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VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Everyone's attention, please.

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

The time is 6:04, and we're on the record.

Won't you all please rise and recite the Pledge of Allegiance with me.

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you all for coming tonight.

Folks, we're here tonight for a public comment session of the Redistricting Commission.

That is the only item on the agenda aside from a brief Power Point that our mapping consultant Strategic Telemetry will give us.

That is the sole purpose.

My name is Scott Freeman. I'm one of the five appointed commissioners.

With me here is Jose Herrera, who is also a
We both serve as Vice Chair of the Commission on an alternating basis.

This hearing is being broadcast live stream over the Internet on our website.

I know the other commissioners, Colleen Mathis, Richard Stertz, and Linda McNulty, are viewing this and watching this.

Over the next two weeks we are traveling all around the state, and in a rapid fashion, and hitting lots and lots of cities and towns to collect public comments from the public on how the redistricting process should play out and how these maps should look.

So the public's input is vital in this process.

Everything that is being said here today is being taken down by Marty, our court reporter. It becomes part of the record.

If you want to make comments tonight, you can find in the back these yellow comment slips. Please fill them out and get them to one of us, our executive director Ray Bladine, who is right over there, or Kristina Gomez, who is also buzzing around.

And that will allow you to come and speak.

If you do not want to speak, you can also find in the back these blue forms, and you can provide comments in...
All of your comments, whether you give them in writing or you provide comments orally to the Commission, become part of our record.

You can also provide comments through our website or call us.

You can submit maps. You can submit written statements, whatever you like.

Let me introduce some of our staff here today.

I've mentioned Ray Bladine, our executive director.

We have Joe Kanefield, who is with Ballard Spahr, counsel for the Commission.

We have Willie Desmond from the firm of Strategic Telemetry, who will be giving the presentation shortly on the redistricting process.

And federal law requires that we make translation services available, and our translator is right there, and he's going to make that announcement in Spanish.

(Whereupon, the interpreter made a statement in Spanish.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Also before we get started I want to recognize some public officials that I've been made aware of that are here tonight.
Senator Biggs, I believe, is here.

There he is.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Representative Fillmore.

Commissioner Pete Rios is here as well.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you for coming.

All right. Okay. I think the next item on our agenda is the presentation by Strategic Telemetry, so I'll give the floor.

WILLIE DESMOND: Thank you all for the opportunity to present to you today.

As was mentioned, this is the fourth public meeting in this first round of public input sessions.

Once this input has been gathered and collected, there will be -- the initial maps will be begin to be drawn. There will be a 30-day review period for the public, and then another round of public hearings where you can make your comments known.

As you mentioned, for anyone listening at home, that this Power Point is available on the website, and you can download it and follow along if you like.

All right. So, again, my name is Willie Desmond. I work with Strategic Telemetry. We're the firm hired to do technical assistance to the Commission as they begin the
process of drawing the new district maps.

This presentation is designed to give a brief background on the redistricting process and the process here in Arizona.

The first thing we will be discussing is why we have -- why do we have a Redistricting Commission?

The next is, what is redistricting?

What is the difference between redistricting -- or reapportionment and redistricting?

Why do we have to redistrict?

What guidelines need to be followed when drawing new districts?

What are the steps in the redistricting process?

And how can the public's input be submitted to the AIRC.

First, why do we have a Redistricting Commission?

This is the second time Arizona's districts have been redrawn by the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission.

In 2000 the voters of Arizona approved Proposition 106, which created the AIRC and established a process and criteria for drawing new district lines. The Commission is made up of two Democrats, two Republicans, and an Independent chair elected by the other commissioners.
The fifth member shall not be registered with any party already represented on the Commission.

The 2011 AIRC members are, Vice Chair Scott Freeman, who is chairing the meeting today. Vice Chair Jose Herrera, who is also here in attendance.

Chairwoman Colleen Mathis.

And Commissioners Linda McNulty and Richard Stertz.

What is redistricting?

Simply put, redistricting is the process of redrawing congressional and legislative district lines.

The difference between redistricting and reapportionment, while slight, there is a technical difference.

Reapportionment is the process of allocating congressional districts based off of -- among the states based off of changes in population.

Because population growth here in Arizona over the last decade, Arizona has been allocated an additional congressional district going from eight to nine following the 2010 census.

Redistricting, again, is just the process of drawing those new boundaries that are established based off of reapportionment.
Why do we have to redistrict?

Well, because Arizona -- sorry, because Arizona gained a congressional district, new lines have to be drawn to add that new district in.

However, even if Arizona had not gained this ninth congressional district, congressional and legislative lines would have to be drawn to account for changes in population.

The concept of one person, one vote dictates that there should be as close to the same number of people per district as possible.

And because, again, of the rate of population growth is different in different areas, the existing districts are no longer representative of and do not have equal populations anymore.

All right.

What guidelines need to be followed by the AIRC when drawing these new districts?

First, they must comply with the U.S. Constitution and the Voting Rights Act.

Next, they plus have equal population.

These first few criteria are federally mandated, and all plans must satisfy these two criteria.

The next criteria established by Proposition 106 is that districts should be compact and contiguous, they
should respect communities of interest, they should use
visible geographic features, cities, town, and county
boundaries, and undivided census tracts.

And, lastly, they should create competitive
districts where no significant detriment to other goals.

The Arizona redistricting process.

Well, the first part is actually happening right
now, and that's these public hearings.

Like I said, there will being 17 of these
conducted across the state with several satellite meetings
also taking place.

Following those, we start with a grid map.

In some states the previous plans are used as a
starting point, but not in Arizona.

The starting point is the grid map, per
Proposition 106.

And the language is the commencement of mapping
process for both congressional and legislative districts
shall be the creation of equal population and in a grid-like
pattern across the state.

It's most likely that this initial grid map will
only meet the equal population and compact and contiguous
criteria.

Following the grid map, it is adjusted to meet the
other criteria.
The first of which is the Voting Rights Act. Arizona's congressional and legislative districts must receive preclearance or approval from the Department of Justice or a federal court under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act before they can take effect.

To get preclearance, Arizona must demonstrate that the new districts do not discriminate against minority voters in purpose or effect, which means there can be no intentional or accidental discrimination.

Under Section 5, Arizona's redistricting plans cannot be retrogressive. Plans cannot weaken or reduce minority voters' rights.

Finally, the presence of discrimination can be determined by analyzing population data and election results.

Following the adjustments to meet the Voting Rights Act, the grid map is adjusted again to again meet equal population, to be compact and contiguous, to respect communities of interest.

One of the goals of the AIRC meetings is to establish -- is to solicit public input on the communities of interest.

There are forms available up here. The yellow forms you can use if you'd like to speak today.

Your, your comments will be recorded on the
transcript, but it will also have -- it will also help the Commission to have written information.

If you don't feel like speaking today but you'd like to submit your input to the Commission, you can fill out one of the blue sheets and turn it in to our executive director Ray Bladine.

Additionally if there's any other information you would like to submit, if you have maps you've drawn, if you have boundaries that you've written out or anything else that you want to be known, you can submit that to Ray Bladine too.

We do ask that if you're comfortable that you put your name and contact information on it. That way if there's any questions, we can contact you and clarify exactly what criteria you're trying to outline.

Following that, we adjust the map to use visible geographic features. We have city boundaries -- county boundaries, cities and towns, and census tracts.

We're lucky that census geography often follows these visible features.

And lastly, we create competitive districts where there's no significant detriment to the other goals.

Finally, the AIRC does want your input, and we're excited that you're all here today, and hopefully a lot of you are going to speak and let us know exactly what you are
thinking and what you hope to happen.

To fill out a request to speak form, you can submit your input to the Commission.

Examples of inputs include thoughts on criteria, communities of interest, or anything else about redistricting or the redistricting process you'd like us to be aware of.

Again, you can speak at a hearing or you can fill out one of the blue forms and submit it.

You can also go to our website. There's a newer form available where you can submit your input directly on the website.

You can visit us at www.azredistricting.org or call (602)542-5221.

Again, thank you very much for letting me speak today, and we look forward to taking your comments.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Desmond.

We have such a great turnout, and before we get started with public comment, I want to emphasize a couple things.

If you are here and want to submit written comments on the blue form, there is a back side to it if you're here to talk about a community of interest that you believe the Commission should respect in drawing the maps. There's questions on the back, four questions, that prompt
you for the information about that community of interest.

And, like I said earlier, the Commission is travelling around for the next two weeks hitting various parts of the state to collect public comments.

The Commission then will be working with its mapping consultant to develop the grid map, which is, as Mr. Desmond said, is the first step in developing the new maps for the state congressional and state legislative districts.

Then we're going to be using the public comment, a lot of public comment that we collect, to take that grid map and adjust it to begin to meet the six constitutional criteria that the Commission must follow.

So that's what's -- that's a good thing about this Commission is there's a heavy emphasis on public involvement and what you have to say.

These maps that are developed don't belong to the Commission or to any consultant or to any interest group or even the legislature.

They belong to you.

And you deserve to be here, heard, and involved, and that's what we're trying to do here today.

I think we'll go ahead and move to public comments now.

I so far have 39 requests to speak.
I think we'll have plenty of time tonight, so I think what we'll do is we'll ask you if you please limit your comments to about four minutes.

I don't -- I'm not wearing a watch, but Mr. Forst will be the timekeeper for us, and we'll keep it there for everyone. And when you hear the buzzer go off, that means please try to wrap it up.

And one thing I'll ask you to do is when you come to the microphone -- what I'm going to do is I'm going to call off three or four names, so you know when you're going to be next, and come up to the microphone so we can go through this efficiently.

And after you correct me for mispronouncing your name, then please spell your name for the court reporter so we get an accurate record, and tell us the city, town, or county in which you live.

And please, please try to speak directly into the microphone.

Commissioner Herrera and I will be able to hear you, but people in the back won't, and they won't like that, and you'll hear from them.

And it's also important that the court reporter hears you and the people who are watching online. Having watched the hearings in Nogales and Yuma that took place Friday and Saturday, it's really important to have people
speak into the microphone.

   So without further ado, I'll call the first few names.

   First we'll begin with Commissioner Pete Rios, followed by Bob Burke, Kit Filbey, and West Kenyon.

   First Commissioner Rios.

   PETE RIOS: Pete Rios. I'm chairman of the Pinal County Board of Supervisors, but I'm here representing myself. I don't want to mislead anyone.

   First let me thank you, those of you who are members of the Independent Redistricting Commission.

   You're very brave, because you're going to take a lot of flack, you're going to invest a lot of time and energy, and you already have, but we as citizens of the state of Arizona appreciate that you're willing to donate your time to do this.

   Let me first say that I'm here to speak about Legislative District 23, which is made up currently of Pinal County, Gila County, and Maricopa County.

   Because of the growth that we've experienced in Pinal County, we can't keep that district intact, nor can we keep Pinal County as a whole, because we're currently at 376,000 people just in Pinal County alone.

   You're going to hear from some Pinal County residents that want to keep Pinal County as one LD.
I'm here basically because I believe in the Voting Rights Act, I believe in Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, I believe in Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, and that is that there are certain protected classes that we need to comply with and we have to ensure that we don't go through what is termed retrogression.

LD 23 currently is one of the eight minority majority districts in the state of Arizona.

And if you keep Pinal County whole, there are a lot of people, specifically Latino and Native Americans, that will be disenfranchised.

So we have some concerns with that.

I have spoken with some people outside of Pinal County in Gila County, specifically the communities of Claypool, Miami, and Globe. And they're interested in being part of Pinal County and what is referred to as the copper corridor where there's a lot of copper mining. Superior, Hayden, Winkelman, Dudleyville, Oracle, Mammoth, San Manuel, they want to be part of that.

They also want inclusion of Eloy, Florence, Casa Grande, and Coolidge, because there are a lot of protected classes in those areas as well.

So I want to make sure that when you all finalize your plans, that you as Department of Justice will say they comply with the U.S. Constitution, one man one vote, and
they comply with the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and that was
renewed under the Bush administration in a Republican
congress in 2006. They voted to keep the Voting Rights Act.

So clearly it is something that is very important
to the American people, so I ask you to please consider
bringing those communities in.

One more point, if I still have a minute left, is
currently in our district we have three Native American
reservations. We have the Ak-Chin Nation, we have Gila
River, and we have Fort McDowell.

My hope is that if we move and pick up Globe,
Miami, we can also pick up San Carlos Apache tribe and maybe
even go up the mountain towards the White Mountains and pick
up the White Mountain Apache tribe.

And that gives Native Americans a bigger, broader
base, so that they can hopefully elect a person from their
tribe.

With that, I will conclude. And I thank you very
much for your time.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Bob Burke.

BOB BURKE: I too want to thank the commissioners
for their service and for your time and for your effort that
you're putting in.

I think the main issue I'm interested in are A, B,
C, and E are probably going to already be settled within your other issues that don't need to be addressed by me.

I think that D, however, like Mr. Rios just said, should as much as possible involve communities of interest such as Indian tribes be considered so that even if they don't elect a member of their tribes to the legislature, that they are representative, and that, that the legislature that does represent them does listen to them.

There are other groups as well that we can point out, but I won't go into that.

Just very, very important to do that.

F is the last one. And it's very important to have competitive races so that a free exchange of ideas can be allowed and so that people can have choices to make.

And thank you very much for your time.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Burke.

Kit Filbey.

KIT FILBEY: Thank you.

Can you pull this down?

Is that okay? Okay. Kit Filbey. You wanted the spelling; is that correct?

K-I-T. F, as in Frank, I-L-B, as in boy, E-Y.

And I am here to speak tonight to competitiveness and equal population.

I, first of all, want to thank you very much for
the job you're doing, a thankless job, and tell you that I appreciate it.

I live in District 19.

And I was a legislative candidate in the 2010 election, a Democrat candidate.

And as probably almost everybody here knows, in District 19 it is not a competitive district. It is probably -- I think it is the least competitive in terms of Republican domination.

The differential between Republicans and Democrats is the highest of all the 30 districts in the state.

I'd like to explain what happens when you live in a noncompetitive district.

First of all, there's no debate.

I showed up for an election debate, but neither one of my competitors did.

They had no interest, and frankly probably there was no need, because it's so Republican it dominated.

There were 50 people that attended the debate, but neither one of my competitors attended the debate.

One of my opponents did not even show up for the Arizona Republic because that was not considered important enough to him. I did get the endorsement, but that didn't make much difference.

I have yet to meet my representative,
Representative Justin Olson, who has not yet shown any interest in the Democrats in this area or the people that voted for me.

And, again, in fairness to Representative Olson, because of the noncompetitiveness, there really isn't a need on his part.

I see that this problem exists in both Democrat and Republican districts that are noncompetitive.

Our leaders only represent the views of the majority of the people they represent.

My ideas are not always represented by our Democratic leaders.

And I find it interesting that two of our most powerful leaders in our legislature, Senator Sinema and Chad Campbell, received less votes than I received, and that is because of the lack of equal population within the district.

I believe strongly that we have to create an environment which encourages listening and discussing and compromise, not a game of power control.

And if we expect Washington to do better, we should begin to do better here.

I hope very much that you look at the equal population and competitiveness when you study everything.

My state senator has told -- has said at rotary that the line is now going to be drawn from Gilbert to
Val Vista. I'm not sure if you're aware of that. But that is what he is saying.

And to me just moving the line over a little farther east is not the secret to doing this.

So, thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

West Kenyon.

And then on deck will be Jayne Friedman, Gloria Morelli, Arthur Jacobs, and John Chiazza.

Mr. Kenyon.

WEST KENYON: Good evening. West is the first name, W-E-S-T, and the last name Kenyon, K-E-N-Y-O-N.

Thank you, guys, for what you're doing. I appreciate it, to the Commission.

There's a ton of stuff to talk about tonight, but I want to pick on one small district line.

And that is the district that runs down Scottsdale Road.

I live in Maricopa County in northeast Phoenix.

And based on all the criteria, we've got a great line. Scottsdale Road as the north-south direction divides two cities.

But I think the importance of that specific district line is the separation of not just two cities, but two very different identities in two totally different
elements of our county.

One is there's been a lot of contention between who gets what side of the roads. Scottsdale owns Scottsdale Road. Phoenix is on the west side. Scottsdale is on the east.

One of the examples was Kierland, and the battle between Kierland, where Kierland was going to be, and what address, and what ZIP code it was going to end up in.

And this is more of a nonpartisan argument, that I'd like to bring to the Commission, that should that particular area be redrawn, mixing Scottsdale, what is now the Scottsdale half, into the Phoenix half or vice versa.

It doesn't matter if you're Independent, Republican, or Democrat. You are going to have a very hard time blending two different medias together, two different climates together, to say I'm going to have to listen, if I was the congressman for that district, for the congressional district, I would have to say, here's what this group wants, here's what this group wants, how do I separate the two demands from two totally different worlds.

And essentially what would end up happening in that respect is, as we're all human, it would end up being one simple thing that I would have to draw a line in my own head and say, well, this group wants this, this group wants this, and you have a new boundary again. Which would highly
affect how legislation gets passed and how people are
actually served.

And I hope that's something that you all will
consider.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.
WEST KENYON: Thank you.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Jayne Friedman.
Thank you, Mr. Desmond, for your, your Power
Point.
The only thing is -- my only concern is that
you're not a mapping company. You're a data mining
operation.
But that's my concern.
Last week I listened to people passionately plead
to honor the integrity of their districts.
Someone even labeled us a bunch of sheep.
Actually, some of us are sheepdogs.
The sheepdog disturbs the sheep. He is a constant
reminder that there are wolves out there.
Political parties have way too much fun at our
expense. They whip us up into a froth, like gladiators.
Not me.
Look, we've been farmed out.
Excuse me.
We've been farmed out, think about it.

Would you be confident enough to map a concrete jungle?

Oh, and this jungle has thousands of little ethnic neighborhoods, communities of interest, if you will, that crisscross and intersect everywhere.

Our landmarks are washes, desert, Indian land, mountain ranges, Strategic Telemetry's landmarks, Trump Tower with a doorman.

And some of you say, don't worry, it's the commissioners who will make the decisions.

That's a talking point.

Come on, this cannot be your first rodeo.

Or do you say that because you too want a political goal over fairness.

Strategic Telemetry will advise these commissioners. And they will defer to their suggestions.

Use your common sense.

Those of you who so eloquently enlightened Strategic Telemetry about our unique geography did so at risk.

You cannot map what you do not understand.

Would a GIS specialist understand the unique qualities of an area in northeast Maricopa County, many of which are dirt roads, propane tanks, neighborhood street
maintenance, horses, and other livestock?

I think it's futile to explain that to someone who lives and works and breathes in a concrete jungle.

And why do I think that?

Because I was born, raised, and educated in New York.

A New Yorker's DNA believes that there is no culture west of the Hudson River.

New Yorkers think they are the nucleus of the universe.

We cowboys out here are like cheap accessories that get lost in some drawer.

If only we were more Ivy League educated, we might understand better.

I object to Strategic Telemetry mapping our unique corner of this universe. And so should you, says this sheepdog.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Gloria Morelli.

I was close enough.

GLORIA MORELLI: Thank you.

Chairman Mathis -- okay. I'm Gloria, G-L-O-R-I-A, Morelli, M-O-R-E-L-L-I.

Chair Mathis and commissioners, first of all, I really want to thank you for your time and your dedication
and your patience and for being the ears of our constituents. I really appreciate that.

I am from Anthem. And as most of you know, Anthem is a real young community. I think around 11 years. And I am a transplant from another state.

And I chose Anthem because of its sense of community and the relationships they have with northern Phoenix and businesses around.

I want to speak to geographic features and the practicality of the competitive districts.

I -- personally a little bit about me. I worked for a U.S. congressman and senator of the state I'm from, and I have been a caseworker and have been at the other end of the phone calls that I get from constituents, and when a fragmentation of communities, et cetera, that you're trying to help someone in one community and someone right next door has the same problem but they need to contact someone else.

And it works at all levels from the very community level to the federal level.

I was also very involved in the medical community, with the EMS system, disaster preparedness, and know what -- how important, especially in our time of terrorism and our budget constraints and everything, how important it is to have cohesiveness.

And when I first moved here -- I wanted to let you
know I've been here almost five years. And I put
50,000 miles on my car just going from Anthem, and then
several years just trying to get through I-17. And
thanks -- I-17 is now completed.
And thank you.
And how important it is to us as a community
in Anthem to have I-17, 101, and SR 51 as a convenience to
us.
I've spent many, many -- a lot of time on I-17.
We have a very active community in Anthem, a very
active community center, and most of the people that we
interact with are businesses with our relationships with our
medical groups are from northern Phoenix.
And I would really to be able to like to continue
with that.
I think splitting districts affects our zoning,
our disaster plans, to name a few, senior citizens.
And Anthem is a community of small businesses, and
they do depend on the communities right next to them for our
common interest that we have.
So I just think that our infrastructure, just to
get a sewer fixed from one community that connects to the
another one can be a real problem.
My top concern is, as all of us are aware from
competing today, is our economy and trying to just fix that
on a level. And border control, terrorism, and a lot of medical issues.

So I would really, again, like to thank you in advance for listening and understanding what our very gut level and our needs in our community is as far as our relationship with everyone else.

Thanks again.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Arthur Jacobs.

ARTHUR JACOBS: Arthur Jacobs. I'm in District 5. Tempe, Arizona.

I've lived there since 1960.

You have all the information you need.

J-A-C-O-B-S.

If I can borrow this lady's speech, I would tell her I was raised in Brooklyn, New York, and I could go about that, but I've lived out here for a long time now.

I would like to start out with that if I would have been doing in your shoes, the first thing I would have done is given me a map and say this is your current district, this is the population of that district, and here's where we got to get to, to make it right, equal population in all districts.

So I can see all the districts.

I mean, I'm telling you, there's a number that
You don't need Strategic Telemetry to tell you to do that.

You go out. You take my current district. It's right on the map. It's shown. You count that population. You look at the ethnicity and those that live there. And I can tell you, I live on my block, and on my block we have several minorities.

I mean, do you count them?

Because they live with me and I am Caucasian and they're minorities?

So this business of treating everybody equally and getting it squared away is a nightmare.

And I don't understand why you want to do this.

I think what you need to do is to start off with, here's where we're at and this is where we got to go.

For example, I'll just give an example,

District 5. You're now at 600,000. You got to get to 733,000 to fulfill your district.

District 1, you're at 500,000. You got to have 200,000 more.

Not that those are going to be the districts, but you ought to start that way.

That's the simple way.

This is not rocket science. This business of
Strategic Telemetry is not the deal.

You know, telemetry means something to me that it may not mean to you.

I don't know what you're going to do here. You're going to take pictures, use GPS, use Google, or what have you.

So I think if you keep it simple, right down to the point.

And remember, I live in a community. That community was made up a long time ago. I have the same neighbors today that I had yesterday.

I'll have the same neighbors tomorrow, and there will be more.

And the neighborhood keeps changing.

So I don't know all this business about equalness and what have you.

And, listen, I have a Republican representative. This is for the lady who talks about her not being representative.

I have a Republican representative. He doesn't listen to me either.

So what difference does it make?

I don't mean to be funny. I'm just telling you. It's a serious thing.
I asked the question the other day. For example, I'll give you an example of this.

We have 535 people up there working for us, all of us. And I asked someone, how can 535 people get by with this credit debacle? How can we let that happen?

You know why it happens? They don't listen to us. Makes no difference what kind of districts you make or how you separate them.

But, please, keep my district the way it is. Just to add a little bit here, a little bit there.

You know, whatever you have to do to make up the 733,000, or 703,000, whatever the number is now.

You know that number; right? What is that number per district? What is it? Please? Are you allowed to answer?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: We're not allowed.

ARTHUR JACOBS: You're not allowed.

Is anybody here that can answer?

It's about 700 and some thousand per district of what we have to have. Let's just leave it at that.

So, if you know what I have now, you can just tweak it a little bit, and you don't need all this hocus pocus.

Thank you very much, and thank you for your time.

(Applause.)
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Folks.

Folks, I'd ask you all to be mindful of the fact that we're trying to get the record, and our court reporter has to be able to hear what people are saying.

So if you can just try, as best you can to -- I know everyone wants to be enthusiastic, and all of that, but if you could keep that in mind, it's an important job that you have here to create the record.

Okay. John --


VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

JOHN CHIAZZA: I'm from Gilbert, and I'm a seven-year board member of the club GEMDEMS, Greater Eastern Maricopa County Democrats. This organization includes four legislative districts of 18, 19, 21, and 22, with Mesa being the third largest city and a big part of our group.

I know for a fact it will need to be split on a congressional and legislative level.

Mesa has to be split apart in a way that recognizes geographic, economic, and demographic differences in the city.

West Mesa is a distinct area of the city of Mesa.

The Tempe-Mesa boundary or the 101 freeway is on the west. Mesa Drive is on the east. Loop 202 and Eighth Street are the boundaries on the north and Guadalupe...
on the south.

    West Mesa is competitive politically and should belong as a part of the competitive district.

    Lightrail extension and downtown revitalization make it much more similar to Tempe than the rest of Mesa.

    Revitalization of Fiesta District is an important issue and is distinctly known as west Mesa.

    West Mesa is a rapidly growing Hispanic community and will have an emerging influence on the region.

    Mesa Community College would benefit from being in the same district as ASU.

    These are districts that you have to really pay attention to in this particular area, in this area that we're in.

    I would like to thank the Commission for all its hard work in this difficult task. All of you are doing a great job. And as a board member of the club of GEMDEMS, I fully support all of your efforts.

    Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you, sir.

Next up I'd like to invite Naomi White -- thank you, sir -- who's here from Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission.

Speaking after her will be Marilyn Zerull, Geri Ottoboni, Lynne Stevens, and Lynne St. Angelo.
NAOMI WHITE: Hello. Good evening. Thank you, commissioners, for allowing me to speak.

My name is Naomi White, with the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission.

In January, 2011, the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission was appointed to work with the office of the president and vice president, office of the speaker, the Navajo Nation Department of Justice, the Navajo Nation Board of Election Supervisors, as well as the Navajo Nation Elections Administration.

And in March of 2011 we are cast as an agency for redistricting in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah.

Because Arizona has a history of discrimination, the main purpose of -- for the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission is to ensure that the Navajo voters' power is not diluted.

Also to avoid retrogression.

Also to maintain our community of interest, as was found in the year 2000.

As far as congressional and legislative districts, our office has composed several maps of which the Navajo Nation council will be meeting within the next couple of weeks to propose a recommendation.

Currently our recommendation for the -- for this Commission to consider involves a deviation of .03 percent
population. And also to maintain our minority majority standard.

Right now in applying the 2010 census data to the current -- excuse me, Congressional District 1, the American Indian population sits at 63.97 percent.

And the Navajo Nation would like to maintain or exceed that number, and the option that we have developed does do that.

It involves an American Indian population of 65.96 percent.

And also with regards to Legislative District 2, the American Indian population in that district that we've composed is 65.97 percent.

And our office has been in contact with the Hopi tribe, San Carlos Apache tribe, White Mountain Apache tribe, Havasupai, Hualapai, and the Kaibab Nation. And we hope to get tribal resolutions, because all of the tribes have expressed interest to be in our Congressional District 1, and also they have expressed interest in the Legislative District 2 map that we have proposed.

Thank you very much.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Marilyn Zerull.

MARILYN ZERULL: Yes, you pronounced it right.

Marilyn, M-A-R-I-L-Y-N. Last name is Z-E-R-U-L-L.
I'm here representing Pima County Republican Women.

I cannot tell the Commission how disappointed I am in how they have selected the mapping company for which we are paying.

Commissioner Herrera admitted to bid fixing, which may not be criminal, but certainly is unethical.

Commissioner Herrera admitted to the Arizona Capital Times investigator that he had given Strategic Telemetry a perfect score and coincidently two other commissioners gave them perfect scores as well.

Herrera said he had to give that score because he was afraid that another company would be chosen.

Today I learned that half of the scoring was to be based on past experience with mapping and that Strategic Telemetry has no experience.

No experience.

So the three commissioners chose for the least experienced and the most expensive bid.

This is exactly what happened at the other meeting that I attended, where the three commissioners told the two Republican commissioners that they could not have the attorney they wanted, though the Democratic commissioners got the Democrat attorney they wanted.

In 2000, both sides got the attorneys they wanted.
So this time the Republicans chose a Republican attorney that had been through the redistricting process before and so was the most experienced.

But the other three commissioners told the Republicans the attorney they wanted was less qualified.

Even though one of the Republican commissioners is an attorney, one who can expect him to know who was the best qualified attorney to represent him.

So the Republicans have been denied the best attorney and the most qualified, less expensive mapping company.

This entire process hinges on trusting the commissioners to do the right thing.

Hopefully Attorney General Tom Horne will make sure that the right thing gets done.

Thank you.

(Appause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Geri Ottoboni.

GERI OTTOBONI: She's taller than I am.

Can you hear me okay?

My name is Geri Ottoboni, and I worked on fiscally conservative Democrat and Republican campaigns in the 2010 election.

In fact, I may be one of the few nonpartisan persons in this room.
What I care most about is being fiscally responsible with my money.

If the government is taking my money from me, I expect my elected representatives to be careful and prudent in how they spend it.

Proposition 106 instituting the Arizona Redistricting Commission took redistricting out of the hands of 90 legislators and put it in the hands of five unelected commissioners who have total authority and are accountable to no one.

Before Prop 106 we had people paid, our legislators, an annual salary that included the cost of redistricting.

Our legislators still receive the same salary, but now they don't do the redistricting.

Instead the AIRC will spend a minimum of $6 million to draw our lines.

For the six million, we were supposed to get public input in the lines and look at all the dealings of the process.

Now documents have been shredded. And I repeat, documents have been shredded.

So that no one can tell how the Commission chose the mapping company.

The company the Commission has hired is a campaign
company that only works on progressive candidate campaigns
and was hired by the DNC to map lines in every state to get
the most Democrat districts possible to counter the huge
Democratic loss in the 2010 election.

Over 50 percent of the Commission's time has been
spent behind closed doors, and now the documents supporting
what transpired behind those closed doors are mysteriously
missing.

In addition, there were cell phone conversations
where voting trading was discussed.

This is a clear violation of the open meeting law,
where nothing can be discussed off the record, even over
lunch, because the discussions -- if it isn't open to the
public to review.

If the three commissioners are corrupt, we have a
corrupt process. With the legislative, 47 elected people
have to be corrupt to get the same result.

And this is what we have acquired for $6 million?

Thank you.

(Appause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Lynne Stevens.

LYNNE STEVENS: Hi. I thank you for allowing me
to speak tonight.

This is Lynne Stevens, L-Y-N-N-E, Stevens,
S-T-E-V-E-N-S.
The first meeting you threw out numbers for different items, and we're going to spend this much for this and this much for that, and I'm going -- and you go to the website, 82,000?

I'm going, um, red flag went blip, blip.

I have been with the company and have a website. I went up there and looked at their most expensive, super duper, giant, gargantuan site with everything and whatever, and $189 for a year.

Who's getting the other $81,000?

You said $82,000 for the website.

Hmm, is that for the web person? I'll be the web person, and I'll do $50,000.

Like I said, I have a website, and I take care of it.

I thank you much for your time. Bye.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: After Mrs. St. Angelo, we'll have Paula Linker, Susan Leeper, Sean Bowie, Daniel Grimm.


I was present at the Redistricting Commission meeting when Jean Clark, the State Procurement officer, went over and over with the commissioners how they must be very careful for categories they use and the weight they give to each criteria in evaluating the mapping company.
There can be no perceived bias or favoritism in the selection of the mapping consultant, or the State Procurement Office would have to pull out of this election process, and the commissioners would have to write an administrative contract with the mapping consultant themselves.

The reason Jean Clark gave to this was that the State could then be sued if there was bias or favoritism used in the selection of the mapping company.

I now have a letter from Jean Clark, that State Procurement officer, to the Commission stating, quote, the Commission has frequently pursued direction other than that offered by SPO, and so the Commission will be responsible for all further procurement responsibilities and actions with respect to this procurement, end quote.

I would like to submit a copy of this letter into the public record.

So the State Procurement Office has done what Jean Clark said and pulled out of the process.

From her own statement in the meeting I attended, this means that there must have been perceived bias or favoritism in the selection of the mapping consultant.

That is the only conclusion the public can reach.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Paula Linker.
PAULA LINKER: That's Linker, L-I-N-K-E-R.

And I am going to yield my time to Karen Garrett, because last week she had to leave before her name was called very late in the evening. So I'm giving my time to Karen Garrett.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Did you fill out a request for speak form?

KAREN GARRETT: No. But can I now?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Yes.

KAREN GARRETT: All right.

After I'm done?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Yes.

KAREN GARRETT: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Give it to Mr. Bladine.

KAREN GARRETT: My name is Karen Garrett, G-A-R-R-E-T-T.

And I live in Scottsdale, Arizona.

And I have been a resident of Scottsdale for 30 years.

I have a couple of children who were born in Arizona and are lifetime Arizona residents, so I have a long -- a record of experience in living in this state.

I want to give you a little bit of background.

A year ago I had never voted in a primary, and I was not politically active.
When I saw the amount of corruption that was going on in our country over the 2008 election, I let a couple -- a year or so go by until I decided that it was my time as a more moderate Republican to get involved in the process. And I too am very, very upset with the corruption in choosing this mapping company.

Colleen Mathis, I've been told, lied by omission on her application to get on the Commission. And her husband was a paid staff member of Democrat Nancy Young.

When she submitted her application, her husband was in the height of this campaign. So it wasn't something that she could just forget about.

We already talked about destroying documents, bid rigging, vote trading, the State Procurement officer. But Proposition 106 in 2000 was passed to keep us from having deals made in back rooms behind closed doors.

The people have gone from paying legislators to drawing lines -- to draw lines and the people can vote them out if they don't appreciate or like what they accomplish to paying $9 million to five people who are totally unaccountable to anyone.

And the voters have no way of removing them.

Strategic Telemetry also has done targeting down
to the precinct level for Barrack Obama, and we are giving them our voting data to use in the future.

And they can also give this to other -- might, I don't know if that's true, but I would wonder if they can give that information to other people to use in the next election.

Strategic Telemetry has now scrubbed its website and Facebook page of all former references to its consulting work for these progressive clients and has bolstered and retooled its resume to highlight its work in redistricting.

On their application they put in 47 names of progressive people that they have represented. Democrats were among the names in the names of more than half of these people that they represented.

Competitive districts should be favored, but as the Arizona Constitution requires, only to the extent that doing so causes no significant detriment to the other redistricting criteria.

We have people say that they're not represented in their precincts by their legislators or congressman, but we can't gerrymander to the point to make sure every single solitary district is equal.

It's just not possible.

And we cannot be gerrymandered solely for the purpose of competitiveness.
The voters clearly rejected that idea when they passed Proposition 106 at the 2000 election.

I appreciate your time, and I hope that I speak for a good many of the people in this room of how upset I am at having been a moderate Republican before I got active a year ago with this process, and I hope that something can be done about it.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Folks, we're getting more request to speak cards coming in, and my concern is that at some point we'll get into a time restriction problem.

I want to make sure everyone has their say and this opportunity to speak.

So -- and is made a part of the record that our court reporter can hear what's going on.

So I love enthusiasm, but if we can try to keep it down so that we can go more quickly and efficiently through the public comment, I would appreciate it.

Thank you.

Susan Leeper?

SUSAN LEEPER: Yes. My name is Susan Leeper, S-U-S-A-N, L-E-E-P-E-R.

And I've lived in Scottsdale for the last 20 years.

Reading about the vitriol happening in other
states over their redistricting initiative, I was proud that Arizona had changed to an independent Commission to accomplish this effort.

But I did not expect to substitute the back rooms of the state legislature for the closed executive sessions of the Commission.

Under the state Commission, the chair is charged with providing political balance, openness, and fairness, something Ms. Colleen Mathis has yet to accomplish.

Number one, the selection of Mathis is fraudulent. She lied on numbers one, six, and eight on the application. Even forgetting that her attorney husband was a paid staff member of a Democrat candidate.

This fraud alone is cause enough to dismiss Mathis immediately, not to mention how she's running the Commission.

Number two, the Republican commissioners were not given the opportunity to choose legal counsel.

Number three, Mathis violated open meetings laws and engaged in vote trading by phoning a Republican commissioner to trade a vote for Strategic Telemetry, hereafter ST, and in exchange for a vote on the mapping portion.

This commissioner filed an affidavit with the county attorney attesting to this.
Four, in violation of open meetings laws, scoring sheets that eliminated three firms from competing were destroyed, and also all seven score cards were shredded.

Ray Bladine, who is executive director of this commission, admits that this happened.

Let's recap the selection of this consultant.

ST received a perfect score from three commissioners even though the firm failed to meet the RFP requirements, did not have the experience, and were twice the cost of any other bid.

ST is not an expert mapping company. In fact, they said they would need time to learn the software package, which is an industry standard.

The State Procurement officer submitted a letter stating that the selection process for ST was in violation of State Procurement operations.

Prop 106 specifically states that voter records not be used in mapping, but ST performed micro-targeting down to the precinct level for Obama's presidential campaign and is now downloading our voting records to Washington, D.C.

Finally, looking at the meeting process, number one, meetings should be, should be scheduled more than 48 hours in advance and should be held on evenings and weekends.
Number two, the chair refuses to put items on the agenda that commissioners have requested, so she limits what can be discussed in public session.

And number three, the first Commission held almost 40 meetings, but 20 meetings now are not adequate for a state that is 1600 times the size of Washington, D.C.

Usually dispersed, densely populated areas have no meetings scheduled within a reasonable distance.

And, four, although it's not happening at this meeting, by putting public comments at the end is chicanery. Let the public speak first, then conduct your other business.

Either way, you stay for the same amount of time.

I'm originally from New Jersey, and we're used to this kind of malfeasance.

If the IRC continues without change, we'll end up paying $9 million for suspect redistricting that will taint all voting for the next decade.

I don't want that, and neither do you.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Sean Bowie.

SEAN BOWIE: Good evening. I'm Sean, S-E-A-N, Bowie, B-O-W-I-E.

Thank you, Commission, for letting me speak to tonight.
I'm not reading from talk points, so bear with me.

I want to talk tonight about something that I think we as the public have actual control over, which is how the lines are going to be drawn.

And I know a lot of us are talking about things about competitive districts, but I think most people don't realize how noncompetitive the current district lines are, at least in Maricopa County.

We have 18 legislative districts in Maricopa County. Seventeen of them have only one party representing them in the legislature.

In the last four years, 16 of them have sent one party to the Legislature.

So, you know, we have competitive areas in Maricopa County, I believe, but the lines are not drawn to reflect that.

West Mesa, I think, is one of those areas that which, you know, drawn the right way can be a competitive district.

Ahwatukee, Chandler, Laveen, Avondale, central Phoenix, you know, we have areas, that, you know, have the potential to be competitive and can benefit the entire state as a whole in terms of who we send to represent us in the legislature and in congress.

But it's now up the Commission to ensure that we
have more competitive races so that better candidates are running, more people participate, and really helps the state as a whole.

At the congressional level, we have six congressional districts in Maricopa County. Five of them have only sent one party to Washington in the last four years.

That's both Republicans and Democrats.

So, again, you know, as you guys are drawing lines, you know, I know a lot of people, myself included, would like to see their own area drawn to reflect their own political party. I'm guilty of that.

Most people in this room are guilty of that.

But I think when we're looking at lines, you know, there has to be a point when we think about what's in the best interest of the state, not just our own communities and our own political parties.

You know, who we send to legislature and who we send to congress, you know, affects all of us.

No matter what party we are, no matter what (inaudible), no matter what area we live in, it affects everybody.

So, you know, what you guys are doing is impacting millions of people, not just hundreds of people who will testify before you around the state.
So I would encourage you, when you're looking at the six measures of -- six criteria measures, looking at competitiveness, and Arizona is a state that is very red in terms of its political feelings, but is also a state where I think if it's drawn the right way we can have more competitive races, better candidates, and higher voter turnout as a whole, if we have competitive districts.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Next will be Daniel Grimm, followed by Mike Wright.

Michael McAfee, Joanne Johnson, and James Leverington, I think.

So Mr. Grimm.


I'd like to address the topic of community of interest.

When we form communities, typically they start out with geographic boundaries, mountain ranges, rivers, streams, washes. And out of those, people plan and develop where houses will be built, planned communities of various sizes and tract homes and custom and semi-custom homes.

And while we may plan and decide where those homes
get placed, we don't plan and decide who lives in them.

Communities form organically.

I chose the community I live in. My neighbors
didn't choose it for me. And I didn't choose my neighbors.

Thank God they didn't have the choice to choose
me. I don't know if they would.

We have examples of how we make our decisions
based on what the local schools are like, where the presence
and absence of local parks and recreation.

Is there going to be a soccer club or Little
League for my kids to play in. Will there be a hiking club
or dog park.

What are the local areas of worship that exist.

How convenient is transportation, access to the
nearest highway, or bus service.

What's the local shopping like. Am I going to
find grocery stores in the chains I'm used to.

What's the entertainment like, theaters and art
and music.

All of these play a part on where we choose we
want to live.

When we finally move into our home, we find very
quickly there's a basic political structure. We have a city
council. We have legislators. We have school boards. We
have water boards.
We have the opportunity to get to know those people.

We find them by meeting them wherever they're going to run for election, going down to where they're going to hold office in public events, calling them up on the phone or e-mailing.

The community I moved into in east Mesa, and I've been out here for about 30 years now having moved here from back east, is a relatively new community.

The boundaries we organically form that define our area are a little bit distinct from those boundaries in the older more established areas of Mesa.

It's neither better nor worse, but it is subtly different.

We have our own community.

We chose it.

To have our boundaries summarily redrawn to cross over various other communities would be as disruptive to those communities and their traditions and establishment as it would be to ours.

I don't see any reason why we need to impose external viewed agendas across our communities.

We need to respect the communities as they are, as they developed organically, as we have chosen them.

I would loathe to see some political agenda
established that would attempt to redraw boundaries in a way to further vulcanize a society that has already suffered under the strife of race or ethnic division.

Nor would I like to see it gerrymandered further all for the purpose of creating weird shapes under the guise of making it more politically competitive.

These divisions have been defined by those of us that have moved and chosen to live where we live. Please honor our choices.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Mike Wright.

MIKE WRIGHT: Mike Wright, W-R-I-G-H-T.

I'm here to speak about west Mesa as a community of interest and help you understand why we believe it is a community of interest.

I was born and raised in west Mesa. I've lived here all my life, 63 years.

When I was born and raised, Mesa was only west Mesa.

As it extended to the east, it grew remarkably farther and farther east, but west Mesa has maintained its identity as a community.

We have neighbors, a large amount of residential neighborhoods, Westwood, Dobson, and so forth.
And these neighborhoods have access to businesses. I own a business on University Drive near Country Club and Alma School. I'm also an attorney and practice law in west Mesa. And I have commercial interests there. Shopping is convenient there. We don't go clear out to east Mesa to do my business. We are close to Tempe, do business there, close to Scottsdale, Chandler, and so forth. So it's kind of a hub, again, west Mesa, that has all of the amenities of a community. West Mesa includes the downtown Mesa area, with the Fiesta Mall area and so forth. So I ask you to consider that in drawing the boundaries so that that area of west Mesa is maintained. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Mr. McAfee.

MICHAEL MCAFEE: Michael R. McAfee, M-C-A-F-E-E. Commissioners, thank you for the opportunity to speak again.

I'm going to be very brief since I've addressed
you before.

    I just want to point out that our constitution, our state constitution, on the requirements that you have to meet in redistricting, each of those requirements have what I call wiggle worms involved.

    You've got, for example, the districts must be contiguous so far as possible.

    That kind of language for each of the requirements, including the requirement for competitive districts.

    The next thing I want to point out to you is that at meeting after meeting, several folks, perhaps more than half the folks, not here tonight, but more than half at the other meetings, come up, and they are pleading with you to have competitive districts.

    Our democracy demands it.

    If we have foregone conclusions, then there's no race.

    Even, you know, at the South Mountain meeting where I addressed you before, in LD 15, a noncompetitive district, heavily Democratic, we had both Republicans, which you might expect, come up urging you to make that area competitive and Democrats coming up urging you to make that area competitive.

    Because why wouldn't a Democrat want that? We
I want responsible and responsive government.

And when you've got the situation we have now, where you have loggerheads in D.C., and you basically have one party rule in Phoenix, that doesn't reflect the party registration in the state.

We're almost 30 percent Republican, 34 percent -- I mean, 30 percent Democrat, 34 percent Republican in this state, yet representation doesn't nearly reflect that when you get to the Legislature.

So, it has to be competitive districts, guys.

Our democracy is at stake.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Joanne Johnson.


I am a 26-year resident of the city of Tempe.

And my understanding of the redistricting process is from your mission statement on your website.

It states the Independent Redistricting Commission's mission is to administer the fair and balanced redistricting of congressional and legislative districts of the state of Arizona.

I also went to the website for Strategic Telemetry, and that's www.StrategicTelemetry.com.
On their home page I pressed -- I clicked press on their website.

I read from the following press releases.


Ken Strasma, president of Strategic Alliance and the national target director for Obama's 2008 presidential campaign, is a pioneer in the application of high tech strategical modeling for political campaigns. His Washington, D.C., based firm launched in 2003 has led numerous campaigns to victory, including many Democratic campaigns as well as the New York City Michael Bloomberg's 2009 re-election campaign.

I also read, support seen for GOP recalls.

District level micro-targeting indices for progressivism.

Ken Strasma, the much lauded national target director of Barrack Obama's 2008 presidential campaign, at the head of this effort was Ken Strasma, the Democrats' demographic genius.

Out of ten press releases on their own website, ten were progressive and democratic leaning.

I could not find on their website conservative or Republican leaning information.

I could not find on their website moderate
I also clicked other services on the Strategic Telemetry website. I read: Other services from Strategic Telemetry. In addition to micro-targeting, Strategic Telemetry offers many other valuable services to progressive campaigns and organizations.

All this information is available on their website.

As a citizen of Arizona, as a taxpayer supporting your Commission, I would like to hear an explanation as to how Strategic Telemetry will provide support for a fair and balanced redistricting of the congressional and legislative districts for the state of Arizona.

I am submitting a copy of my statement to this Commission, to Governor Jan Brewer, to Attorney General Tom Horne, and to the Arizona Republic newspaper.

Thank you for your attention.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Jamie Leverington.

JAIME LEVERINGTON: That's fine.


In Mesa, Arizona. And I live in Maricopa County.

I've been here since 2004.

The first thing I wanted to say is I respect
all members of the Commission and I appreciate your work. This is something that's difficult to do, and I appreciate that.

And I'd also like to address the people of Arizona, the people in this room, and the Commission, and say that I appreciate the fact that we live in a state where we get a chance to be a part of this process, that we get to do this outside of the legislature.

In almost every other state this is done in the legislative process, excluding the people and their voice. And the people that are elected are not elected for the purpose of redistricting. They're elected for many other purposes.

So I think that references to the elections as a solution to maps that don't appease the people in some way aren't -- are maybe a little misguided. We are -- and I would also like to say that I appreciate the fact that we as citizens are filling a room here.

I'd like to see more people here, and I respect everyone in this room for showing up tonight and giving up their time to be a part of the political process in this state.

It is remarkable to see this.

I think it's important too to remember that the
purpose of this meeting is to offer comments on redistricting and to offer the communities' concerns about the actual map that we will be voting within for the next ten years.

It is important that we create competitive districts, respect community interests, as those are really the only two purposes that are listed on the map that have any real possibility of shaping that map outside of the other restrictions.

At the end of this, we will get a map that we will vote within. And it's important to remember that we should focus on that this evening.

I'd like to take a moment just to look back to the purpose of the House of Representatives for the United States, which was described in Federalist 52 by Alexander Hamilton and James Madison. And they in that Federalist paper said: As it is essential to liberty that the government in general should have a common interest with the people, so it is particularly essential that the people -- it is particularly essential that the branch of it under consideration should have immediate dependence on and an immediate(sic) sympathy with the people.

I believe that in order for this legislature to have immediate dependence and an intimate sympathy with the people of Arizona that it is essential to break up Mesa into
different legislative districts.

Voting in District 6 for the past several elections, I've voted in the least competitive district in the U.S. House of Representatives in this state and one of the least competitive districts in the United States of America.

In the past elections, the Democratic candidate has had no real opportunity and no voice.

And I believe that we should, as citizens of this the state, look to a way where we can have elections where there is competition, where there is debate, where we as citizens can hope to have our voices heard and have the goals of sympathies and dependance met.

Thank you for your time.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Next I have a John Fillmore, followed by Steve Muratore.

Followed by Patty Meyer.

And then Christopher Bradley.

John Fillmore.

(No oral response.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Steve Muratore.

STEVE MURATORE: Here.

Thank you, commissioners.
A couple of points I think it's important to cover.

I've heard tonight comments from several people misstating a number of things, but most specifically, I want to address that there has been exaggerations of the amount of money this Commission has to spend.

People have variously stated 6 million and 9 million.

We know it's only three and a half million.

And that is significant in the difference.

And I'd also like to mention that while Commissioners Stertz and Freeman have on several occasions said on the record that it is time to move on past the controversy that several people have raised today --

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Then let them move on.

STEVE MURATORE: -- I would like to ask, and I know you can't say anything about it now, but I'd like to put it on the record that I think it's time for Mr. Freeman and Mr. Stertz to clearly and emphatically state that for both the record and for all of the state's media.

It needs to be done in order to let the people know that it's time for you to keep focused on the job that you have.

I thank all five of the commissioners for the hard
work that you've subjected yourself to as well as the public pressure.

I know that you are putting a lot of effort into it.

I know that and I believe that all five of you have a great deal of integrity and ability, and I appreciate it very much.

And I know that ultimately you will do the right thing.

So thanks.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Patty Meyer.

Followed by Christopher Bradley.


And I really don't have a whole lot to say. I have three brief statements.

The first thing I'd like to say is that I second what Joanne Johnson said with regards to the Commission. I have great concerns about the mapping company that was chosen.

Secondly I'd like to say that we have not had enough meetings. The meetings are too few and they are not in enough locations to get the input of all the people that
are involved in this issue.

And thirdly, and my last statement, is that I live in Tempe, I've lived there for many years, and I think that it is a community of interest.

We focus on Arizona State University.

I believe that if you were to draw lines that would somehow include other communities that are not focused on the university, that that would be unfair, and that it would create a situation where the needs of two different distinct groups would be in conflict. And therefore it may be impossible for our representatives to represent us completely.

And that's all I have to say.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

PATTY MEYER: Thank you.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Next will be Christopher Bradley, followed by Ryan Duncan, Wayne Manske, and Michael Conway.

CHRISTOPHER BRADLEY: I'm Christopher Bradley, B-R-A-D-L-E-Y.

And I also, like many others, I just want to thank the committee for the work that you're doing.

And I just want to make my comments brief here, but I think it's very important that this is an independent
When you have a state that's essentially one third Independent, one third Democrat, and one third Republican, and there's a massive over-representation of Republicans in the legislature, there's something wrong.

Something's not happening here.

And I understand that the Republican party doesn't want an independent committee, doesn't want that money spent on an independent committee, because it takes then their -- essentially the isolated power that they have, it threatens that isolated power.

But no matter who draws the map, we've got to start having districts that actually represent the actual breakdown of political parties in this state.

And I hope that when the districts are being redrawn that you'll keep that in mind.

Thank you very much.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

(Appause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Ryan Duncan.

RYAN DUNCAN: My name is Ryan Duncan. I'm a multi-generational native to Arizona that was raised, still live in, and now raising my family in the east valley city of Tempe.

I did go away for college years, as I applied for
scholarship. I was excited to return and begin my goal as a land broker in the east valley.

It is the area that resonates with the quality of life that I expect and enjoy during my formative years. There's wonderful schools in the Kyrene and Tempe School Districts, and access to any and all forms of activity and entertainment that are important to a young family like mine.

I was keeping an office in Scottsdale in the last ten years since graduating from college. I made a living selling land parcels located in the east valley cities of Tempe, Chandler, and Mesa.

This is my home, and I enjoy playing a small role in the growth and development of this area for future generations to come.

I'm here today to say a few words related to what I feel is an important distinction in discussions surrounding the possible redrawing of congressional district lines that could possibly change the direction of my current area and therefore quality of life that I've grown up knowing and expect for my family.

From my perspective, Tempe is the nucleus of all these valley cities, especially in the case of neighboring municipalities of Scottsdale, Chandler, the Ahwatukee neighborhood, and parts of Mesa.
The possibility that it could somehow be made part of other valley communities west of this area makes little sense to me.

Tempe does obviously draw people from across the state because of all it has to offer, but I would submit that if you were to poll my neighbors they would tell you that they are an east valley community linked by the 101 Freeway, U.S. 60, and I-10.

That fabric of growth, entertainment, and facility that I enjoy as a resident is important to me and my family. The east valley is our identity, and I do not want that to change. I'm a resident of the east valley by choice, and I believe the lines should remain the way they've been since the time I was raised here.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Wayne Manske.


I've lived here in Mesa since 1973.

It's interesting to hear all the experts here that know more about mapping than our professional mapping company that we've selected.

I appreciate your efforts to make Arizona and Mesa, Mesa particularly, to have more competitive districts.

I am very satisfied with the work each commissioner and their chairperson has demonstrated.

Your choice of map developers and your desire to
hold open meetings such as this one ensures that our
community has public input.

I have a great appreciation for your business -- excuse me.

I have a great appreciation for your efforts to conduct business up front and to accept public comments at the end of the business meetings so that the public comment shenanigans that have occurred at prior meetings do not occur and that we can hear the business that the Commission's in charge of.

Regarding the district we are meeting in this evening, current LD 18, west Mesa, I would hope that you would consider incorporating the current LD 18 boundaries south to include the Fiesta district and the Dobson Ranch community.

West Mesa should remain intact, but I hope that our west Mesa district will be allowed to include Mesa Community College, the Fiesta district, and Mesa's Dobson Ranch.

Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

(Appause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Michael Conway.

MICHAEL CONWAY: Mike Conway, Mesa, Arizona, C-O-N-W-A-Y.
I'd like to thank the commissioners for coming to my home, Mesa, and my Legislative District 18, the home of the recently and only senate president ever to be recalled, Russell Pearce --

(Applause.)

MICHAEL CONWAY: Okay. The people over here obviously don't understand the process, which should come as a surprise to no one.

I'm frustrated. I'm frustrated for being interrupted right now.

And I'm frustrated that people cannot be respectful and allow the process to move on.

Russell Pearce, Andy Biggs, Steve Montenegro, these are all examples of the disasters that come out of noncompetitive districts.

I'm going to disagree with, I believe, Sean Bowie, who said most of the people don't realize how uncompetitive the districts are.

I'm going to make the reverse argument.

I'm going to argue that most of the people in this room understand completely how noncompetitive the districts are, they're happy with the way the districts are, and they're afraid of losing their hold on political power.

That is why you have the anger and vitriol against the commissioners, the head commissioner.
If they really were concerned about all
commissioners not being honest on their applications, surely
the name of the commissioner who was put on the board by
Russell Pearce in his non-truthful answers on his
application would come up.

But never a word from these folks.

Complete silence.

Just in closing, I'd like to say that I'm also
from New York, and not everybody from New York is so
ignorant to think that nothing has culture west of the
Hudson.

(Prolonged applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Once again, let's try to curb
the enthusiasm a little bit.

We had a problem with our last speaker, the court
reporter couldn't hear him, and it's not fair to that
gentleman --

UNIDENTIFIED MAN: He doesn't need to point at
people and --

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Just a moment, sir. Just a
moment.

Let's have some order. Okay?

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Excuse me. I have
a question.

Is it okay for the former speaker to tell someone
to go to hell right now as he left?

(Inaudible comments by multiple members of the audience.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Let's continue.

Next we have Don Markowski.

Followed by Randy Keating, followed by Patrice Kraus.

DON MARKOWSKI: Thank you, commissioners.


And I live in LD 20, northwest Chandler.

Okay.

I would like to begin by echoing a previous person's comments that it would have been a nice way to start the meeting by showing a map of where we are now and where we need to be without drawing the specific district lines but giving the folks an opportunity to see that such and such area has too much population, such and such area has too little, and we need to shift some districts back and forth.

Okay.

For those of you who don't know, LD 20 in northwest Chandler is the same district as the Ahwatukee area.

Okay.

And I feel it's abhorrent that we have a
representative from Ahwatukee representing northwest Chandler.

And I'll give you an example of why I feel that way.

Senator John McComish is the current senator from Ahwatukee representing northwest Chandler.

A few years ago I wrote to him regarding a situation with the Mesa School Board hoarding money.

His quick response back to me was I don't represent the Mesa School District.

Well, he was representing the Mesa School District for about six years before he realized he was representing the Mesa School District.

So one of the things I would ask the commissioners is to strongly consider breaking off Ahwatukee from northwest Chandler.

As far as I know, it is not adjacent.

I don't see any commonality of interest, and it's not contiguous.

Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Next will be Randy Keating.

I agree with the man -- with the woman who spoke about ten minutes earlier that Tempe is definitely a community of interest.

Contrary to belief, our biggest voting block actually is Independents. They compose 36 percent of all voters in Tempe, with Republicans and Democrats only being separated by two points.

Speaking for the 17 Democrats, I say we welcome competitive districts. Nothing would please us more to avoid things like Green Party candidates and voter fraud allegations, cheap tricks like that that we saw in the last election cycle that we don't want to see anywhere in our community.

Also, outside I was given two pages worth of talking points to yell at you guys about.

Although I am not going to do that tonight, I am going to thank you for what you are doing here.

You guys are providing us, the public, with a very important service that our voters have mandated that you do.

Being as it is, I ask that you look past the intimidation, look past the yelling, look past the threats being shouted from the back of the room just today, and maintain the integrity that the voters expect of you.

Keep politics out of it, and thank you.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Patrice Kraus.

She's going to be followed by Gary -- Gila? Brad Barlum and Christina Shelley.

PATRICE KRAUS: Thank you, members of the Commission.

For the record, my name is Patrice Kraus, P-A-T-R-I-C-E, K-R-A-U-S. I'm here on behalf of the city of Chandler.

As a fourth largest city in the state, we're very concerned about our representation, especially at the state legislature.

We currently are divided into two legislative districts, and we like having six members at the state legislature. However, we do not want to be divided into more than two districts.

Both of our legislative districts currently have significant numbers of Chandler residents in them, and so our influence is not too diluted by other communities that make up these districts.

We would like the new districts to be divided somewhat in the same way so we can maintain that influence.

Although we know that there's going to be a need
to change these districts because one pop -- one of our districts is slightly overpopulated and one is slightly underpopulated, we are generally happy with the lines that we have in our city now, and we would like to make as few changes as possible.

We also do have a very close relationship with an incorporated area, Sun Lakes. We provide some services to them, and we would like to have them continue to be in one of our districts.

We're looking at how best to balance a population between these two districts right now, and will likely submit a map in the next new weeks.

And I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak tonight.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Gary Gila.

(No oral response.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Fred Barlum.

FRED BARLUM: I'd like to salute you, the hard working members of the IRC, for the excellent job that you were doing in keeping the redistricting process in Arizona independent.

I'm going to be very brief because I know we have a new more speakers for this evening.

With the passage of Proposition 106 by the voters
in 2000, independent redistricting became the law of the land of Arizona.

It is highly disturbing that there are elected officials, such as Attorney General Tom Horne and people from political factions, who want to undermine the legally mandated independence of you people, the IRC.

And even more disturbing is the view that the continuing independence of the IRC is a threat.

An Independent Redistricting Commission is a boon to freedom-loving people throughout the state, and voters wisely realized that in 2000.

Fair and competitive legislative and congressional districts will ensure that the voices of all people of Arizona will be heard, and isn't that what democracy is really about.

If the people who speak so vehemently in opposition to having an Independent Redistricting Commission truly love liberty and freedom, then it is time for them to proclaim that the independence of the IRC must be preserved in order to create fair and competitive legislative and congressional districts in this state.

The founding fathers of this great nation would have demanded no less of me, no less of you, and no less of them.

I thank the Commission for allowing me to speak
this evening.

(Appause.)

CHRISTINA SHELLEY: Christina, C-H-R-I-S-T-I-N-A.
S-H-E-L-L-E-Y.

I'm Christina Shelley. I am on the board of directors for -- I'm on the board of directors for LD 22 Democrats.

I live in Gilbert, which could not be more polarized, although I recognize that a lot of the districts are polarized.

I would like to point out that, and this is secondhand information, but it's from a very credible source, in 2000 the mapping company was primarily backed by Republicans, and the Democrats had a cow.

This year they're primarily backed by Democrats, and the Republicans are having a cow.

So maybe next time we can find someone backed by Independents.

Okay. That was a little subtle.

I'm an Arizona native. I haven't been here as long as Mike Wright, because Mike's older than me.

Just a little.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Into the microphone.

CHRISTINA SHELLEY: It's my hope that this Commission -- and you guys must feel like you're damned if
you do and damned if you don't, and I feel for you.

    But I hope that you proceed in changing our
legislative districts so that they're equally divided, much
more competitive.

    And, no, we're not going to be one to one.

I don't want to have 100 percent Democratic
districts, not that that would be possible, but that takes
away from the rigor of the process.

    I was involved in the process last year very
depthly.

    My son ran.

    It's a wonderful process.

    So I don't want anything to be lopsided. And
right now most of Arizona is really, really lopsided.

    I would hope that outside interest groups, groups
from outside of Arizona, and even Arizona based special
interest groups, would understand why this is so important
to democracy.

    It's the only way that we can have a responsive
and responsible government.

    I would also hope that recognized political
parties would appreciate this.

    As Ms. Filbey has said, the districts are far from
even.

    The losing candidate in District 7 last year got
more votes than the winning candidate in District 18.
    That's how lopsided the voting has gone.
    Thank you very much.
    (Applause.)
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.
Next up we have Armando Shelley.
Brenda Rascon.
Roman Ulman.
And Loren Kuby.
AMANDA SHELLY: Good evening. It's actually
Amanda Shelley.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Sorry.
I'd like to thank all of the Commission members as
well for the good job you're doing.
I'd like to encourage everyone to please allow it
to continue as an independent process, and not try to get
too politicized about it.
I too am a multi-generational Arizona native.
I was born and raised in Mesa and moved to Gilbert
because I thought it had better things to offer for my
family.
On arriving in Gilbert, I realized that I'm an
outsider there.
I have zero chance of getting someone who
represents me on a city level, a state level, or on a national level.

My legislative district, which is LD 22, and my congressional district, are so far lopsided that even candidates realize there's no chance, so no one tried.

There is absolutely zero fairness.

I think everyone in this room should recognize that if someone who has the right to vote has absolutely no chance of being represented, it's an un-American idea.

Thank you, and thanks again for holding this session in Mesa.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Brenda Rascon.

BRENDA RASCON: Good evening. Thank you for allowing me to speak tonight.

I'm an LD 18 resident. I'm a resident here of this area of Mesa.

I believe the redistricting process should split Mesa in a way that properly reflects its diversity.

So there's a lot of diversity here economically, culturally, demographically.

I would like west Mesa to be a more competitive district or to be absorbed by a competitive district.

Again, I'm going to echo what everyone else has said, that a competitive district is important. It's
crucial and pivotal to a good democracy. It creates a higher civil involvement, better representation.

What I'm afraid of, my biggest concern is when districts become noncompetitive, I think it encourages extreme politics.

I for one am really tired of being poorly represented, poorly represented by the politics of my district.

I have a representative who wants to nullify federal law, throw children off health care, and who make law that infringed on my civil rights as a U.S. citizen of non-White descent.

Please district in a way that will not further dilute the voices of minority U.S. citizens, please.

And I'd like -- once again, my main concern, equal population, fairness, checks and balances.

I think a lot of people have said here that there are no checks and balances right now. We're one third Independent, one third Democratic, one third Republican, and we have a wildly conservative legislature at the moment, and that's my main concern.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

BRENDA RASCON: Brenda Rascon, B-R-E-N-D-A, R-A-S-C-O-N.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Folks, when people are speaking, I'd ask everyone to be respectful of the speaker so they can get their comments into the record. And probably I've been remiss in that. And I'll remind you when you come to the microphone, please spell your name for our court reporter. Next is Roman Ulman.

ROMAN ULMAN: Roman Ulman, R-O-M-A-N, U-L-M-A-N. I'd like to thank the commissioners for allowing me to speak today. During my lifetime I have worn many hats. Today I am speaking as a small business owner in east Mesa. Let me say, first of all, I want to thank you very much for taking the insults that are being hurled at you so graciously. I have served on the Mesa master planning committee and went through some of the things that you are now going through. Except at that time we had the developers were trying to control the entire process. We ignored them, and because of that fact we've drawn up a very good master plan for Mesa. I urge you to do the same thing. Ignore the political parties, ignore the factions
of the political parties, ignore the out-of-state special
interest people, and do what the people of Arizona have
mandated you to do.

    I was in states where the politicians drew the
boundaries.

    And they were really bad.

    And that is why the people of Arizona set up an
independent body, because they were sick and tired of the
politicians trying to draw districts where a line ran
20 miles this way so a politician could stay in his own
district.

    That is not what you have been mandated to do.

    You have been told specifically by the voters of
Arizona how to conduct yourself, how to draw up the
districts, and I urge you to do that.

    There are a couple of charges that need to be
answered.

    First of all, I resent very much that anybody
would ever say that a wife was an extension of her husband.

    My wife, my three daughters, my seven
granddaughters would say that that is a lie.

    My wife is the president of our company. If
anything, I'm an extension of her.

    And to bring up that charge here I think is an
insult.
Number two, you have been selected by a process that ten years ago was controlled by the Republicans. They did the same thing that you are now doing. They selected their own staff. And for anybody to say that your staff is going to tell you what to do is an insult to the commissioners. You ought to be -- just totally ignore that charge.

The other allegations that are being made, and you notice I don't have any speaking points, is that all of the allegations that are being made to you are on talking points for certain factions of political parties and certain out-of-state interests. You can go out there and check them. And that's why you have talking points.

You are responsible to the voters of Arizona. This process was set up by them because the previous process did not work.

I would just say one other thing. Even though I'm represented by a member of another party, I like that representative.

He's very good because he cares about our community. Our city of Mesa representatives care about our community. I'm very happy with the administration.
And I would urge people to stop practicing hate and anger and start coming together.

These people run as politicians, but once they're elected they're representatives of the people.

Thank you very much.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Before you begin, there's been more talking, and I would ask everyone to be respectful of the comments so that we can hear them and so we can have a record.

Next we have Loren.


And I was hoping to speak earlier because I wanted to sort of rattle off talking points that I received when I came inside the room, and I received them by e-mail as well, from the Tea Party.

So we have heard a lot of these talking points tonight, and I want to approach them because I know this is a public comment period and you're not to supposed speak and I respect that.

We know that a lot of people in the room aren't happy with the mapping consultant you've chosen.

They comment that ST's previous clients include
Democrats, that somehow Barrack Obama is here as a puppet master trying to control with strings the operation. And I think he's a little busy with a major league crisis right now that he's not able to attend our redistricting commission.

Also they've attacked the choice of attorneys, and wish that we had chosen or you had chosen Lisa Hauser who was the original attorney in 2000.

You guys are public service. Lisa Hauser was a paid employee. She earned $2 million from the process.

She's, if I'm not mistaken, suing the State, suing you guys, because she feels she should have been chosen to represent whatever interest.

I also want to remind our audience that the Republicans on the Commission gave Strategic Telemetry very high marks too.

The old company really mucked things up, and you chose to go a new direction.

I salute you for that.

Another talking point we've heard is they attacked the integrity of Colleen Mathis, and since her husband was paid treasurer to a democratic legislative candidate, somehow she can't be impartial.

It won't matter that she and her husband have donated and worked for Republican candidates in the past and
have even attended George Bush's inauguration.

   Somehow she's married to someone who's worked as a treasurer in a democratic campaign, so she must be taking his orders.

   So I reiterate Roman's complaint as well.

   Another thing is this idea that somehow there are not enough meetings.

   Now, there's 17 public meetings where you've asked for input.

   This is, I understand, this is the first stage. You're getting public input before the maps are drawn, and then there's going to be many opportunities later to get public input once the maps are drawn, so let's clarify that.

   There's also this sense of this backroom dealing, things are happening behind close doors.

   In my position at ASU, I interview a lot of people for jobs, and I know that we do not make it sort of public or out in the open when we're discussing different candidates for different positions.

   That's considered -- in the resume things are confidential, and you need to talk in confidence about the candidates that are before you.

   And another complaint is that 48 hours isn't enough for a meeting.
I know in this case, today's meeting, we had more than 48 hours, but the Arizona Constitution requires 48 hours, and you guys have met that requirement.

I thank you for that.

They also complain that there's no agendas for these public meetings. These public input meetings are meant to have public input. That is the agenda.

So that also is a capricious sort of claim.

We have to ask ourselves why is this organized group trying to stall and impede the independent redistricting process. Could it be that voter registration numbers which show the growth of Independents in Arizona do not justify the GOP having a super majority in the legislature?

Just asking.

Within these talking points we don't hear any discussion of what they would like to see in terms of a fair map. That is why we're here. We're to give public input about mapping.

And I realized it's ironic because I haven't focused myself on the map, but give me that break.

So because this is why the Commission was created in the first place, to redraw legislative district lines so that we have competitive elections.

So I ask my fellow citizens, can we please let go
of these attempts to impugn, malign, and castigate the
Commission, and get on with the task of giving input to the
Commission about the maps that they will be drawing.

Thank you very much, and thank you for your public
service.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Next up will be Philip
Amorosi, followed by Craig Falasco and Paul Brierley.

PHILIP AMOROSI: Philip Amorosi, P-H-I-L-I-P,
A-M-O-R-O-S-I.

I'd like to address the Commission on legislative
districts.

I know they have to get larger.

I live in Tempe.

As a community of interest, Tempe has been around
since the 1870s.

I've been in Tempe since the 1970s.

And I think that right now it's two districts.

I don't want to see it split up into any more
districts. Tempeans really identify with each other, and if
anything we should try and make Tempe as much as one
district as we can.

And if there's another community of interest that
should be included, it would be the small town of Guadalupe,
which is surrounded on three sides by the city of Tempe.
Their other side is the I-10 freeway.

And, but right now they're part of District 16, which is part of Phoenix.

The small town of Guadalupe actually shares some city services with the city of Tempe, so I would think that they would be a better match with the city of Tempe than maybe some other areas.

Second point I want to make is that I'm part of District 17, which currently is one of only four competitive districts in the state.

I've seen the people get more engaged in the process in a competitive district. A lot more people want to get involved because they know they have a fighting chance.

And that way more people vote and the best candidates do get elected.

We don't want to lose that.

We need more than four competitive districts.

My final talking point is for the Commission to be strong, stay independent, don't bow to the powers that be, and from what I can hear are obviously scared and going to go down swinging.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

Thank you for allowing us to speak tonight.

First of all, I want to say that I am concerned about certain elected officials trying to interject themselves into this process.

In 2000 I voted for an independent Commission. And, in fact, I think it was 56 percent to 44 voted to approve that proposition.

I think we did the right thing.

I think we need to stick with this process and not allow it to go back into the hands of elected officials.

We did this because we knew that the elected people who are elected should not be drawing their own lines.

And, lastly, I just want to say that I have done quite a bit of reading about this process and the Commission, and I really have not read anything or heard anything credible that would cause me to question the integrity of the process or the Commission.

Thanks for having us tonight. Thank you for listening.

(Appause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: After Paul Brierley, we'll have Wendy Rogers, David Cantelme, and Dawn Master.
PAUL BRIERLEY: Thank you. Paul Brierley, B-R-I-E-R-L-E-Y.

I'm chairman of District 21 Republicans and also director of organization at the Arizona Farm Bureau, but I'm here representing myself tonight.

I want to thank the Commission to your efforts gathering public opinion.

I think that's important.

And I hope that's nothing predetermined and you'll take what we say tonight to heart.

First, I want to give you my perspective as a district chairman for a legislative district, and I'll do it in a nonpartisan way.

If you think about it, a legislative district is really the ultimate community of interest.

It's a group of people living in the same area, working to elect their congressmen and their state legislators to best represent us.

For logistical reasons and to better define a community of interest, I believe legislative districts should be geographically compact and they should be contiguous.

They shouldn't cross the boundaries of congressional districts, counties, municipalities, or tribal nations.
Why is that?

It's because we work together to elect the best representatives for our community.

If a congressional district, county, or municipality is split with only a minor part of our district, then we can't work together to elect our representatives.

For example, District 21 is most of Chandler and small pieces of Mesa, Gilbert, Queen Creek, and Sun Lakes within our boundaries.

Only three of our 79 precincts are in the town of Gilbert.

That makes it pretty tough for our district to get real excited and get behind them on Gilbert's town council race, and those precinct committeemen don't really have a voice to help with that election.

Most of our district is in Congressional District 6, but a few of our precincts are in Congressional District 5, so, again, those people in District 5 don't have much of a chance to work together with our district and try to elect their representatives.

If our boundary was moved to the east, our district would include parts of both Maricopa and Pinal Counties.

And I have a concern about that.
There would be different county meetings for people to attend, different issues, different elections depending on where you lived in the district.

Not only does this really violate communities of interest, but it exponentially increases the complexity of managing the affairs of our district.

We'd have different sets of precinct committeemen, different proxies that could be accepted and all sorts of stuff, and it makes it very hard to help those people be politically active.

If our boundary were moved south, our district would include part of the Gila River Indian community, and that would clearly break up their community of interest.

So to end that point, District 21 clearly is going to have to shrink. We've gained a lot of population growth.

I ask you to keep it compact, contiguous, and to not cross the boundaries of municipalities, tribal, or congressional districts.

And that brings me to the second point I want to make.

One of the greatest, the strongest communities of interest we have in this state consists of Arizona's rural communities.

They share much in common with each other, no matter how far apart they are.
Their voices can be drowned out by an urban population in their district, and that urban population might be closer in proximity but not in ideology.

Rural areas are focused on issues such as natural resources and public lands, agriculture, small business, transportation, property rights, and much more.

If I can tell a little story to demonstrate why it's so important.

Back before, before we had CD 1 in the last process, there was a gentleman representing a small community talking to his congressman who had most of his constituents in Tucson and then of course spread out to a lot of rural area.

And he talked to him about an issue. And the congressman said, Mark, I understand what you're saying. And, Mark, I even agree with you're saying, but, Mark, I can't vote that way because my constituents in Tucson don't feel that way.

So the rural areas don't get represented if they're mixed in with urban populations.

Ten years ago I stood before this Commission as a resident of Graham County to ask for an all rural district.

And we got that with CD 1.

By all measures it has been a great success.

We've had Republican representatives and Democratic
representatives. And I'd say, yeah, I used to live there. And both sides always focused on natural resources in their issues.

So I asked you to remember that if you combine a rural and urban population, the rural people are going to lose their voice.

Thank you for your attention. The work you do is critical to the future of Arizona. I hope you will do it impartially and take the best interests of the state to heart.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Wendy Rogers.

WENDY ROGERS: Wendy Rogers, W-E-N-D-Y, like the hamburgers, R-O-G-E-R-S.

Thank you for letting me present.

I'm from District 17, which I've had many fellow voters up here to talk from.

District 17 is comprised primarily of Tempe, with some of south Scottsdale. So it's about a third south Scottsdale.

By way of background, I'm a retired Air Force lieutenant colonel, a pilot, and served 20 years, and have been a small business owner for the last 14 years. I have ten employees. I own a business in Tempe.
I ran for the State Senate in this last 2010 cycle.

I bicycled to over 10,000 homes over the course of 15 months.

And I would argue that District 17 is perhaps not as competitive as you might be led to believe.

I raised my funding privately. I did not participate in clean elections as did my opponent.

I raised four times the amount of money that my opponent did.

I had over 400 donors, small donors.

I had probably 3,000 yard signs out in every single precinct.

And worked very hard.

Yet could not overcome what I saw as a competitive -- noncompetitive district.

I say it's noncompetitive because for the last ten years all three, both state representative and state senate positions, have been from one party.

So if someone works very hard, follows through, and does the degree of door-to-door work and fundraising and outreach for a solid year and a half and can't overcome what is the landscape there, I would submit to you that it is arguably not competitive.

So, my suggestion is as follows.
Right now District 17, I agree, community of interest-wise and competitive-wise should still keep Tempe primarily intact.

As such, with it including a third of it is south Scottsdale, I would suggest that the district, because it must grow by some 60,000 voters or so, I would suggest that it extend more up into Scottsdale.

In that way it would still keep the community of interest intact of Tempe primarily, and it would simply extend the south Scottsdale component up in a more northerly direction.

Thank you very much.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: David Cantelme.

DAVID CANTELME: Good evening, members of the Commission. I also commend you for your hard work. I know this is taking you away from your families, and I really appreciate the job that you're doing.

I'd like to make a few points.

First point I want to stress is that of course the U.S. Constitution, the Voting Rights Act, and the Arizona Constitution must be strictly followed, along with the laws that govern the way the Commission is supposed to do its work.
Second, Native American reservations and communities must never be split, either congressionally or legislatively.

Third, Latinos make up 29 and a half percent of the state's population, and that means that they are entitled to have at least two congressional districts from which they can elect someone of their choice, and a third district in which they should have a strong influence.

By the same token at the Legislature, they should have at least nine districts from which they can elect someone of their choice.

You know, Arizona's had a very poor history the way it's treated its minority residents.

In my lifetime we had high schools in Phoenix and Tucson segregated. We had areas in Arizona in which minority populations could not buy homes.

Not in my lifetime, but not much after it, Native Americans didn't have the vote.

Now we've passed that thankfully. That sad history is gone. But it should never be repeated, and the way to make sure it's never repeated is to strongly enforce the Voting Rights Act in this state.

Whole counties and cities to the extent possible should be placed in the same district.

Districts should have equal populations. The
software exists so that you can do it with no more than one
person different per district.

That can be done. The state constitution requires
it.

Communities of interest. I would strongly urge
you to adopt definitions of what those -- that term means,
so it can be applied evenly and equally all around this
state.

Communities of interest should be respected. Our
state constitution says that.

Independents. The numbers of Independents we know
have grown enormously in this state and yet they don't seem
to have any voice.

Their voice must be respected as you draw the
districts that are before you.

And last I want to address competitiveness.

A lot has been made of competitiveness, and it's
certainly a factor in our state constitution, but only to
the extent that it does not cause significant detriment to
the other criteria that are placed in the constitution above
it.

I want to make a point with respect to
competitiveness.

In our congressional districts in the last three
elections, we have elected -- we have eight seats in
congress, three elections, that makes 24 seats. We have elected 12 Democrats and we've elected 12 Republicans, and that is a very competitive number, and I would put it up against any state in the United States.

Finally, I would strongly urge you not to gerrymander districts just for the sake of competitiveness. You must respect communities of interest. Competitiveness will follow.

Thank you so much, and I again applaud the work that you're doing.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Dawn Master.

She'll be followed by Ronald Gibson, Naomi White -- oh, she already spoke.

And Martha Jo Billy.

Ms. Master.


And I've lived in Arizona for most of my life, and I consider myself a native even though I've grown up on the east coast.

I've listened to some extremely good comments here tonight with regard to fairness regarding redistricting.

I've also heard some vitriol, and I am sorry to
hear that, because political slams against the candidates that we voted into office have no place in meetings such as this.

I've walked my area with a Democrat who was campaigning.

I've also walked my area with a Republican, Justin Olson.

And, by the way, he did visit the houses of Independents, Democrats, and Republicans, and so did the Democrat. So if you weren't home, you didn't see these two men.

But let's be fair to them.

The other thing I have to say regarding your redistricting, if we start doing this on a racial ethnic basis, then where do my Irish, Scottish, Welsh, German, French, et cetera, et cetera, ancestors, with their little carved out section, so I think you have to be very careful doing this.

Communities have developed for a reason.

Within my community, I have Blacks, I have Hispanic, I have White, and we have other, other ethnic groups. So are you going to carve those out and put those over into a Hispanic area?

I certainly hope not.

I've campaigned for some of those people.
I think we need to use common sense here.

And the gentleman that spoke just shortly from the beginning, who said this is not rocket science work, he's absolutely right.

You people have been selected. You're highly intelligence, anyhow we're hoping for that, and hoping you're fair.

And we think any one of you could sit down and look at a map and see where our districts now are, are -- the lines are drawn, and understand if you need 50 more people, you don't go drawing them from up in the north end of the state or taking them from the south.

As for the rest of us here, I would like to tell you that one third of Arizona are Democrats, one third are Republicans, one third are Independent.

What does that really mean?

Well, obviously we've heard from the Democrats, and we've heard from the Republicans, and that crosses both sides here this evening.

They have definite views. What are the Independents? Who are they?

They're disgruntled Democrats and Republicans.

We don't like to hear that, but that's exactly what they are.

I'm a precinct committeeman, and I've visited the
homes of all these people, Independents, Republicans, and Democrats. They're disgruntled. They are unhappy with what our representatives are doing.

Not, not the Republicans aren't just unhappy with what the Democrats are doing. They're unhappy with what the Republicans are doing.

The Democrats aren't just unhappy with what their Democrats are doing -- or the Republicans are doing. They're unhappy with what the Democrats are doing.

We're a very unhappy nation.

So if you're going to draw your lines based on Independents, and they're not getting their vote, believe me they are voting.

And they are switching back and forth.

That's why you see Republicans get in, then you see Democrats get in.

It's not because they're not being represented. It's because they're tired of all of them.

So if we have representatives that get into our office and speak clearly and do what they say they're going to do, just like we're asking you gentlemen and the lady who is missing to do, if you do what you promise us you're going to do, we'll say God bless you, get on your way, you've done a good job.

But if you're giving us double speak like some of
our politicians on both sides of the aisle have done, we're going to boot you.

So, that's what I have to say.

And I'm just a grandma, but I'm telling you we care about our kids, we care about our grandkids, and we care about our community. And we don't need to be divided racially.

That's what is wrong with us right now.

Let's start reaching out to one another.

My father was a Republican. My mother was a Democrat.

I truly know what Independent means.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Ronald Gibson.

RONALD GIBSON: I am Ronald Gibson. My last name is spelled G-I-B-S-O-N.

I too was born in west Mesa like many others here, but more recently than some of the others, so I've probably not seen as much of the politics of the state as you have.

I have however learned a lot of history of politics of this state and this of nation which I imagine most people in this room don't seem to pay that much attention to.

George Washington stated in his farewell address...
in 1789 a long list of reasons why we should not allow a two-party system in this country, because of the reasons being to assure that if we did, that all of these reasons which he had seen happen in England before would happen here.

Every one of those predictions came true.

I would like invite everyone to read that.

Now, I am a Libertarian, which is why I will not comment on any of the Republicans statements here or the Democrat statements here.

There has been a lot of repetition here tonight.

You want to hear something new, listen up, because that's what I'm here to say.

All right.

Now, I rehearsed a lot of this and now I can't remember.

All right. Well, at any rate, what we have here -- see, Thomas Jefferson wrote that all men are created equal.

It's a self-evident truth.

There's a lot of talk here about racial people here who want to make sure that the districts are based on race.

Why do we want to make them based on race?

Are we not all people here? Is it not one race,
the human race?

The census shouldn't even be counting people's race.

These districts should be based on the total number of people in them, period.

Not White people, Black people, Hispanic people, Asian people.

People.

We're all humans.

How many races do we need to consider?

Do we have Martians that are here? Do we have Klingons? Do we have any Wookiees?

I don't think so.

We're all humans here.

And many of us are actually mixed race. Where do they get counted as was mentioned before?

Okay. I am repeating a little bit. I should avoid doing that.

So my basic point is we need to stop thinking of race.

We need to just divide people.

Now, I don't believe that we can necessarily get them all based with one different, one person different, as most houses do not average one person in them. And this is also part of the complex decision, but within five or ten,
it's possible.

    Why in the world would we have any districts that
were not connected -- the entire district was not connected
to each other.

    I've heard several people mention districts that
have a little bit over here, a little bit over there.

    Why don't we draw the lines to where they're all
connected and, as was also mentioned, that they can work
together to elect their people.

    Also a lot of other people have also said that
they are very happy with the way the districts were drawn
and they won't want to change.

    That could be because they're happy with the chair
they're sitting in right now.

    That might be a good thing. That might be a bad
thing.

    But if things need to change, they need to change.
That's simply the way it is.

    And we're going to need a new legislative district
for the state, because Arizona's going to get another
congressman.

    The question is where that congressman is going to
be from.

    I'll be interested in seeing that.

What else did I have to say?
Oh, yes, nearly every district in this state has either a Republican majority or a Democratic majority. Now, I would like to see that changed. I don't think necessarily that we should be gerrymandering based on party. But if we do, we might consider having some parties -- some districts that are not dominated by one of these parties.

There are the Libertarian party, there's the Green Party, and there's about two dozen other parties in this state.

I think perhaps we might have a better chance of fairness if instead of having two Republicans and two Democrats and one so-called Independent, that is, in fact, a purported Democrat in disguise, depending on which party happens to control the district -- the Redistricting Commission, we should instead have five different parties represented here.

Because we do have more than two parties in this state, believe it or not.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Sir, four minutes, could you wrap it up, please?

RONALD GIBSON: Okay. Well, I pretty much said what I had to say.

I mean, we need to consider other parties around here.
It's been -- we've got Republicans fighting against Democrats, and that's all we've got. We need to have somebody else to consider.

Thanks.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Martha Jo Billy.

Followed by Kathy Pearce and William Crum.

MARTHA JO BILLY: Good evening. I'm Martha Jo Billy, B, as in boy, I-L-L-Y.

If I -- this -- I'm not used to public speaking. So if I get rambling, blink a red light at me as long as it's not a laser.

I know some people have talked about their number of years in Arizona. And other than the man who said he was born in east Mesa and had the white hair, I may have been here longer than anybody else.

I've been here 54 years.

And living from the Navajo reservation, the Fort Apache reservation, down through the center of Arizona, south, and I live in District 18 now, which is very noncompetitive.

And probably the most noncompetitive district in the state.

I would like to say that I admire you for your work you're doing and the purpose of doing the redistricting.
And, please, do it in a fair way and not have districts going from the northern part of the state down through the southern part of the state.

The gentleman that mentioned redistricting and not doing it by race, it was done by race.

I know like with the Navajos, they were divided up in the last redistricting because predominantly they have voted Democrat and they were divided up so they would have less power as a nation in their voting.

I heard someone remark tonight that they needed more than 48 hours to know -- be notified about these meetings.

I believe that's the way she said it.

I don't know why she didn't know before, because I could have gone to all of your meetings.

I've gotten them in the e-mail. I think you had one in Yuma and somewhere else.

If I could have driven to them.

So I've been -- I think you've done well in notifying people where the meetings are.

I would -- I cannot believe after the last census the way the redistricting was drawn. It was obvious it was political. And I hope that this committee will not redraw the lines in a political way.

I also for a short while, a little earlier,
wondered if I was at the 2012 presidential election when
people were talking about President Obama.

What does he have to do with the redistricting in
Arizona?

These people should not be allowed to get -- go to
websites and then stand up here and read and quote websites.

And if they are planning to do that, only one of
them should do it.

So, I haven't seen the red light, but I -- oh, it's that.

Then I'll quit, and thank you very much.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Kathy Pearce.

KATHY PEARCE: My name is Kathy, K-A-T-H-Y,
Pearce, P-E-A-R-C-E.

As in Senate president Pearce's spelling.

I'm going to yield my time. I think everything has pretty much been said.

A gentleman covered the topics that I was going to talk about.

But I just want to remind everybody in this room and you commissioners that if we will follow the constitution and the Voting Rights Act and the Arizona Constitution, that I think we can solve all of these issues.
And that competitiveness is not the major factor here.

That can be done as long as we're not eliminating other more important factors in redistricting.

Thank you for your time.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Next we have William Crum, followed by Karyn Cushing, and then Richard Van Duyne.

WILLIAM CRUM: My name is William Crum, W-I-L-L-I-A-M. And the last name is -- last name is C-R-U-M.

I can give you a perspective from my -- basically what I am. I heard our -- my party mentioned in a negative way, which is the Arizona Green Party.

We are the smallest party in our state.

And when you look at both sides of our -- the Democrats and Republicans, and say what the heck, they've already carved out the state, so we're not going to -- but we're still going to try.

Because the first thing that I am, before I am a member of the Arizona Green Party, I am an American.

And that's all we would be doing here.

I have the largest district per people voters in the state. It's over 500,000.
It's in CD 2.

Now occupied by Trent Franks.

And why is Trent there? Because the party had over 206,000 voters in my district.

They have 146,000 Democrats. 146 Independents is what we call that.

So I do like the last name they call them. They called them others.

The last time -- I'm still an American, and that's what I would like to be called.

When I sit there and run, and I don't know if anyone here has run before, but you get to see a different perspective when you run. Perspective, pardon me.

The thing is make it fair.

I mean, I don't care what you do. Basically right now part of CD 2. It's the Hopi nation.

Does anybody know what the Hopi nation?

Why are they included in CD 2?

The problem is these districts are White people.

There's some the Democrats can walk in with any Democrat and win.

There are some the Republicans can walk in and win.

But there's none for me.

So I'm fighting all the way, regardless of who's
in charge.

The problem is I have a lot of things in mind. I've been married to Marilyn for over 35 years, and it's all in Arizona.

I have five daughters, and they have for some unGodly reason gave me 21 grandkids.

So who do I fight for?

They're not part of a party.

They're not part of the left or right. They don't need to see their school cut in half because we need to make people stupid.

And we don't.

These are smart kids out there. When they catch on, get up where they can vote, I'm afraid some of these politicians are going to get walking papers.

That's what I want.

I want to make it fair enough that regardless of race, if you want to call it that, your color or creed, whatever you want, that people look at you as just an American running for office.

Thank you.

VICe-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

VICe-CHAIR FREEMAN: Karyn Cushing.

KAREN CUSHING: Karyn, K-A-R-Y-N, Cushing,
C-U-S-H-I-N-G.

And I just want to say that on this piece of paper here is my own talking points and my own thoughts and concerns.

I'm sure that all of you gentlemen here are aware -- are aware that a great many of us are concerned about Strategic Telemetry's ability to redistrict our state in a fair and nonpartisan manner.

What really disturbs me is that Strategic Telemetry has specifically been involved in helping only Democrat and progressive campaigns to help liberal progressive candidates to win.

Now, those of you that may think and vote differently than I do, let me ask you this. How would you feel if you discovered that the consulting firm that your Commission hired backed only Republican and conservative candidates and causes? Wouldn't you be suspicious?

The American task before you is to be fair and nonpartisan.

Conservatives like myself will be watching the redistricting process very closely.

And I just want to add, we talked -- we've had people come up and talk about the constitution. And I just want to say that nowhere in the constitution does it say that we live in a democracy.
We live in a constitutional republic.
Thank you.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.
(Appause.)
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Richard Van Duyne.
RICHARD VAN DUYNE: My name is Richard Van Duyne,
To the committee, thank you for taking on this task. I said this to you once before, and I mean it.
Thank you for listening.
I live in District 19.
It's not very competitive.
My concern is the importance of competitive districts.
I understand communities of interest, neighborhoods, and a common culture.
I like my neighborhood. I like my schools. I like my community.
However, and this is my point. It is my opinion that competitive districts allow voters and compel candidates to better understand the concerns of others.
In a representative democracy, our government, that's us, we should be concerned about all people, just not ourselves.
Thank you.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I want to call out for John Fillmore, Representative Fillmore, sorry, we missed him earlier apparently.

And Gary Gillger, is he here?

(No response.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: No, he isn't.

That brings us to the end of the public comment phase of the hearing.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I want to thank you all for coming.

The commissioners -- and I was probably remiss in not giving my friend Jose Herrera a chance to welcome you all when we started.

The commissioners are allowed to respond to public criticism at the end of the public comment, and I want to give him the opportunity to do that, and also to say any other words he may have.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I can't thank you enough for being here. These are long meetings. I know most of you work.

We work.

We don't get paid for this.
The reason I volunteered is I really want to make a difference in the state of Arizona.

I'm a native here.

I intend to live here.

And to me competition is the main thing.

I don't care if it's a Republican district or a Democratic district. You got to have competitive districts for all districts.

And if, you know, things eventually will change in Arizona, whether you like it or not. They may go Democrat and may switch back. But if the party that you favor is in power, some of your thoughts may change.

You may not want the legislature to redraw the districts as they did once before.

And I don't know if they had public comments like we did, but I think I want to urge you to, you know, if you supported Prop 106 in the past, I hope you continue to support it.

Because the voters spoke, and I think it's the right thing.

I voted for Prop 106, and we are trying to make it as open as possible to get the comments.

And I appreciate you guys being there.

We may not always agree.

But I think all five of us, including my fellow
Republicans and the Independent, they're good people. They really are. They care about the state.

And when you vilify them, it really doesn't help us in terms of determining what you want from us.

Because we're looking here for -- to draw the maps, and vilifying us or the mapping consultants or the attorneys doesn't really get at what we want from you.

What we want from you is to tell us about your community, tell us about if competition is important to you, and those six criteria that we're looking at. That's what we're looking for because that's exactly what can help us draw those maps.

And I encourage you in the next meetings to do that.

If you didn't talk about those issues that are important to you, do so.

Because that's how -- it will make our lives a lot easier.

So I -- we tend to focus a lot on our differences, but I would bet that some of the Tea Party members, or some other parties represented here, we probably have more in common than you think.

We are all Arizonans. We love the state.

And let's focus on the similarities we have instead of the differences.
We tend to do that quite a bit.

I would venture to guess if you guys get to know me, or the other Democrats or Republicans, that we have a lot in common.

I, again, thank you for being here. We'll be in Lake Havasu -- excuse me, Bullhead City tomorrow. We're traveling there. And if you're planning and you want to travel with us, not in the same car, but maybe follow us, I'm happy to have you.

And, again, get to know people in the Commission, and you'll find out that we're not bogeymen and neither is the mapping service or the attorney that we hired.

They're good people, and they care about the state, and they will do the job that the public wants us to do.

So, thank you for being here tonight, and have a good night.

(Applause.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Herrera.

Before we break up, can we have quiet, please.

I'm sorry, I didn't mean to delay you. I wanted to take a quick moment to respond to some of the criticism myself.

First on the issue of hearings.

The Commission has scheduled a lot of hearings
over the next two weeks all over the state.

I agree with some of that criticism that perhaps we needed to be looking at other high growth areas in the state, and, and in service more -- another hearing, perhaps one in the Globe, Chandler area, Flagstaff area, perhaps the west valley.

I'll ask around to see if the Commission will take that correction.

There was also criticism levied and here tonight it has been a recurring theme that goes towards the almost -- almost the legitimacy of the process or perhaps even the Commission itself.

And unfortunately that is a narrative that began some months ago.

It's been quite a distraction for us.

It began with the retention of the lawyers. And there were accusations raised at the time of behind closed doors negotiations and sort of rigging of the -- sort of a result-oriented process has been the narrative.

That continued unfortunately with the retention of the mapping consultant.

Again, there's been lots of controversy swirling around that.

Again, the theme is it's a result-oriented process.
And for some people out there, I want to acknowledge, they feel like that's two strikes against us right now, and we're just coming up to the most important thing we're going to do, which is to develop these maps. And I don't want it to be strike three. I want us to swing for the fences.

I want us to do a good job for the people.

What I support here is a fair, politically balanced, and independent Commission that conducts itself in a way that builds confidence in the people, not only in the process, but I would hope in the end result.

And I want to be very clear on that. To that end, I support each and every one of the commissioners. I support Commissioner Herrera, Madam Chair, and Commissioner Stertz, and Commissioner McNulty.

And I think the most important thing we can do is to make sure we do a good job with the maps.

If the people get very involved and watch every step, come to our hearings, make comments, make criticisms, tell us about your communities of interest, tell us about competitive districts, compactness, community of interest, geographic lines, and just stay with us on this process.

I hope we get to an end result where it's not a 3-2 vote, that we have a bipartisan map that represents the
state and we can all feel proud of it.

    And with that, that ends our hearing. We will
close the hearing at 8:46 p.m.

    Thank you all very much.

    (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned.)
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