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(Whereupon, the public session commences.)

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

The time is 1:35 p.m.

It's Wednesday, August 3rd.

And let's start with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Please rise.

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It's good to see so many of you here today at our meeting.

I'm going to start with roll call first.

Vice Chair Freeman?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Vice Chair Herrera?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner McNulty?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner Stertz?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Here.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We have a quorum.
I'd like to also acknowledge other folks here today.

Our legal counsel, we have Joe Kanefield and Mary O'Grady.

We have our mapping consultant, Korinne -- you'll have to help me.

KORINNE KUBENA BELOCK: Belock.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Belock, and Ken Strasma.

And our executive director, Ray Bladine, is going to be here shortly.

We also have Buck Forst who is our chief technology officer, our public information officer Stuart Robinson, and our deputy executive director Kristina Gomez.

And Anna Garcia is also on our staff in the back. Thank you, Anna.

And so if any of you have questions for staff, feel free to address them throughout the meeting.

Our next agenda item is the executive director report, but we will go ahead and move on to the next item, since Mr. Bladine would be giving that report for us. He'll be here momentarily.

So that takes us to agenda item three, presentation by Strategic Telemetry, discussion of possible
action on the purchase of online mapping software.

   So if you all ready to go.

   KENNETH STRASMA: Certainly.

   CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great.

   KENNETH STRASMA: We brought up at the last meeting, there have been three different companies that have provided bids for online redistricting software.

   I do want to clarify, because there were some public comments raised at the hearing about the distinction between this and the existing AIRC website.

   The AIRC website already has ability to host maps, picture maps. We will be able to put images up, what's called block equivalency files.

   So anyone who wants to grab copies of draft maps can pull them down and also be able to post them in native Maptitude and by shapefiles.

   What's distinct from the online mapping software is that's something that actually gives the citizens ability to go online and with access to a web browser and draw their own maps.

   In many states, in past redistrictings, there have been different types of public outreach that have been tried. For example, having computer terminals installed at public libraries, traveling public access terminals.

   Sometimes, like, I think it was 20 years ago, we would have
big paper map books, and people would write the numbers of
census blocks on a piece of paper.

So the technology has come quite far, and then now
there's ability that anyone who has access to a web browser
can log in, draw maps, experiment with changes to different
maps, submit if they want to the Commission.

The three different bids that we received are from
ESRI, Maptitude, and Azavea.

ESRI is the maker of the ArcView GIS, probably the
most commonly used GIS package.

They have submitted a bid that would be $116,000.

Maptitude is from Caliber Corporation. They are
the makers of the online -- of the desktop software that the
Commission selected at the last meeting.

So you have the advantage of the familiar user
interface to people in Arizona who have used Maptitude over
the last ten years.

They've submitted a bid at $87,000 for online
access for a year.

The third company, Azavea, provided the software
that was used for the Arizona Competitive Districts
Coalition's online mapping contest that many people are
familiar with.

And they have submitted a paid that would
essentially allow the Commission to take over the remainder
of that contract and use the same software that people who
were in that contest are familiar with.

And they submitted a bid at $49,651.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And do you know how much time
is left on that contract?

KENNETH STRASMA: I do not.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Maybe we can find that out.

What other questions or comments do you all have
on online mapping software?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I did have a question about
the ease of use for the three alternatives for the public
and which would be most likely to provide a tool that is
easy to manage.

KENNETH STRASMA: There is some -- a bit of a
learning curve for any of the three.

If someone has used one of them before, so people
have done the online contest before, and that's advantage,
if you are familiar with Maptitude, that's an advantage.

For all of them there is training available. And
I would suggest doing a web-based video training so people
could actually see how it's done online rather than having
to read through a manual.

So they all take some training, and I think we
would have to make an effort to make it as accessible as
possible.
I don't see any one of them being above the others in terms of usability.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: In terms of our ability to understand what's provided to us versus the users -- the fact that many of the users who are really involved in this process already would have used Azavea -- is that what it's called, Azavea?

We're going to be using Maptitude. Is it going to be fairly easy for us to understand what the Azavea product is when it's provided to us?

KENNETH STRASMA: Yes, we will see to that, commissioner.

When we do a transfer, if one of the other packages is submitted, we will translate them into Maptitude and make them available on the desktop package that the commissioners use.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So it sounds like there wouldn't be a reason to spend more than 47 or $49,000 to use Azavea if that should provide the same bundle of sticks for the public --

KENNETH STRASMA: Right.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: -- and that we would be able to re-translate it to what we use.

KENNETH STRASMA: I do believe that all three packages provide a similar amount of coverage.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Ken, thank you for getting these proposals put together.

When did you -- when did we get these proposals?

KENNETH STRASMA: They have come in over the course of the last week.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm a bit at a loss because other than Maptitude, the ESRI and Azavea software, neither of those two I've had the opportunity to look at.

So other than taking a recommendation from Mr. Strasma and looking at the financial components of this, I wouldn't, I wouldn't have a comment at this time.

It would have been preferred if we would have had an opportunity to at least know that who the companies were and the software we were anticipating taking action on today.

Because it was -- the hope is to get this out into the public as quickly as possible so that they can start doing their work.

Post grid-map design.

So with that being said, it's -- I'm -- for lack of information, I don't know how I could possibly make a recommendation or a decision based on what's been delivered today.
Is there anything else that you have? Is there a presentation comparison between the three?

KENNETH STRASMA: The -- we made a conscious decision not to forward the proposals, because one of the three had included a request that it not be made public to anyone who is not involved in the decision-making process.

What I probably could do is go back to them and say is there a proposal that you are willing to have made of a public document, and make all three of those available to the public.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other questions or comments from other commissioners?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I think I'm in the same road as Mr. Stertz.

You've given us names and some numbers. And as an aside, the decision doesn't -- easier or not, I don't know how we're to . . .

I played with the online, went through the initial training for the one at AZredistricting.com, but I have not had the opportunity to use either of the other two options we have, so I don't know.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Well, I would agree. I don't know either. I'm not familiar with those particular packages.

It would be helpful, I think, Mr. Strasma, if you could come back to us -- if you could find out, first of all, if that one company will even allow us to all look at it, because if they won't, that will make the decision between two.

And then, and then if you could maybe just put together a few pros and cons of them.

And also now that we know the names of the companies, we also can be looking into them ourselves and seeing what we can find out too.

But to the extent you can provide any information on those particular offerings, that would be great.

KENNETH STRASMA: Okay. Certainly, Madam Chair, we'll check with the company and ask them to submit something they're willing to share.

And I'll circulate those to the commissioners and also links to sites that are currently up and running using the various packages.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right. And also to find out how much contract time is left with the one package.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Could you elaborate on that question you asked.

I don't -- when you asked a question about how much time is left on an existing contract, I'm not sure what that means.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh. Well, he had mentioned at the beginning, when he was articulating the three packages, that the Azavea one, which is the online redistricting software package that I believe the Competitive Districts Coalition is using, he said that we could take over the remainder of the contract for 49,000. And I was just wondering how much time that is.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

And the other question that I -- that I've got for you, Mr. Strasma, is that you had mentioned that currently we have the ability to post maps on our AIRC website.

KENNETH STRASMA: Yes.

And that's, for example, the maps from the last cycle are currently up on the website in JPEG format. And there's also the opportunity to download those in what's called shapefiles.

And I anticipate being able to do that with the maps for the process as well, no problem.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

Ken, when were those posted?
KENNETH STRASMA: They have been up as long as, as long as I've been working with the site the last several months.

These are maps from the last --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: They're in the 2001 and 2010 link.

KENNETH STRASMA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Where are these -- where is any of the current data located?

There's nothing going forward; correct? You've got --

KENNETH STRASMA: Correct.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: There's nothing that's been currently submitted in any of the public hearings that we've had?

KENNETH STRASMA: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And also is the questionnaire that we keep referring to in our public hearings, is that available on our website?

KENNETH STRASMA: I believe so.

Let me defer to the executive director on that.

Ray?

RAY BLADINE: I don't believe we have been telling people that, but when I checked the other day because we had a problem in getting the -- we could fill them out and
submit the form, it is either on there but not submittable or is not on there.

I'm going to turn to Buck and see.

BUCK FORST: It will be ready today or tomorrow.

RAY BLADINE: It will be ready today or tomorrow.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

Just on that point, we've had a number of people submit maps at these public comment hearings so far.

Can we get those up on our website as well so members of the public can see what's being submitted?

RAY BLADINE: We -- should I go ahead?

We are scanning those maps as quickly as we can along with the other dialogue, and the intention would be to put the maps up on the website.

But right now we're behind in scanning.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Bladine, are we going to indicate the source of the map as we post them?

RAY BLADINE: I would think that's a good idea, so, yes, we will.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And the date.

RAY BLADINE: And the date, and from where.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Any other questions on the online mapping software decision?
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I do have one more question.

Once we make a decision, how long will it take to get the package up so it's available to the public?

KENNETH STRASMA: Approximately two weeks.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Other questions?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Strasma, when will the commissioners be able to see these proposals so that we can review and start drilling down on any questions that we may have, and who will we be directing the questions through to be able to get answers?

Are you administering the contract or is Mr. Bladine?

KENNETH STRASMA: Mr. Bladine would. It would not go through Strategic Telemetry.

And in terms of timing, it depends on the response from the other company.

I would offer getting information out Friday and letting them know -- let us know one way or another if they want to be included Friday.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Which is the company that is not --
KENNETH STRASMA: ESRI.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

So we've got information on Maptitude and obviously there's a public access on AZredistricting.com for that usability; correct?

KENNETH STRASMA: Correct.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: All right. Perfect.

Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Other questions, comments before we move on?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Obviously I want to make the right decision on this, the appropriate decision, but time is of the essence.

It's going to be a two-week lead time, on that time the Commission is going to move ahead on the grid map and the draft map, and I don't want the public to not have this capability with very little time to do or submit anything to the Commission before all the draft maps are in.

My concern is once the Commission is at the draft map stage, we now, we now present the public with a presumption, a presumption that we have to overcome that they've always seen the direction the Commission is moving on and now they have to persuade us to move on off the
persuasion.

I know it's within the right of commissioners to make any changes we want to down the road, but it might seem a little more daunting to members of the public like right now we're working with a blank slate, the Commission hasn't tipped its hand or drawn any maps.

And, from the public perspective, I would think that they view the playing field as lopsided.

So it's a long way of saying, I think, we need to make the right decision, but we need to make it as quickly as possible.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I was going to ask, what do you propose?

I agree completely.

And to the extent -- you know, we're going to get to future meeting dates as part of this agenda, and it may be that we may need to by telephone or something to at least make some decisions at a meeting that this is coming up faster than maybe we had planned that we were going to before.

So, at least a telephonic one can be -- we can mobilize quickly if we need to.

So we look forward to getting the information from Mr. Strasma on these options, and then decide, maybe Friday, start to review that material that he gives us and proceed
accordingly.

And hopefully we can all review it quickly and decide what we want to do in our own minds and come together and discuss that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Am I under the impression from the rest of the commissioners that Maptitude was discussed at the prior hearing as the preferred online mapping service because of its relationship with, one, what's happen over the previous ten years and what we're using as our own mapping software?

And Azavea came in as an after discussion opportunity for cost savings and for knowledge of the general public was using that software?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: My recollection was that we talked about Maptitude for the desktop version. But I didn't think we necessarily talked about it for online mapping.

I could be incorrect with that, if you guys remember differently.

I know we have discussed the AZredistricting.com as another option out there, but I don't remember specifically covering Maptitude for online mapping.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, as everybody
knows, I'm a big fan of saving the taxpayers as much money as possible.

So the more quickly we can make the decision, the better the public is going to be if we actually give them drawing maps at their own time, their own discretion.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Agreed.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Let's table this -- do we need a motion to table this item until the next hearing?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Or we can agree to have it on our next agenda, this decision.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Move to the next agenda.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

So that -- any other comments?

Okay. And we are -- so, it's not specifically noticed on our agenda. We have public comment will be allowed regarding the options prior to the Commission's actions, but that's for agenda item four, and not three.

So I'm not sure how that -- we have a request legal counsel for a comment with regard to agenda item three.

And I am happy to entertain it, if we're allowed to.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, you have the discretion to take things not in the order listed.

And there is public comment at the end for any
matter, and so you can hear public comment on a specific agenda item now.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right. Great.

Then that said, I'd like to go ahead and ask David Cantelme from Fair Trust in Phoenix to come up and comment on agenda item three.

DAVID CANTELME: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Commission.

There is a fundamental principle in public procurement law that all bidders be treated equally.

In effect, what you have is a subsidy to Azavea, if I pronounce that correctly --

UNIDENTIFIED WOMAN: Could you spell that, Azavea?

DAVID CANTELME: I can't. I'm just repeating what I heard here.

As I understand it, there's three competitors, Azavea, Maptitude, and ESRI.

And the proposal for Azavea is that the Commission would take over its contract and thereby would enjoy a savings -- would only have to pay, as I heard it, $49,000, which is less, of course, than the other two bidders.

The problem with that is that in effect it is a subsidy by the Coalition to the Commission to purchase this particular software.

And while it's great to enjoy savings with public
dollars, to do that would mistreat Maptitude and ESRI unless
the same subsidy was extended to them so that they would be
placed on an equal footing.

Members of the Commission, you cannot favor one
public bidder over another.

You cannot extend one privilege to one public
bidder not enjoyed by the other, even if it would result in
a savings.

Because that would violate the fundamental
principle of equal footing and equal treatment.

Nor, members of the Commission, can you take into
consideration for purposes of your decision the fact that
certain portions of the public have been using that
particular software. And the reason for that,
commissioners, is that the two competitors were not allowed
the same access to the public.

As a result, you've got a privilege or favor being
enjoyed by one of the competitors, in my opinion, not
enjoyed by the other two. And you just can't do that.

Unless there's questions, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any other comments on agenda item three that
anyone would want to -- we'll need you to fill on a request
to speak form.

Oh, great, you did.
WENDY SCHOPS: I didn't specify agenda three because I didn't know the situation was going to come up.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Sure.

Let me -- can you tell me your name?

WENDY SCHOPS: Wendy Schops.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Wendy Schops, representing self, from Phoenix.

WENDY SCHOPS: Thank you.

I wanted to first say that Azavea's client is a far left progressive company, Arizona Competitive Districts Coalition.

And taking over a contract from a progressive liberal group is a corrupt and conflict of interest.

We want to know -- the public wants to know not only the bids that are coming in regarding these companies, but if any of these companies have any particular party affiliation.

I think the public also has a right to know when making that decision.

That's it for agenda three right now.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Ken Clark is raising his hand.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm sorry?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Ken Clark is raising his hand. I think he would like to speak.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, yes.

KEN CLARK: I didn't specify item three but --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. But you're in here as well?

KEN CLARK: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Ken Clark, Arizona Competitive Districts Coalition, from Phoenix, and let's talk on agenda item three as well.

KEN CLARK: Thank you, Madam Chair, commissioners.

There are a couple points that are somewhat alarming.

First, that somehow by turning over the rest of the contract that the Arizona Competitive Districts Coalition had with Azavea it's giving a preference. I don't understand how you can make that jump.

A preference in what?

We began a process, we developed this tool, and we are willing to turn it over for the cost that Azavea has decided on their own it would cost to move that tool over and upgrade it.

The fact that we were already doing this in the state and the fact that other people were using it is no
more an advantage to anybody else than if Maptitude had taken the time to look at our little state and come on over and pay attention to it.

Which clearly it did not.

The idea furthermore that we are some kind of far left progressive group, my co-chair Roberta Voss, a Republican, would contest that idea.

It's simply not true.

We had a mapping contest that just culminated the other day -- or yesterday, and we had the awards, and people were allowed to map with whatever they had in mind.

We obviously would like to see greater competition, but anybody can use this tool for any purpose.

And the beauty of it is that you have transparency and you can scrutinize anybody's maps that come forward.

It's simply not true.

Furthermore, one final point, in turning the software over to the Commission, whatever assumptions that we built into the software regarding what is a competitive district, what is a compact district, would then be redefined based on the assumptions the Commission wants to do.

So even if we were a bunch of Maoists, it wouldn't matter, or whatever we are in this political spectrum, because the Commission uses the neutral tool to redefine and
use the definitions that the Commission's going to use so that it matches.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Clark.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Commissioner Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, I'm not sure that the -- that we don't -- you know, I'm not familiar -- I've heard of the three mapping consultants. I guess, I never thought of the political leanings of these mapping tools, and I didn't take that into consideration, and I frankly don't care.

Whatever the best tool we can purchase and save the taxpayers' money, that's my priority.

If it happens to be Azavea -- did I pronounce the name correctly? -- then so be it.

So to me, it's -- is it the right tool and is it for the right price.

But I also want to make a recommendation. I know plenty of people that participated in the contest that Mr. Ken Clark was referring to, Republicans, Independents, Green Party, Libertarians.

And I think they got a wide range of people from different political views participating, and I would recommend that we consider the -- and I think there was a press conference yesterday where they announced the winners
or at least the top two. And for us to at least consider looking at their maps.

Because I think members of the public, they participated in a fair contest, and I recommend that we at a minimum as a Commission look at their maps as well.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

We have another -- sir, have you filled a request to speak form?

GENE DIEHL: Yes, I have.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And your name is?

GENE DIEHL: Gene Diehl.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Gene Diehl representing self, Sons of Liberty Riders from Maricopa County, on agenda item three.

GENE DIEHL: I'd like to state for the record that in the business world if this same type of transaction were attempted, it would be considered fraud and malfeasance. So to do it in the public forum with the public funding is bordering on the same thing.

Contempt? Yes.

Illegal? Yes.

They became an interested party when they signed a contract with that coalition.

So to, quote, use the excuse of savings for the public, they've already become a disinterest -- or, excuse
me, they've already become an interested party in these proceedings when they signed a contract with the other organization.

So to use that, quote, savings for the public, it's a misnomer at best.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, can we move forward from this conversation?

You know, we have an area for members of the public to speak, and I recommend that we keep going with our agenda.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, we will.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I think we have a long day ahead of us, and I prefer to do that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We will.

Ms. O'Grady.

MARY O'GRADY: I thought it might be appropriate for Joe and I to follow up in terms of whether this is a viable thing to even consider at this point in light of the concerns that have been expressed.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great.

Thank you. So you'll let us know whether that's even a viable option for us.

MARY O'GRADY: I think that makes sense.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Thank you.

Any other members of the public on agenda item three?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Hearing none and seeing none, we'll move on.

So we'll go back now, I think, to agenda item two, executive director report.

Mr. Ray Bladine.

RAY BLADINE: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I apologize for being late.

I would not want to accept responsibility myself.

I'm going to blame it on Christian Palmer, because he called me when I was driving into the garage and surprised me, and I couldn't remember where I parked my car. So I've been running around going like this trying to find my car for the last 20 minutes.

And I hate that, being the age I am, because it just confirms what people sometimes think.

I do sincerely apologize.

And I will now proceed with our report.

I just wanted to update everyone on public information requests.

We do, just so you all know, we do have daily
contact with the press asking for a document or a document or two. If we can provide those documents to them, we go ahead and just do that.

They are public documents. If they are available, we should make them available as soon as possible.

In terms of formal requests, the ones that I'm aware of that are currently outstanding is a request from Senator Andy Biggs about all documents related to the Strategic Telemetry contract.

We are in the process of pulling that together.

I met with Mary yesterday and saw a stack of data like this that we're still going through. And we're doing it as rapidly as we can.

But my instruction to staff has been that we've got to do these public hearings and then as quickly as possible provide the information.

So, in fact, we've had the staff from the -- from Mary's firm going through some of my e-mails, because I've been out of town so much that I haven't been able to do that.

The second one I'm aware of is Christian Palmer's request for procurement files and documents and all documents held by commissioners. And that's pretty much done, except for some very last information that we need to provide him in terms of commissioner notes.
But I did review the procurement file with him, and he made copies of the documents that he wished to have copies of.

Representative Terri Proud requested all of the documents that others requested, so as we're going through and getting the documents together, we are making a copy for her.

And then I would just tell historically there's been a number of requests.

If they're in writing, we try to send them out as a part of the packet that we were trained to do weekly of information that comes into the Commission.

As you know, recently we've gotten behind in that, and I apologize, because some of that information just hasn't gone out in terms of public information.

I'll start to make sure that if I have a written request, I'll pull it out and then forward it to you under separate cover.

So I guess in summary we have two requests we're really working on. One that's rather large. We're making progress.

I can't give you an estimate right now of when we'll have it done, but we are putting the resources that we can on that.

The second item, we have heard a lot of
information about what our budget is.

I thought I would correct it for the record.

We had $500,000 for last fiscal year.

And we're allowed to carry over the balance to this fiscal year, for which there was an appropriation of three million. So the total amount we have for the two years is three and a half million.

We've heard people claim that we have ten million. That's not true.

Looking at the documents that were submitted, the Department of Administration requested 10 million, but we didn't get 10 million.

Last year -- ten years ago there was an appropriation of about six million at this period of time, and that went up as there were lawsuits.

So if we have lawsuits, obviously our budget will go up.

But it looks like we're fairly comparable to what the other Commission was ten years ago in terms of appropriation.

And, again, that is three and a half million dollars.

First round public hearings.

As you probably all recall that when we brought the item of first round public hearings to you, we basically
said why don't you let us get started, set up these meetings.

We probably won't be able to achieve all the cities exactly as we laid out because of scheduling and other issues.

We also indicated that the schedule was open, and that if people would like to submit additional locations, they could do that, and we would try to accommodate.

Unfortunately, I missed a memo from Commissioner Freeman where he had laid out some very specific locations, and we did not add those to the first round hearings.

And I did correspond back to him to let him know that we would work those out with him as we could.

At this point, we're close to the end of the first round hearings.

I would tell you that from what I've seen I thought they had gone very well, except for an exception, particularly in Flagstaff this weekend, where I messed up in not confirming who would be there.

And I must say that the community was most gracious with us.

They proceeded with testimony. They gave us good information in terms of what they would like to see for mapping.
And it's certainly my impression from having talked to people involved ten years ago that the type and the quality of the information that we're getting at these hearings is much more useful than it was in the past.

That we are getting specific concerns of areas, like the Bullhead City area and Yuma area talking about a river district, specific discussions of how the Flagstaff area should look, and some Native American communities.

Does that mean we have all the information? Of course not.

If we want to add additional to round one, we could certainly do that, but I would not recommend that you hold off in continuing with your mapping until that's done.

There is a round two, and most of the professionals that I have talked with, which are two, would indicate the most important type of input is once you have a map up there.

And, in fact, when NDC's Doug Johnson was in town, we specifically asked him about that.

And his comment was the first round is good. It gets people's attention. It gets the Commission information.

The second round is really where you give people the opportunity to be specific.
So I would -- it's my recommendation would be that you could add additional areas in the second round that we missed.

However, that's your decision, your decision to make.

But I do believe that process we've gone upon has maximized the public input into the mapping process.

And I think that with the information that you have now, you probably all are starting to formulate your direction that you'll want to give the mapping consultant in terms of concepts that you would like to see them come back on.

So this week will end the hearings that we have scheduled for the first round.

There has been some concern that some meetings got shifted.

All of those were really the result of facility or date changes to accommodate areas.

For example, we thought that we would do Glendale as one of the first hearings.

They asked that we be held later because they were doing their own redistricting.

We had some contact with the Town of Eager. And at the time that we had the contact, they had a lot of issues related to the fire and did not think that was a good
time for us to come up there.

    I personally talked to the mayor and indicated we
would put her on the second schedule when I talked to her.
And she had called me because she wondered why we weren't
there, and I don't think realized that some of the Eager
staff had said, gee, right now we're tied up in the fire.

    So we've tried to accommodate other agencies as
best we can.

    Bullhead City, we went there instead of Havasu
because Havasu had a council meeting that week. Bullhead
City had a better facility.

    They indicated to us, and it proved to be true,
that Havasu, Bullhead City, and Kingman all work together.

    In fact, the three mayors were -- two mayors were
there, and representative from -- or a statement from the
Havasu, so we got very good input in that area.

    The facility was very good.

    They were able to broadcast it out and then do the
connections.

    I'd say the thing we have learned for round two is
that if we -- we now know some good locations to go where we
can have satellite activity.

    And we know some not to go to that the Internet
connections are just not good enough to make a link to make
it work.
I was in Winslow, and, again, I think we had about 15 people.

We really could not hear what was going on at the Hondah location.

Again, they were very nice.

I got there. We did get their input in, and that is recorded, but it was embarrassing to be there and not be able to know what's going on.

So I did apologize, and take -- give them all my business card and tell them if there is additional information you want us to know, we'll arrange to call and give testimony and we'll add it to the end of the record.

But, I guess what I would say is if we have to rely on Skype, it's not very reliable, because we don't know what connection speeds will be.

If we can work with agencies that have the connection, that should work well.

I did find out in Winslow there's a Northern Pioneer Community College, and they do have links, so perhaps when we go back in that area we can take a look at using that to link into some of the other facilities.

I think that pretty well covers that item.

Commission mapping training.

I think that whatever the map it is in, I think we're ready to provide that.
And if we contact either Ken, Andrew, they can set up time to train you on mapping. And so we're ready to start doing that activity.

Strategic Telemetry contract update.

I had questions about whether or not there should -- there could be additional changes to the contract to make clear that there's a division between Strategic Telemetry's work for us and not get confused with any political work that they might do.

Mary has drafted some language on that and some goals.

I will let her mention kind of the approach, but I would say that while you gave me authority to execute the contract, in talking to Mary I don't have authority to amend the contract.

So if you want to proceed that way, I can -- you can certainly authorize me to amend along the lines.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: It was authority to negotiate the contract, not execute.

RAY BLADINE: I went back and looked at the wording for both meetings, and the first meeting did say specifically that I did not need to bring it back to the Commission.

And my recollection when I listened to it, it also said I could execute.
The second meeting there was confusion about whether I had that authority.

But, what I heard was Mary say clearly I had authority to do it. Whether I wished to do it or not was up to me.

And there was then the discussion about having an opportunity to add some amendments to the contract.

I did not realize at the time that I didn't have authority to amend the contract, but I did have authority, I believe, with legal counsel support, that's when I executed the contract.

But I'd be happy to, you know, talk further about that if you'd like, or we can sit down and look.

I felt that I, I -- you had authorized me to go ahead and execute it, and that's what I did.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: For the record, my recollection was that we gave Mr. Bladine the authority to negotiate and execute the contract as well.

I remember that meeting clearly, so there's no confusion on my part.

My only question was regarding the amendment to the contract. I would like to get some more information on how this came about and what the amendment will say. That I
RAY BLADINE: Perhaps I can ask Mary to just talk about the concept she's thought about, as part of my report, since she can do it better.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure.

Ms. O'Grady.

MARY O'GRADY: Sure. We were following up on issues, I think, that Commissioner Freeman had raised at that earlier meeting. And what we're looking at is something that would make it clear that Strategic can't execute any, execute any contracts in Arizona, work on any projects in Arizona while they're working on redistricting. Was one aspect of it.

And also a documentation so that transparency in terms of speaking of any laws or contracts regarding this project, not necessarily staff contracts and Commission contracts, but any third party contracts, that those would be well documented.

And so, again, providing some transparency and accountability in terms of who all is contacting consultants, if anyone.

Sometimes I do think they do get some media calls that might be a handled.

I don't know if there have actually been others, but those are some of the issues that we were addressing.
Or the possibility like a screen, screen off this project from some of the other projects, which did not seem feasible really at all. Because we're dealing with a small business here.

And we want to get the expertise we need to get the project done right, that really wasn't feasible.

But, so we did explore the different things like that. And where we landed was the agreement of no additional contracts in Arizona and then the documentation process.

So that's what we're working on. We can put that on a future agenda.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: In the future I would like to know if -- and I respect Mr. Freeman and his input on the contract, but I think we as a Commission should -- if an individual commissioner has changes to the contract, we should all be notified before any -- before you enter into those changes with Strategic.

Because I don't mind the first two. The last one is unreasonable, considering it is a small firm.

I would hope in the future you bring this up before anybody goes to Strategic, because I think we should at a minimum know about what's going on.
This is the first time I've heard about it.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, Mr. Herrera, that third item I mentioned, that screen, was not something that I was proposing. It just didn't seem like it would work.

And the proposal was to put this on a future agenda so that to address your concern, yes.

If there are amendments, it comes back to the full Commission.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair, I made all my comments in public hearing. So perhaps Commissioner Herrera doesn't remember.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: No, I understand the comments you made.

I didn't know they were amendments. Two different things.

Because I made plenty of comments in public that weren't added to the, quote, part of the contract.

And my understanding is they were not amendments, they were just comments that you made.

So I apologize if I misunderstood them being amendments.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: They were requests for an agenda, future agenda item, to discuss modifications to the
contract with Strategic Telemetry, and I want a few of those proposals --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I apologize.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

So our -- that will be a future agenda item at our next meeting, that you'll be coming to us and providing those amendment proposal ideas to us.

Okay?

RAY BLADINE: The next item I had was just introduction of Stuart Robinson.

And I see Stu here. He's our new PIO, been on board two weeks.

STUART ROBINSON: Tomorrow.

RAY BLADINE: Tomorrow two weeks.

He's been baptized by fire coming in, and there's a lot going on.

He certainly has been a big help to me in helping getting statements drafted, providing information to the press. And I'm very glad that we have him.

He certainly is available to assist any of you also if there's some things that you'd like to have him address.

I told him he works for me and we work for you. So please use him as you feel is appropriate in terms of getting Commission information, information out.
And just to summarize, we've introduced people before who've sent resumes.

We have two other members of the staff that helped with the outreach and have done a very good job, Christy Olsen and Lisa Schmelling.

And both of them are also right now doing the logging of all these public documents that you're going to be getting copies of.

I think they're going to be doing a good job.

Earlier we had indicated that Anna Garcia is our executive assistant. And she was very helpful in getting translations of documents in a quick period of time and also arranging for the translators.

So we have a couple more positions we could fill up.

We probably will start to do that as we move towards the second phase of hearings and as we get more data that we need to get organized and submitted.

And that is probably -- recent events, we are trying to keep up with all of you as you travel the state, and make sure the facilities are set up, and people are there, and that security is provided. And we will continue to do that, and look forward to when we can get down to the mapping activity.

If there's any questions, I would be glad to try
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, I commend the staff on the excellent job they've done with the first round of hearings.

I think they did a really good job around the state, including areas that through streaming I've enjoyed attending a good number them and listening to some of them as I said on the streaming and encourage the public to keep attending.

I enjoy the comments about the -- been hearing a lot of about competitiveness and how important it is to the state.

And I agree with that, and I hope I keep hearing comments like that. Because it is -- that's exactly what we want to hear that will help us to be able to put together those maps.

Thank you to the staff.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Other comments? Questions?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Bladine, in regards to the budget appropriation and the correct information, you
had said that we -- we obviously spent some money in the
last fiscal year, so the 500,000 did not carry over?

RAY BLADINE: The balance carried over, about
400,000.

I think we spent 900 -- or spent 100,000 and about
900,000 carried over.

It was in that last budget report I presented, and
I don't remember it exactly but...

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: What is your anticipation of
when you'll be providing us an ongoing budget, ongoing cost
report? Where's our -- you know, what our expenditures are
so we can -- ourselves and the public can know how much is
being spent on an ongoing basis?

RAY BLADINE: As I mentioned to you several months
ago when we talked about the budget, I would try to do that
on a monthly basis as we get the expenditures in through the
state system, then update the expenditures against what we
budgeted, and kind of see where we are so we can monitor it,
because it is clear as we move forward there's a lot of
things that are going to be different in terms of the cost
than we thought.

Translations is probably a lot more than I
originally had thought they might be.

Meeting locations might be a little less, because
we've gotten a lot of service from other parts of the
But certainly I understand you want to monitor and manage the budget as I do.

So we'll try to, once we get the data from the state, provide an updated monthly where are we and against what we budgeted, and recommend any changes that we might see that need to be made.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So when are we going to see the numbers?

RAY BLADINE: As soon as I get the numbers from the state of Arizona. And I don't have any idea honestly when I will see those.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: When will we know when you're going to know?

RAY BLADINE: When --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I hate to be -- Mr. Bladine, I just -- all I'm trying to do is try to get a handle on where we are currently and where you anticipate this being.

I know that you just had a large amount of expenditures over the last four weeks.

The selection of the mapping consultant, you had a retainer check that you had to issue to them.

We've have staff increases. I understand that.

We've had moneys that have gone out to the legal counsel.
We've had money going out all over the state to different locations and different uses, and I understand all that.

So I'm just trying to be able to know when we're going to -- is it 30 days, 60 days?

RAY BLADINE: I will certainly find out how long it takes for the state expenditures to come through the system in a day or two.

I'm used to a system where monthly expenditures are -- may be available two weeks to 10 days after the end of the close of the month, which closed, what, two days ago.

I would think once I get that it won't take me very long to go through it and prepare a report for you.

I'm going to guess that we'll probably be about three weeks behind the close of the month before I'll have that information, but I will certainly get a better time estimate once I can talk to our financial people at the State Board's Office.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So the best case, the best case as you know it now, that would be in the third week of the month following the expenditure month.

RAY BLADINE: That would --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: We should anticipate seeing where we, where we were historically, and at that same time that you will be providing us a budget on a going forward
RAY BLADINE: Right. My plan would be looking at the expenditures against what I had previously estimated, change those expenditures based upon what we now know and what we can see coming up in the future.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay. Perfect. Let's go to the next line item, which is public hearings.

Again, I'm going to echo Mr. Herrera's comments. I think that the public hearings for a new group of individuals coming together with new technology was pretty exceptional, with very few hiccups. And I think that your corrective measures that you're taking are appropriate.

I did have a question about the level of security that we are having.

There were -- in Tucson, in south Tucson yesterday, we had five officers inside the, inside the room with us. And I'm trying to find out, one, whether or not -- if that's an anticipation that you expect to have that much security.

And I will want to ask the question if there is anything that has come about that has led you to believe that there is a security problem at any of these outreach meetings.

RAY BLADINE: My comment would be that we have had
contact with the Department of Safety about the fact that there has been some verbal and other possible threats against members of the Commission.

They haven't necessarily been in a public meeting.

And for that reason we talked to them.

They have put us on whatever they call their watch to notify local agencies that they should be aware if we're holding meetings there and when.

We have had a policy, as the last Commission did, at least the last staff did, and I guess Commission supported it, of each area having at least one uniformed officer.

In some cases we have paid for the uniformed officer. In other cases the agency has provided it because they thought it was in the public interest and public safety to do that.

So I guess last time they had security at all the meetings.

We are also doing that at this time. The amount of security pretty much depends on what the local area thinks is appropriate.

And I don't know this for sure, but I'm assuming that's in consultation with the Department of Public Safety.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And, Mr. Bladine, who's making -- first of all, I have not been made aware as a
commissioner as I've been attending these meetings that there have been any of these issues that you've talked about.

And if I'm at one of these hearings and I'm unaware, why -- the question to me would be why am I not being made aware?

RAY BLADINE: As I mentioned a minute ago, that we really have not had a problem in the meetings.

What I have had is concern that individual commissioners have had activity that could be called intimidating and also threatening.

And certainly if any one of you were to call me and tell me that, I would pass it on to the Department of Public Safety and would take action to make sure that there's nothing more than talk.

And if it were happening in this room, certainly we'd all know about it and could talk about it.

I've only seen one instance where I thought perhaps we were getting to a point an officer would be needed at the meetings I attended. That was in south Phoenix where a threat was yelled across the room.

But the individual left, and so there was no need for a police action.

But, I think we all are familiar with the kind of rhetoric and the kind of comments that have been made in the
public meetings.

    Certainly there's a right of free speech, and we're not talking about doing anything to dissuade that.

    But I think it's incumbent upon me when approached by a commissioner with safety concerns to make sure that's passed on to the appropriate authorities. And that's what I did.

    I am not sure whether or not it's my responsibility, but you can correct me if I'm wrong, to pass that on to all of you.

    I guess I could at least tell you that there's -- like I am now, there has been a concern.

    But I think that's something that I would think the individual commissioners could make a decision about whether or not they want to talk about that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

    In regard to the second round schedule, where are we in the development of the schedule and the locations?

RAY BLADINE: At this point the only thing we have is the last schedule we provided to you when we did the first phase.

    As soon as we finish these rounds of hearings, we'll start again to set those up.

    We will bring a memo back to you.

    I think what we told you last time is that we
I would probably go back to the same locations but add some that we missed.

I certainly welcome any specific directions in that area that you would like to give us.

I would hope that next week we would be able to start again, because the hearings will be concluded.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, on that point, that is not an agenda item.

We would have to put the second round meetings on a future agenda item.

RAY BLADINE: Thank you. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Go to D, the Commission mapping training.

You had mentioned that there was going to be training to be coordinated. Is this to be coordinated between the individual commissioners and a member of Strategic Telemetry?

RAY BLADINE: That's my understanding, that they're willing to work with your schedules do the training. Perhaps I could ask Mr. Strasma to tell us what he's able to do in that regard.

KENNETH STRASMA: Yes.

As I believe I mentioned at the last meeting, we want to schedule it at the commissioners' convenience.

That could be either through the end of this first
round of hearings.

Andrew will be up here starting tomorrow, coming to the hearings, and if you want to set up with something with him.

Otherwise, you know, at some future date, perhaps around the next Commission hearing.

Just contact us directly, and we'll set up something at your convenience.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

I think this is a relevant item, but, Ms. O'Grady, you can correct me if I'm wrong, because this was specifically on this, to be trained, we'd have to have the software and computers?

Can I ask the question if we have the software and computers?

MARY O'GRADY: I think that's fair game.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you. I appreciate that.

RAY BLADINE: I believe we now have the software. I know at least in my office I saw yesterday there were two maps.

So I'm assuming you also have -- and I believe we have the computers.

We may have to switch them around, because I think some of the ones we were planning to have for the
commissioners we used as part of the outreach program.

    But we will have -- we may be off one, and we'll get that taken care of, so we will have the computers and the software in. So you can start any time you want.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Bladine, again, when will the software and hardware be available to the Commissioners so that we can adequately have it to make sure that we're not scheduling a time with Mr. Strasma's staff that will not be effective?

    RAY BLADINE: I would think that we could do -- if the Commission wanted to do it after this meeting and before -- between the other meeting, we have the software, we have the computer. If you want to do it tomorrow, we could do it tomorrow. It's just a matter getting it set up.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay. So you are saying that we do have the software and we are -- you are able to deliver it to other us immediately.

    RAY BLADINE: Yes, correct.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Got it.

    RAY BLADINE: That was the question.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

Strategic Telemetry contract update.

    As you look at the schedule of deliverables as was included as part of the contract, what is your opinion of
where we stand currently as far the original contract as
scheduled, the deliverables that were to be included, and
the status of the Strategic Telemetry deliverables on
schedule?

RAY BLADINE: I know that I got a revised schedule
two days ago, and I haven't really had a chance to look at it.

The last one I looked at, we are pretty much on schedule to what we had talked about and you approved.

In terms of the deliverables, they had certainly been very responsive to get all of the materials that we
needed for first round public hearings available. That's all done.

They have certainly met their requirements in terms of being at the hearings and providing the input.

So at this point I'm not aware of anything that was in their contract at this time that has not been
delivered on schedule.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Well, in regards to some specific things that are in their schedule or in their
contract that were not tied to the schedule, the social networking and outreach, what is the status of the
implementation of that?

I know that our Facebook page was implemented by someone not on the Redistricting Commission team or
employee. It was someone from the general public that
actually opened up the -- an account and actually did some
responding and some dialoguing with the general public that
appeared to be on behalf of the Commission.

I was under the understanding that that was
something that Strategic Telemetry would be posting,
managing, and implementing based on their contract.

RAY BLADINE: I'm sorry, I didn't -- that's not
the way I saw it.

I saw them being assisting us.

And Stuart Robinson, our PIO, has started a
Twitter page for us and has taken control of the Facebook
text.

And my understanding or memory of the contract was
that they would interface with us and help us get that
accomplished, but that it would be the responsibility of the
staff and the PIO to do that.

If I'm wrong, we can correct it, but that's what I
recall.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: You're going to want to take
a look at the contract, because it was not an assistance of.
It was an implementation of.

RAY BLADINE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So I would suggest that you
start -- that we start drilling down.
And if it's convenient for you, I can certainly assist you in pointing out some of the things to make sure we are staying on track with some of those items.

RAY BLADINE: All right. Glad to accept that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: In regards to the PIO introduction, welcome, Stuart.

Could you give us an idea, Mr. Bladine, of what your public information officer's job description is, what he's going to be doing, and how he's going to be operating the public?

RAY BLADINE: I didn't bring the job description that I sent to you before, so I'll have to do it --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm doing this for the benefit of the general public --

RAY BLADINE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: -- that wasn't privy to our e-mail.

RAY BLADINE: All right. Thank you.

Basically to help us coordinate public hearings, get press releases out, public information, bulletins out about the hearing schedule activities of the Commission, draft letters or statements that we might need pertaining to Commission work.

Right now he's been helping me get a letter of apology to the city of Flagstaff and northern Arizona.
So that's what we're doing.

As I mentioned, he did launch the Twitter page. I see him being very much involved in the Facebook, Twitter kind of activity.

He's worked to handle the press release types of inquiries that we would get, like we did get on the original schedule we sent out.

Then we had a lot of follow-up calls from local newspapers and media about, okay, what's going on in our area.

He's been helping with that and will continue to do that.

He's been updating our media contact list so that we'll be able to notify all of the appropriate media about where we'll be.

And just in general being available also to the Commission, the Commission chairman, to get ideas you may have about getting public information out.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Bladine, in regards to that last statement, I'm not exactly sure, is that something that when you want to get -- when a commissioner would want to get a piece of information out, we should deliver that to you, which we would be -- or we deliver that to Stuart?

RAY BLADINE: Frankly we could do it either way, because if you got it directly to Stuart, he would let me
know.

And if I for some reason saw there was a problem, I could get back to you.

If you wish to come through me, that's certainly fine. But I'm also okay if you want to make direct contact with him and to suggest things.

Because I think he needs to know what all of you are concerned about.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Terrific. Thank you.

Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other comments and questions on the executive director report from other commissioners?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I just want to follow up on a couple of Commissioner Stertz's questions.

You mentioned the equipment that has been installed now.

Did that include the printers and the plotters? Do we have them now?

RAY BLADINE: No, we do not have -- in fact, we're going to need to upgrade our copier. It's pretty obvious that giving the scanning we're doing that that machine is not the right size.

And we still do need to get some office equipment
as it will be related to supporting the mapping function.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay. I believe part of the proposal was that they would have high speed color printers and a color plotter capable of producing wall-size printouts of maps as needed. That's still something that needs to be done?

RAY BLADINE: I'm sorry, Commissioner Freeman, are you saying that's in the contract with --

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I believe that's in the proposal, yeah.

RAY BLADINE: Okay.

We have not installed that in our office.

Maybe Ken would like to talk about it.

But we do -- we have a plan that was in our original equipment that we would need a plotter, but we haven't coordinated with what they may provide and what we need to purchase.

So maybe Mr. Strasma could comment on that a little more.

KENNETH STRASMA: If I may, commissioner.

Reference in our proposal is the plotter that we have in our offices, we will be producing wall-size maps as requested.

I imagine the volume will call at some point for the Commission staff to want to have their own plotter.
We will also be procuring a high speed color printer for our work space in the Arizona office separate from the Commission's and shipping one of our high speed scanners.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

One other question on the social media issue that Commissioner Stertz mentioned.

I believe the proposal called for Strategic Telemetry to solicit input that would employ a process, an automated process to gather data from social media sites like Facebook and Twitter, and basically collect public input that way and then catalog it and make it a part of our record.

Is that taking place?

RAY BLADINE: To my knowledge, that hasn't been started yet, unless -- Ken, do you want to comment?

KENNETH STRASMA: If I may, we have begun the web scraping process specifically on Twitter.

We are working with the Commission staff and the legal team about how public comment is going to be documented and catalogued.

We've submitted to the company Catalyst that will be maintaining the legal database a sample of the first web scrapes from Twitter referencing AIRC or Arizona redistricting to go through the testing process of loading
And there is a meeting scheduled Friday for our staff and Commission staff on how that will be accessed and coded. So that is in the process.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Questions and comments?
Are you finished, Mr. Freeman?
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I was just checking.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No, go ahead.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I think that's all I have.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

RAY BLADINE: I'm going to have to budget more time.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah. Well, we haven't had a meeting since July 8th. There's been a lot going on.
I had a few comments.
The update on the status of public records request.
I do think that whenever one of those comes in, that letter or e-mail or however it comes in should be sent out to all commissioners, because I actually learned about one online just on the Internet.
I didn't know we had had it.
So it would be helpful for all commissioners to be
aware of that as soon as it comes in.

The first round public hearings, I also wanted to extend my gratitude to the staff, to counsel, to the commissioners, to our mapping consultant, and everyone who helped host those meetings and is hosting. They're continuing. This first round isn't over yet. And they've been phenomenal.

It's been the funnest part of this whole Commission frankly is to go out and hear directly from the communities that we're visiting.

And I wish we could visit every town frankly, because -- I know that's not practical, and I am sure you're ready to fall over, but the press coverage has been great. I thank the press for covering that information.

It's really been good. And I look forward to more.

And frankly I'd be happy to add some more.

I know that Mr. Freeman and maybe other commissioners too have suggested some other hearings. And if we can make that happen, and yet still not, you know, sacrifice deadlines with our mapping process, I'd really like to do it.

So to the extent we can add any more.

I know that Mr. Freeman and I were in Pinetop, and in a location Scott mentioned as an area like the Payson
area was one that people felt like there was a void.

And if there are any other places, regions that we missed during this first round so far, if we could add those and make it happen, I'd like to do it.

I know it's a big push for everybody. But if we can do it, I'd like to.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: You know, I -- as I mentioned in my comments about the public hearings, they're going well, and I think we've done a pretty good job of spreading them out.

I am waiting for the second round.

The only thing I caution is adding more.

We've had a couple of them where there was only one commissioner. And/or sometimes one commissioner by Skype because we actually forgot.

I -- and also for the staff, I worry about the staff.

I think we -- I don't want to overburden them.

So if we're going to start adding other locations, then we also need to allow them to hire as many staff as they need with us, maybe get involved in terms of the hiring and slowing that down.

So if we're going to do that, I want to -- I care
about the staff.

I think we have a good set of people, including our attorneys. And I want to make sure we keep them around. And I am going to be a champion for the staff as well, so I want to make sure that we respect their time because they do have lives.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I appreciate that.

I mean, a lot of commissioners have families and/or jobs, so it's definitely a push. But I do think that to the extent it's possible -- and I don't want to go overboard. You can't, you know, just continue first round hearings until November or anything, but just if there were a way to add a voice --

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, I would say, again, put that as an agenda item on further hearings.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

MARY O'GRADY: And you might want to -- at some point another item we'll be summarizing the input from prior hearings and see where it stands. But that's a future agenda item specifically --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: But this says first round public hearing updated status.

And it seems like what I'm proposing the additional first round public hearings, that's part of it.

MARY O'GRADY: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Not to overrule the legal counsel, but I'm just trying to clarify.

So were there spots, Mr. Freeman, that you had specifically thought we should go to?

Or Ms. McNulty or Mr. Stertz?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Let me find my e-mail.

I proposed, I believe, at the last hearing, and subsequently to e-mails to Mr. Bladine, that we cover again the southeast valley with a hearing so we could make sure to cover the Chandler, Gilbert, Queen Creek area.

The west valley probably in my mind deserved another hearing. That would be the Surprise, Avondale, Litchfield Park area.

Perhaps Oro Valley and Marana, we've already heard lots of comments from them. And I know we've had a Commission hearing in Oro Valley, but it was not a Commission hearing focused on the intake of public comment for mapping purposes and it did not include the presentation by the mapping consultant.

Those areas of the state to me seem like they're interesting areas because they're areas of growth coupled with -- where growth intersects political, tribal, and geographic boundaries.

So there's lots of -- and no doubt the communities of interest that people in those areas would ask you to
respect.

So there's some areas.

And then I know from -- I know we had Bisbee on our schedule, but it got dropped, and I did not know why it got dropped.

I know there might be a very good reason or if we were told they couldn't accommodate us or forget it because no one's going to show, but maybe if I knew the reason I would understand that.

And I know when we were at Hondah, we heard some comments about how Payson and Globe and Safford, so Gila County and Greenlee County or Graham County, didn't have a stop.

And those don't have to be -- obviously some of those could be covered by satellite intakes if appropriate.

But those are some of my thoughts on where we could cover the first round.

I agree that the second round is a very interesting round in that there's going to be a map proposed presumably.

But, like, going back to my comments I made earlier, maybe that is -- I don't think that necessarily solves the problem.

Because there's a map already, and now the public has to confront that map, whereas right now it's a clean
slate.

So I was interested in maybe hitting those areas in the first round as well as the second round.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Thoughts on those, any of those locations from other commissioners?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, this was identified as a report from the executive director for an update.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

MARY O'GRADY: But I do have concern about -- I mean, I think it's fair to -- I think for the commissioner to comment on the report, but not debate the issue of additional public hearings.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

MARY O'GRADY: Because that should have been then noticed so that people can show up and express their views on that issue.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So we can't talk about adding additional hearings at this time.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, the staff has the input that it's received, and I think if there's going to be further discussion, there needs to be a further agenda item so the public has notice.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

The next item I wanted to comment on was the PIO
introduction and staff update.

I think we're all very interested in the social media aspect of Strategic Telemetry’s proposal.

And I think it would make sense, Mr. Bladine, to have Stuart work with Strategic Telemetry on that particular aspect, since he's already starting some of that social media work, and it would make sense to have the interface be there, if you agree.

I think that's it.

Any other questions or comments on the executive director report?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Bladine.

What time are we?

Okay. Could we take a five-minute recess?

It's 2:53, so we'll be back in five minutes.

Thank you.

(Brief recess taken.)

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

The time is 3:04 p.m.

The next item on the agenda is agenda item four, Strategic Telemetry mapping presentation on possible grid map processes and options, discussion, and possible
Commission direction to the consultant. Public comment will be allowed regarding the options prior to Commission actions.

So if I could ask Mr. Strasma to go ahead and tell us about his grid map processes.

KENNETH STRASMA: Okay. Thank you, Madam Chair.

As the Commission knows, Proposition 106 specified that the mapping process begin with a grid-like map, which is our next step on the time line is to create that map.

And I wanted to ask, today, ask for direction from the Commission on the process that we should follow.

I thought it would be worthwhile to give some background on how the grid process was done last time around. And to present a few options that we have looked at, although there are no doubt infinite options, and the commissioners may have other suggestions or provide other direction.

If the Commission is able to see the screen, the grid process.

One of the things that I think would be useful to see -- if we can get the next slide.

This is a slide of the grid map that was used in the last process.

And I think it's useful to see it for two key
takeaways.

One, to the uninitiated, your first reaction might be, well, that's not a grid.

And of course the problem is the population in the state, with more than a half the population in Maricopa County, doesn't lend itself to be a perfectly square grid.

So this was the starting point for the last Commission's process.

If you can see the next slide, you'll see the great difference between that starting point and the first draft map that was published for comment by the last Commission.

And then next, in the next slide we see the final adopted map, 2002.

So as you can see from there, the final map, although this started with the grid map, did end up fairly different from the initial grid. And the initial grid is not, you know, despite anyone's best efforts, going to look exactly like a chessboard.

I would like to walk through a few different options for how we could go about drawing this grid map, flag a few issues that the commissioners wish to weigh in on, and then just seek your guidance.

I brought up at the last, at the last meeting the process that we had in mind, which is what we're calling
using a literal grid, where we take the latitude and
longitude, divide the state for the congressional district
into thirds, so there's three across and three up and down.

And basically drop that -- commissioners drop the
tic tac toe board on top of the state.

See the next slide.

And the next, starting with the state and counties
there.

And the next.

So this is the literal grid applied to the state.

Now, Arizona's geographic features don't follow
nice, neat, straight lines.

So even when, you know, we're able to use the
mapping software to assign all the census blocks that are
within each of these green cells on the literal grid, and we
just cycle through that and show the process that we went
through, as you can see it's not a perfect square, but
that's any blocks that were intersecting the green lines,
and then went through repeating the process for all nine,
nine districts.

So that's a fairly straightforward process that
does give us nine very close to grid-like districts.

Now, of course the problem is that is not going to
be -- meet equal population.

The grid map goals are to be as compact and
contiguous as possible and meet the equal population

requirements.

And they will not meet any of the other criteria

specified in the constitution.

That's what happens in the adjustment process.

If we could have the next slide.

This is a slide that is shaded by population.

The green grid cells are the ones that are

overpopulated. The red ones are underpopulated. The darker

red, the greater the underpopulation.

And so as you can see there, you know, 3.3 million

in the central grid and very underpopulated cells at the

top.

We stop at this point.

I did not want to go too far down the line on any

one of these processes without getting input from the

Commission.

We would have to follow a process to adjust the

population for these.

What I recommended at the last meeting was that we

follow a geographic hierarchy, where we make adjustments

starting first with whole counties where possible, then

county subdivisions, census tract, census block groups, and

finally census blocks, using first the largest pieces of

population possible, working on down, that we where possible
make the cells square, that is to say if we need to add or subtract from a cell that is higher than it is wide, we attempt to, you know, make it shorter. If it's wider, then attempt to make it more narrow.

One of the questions that I present to the Commission is also the order in which we do the adjustments. This map here could be adjusted either starting at one of the extremes of the state and adding population until getting to the ideal, the 71,224, for congressional districts, or to be adjusted starting at the center and shedding population.

It's not -- although my goal is to have this be a purely political and technical exercise that we can get to quickly to get to some of the more difficult aspects of this process, there are implications to the approach taken.

And one of the things that has come up very often in the public hearings is the question of the number of districts on the northern and southern borders.

And as we'll address when I walk through the process that the previous Commission took, I believe, I don't speak for them, that that was one of the reasons for the quadrant approach that was taken by the previous Commission.

I would suggest that if there is concern about a process leading to a single northern or single southern
district, that that would be part of the process that the
Commission specified.

We could, for example, say that no adjustments
would result in there being fewer than two districts for the
northern and southern quarters.

Although I remind you again of the difference
between the initial grid and the first draft map that, you
know, there is great difference between those two.

So except perhaps for perception's sake, the
initial grid doesn't lock anyone to anything.

If we could see the next slide.

And this is just showing the same process as it
would apply to legislative districts.

And the malapportionment in terms of population is
even more extreme.

Next.

On the legislative level you can see again the
overpopulated is green.

And we propose following of the same adjustment
process, starting with the largest units of geography,
counties, county subdivisions, census tracts, census block
groups, and finally census blocks.

Next, please.

Is that the last one there?

BUCK FORST That's the last one, yeah.
KENNETH STRASMA: Okay.

I apologize. I apparently saved the wrong draft of this. There is another slide, but I will describe it for you and walk you through the process that was taken last time.

Where rather than having the tic tac toe board approach, the state is divided into quadrants, starting at the Gila and Salt River meridian. Basically the southwest center of the state. Divided the state into four quadrants. And then began building the districts using much the same process I described, starting with the largest blocks of geography, and moving smaller in a spiral shape pattern, starting in one of the quadrants, moving clockwise out from the center of the state.

One other variation on that that I believe would be viable would be if instead of starting at that center point, we were to start at one of the four corners of the state.

I would suggest in the spirit of making sure that there's not any kind of perception that the starting point is leading to any desired outcome, that some element of randomness could be produced.

If the Commission is comfortable with one of these different approaches and different perspectives to do that, then perhaps at the end of the day the Commission could draw
lots for the direction on starting point, direction that we move around the state, aspects like that, would introduce some level of randomness.

And with that, I would be glad to answer any questions and solicit any direction.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ken, I can't read the map very well from here, so I was just curious, the red and -- what do the other colors mean?

KENNETH STRASMA: Right. This is the population deviation from the 213,000 ideal population for a legislative district.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Uh-hmm.

KENNETH STRASMA: And basically what it's showing us is that the green legislative districts there are the ones that are very overpopulated. Anything in red is underpopulated.

And that is, you know, basically as we know the concentration of the state's large two urban areas, at least of those four areas overpopulated districts that have to be adjusted and made smaller to move the population out to any of the other districts that are showing red currently.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Other questions for Ken on these different alternatives?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I'm in favor of something random, to give choices, and it would be nice for us to either randomly select a random choice -- does that make sense?

And for us to go -- to move forward with the process.

I know we have a deadline, a time line, that we need to help you meet, so if it's something random, hopefully that would be noncontentious and we can move forward.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other thoughts?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm not exactly sure what a random starting point means.

You've got -- what we're required to do right now is to craft 30 equal population districts in the state from -- and pick from a starting point.

Is your goal today for us to give you a starting quadrant to begin from to work out from?

KENNETH STRASMA: That and a process, commissioner, that -- I've outlined three different possible approaches, and any one of which I think would work well. And I'm certainly open to any other processes.
But if the Commission can direct the process -- and then my suggestion as to the element of randomness was so that, you know, the process itself doesn't dictate the end result.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So, for example, if you chose the densest -- smallest densest area in the center of Phoenix as your starting point, and crafted a 712 --

KENNETH STRASMA: 712,000.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: 712,000. Thank you. You rephrased that, 712,224 -- that as your starting point, and then worked out, how would you see that -- in that scenario, how would you see that?

KENNETH STRASMA: There I guess I would say the element of randomness would be the starting point.

Whether you direct us to start in the center of the overpopulated district or to start from the least populated district.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: If you started in the center of the most populated district, for example, and worked your way out in equal distance in a grid from that location, that would create your center square on your scrabble board to be able to work from.

And then you'd build your blocks off of that.

Is that correct?

KENNETH STRASMA: Correct.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And would you recommend following a similar pattern for legislative districts as well? Would you approach both legislative and congressional districts in the same way?

KENNETH STRASMA: I guess that would be my recommendation.

There is -- there's no reason they couldn't be done in different procedures, but I also don't see any reason to do them differently.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

KENNETH STRASMA: And if I can elaborate also on the question of randomness starting out on the center-most compact.

If the Commission wished, another element of randomness would be the direction from there. If we go from the initial square, do we start above it, diagonally above it, at 1:00 o'clock, 3:00 o'clock, etc.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And that is how the last Commission did it; right? Where they flipped a coin and it determined which direction to move once they had picked a starting point?

KENNETH STRASMA: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: What are thoughts on how the last Commission did it? Did people review that at all or have feelings?
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The reason I brought this up to Mr. Strasma at our last meeting is the way the language is written in the constitution.

The constitutional language shows that after we create a grid-like pattern, proper future adjustments to the grid shall be made as necessary to accommodate the goals set forth below, which is the six criteria.

Therefore the level of randomness is paramount because it could lead to, could lead to, by where the starting point comes, it could lead to which direction that you could actually want to grow or adjust these lines.

How do we show to the general public that this, this process is as absolutely clear and participatory and transparent as possible in the creation of the grid which will then be adjusted?

And how do we track these adjustments on an ongoing basis as they're being made?

KENNETH STRASMA: In taking your second question first, how they are tracked, we can take, you know, as I've described before, snapshots of the adjustment process at every step along the way.

So if the Commission wants to see, you know, this is just District 1 adjustments, and then along the way, as
those adjustments are made, we will save all of that.

And then in terms of assuring the public about the openness and transparency of it, I believe that this discussion is going a long way towards that.

And that rather than our coming and presenting a grid map and saying here is the grid, will you approve it, soliciting direction from the Commission allows the public to see and also on the agenda there there is a public input on this question now as well, and I believe those are both valuable steps.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Perfect.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Is Mr. Stertz proposing a starting point?

Because I'm open.

I think the grid map is a starting point that as you can tell by the grid map previously in and what they ended up, it was nothing what they -- how they started with.

So I'm very comfortable with us having a grid map and not debating it, because it is a starting point and then we'll have plenty of time for us to discuss where we move the lines once we come up with the grid map.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Before I make a recommendation or to move on a particular direction, I would
like to hear from the rest of the Commission.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other commissioners.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Sure. I'll make a comment.

My understanding is that the purpose of the grid map is really to make clear that we're starting over, that we're not taking the existing districts and moving them around. We're wiping the slate clean, and we're starting over.

And for want of a better place to start over, we're starting over with 9 and 30 boxes, won't be square boxes, but 9 and 30 sections of the equal population.

And so what we need to do right now is create that map of 9 and 30 sections of equal population.

And once you do that, in whatever procedure we direct you to do it, you're going to bring it back to us and then we, the five of us, are going to make every single change to that map until we get to the final map.

So it isn't as if that map has any significance other than starting over.

That's my perspective on it.

Once it comes back to us, whatever it looks like, we're all going to work with that in what I'm sure will be some, you know, very detailed and probably difficult before we've done processes to get to the final map. But the grid map in and of itself decides virtually nothing.
So, I would be open to a process as long as it is, in fact, objective and clinical.

And I like the idea of randomness. I think that's fair.

You know, whether we put center, northeast, west, south, in a hat, and we pull those out, and that's our first, you know, direction, that's what we're going to either start in the center or start in a corner or, I don't know, maybe we could start in all corners.

And then the second hat we pull out which direction we move in, from whichever hat we first started with.

I'd be comfortable with something like that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Yeah, I think it's a matter of picking the starting point where you start from and apply the algorithm.

We could easily assign values to each one of the grids, and with a pocket calculator generate randomly the values on what the starting point would be.

I think our agenda allows for some public comment on that before we make a decision, so I think we should do that before we commit to any process.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Any other thoughts?
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: One quick thought.

Commissioner McNulty in her point about where we're starting from.

This is a -- just as a clarification, this is a constitutional requirement that a grid map be crafted. So a grid map has to be crafted before we can move on to the next step.

As a clarification to the public, it's in Section 14 of Proposition 106 that a grid map is the starting point.

Even though if it may not appear to have a relevance on the end product, it is -- the public, when they voted on this constitutional change, said this was a good idea to do.

And I think Commissioner McNulty is absolutely correct. It was the concept of us not adjusting existing lines, but wiping the state clean and starting over again.

We're one of the very few states that actually operates this way.

And it's unique, and that's why this grid map component is included in the constitution, for us to be able to move it forward from a clean slate.

So from that point, I'll turn it back to you, and the public can share its comments.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Just keeping mind we have a meeting tonight.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And I do want to make sure we give Mr. Strasma the information he needs in terms of our direction and in terms of putting a grid map for us, for us to look at, hopefully by next week.

So I want to make sure that we keep that in mind that we're between an hour or less before we are have to move on to Glendale.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

So, there is provision on the agenda to have public comment on this particular agenda item.

And if any of you have any thoughts or comments, and would like to address the Commission, please feel free to come to the podium.

And if you haven't filled out a request to speak form, I'd ask you to do that.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: For clarification, it's regarding the grid map, the grid map only.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right. Agenda item four.

Let me see.

Mr. Bengtson, representing self. And you'll have
to tell us which county you're from and if you could also
spell your name for the record.

    PETER BENGTSON: Yeah, it's Peter Bengtson,
B-E-N-G-T-S-O-N.

    I live in Pima County, Legislative District 26.
    I'm just kind of real intrigued with this process
when I saw the map of how they did it last time, and think
of the population in Arizona.

    I'm not sure it's going to come out looking all
that much different.

    But I guess my suggestion would be if last time
they started in the center, and worked out, I would suggest
you start in a corner and then work in and see how it works
out.

    That seems to be the best way to show an
independent way of doing it.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.
Other comments from other members of the public?

    Mrs. Schops?

    WENDY SCHOPS: Schops, yes.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Schops. Thank you.
Representing self, from Phoenix.

    If you could spell your name, too.

    WENDY SCHOPS: Yeah. My last name is spelled
S-C-H-O-P-S.
I've been to four of the other meetings, and part of this section on the agenda today I just have some questions about.

There's words there, use of communities of interest.

And when we're talking about defining this map and how we're going to go about drawing the lines on it, I wanted Ken Strasma from Strategic Telemetry to define what is the definition of a community of interest.

I haven't found anything out there where these terms are defined for us to make these decisions on.

And for him to define what is the transportation corridor being considered.

I want to know what are the parameters Strategic Telemetry is looking at when they define what is a community of interest.

Additionally, I want to know what particular data they're going to be mining to assist them in defining community of interests in Arizona, and what software program are they using to gather that data.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, Ms. O'Grady.

MARY O'GRADY: Oh, and just a clarification, this was the public comment on the grid. And the communities of interest and the other issues there don't come into play with the grid.
Those aren't considered at this stage of the
development of the constitutional process.

WENDY SCHOPS: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Just for the record,

Strategic Telemetry will not be defining communities of interest, nor competitiveness, nor any other definition. It will be the Commission.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right.

WENDY SCHOPS: Thank you. And when can we get that definition?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm sorry?

THE WITNESS: My question was when is that definition going to be there?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, we can kind of follow up afterwards, because on the agenda today is just the grid. And that's not part of the grid development. The grid is, as Mr. Strasma explained, population is the factor there.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other -- Mr. Craft?

Let me pull out his sheet.

Mr. James Craft, you need to say who you're representing and what city or county.

JAMES CRAFT: I'm representing myself.

I live in Maricopa County, in the city of Phoenix.
And I wanted to make a public comment tying in Azavea to our grid map as well as Maptitude, because I think they will both work together.

Back in December, Roberta Voss and Ken Clark made available to the public that piece of software.

The first thing I did, within training, met with some -- Steve Muratore and the folks at that area to train me quickly on how to do a grid map.

After the training, I was able to do three grid maps, both to spiral, as you and your suggestions.

Now, I found this, being a professor and teaching of business courses, there were three different approaches.

However, in the computer sciences, it became like using Word.

One person would say I want to use Arial, font 12. The other would say I want to use Times Roman, font 16.

It's a real basis that became and where I was headed for the grid, and only took three days, you kind of wonder what's taking this so long, which is a frustration.

But the other part in doing the grid, whatever software you have should immediately be available to the public. Because these hearings, they want to go out that night, put in what you see, and see if they agree with it.

So you have this dichotomy or this conflict with
Azavea.

And I would request that you ask your legal counsel how to remove any possibility of quid pro quo. Maybe Azavea could come in and say this is our price to anybody.

I'm not sure if that would work.

But I've used both Maptitude. I've used both and Azavea in my areas. And the answers were equivalently the same with my subjective information.

It's just a tool.

So if you could remove those, then it will give you a clear playing field, then it becomes what is available for the public to get on their website at 2:00 a.m. in the morning once O'Grady and Kanefield have gone to bed.

So that's my observations of both of them.

So thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Other comments on the grid map process, the options that were presented?

Okay. We have a few.

GENE DIEHL: Diehl.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Diehl, I have your form.

GENE DIEHL: My name is Gene --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Go ahead and spell your name.

Thank you.
GENE DIEHL: Last name is Diehl, D-I-E-H-L.

And I had a suggestion. Mr. Strasma made recommendation or comment with regard to starting in different reference points on the map.

Why not do all three or four and do an overlay of those, because I think you might find a combination of all of them is going to equate to almost what we decide or created in the effect.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Comments from other members of the public on the grid map process?

Marcia Busching.

And if you could spell your name for the record and who you're representing.

MARCIA BUSCHING: My name, my name is Marcia Busching, B-U-S-C-H-I-N-G.

I'm not representing anyone other than myself.

And I'm here just to echo what a number of you have already said.

I think that drawing the grid maps is one of the easiest parts of this process.

Having worked with this Azavea software, I think that just trying to get equal populations should be a simple process.

And I would suggest that you ask your consultants
to propose, you know, two or three or four different equal population maps so that you could start to see just where the populations in the state are.

Because I think that will give you some indication then of the complexity of the task that you have going forward.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Other members of the public?

Lynne St. Angelo.

LYNNE ST. ANGELO: Yes.

And spell your name and say where you're from.

LYNNE ST. ANGELO: Yes. St. Angelo, S-T, period, A-N-G-E-L-O.

I'm from Pima County. I happen to also be from LD 26, which our first speaker is also from.

My comment on his suggestion that if the last Commission started in the center, that then you should start in a corner.

I think that would give the appearance of prejudice against what happened with the first Commission.

And so I would say instead of doing that, is that is the purpose of it, is to do a random drawing of some kind and let the chips fall where they may.

I do like the idea of having several different sets of grid maps, maybe from different things, as you do
different drawings, and see how it all comes out. That's my suggestion.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Sir.

JIM WILLIAMS: Jim Williams.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. I've got your form then. I remember seeing that.

Representing self.

JIM WILLIAMS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: From Glendale.

JIM WILLIAMS: Yeah.

I guess now is not the appropriate time, like you said. I was going to ask about the glossary or definition of all the different terms, if they could be put on a website so people like me could know what is being talked about.

I don't understand the communities of interest and competitive districts, compact districts, or all of that. I would like to see that on a glossary of some sort so that I could look it up and see what we're talking about.

But this is not the time for that.

You said this is just for the map.

And then, if I'm correct, I heard somebody say that this map doesn't really mean anything. They're going to make this grid. They're going to do this grid. But the
Commission is going to finish the thing out. They're going to do what they're going to do.

So why are we doing this exercise of making the grids like this if it has no effect? It may not even be used. You can throw it out and do what you're going to do anyway.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Other comments --

JIM WILLIAMS: Exercise in futility. The constitution says do it anyway and throw it away, so we do it anyway?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments from the public on the grid map process.

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you for providing input.

So that leaves us with some more suggestions. Do commissioners have other thoughts?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: If it makes sense, either we come up with some random ways of a starting point, put them in hat, or maybe that throttle bottle, and pick.

Because to me I think that's doing it randomly, and it's -- I'm okay with that. And I think that's fair.
Everybody -- people are streaming it, watching it, people are here live, so I think that's transparent.

So let's do it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other thoughts from others?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I think the idea of doing a couple of different grid maps for presentation using a couple of different approaches is good.

I suggest you do one where you take the center of the most concentrated population district and build both your congressional and your legislative starting point. The direction that it grows from there could be random.

I would suggest that we work from -- do another one going from the, from the outside of the state in.

And, and both of those in direction and corner could be absolutely random.

Compare those two.

Brings those back to the Commission, discussing that how they got to those points, and then a decision could be made for where we grow out of.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Is that a motion, Mr. Stertz?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I can make that in the form of a motion.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'll second it for purposes of discussion.

I have a question, Mr. Strasma, about the idea preparing two separate grid maps.

Is that a problem from your perspective in any way?

KENNETH STRASMA: No. We're certainly happy to do that, commissioner.

I -- one note of caution would be, I think the process will work best if people don't take the maps and try to analyze them about which one has a potential benefit.

And which was one of my hopes about picking a process with an element of randomness and going through it. But if the Commission wants to see that the results are different, different approaches, we're more than happy to do more than one.

My personal editorial would be just to, you know, not try to game out which one is going to lead to what final outcome, because I do believe that is all based on direction of the Commission give us for the adjustment of maps.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

I couldn't agree more with that comment. I want to just stay with one. If we have more than one, I agree with Mr. Strasma that I see that happening, which one will be more advantageous to maybe one or two, maybe all
commissioners.

So I would stress that we do a random drawing of one map, one grid map, and stick with that.

So it's random.

I don't know how more unbiased and fair I could be if it is random.

So I don't want to do more than one.

Because I think we will end up bickering and arguing over which one to pick. And I don't want to do that.

Let's do it random. Only do one.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other thoughts?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: If you generated multiple grid maps, could they be combined to make -- you could take two maps and make a third? Would that still constitute a grade map?

KENNETH STRASMA: Commissioner, if I understand correctly, there would be areas that would be common much like the states that start with the previous district, and see what is in both version A and version B.

Some decision would have to be made about how to deal with areas that are not in common. Not having worked this through, but just picturing how the process would work out. I think there would be significant differences.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I would, I would prefer to have one random map.

But I also think that I agree with Ms. Busching's point that if we have a couple, it's sort of a learning experience, because it gives us some information about where population is and let's just say exercise.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Sure.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And whichever one we then choose as a starting point to continue, we're going to make a number of changes to.

And I think we are going to bicker.

I think, you know, I think it is going to be difficult.

So I guess I'm willing to do it either way, with the understanding that if we did two, it would be more of a learning exercise for us.

I would not support the idea of doing two with the idea of having to merge them at the end of that process.

I would support doing two just to see how population lays out.

And then we would have to proceed from there.

I guess maybe one disadvantage of doing --

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Just building on that, I suppose if two or three grid maps were made, and the Commission couldn't make a decision on which one to go by,
go by lot, randomness.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That's fine too.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I like that.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: My next question would be to Mr. Strasma.

Commissioner Stertz's motion, did that give you sufficient direction, or are there other bits of information that you need?

KENNETH STRASMA: Commissioner, I did want to seek clarification as to -- if we're talking about the quadrant system or the literal grid, or I suppose we're talking about multiple maps, did he want us to work out options for both.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I understand the motion to be that one would be from the center point working out, and that there would be a random choice as to which direction to move in, and perhaps we would choose that random choice right now.

And the second would be from the outside of the state moving in. And, again, with the random decision on direction, and maybe we need to decide whether that random decision is which corner, or whether -- would that be at which corner and which direction?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Which corner and which direction.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. So we would -- if
that motion were to carry, we would have to draw three things out of a hat. The first would be the direction that you would go in from the center.

The second would be the corner that you would start in from the exterior.

And the third would be the direction you move in from that exterior corner.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That's correct.

Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Strasma, in clarification of the grid, meaning that these would be a -- try to remain in a grid-like pattern, not in a -- not very similar to how you had presented in your nine by -- you know, your three by three and your six by five.

But you would start from a square that would be of equal population, starting from the center of the most -- the densest district within the state, for both the congressional and legislative districts, and then we'll pick the direction of which you're going to go out and to start build boxes, build blocks around it.

In the order in which you had described earlier, which is using your census track and your blocking methods.

KENNETH STRASMA: Okay. And that --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: The geographic hierarchy.
KENNETH STRASMA: -- that's sufficient direction.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah. Okay. So we should probably do that here now to determine those.

Anybody has a coin?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Does Ray have a hat?

RAY BLADINE: I don't have a hat. I don't even have a coin.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The question on the first is, is clockwise or counterclockwise? That's first.

KENNETH STRASMA: As the direction from the center.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: As the direction from the center.

All right. I think legal counsel needs to flip the coin.

Can we verify that there are not two heads on that?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Pass it around.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Two tails.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Two tails. That's all right.

So, all right, an Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Let me look at that coin.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: You're satisfied with that coin.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, this is one of the earlier quarter, from 1965 actually. It's a head and a tail.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: How long have you had that? Okay. Since I made the motion, I'll -- heads clockwise, tails counterclockwise.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Is that, is that fair, a Republicans flipping a coin?

Let me see, I want to make sure you -- go ahead, flip it.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

What did I say, heads, clockwise? Tails, counterclockwise.

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So it was tails, counterclockwise.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Counterclockwise.

Next is the which direction, so we're starting from the center and you'll be building blocks out from the center, and work your way out counterclockwise.

KENNETH STRASMA: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The next question was?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Which corner?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Which corner.

So this is going to be east or west, north or
south.

Okay. So I'll do east west -- northeast, northwest, southeast.

So I'll do northeast or northwest, heads or tails. Northeast, northwest. Heads, tails.

Okay.

KENNETH STRASMA: What we're doing, east versus west in one flip and north versus south in another.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yeah, that's correct.

KENNETH STRASMA: Which is the first? I apologize.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Pick one. Does that work?

Okay. East versus west.

KENNETH STRASMA: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: East, heads.

I want to be fair and equitable.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I don't want anybody complaining.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Absolutely.

East is heads.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: East is heads.


Now we are doing --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Now this one is north or south.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: North or south.
Heads, north.
Tails. Start from the south.
So we're starting in the southeast corner.
KENNETH STRASMA: Southeast corner.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.
KENNETH STRASMA: And one more is the direction.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Direction. And we're going
counterclockwise to clockwise; is that correct?
Okay.
Clockwise, clockwise -- heads is clockwise.
Heads is clockwise.
I'm hoping that the audience and the general
public who's watching us today is, one, respectful of the
randomness of this and amused by the process.
GENE DIEHL: May I say that randomness proved
itself out?
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yes, it did.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great. So we have a motion,
that's been seconded, to basically authorize Mr. Strasma to
generate two grid maps, one starting in the center, most
dense district of the state. And we'll work outwards
clockwise based on geographic hierarchy --
AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Counterclockwise.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, it was counterclockwise.
Thank you.

This is like a game show.

So, excuse me, I had written clockwise.

So it's counterclockwise. Thank you.

Based on geographic hierarchy.

The second grid map will be starting in the southeast corner, and will move clockwise around the state and again using geographic hierarchy, as how you would add those sectors.

And so with that, is there any other discussion on that motion?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. All in favor?

("Aye.")

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any opposed?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. The motion carries.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, my only question is when are we going to see the one or two drafts?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: How long will it take to generate the two grid maps?

KENNETH STRASMA: If you can give us a week.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. A week.

Is that okay with everybody?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair?
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Does that still keep us on track, a whole week?

KENNETH STRASMA: Yes, I believe it does, commissioner.

And I believe another agenda item is future meetings.

But as long as we can have it done before the next meeting, I believe we can.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

And is that the kind of thing we can put on our website, the grid maps? Is that possible?

Buck can advise later. That's good.

Yeah, I think that would be a good thing to show, since it's a constitutional requirement.

Any other comments on the possible grid map processes or randomness?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next item on the agenda -- let me check the time. Where are we?

Okay. About 3:50 p.m.

We probably need to wrap this meeting up by 4:30 in order to make it to Glendale for the hearing at 6:00.

So, with that in mind, let's move to the agenda item, number five, report, legal advice, and direction to
counsel regarding attorney general inquiry.

The Commission may vote to go into executive
session, which would not be open to the public for any item
listed on the agenda for the purpose of obtaining legal
advice.

So given that there is an attorney general
inquiry, it would be great to get an update on that inquiry
and investigation, so if maybe Joe or Mary could tell us,
that would be great.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, members of the
Commission, thank you.

On July 21st we received word that the attorney
general had opened an inquiry which he characterized as a
inquiry into open -- whether or not there were -- there was
an open meeting infraction.

We, through conversations, Mary O'Grady and I had
with counsel for the Attorney General's Office, we believe
that the scope of the review or the inquiry is related to
both -- determine whether or not an open meeting law
infraction occurred, and also whether or not a procurement
infraction occurred.

As the -- even though we haven't been given
anything in writing from the Attorney General's Office other
than some e-mails that we have exchanged between counsel for
the AG and Mary and I, we believe that the scope of the
inquiry is limited to the procurement of the Strategic
Telemetry contract.

We've asked the attorney general to define the
scope of the inquiry as is typical in an open meeting law
inquiry so that the Commission can know what exactly the
inquiry is about and then we can adequately advise you.

I'm trying to think.

What specifically the attorney general has asked
for is he would like to interview the commissioners with
respect to the open meeting law inquiry. And I believe the
procurement inquiry too.

Mary can correct me if I'm misstating any of this.

They have -- we have, through our conversations
with Attorney General's Office, we have told them that we
needed to meet with you all to at least give you some legal
advice with respect to what the open meeting law says, what
the powers of the attorney general are in this kind of
situation. And, and the first opportunity to do that was
today as an entire Commission, which we felt was the most
appropriate to proceed.

In the last -- I think the attorney -- the
representative for the office expressed some frustration
about not having already undertaken the interviews.

And we, again, explained to him that we weren't --
that we were trying to work with them as quickly as we
could, but we felt it was necessary to advise the
Commission. Again, this was July 21. It's now August 3rd.

This is the first opportunity we've had to meet
with you all.

One issue that was raised with respect to the open
meeting law, the attorney general obviously has authority to
conduct an open meeting law investigation.

The relevant statute is 38-431.06.

And through that process he may issue -- he may
administer oaths or affirmations to any person for
testimony.

In other words, he can interview you all under
oath as he's trying to ascertain whether or not an
infraction has, in fact, occurred.

There's an issue that we raised, and one that we
wanted to talk with the Commission about, and that is
legislative privilege and whether or not the commissioners
could invoke legislative privilege in response to an inquiry
of this nature.

We shared that with the Attorney General's Office,
that we are looking at that.

Your predecessors' former colleagues spent a good
number of years in court litigating that exact question, and
were ultimately successful in defining this body as a
legislative body that enjoys legislative immunity and may
invoke the legislative privilege with respect to legislative acts.

We know from the court decision of the Arizona Court of Appeals that that means -- legislative acts most certainly mean when you're engaged in the map drawing process. What we don't know is --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Kanefield, are you giving us legal advice in a public session here?

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Yes, I guess I am. And I'll pause there, because -- let me ask if the Commission wishes to go into executive session to receive more advice?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: If you're planning to give us legal advice, I would propose that you do it in executive session.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, members of the Commission.

I don't believe I've crossed into the realm of legal advice.

I was trying to give you background before we actually give you legal advice.

I'm glad you brought that up, Commissioner McNulty, because at some point we will need to advise you on how you may want to proceed as a Commission and as individual commissioners.

That obviously could be done -- that would be
attorney-client privileged advice. That could be done in executive session on majority vote of the Commission. Or if the Commission does not wish for that advice to be given in executive session, it could be done in open session.

So I'll just finish my thought very quickly on this, and you can talk if you want to go to into executive session.

Summarizing the legislative immunity doctrine that was adopted by the Court of Appeals as it applies to this Commission, you're a legislative body. Your legislative acts are subject to legislative privilege, which means that you are not -- cannot be called upon to testify under oath in a legal proceeding, civil or criminal for that matter, with respect to your legislative acts.

The question is legislative, whether it's legislative act versus administrative act.

At that point I think I'll pause and seek more direction from the Commission how you would like me to proceed.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Commissioner Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I would like to stress the -- I want the AG's Office, even though I really do think they're wasting taxpayers' money, I think all the information is in executive session, whatever records they
have access to, which I think are most records in executive session; is that correct?

    JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair,

Commissioner Herrera, under the open meeting law they are entitled to review the executive session transcript. And we have provided that to them. I'll share with you though that we do have one concern, and that is with -- they are, at least in my opinion, they are entitled to review the executive session transcript including attorney-client advice, because what they're looking for is they're trying to make sure that the Commission or anybody for that matter isn't using the attorney-client relationship to circumvent the open meeting law.

    But what -- where we differ is whether they can use that information that they read and learn through their open meeting law inquiry for any other matter.

    And as we know, they have told us they have two separate matters here, an open meeting law inquiry and a procurement inquiry.

    So that's something that we're trying to work through with them, because they certainly respect the attorney-client privilege and what it means, and they don't wish to infringe upon that.

    So that is one issue that we're going to have to work out, because one of the executive session meetings did
involve -- a portion of it did involve attorney-client advice.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I want to make sure that we keep as much of the -- this part of the hearing public and not go into executive session unless we need to.

I want to make sure I stress that, unless we -- either counsel recommend that we go into executive session.

But before you do that, you know, we are a legislative body, and the previous Commission went through the whole process, debated it. And I think we should be treated as such.

If they -- if the AG's Office would not be able to do that for a particular legislator or -- a legislator or a senator or a congressman, then we should be treated the same way.

They should respect that, that we have legislative immunity.

And I make sure that you, as our attorneys, that you help us with that.

Because I really do think that it is a waste of taxpayers' money, when people are -- you know, there's that perception that people are -- you know, that either the Commission or someone is leaning a certain way that they
don't agree with, they can file a complaint with the AG's Office.

    Again, there's no proof of that, and it's just people complaining.

    And to me it's sad. It's sad that the people want to involve partisan politicians to, to waste the Commission's time and the public's time.

    Because if they -- if it were the other way and the AG's Office was a partisan Democrat, we wouldn't be hearing from the other side, and they wouldn't be complaining that -- and I hope that never happens, for the Democrats, because I would be up in arms as well, if a partisan AG was investigating a Commission that they -- supposedly leans left or leans Democratic.

    And I hope you protect us. I think that's what you guys are getting paid for, and we do have legislative immunity, and I would hope that the AG's Office respects that.

    Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz, did you have a --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I did.

Mr. Kanefield, Ms. O'Grady, can you give me the -- three of the five members of this commission are not attorneys. And the two, I don't know whether or not they've got a clear understanding of what legislative privilege
1 means.

   So if you can give us a little thumbnail sketch of
2 what that means.
3
4 And then as a follow-up to that, what is the
5 upside to accepting legislative privilege and what is the
6 downside to waiving it.

7 JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair,
8 Commissioner Stertz, again, we're happy to advise you.
9 That's obviously what we're here for.
10
11 And, again, we can do it in executive session. We
12 can do it in open session. It's up to you.
13
14 I'll just say part of the -- part of what
15 attorneys do is give advice.
16
17 And the reason the attorney-client privilege
18 exists is so that we can talk through all options, pros,
19 cons, risk, benefits. And candidly.
20
21 And you can then weigh whether, you know, what
22 the -- based on the advice we give you, how you wish to
23 proceed and give us direction.
24
25 Well, that's not -- again, I'm not suggesting how
26 you want to do it.

27 I recognize we're talking about an open meeting
28 law, an alleged open meeting law infraction, and here we're
29 suggesting that we go back into executive session because of
30 attorney-client privilege.
So the only thing I would add is that even if the attorney general understands the attorney-client privilege, that's exactly -- he has hundreds of attorneys that do that every day with their boards and commissions and public officials.

So it should not be for fear of doing some -- non-transparency should not be the reason to not have executive session for attorney-client advice.

But, we're fully prepared to do it either way.

So it's completely at the discretion of the Commission.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, Ms. O'Grady, Mr. Kanefield.

I'm not suggesting that you give the Commission any legal advice.

I think what you're doing is you're delivering an analysis of what legislative privilege means by definition and by -- so we would have an understanding of that and so would members of the general public.

And the likewise what the upside and downside would be of accepting or denying it.

That's not getting legal advice. That is purely giving an understanding of what it might be.

And Ms. O'Grady might disagree with me, but at least the first piece you cannot.
JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Well, I'm doing all the talking here.

Mary, do you want to weigh in on the question of privilege?

MARY O'GRADY: Oh, absolutely. That is legal advice in the context of a fact specific inquiry. That would be in the range of legal advice that is perfectly appropriate as Joe said for executive session.

I haven't heard that motion to move into executive session yet, so that's why we are continuing this --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Could you answer Commissioner Stertz's question in a very broad and general way?

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Well --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I think I agree with him that a -- and I could be wrong. I've taken one law school class.

So I would recommend that you, again, do it as a general speaking and as broadly as you can, so we can have a understanding and so can the public.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: As to what executive -- as to what legislative privilege is, which I think is a distinct question from the waiver issues which would be
JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, Commissioner Herrera, thank you.

What I was going to suggest, we did a summary of legislative privilege for the Commission.

It's part of our legal briefing in the materials that we gave you.

I'm going to cue from the materials.

That information is also available to the public on our -- on the Commission's website.

So pretty much what I'm going to be saying here is directly from information that you all have access to.

Legislative immunity, it comes from the speech and debate clause of the U.S. Constitution that also exists in the Arizona Constitution.

If I'm boring you, the courts have basically held the precedent that applies to the U.S. speech and debates clause applies to the state.

It also springs from the separation of powers doctrine.

And what it essentially says is that it's a privilege that exists for legislators acting in the legislative capacity.

And you are all, for all legal purposes, legislators.
It's a testimonial and evidentiary privilege as we now know from the Court of Appeals decision. That means that if you are called in any kind of legal proceeding to testify through discovery or through a subpoena to testify at trial, you can invoke the privilege, and you would not have to testify.

And the same applies to evidentiary information.

And that was one of the issues debated last time, which was whether or not any communications between the Commission and its consultant, the predecessor to Strategic Telemetry, were -- fell under the scope of the legislative immunity doctrine.

And the Court of Appeals eventually said, yes, they did, because it was part of the legislative map drawing process.

The wording of -- I'm trying to find the court. I'm going to read you right from the court decision.

Okay. Here's what the -- here's reading from the court decision, which I think states it very nicely.

It doesn't extend to cloak all things in any way related to the legislative process. Rather, the privilege extends to matters beyond pure speech or debate in the legislature only when such matters are an integral part of the deliberative and communicative processes relating to proposed legislation or other matters placed within the
jurisdiction of the legislature, and when necessary to prevent indirect impairment of such deliberations.

It doesn't apply to political acts such as communicating with your constituents.

And then it does not apply to the performance of what the court calls administrative tasks, which is defined in this case because that was at issue.

So I think that that -- I hope that that gives you somewhat of a -- and the issue here is under the attorney general's open meeting law investigation authority, he, as I mentioned before, he can ask -- he can put people under oath, which is, which is a discovery kind of process.

It's a civil procedure. It's not a criminal proceeding.

And then -- and the statute itself says that in that situation a privilege can be invoked by -- you know, whether for attorney-client privilege or legislative privilege or any other privilege for that matter.

So, Mary, do you want to add --

MARY O'GRADY: I was going add one thing on the purpose of the privilege and what the court said that Joe's been citing.

The privilege is not intended to protect legislators' individual interest but to support the rights of the people by enabling their representatives to execute
the functions of their office without fear of prosecutions, civil or criminal.

So that's sort of the context and the purpose of the -- that underlies the legislative privilege.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Ms. O'Grady, would you be so kind to repeat that last sentence, please?

MARY O'GRADY: The privilege is not intended to protect legislators' individual interest but to support the rights of the people by enabling their representatives to execute the functions of their office without fear of prosecutions, civil or criminal.

And as Joe said, it's an evidentiary privilege, both the testimony and the written documents.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: One of the -- I think when all of us signed up for this and got nominated and appointed, we wanted to do the right thing, be all fair to Arizona.

And one thing that we didn't want to do is, as volunteers now, is being persecuted by a partisan politician.
I think we -- I would not recommend that you waive your legislative immunity.

We're all volunteers, just trying to do the best we can.

And when I volunteered, I was assured that we would have protection from -- from partisan, you know, individuals. Because I didn't -- I was told last time there was -- you know, obviously there were some issues. People disagreed with certain things.

But there is nothing like it is -- what it is going on here, meaning politicians getting involved.

And it shouldn't be that way.

It shouldn't be that way that we have politicians trying to intimidate individuals, and trying to -- you know, basically intimidate.

And I will -- I refuse to be intimidated, and I will refuse to be put under oath.

Because I have nothing to hide.

What I said before, that everything was done in the open.

And as I mentioned to my attorney, and I mentioned to my attorney, Mary O'Grady, or our attorney, excuse me, that everything was done according to SPO.

And so there's no reason for them to interview me.

None at all.
And I probably will not be interviewed.

So that's where I stand. I want to make sure I'm protected as a volunteer of the state, and protect the members of the public that they care about this process and they don't want to see partisan from either side of the party getting involved in trying to corrupt the system.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think it's important that we discuss all of these things, but my concern is that we have about two hours' worth of agenda items here that we haven't done yet, and you all need to be in Glendale in, what, an hour and 45 minutes, for folks who are doing the Glendale hearing.

And, you know, I would make a motion, I guess, that we go into executive session to hear your advice, but I don't think we have the time for that right now.

And I think we should table this, look at our future meetings, set up another meeting, and then continue.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I would agree.

Can I make a motion to table this discussion to a future agenda?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: You can make that motion.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'm not sure we need a motion. We didn't need a motion for the last item that we
tabled, just agreed we were going to put it on the agenda.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I withdraw the motion and just table the item.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I am concerned that we know when we're going to meet next so that we can -- you know, it looks like we have a half a day's worth of discussion here. We still have to approve our minutes and other things.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other thoughts from other commissioners on this topic?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Joe.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, members of the Commission.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Before we leave, I guess on the next item that I would like you to address, which I don't think should take very long, is agenda item six. I'm bad with Roman numerals.

Which is the discussion, legal advice, and possible action approving expenditures for counsel.

I'm happy to brief you on why we asked for that item to be put on the agenda.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. I would be happy to hear that.

Others?
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Will we need a lot of time
to -- Madam Chair, a lot of time to --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Where are we?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: -- for that topic?


VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I know, but it says 15

minutes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is that how long it will
take, Mr. Kanefield?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Is that enough for that? I
definitely want to come up with dates for the next meeting.
I think that's equally if not more important.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: We can push --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It can wait?

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Let's, looking at the agenda -- okay, let's jump
to discussion of future meetings, and we'll at least get
that nailed down.

If we have time we'll do something else, but
discussion of future meetings.

So, what is the situation for everyone's
schedules?

We've got, I know, some folks going out of town.

Yeah, Mr. Bladine has some.
RAY BLADINE: I don't have everyone's current availability beyond, like, next week.

Next week I know that two of the commissioners are -- one is gone all week and another commissioner substantial parts.

The weeks after that, I don't have any recent information on. And I was hoping that today people would have their calendars and we could do that.

In talking to Mr. Strasma yesterday, it would be most likely, and I'm going ask him to correct me if I'm wrong, that if we could do about three half-day meetings in a row following the preparation of the grid map, we would then be able to get into the process of making adjustments to it.

That would also give him time between those half-day meetings to provide the information back to the Commission that they would ask for.

So I guess what I would ask you all to do is, if you can do it now, tell us when we might be able to do three meetings in a row. And if not, at least send it to me and I will try to coordinate something and send it back to you in terms of when we could do it.

I think also that it would -- since it would take a week, we could be doing things as early as the following week around August 15th, if I remember correctly.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So is the week of the 8th completely out?

RAY BLADINE: I would say yes. Mr. Stertz will be gone all of that week.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can you dial in or no?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Very challenging where I am.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: We -- I think we had -- Strategic Telemetry had asked for a week to complete the grid map.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: That would take us to next week.

And we had talked about staying on course. So I would recommend that we meet at least to approve, either telephonically, to approve the grid map.

I don't want any more delays.

And I understand people are out of town.

But if people can make every effort to at least participate by phone or by Skype, I want to approve the grid map next week.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I've noticed -- Mr. Herrera, I'm all in favor of trying to move this thing progressively. I would like the courtesy of the rest of the commissioners to recognize that I notified Mr. Bladine a month ago that I was going to be off this upcoming week. And I think that something as paramount as this would be a disservice to me as a commissioner to not be able to participate. And I like your indulgence in being able to move that to the following Monday.

My schedule, Mr. Bladine, before or after that date is completely clear and manageable. I think that we've got a couple things that we need to do between now and our next meeting. One is that we need to get a map guide on computers in front of us.

Second, we need to be trained, either telephonically or in person.

I'll make myself available to Mr. Strasma between now and Sunday to do so.

The third is that we have a -- that the grid map is made available through distribution.

And, Mr. Herrera, could easily be distributed to the members of the Commission a week from today or a week from tomorrow, so that we could have review of it, and independent of notification to the public, so that when we
came to the open meeting, that we could at least have our
questions in place, rather than having what we did with the
three consultants or the three map -- the online mapping
service questions.

We were -- I was caught off guard. We weren't
able to make a decision today.

So it would be nice to be able to have a little, a
little of couple of days' worth of look at the map so we
could give -- be adequately prepared to ask questions.

And then once -- and then drilling down, I'm, I'm
a tremendous advocate of taking big tables and big screens
and putting us all in work sessions.

And as I suggested to Mr. Strasma before, an old
planner's style of charrette, which is working together. It
actually means to squat, which means everybody getting
around the same place and drilling through and working
through to get to the next level of information.

There have been -- there's a consideration right
now of some addition of some public meetings taking place,
that is going to come into play. And then there's going to
be the culling together of all of that data. That's going
to need to be done as well.

So there's, if the rest of the Commission will
indulge me, and give us the opportunity for me to
participate in this, I would surely appreciate it.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz, does Saturday the 13th work at all, or no? The afternoon?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, the Saturday the 13th, we are going to be hearing on -- oh, Saturday the 13th, no, I'll be -- Sunday the 14th, yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. I thought the hearing was the 6th.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: It is.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So, okay. So that really doesn't buy us a lot, just the 14th, on a Sunday.

But I'm open to that if people want to meet on that Sunday.

Are others available?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Starting Sunday the 14th, moving forward.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Might be hard to get a court reporter on a Sunday. I suggest we start on a Monday.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So moving from the 15th on.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair, I'm available the 15th. I'm not available the 16th.

I'm available the 17th.

Those two days.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Mr. Herrera.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: What is the earliest we'll be receiving the grid maps?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It would be a week from today, right maybe the 10th.

KENNETH STRASMA: I would say a week from tomorrow.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. The 11th. Thursday the 11th.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: The 11th.

And maybe we would get it electronically, I'm assuming?

KENNETH STRASMA: That's okay to distribute electronically.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And we would then review it or make a decision the following week?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right. Could we meet on that Monday, the 15th?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I am available.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Would everyone be?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'm available.

KENNETH STRASMA: Madam Chair, if you need me, I am probably not available the 15th, but available the 16th.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Are you available the 17th, 18th, 19th?
KENNETH STRASMA: Yes, I'm available any time between the 16th and the 19th.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I would suggest that we meet the 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st, 22nd, 23rd, 24th, 25th.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Are you forming that in the form of a motion?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I hope no one seconds it. We definitely need to be meeting a lot then. Starting -- okay. On the 16th Mr. Freeman is out. 17th would go our first date where it sounds like everyone is available.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I wonder if we should consider meeting on the 15th to finish our agenda here.

We don't need Mr. Strasma to do that. And we can meet on the 17th, 18th, and 19th to start our mapping process. Does that work?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: If we meet Monday the 15th, and we'll cover non-mapping agenda items.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, this would be an agenda idea question for Mr. Bladine.

When will the schedule for round two be available?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Maybe we can add that to
agenda on the 15th, because I think we may want to have some
input to that given the concerns last time.

RAY BLADINE: I think that would be no problem.
We pretty much have that together. We just need to modify
it by what happens and get that to you, so I would think we
could be ready by the 15th easily.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I had some thoughts about
that too. Maybe we could would talk about it.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, Mr. Bladine,
Commissioner McNulty.

The goal would be to get it earlier than the 15th
so that we can have our comments ready and get them
distributed to you so we can actually -- make it an action
item on that.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We would also give our
thoughts about hearings to Mr. Bladine --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: -- to one another so that
could --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Try to get something so that
he's publishing something to us in a draft form so we can
review it and give you our comments back prior to the 15th.

RAY BLADINE: Which would mean we need to get
something toward the end of next week to you so you would
have some time to review it toward Monday.
I'm sure we can do that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Great.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Bladine.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Bladine, while I'm thinking about it, I have to go to a three-day meeting September 14th, 15th, and 16th.

It's a Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday in September.

Prior to that, I'm available every day.

After that, I'll be available every day until Christmas or New Year or whenever we finish this.

RAY BLADINE: That may be the easiest thing for me to record.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

So we're going to meet the 15th, cover non-mapping agenda items.

We'll have to figure out if that's Phoenix or Tucson or wherever.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, the time, have we agreed on the times?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No, we haven't.

So, I'd prefer morning to start.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And I prefer Phoenix.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.
I've got a 4:00 p.m. meeting in Tucson that day.

But if I could -- you know, if we started at 9:00 a.m. in Phoenix, we could go until 2:00.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Where are we going to meet the 17th -- 16th, 17th, 18th, and 19th?

RAY BLADINE: We'll have to work on that and find a location where we can do that. And I'm going to anticipate until we get further along that those would be half day meetings.

The last time the Commission did find a hotel with a conference room, and they used that three days in a row so that everything didn't have to be moved.

I might take a look at that and bring that back to you on the 15th. That's not -- I'm going to have to figure it out before the 15th.

So I think I'll take a look at that, unless there's an objection, to see if we can find a location that we would have to pay some cost, but so far we haven't had to pay much to do public hearings.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Strasma, does it matter whether we're near the Evans House?

Do we need facilities at the Evans House for any of that?

KENNETH STRASMA: No. The software is on laptops, and the projectors are portable.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: All right. As much as I'd like to be in Tucson, I think we probably need to be in Phoenix or Casa Grande or halfway or Phoenix for those three days, so that we -- I know Tucson people can get home from Casa Grande, or -- I guess I'm the only one that can work in my office, so it doesn't really help you guys up here.

RAY BLADINE: We'll take a look first to see if we can do something in Casa Grande. And if not, at least someplace off the freeway in Phoenix so it would be easy access for Tucson.

But we'll take a look and see what we can find that's closer to Tucson.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Casa Grande is a lot easier access.

RAY BLADINE: Okay. And we'll work there and see if we can't find --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Halfway, somewhat close to halfway.

RAY BLADINE: We'll make that our goal. And if we can't, we'll tell you.

But that's what we'll start with.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

With respect to the meeting on the 15th, you have your meeting at 4:00, I just wanted you to know I've got a
hearing the 3:00, which I believe I can do telephonically, so if we can schedule it early enough to finish by 5:30, I would.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

RAY BLADINE: Pardon me, that was on the 15th.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: 15th.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, depending on the time that we start and the location, on the 17th, just calendar check, I'm hosting a breakfast that finishes at 9:00 o'clock on Wednesday the 17th.

So, other than that, the schedule is clear for the rest of the week.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

So we're going to meet the 15th in Phoenix or Casa Grande, most likely, probably Phoenix.

To cover non-mapping agenda items.

And then looking at possibly 17, 18, 19 and then into the following week, a date for consecutive half day meetings; is that the idea?

Is that what everybody thinks would work well?

RAY BLADINE: I think that's our best guess right now.

We'll have to try it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. And we'll definitely send anything to Ray that is with regards to your schedule,
that is immovable, so that he has that information and we can plan accordingly.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: In regards to both of these, these three day half sessions are going to be public sessions, I want to really encourage Mr. Bladine to find a location in Casa Grande because it will be really advantageous to the people in Tucson that want to be able to attend these meetings.

Not just the three, not just for the benefit of the three commissioners, but for members of the general public.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So you're expressing a preference for Casa Grande?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We'll work on that.

It's now 4:25 p.m.

Is there anything else on meetings?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

Yes, Mr. Herrera?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Can we make some time for public comments? There hasn't been some people that haven't spoken.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, I think that's a good
We have a few request to speak forms. Some of you I know have spoken.

I know we spoke on items three and four, but if you have general things to discuss, we can get through as many as we can.

I think David Cantelme, if you're still here?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, I would prefer people that haven't spoken, personally, because I think we are going to end as close to 4:30 as possible.

So people that haven't spoken --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. I'm open to that.

Let me see if there are -- might be anybody that hasn't spoken yet.

Most have.

Barbara Klein, is she here?

Great. Okay.

We'll go that public comment.

Barbara Klein, president League of Women Voters of Arizona, from Scottsdale.

BARBARA KLEIN: Look at this.

Okay. Thank you. I'll try to speak quickly here.

The League has been very supportive of the Independent Redistricting Commission for a long, long time.

We are part of writing it, and we do a lot of public
As part of the Arizona Competitive Districts Coalition, we want to repeat that every effort was made to be inclusive.

And we were successful at that.

We were not only bipartisan. We were multi-partisan.

And so were the judges in our contest.

Our public mapping forums were held at coffee shops, organizational meetings, like the League, and at Tea Party gatherings.

And it was open to everyone.

Regarding the costs of the Azavea, I'm not certain why this should be held against the company or against the Arizona taxpayers for that matter.

I hope it won't be.

But all of the tools, any of the three, will be converted to meet the needs of the Commission anyway.

I also want to say that I think that already established participation, there's over 400 people that have signed on and kind of used it to some degree or another, and public familiarity with it, is indeed something to consider and not to dismiss.

More than the money actually, this is important to us, because we want to support the public tool the people
are already aware of.

Yesterday co-chairs of that organization, Ken Clark, a Democrat, and Roberta Voss, a Republican, held a press conference to announce the winners of the public mapping contest.

In passing, the maps were judged with coded names only so no one ever knew who they were.

We have prepared a report for each of the commissioners to explain the strengths and weaknesses of the maps they close.

We are not presenting these as suggested maps. But as a starting point for consideration for the public and discussion.

And we have these for you now as far and also a few for the staff and consultant.

I would also like to express some concerns of the League.

That the public comments seem to be developing code words, at least in our ears.

Competitiveness, if you get up here and you use the word competitive, it means progressive.

If you get up here and you know use the words communities of interest, it means conservative.

This is distressing to us.

We believe that both of these issues can be
addressed fairly.

And while competition is not more important, it is of equal importance to everybody to have fair districts and fair elections.

Communities of interest are very important.

But, we hope that the Commission will be sensitive to avoid manipulation by outside sources or those trying to gerrymander a district for their own outcomes and using communities of interest as a code word to do that.

We really want you to look at both things and look at them strongly.

And we will hand you our...

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Bob Rosenberg.

Is he here?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sorry, Bob.

Next is Mohur Sidhwa representing self from Tucson.

Thank you.

MOHUR SIDHWA: I do agree with Barbara Klein here. She spoke very well and she -- although I keep banging the drum for competitive districts, it's just that in the
ten years ago we found ourselves in somewhat noncompetitive environments.

As to what a competitive district is, I kind of mentioned that yesterday.

It's one in which the ability to predict the outcome of an election is fairly low and in which no party fails to field candidates on a regular basis.

Another issue that came up was how do we deal with the no party candidates or the Independents? They are Independents because sometimes they swing one way, sometimes the other that. And you cannot define them.

By their very nature, they've chosen to be independent.

They have chosen not to be defined in one category or the other.

And we have to respect that.

Although I have found, and because I've done a lot of walking on the streets, both in District 26 when I lived there and District 28 where I live now, those Independents who tend to be in District 28 tend to lean definitely on the progressive side.

Those are who are Independent in District 26, more often than not, tend to lean on the much more conservative side.

And just granted not a total, but that's about as
best an answer as I can give how to do it.

But those districts, I gave you guys some graphs yesterday, those districts where it's very close between Democrat and Republicans, with a nice healthy chunk of Independents thrown in, those are the most competitive.

Because that means all ideas get an airing, so we can fight on the field of battle rather than up here.

So, that's all I have to say.

Thank you all again for everything you do.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

There's just one last speaker that hasn't gotten to speak at all yet.

Geri Ottoboni from Rancho Vista HOA.

GERI OTTOBONI: Geri Ottoboni, G-E-R-I, O-T-T-O-B-O-N-I.

And I have one particular thing I wanted to address, but then again after listening to this lady speak I wanted to address that as well.

The first thing I wanted to say is I wanted to set the record straight about the amount of the money that was required for the Commission to operate. Proposition 106 requires that the Arizona State Legislature give six million to the Commission.

But the last Commission actually spent 9.55 million, so that the state is budgeting 10.2 million
for the next ten years.

The budget of 3.5 million is for any one year, as Mr. Bladine has said.

But the actual amount spent last time was 9.55, and that is public record.

I know I sort of hobble around, but I tore a ligament.

And so I walked probably two hours, four days week in the last election.

And I went to no parties and I went to Independents.

And it's interesting -- and I went to every house.

And the interesting was it wasn't necessarily conservative in LD 26, because a lot of people became Independent because they were unhappy with the Republican party and a lot of people were unhappy with the Democratic party.

So this way sometimes they'll vote either way.

But I stopped at many Democrat's door -- or, you know, liberal door, doorsteps, and houses. So I have to somewhat disagree with the previous lady because I've walked thousands and thousands and thousands -- I've walked all the way from Saddlebrooke all the way down through Oro Valley, all the way down to Casa -- to the street Magee turns into. I forget the name of it.
Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

That concludes public comment.

I appreciate everyone filling out the request to speak forms and giving us your advice on agenda items three and four today too.

That was very helpful.

The time is now 4:34 p.m.

And without further ado to get to our meeting in Glendale, I'll declare this meeting adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned.)
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