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

The time is 1:14 p.m. The date is Thursday, June 30th, and let's all rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. I want to remind the public to fill out a request to speak form if they are interested in speaking. I have a number of them already and we'll get to public comment in just a minute.

Let's start with roll call.

Vice Chair Mr. Freeman?

COMMISSIONER 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.
And I would like to acknowledge that we have a court reporter today, Michelle, so everyone be sure to speak one at a time.

And for the public, if you would please spell your name for the record, that would be very helpful for the court reporter so she gets an accurate transcription.

I also would like to acknowledge our counsel today, Mary O'Grady, who is here.

And I believe those are my announcements. So let's move to scheduled agenda item II, which is call for public comment.

And I'm just going to start in the order these are sitting here now. And please come up to the microphone, as I mentioned, and state your name and spell it, if you could.

I would like to also request that the public limit comments, if they could, to three minutes each so we can get through the meeting as efficiently as possible.

First person is Representative Daniel Peterson (sic). He's the State Rep for LD29, Tucson. He's representing himself. The subject is competitive district.

DANIEL PATTERSON: Thank you members of the
Commission. I'm Representative Daniel Patterson from here in Tucson, and I was planning on just showing up here to listen.

I first want to thank the commissioners for doing an important job for the State of Arizona, and I wanted to also thank on behalf of myself and the constituents here in Tucson, thank you for coming to Tucson and listening to what people have to say in Southern Arizona.

I think that we are all interested in competitive districts, making sure that everyone's vote counts and really focuses on making sure our district reflects what's going in our state.

And so I appreciate that you're doing the job and mostly just want to say welcome to Tucson and good luck with the process and hopefully create competitive fair districts across the state.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Kenneth Moyes, representing Citizens for Commonsense Redistricting. The subject is Commission Missions and Arizona Constitution.

MR. MOYES: Can you hear me?
Good morning. Kenneth Moyes, M-o-y-e-s.

Members of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission, on June 24th you heard compelling reasons why Strategic Telemetry was a highly partisan company with stated objectives to observe progressivism. They clearly do not have a balanced objective and do not take clinical approach to their work.

The Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission's mission is to administer the fair and balanced redistricting of the Congressional and Legislative districts for the State of Arizona.

Yet on Wednesday, June 29th, the Commission voted to select Strategic Telemetry to draw Arizona's districts. I can understand the vote of the Democrats on the Commission, but the vote of the chair, Ms. Mathis is puzzling. She is quoted as saying she voted for this vendor because they worked the campaign of Mayor Bloomberg of New York City, an Independent. May I remind Ms. Mathis that she was told on Friday that this vendor chose the Bloomberg campaign for the following reason, based on a quote from the president of the vendor, Mr. Strasma.

Bloomberg's decision to switch his party affiliation to Independent, and that was from
Republican, and its progressive positions on most
issues was what led many Democratic consultants,
including my firm, Strategic Telemetry, to support
him.

It is Ms. Mathis' vote for a heavily and
clearly partisan firm and ignoring the compelling
evidence and comment that smacks of a highly
partisan chair or an incapable chair. We call for
Ms. Mathis to be served written notice in
preparation for removal by the Governor.

Article 4, Part 2, Section 1, Paragraph
10 of our State Constitution states: After having
been served written notice and provided with an
opportunity for response, a member of the
Independent Redistricting Commission may be removed
by the Governor with the concurrence of two-thirds
of the senate, for substantial neglect of duty,
gross misconduct in office, and inability to
discharge the duties of the office.

It is clear that Ms. Mathis neglected her
duty to administer the fair and balanced
redistricting of the Congressional and Legislative
districts for the State of Arizona. She has
demonstrated an inability to discharge the duties of
office, thus grounds for dismissal. We ask that
members of the Commission, legislators, or the Governor serve Ms. Mathis with this written notice, obtain her answer, and if found insufficient, the Governor remove her from the Commission.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

MR. HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is David Cashion, representing CCSR and the subject is the letter of the law. And if you could state what CCSR is.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Before you begin, I want to make sure that the people in the audience, you know, no laughing. I appreciate that. No laughing. If you find something funny, keep if to yourself or go outside. Just respect the people that are in this room.

Thank you.

MR. CASHION: CCR (sic) is just loosely, Citizens for Commonsense of Redistricting.

My is Dave Cashion, C-a-s-h-i-o-n, and I just ask that you guys consider the Constitution, consider 106, and consider the voting laws -- I mean, the voting rights law.

If you want to look at keeping
communities together, that's perfectly within your bounds. But to go and look at strengthening or keeping somebody's strength, their position in their district strong, that's not what your job is.

To go and look at historical voting records, to decide, there's nowhere in any -- that I could find anywhere, that gives you the right to do that.

So I would just ask that you just stick to the letter of the law, plain and simple.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Vicki Davis, representing self and CCSR and the subject is questions on procedures.

MS. DAVIS: My name is Vicki Davis, D-a-v-i-s. I've been trying to find the proposals of the various companies, and I can't find them. I don't know if other citizens have been able to find them so that we can know what you are considering.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can't hear you.

MS. DAVIS: Hello?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There you go.

MS. DAVIS: And I've been trying to find the
minutes. I attended the meeting yesterday, but because you were in executive session for three hours, I had to leave before I could hear the results. And so I just had to Google somewhere else. I couldn't find it on your website.

Again, I question why you make your meetings available to us with such short notice and that you have no meetings scheduled in the evenings so ordinary working citizens have a chance to have some input.

I don't understand why you had to have a three-hour executive session. You evidently are supposed to do that if you are choosing an individual, not a vendor, and in this case it was a vendor. Or if you're getting legal opinions. And if it took three hours to get a legal opinion, you have a really bad lawyer.

You said that -- in the report that I read on the Internet said that all companies are political. So why on earth did you choose the most political company? In this economy, why did you choose a Wisconsin/Washington, D.C., based company.

I know my husband had a small company, a civil engineering company, and I know that he submitted proposals, he couldn't compete with big
companies. And he knew and I knew and the city knew
and whoever he sent proposals to knew that the most
slick, fancy detailed proposal isn't necessarily
always the best one.

I really don't trust what you have done
so far because it's been so hard to find -- to know
ahead of time when your meetings are and find
records. I've never seen an organization that
didn't have minutes approved and so forth.

So I just suggest that you need to have
more consideration for the ordinary citizens to keep
track of what you are doing.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

The next speaker is Don Nevins. The
title of his organization, Men of the Bean and the
subject is mapping company independent/integrity.

MR. NEVINS: Men of the Bean is a coffee
group. I spoke before --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can't hear you.

MR. NEVINS: I spoke before this committee --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can't hear you.

MR. NEVINS: Is that close enough?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

MR. NEVINS: How about that?
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Getting better.

MR. NEVINS: I'm still on the same topic.

I appreciate the ability to speak to the Commission. Independent, fair, unbiased redistricting.

Washington, D.C., nobody, in the district has the respect of Arizona voters. Congress is at 20 percent. The administration is at 46 percent. The district mayor is in disrepute, the lobbyist and vendors are disreputed. And you pick a mapping company from D.C.?

This independent Commission not only has appeared to fail the voters of Arizona in maintaining a fair and balanced reputation, it has, in fact, deliberately chosen a mapping company whose CEO has a highly biased reputation. Obama's campaign, national target director.

In conclusion, I'm outraged. Is this treating the citizens fairly? No.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Ed Johnson representing self, and the subject is objective.

And, Mr. Johnson, if you wouldn't mind stating where you live or just -- so -- and actually, that's for anyone who speaks that just put
"self," if you would be helpful just to know in what area you reside in.

MR. JOHNSON: The name Edward J. Johnson. That's E-d-w-a-r-d, middle initial J, Johnson, J-o-h-n-s-o-n. I live at 5160 North Sabino Foothills Drive, which is in 85750 by Sabino Canyon and it's in the country.

I won't take a lot of your time because more eloquent people have already expressed pretty much my feelings, but I am just here to object to the lack of objectivity.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you, Mr. Johnson.

Our next speaker is Bill Roe, representing self and competitive district.

And just to clarify, you don't have to give your full address or anything. I was just looking for if you live in Tucson or Oro Valley or Marana or wherever.

MR. ROE: I'm Bill Roe and I live in the city of Tucson. And I was one of the pool of 25 applicants to be on this Commission. I was disappointed, of course, that I was not selected, but I think I recognize more than those people the amount of time, energy, and effort that each of you
put into this. It is an enormous commitment to the future of the state of Arizona.

My own interest is particularly in competitive districts, and then a little more selfishly for Pima County and Southern Arizona. My interest is to make sure the interest of this part of the state are adequately protected in the final results.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Gary Gomez, representing self and the subject is decision on mapping.

MR. GOMEZ: See if I can get this right the first time.


Madame Chairman, Commissioners, I am a citizen, a citizen who is now questioning the Commission's integrity and commitment to inclusion of the public in a nonpartisan process.

After attending the last two meetings, my feelings are that this is a predetermined process with one agenda: Remap Arizona to improve Democratic representation. Code word, competitive
districts. So much for transparency.

Meeting behind closed doors and now a mapping company that will draw districts back in D.C. and New York and return them to the state. Will David Axlerod be invited to approve the maps? Well, how would we know? The maps are going to be drawn out of state.

What really saddens me is that in this economy you are sending our money out of state. We had two companies that were Arizona firms. So we get less input, less transparency, out-of-state mapping, mapping by a company that doesn't understand the differences, nuances in our population.

But that apparently isn't important. This Commission has its own agenda, an agenda that disregards its own RFP, its own mandate and any resemblance to being nonpartisan.

The winners will clearly be the Obama 2012 campaign with NDC, two clients of this mapping company, Arizona Democrats, and, of course, the attorneys.

Let the lawsuits begin. You better get back to the Legislature and ask for more money. You have guaranteed more lawsuits than less. Lawsuits
may begin before you even start drawing maps.

Oh, that may be incorrect, just like this decision. Maybe the maps are already drawn. There are a number of them floating around from Democratic groups. I've seen some maps out there. It will be interesting to see if the final mapping, the final analysis these maps will be the ones that are accepted with mere cosmetic changes.

The losers are clearly the citizens of Arizona, Arizona economics by sending our money out of state, and confidence in the nonpartisan process.

I started attending these meetings with no agenda, not looking for a win for the R's or the -- who are the majority in Arizona just looking for the mandate to be fulfilled, an independent nonpartisan commission. Silly me, partisan politics is alive and well.

This brings to mind the quote made by the commander of the successful Japanese fleet after -- or attack on Pearl Harbor. "I'm afraid all we have done is awakened a sleeping giant."

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Gini Crawford. Title is campaign manager for People of Arizona and the subject is mapping company.
MS. CRAWFORD: Gini Crawford, G-i-n-i, Crawford, C-r-a-w-f-o-r-d, and I live in Marana.

And I want to say right now, forgive me. I'm not going to use niceties because I am so upset over this situation.

I have heard the board is stacked against Republicans three to two in the voting and all of this, but I have thought I'm going to give them a break. You know, things can be passed around, rumors and stuff, but the end product has not been done. So I thought I'm going to give you all a break.

And then I heard today that you picked a mapping company that is a campaign company. And I understand campaign companies. I have one. I am a political campaign manager, and I own a political campaign company. And this is what this company is. It's not a mapping company, it's a political campaign consulting company. And if that isn't bad enough, it's a Democratic campaign consulting company. And as people will say, Obama is one of their clients.

You know, all of you knew this because I went to their website and this company doesn't hide anything. I mean, it's very transparent. So I
really give that to this company.

But on their front page, they tell you it is a campaign company and they explain how they can help your campaign do things better.

I have their front page right here. Anyone can clearly see it's a campaign -- political campaign company.

And then you go on in this website and they are clear, they are transparent. They tell you that their clients are progressive Democrats, as I just said, Obama being one of them.

The whole -- like I said, all of you knew this.

You know, I thought this Commission was supposed to be nonpartisan. Dammit you can't get anymore partisan than this, and I hope you got that. I am so mad over this. And you're probably thinking, oh, well she's Ruth McClung's campaign manager and these Republicans and if they would have picked a campaign company that was Republican, she wouldn't be standing here, she wouldn't be whining.

But that is wrong because I am American. And if we don't do these districts unbiased, if we don't draw these districts all over America, unbiased, and -- then we have lost this country as
we know it and this country won't be representing
the people. It will be representing a small
interest.

There are many mapping companies out
there -- I am sorry, I am so upset -- that you could
have picked that are nonpolitical. Why didn't you?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Lynn
Wildblood and she's representing Wildridge HOA and
the subject is mapping selection.

Sorry Mr. Wildblood.

MR. WILDBLOOD: My name is Wildblood,
W-i-l-d-b-l-o-o-d.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can't hear you.

MR. WILDBLOOD: My name is Lynn, L-y-n-n.

Colleen, I have your comments that you
had posted and I have a few comments about it and it
has to do with something that you already have been
hearing about.

You made a few comments about I
understand there are partisan feelings and passions,
which obviously there are. But when you talk about
firms, you had made mention of the fact that it sure
would have been good if there were possibly two
firms.

Well, I'm going to suggest to you what's
wrong with having two firms that would work
together? It's a good possibility.

    That's about all because you've already
heard a lot of the comments by other people in
regards to this decision, so thank you.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you, Mr. Wildblood.

Next speaker is Keith Rollinson
representing self and the subject is choice of
redistricting company.

    MR. ROLLINSON: My name is Keith Rollinson,
R-o-l-l-i-s-o-n. I live in Tucson.

        I was going to get up and ask you guys
basically a direct question to you, the chair,
basically the same question everybody has been
asking.

        What motivated you guys to choose these
people? Because it's just obvious, obvious what
they are doing. But there's no sense in asking that
question because it's pretty obvious to me why you
did it.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Rick
Meyer, representing private citizen and the subject
is fair elections.

    MR. MEYER: Hello. My name is Rick Meyer,
M-e-y-e-r. I live in Tucson, been a long-time
Tucson resident, but more importantly, I'm an American.

I've been following this issue on-line for a little while. I've usually kept my opinion to myself for the most part, but I feel it's important to have you hear my opinion on this.

Choosing a vendor that has so many obvious Democratic ties tends to give an appearance of bias and impropriety almost.

This is such an important issue with such long-term -- long-lasting results that it seems like a company that would be a little more nonpartisan would have been chosen. And it concerns me in that respect and it concerns me that the decisions made are going to be lasting until the next census. So I'm just a little disappointed and I wanted to voice my opinion.

Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Christine Bauserman, title representing Tanque Verde Valley, CCSR and the subject is LD30; is that right?

MS. BAUSERMAN: Yes.

It's Christine with a C-h, and B, as in
boy, a-u-s-e-r-m-a-n. I live in LD30.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And can you state what CCSR is?

MS. BAUSERMAN: That Commonsense Redistricting.

I live in LD30 in the far Northeast Valley, and I want to talk about communities of interest and where I would like LD30 lines to be.

LD30 has to lose a small amount of votes, and you can do that easily by moving Houghton Road -- the line out to Houghton Road between Speedway and 22nd Street.

You can lose the southwest area to LD25 and give everything west of Sabino Canyon LD26, which actually they have more in common with that community.

What makes us a community in Tanque Verde? One is natural boundaries. We are like a rural suburban area out there. Most of our homes are one acre to three acres.

We are connected by Houghton Road, Old Spanish Trail, and recently Mary Ann Cleveland and then we all know all of the little back roads to get to each other because there's a lot of dirt roads out there.
We do have the windy roads and narrow roads and our kids ride many bikes and bicycles and we raise animals out there. I sit at my house and horses ride by within these areas.

We enjoy boy scouts, girl scouts. I moved out there to be near my charter school. We do these activities with people in these same areas.

We're in 4-H with people from Sierra Vista, Vail, Rita Ranch and Sahuarita. We don't see from people from FFA from Sahuaro High School or any of the other high schools. Our -- like I said, our kids raise these animals on our land out there.

We hike around there. We have that in common. I go out my door and I hike in Molina Basin. I go to the end of Portal, Speedway, Old Spanish Trail, we hike that mountain -- that part of the mountain. We don't come into the Foothills area.

We know each other. We see each other on hiking trails. We know you live somewhere in the neighborhood. Then we see each other later in the grocery store. We exercise at the same club and it's actually become a topic amongst us, like we'll see each other, it will be where do I know you or what do I know you from when. We start trying to
limit it. And we're, like, okay, you live in Tanque Verde. That's all you need to say.

So I would like to make an additional comment is that Steve Muratore with the Egalitarian seems to get information before it's published on your website. Like Monday night he said that you were going to be moving the meeting to Phoenix on Wednesday, and I don't know what his connection is. He is a blogger, but he does seem to get some information that he puts out there before you guys can even put it out there for the public. So it makes it appear that he has an inside connection.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Beverly Lockwood representing LD30, the subject is Tanque Verde Valley.

MS. LOCKWOOD: Yes. It's Beverly Lockwood, l-y, L-o-c-k-w-o-o-d.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can't hear you.

MS. LOCKWOOD: L-o-c-k-w-o-o-d. I live in the Tanque Verde Valley area. I could mimic everything Christine Bauserman just said, so you can put that on the record.

What I was thinking sitting here
listening was if you all haven't already let the contract to hire this company, would you take our comments into consideration and go back to your drawing board and try to get somebody that better represents us in Arizona? We have plenty of representation for the company that you've hired.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Lynne St. Angelo representing self and the subject is choice.

MS. ST. ANGELO: I am Lynne St. Angelo. It is spelled L-y-n-n-e, S-t period, A-n-g-e-l-o.

And I have been not wanting to do this, someone pointed out to me a long time ago, but now I feel that I am -- based on what happened yesterday, I have been compelled to now bring the Declaration of Independence into what is happening on the Commission.

When our founding fathers penned the Declaration of Independence, there were 27 things that they had as objections to what King George had done. These were things they considered so egregious to them that they were actually willing to lay down their lives and their fortunes to withdraw from Great Britan.
And what they said is, "The present King of Great Britan is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these states. To prove this, let these facts be submitted to a candid world." One of these facts is this: He has called together Legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public records for the sole purpose of critiquing them into compliance with his measures.

Now, you have changed your venue. You have changed last minute. You have been down to the very minute of being the 48 hours that you are required by law to give to change from one city to the next, to have people go all over.

And up to now I've been saying, well, you know things come up, but I know, in fact, that you knew a week ahead of the Oro Valley meeting and you didn't let the public know about it until 48 hours before.

Your charge to the Oro Valley town council was that your mission is to administer fair and balanced redistricting of Congressional and Legislative districts of the state of Arizona.
That's your own stated mission.

And in your RFP in hiring this contracting company that you hired to draw all of the maps in Arizona, you said, "I'll clearly state the promise of public input that the contractors shall be complying -- they are responsible for complying and soliciting public input as well as providing the public with information as directed by the AIRC, including such items as draft maps and other relevant information."

That same thing is true of the Commission. You are required by law to listen to us, the public. You have been hearing from us, the public week after week. Even yesterday I was streaming your meeting, there were more people telling you about Strategic Telemetry and how this of all of the companies was -- had the greatest conflict of interest and should be ousted.

If it was a legal situation and this was a lawyer or a judge sitting on the stand, he would have to recuse himself. That's how they are. Yet that is who you choose.

This is blatant. What has been done is a blatant disregard of what was said. And I want to know why? What faith can we possibly have that you
will be fair and balanced? You aren't being now. You haven't listened to us, not one bit. It hasn't been one person. There have been many people representing many groups.

So slanted have your votes been against Republicans that there is no question what the goal of this Commission is. But what can we expect when the Independent is not really an Independent. She's married to an activist Democrat who is treasurer for Nancy Young-Wright's campaign.

You're not listening to the public now. How can you possibly think that we believe that you will listen to us in drawing maps. Fair, balanced maps. How can we possibly believe you?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Raquel Cook, representing self and the subject is fairness.

MS. COOK: My name is Raquel Cook. R-a-q-u-e-l, C-o-o-k.

I have lived in Oro Valley and I would just like to say in interest of time, I am strongly in favor of everything that Lynne St. Angelo and others have just stated. So I will not go into it in detail, other than on the record, I am 100 percent behind everyone who has complained about
your selection of the mapping company and they question how truly independent this Commission is.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Frank Olivieri, representing Pima County Tea Party Patriots. The subject is mapping transparency.

MR. OLIVIERI: Frank Olivieri, O-l-i-v-i-e-r-i. I live in Pima County.

And I guess I'm going to say what others have said. I had a history teacher way back when and he told me when you go in and discuss politics, back in high school many years ago, said make sure you put it on the public record, so I'm going to say it again.

Shame on the three of you that voted for Strategic Telemetry. Your decision clearly shows that there is nothing independent about this decision, it is purely based on political ideology. The record of prior AIRC open meetings will show the public's concerns of Strategic Telemetry fell on deaf ears.

Strategic Telemetry is a company that's primary function is political and not mapping. Let me read from their website.
Quote, Strategic Telemetry is dedicated to providing individual-level microtargeting, data analysis, strategic consulting and other services to help enable campaigns to successfully reach their target audiences and have their messages heard.

In today's evolving landscape where each vote is more important than ever, making sure that your campaign is running as efficiently and effectively as possible is critical to your success.

Whether your campaign's needs are big or small, contact us today to learn how we can provide a custom solution for your outreach and management needs.

Then they go on to state, "In addition to microtargeting, Strategic Telemetry offers many other valuable services to progressive campaigns and organizations, including campaign, maps -- campaign plans, mapping, redistricting, and so forth.

It is an independent position. Is this an independent position? I don't think so. Arizona Central reported this morning on Chairwoman Mathis' response as follows.

Commissioner Chairwoman Colleen Mathis, an Independent, said none of the applicant firms were free from partisan connections because that's
political -- typical for work in the political and elections arenas. While Strasma has done most of his homework for Democrats, he has proven expert -- expertise, and commissioners will strive to tap the expertise but not defer to it," she said. "This is not a shy group" -- thank you for that -- "with highly skilled consultants and transparent processes, any dissatisfaction can at least be minimized.

Now, here is Ken Strasma in his own words in February 2010.

Again, Bloomberg's decision to switch party affiliation to Independent and his progressive positions on most issues was what led to Democratic consultants, including my firm, Strategic Telemetry, to support him, unquote.

Chairwoman Mathis, what part of blatant partisan politics don't you understand? He states his political bias towards the progressive Democratic agenda.

It has been documented to this Commission before that Ken Strasma, president of Strategic Telemetry, was the national target director for Obama's 2008 presidential campaign.

Timeout. How much more politically
motivated information do you need? He is the
president of his company. He is the major influence
in a strategic direction his employees will take in
this assigned task.

Finally Chairwoman Mathis, it should be
noted once again of your affiliation with your
husband's campaign, treasurer for Democratic House
Representative 2010 campaign of Nancy Young-Wright.

The public has spoken and you have
refused to listen. Are you really Independent? Of
the four mapping finalists, there was at least one
that had no prior bias and is not -- that is an
Arizona company with a Democrat and a Republican
owner. TerraSystems Southwest, a Tucson-based
company, represents Arizona and not the interests of
Washington, and the money stays in Arizona.

I'm ashamed.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is
Peter -- and forgive me if I'm mispronouncing this,
Bengtson and you'll have to tell us who you're
representing. The subject is competitive districts.

MR. BENGTSON: Thank you. Can you hear me?

My name is Peter Bengtson. It's
B-e-n-g-t-s-o-n. I live up in the Catalina
Foothills. I'm representing myself.
I'm here to speak on competitive districts. I believe that's important. The districts we have should be competitive. I also would like to say this is the first time I've been to one of these meetings.

And I'm a member of the public and I think you guys are doing all right. Just keep up what you are doing.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Next speaker is Carolyn Cox and the title is president of the Tucson Conservative Forum and the subject is fairness.

MS. COX: Yes, my name is Carolyn Cox. It's C-a-r-o-l-y-n, C-o-x.

I declare that the Redistricting Commission was improperly chosen because Ms. Mathis should not have been considered as a valid Independent since her husband was the treasurer of Nancy Young-Wright, who is a Democrat, campaign in the 2010 election. You are not Independent.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Don Wooley, retired engineer and the subject is mapping.

MR. WOOLEY: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Don Wooley, W-o-o-l-e-y, from Sahuarita, Arizona.

I have two inputs for the Commission
today. First, I want to introduce a map that I have produced using some different software. I've drawn the mapping Congressional districts for the state with the supporting data and all validated with Proposition 106 criteria. So I wasn't quite sure how to submit this to the Commissioners. I did fax it to you yesterday. Don't know if you got it or not. But I have a copy of that presentation available if you want to see it today.

Secondly, of course, the big topic this morning is the consultant that you chose. Obviously, everybody is using their baseball bat. This morning, the big news, the Commission selected Strategic Telemetry as their mapping consultant. A Washington, D.C., based firm like Ken Strasma with progressive ties to several actions around the country, including the current effort to recall state senators, even the governor of the state of Wisconsin.

This is a company while redistricting committee (inaudible) 16 services provided, most of which are political in nature.

From our winning campaigns on microtargeting, which is one of Ken Strasma's specializations, Ken Strasma is president of
Strategic Telemetry, an organization specializing in microtargeting and other strategic consulting services for progressive campaigns and organizations. I think that's pretty clear where he stands.

In my opinion, Ken Strasma's company would have been the fourth bad choice of the four based only on the facts on record -- on the public record for each company and not on any fancy words and promises in their presentations.

I think the audience is tired of fancy words and fancy presentations. I myself am not convinced, and many others are not convinced, unlike Chairwoman Mathis and the two Democrats, that Ken Strasma and his firm contributed unbiased input to this Commission. I do not believe him for a minute. If you do, then I have some ocean-front property in Arizona to sell.

Hopefully the Commission will make the decision as to mapping. And I submit that transparency is paramount with regards to this consulting firm's inputs to you.

Thanks for your time. I hope you'll look at my map.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I should have
acknowledged, Mr. Bladine is our executive director. Please submit any information or documentation to him.

Our next speaker is Ed Slentz, representing self and the subject is choice of Strategic Telemetry.

MR. SLENTZ: My name is Ed Slentz, last name is S, as in Sam, l-e-n-t-z, and I live in Oro Valley.

I have a question and then some comments. Question is, is the cost benefit analysis available for the public to review on the choice of Strategic Telemetry?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I would ask our legal counsel about that question.

MS. O'GRADY: Let me turn on my little thing. Right now, since we are in this sort of open public comment phase, the Commission is not permitted to do anything. They can respond to criticism, refer things to --

MR. SLENTZ: So it's not available for the public to see the cost benefit until after it's done?

And another question is was the contract let yesterday?
MS. O'GRADY: I'm sorry?

MR. SLENTZ: Was the contract let yesterday?

MS. O'GRADY: At this point, this is just your time to make comments and then if you have additional questions, you go follow up with that after. But this is just your time to make comments.

MR. SLENTZ: I am very, very upset that this panel would consider that no one in the state of Arizona is capable of redistricting. That you would have to go out of state to Washington to get people in here to do that job.

Recognizing the type of company that Strategic Telemetry is, how in the world can you consider them?

The reason why I would like to see the cost benefit analysis and how you came to that conclusion, because I'm not sure there's something funny that's not going on here. A company outside of the state, not in the state, winning an award, there usually has to be some very, very significant reasons why that company is selected.

My next comment would be if you have let the contract -- I wrote contracts for a major aerospace company for 30 years and administered those contracts. You can issue a stop-work notice
immediately, you can issue a cessation of work notice.

I would urge you to do that, to reconsider public input. It is very apparent to me, and I thought you were required to listen and consider public input. You have done none of that. And if you need help writing a cessation of work or a stop-work notice, let me know. I'll be happy to do that for you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Mona Moehring. Again, I apologize if I'm mispronouncing. You can let us know. From PC227, representing Chula Vista Villas HOA. The subject is independent, fair commission.

MS. MOEHRING: Mona, M, as in mother, o-n-a, Moehring, M, as in mother, o-e-h-r-i-n-g.

We're here today because of Proposition 106. And it starts off by saying the purpose of this Commission is to prevent gerrymandering. It goes on in this law to say that every member of this Commission, that it is to be fair, balanced, honest, and independent.

The law goes on to list the word "independent" 28 times. I can't even begin to tell you how many times impartial comes into it, and yet
you have sat there in these meetings and previous
meetings taking no regard to the input of the
people.

I just say this: I think it's time that
you admit you made a mistake with the map person and
just go back to the drawing board. We would respect
you if you admit your mistake.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Shirl
Lamonna, representing Overlook Group. Subject is
mapping.

MS. LAMONNA: Thank you for the opportunity to
speak before the Commission again and also to
provide the correct spelling of our names as it will
enable our resident blogger to more efficiently
research what social networks we all belong to.

Much as we were concerned with your
attorney selection, the Overlook Group was appalled
to learn of yesterday's decision to hire Strategic
Telemetry as its mapping consultant. Clearly there
were other options that would not lead the public to
conclude that the Commission has a political bias.
But you chose to ignore our concerns.

Yesterday's Rasmussen poll for the week
ending June 26th, indicates that 68 percent of
Americans believe that our country is heading in the
wrong direction. Citizens are especially concerned with the economy, unemployment, the new healthcare law, and our need to develop domestic gas and oil resources.

The most recent Zogby poll from April indicates that only 38 percent of those polled think the president deserves to be reelected.

And according to June opinion polls, voter approval of Congress' performance continues to fall.

The Gallup poll indicates that only 17 percent of Americans approve of the job that Congress is doing while Rasmussen reports that number to be only 8 percent. In that same Rasmussen poll, the view that Congressmen are corrupt has remained in the 36 to 45 percent range since January of 2010.

Moving to the Arizona state level, in January of this year, the Arizona Republic broke down the percentage of Arizona registered voters as 31.6 percent Democrat, 35.5 Republican, and 31.66 percent other. As an Independent, Chairwoman Mathis seeks to represent that Independent group. But how is that accomplished by voting for a mapping consultant with strong ties to the Democrat party?
Perhaps voters are changing party affiliations to Independent because of their dissatisfaction with the current administration and Congress.

So why select a consultant with an agenda that will likely support the Democratic party in terms of realignment.

We would be remiss if we didn't express our concerns with the partisan direction this Redistricting Commission has taken. We certainly hope that Strategic Telemetry's use of social media to involve the public in the mapping process results in the Commission finally listening to some public concerns.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Dee Pfeiffer, representing Vail residents, subject is mapping.

MS. PFEIFFER: Good afternoon. It's D-e-e and then P-f-e-i-f-f-e-r.

And this is my first time to ever speak, so I would like to change who I am representing to self. But I am from Vail and I don't think many have come up from Vail to these meetings.

This is my first meeting, not because
most of them have been held in Phoenix, but rather
because of the last-minute changes. So I would hope
in the future -- I know you're probably easier than
I am, but being able to schedule yourself further
out than 48 hours, I would hope would be something
that you would at least try to do in the future so
that I and many others that I know will have time to
schedule it.

Let's see. To the most casual observer,
the Strategic Telemetry Company is extremely
partisan and results cannot be considered fair by
any standard.

I won't repeat what they have on their
Facebook account -- Facebook account because it's
been said here many, many times. And I would just
send out a big ditto to Ms. Crawford's point and
also to Lynne St. Angelo's points. I absolutely
agree with them.

I want to express my skepticism about the
true independent status of this commission, due to
research that I've done and I've heard other people
have done in regards to Chairman Mathis.

Since you as a committee have not
listened to the Arizonans so far at these meetings
about the fairness of this committee, the members,
the selection of the attorneys, and now the mapping company, I just don't see how the outcome can be fair by any stretch of anyone's imagination.

I just hope that you will listen to us and if you can't remedy any of the decisions that have been made so far, that you would do that.

We are looking for a fair Commission, fair mapping going into the next election.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Payton Davies, representing Sun City Vistoso. Subject is firm chosen to draw lines.

MS. DAVIES: Hi. My name is Payton Davies. That's P-a-y-t-o-n, D-a-v-i-e-s, and I live in Oro Valley.

And I hadn't planned to speak, but I think I'm one of the people that have been awakened. I don't consider myself a giant, but with all of the people with like minds, we are getting away.

And when I first heard -- but I also -- I keep up with things. I think I would be much more involved if I weren't up to here with things at home, my personal life, but this was enough to get me down here today.

And when I first heard about the
composition of the committee, I thought to myself that it was just hysteria from some people's, you know, e-mails, that it was a little bit over the top. But the more I looked into it and the more I heard, I don't believe it's an independent commission. I don't believe that the chairman is truly an Independent. I can't say that. I don't know what's in your heart, but your decisions show otherwise.

Now, as far as the mapping company, everything has been said. The thing that outrages me the most is the fact that it's not an Arizona company. This state could use the business. We need to keep the money here. We don't need to do what Raul Grijalva did last year and call a boycott on Arizona and send our business to Washington D.C. We need to keep the money in Arizona.

And I know -- excuse me -- and I know that people revisit decisions all the time and I don't think any of this has been written in stone yet, and I would like to ask, respectfully, that you revisit the decision of the company that you picked to do the mapping for redistricting.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Alen
Bissett -- I'm sorry, Alex Bissett. He's a professional engineer, title -- sorry, representing Sun City Vistoso, subject is mapping company selection.

MR. BISSETT: That's close enough.

A-l-e-x, Bissett, B-i-s-s-e-t-t, Oro Valley, Arizona.

I'll be very brief because all of the stuff I wrote down has been said before. But there were a couple of things that jolted me in the last 24 hours. One was a phone call I got last night telling me about the decision of this Commission.

What came to mind was this is the worst decision I have heard in years, since O.J. Simpson was acquitted.

Now, I have a very simple question to ask the Chairperson -- Chairman Mathis. I hope you will answer it. This requires a yes or no.

When you examined the qualifications of the five companies considered, did you really believe that Strategic Telemetry was unbiased? A yes or no.

MS. O'GRADY: And again, this is the time for public comment and so the Commissioners' role at this point is limited to listening.
MR. BISSETT: We'll conclude -- I hope you will ask yourself that question.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is James Cook, representing self. Subject fairness in redistricting.

MR. COOK: James Cook, James, C-o-o-k, Oro Valley.

I'm another one of those that have come out of the woodwork. I have never spoken at one of these political meetings before. I always believed that people on these commissions would do the right thing. It's obvious to me they are not.

And I would like to cite that the lady who spoke about the polls and how many -- how the polls are shifting to Independents. My feeling is there's a lot of Democrats that are absolutely upset with this just as well. I mean, honest Democrats as well. I think you're an embarrassment to them as well.

So I understand by what 99 percent of the people have spoken here today and I will say no more.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Mohur
Sidhwa, representing self and the subject is redistricting in favor of competitiveness.

MS. SIDHWA: Yes. The name is Mohur Sidhwa. M-o-h-u-r, S-i-d-h-w-a.

When you look at most state maps, you get a feeling that a fifth grade class using no more than a ruler would probably have come up with more and balanced districts, if you look pretty much anywhere in the U.S.

I want to talk about competitive districts and redistricting as well as communities of interest.

It is true that a reservation like the Pascua Yaqui should not be divided, but every time the community of interest dominates and consideration, we wind up with highly improbable looking contiguous areas. We also wind up with protection for people who have lost the energy but improved the contacts while elected to office.

A lack of functionality in government, including Arizona, tells me that competitiveness of districts is most important criteria. We need to be able to debate back and forth. But if the election results are foregone conclusions, it leads to water apathy and it hurts the very concept of Democracy if
there isn't enough competitiveness, and that is, after all, what this nation was built on, was Democracy and competitiveness.

By the time this whole horse-and-pony show is over and done with, yes, you will be vilified, probably from all sides of the aisle.

Keep focusing on your job without allowing yourselves to be bullied, no matter how many people are turfed in here. Do what you think is right, and that is basically all you can do because it's a very difficult job.

And I thank you all for doing it, but do keep competitiveness in mind because that is the essence of Democracy, not caging.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Onita Davis, representing Tucson SmartGirl Politics and the subject is RFP selection.

MS. DAVIS: Good morning, once again.

From the beginning, the RFP process appears to be stacked against an unbiased and nonpartisan decision. The voting record of our Independent Commissioner has consistently been along party lines and has compromised the integrity of the independence in the AIRC.
Despite the concerns expressed to the Commission by the citizens of this committee -- community, the voices of the people have once again been silenced by partisan politics.

And I appreciate what the lady just said in her point of view. And I'm not asking for consideration as either a Democratic or a Republican, because I'm an Independent, and I thought that this is what the Commission was supposed to be, independent, nonpartisan.

The most politically biased company of the four considered has been selected. Strategic Telemetry has publicly stated a position that is contrary to the Arizona laws and the AIRC criteria governing the redistricting process.

Yes, you know, communities of like interest is one of the criteria. Yes, competitiveness is one of the criteria. There are five important items to be considered in redistricting. Only two are really being talked about today.

If you did not listen to our concerns during the selection process, how can we trust you to listen to us during the mapping process? It is obvious that we cannot.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Bill Yarnell, representing himself and the subject is competitive districts.

MR. YARNELL: Hi. Bill, B-i-l-l, last name Yarnell, Y-a-r-n-e-l-l. I live in Vail. And I would like to talk today about competitive districts.

I came to the previous Commission a decade ago to talk to them about competitive districts and they used commonalities of interest and minority representation and some other excuses for not coming up with competitive districts.

Of the 30 state districts in the Legislature, three of them were competitive.

Now, politicians are most responsive if they are in a competitive district. If they are in a district where they are going to get reelected every time whether they do anything or not, they are not going to listen to their constituents. So competitive districts end up having the best politicians, the best elected officials.

So please don't use any excuses like the last Commission did, and make sure all of the districts are competitive, or as many as possible because that's for a healthy Democracy, a healthy
Arizona.

Whatever company ends up doing the mapping, don't use that as an excuse. Don't say, oh, well, the mapping company wanted it here or there. It's your decision. The five of you make the final decisions. Please make sure Arizona has competitive districts.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is James Kelley, Chairman LD29, Pima GOP, and subject is mapping vendor.

MR. KELLEY: Thank you very much for letting me address you again.


I'm not going to pretend to belong to a nonpartisan group. I am a partisan individual. I am chairman of LD29 for the GOP, but I also live in Rancho Valencia. My community has absolutely nothing in common with most of 29, in terms of how it's presently set up.

We have a very downtown center leadership. We have one member of our delegation that doesn't even live in the district and yet he's calling it a competitive district and he runs
unopposed, so go figure.

Strategic Telemetry was a bad decision.
I do hope that you will revisit it. It is a very, very bad decision. There are two Arizona vendors that could do the job just as well.

It is not my job to be nonpartisan and independent, it is your job to be nonpartisan and independent. There's been way too much -- just arizonaredistricting.com supported by eight different organizations that are heavily on -- and, again, whose mission is the election of progressive Democrats. And yet you touted them and said how much we should all go to arizonaredistricting.com and use their mapping process, that only about half of the people could get into it.

Not once has anybody said, oh, you know, go support Tea Party Patriots or go support Citizens for Sensible Redistricting. So obviously, there's a bias in there, and that bias needs to stop. It needs to stop entirely. You need to just stop listening to them, you need to throw them out of your Commission and move on with what the people are looking for.

If you want competitive districts -- you will look at an example of a very noncompetitive
district, just look at 29. You know, there's no way
that that is a competitive district in any way,
shape, or form.

It is my sincere desire Mr. Executive
Director, that my borders change for LD29. I need
to pick up voters. 28, 30, and 27 need to lose
voters. It's just that simple. I want my borders
moved.

I want Campbell to be my western border,
Houghton to be my eastern border, Broadway to be my
Northern border and Pima Mine Road to be my southern
border. That's the way -- we have much more in
common with each other and we have homeowners and
homeowners association. We don't have a highly
transient population like we do west of Campbell.

So east of Campbell, west of Houghton,
south of Broadway, north of Pima Mine Road. That's
what I want. And any company that will give me
that, great.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Steve
Dotson. You can correct me if I'm mispronouncing
that. Representing himself and the subject is
mapping.

MR. DOTSON: Sorry for my poor handwriting.
It's Stephen Dotson, S-t-e-p-h-e-n, D-o-t-s-o-n.

I want to talk to you about mapping. The consideration of companies not from Arizona but from Washington, D.C., only sends money and jobs to national political interests and disregards the local communities that they affect. Do not let our tax dollars be spent to take jobs away from Arizonans.

Dissolving communities of like interest to change the balance of power in the State Legislature is both unethical, it is biased, and it is irresponsible.

This panel must listen to the constituency, and I use that word -- that term because you are appointed here to represent all Arizonans, not just Democrats.

A failure to do this will completely unveil a bias on this panel and result in more of our precious Arizona tax dollars and time spent on litigation.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Geri Ottoboni, representing NETOT, subject is mapping. And if you could, again, remind us what NETOT stands
for.

MS. OTTOBONI: Madame Chairwoman and Commissioners, it's Network of Tucson.

My name is Geri Ottoboni, that's O-t-t-o-b-o-n-i. It means "I am good" in Italian.

After I spoke at your meeting in Phoenix yesterday, I get the impression that you are not interested in citizen input, as your website and you all have stated.

You have chosen a company from Washington, D.C., not Arizona. I'm shocked. Arizona needs money, Arizona needs jobs, an Arizona company knows more about Arizona.

You have chosen an obviously Democratic company, one whose president, Ron Strasma, was the national director of Obama's 2008 national targeting. Excuse me, how nonpartisan is that, the most Democrat companies of all of the companies interviewed. Why take financial advantage out of Arizona and give it to Washington, D.C.? This smacks of bias.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Shirley Cooney, representing self and the subject is fairness in redistricting.
MS. COONEY: I'm Shirley Cooney. That's S-h-i-r-l-e-y, C-o-o-n-e-y, and I'm from Pima County.

And I just wish to say as I'm holding here a paper from the Proposition 106, which has given all of you a very serious charge, and this is what the voters voted for when this came up in that election.

And it relates to the ending of the practice of gerrymandering and improving voter and candidate participation in elections by creating an independent commission of balanced appointments to oversee the mapping of fair and competitive Congressional and Legislative districts.

And I must say I was quite appalled when I heard yesterday that there has been a mapping company chosen that was so highly partisan as the one which we are facing now. And if the voters who voted for this initiative, when they find out who this mapping company is, I think there are going to be repercussions.

We as voters of Arizona should expect -- we should demand that we have fair and balanced districting so we can have fair elections.

May the best candidate win but only if we
have fair districting.

    Thank you.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is
    Donald Spann, representing Jennifer Rawson, and the
    subject is redistricting.

    MR. SPANN: I am Don Spann, FPA again, and
    this is a letter from Jennifer Rawson, R-a-w-s-o-n.
    Jennifer is a city -- candidate for city council.

    Thank you.

    My name is Jennifer Rawson. I am the new
    residents greeter in the Harrison Hills Homeowners
    Association. We are on the northeast side of
    Tucson.

    We have an area of interest with the
    total east side of Tucson from Barrett Canyon to
    Rita Ranch. We are presently in one Congressional
    district. It would be unfair and unfortunate if
    this Commission would lump us in with the south side
    of Tucson.

    We live close to open land and have great
    views of the mountains. Our social and political
    structure is mirrored with the district that runs
    north to south as opposed east to west.

    I know you will do what is beneficial to
    your party. When you make that choice, you reduce
the representation that is available to the people.

Each election should be an honest contest of ideas. Power should be in the hands of the people.

I respectfully request that you do not gerrymander for the benefit of a party, but honestly redistrict for fair representation of all the citizens.

Jennifer would say thank you; I say thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Jack Heald. Again, you can correct me. He's representing LD26, GOP.

MR. HEALD: That's close enough, Madame Chairman. As long as you call me for dinner.

It's H-e-a-l-d, Jack.

In regard to the independence of the Commission, I have a question -- two questions for you, is why was Chris Gleason not considered eligible to serve? Was it because he was a Christian?

The second question is considering Representative Grijalva and President Obama's calls for an Arizona boycott, why would this company come, and better, why would we send money out of state?
As a Mexican lady on the TV ad said to Raul, "Shame on you."

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Merritt McGlothlin, representing Sun City Vistoso and the subject is redistricting.

MR. MCGLOTHLIN: That is Merritt, M-e-r-r-i-t-t, M-c-g-l-o-t-h-l-i-n.

I'm not going to be redundant and it would an understatement to say that redistricting is not a hot topic or a hot-button item. But judging from the comments that I have heard here today, our little experiment here in Arizona as being, I think, one of two states in the country to allow redistricting to be done by an independent, I put in quotations "independent panel," is a tough process.

I don't know, because I don't know any of you. I can't look into your hearts and know why you took on this job and I don't know if any of you have ulterior motives or not, but I can say this: That it is a tough process and it should be an open process.

And I hope that you have sat here and listened to this crowd and do not casually and arrogantly dismiss this group as a bunch of
disgruntled Republicans. They are Americans, they are Arizonans, and all they want is a proper independent redistricting of the state and Congressional districts without bias and it certainly should be done, I would think by Arizonans.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Joe Boogaart, representing self and the subject is choice of firms, committee makeup.

MR. BOOGAART: Hi. I'm Joe Boogaart. That's B, double o, g, double a, r-t, and I'm a resident of Marana.

And I haven't participated. I haven't come to any of the others. But somebody notified me today, you might be interested if you came down here.

All I can say is "Wow." I haven't -- I live -- I went to the University of Arizona. I moved away. I went to Florida for about 28 years. My wife said, "I'm going back to Arizona. You coming?" So here I am.

But in Florida, we had something called the sunshine law and there were no closed meetings. And I think that's what we're failing to have here,
is there's a lot of closed-door meetings on this. And I think if it was more open, that more correct solutions would be made and a lot more knowledge would be had by the public and maybe eliminate a lot of the antagonism that we have here.

But I've been listening to the people here, and I was going to reiterate what they all said but they said it pretty darned good. I can -- and it appears to me that there's a majority of people here who have great concerns about this. And I think it's your responsibility as the Commission to listen to it.

That's all I have.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Linda White, representing precinct 326 and the subject is mapping company designee.

MS. WHITE: That's L-i-n-d-a, W-h-i-t-e.

I just want to add my voice to the majority of people here who are very outraged at the selection of the mapping company.

At the Oro Valley meeting, the chairwoman recognized my question from the audience when I asked how many of those mapping firms were from
Arizona, although after she answered and told me two, she was told the information was confidential. I was somewhat pleased that perhaps a mapping company would be from Arizona.

It's an outrage that the business would go outside of this state. It's an outrage, an absolute red flag that a company that is about to have a recall in the state of Wisconsin did not make you sit up and realize that perhaps this was not the company to choose.

So on behalf of everyone sitting here, I, too, am outraged at the selection of this company.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Chris Bubany, is representing self and the subject is mapping the districts.

MS. BUBANY: That's Chris, with a C-h, and last name Bubany, B-u-b-a-n-y.

I'm a small business owner and wanted to come to some of these redistricting meetings but I couldn't because they were held during the day, most of the time, or up in Phoenix. It's only because I am on a staycation this week that I am able to be here.

So my original intent was to come and talk about redistricting, keeping in mind
communities of interest.

I live in the Tanque Verde Valley. I do a lot of my business, I go to church, all kinds of things in that valley.

And so I was going to implore this committee to keep that in mind, communities of interest, not competitive districts. Because communities of interest need to be represented by the people they elect who are going to respond to those interests.

The other -- but then when I found out that this out-of-town company had been chosen for the mapping, I thought what good will it do me to come and make a case for redistricting with communities of interest. And not only was it an out-of-town company chosen, it was one that is highly favorable to the Obama administration.

Arizona is primarily -- is a majority Republican, next we're Independent, third we're Democrat.

Now, is this another fundamental transformation of America? We're going to have a company not even of Arizonans to redistrict our state for us? I think that's not right.

And it is a company that expressly says
that they are progressive Democrats. Now, we know progressive is a nice word for socialist and we also know that the Democratic party is being highjacked by the socialist movement, which maybe is only 20 percent of the party.

Is this okay with the majority of Democrats that we are leaning to become a more socialist country? That is not what we are about.

And it's very disappointing now to see how that company who is progressive Democrats, highly favoring the Obama administration, is now going to have influence in this state. That is not right.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Dianna Lebrecht, representing self and the subject is redistricting mapping.

MS. LEBRECHT: My name is Dianna Lebrecht, D-i-a-n-n-a, last name L-e-b-r-e-c-h-t.

I'm a native of Tucson. My parents moved here in '45. They loved this town and I love this town. I love this whole Valley. And I love our state. I wish to remain here.

I sell real estate, and I have since 1971. But I can tell you that I am getting more and more comments that we don't want to stay in Arizona.
We sure don't want to stay in Tucson or Pima County. It's getting corrupt. Nobody is listening to the people.

Now, you know what, I've been looking in your eyes since I've been here and I know you have good hearts. I know each and every one of you have a good heart and I know that you can listen to your highest sense of what's right to do.

We always have to listen to the people because that is what brought us to America. We listened to the people. We didn't want a select few in England to tell us what was best for us and regulate and dictate to us so that a few would govern the rest.

Now, you guys are good people. Listen to what's being said. You can change your minds. It's okay. You don't have to laugh at the man that said he would be happy to write that resignation letter. It's okay. It needs to be done. You guys made a mistake. You're good people. And I'm trusting in your highest sense of what's right.

"Lebrecht" means live right. Come on, let's do it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Barney Brenner, and you'll have to tell us who you
are representing. The subject is clear conflict of interest.

MR. BRENNER: I am Barny Brenner, B-r-e-n-n-e-r, and I'm just representing myself.

I didn't come here planning to speak but there have been so many astonishing revelations here today that I just want to comment despite the fact that you think although Arizona is or has been significantly Republican in recent years, Pima County and Southern Arizona and Tucson is largely Democrat majority. And you would think that the actions of this board, which seems to be highly partisan and biased, would be championed by people in this community. But yet here you have a room full of people who showed up in this -- in what's somewhat partisan community here, yet they want to see fairness. They don't want to see bias. They don't want to see a conflict of interest, which was the subject line that I put down.

Now, I could be wrong, but Madame Chairman, but if you're married to a man who is the treasurer on a campaign for a Democrat that came in -- that got the third largest amount of votes for two seats under the existing district lines, you would think that that would represent a clear
conflict of interest in being on a committee that wants to redraw those lines.

Now, I do want to ask one thing that's been kind of tiptoed around but it's a one-word answer and I haven't gotten a clear answer, on the contract that was given to this so-called mapping firm, has that been signed? Is it a done deal?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Doesn't make a difference.

MS. O'GRADY: Again, this is the time for comments. This is their time to listen.

MR. BRENNER: Okay. Can't answer.

Let me just say if it has, there's usually clauses in these contracts that manage to cover a company's expenses up to a particular point, if they've done any work.

If they haven't done any work, sometimes there's still clauses in there that they get paid. Just so you don't use it as an excuse that we don't want to cost the taxpayers money. I'm sure you could get lots and lots of private citizens who would love to offset the cost so we can have an unbiased firm doing this process.

And so I mostly wanted to talk to say that -- I wanted to get the word "conflict of
interest" on the record clearly, because it does seem to me that that's the case and the fact that if someone lost under the existing lines and the chairman's husband worked for that person, seems clear to me the right thing to do when you have a conflict of interest, I hear there's a process for removing members of the Commission.

I hope that's not necessary. Seems to me whenever you have a conflict of interest, the right thing to do is to step down and say I can't be impartial.

So one way or another, I hope that's done, and I hope we can get an unbiased committee here and an unbiased result.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Brenner, can you state where you live, what county or city?

MR. BRENNER: I'm in the county, just outside of city limits.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Of Tucson?

MR. BRENNER: Of Tucson, yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

MR. BRENNER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Next speaker is Curtis Dutiel, representing self and the subject is mapping
MR. DUTIEL: My name is Curtis Dutiel, C-u-r-t-i-s, D-u-t-i-e-l. I'm a resident of Tucson. I'm a second generation native of Tucson, third generation, Arizonan, if that really matters. With some people it seems to.

I'm here to speak about the selection of a mapping company.

It seems a lot of people are upset that this particular company has ties or has done work for other companies. Maps -- the maps that are drawn are -- that are going to be created, it doesn't matter who creates them, the Commission has the final say, and I think that seems to be lost.

Another thing that seems to be lost is that while this company is from Washington, D.C., the other company that got votes was from California.

So it seems to me that at some point in time, the companies that were in the running for this that were from Arizona were dropped by the wayside for one reason or another.

This Commission was created to be Independent. The process was clear, drawn out. Had to go through one revisit and I think we need to let
the Commission kind of do their work, and I'm hoping
the Commissioners will realize that though you have
people up here that are yelling and screaming, don't
just listen to people because they are the most that
can make a meeting in the middle of the day when
many people are working. That they look at what
they have done and they've made a choice. Let's
move on.

Keep revisiting these issues is going to
draw this process out longer and actually could
result in the Feds actually having more of a say in
this. Let's let the Commission of people from
Arizona do their job.

Thank you.

MR. HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is David
Higuera, representing self and the choice is
out-of-state firm is the subject.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair, can I
remind the audience not to -- you know, when the
people are making comments, whether you agree with
them or not, you know, don't speak under your breath
loudly. Let people voice their opinions. So I
would appreciate your respect of every person
speaking, whether you agree with them or not.
MR. HIGUERA: David Higuera, H-i-g-u-e-r-a.

Somebody just mentioned it, but one of the other firms -- a couple of the other firms I think that you guys were looking at were also out of state.

I think it's really interesting, the firm that was chosen ten years ago was the same California firm that was in the running this time. They were chosen by the 2000 -- or they made the maps in 2000.

I doubt that a lot of people in this room would be as up in arms if that same California firm had just been chosen yesterday.

So I think this whole argument about it's an out-of-state firm, the economy and market spent our money in Arizona is just a total red herring.

On the other hand, I do think there's something important to consider now that you have got your firm.

Last time around, ten years ago, that redistricting commission took the competitiveness criteria and they put it way at the bottom. They thought they had to answer all of the other ones first and then they could get some competitive in there, they would try.
We developed, I think, 4 or 5 truly competitive districts in Arizona out of 30. We ended up with about 16 or 17 quote, unquote, safe Republican districts and 6 or 7 or 8, quote, unquote, safe Democratic districts.

A situation like that just means you're always going to have one party of power. And I'm an American. I believe that two parties in power is the way our system is meant to be.

And so I hope at the end of the day, regardless of all the rhetoric here, that you guys just focus on the most competitive maps at the Congressional level and Legislative level that you can possibly come up with. Because ultimately those candidates have to run for the middle run, for the moderate votes, that's when we end up with a better government. And I think we can all agree that the government we've seen here in Arizona in the last few years has been lacking.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Maria Apodaca, representing self and the subject is choice.

MS. APODACA: Good afternoon. I wasn't planning on speaking. I just felt really compelled in my heart to get up here.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: State your name.

MS. APODACA: Oh, Maria, M-a-r-i-a, Apodaca, A-p-o-d-a-c-a.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm sorry, if you could just state where you live, county or city.

MS. APODACA: Tucson.

And just because some people have said, my family has been here for years, even when this was still Mexico. So I have deep roots in this area. I don't know if that really matters.

But what I wanted to say was this is America and we are a republic. You are to represent the people and the people's voice and hear what the people have said.

And what I find disheartening is when people go and take time, because we're all busy people. I work. I have children. One of my children is disabled. It's hard for me to get out and do things like this in the middle of the day -- well, at any time really. But when I do -- and then I just feel like it's a real big slap in the face when things go the other way because the peoples' position has not been taken to heart. And I really -- I really want -- I really am asking, I want to put my faith back into the system, because right now
it's not there. I feel like I've been -- my voice has not been represented in what I have to say.

Now, I understand there was Proposition 106. If you look at the details that are on there, what you're to do, the criteria -- I think that's what you should follow, that should be your guidelines.

I don't know if you take an oath for this position. I don't know, but -- you do? You do all take an oath for this position?

I ask you please to honor the oath you take. This has been one of my pet peeves for the longest time is, you know, Congress and everybody takes an oath to defend the Constitution but yet we've gotten so far away from it, and it really is a pet peeve of mine.

If you're going to be in a position, any position, whether it's federal, state, or local level, honor the oath you take. Okay? Honor it. Go back and look at Proposition 106 and read what's there.

Now, for this law firm company -- not the law firm, but the mapping company that you got, from what I'm hearing I just found out yesterday myself, it's a progressive Democrat mapping company. I
I don't know how you can get fair redistricting from that.

So again, help me put me faith back into the system.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

MR. HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Brandon Patrick, representing self. Subject is redistricting in general.

MR. PATRICK: Good afternoon. It's Brandon, P-a-t-r-i-c-k, is the spelling of the last name. I'm a Tucson resident.

Thank you.

I am here for two things. First off, to thank you the Commission for the work that they do. I know it is a thankless job, can be a thankless job and there are people that appreciate the work that you guys are doing.

The other thing that I wanted to say is that to me, this issue boils down to the intelligent expenditure of taxpayer money.

As I understand it, we had two people in the running -- or two firms, Arizona firms in the running for this contract. One them was ruled out
of hand by Republicans, it was accused of being a Democrat firm; and the other firm that I believe the Republicans were in favor of had absolutely no experience whatsoever with redistricting. So those two were ruled out leaving us with the California firm and the one that ended up being chosen.

As has already been said, the California firm did their work last time and didn't do it extraordinarily well with concern to making -- creating competitive districts.

So as a taxpayer, my concern, honestly, and as a voter, is that we have districts that are competitive and a contract -- or a contractor that's able to fulfill the requirements of the contract. That requires experience.

I think what the Commission has done, although no solution is absolutely perfect, I think that the Commission has chosen the contractor with the most experience and which is most able to complete this contract successfully. And I think that they are on the right track with that decision and I think we should press forward with it.

Thank you very much.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.
Our next speaker is Cruz Moran. Again, you can correct me. The subject is review and you'll have to tell us who you're representing.

MR. MORAN: Hello. How is it going?

My name is Cruz Moran. I'm a civilian, is as anybody in this room.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can you state where you reside?

MR. MORAN: What's that?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can you say where you reside, either town --

MR. MORAN: East side.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Tucson?

MR. MORAN: Yeah.

So I don't know who has the authority or -- you know, to make decisions in this course of time, but, you know, most importantly what citizens want to know more about is -- you know, check your history. You know, how -- you know, written elevations and innovations accumulated over time.

Do some research. I'm not going to tell you guys what to do or how to do it. You know, just brief input on what you guys are doing and paying attention on how well you do it. Communicate within each other, because most people -- you know, get
tired and, you know, they really don't want to speak
how they feel, you know, like Obama.

This guy, he's trying to get -- he's
shaking everybody's hand, you know, he's trying to
meet everybody and trying to get to know -- get a
feel for who they are really.

As your citizens here in Arizona, you
know, they all -- they all feel the same way and the
concerns --

You know, progress is not going to happen
overnight. We all know that. It takes time, you
know, bringing in education.

I was here -- I watch the news
constantly. Things like fires burning out there,
wasting millions of dollars trying to cool these
fires out. I mean, pick up some dirt, throw some
dirt on it. Stop wasting so much of your resources.

You know, another way that we could
impact and subside the global warming and all of
these conditions that are occurring in environmental
patterns as well is that to create more jobs and
stabilize more jobs, we would have to -- I would
like to see if there would be -- like back in the
day they created or accumulated a bunch of people to
work out and plant trees somewhere, you know,
wherever they may be, but they grew fonder, they
grew as a society, they united more.

These people, you know, reconstructed
national forest, Sahuaro National Forest, Grand
Canyon, they designed the whole thing.

I mean, I'm not pointing out and saying
specific things here, but this is just a matter of
who you are and where you are at and what you're
doing with -- with your productivity.

You know, race doesn't really matter for
me. I'm Hispanic, but I've been involved -- I've
traveled from the West Coast to the East Coast.
There's probably like four states that I haven't
been to, and Arizona is probably the only state that
involves a lot of adverse cities within border
lines.

Other states are isolated. They are
conservative to some degree. They deal with their
own statutual (sic) concerns, you know, whether the
community gets involved or doesn't get involved.

You know, I'm saying -- I'm expanding --
I'm trying to expand your guys' horizons to
communicate with other individuals instead of just,
you know, narrowing it down.

You know, most people are concerned about
their health, health issues, how healthcare is --
how healthcare -- costs -- a visit -- a visit to --
a visit to the ER is probably, you know, thousands
of dollars, you know, just to go to a visit.

I mean, there's a lot of things that play
-- that play a part.

I'm from a young generation. I'm 23
years old. I can sit here and talk about -- and
give you guys information that's valid because, you
know, it's true, it's happening, it's recurring.
It's progressive, it's going forward, not backwards.

You know, most individuals are -- could
be Republican or Democratic. You know, right now,
there are a lot of Democratic campaigns out there.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Moran, I apologize,
but we asked all of the public to limit their
comments to three minutes. We've gone over that.
If you could wrap up, that would be great.

MR. MORAN: That's it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

MR. MORAN: You guys know what you guys are
doing.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Three minutes.

MR. MORAN: You know, just figure it out.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.
Our next speaker Lee Cornelison. I'm sorry. Cornelison. I'm really bad. Representing self and the subject is representing Democracy.

MR. CORNELISON: My name is Lee Cornelison, C-o-r-n-e-l-i-s-o-n. I live in Green Valley.

And I'll tell you, about a year ago my wife and I retired and decided to come home to Arizona. One of the reasons we wanted to come home to Arizona -- one of the many reasons was we felt like this state had a good government, constitutional Democracy, that protected and defended representative Democracy.

This Commission has responsibility to protect that thing called representative Democracy. And I spent 30 years in an Army uniform defending and protecting. That's a huge responsibility.

And as a veteran, I charge each one of you to be unbiased, to forget your political alignments before you came here. You need to protect the very principles that this country survives on and thrives on.

As I said, I've only been here a year, but what I'm reading in the papers makes me question how unbiased this Commission is. The selection of the mapping firm. I have to ask the question, that...
is so biased and so far over to the left, I have to ask, did you do that as a red herring? Because you knew there would be a public outcry. Was that simply an act to try to have the opportunity to select the firm you really wanted? You know, I can't believe five intelligent people could make that decision.

And finally, I'll end with this:

Ms. Mathis, if you're an Independent, I'm a French fry.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Frank Rice, representing self and the subject is mapping the districts.

MR. RICE: Hi everybody. My name is Frank Rice, R-i-c-e. I'm a Tucson resident. I've lived here since 1986. I'm from Atlanta. I'll try to be coherent.

I am heartsick, and I would like to point out to the Commission that that's what you're hearing. You're hearing from people that are heartsick because we know -- I'm 65 years old. We know that without the strong fundamental principles of our founding documents, that we're never going to survive the progressive element in this country.

And the war, the political war between
the progressives and the conservatives in this country has been going on for a hundred years. I'm not sure if you all know that.

Now, listen, just as an aside, I spent ten of those sixty-five years living in and around Washington, D.C. And I can guarantee you, there is no more corrupt city in this nation than Washington, D.C. If you have lived there, then you know that to be true. But I think I probably spent more time there than you have.

If you go -- you know, there's nothing wrong with evolution, progress, that kind of thing, but without a firm founding and a basic principle, a basic virtue, a basic honesty, and a basic liberty, you have nothing but corruption, which is why we're all heartsick about this, because we know we got an uphill battle.

What you are about to do is give the advantage to the people we consider to be political enemies. That is progressive socialist agenda, as my political enemy, because that party ignores my liberty, my right to be an individual that's free to pursue my own God-given abilities and talent and to travel from one state to another, which Canadians could not do until 1987. I'm not sure if you knew
that.

If you look at this founding document of ours, the preamble, it says "We the people." What that actually means is that the people of the United States are self-governing and you have been chosen as a representative of the people of the State of Arizona. And our input is to be represented by you, not given away to a company that lives in the most corrupt city in the nation.

That's -- I just need to let you know. If you do not listen to the people, then our ability to self-govern has been cut off at the knees. That's why everybody in this room is heartsick, with the exception of a couple of people.

And I would just like for you to consider that without -- without that ability to self-govern and the freedom that has given us all over these last 200-and-some years, you would not even be sitting here in this position of responsibility. It's not a position of authority, it's a position of responsibility to us, we the people.

And thank you for letting me speak.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Shelby Hawkins, representing self and the subject is mapping.
MS. HAWKINS: Hi, my name is Shelby Hawkins.

I've lived in this community since August 1st, 1978. I came to Tucson because my husband's parents were here and started a business. I'm a small business owner. I'm in my 31st year.

As raising family by myself, because I was divorced early on, I really didn't have a lot of time to get into politics. Raising three little babies by myself was kind of tough.

But as I was -- as the business was growing, I kept hearing this one name, and the name was Grijalva. And again, I didn't pay attention to any political activities, but -- because I was just too busy building my business.

I can tell you in the last ten years here in Tucson and Southern Arizona, it has gotten harder and harder and harder to run a business. It has gotten beyond competitive. It's gotten progressively worse.

And the one man that called for a boycott in our state is a progressive Democrat.

Now, I hear a lot of people talking to you folks and I hear them saying please listen to me and please understand where we are coming from.

For me, I hear -- for me, I see that you
are hearing but you're not listening. And as far as I'm concerned, I really don't have a whole lot faith in what you are going to do. So just keep that in mind for businesses, because you're driving more and more out of the state.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Randy Graf, representing self and the subject is mapping and Prop 106.

MR. GRAF: Madame Chairman, Commission, thank you for being here today.

My name is Randy Graf. I live in Green Valley, which is in the county.

Ten years ago I had the privilege of serving in the Legislature when the first redistricting commission was put together and did their business.

Proposition 106, when it was passed, basically what I told that Commission then was it gave them basically virtually an impossible task. You're being asked to create districts that are competitive, that represent communities of interest, that are contiguous, there's about a half a dozen different criteria.
You may be able to get a district that is competitive, you be me able to get a district that is contiguous, you may be able to get a district that -- out of 30, you may get one district that will combine three or four of the criteria that you're supposed to try to meet.

So you've been given an impossible task.

I think the last commission did the best they could under the circumstances. Brand-new, they had to come up with 30 new districts and 8 Congressional districts.

But I'm challenging right now the schedule and the pace that you're on. Are you planning on tweaking the current districts or are you going to start from scratch and create 30 Legislative districts and 9 new Congressional districts?

You've got elected officials that want to know whether or not they are going to be in the district they ran in last time or something that is closely representative or are they starting over. You got voters that want to know. You got possible candidates that need to know.

At this point in time, I'm concerned about the schedule, your pace, and when these
districts are going to be put out to the public.

But with the selection and what I have heard here today -- and I went to the meeting you had in Oro Valley a couple -- a few weeks ago and with the selection of this particular firm and the outrage that has been presented here by the public today, I've got some concerns that, A, the proposition, the way it was passed, was flawed, that it is impossible to implement and that maybe just maybe it's time for Prop 106 to be repealed.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

This is my last request-to-speak form. If anyone else would like to address us, feel free to fill one out and give that to our Executive Director, Ray Bladine.

Our next speaker is Matt Kopec, and he's representing self and the subject is mapping and fairness.

MR. KOPEC: Thank you.


I just want to be -- I am a voter and a taxpayer.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can't hear you.
MR. KOPEC: I'm sorry.

I am a voter and a taxpayer, and I believe that the choice of going with the firm that has the experience and expertise was the right decision. I know that was a sentiment shared by all commission members. All commission members felt that it was best to go out of state for a firm to do that.

But then the other point I wanted to make is I believe it's paramount that the Commission prioritize competitiveness. I believe that people have the right to change government if they don't like the direction it's going, and I believe the last commission didn't give us that opportunity.

So these are some tough decisions. I believe you are on the right track.

Thank you for the opportunity.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is there another one?

RAY BLADINE: One more. We ran out of forms.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We ran out of forms.

Our next speaker is Barry Kirschner, and the subject is competitiveness. He's representing self.

And if you wouldn't mind spelling your

Two states with which I am most familiar regarding political functions are Arizona and California. Most states are in the throes of deadlock where the sides don't talk to each other. There's virtually no change in both Congressional districts and Legislative districts in the state of California, and the state level is virtually the same in Arizona.

We have a system where partisans are elected in a primary and those who vote in the primary tend to be the most extreme. And what's happening in states not only California and Arizona, is that quality of government and how it performs with the people deteriorate.

There are many criteria that you are supposed to be looking at. The competitiveness is that central criteria, in my opinion, on what might make the government function in an improved manner in the future.

The second thing I mentioned on the form, it wasn't really a form it was just a blank piece of paper I filled out. It's quite possible that the
chairwoman couldn't read my writing. That would put you in a large group of people who have tried.

The charge that you have is to do the best that you have -- the best that you can. And the way that reasonable responsible people do the best that they can is not by functioning in an evidence-free zone, not by cutting off people or data, but by analyzing data, looking particularly for the logic in the data and acting in accordance with the mission and the logic that you find.

When you go ahead and you weigh several different competing entities, the investment of time that you put in that is far greater than the investment of time that someone may read in the e-mail which calls for action and making a complaint about it.

The nature of your work is complex. Former Representative Graph is absolutely right in saying that your mission is very difficult and it will be impossible to satisfy everybody.

But as far as our collective goal is an improvement of government and better government relying on the evidence and the logic to help you perform your charge and to create the most competitive districts possible, I believe will
improve our situation.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

No more request to speak forms?

Okay. And Mary, is it okay if I can address just some of the criticisms since that's one of the things --

MS. O'GRADY: Yes. As indicated on the agenda, we can't -- the Commission can't discuss the issues that were raised or take action, but at the close of the public comment, you can do what's indicated on the agenda, and one of which is respond to criticisms. You can also refer matters to staff, schedule them for some further consideration at a later date.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thanks, Mary.

First of all, I really appreciate everyone coming out and taking time out of their day to come and address us and give us your feedback.

I know that the decision yesterday was not a popular one, by the majority of the comments here and that many of you don't agree with my decision on that.

And I can only tell you I would ask you please to read my statement from yesterday which was
posted on our website which details my rationale, however flawed that may be, for choosing that firm. And I would really ask you to just have an open mind as you read it and you can see my rationale and what was behind that decision.

There were so many comments, and I'm just trying to think of which ones to address. I did appreciate that the location of the firm was outside, and I wanted to let everyone -- outside of the state. And I wanted to let everyone know how we did this process.

We followed State Procurement procedure and created a request for proposal that was extremely detailed. All of the commissioners had a say in drafting that. And that's -- you can view that on the Internet, actually at procurement, maybe even we can put that on our website, Ray.

There are numerous criteria, and it was quite a job to ask of any firm, frankly. Most of these firms put together teams. They put together subcontractors and they acted as the primes and then had a numerous group of people around them to respond, because it was such a huge request to ask of any one firm.

Seven firms responded to that question
for proposal. We had no idea who would be responding. State Procurement contacts us one day, once the bid closed and said these are the seven firms that responded.

We all looked at those firms very carefully and evaluated them on specific criteria that was outlined in the very beginning. Their methodology, their capacity. Two were price and conformance. And price and conformance actually were not judged by the Commissioners. We didn't get to look at those. That's what State Procurement dealt with.

So we were really just looking at could they fulfill what we had done - we had written in our scope of work, that they actually accomplished the mission.

Of those seven, we felt there were four that could and we wanted to talk to them further. So we had an interview, which was in public session which you can view on-line. If you look at our website and download the June 24th meeting, you can see it all for yourselves and watch the questions we asked and how the firms responded.

What you haven't seen yet is the actual -- the written responses that they submitted to
State Procurement. And that's something that I'm hoping that Mary and Ray can help us coordinate to get so that it's easily accessible and everyone can see those.

Up until yesterday, those were considered confidential documents. So nobody could see them except us and that's why also we were always having executive sessions, because it was a requirement of State Procurement that we not divulge the contents of those responses.

So -- and I mentioned this yesterday, for anybody who might have been at our meeting, I know it's very frustrating for the public. This is supposed to be as transparent of a process as possible. You should have access to everything we are seeing, and all of the commissioners feel that way.

Sometimes -- you know, we decided to follow that process for State Procurement and follow the rules. So we did have to go into executive session on those, whenever we discussed those documents.

Those now -- now that we have made a selection, those are all available for all of you to read, and I would ask that you look at those because
I think it's important in terms of just understanding how we came to the decision that we came to.

Let's see what else.

I would like to also say that all five of us, each and every one of us, represents 6.4 million Arizonans. Even though two were appointed by Democratic leadership and two were appointed by Republican leadership, we all represent everyone and there is no partisanship that is to be had on the Commission. The goal of all of this is to be an independent redistricting commission. That is what Prop 106 called for.

We understand that role and we are -- we also all took an oath. That is something that came up. And, yes, we did take an oath and we all take it extremely seriously.

I think it's also important to note that this firm, whatever firm we had selected, they act at our direction, period. They are not to define communities of interest, they don't define competitiveness, they don't even define compactness.

If you listened to the interviews, Mr. Stertz had asked a question of all of them about a specific test that can be used to measure
compactness, because that's one of the six criteria that we have to abide by under the Arizona Constitution.

They -- these firms -- they are technical consultants. That is their role in this. We direct them. We get public input from all of you -- and we haven't even started yet that mapping process. You've heard some of the people come and talk about specific boundaries, and that's great. That's -- we need to hear from everybody who has an opinion on that matter.

But these firms, they do not act on their own volition, ever. They don't do public policy. They strictly are there to draw lines, and we are to tell them how to draw those lines.

So it's really up to these five Commissioners how those lines get drawn and how we decide is based on your input. And all I can tell you and assure you is we are all listening very carefully at what everyone has to say.

There has been a great deal of talk today about partisanship of the firms. There is no question all four of them, of the four we interviewed, had partisan ties. And it's kind of in the nature of this business that they would because
the people who hire them are typically political candidates.

So all of the firms we -- that was part of our criteria in our RFP, to provide all information on political contributions, on their client list, and their affiliations, if there was anything they thought would impair their decision to be objective and fair in their work.

And you'll see this in the request for proposal. It's all outlined in numerous questions. And all the firms were to respond to that, and they all did. They were very forthcoming in their responses. And of those four, there were three that had Democratic leanings and one that had Republican leanings.

And as I said in my statement yesterday, I would have preferred to have two Republican leaning firms and two Democratic leaning firms for balance so that we could have made a decision based on those four. That wasn't the hand we were dealt.

So we looked at those four and compared their responses and what they said in their interviews to what we had requested, and that is how we made the decision that we made.

Two of the firms had direct prior
in-state Arizona involvement and one firm did not have any and then one firm didn't have the redistricting experience that we needed to move forward. They had redistricting experience in one county but no state-level redistricting experience.

So by process of elimination, the two in-state -- the two firms that had in-state prior Arizona involvement had a lot of baggage, frankly. One firm had done it previously, and there are people on one side that view what they did last time as not good and there's the other side that says what they did do was good. And there are very passionate expressions on both sides regarding that work.

I would like to say that that previous commission, the first commission, my hat is off to them. They did the best they could with the information they had.

They didn't have a Supreme Court decision that had decided how to deal with those six competitive -- or six criteria that the Arizona Constitution has outlined.

Someone had a mentioned earlier that it is a very difficult process, and it is. They performed their task very admirably. They did the
best they could with the information they had and
made the best decision they could and that's all we
can ask of anyone.

Mary, I'm curious, can the other
commissioners at all address the criticism or is it
only the chair?

MS. O'GRADY: Other commissioners can as well.
What the law says is, "At the conclusion of an open
call to the public, individual members of the public
body may respond to criticisms made by who those to
direct the public body," and then some other things
you can do as well. But it's individual members.
But there's no discussion among the members. Just
make your individual comments.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. I ask that because
I would ask my fellow commissioners to also speak.
And I'm sorry for taking this much time, but I just
think it's really important, given the amount of
comments we heard here today and to show that we are
all listening and to see what others have to say.

So I would ask the other commissioners if
they have anything, I would be -- I would welcome
their thoughts.

MS. McNULTY: Thank you, Madame Chair.

Is this working?
I would only add that for me, the skill that this company brings to bear that really stood out for me is the expertise they have in documenting every single change that's made to a map and evaluating all of the public input that we receive, helping us to integrate that into the maps, deciding, for example, whether the public input is directed toward a particular district. They can tell us whether a particular change that has been proposed in a map, how that affects that criteria in our Constitution that we have to comply with.

If we move a line based on another comment, they will be able to tell us how it either improves a set of criteria or makes a situation worse.

And they have some very sophisticated abilities to document all of the changes that are made so that the public and the Department of Justice, when we have to go to them, can -- there will be a complete record.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you, Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair, I want to talk first about passion.
It was very clear to me that the people that came to this meeting today, I want to thank each and every one of you for bringing your heartfelt passion to this room. You've got a passion for your beliefs, you've got a passion for your community, you've got a passion for your city, and you've got a passion for this state.

I believe more -- and above that, you've got a passion for the truth.

And so as we -- what I want to clear up is a couple of things regarding passion.

When anyone does whatever job that they do, it's the goal of someone's life -- there is an old adage that "If you're doing a job that you love, you never have to work a day in your life." That's because you have passion for that job.

The company that we hired has passion. And you can see by their own resume -- the passion -- what they have a passion for. They have a passion for hard Democrat partisan processes. They have a passion for causes that are hard-partisan line.

Not -- there wasn't -- you couldn't go through their script and find there was any level of balance at all. They have a passion for it.
So when someone has a passion that is that dynamic, it is clear to me that whatever their words are, whatever their rhetoric says is going to be clear to me that their passion is going to carry through. And whatever we are charged with in our independence about doing the best we can, we are still going to be reviewing documents based on our suggestions and their return of information to us.

We will do the best we can with the hand that we have now been dealt. We've been dealt a hand from a group -- with a company that is extremely passionate about a specific cause.

I also want to share something that this -- the choice that was made yesterday was not a choice that was made by two of the Republicans here. The two Republicans voted no against this firm. We voted no and we had great criteria why we voted no. And I'm not going to hash over those reasons because it's irrelevant at this time.

But I will tell you that the choice that we made for this firm has -- in their own submission, has a price that is going to be the most expensive of all of the firms that were submitted.

They have a schedule that is going to last the longest. Their delivered product is the
latest in delivery. They are -- and that concerns me because it puts and onus on us as commissioners to now respond back. It was brought forth by several members of the community that we are under now an unrealistic time frame.

And I also want to correct the record that we as an entire Commission did not defer our decision-making to this State Procurement Office.

At one of our very first meetings I put it on the record that I wanted to have our meetings done in public; that we have by virtue of Proposition 106, we have constitutional authority to hire any firm that we want and we can create our own decision-making process.

It was by the majority of this Commission that decided that it was to the best interest to utilize the State Procurement Office to assist us in that process.

The process happened -- what happened was that we actually got a little bit highjacked by this process. Again I go back to at the very beginning, I suggested at a very early-on meeting that if we follow the process outlaid by the Arizona Department of Administration and the State Procurement Office, that at best, the best-case scenario is that we
would not have a mapping consultant on board until mid-June. I was wrong. We will not have mapping consultant on board until after the 4th of July.

The question came up whether or not -- whether or not the contracts have been let or not. The decision that was made in public session yesterday was that -- by the majority, on a three-to-two split vote that the authority was given to the Executive Director, Ray Bladine, to enter contract negotiations with Strategic Telemetry. That was the motion that was made in public session yesterday.

So I want to go back to the idea of passion.

As we continue through this process, I implore you to continue to bring your passion to these meetings. It is imperative that we hear from you, your neighbors, everyone that you are involved with, about what this -- what -- the passion that you have.

There was a young man that came forward and said that we are on the right track. We are on a track. We are on a track that we've been dealt right now and we will do the best that we can as a commission of five to work for the State of Arizona.
I can tell you that in the two primary selections of our -- first of our legal counsel, there was a precedent that was set in the previous commission where the two Democrats selected their counsel and the chair acquiesced and voted with the two Democrats. And the Republicans voted for their two counsel and the chair acquiesced and voted for their counsel.

The choice for the legal counsel at this time, as you're probably aware, was not followed in that same way.

So my concern going forward is that we -- one, we have a mapping consultant that has been -- that has been given -- the Executive Director has been given the authority to enter into negotiations on. My concern is whether or not we are utilizing the taxpayers' money in its highest and best use.

My concern is whether or not we even have a chance of meeting a schedule based on the deliverables that they have included in their own proposal.

Madame Chair, thank you for indulging me, and thank you everybody here for participating in this process.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other comments from --
Vice Chair?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Madame Chairman?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I would enforce Commissioner Stertz's statements. I stated the concerns that I had yesterday before the vote, and I don't want to belabor them.

There was a discussion before the vote yesterday and it was pointed out that all of the commissioners made their decisions based upon their best independent judgment, based upon the record that was before us, and I believe that. I don't question the motives of anyone on the Commission.

The record that was put before was pretty specific. There were proposals submitted by the four vendors and there was a presentation by the four vendors and there was responses by the vendors with questions put to them by the commissioners.

One of my prime concerns was the perception, public perception of potential bias. That's a big issue for me. We're constitutionally required to carry out duties in a way that will build public process in the result. And for me, based on the record that was before me, that is why I could not -- one of the reasons why I could not
support Strategic Telemetry as the mapping consultant. Based on the record that was before me, I thought there was another firm that, yes, they are based in California, they do have some personnel here in Arizona, they are familiar with Arizona, they did the mapping here before. They did mapping in various localities.

But I thought based upon the resume, the other work they had performed in various other jurisdictions across the countries there was evidence there -- and other evidence as well, such as the principal having been called upon as authority to speak before national conferences and state legislatures in a bipartisan session about redistricting issues, not in a partisan setting at that conference.

I thought there was some evidence that -- where -- there was an accusation made of some partisan leading. That's a record that will give some assurance there.

As a matter of fact, my initial reaction during the initial evaluation of that firm was that the team that they had assembled, and it was a pretty all-star team, actually leaned to the Democrat side. And, in fact, during the public
interview, that was one of the first questions put
to Mr. Johnson. He's the principal of National
Demographics Corporation, who was not selected.

Basically, the only thing we saw was each
one of these vendors was to question of potential
political bias. He said that he was ready to answer
the question of Democrat -- possible Democrat bias.

But I thought other factors in the record
before me affiliated against the conclusion that NDC
would be perceived as biased either way. I can't
say that for Strategic Telemetry, which is one of
the reasons why I did not vote for them.

But yesterday there was a three/two vote
and Mr. Bladine was given authorization to enter
into a contract with that company. I do not know
the status of those negotiations, but I assume they
will happen fairly quickly. And I want to move
forward with this. I want to move forward with the
chair and the other members of this Commission and
work with Strategic Telemetry, a mapping consultant,
yes, they do (inaudible). That's essentially what
they were supposed to do.

But understand what also mapping
consultant is asked to do is they are presented with
a very complicated problem, a Constitution with six
criteria that all, in some instances, work against each other.

It's a complicated problem to solve. And it's important to have trust in that mapping consultant, because when we as a Commission, listening to the public and getting that public input, which is important, because -- as an aside, these maps belong to the Legislature. They don't belong to any candidate, they don't even belong to this Commission, they belong to the people. You the people should get to decide how these maps are drawn. And I think that was one of the intents behind Prop 106, is to let the people have a say in this, involve them in the process. It's a very good thing about having a Commission like this. But -- and I went to the aside and I lost my train of thought.

I think the mapping consultant is going to be asked to make certain decisions to draw new maps to say we need to take into consideration this community of interest or we need to try to make this district more competitive. And they are going to present us with options. You can imagine the problem -- the complexity of problems. There are probably a myriad of answers and it's important to
be able to trust that they are giving us fair and balanced responses. They are not trying to lead us by the nose to get a result.

And that is a concern I have. The chair has confidence in this company, so we are going to be entering into a contract with them and I really want -- we really need to get going.

And I'm looking forward to working with them and I hope everyone continues to be involved in the process and I really appreciate hearing from all of you today.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Mr. Herrera?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you. I thank you guys also for being here. You know, the two consultants were at the end that we were considering, the final ones were, obviously, the one we chose and also NDC.

Now, if we truly care about public perception, NDC wouldn't have even been considered. NDC did the job last time, and the majority of the people I think that are familiar with what happened last time are pretty unhappy with what they did.

I mean, we had Andi Minkoff who participated in the Commission and she felt that she
was pretty much ignored throughout the whole process by NDC.

NDC's chair is a highly partisan Republican. The Rose Institute, which is affiliated with NDC, basically they are almost a one -- one institution, they just happen to have two names, the board of directors is highly Republican and highly partisan.

So if you truly cared about public perception, they wouldn't have been considered. So let's be honest about that.

And the other thing, you guys haven't read the proposal. And it's probably the sloppiest proposal I've ever read. They -- basically what they ended up doing was they got the California -- because they applied for the California redistricting.

What they ended up doing is basically rewriting -- it's the same proposal. All they ended up doing is changing Arizona here and there, obviously, some other changes, but they forgot in certain cases to change Arizona and left California. They left California -- some information referring to the California RFP.

I mean, just a sloppy proposal. If it
was up to me, they wouldn't have been interviewed because I guarantee you, if you guys were reading the proposals the way we were doing, they shouldn't have been interviewed at all.

They took it for granted that they got the job two years ago. They made 2 million, by the way. Around there, roughly $2 million when everything was said and done. Not chump change. And I think they came out -- they probably lowballed us ten years ago, but they ended up getting a huge amount of money.

So, I mean, let's talk about public perception, what happened ten years ago. I don't know how many of you were here ten years ago. I'm assuming that most of you were in Arizona. Were you protesting NDC? Because NDC was highly partisan. And anybody that thinks that they are not -- I don't know what they are smoking. Because if they are as partisan as RAS was, which my first choice, but I acquiesced and said, you know, what I'm going to give them -- I'm going to side with the Independent and go for Strategic Telemetry.

So if we are really concerned about those options, about the public perception, then we wouldn't be considering NDC as well. So let's be
honest and true to the people that are out here.

    I care about this state. I'm a social,
liberal, whatever you want to call me, but I
guarantee you, the people out there, we don't have a
lot uncommon. We probably have -- tea parties, we
probably have a lot more in common than you think.

    So let's focus on the things that we have
in common as Arizonans. Let's move forward because
the issue of Strategic Telemetry isn't going to go
away. They will be our mapping consultants.

    The attorney that we chose, she will be
our attorney. So let's not rehash what happened in
the past. Let's move forward.

    I think all of you here are smart people.
And if you want to rehash the same old things, we
are not going to move forward.

    So I do thank you for being here, but
remember, we represent 6.5 million people. This is
a small sliver of people that are here. So I
guarantee there's people that agree with what we
did. Obviously, not the majority here, but we are
going to agree to disagree and move forward.

    So I thank you for your comments. I
thank you for being respectful. And this is my
honest feedback and hopefully you respect that.
Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I can't let that go.

MS. O'GRADY: I'm sorry, we can't discuss --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm not discussing anything. I'm not discussing what Mr. Herrera said.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: You said you can't let it go.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I can't let this go without making this comment. I'm not making a comment on Mr. Herrera or any other person's comment. It will be solely on comments that were made in -- by reaction to members of the public. All right?

MS. O'GRADY: You can respond to criticism from the public.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: In response to criticism from -- or criticism to the public.

The concept we are coming back to regarding the word "trust." I want to focus on the word "trust" again. It was brought up several times. You don't trust what we are doing.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I do.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm asking --
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, we don't trust. We'll be watching you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And my comment to that right now is -- I'm going to go back to a very wise man once said in the middle of one of the toughest times in our generation, and that was the phrase "Trust but verify."

It is going to be incumbent upon all of us on this Commission and all of you in the general public to hear those records that I am saying and please help us as we move this along in this process.

You've just heard the comments that were made, and I'm asking all of you as you have -- you said you don't trust this process, that the comment I want to leave us with right now before we go to the next agenda item, is trust but verify.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: The time is ten minutes to 4:00, and I am so sorry, Michelle, for not being more cognizant of our time. And we'll go ahead and take at least a ten-minute break, a recess so that you can have a break. And I'm sorry that we didn't do that sooner.
So the time is 3:50. We'll have a short recess.

(A recess was taken from 3:50 p.m. to 4:12 p.m.)

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

The time is 4:12, and our next item on the agenda is the Executive Director's report.

Mr. Bladine?

RAY BLADINE: Chairwoman Mathis and Commission members, can you hear me all right?

I believe you have in your packets three separate pieces of paper that I thought would be helpful to bring you up-to-date on our resources for the rest of the year.

The first assembly, a single sheet -- I believe we have copies in the back -- that lists the appropriation for the current year so that you don't have that --

MR. HERRERA: It's not in my folder.

RAY BLADINE: Maybe I have an extra here.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I can share.

RAY BLADINE: It basically shows that we have $3 million for the 2011/12 and -- 2012 fiscal year and 500,000 for this year. That's just basic
information for the budget.

Then you have two sheets stapled together that are a budget that I threw together quickly as our first draft and primarily to be able to track our expenditures and to be able to make some changes.

The first sheet shows as of a few days ago how much money we've spent out of the $500,000 that was appropriated this year. And we are about at having spent a hundred thousand. That number will change when the year end actually closes, but it gives us a carryover balance of approximately $400,000 to be added to the $3 million next year.

Then the sheet behind that is a budget projection for the 2012 fiscal year, and basically the estimates I came up with were a total of $2.5 million at this time. I'm sure one of the big numbers you all will wonder about is the consultant. And without having any idea where we might be, I did plug in the $960,000. I frankly did that by looking at last time and then two years they spent about a million two. I figured we would probably be there, but I don't know. So that number, obviously, is a pretty wild guess. But I did plug that in at 960.

You will also see it ties into another
part of my report that under the personal
services -- actually it's the 6,010s plus the ERAs.
I plugged in money there to hire temporary staff to
go out and do the hearings with us so that they will help us do the setups, they will help us greet at
the satellite locations.

    I think I budgeted roughly a solid eight weeks of five people at about $22 an hour, just to get something like that, but that varied. Kind of the same way for the in-state travel. I looked at what happened last year -- or ten years ago and did my best to say, okay, what's a reasonable amount of travel.

    My thought would be that once we get the expenditures for the end of each month, I will take and look at it, update it, and give something back to you to see on a monthly basis where are we.

    So at this point in time, I'm projecting that the rest of this year we would spend two million five. That would leave us an unallocated balance of 900,000 at this time.

    That may seem like a lot of money, but I got a funny feeling that as we move along, there will be other costs and probably end up at least where I would think the Commission did last year, or
pretty close. But right now our projections are a little less. 

I would be happy, if there's any questions you can send me a note or give me a call and I will be glad to respond or I can do that now.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, the issue of staff, when do you expect to have all of the staff that you need on board?

RAY BLADINE: I would say within the next two weeks. Two things is, one, I need to -- and on my report I will talk about -- well, I guess I can do it now because it's on my executive director report. We do have a PIO position that needs to be filled. I have received some, I think, very good applications. My suggestion, with your approval -- well, I guess I can't have you approve it, but my suggestion without someone objecting would be I'll take those, send them to you with a sheet and rate them one to ten, send the one to ten back to me. Then I can at least take a look at what the top ones are and send them out to you.

You might in a future meeting want to create a subcommittee to interview those people.
You may want to do it yourself. That's really up to you.

But I think if I get you the resumes and I give you a one-to-ten sheet, just very simply, we can get the numbers down to make it easier for you to deal with. So that's one position.

I probably in this next week will get a temporary Manpower or use one of the positions that we'll use for staffing in the office, the phone calls are starting to pick up. And so with that -- and then there are five positions that in the last week I got authorization through the personnel DOA for five temporary positions to do the outreach work and I'll have the justifications to fill completed. So all of the paperwork for us to do that is done. And I would hope to have them towards the end of -- sometime between the end of next week and the start of the following week.

We need to have them on board for some training before we start the public hearings. We need to coordinate the public hearings with the mapping consultant.

But as part of my report I would also tell you that Kristina has spent a lot of time in the last few days in particular of trying to locate
various facilities throughout the state that we could have hearings. And we will have -- I think we have sent you a draft schedule, but I think that at this time to really talk about it without the mapping consultant is premature.

I did send a copy to the mapping consultant earlier this morning. And -- so that he could take a look at what we are talking about, but as a summary. It would involve pretty much solid meetings for about three weeks statewide. And we would ask to have one Commissioner at each hearing, not the subhearings, but that's up to you. And then we will basically have staff.

We are going to need to find some facilities that can handle some of the Internet functions because otherwise, Buck's family won't see him for three weeks and I don't think that's going to work.

But that's kind of where we are headed on that part.

The last thing I would show you is I just gave you the expenditures of the last commission and what they ended up spending during 2001/2002, and that amount was 3.523 million. They had a 6 million appropriation, but, of course, that carried over to
later years and covered additional legal and mapping expenses.

So I guess the simple answer is I think that based upon preliminary analysis, our funding should be -- should be adequate, but we'll watch it closely as we go along.

Any --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: You said the PIO -- and providing the commissioners with the applicants. I would prefer not to be involved. My personal opinion is that's why we hired you. Doing this as respectful as I can, I don't want to be involved in the process. That's why we hired you. I don't want to do that, but that's just from me.

RAY BLADINE: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other questions or comments for Mr. Bladine on the budget?

Thank you for all of this work, by the way, for assembling it all and preparing it for us today.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I would for one would
like to take a look at the ten applicants. So don't
discount me from that outreach.

Am I correct by your recommendation that
items IV, V, and VI are items that will not be under
discussion at this time, pending review of the
schedule that you sent to the mapping consultant?

RAY BLADINE: I believe that -- that is my
recommendation. It's up to you and the chair. But
I think that it makes some sense.

As much as we are anxious to get you to
approve a schedule, we really need to coordinate
with the mapping people.

You have the data, so you have some idea
of what we are talking about, but I don't think -- I
think it would be premature to talk about.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Our next meeting is
scheduled for July 7th?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes. I don't know if we
have a venue yet.

RAY BLADINE: We do not.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Do we know when the
venue is going to be selected?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Hopefully soon.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Will it be Tucson or Phoenix?

RAY BLADINE: I don't know the answer to that either.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And we've got a subsequent meeting scheduled for --

RAY BLADINE: The 8th.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The 8th, the following day. And again, we don't have a venue or a city for that as well?

RAY BLADINE: No, but I would make a recommendation to you that we do the two meetings at the same location, just because of the setup time and the making sure we have it set up right.

It is a considerable -- it's nice to be out in the community. We will be out in the community somewhere, but it takes a lot of staffing time to set up and tear down for each meeting like this where it is not a hearing.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And then, Madame Chair, regarding number VII agenda items and future meetings, I think we are going to need a motion to move items number IV, V, and VI to the subsequent meeting.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yep, I think so.
Are you done with your executive director report?

RAY BLADINE: I would just make two other comments that over the last several weeks, we have been meeting with your legal team and talking about the kinds of things we need to do to make sure we properly document public input.

And we have actually looked at some firms that specialize in receiving public input and categorizing it so you can go back and research it.

We have -- no decision is being made yet because we need to see what mappers can do. But we really want to be able to provide a good system to log and manage that. So we have done that.

We have also worked with the legal staff so that they are able to start taking a look at the submissions to the Department of Justice, so that they can do as much prework on that as possible.

So we've done a lot of little things to try to move along and be ready so that once the mapper hits the ground, we'll be ready to go.

With that, that's all that I have to report.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair, as a follow-up to that, as you're doing work with legal
counsel, I'm assuming that you're also trying to assemble -- and this may fall under the agenda items for future meetings, and I'm assuming that you're trying to put together all of the previous meeting minutes, transcripts? There haven't been any distributed and/or reviewed and/or approved and put into the record for the last almost month and a half.

RAY BLADINE: Chairman Mathis, Commission Stertz, We are way behind in that. We did add Anna Garcia to our staff last week, and that is one of the projects we are putting her on to get them categorized.

We do now have a system with the legal team where this month Mary's staff reviews the minutes. And I think once -- unless, again, I hear differently from you, once approved by legal, we'll go ahead and post them on our website.

And we are having both transcripts and minutes taken. We are not paying extra to have the minutes done early because we do have the video of it. But yes, I am very embarrassed that I am that far behind on the minutes.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Madame Chair?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.
COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Just a clarification on the minutes.

Everything goes in as draft minutes.

Once legal has approved them, ultimately the Commission needs to approve them?

RAY BLADINE: Correct. We haven't posted them as draft yet, but I think that's what we need to do.

Pardon me. Thank you for correcting it.

We would propose them as a draft after legal review and then it would be your need to approve them. But we need to get the draft minutes on the agenda and then get them on to you for approval, would be our --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments or questions for Mr. Bladine on the executive director report or information he provided?

Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Bladine.

And thank you, Kristina, for all of your work, too, on the public hearing schedule. We will get to that at some point.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair, I'm going to make a -- I'm going to go ahead and move that we move items number IV, V, and VI to a subsequent meeting agenda to be determined in an effort to
allow any of the members of the public that may be 
waiting here to see the mapping consultant, as this 
is an agenda that there is going to be a 
presentation by the mapping consultant, that they 
will not be here to make. So let the members of the 
public know that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right. The time has 
gotten late today, and we have decided that it would 
be best to postpone IV, V, VI on the agenda. So 
that will be at our next meeting, which right now is 
scheduled for July 7th. Again, the venue to be 
determined and time to be determined, but we'll get 
that information out as early as we can.

RAY BLADINE: And, Madame Chair, we have been 
trying to -- if we know a meeting is coming up, even 
though we don't know the location, at least put 
something on our website to give some idea of when 
it might be. But we certainly will move as quickly 
as we can to get the official notice up so that 
people have as much notice as possible.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you. That's great. 
So I need a motion, I think, to table 
those items, if everyone agrees.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I second the motion. It 
was made already.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, you made it.

Second.

Any discussion?

All in favor?

("Aye.")

Any opposed?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We will table those items until next time.

And our next meeting, we just talked about.

Any agenda items that anyone wanted to raise that should appear on the next agenda?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: IV, V, VI.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, besides IV, V, and VI?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I would say it's important for us to get everyone up to speed. So whatever staff needs to do and legal needs to do to get gas to get that under control. We are about to go into -- into hyperspeed in regards to public meetings. And if we can't keep up with our own meetings -- we need to instill a level of confidence
to the public that we are going to be able to be delivering information and review back to the general public about what we're -- what's happening in the rest of the state.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Good thought.

Any other agenda items?

RAY BLADINE: Madame Chairwoman, I think we did also discuss on the 7th or 8th about having our legal team give us a briefing on those laws that pertain to redistricting so that you have that fresh in your mind.

Is that correct, Mary?

MS. O'GRADY: Yes, Madame Chair, Commissioners. We'll be ready whenever the Commission wants to put that on their agenda. And we might coordinate on some issues with the mapping consultant, I think.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I think it would be good to revisit the open meeting law discussion. We had one briefly with Jim Bartlet at the beginning of our session but it would be good, now that our team has been assembled, we've got new legal counsel, that we
have another briefing in public of what the open
meeting law, how it states, how it's organized, and
what the processes are.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, good idea.

And, yeah, especially now that we have a
full team in place, that would be very helpful, I
think for everyone.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Just for clarification,
who would be doing this discussion?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, in terms of open
meeting law, I think it would be legal counsel.
Mary would you or Joe or both be doing that?

MS. O'GRADY: Yeah, Joe and I can work
together to do whatever the Commission wants. I
guess we need just a sense for how much time you
would want to spend on it since this is the second
time you have dealt with it.

And I did think -- also we planned on
briefing the mapping consultant, so right -- so they
are up to speed on the legal requirements right from
the beginning, both in terms of open meeting and
public records laws.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Any other agenda items?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair?
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Just to clarify, I think it would make more sense if we have an open meeting law, go over the whole process, that the mapping consultant be included. Just do that one time.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Agreed.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair, that was my intent.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Perfect.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other agenda items?

Okay.

Hearing none --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair, I'm sorry, I do have one more, and this is a question for timing.

What is the anticipated date of the draft contract with the mapping consultant? Are we going to be ready for a decision or Commission review?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think that's for --

RAY BLADINE: The best I can tell you at this time, we intend the -- legal counsel and myself intend to meet on the phone with the consulting firm. We have talked to them. I would like to tell you that we are going to get it done on Friday, but I do want to, as you've instructed, to negotiate the
fees. So it will certainly be early next week, if
not this Friday. I think it's going to be very
difficult to get it done Friday.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: This Friday, you mean
tomorrow?

RAY BLADINE: That's correct. I mean, we
actually started on it this morning about 5 o'clock
to make the initial contact with them and talk with
them about the fact that you had authorized me to
enter into a contract and negotiate the rate. And
then yesterday we had a discussion with legal
counsel about getting a draft contract.

I don't think we will get it together
tomorrow, but it will be early next week. My
anticipation with legal approval will be we'll go
ahead and get the contract as quickly as we can but
allow for expenditures they may extend prior to the
contract to come out here and do what would need to
be done, because I don't want to delay that, but I
also want to make sure that I properly have an
opportunity to see what we can do to better refine
the costs.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So what I'm hearing is
that prior to the July 7th meeting, a draft agreement, as you just described, would be distributed to the commissioners?

RAY BLADINE: I would -- that would be my plan.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

RAY BLADINE: Mary might --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mary.

MS. O'GRADY: I guess just for clarification, is it the Commission's understanding and intention that it would come back for Commission approval again or that the agreement can be executed?

My understanding was that the Executive Director had the authority to negotiate and work with legal to get the agreement finalized and approved without further Commission action, although we are certainly to keep the Commission informed.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Madame Chair?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: My recollection of yesterday was Mr. Bladine was authorized to enter into the contract but perhaps an agenda item, future agenda item, that we make sort of a contract review an agenda item. Perhaps there might be a modification in addition that the Commission might
want to consider. Because we are -- basically the
authority has been given yesterday, but I also want
to see the final product. And perhaps it's
irrelevant, but I'm at least -- I would like to have
the opportunity to review it and perhaps comment on
it.

Does that make sense?

MS. O'GRADY: So -- yes, I'll just -- I guess
the Executive Director has the authority to execute
the agreement, but you just want to make sure you're
aware of what the final product is, right?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Right.

MS. O'GRADY: So we may execute before the
next --

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Well, I think that's
what the vote gave him the authority.

MS. O'GRADY: That's my understanding.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: That's my recollection
of it. So I guess I would like an agenda item
whereby if that's -- you know, if it's an
appropriate agenda to ask for modification to
propose, that we be given that -- I don't know when
that might be, but at least it gives me an
opportunity to look at the contract with that sort
of thing in mind.
MS. O'GRADY: Okay. And maybe we can follow up to make sure -- because typically, we wouldn't have modifications that quickly after execution, is my concern, in terms of an agenda action item. But we can work with the Commission in terms of making sure that the commissioners are informed and that if it needs to be an agenda item before the Commission -- next time, we can do it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is it possible to circulate the draft contract? Would that work in terms of letting the commissioners review it or is that not --

RAY BLADINE: Madame Chair?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Bladine.

RAY BLADINE: We have some work to do to figure out legally what we need to do because we are under delegated authority with SPO, even though we also have our Constitutional right. So I'm trying to, one, quickly learn again how we should do this to be consistent with SPO and with the legal counsel.

So I'm not sure that it would be appropriate for us to circulate it, but it would certainly be something that we could bring to you in probably executive section. But we just need to
As I'm sitting here, I think it's going to be difficult to get all of the i's dotted and t's crossed by the 7th.

I really -- you know, I really need to know how we're going to do this. We are in completely unchartered territory of having started the process being delegated by SPO and having Constitutional authority. And the attorneys are going to have to help us sort through how to do that so we can --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Madame Chair, we can't hear Mr. Bladine and the commissioners. And I'm getting text messages from people on the Internet that they can't hear either.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

RAY BLADINE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Bladine, Counsel, I think our vote is that Mr. Bladine have the authority. He was directed to enter into negotiation with the consultant and contract with the consultant.

I would suggest that we add as an agenda item for the next time an update on that status. And if at that point we think any further agenda
items are appropriate, that we add them. I don't think we have an agenda item right now to discuss the details of that particular endeavor.

So I would suggest that we put it on the agenda the status of Mr. Bladine's progress.

MS. O'GRADY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: You mentioned the complexities of the SPO delegation to the Commission.

Could you describe the complexities?

MS. McNULTY: Madame Chair, I don't think that's an agenda item today. I don't think that's on our agenda.

MS. O'GRADY: That's not. That's a good point. He can give a summary of current events, and I guess the current event is he is working with the mapping consultant to follow up on the Commission's direction from yesterday.

RAY BLADINE: And I guess I can give you an update that having talked with the consultant, I have also reviewed what was done last time. I pulled out the contract. And even though SPO didn't negotiate last time, they did issue the contract and
I want to make sure if I sign the contract under that delegation, I am doing it properly. And right now I don't know what that means.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mary.

MS. O'GRADY: Madame Chair, so we'll continue working with Mr. Bladine to get that --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Nail it down.

MS. O'GRADY: Move it forward. And if there's an agenda item next week, update the Commission on the status and keep you informed on the drafts so that if there's -- so that we satisfy the Commission's needs for information on this issue.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sounds great.

MS. O'GRADY: I had one other agenda point, if I may.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure, Mary.

MS. O'GRADY: On Roman Numeral V that you are carrying over, which is the presentation from the mapping consultant, it might help to -- if there are specific issues they want to cover in the mapping consultant's presentation to identify that the commissioners want to hear to identify those. So that can be specified in the agenda.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I think it would make sense if the mapping consultant goes from step one -- there will be people in the audience that probably may not understand the things. Maybe even myself. I think it makes sense to give -- just lay the groundwork, the whole process. Give everybody a good understanding, a good foundation of how the process -- what we get and then progress.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, that's a good idea. A step-by-step outline of the entire process.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Anything else that the Commissioners want to say about what should be specified under the mapping consultant presentation? Anything specific?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: The issue of public comment, I would like for the mapping consultant to focus on that and to reassure, but let the public know that their public comments are being recorded -- their comments and also their maps, just the whole process of how that happens.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Any other comments from other
commissioners?

Okay. Hearing none, that concludes agenda item VII, which takes us to agenda item VIII, which is adjournment.

And the time is now 4:40 p.m., and I declare this meeting adjourned.

(The deposition concluded at 4:40 p.m.)
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