say, too.

RAY BLADINE: I just couldn't resist that. But I'm sure we could post it if Ken can provide it.

KEN STRASMA: Definitely.

And one update, it was mentioned by two of the speakers about the census information. Census does have group quarters population counts, and a subcategory is involuntarily incarcerated. So we'll make that data available as well and work to add that to the reports you see for the numbers of prisons and number of prisoners.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great. We'll get that on the website as soon as it's available.
JIM MARCH: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is David Cantelme, representing FAIR Trust from Cave Creek.

DAVID CANTELME: Madame Chair, members of the Commission, just one brief point. This is on the legislative side.

I just want to remind you that at the meeting at Hon-Dah that the Commission held, you received a letter from Chairman Lupe, the chairman of the White Mountain Reservation, indicating that he was good with the existing configuration, and that should be given a lot of weight, in my recommendation, in my estimation.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Rivko Knox, representing self from Phoenix.

RIVKO KNOX: I'm glad Mr. Bladine talked ahead of me so he lowered the mic a little bit, at least.

My name is Rivko, R-i-v-k-o, first name. Last name is Knox, K-n-o-x. 3134 West Gelding Drive, Phoenix, Arizona 85053.

I want to start really briefly and thank
you all for what you are doing and both the
commissioners and the staff. It's a very, very
tough job. And this is my second meeting at which I
have appeared, and from the two that I've been at,
you're doing a very good job. And I appreciate all
of you. Like I say, including staff.

Secondly, I'm not a cartographer and I'm
not a data person. So I guess the question would be
why am I up here. Well, I have very strong feelings
about the importance of competitiveness.

I've talked to too many people who live
in districts that are so skewed that their attitude
is it does not matter, and the reality is it does
matter.

So it's very hard to get people to really
get enthusiastic about coming out to vote, and even
registering to vote when it's so skewed.

The whole county map, to me, idea is
rather unrealistic in the sense that county lines
are not sacred. I mean, they exist. I'm not saying
that they don't exist, but they don't -- they were
drawn by -- just like the state lines, drawn in
strange ways and we have already seen in the last
few years how communities bleed over county lines,
Sedona, Apache Junction to name two that I'm aware
of. And in addition to that, Pinal County is kind
of building up into the Phoenix area, building down
to the Tucson area. So I don't see the validity of
that.

    I would really -- when I looked at the
numbers -- and the most recent time I looked at the
numbers was yesterday -- I was really truthfully
with this whole county map horrified to see that
there were only two competitive congressional
districts when we know the registration in this
state is a third, a third, and a third.

    I think that there has been way too much
focused on communities of interest with not enough
attention paid to competitiveness. To me a
community of interest represents people who share my
views. And by and large, my views are related to
things like the importance of public education,
environmental protection, a society that takes care
of people who are old and sick, et cetera.

    And the lines that are based on -- oh, I
don't know, like I said -- county lines are a good
example, I think, of a community of interest. I
don't think they represent that necessarily.

    So I'll look really fast at what else I
was going to say.
Oh, I think that somebody has talked about -- I think it was also pretty terrifying to me to see that the Phoenix MSA -- I don't know if it's called MA -- I think it's changed, but anyway, has no competitive districts and it was just horrifying for me to see that.

The Phoenix MSA is the 14th largest metropolitan district in the country. It is larger than 24 states. And to have no competitive districts in that just to me kind of violated the concept of one person, one vote.

Two other really quick comments. One is we're all aware, obviously, of the Title V voting rights but that should not be used to skew districts so there are not enough competitive districts.

And my final comment, I promise this really is, is I wish you could get your schedule up earlier. I had to change my whole day today to get here. And I am on your list, so I get the notices. But it would be really nice as you plan your second round, which will be critical, obviously, to get them out all at one time. Even if you're not sure of the exact location, I mean, if you haven't found a spot, and I understand the practicalities of that, but if you know there's going to be these many
dates, these times and the general area, like Phoenix or Casa Grande or Tucson -- because I think it would generate more people being able to attend.

    Thank you very much for listening to my comments, and, again, thank you for all you're doing.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much.
    Our next speaker is Lois Pfau. I'm sorry if I'm not pronouncing your last name correctly.

    LOIS PFAU: Pfau.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So you can spell that for Michelle.

    LOIS PFAU: Madame Chair and commissioners, my name is Lois Pfau. I live at 1023 West Vision Lane in Phoenix, Arizona --

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And can you spell your last name?

    LOIS PFAU: P-f-a-u.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

    LOIS PFAU: -- 85021.

    And I was going to talk about competitiveness, but Rivko stole all of my glory, so I'm just going to leave the word out there for you.

    Thank you very much for your time.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much.
Our next speaker is Jill Kipnes, representing Pima County Governmental Alliance.

JILL KIPNES: Good afternoon. It's Jill Kipnes, K-i-p-n-e-s. I'm with Robert S. Lynch & Associates, and we represent Pinal County Governmental Alliance.

I wasn't really planning on speaking today but I need to clear up the statistics based on prison population.

Pinal County as a whole for -- in the 2010 census has a total prison population of 6.5 percent. That number is 3.4 percent of the 710,224 people that will make up a congressional district. So again, it's not a very large number.

Congressional District -- current Congressional District 1 that is currently represented by Dr. Gosar -- so in the 2000 census, prison population was 2.8 percent.

In Pinal County's CD 9, which you saw today, so Navajo, Apache, Gila, Graham, Greenlee, and Pinal prison population is 4.1 percent. So it's a 1.3 percent increase from 2000.

Each district is growing more than 9.5 percent. So again, it's certainly not packing prisoners into one district or another.
Legislatively, there's no problem with us splitting Eloy and Florence. Actually, our maps that we have presented does do that, not necessarily for prison population purposes because we did not bring that into account when we were building these maps, but we do expect for Eloy and Florence to be split just because of where they are geographically, I-10, and now for prison population.

So there's certainly no problem with splitting Eloy and Florence legislatively, but there would be a problem splitting Eloy and Florence, and, therefore, all of Pinal County, congressionally just to split up their prisons.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our last speaker is Kelli Butler, representing self from Paradise Valley.

KELLI BUTLER: Hello. Kelli Butler, B-u-t-l-e-r. My address is 5926 North 33rd Street, Paradise Valley 85253.

Commissioners, thank you so much for the Herculean task you are taking on. I can't imagine how mind-numbing looking at all of those maps would be over time.

And I just wanted to come and talk about
competitiveness. And when I walked in late, I was shocked that we were -- there was even a debate about the importance of competitiveness. I thought that was the whole point of redistricting our state was to allow everybody to have a voice. And frankly, the only way to do that is to make our districts competitive.

I'm a native Arizonan. I hate the extremism that I have seen talking over, and I think the solution is to allow for competitive districts, let everybody have a voice and let -- like you have been.

And also I was impressed at the ability to compromise that I have seen here, you know, the discussion and differing viewpoints. We need to compromise and that cannot happen without competitive districts and without representation for everybody.

So that's all.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Well, I believe that concludes public comment. And so I appreciate all of you coming and sharing your thoughts with us.

The time is now 3:57 p.m., and the only
item left on the agenda is item 7, which is report
legal advice and direction to counsel regarding
Attorney General inquiry. The Commission may vote
to go into executive session which will not be open
to the public, for the purpose of obtaining legal
advice and providing direction to counsel.

JOE KANEFIELD: Madame Chair, at this
point it would be our recommendation that the
Commission go into executive session to receive an
update.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.
Do I hear a motion to go into executive
session?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So moved.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is there a second?
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I second that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: All in favor?

("Aye.")

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any opposed?

Okay. Hearing none, the time is

3:58 p.m. We'll exit out of public session and let
the public clear out and then we'll begin executive
section momentarily.

Thank you.

(Whereupon the public session recessed
and executive session ensued.)

* * * * * *

(Whereupon the public session resumed.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. The time is 4:32 p.m. We'll enter back into public session. And the only item left on the agenda is number 9, adjournment. So at 4:32 p.m. I declare this meeting adjourned.

Thank you.

(The meeting concluded at 4:32 p.m.)
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