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PROCEEDINGS

(Whereupon, the public session commences.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Good afternoon.

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

Today is Saturday, September 3rd. The time is 1:36 p.m.

And if you will all rise, we'll start with the pledge of allegiance.

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

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

Vice Chair Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Vice Chair Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Here.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We have a quorum.

Other folks around the room today are our legal counsel today, Kristen Windtberg and Joe Kanefield.

We also have a mapping consultant, Willie Desmond.

We have a court reporter today, Marty Herder. So when public comment comes around, be sure to remember to spell your name so that we get an accurate spelling in the transcript.

We have Stu Robinson, our public information officer.

Buck Forst is our chief technology officer.

Our executive director, Ray Bladine, is in the room, in the house. And so is our deputy executive director, Kristina Gomez.

I think that's all we have today from staff.

And thanks to all the members of the public who came out today on a Labor Day weekend to talk to us or follow us.

Our next item on the agenda is map presentations, public proposals.

So I don't have any request to speak -- anyone who has actual maps to present to us today.

Was there anyone that we just haven't heard from yet?

(No oral response.)
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. This will be a recurring agenda item for the Commission, so from now on out there will be an opportunity for the public to tell us about any maps they would like to present.

The next item on the agenda is number three, review, discussion and direction of mapping consultant regarding ideas for possible adjustments to the congressional grid map based on constitutional criteria.

And I believe Mr. Desmond did his homework last night, and we received in front of us this morning some what-if scenarios that we had given him direction on yesterday.

So we'll start with those.

And let Mr. Desmond take over.

WILLIE DESMOND: Can you hear me? Buck, can I get batteries?

Thank you.

All right. So I think if it's okay with everyone we can start with the what-if scenario that is whole counties version two.

There's four new maps, two versions of this map and then two new versions of the river district.

Just one second.

All right. Okay. So for this version of the whole counties map, it was adjusted just to take into
account Native American areas.

I believe that in the process of not splitting any reservation lands we did have to split some more of the counties.

Bear with me for one second. Sorry.

I don't have -- I know we had to split Mohave County.

Mohave County.

We had to split Pinal County twice.

And we also had to split Graham County in order to not split Native American lands.

Other than that, the map remained roughly the same. Most of the changes came in Maricopa. Since in this district places where counties need to pick up or lose population, a lot of that happens in Maricopa, in order -- because it's one of the counties that needs to be split just by necessity.

So, for instance, when District 5 took into account all of Coconino County in order to not split the Navajo and Hopi reservation, and then also went into Mohave a little bit, that added about 150,000 people to that district.

Additionally, when we went a little bit further into Greenlee and Graham -- not into Greenlee, just into Graham, that also added a little bit more population.
As a result, down in Maricopa County we had to kind of reallocate some to District 4 and to District 3, I believe.

Is there some specific areas that you guys would like to see, or is there anything, anything you want me to look at?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Mr. Desmond, could you go in on the proposed District 4, just take a look at where -- I guess I would like to see the census places and see how far it intrudes into Maricopa County.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

So it's part of Sun City, Peoria, Morristown, Buckeye, and it looks like a little bit of Goodyear also at the bottom.

I can go farther west, if you like, where we can see which ones of those municipalities that it split or takes part of.

I did pay attention when I had to make changes to try to keep whole areas this time. Due to time constraints and stuff, I wasn't necessarily -- I didn't worry about it too much. I didn't fuss over it. Just to try to get a lot more done for today, so . . .

Would you like me to zoom in anywhere to look at
it a little more closely, or does that pretty much answer your question?

Sorry.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: That answers that question. Let me look at it a little more.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah. No problem.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: At this one, you did not attempt to take into account -- create the voting rights district.

WILLIE DESMOND: No, that would be version three, which I can just go ahead and load up right away.

Why don't I just load that one up.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Sure.

WILLIE DESMOND: All right.

So there is another version following this one, version three, which takes into account the voting rights districts that were submitted by the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government.

So we accepted their changes.

We accepted their changes wholly, and then just adjusted our maps to reflect that.

This isn't the -- excuse me for one second, there's something here.

I'm sorry. For one second I'm going to have to reload it up. It's screwed up.
Excuse me, I apologize.

That's one nice thing about the system we're using and how we've been going about this is each change is logged, so I do have the ability to go back to any one of the versions that I was making.

These are all the changes that I made when adjusting it to meet the. . .

I'm sorry, some issue, technical difficulty.

Excuse me.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: If you don't mind me asking you a question while you do that, are these going to be posted versions on our website?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, I believe they'll be posted very shortly.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: And could I get these from you before we leave today?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, absolutely.

And I think Buck just nodded. They should be up within the next 15, 20 minutes, I think, or an hour or so.

BUCK FORST: Yeah.

WILLIE DESMOND: So they'll all be posted.

I'm sorry. If you guys would all bear with me just a little while. I really apologize. I would like to get this spread out.

I'm going to try to load it one more time.
This will take a minute unfortunately.
I swear it worked an hour ago.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, would you like to conduct any other business while Mr. Desmond is doing this?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I was just looking at the agenda to see what we might cover.

We have the future meetings and future agenda items, the executive director's report.

Anything on future agenda items that anybody has thought of since yesterday that we want to add?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: There's one item I wanted to add that actually has been discussed by our Commission a bunch over -- since the beginning frankly, and that's this issue of transparency.

So I thought maybe we could have a discussion about that at our next meeting. Because it's been raised again recently, and I thought that might be a good one to cover.

So maybe if Mr. Bladine is around, he can put that on our next item -- next meeting. Which is Thursday?

RAY BLADINE: Yes. And we'll need to post Tuesday.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Yeah. We'll get the
agenda posted by Tuesday, so if we could add that.

RAY BLADINE: Discussion of transparency.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Uh-hmm.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, can you go into a little more detail? I want to make sure I understand what you're talking about. I think I do. I just want to make sure.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure. There's just been -- from the very beginning there's been discussion of, you know, whether commissioners themselves should log, for instance, all contacts that they have with the outside to indicate who's contacting them and who they're talking to. And it's been raised in public comment numerous times at our meetings. And recently was in the Arizona Capital Times editorial on that. And I just think it's worth talking about.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

I would agree.

WILLIE DESMOND: Again, I apologize.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's okay.

Any other agenda items anyone has for a meeting on Thursday?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, this issue of transparency would also apply to the staff and our attorneys.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Are you asking would it apply to them?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: No, I'm saying it should apply to them as well, that conversation.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We'll discuss that at our next meeting.

WILLIE DESMOND: While this is going, does anyone have any other what-if maps that they would like me to work on before the next meeting?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioners, do you have any guidance for Mr. Desmond?

WILLIE DESMOND: As far as any questions that I can answer about these maps before you can actually see them.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, on the issue of that transparency discussion, I would, I would -- I think as a prelude to that, it would be helpful to have our attorneys give us a summary of what the rules are that apply to the legislature, both in terms of their obligations and the lobbying rules, so that we understand what the framework is for the legislature.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

I see Mr. Kanefield noting that. Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe we were successful.

So, I don't know how much you want me to go into
what I think went wrong, but I think it was just --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: -- merging the plans. I did remove the two -- the extra part was left over.

I think it was looking for those, and it was tripping itself up.

We started from the completed plans blocked and closed.

I think we're good to go now.

So, I zoom back out. Yes, this is the District 3, and then District 7 were taken exclusively from or directly from Hispanic Coalition for Good Government proposed districts for this map.

As a result, there were some areas that were no longer allocated to any district and some parts of districts that were like little islands floating, so that all had to be kind of re-worked out.

Again, I attempted to keep whole municipalities and census places together. However, due to time constraints, I didn't have success over that.

As you -- if you want to look at the data table, you can see there is two majority-minority districts now. District 7 is 60.22 percent. District 3 is 53.38.

And, again, that's because those are the districts that the Hispanic Coalition submitted.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: But this map did not attempt to accommodate Indian reservations. Are you able to show us where --

WILLIE DESMOND: It did. It did. Because I did use the earlier version that did accommodate reservation lands and also because the Hispanic Coalition did not split any. There are no splits in reservation lands, to the best of my knowledge.

And I can turn that layer on.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Desmond, while you're turning layers on, are you able to turn on the -- just population density layers?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes. Just population density of everybody or voting age population --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Looking more specifically for, for example, in the District 5, where the population density pockets are, for example.

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

Sorry. One second.

Oh, shoot.

I'm so sorry.

That's just the ceiling.

So this is population per square mile.
So the lightest shade is under 500 people per square mile. Slightly darker shade is 500 to 1,000. Let me know, I can narrow this down a little bit. I was just kind of guessing there. So I apologize if it's a little hard to see.

I can tweak it if you think it would be useful.

So you wanted to look into District 5. Any particular areas of District 5?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I chose District 5 as an example of a large land mass that has broken up large chunks of population in two different areas. And I wanted to determine the -- if we look at the general population of the tribal lands and where the population of the tribal lands are all inclusive in the northern tribal lands as they would compare against, be offset of the urban population, but where the concentration of population would be.

WILLIE DESMOND: There is a concentration of population down in Maricopa County.

Then Flagstaff also.

And I am not finding any of those. . .

So, I mean, the population is -- the only place there is any real density in the district is in Maricopa County.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So, Madam Chair, if, Willie, if you could tell me if that -- of those, of those areas right there in Maricopa County, how many folks are in that small piece of real estate, of the 710,000 in District 5.

WILLIE DESMOND: I think the best way to do that would be to look at what it would, what it would -- how it would affect if we put them in a new district.

So I'm going to say I'll take them from District 5 and put them in a new district.

So, that represents 242,000 people, the area that I just shaded.

So I guess roughly one third of the district.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And would you now extract out to see the entire district?

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

My question is this is going to lead on to is that as we are looking at representation, representatives and congressmen, that you have a third, a third of the population is concentrated in that small area of that large district. If we are looking to make accommodation of all the tribal lands and the 165,000 tribal members, the level of representation that they may or may not receive from a representative, that was a consideration in the last analysis of trying not to make a large combination of all
tribal lands into one specific district.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. And just to answer, to expand on that, I guess, there's about 100,000 Native Americans, voting age population, in the other part of the district.

And that's not necessarily compared to that section, because that section is all population. So if you look at District 5, there's 531,000 voters. So, it's about a, a little less than a fifth of the district as it's currently constituted is Native American.

Are there other -- and -- well, I was just going to say I think in some respects this map might emphasize that issue, just because so many of the districts did have to reach into Maricopa in order to keep whole counties.

So it might be particularly worse in this particular what-if scenario.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, just to recap on this thought experiment, we took our grid map, and then the next version was to create a map that tried to maximize respect for county boundaries, that is to say split as few counties as possible recognizing that where the population concentrations are in Maricopa and Pima County are inevitably going to lead to a split.
Then the next version, version two, was to, to redraft it so that tribal areas are kept whole. And then version three was then to also overlay the -- one of the Minority Coalition maps to create the minority-majority districts. Really with no other consideration. And there's probably more than one way to do this, recognizing that as well. So, now I thank you for pairing those, and I'd just like to study them further before we tinker more with them.

WILLIE DESMOND: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I do think this is interesting and revealing and helpful. I do, I see county boundaries as we've gone through this process. One is that I think we've got a lot of comment from folks who live on county lines. And it's clear that people who tend to live on the boundaries of counties have relationships with adjacent counties. It's also true, I think, that these county boundaries were drawn, what, 200 years ago, 115 years ago, in the 19th century, 18th century, kind of arbitrarily. And
so while I think it's a really useful exercise in some cases, it makes sense I think in other cases there are other factors that probably weigh more heavily, at least in my thought, as to useful to look at.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other comments, questions?

WILLIE DESMOND: Can I just mention real quick?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure.

WILLIE DESMOND: The maps are up on the website, on the maps page. Anybody watching on the live stream that would like to download this information is on the data tables on the website.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thanks.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I just wanted to add that I agree with everything Commissioner McNulty said, with the possible exception of how the county lines were drawn. I know initially in the state had, I forget, probably four counties. I'm probably wrong on that. But --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Fair enough.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: -- there's been a few splits, and I am sure the people when they drew the lines and split the counties, there were some reasons they had to split them.

So I don't know if they're completely arbitrary.
And since then, you know, the counties have organized their
governments around those lines.

So I think that's why I wanted -- it's one of the
constitutional criteria.

And this is, like Commissioner McNulty said, a
thought experiment.

So, and I do agree there are people probably who
live near county lines who may have a stronger relationship
with an adjoining county.

And that's, I think, the next iteration down the
road for all these thought experiments will get into those
kind of details.

WILLIE DESMOND: And I should mention also, this
third version did also split Yuma County obviously. And
Pinal County gets even more sliced up here.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Willie, as a continuing
place in the exercise, the criteria that we are, we are --
the full review criteria includes geography. As
Commissioners McNulty and Freeman just said, inclusive of
that is municipalities, of course, and counties.

But geographical features in Maptitude, is there a
definition of geographical features that you are using?

WILLIE DESMOND: No, not that I've been using.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Geography can be land mass, land -- vast land tracts, or it could be mountain ranges, or it could be rivers, of which many of those were part of the designation of county lines. Some were divisions purely to divide equally of equal mass.

So is there any layering that includes that as part of Maptitude?

WILLIE DESMOND: It's something that we can look at more.

I wouldn't say that census geography tends to be drawn to reflect natural features.

So it will run along mountain ranges. It does run along rivers and stuff. So at the block level, and then at the block group level, even at the tract level, it tends to follow those types of natural features that you just mentioned.

It's not something I have been emphasizing at this point.

And I'm not even totally sure what -- how good the coverage is, so I would have -- I would want to look into that a little bit more offline before I give you a solid answer as to whether that's preloaded in Maptitude.

I do think a lot of that information is available and is something that we could add in to these maps.

And we can take other shapefiles, and geographic
information is one of the most extensively available types of shapefile, and we could add those in as kind of a guideline going forward.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I found that from a -- I found as a practical sense that your overlay onto Google maps becomes very prevalent, because you can see rivers, maps, and concentrations of homes, and where the mountains are, but it makes it less practical in Maptitude.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, we could -- I can load Google maps underneath this and look at it in Maptitude. It just dramatically slows everything down. Every time the map has to reload completely, so I've avoided doing that. Mainly just because of the time factor.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Is there data, in regards to our traffic corridors and traffic patterns, is there data that is available that can be also loaded into Maptitude?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, there's streets, and it's extensively already loaded.

As far as traffic patterns, I don't know.

There's, there's nothing that can be loaded in Maptitude. That's not a census type of field. So that would have to come from a third party.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That throws into the communities of interest and the connectivity between communities. If you've got highways that are connecting or
roadways that are connecting, again, alluding back to where the original lines were drawn. There were dust trails, at that time. And now we're talking about an interstate grid system, and a little bit different traffic patterns that really does designate where people are coming and going.

WILLIE DESMOND: And, you know, from the public hearings, there was a lot of talk about the I-17 corridor and those types of things.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yes.

Is that data that -- I guess the question is to all the commissioners, is that data, because it is not data that is generally census driven, is that data that we would want to collect for use of our determining process, one of those data points that I was speaking of yesterday?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other commissioners, do you have thoughts on Mr. Stertz's question?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: My thought is that we're going to know that. As we go through these communities and areas, those are things that I think we'll be aware of and be able to direct.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I guess my question, Madam Chair, Commissioner McNulty, is that how do you become aware unless we collect the data?

There's real empirical data that's collected on every municipality and every street of traffic patterns. It
would be, I think, incumbent upon us to know where that would be rather than knowing what the empirical data would be as a design criteria rather than just an opinion of the criteria.

I don't think that's what you're referring to but --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I was referring to, I think, the public, the public input. The knowledge that we're developing of the communities is what would drive it, as distinct from empirical data on the map.

The map is going to show us a lot of roads. And they may or may not be important for community purposes, and I think the communities will tell us that -- happily be telling us that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, if I hear you correct, as we drill this down, as we would be able to collect data that might be empirical based on particular opinions or testimony that we would be given, saying we believe that this is a data corridor that needs to be respected and contained together in a particular legislative district or for a community of interest, that we'd actually collect that -- instead of collecting the entire state, collect it on a need-to basis.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That would be my thought about the way to consider it, you know, as people, for
example, with Flagstaff, I think people -- there's been
input about the I-40 corridor, which would be just an
element that comes to mind.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Uh-hmm.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other -- anyone else have
thoughts and ideas on that? Opinions?
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Do we want to look at some
more what-ifs?
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sorry?
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Do we want to look at some
more what-if scenarios?
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure.
So version two and version three we've done.
WILLIE DESMOND: Yep.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.
WILLIE DESMOND: Those are available on the
website.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great.
WILLIE DESMOND: And I should say most of
version two's changes are taken into account, for version
three also.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So the other is the
river district, versions three and four.
WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.
I hope this one opens up just fine.
It should.

I'm going to have to do that same process.

I really apologize. I don't know what's going on.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Does Mr. Bladine have an executive director's report?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes. That's what I was thinking.

So we'll jump to agenda item six, executive director's report.

RAY BLADINE: I really don't have much to report from yesterday, but my plan is to take the agenda dates and meeting times that you all gave me yesterday, type them up, and e-mail them to you so you'll have them before the end of the day.

And then we will -- I'll start working also on the agenda for Thursday, since we'll have to get that posted Tuesday morning.

I think that's -- we talked yesterday about the data we had inputted and the maps.

And I don't believe that I have anything else to report.

Sorry I can't make it longer.

I can dance maybe.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Well, I can help you make it longer.

RAY BLADINE: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Actually there's two questions I've got for you.

The first is looking back at meeting minutes, our -- the last -- at the last meeting, we approved two weeks in the month of April.

Obviously they were taken completely out of sequence and they were -- because they were obviously an oversight that they weren't picked up before.

Where are we in regards to our meeting minutes and then being approved -- reviewed and approved and posted?

RAY BLADINE: With those two, all of the meeting minutes will be -- will have been approved that, that we have.

I think we still need to go back and correct the ones from the time before where there were, there were typos that the Commission asked to be changed before they're reposted.

But that, to my knowledge, covers all of the minutes up to date.

Since -- and as I recall, we decided that since we have the transcripts and the posting, that we would do kind
of a summary of action items and post that. And we will
start doing that probably next week.

    I think we have quite a few in that we haven't got
posted yet.

    But all of the meeting video is on, I think except
maybe the last meeting. And we are also pretty caught up on
transcripts.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

Then also on your executive director's report is
regarding overview of recent public input.

    As far as, as far as Catalyst is concerned,
Catalyst is now up and operating?

    RAY BLADINE: I don't believe it's up and
operating yet, but I think it will be, like, early next
week.

    Kristina probably knows that better than I do.

    Here she comes.

    I know that we have -- I think we have all of the
data inputted that we need. I'm not sure whether it's
actually up and searchable yet.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And maybe for the sake of --
for any public that may or may not be watching, or will in
the future, maybe you can describe what Catalyst is and what
its purpose is.

    KRISTINA GOMEZ: Catalyst is actually up and
running. Staff has been using it to log all of the public
input that, that we've received so far.

We are working on that right now.

And also Catalyst is a system that we'll also be
using to enter in all of our transcripts as well.

And we will also be entering all of the news media
articles, which I am working on right now.

So this is a searchable base that's used for
staff, for the commissioners, and for legal counsel.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Very good.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: And I believe, I believe
Mr. Drechsler did send out an e-mail yesterday afternoon to
all of the Commissioners with a user guide document, and
also with the password and with your user name so you can
log in and start searching documents.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Terrific.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Other, other questions for Mr. Bladine?

RAY BLADINE: Hurry up, Willie. We need you on,
because Kristina is showing me up.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Bladine, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: For the second round of
hearings, are you planning on hiring any more staff?
RAY BLADINE: I think we'll have one more person we'll add.

And I believe we are looking at September 12th to add one more person with the outreach staff for that second round.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Bladine, what is the, what is the schedule for the start date of the second round of hearings, and what is, what is the term -- how many cities will we be going out to and has anything changed since the last tentative schedule was presented?

RAY BLADINE: I'll let Kristina help me with this also.

But I think that we're still looking to start on the 26th, 27th of September.

And I'll let her go with the numbers, because I know she knows them.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: I believe we have a total of 23 public hearings.

We have added one at the request of the Navajo Nation. We did add at the Kayenta location, so that would make 24.
We are thinking of having simultaneous meetings. So, with your permission, we are hoping to have two meetings on the same night.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: When you say simultaneous, are they going to be going on at the same time?
KRISTINA GOMEZ: Yes.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: So that means we'll be renting equipment or...
KRISTINA GOMEZ: Um, that's another issue. We're also thinking of looking into working with a streaming firm to go ahead and to negotiate a few meetings with them, just to get us through the few weeks of public hearings.

But also during the first round of public hearings, there were a few cities who actually allowed us to use their streaming system or their video equipment.

So that kind of put -- that took pressure off of Buck having to go to every single meeting.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is there a way they could be consecutive, or are these just too geographically disparate that we can't?
KRISTINA GOMEZ: I have to look into that.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm just curious what the
situation was.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: We're actually going to start working on that on Monday.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Tuesday.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Tuesday.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I think that's a good idea, you know, if we were having 24 visits, I think we need to double up as many as we can in order for us to be able to accommodate that schedule and still have enough time to take public input into account before we come up with another draft map.

RAY BLADINE: Commissioner Herrera, Chairman, we -- Kristina and I have had the discussions, we're talking about how might we do that.

We have some ways to go in terms of figuring it out.

As she mentioned, one might be if the city can do the streaming and maybe we can do another city with our equipment.

Perhaps we can hire another firm to fill in.

So we're looking at alternatives to try to do that so that we can get as much input in in as reasonable a period of time as we can.
But we'll come back to you with more details once we get that -- we get it worked out.

I would comment, I think I did last time, we had had discussions with Flagstaff, and they would prefer to be on a weekend versus the first. On the other hand, we had some discussions with the Navajo Nation, and they would be happy to be first and at the start of a week.

So we're trying to figure out how to work that in, so that we can start on the 26th, 27th, and still meet Flagstaff's request.

And then, of course, we all need to figure out how your schedules are going to go.

So as soon as we can get some tentative dates together next week, we'll start shooting them out to all of you, and then we'll also come back to ask for specific approvals the way we're going to proceed.

And I am sure as last time we'll have some cities that will drop out and others come in, but we'll try to be true to the areas that you wanted to go. And we'll keep you informed on that as we proceed.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Bladine, have you talked to ASU about using their community college system?

RAY BLADINE: I have not yet.

It has been on my list and is on my list now for Tuesday. But I will -- they do want -- they appear as if
they may have something in SkySong, is the last information I had. It can broadcast out to other areas. I'm not sure whether it's back and forth or out, but we will -- we are going to follow up on that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments for Mr. Bladine or Ms. Gomez?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thanks very much.

RAY BLADINE: Thanks very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And how are we doing on the mapping?

WILLIE DESMOND: I think we're all set.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: So for this version of the map, we're asked to remove as much of Maricopa County from the river district as possible, move that into, like, rural Pinal County, I guess.

We're not able to move all of Maricopa County really because you need to go through it to get to Pinal County.

But that was my intent there.

First of all, I will look at Maricopa County.

It is kind of a -- well, it's a very ugly district in order to do this.

I turn on -- you can see some -- so District 8 is
one of the northern districts. District 3 is not.

District 4, this area all over here, this is what's included in the river district in Maricopa County.

So, if you look up, it has Maricopa, Morristown, Wickenburg, parts of Buckeye, both the north and the south, Gila Bend, Theba or -- I'm not sure how to pronounce that one. Sorry.

I apologize if I got that wrong.

And then I'm going to zoom out just a little bit, so you can see.

It comes through and pick ups -- basically it picks up a lot of Casa Grande, and goes south down to the Pima County border, and north over here.

And that was just in order to pick up enough population to make it, you know, reach right around the 710,000 that it needs to have.

I should also mention that because District No. 2 had to be altered in order to accommodate this, the Hispanic population did drop a little bit.

It's still above 50 percent, but it went from 52.25 to, I think, yeah, 50.07.

So it's a little bit less voting age Hispanic.

It might help quickly if I -- it kind of circles Maricopa. It does have some of the, you know, the outer lying, more rural areas, but it does have.
And then one thing I forgot to mention yesterday when we were talking about the previous change to this district, is that in order to keep Coconino whole I had to take some more population from Maricopa, but I did need to give District No. 5 a little bit more population, so I took that from Yavapai, and moved parts of Sedona, and then a little bit of this area out to District 5 also.

So that's one place it did hurt, that I forgot to mention yesterday.

Is there a specific thing that you would like me to look at with this one?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Can you put the -- or maybe you do have the places layer on.

WILLIE DESMOND: I can zoom in a little.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Yeah, maybe -- well, zoom in to where two curls up around and -- right there where you had the hand.

WILLIE DESMOND: Right here?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Right in there, yeah.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Is that -- would it be helpful if I shaded the districts again so you can see?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I -- yeah, go ahead.

So it looks like it's following the Gila County
line there. So we've got Superior, Kearny, Hayden. Or Winkelman probably in there as well.

    WILLIE DESMOND: That actually follows a reservation in there, that dips down right there. And I add that later on. I didn't have that set here.

    Yeah. It's the San Carlos reservation is right here.

    Let's stop for a second.

    You can see this is the county line.

    So, it follows the county line here.

    VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

    VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I recommended some changes to the version.

    Is there any way -- I mean, I guess I didn't, I didn't anticipate that the, that the Hispanic voting population would dip down that much to me. I think it's a significant amount. Can we reverse those changes?

    WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, yeah.

    And then there is another version where I started back with --

    VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Is that four?

    WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, that's four.

    VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Oh, before you do that, let's look at four.
WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. And, again, bear with me.

If this doesn't open, I'm not sure what is going on.

These were all working this morning.

I printed everything off this morning. So I'm not sure. I apologize if this doesn't open right away.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Desmond, you don't need to apologize.

Technology is what it is.

WILLIE DESMOND: Ah, success. It worked.

I shouldn't say that so fast.

Okay. In this version we took what we had, took version number two, which is changed from the original river district to keep Coconino whole, and not split any of the Native American areas in the north, and we adjusted it based off of the Hispanic Coalition for Good Governments districts.

So, now District No. 2 follows that, that district line exactly.

And our District No. 6 follows theirs also.

So very similar to the third version of the, of the whole counties map.

Those two districts are, again, exactly the same in here.

And surprisingly there was some, some, some real shifts in District No. 3, I guess, to gain some more
population, as District No. 1 gets bigger using the Hispanic Coalition's line, but -- and there were some shifts in Maricopa. But other than that, it fit fairly well with what we already had.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, how far of a jump -- I know that on version three that District 7 is 58.92 HVAP and in version number two it's 60.22. Can you explain that?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, in that version, version number four comes directly from the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government.

So that's the number that they submitted for their proposed district.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Desmond, how is this map different from river district version two?

WILLIE DESMOND: It's different in that we -- it's basically two but with the Hispanic Coalition's districts. Then as a result, we had to change a little bit here in Maricopa.

Maybe it would be helpful if I added version two as a layer.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Would you do that?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah. I think.
Too many greens. I'm sorry. The color.

So the red line was where we had it in version number two. And then the green line and the current district line is the Hispanic Coalition and our current iteration.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: So, in our old version, version two, there had been some changes made to, you know, include parts of Glendale up to Northern Road, but Ahwatukee and Tempe into District No. 6.

So some of those changes matched fairly closely with what the Hispanic Coalition asked for, but then there is some -- you can see some diversions.

And I guess the other place where there is some real switches was down in Pinal County, Pima also.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Desmond, could you do an overlay of whole county version three on river district version four?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, I can.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Because it appears to me that districts three and seven are identical.

WILLIE DESMOND: That would be -- yes, because those are both from the Hispanic Coalition. They are
identical.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: District 4 and -- is identical?

WILLIE DESMOND: Should be just District 3.

Let me -- whole counties version three; correct?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That's correct.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm running out of pretty colors.

Okay. So now this darker purple, right here, I know that's a little difficult to see, I apologize. That would be -- that's whole counties, number three.

Why don't I make that line a little -- make that dashed. See if that helps a little.

Okay.

And I'll zoom out a little bit.

So, whole counties, district number two tracts, I guess this is District No. 3, whole counties, is significantly smaller, I guess.

That is -- oh, it's actually not.

They come down, and I'm . . .

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: It goes all the way to the north border of Santa Cruz County.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm -- yes.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So in whole counties versions three, you integrated the maps of -- for Districts 3 and 7 from the --
WILLIE DESMOND: Hispanic Coalition for Good Government.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you. Hispanic Coalition for Good Government.

And you've kept -- so you've kept those two intact. And you've got, if my count is right, you've got nine districts -- or nine counties that are staying intact.

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe so, yes. Anyone that gets split additionally, and, again, Mohave got split, Graham got split, and San Carlos might have been split also.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And the natural splits of Pinal, Maricopa, Pima.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And in this case Mohave.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, can you let me know what the benchmark was for your version -- so for District 7, say it went from 60.22, from what? Hispanic voting age population.

WILLIE DESMOND: To what is it currently in that district?

The current -- do you have that information,
counsel?

It's currently 57.45 percent, the current District 4.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Which is now in our map seven.

WILLIE DESMOND: Which is off the grid map as number seven.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Sure.

If -- I think the district, river district version four is -- Commissioner McNulty, I was wondering if she would be okay with that, trying to see if we can get it closer to the benchmark.

WILLIE DESMOND: So just closer to the current map, so across the Hispanic Coalition's?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah. Is there any way you think that the 60 -- the 60.22 is a little high?

WILLIE DESMOND: Would you like me to go back to version number two with a 58.92?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Please. If Commissioner McNulty would be okay with that.

WILLIE DESMOND: I mean, it would be version five then.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I want to make sure she is agreeable to that.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Sure. I'd be interested in
looking at that.

WILLIE DESMOND: And then would you like me to kind of -- so if we look at those two, I guess, side by side.

So the real areas of diversions are here, here, here, and then Glendale.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: So I can go back to some of those past changes.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And the reason I bring this up, I mean, if we were to -- I mean, obviously this is a what-if scenario, but what I don't want to see happen is for us to adopt a map which has a significant increase of the HVAP population from the current benchmark and then every ten years we're going to have to increase it and then it's super high.

I think 58 is probably already at a good level, and I don't want to have to increase any more if we don't have to.

Again, I'm looking at the issue of packing and trying to avoid it.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That area northeast of seven, the red line that deviates over into --

WILLIE DESMOND: Right here?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes. Maybe I should use
the pointer.

These areas, should that -- should we think about moving those here or no?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Well, if, if it reduces the HVAP, but then we're going into an area that may not be well represented by District 7, going into the Paradise Valley area.

WILLIE DESMOND: I think what happened was -- you asked me to go over to -- all the way to, I guess, the Scottsdale border. So this is taking it -- this red line, I believe, is going to, like, the Scottsdale border.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That's what you had asked for?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I think, I think it is.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Use that as one of the -- the kind of the easternmost border, so...

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Right.

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe that's what that line reflects.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: And I think, I think that's what it is.

I'm sorry.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I believe you.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Where's the 101?

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm sorry, are you looking for the... Sorry, that's a little crazy.

Sorry again. I made it a little better. Is that kind of what you're looking for?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Pull the whole map down.

The other way.

I want to see where the 101 wraps around to the north of nine, and see if we've got all of nine within the 101.

Keep going around.

WILLIE DESMOND: No.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It looks like it's interrupted here.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, it's probably not considered -- they had a lot of different classes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I understand. So it depends on how the particular road is classified.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: If you could look this week at that question, this district, and exploring whether it could be within this 101 rather than spilling out.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Commissioner McNulty, I'm curious on your -- obviously all the questions are questions for what-ifs, but I'm curious on the containment of within a, within a highway system would be --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: What my thinking is?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Why I look at that?

Because my, my -- I believe that this part -- this is kind of an older established part of north Phoenix. And last time when we looked at the map, we saw some Hispanic areas in here, and I think there's some growth and in fill happening in here.

So it's kind of a, a little bit, I think, like the area where we live.

And so I'd like to see if this could become combined into one area that combines these north Phoenix neighborhoods, and what that would look like, and what the HVAP would be, and what it might do in the future, and what the competitiveness might be.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Is that something that you want to see as a separate what-if, or can that be combined with trying to lower the HVAP?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think that can be
WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I don't think we need separate ones.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Are there other areas of this you want to look at? Are there other what-ifs that you guys just want to look from scratch again?

I know we've been building a lot of current ones, but feel free to start anything from scratch that you would like to see.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Are we done, are we done looking at this?

WILLIE DESMOND: Totally up to you guys.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I am.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

What I'd like to take a look at is to do a build off of the three border district map.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

And I should -- I think the overlay right now is -- I think that's the Pinal County submission from yesterday's overlay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The question that came up in
our brief overview of the three border district map yesterday were concerned about the current District 7 as sort of amalgamated itself and crept around to pick up population to meet the Voting Rights Act standard for HVAP.

I'd like you to, I'd like you to explore that further utilizing a criteria very similar to the Hispanic Coalition's map for District 7 and picking up population for District 2, instead of going towards the western border of Maricopa, going to the western side of Phoenix to be able to pick up.

The one thing I liked about the three border district map, based on the criteria that we've been discussing, is that we had nine counties that were intact, two districts were very close to the percentages of HVAP as are currently, currently in place, almost identical, which leads very closely to what Commissioner Herrera was alluding to, and yet we had an increase into District 3 to a higher percentage of Hispanic representation under that than any of the other maps so far that have been presented.

So it was intriguing, because it met so many of the criteria then that had been discussed in the what-ifs.

But I'd like to see if we can take the serpentine design of that out.

I think you can. I think there's some compilations that you can, by playing a little bit, coming
around at the west side of the state, and picking up the
concentration on the west side of seven and turning that
into, into two.

WILLIE DESMOND: Should we try that now?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Certainly now, or you can
give us a what-if scenario.

It's up to the chair how to decide you want to
approach that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We have the time.

Do others want to see other what-ifs too that --
besides that? Anything new that Willie needs to generate
for our next meeting on congressional?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I'd like to go back to the
map that we were looking at the river district, which is
version four. And we were making some changes to make a
version five.

Can you go back to that?

I think we're done with that what-if scenario.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: How long will it take to do
the river district one, just out of curiosity?

WILLIE DESMOND: To actually do those changes?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Uh-hmm.

WILLIE DESMOND: Probably get that done in an hour
or two.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Or we can go through it. It might not take that long.

It's entirely possible it would be less time than that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Do you have legislative ones to present today too?

You don't. Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: I do not.

Just to clarify about those, I think the next set of what-ifs for those would be to take the two -- nine majority-minority districts and just try to respect county boundaries and town boundaries a little bit more. I'll prioritize those types of things.

So I did not have a chance to do those last night.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm wondering if maybe we can do both of those, unless Commissioners Stertz and McNulty also have some additions, but maybe we can go through the two that Mr. Herrera and Mr. Stertz are interested in.

I mean, I find it useful to just see how this is proceeding.

But if others are not inclined, I'm happy to see what you all think.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I don't think I will sit
here and watch Willie for two hours.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I would not. No offense to Willie.

But my -- the what-if scenarios that I proposed some additional changes would be for homework.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Homework.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, I don't want to sit here and watch him move stuff.

WILLIE DESMOND: Should we try to just make some minor changes here on this three border one, and then we can go back to the version four of the river district and discuss the changes? Or would you like to do that, discuss the changes for the river district and then do these? Or do you want both to be for homework?

As I understand it right now, basically district number seven, you know, currently is ugly.

So ideally what we would do is have two, instead of coming up into Maricopa like in the middle of downtown Phoenix, have it come up in here.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Correct.

WILLIE DESMOND: And see how much of the western edge you can take off in order to make this district a little --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Contiguous.
WILLIE DESMOND: -- more contiguous.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Correct. It will be contiguous and compact, and will have the natural -- when you look at the highways and the traffic corridors, which, again, I've already given my explanation why this was intriguing, you also have this -- if you pull out, you'll see that in District 2 there's sort of a tongue that's licking its way to the west in District 2. That little piece right there, to the west.

WILLIE DESMOND: Oh, sorry.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yeah, the west, there you go.

If that comes off, that's going to -- you'll be able to pick up population in other areas.

There's not enough density in there.

But you will be able to pick up the density in more of a contiguous traffic pattern.

If you do an overlay of highways, I think you'll see that that will, will make some sense.

And also the intent of seven, it will be closer to the Hispanic Coalition's submittal.

And I am okay with doing that as a homework assignment.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: This is -- it's fascinating
for us to look at it.

As long as we've got these maps as they currently exist all available to us, the public has these, it's fascinating to watch and tell the public right now to be able to do this, but a lot of this is also like watching paint dry, so --

WILLIE DESMOND: I completely understand.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: -- as you're going through the exercise.

But it's also important to know as we start drilling down that once we get past this place, we start getting sort of these large block views, and we're capturing a lot of this data.

I think that -- and, Madam Chair, as I was alluding to before the hearing started, I think our, I think our next meeting is going to be more so let's focus on putting Willie in the center of the room and doing more of a design work session, where we can be having him work this through.

Because I think the next few meetings that we've got are really designed for design meetings where we can be making a lot of adjustments and seeing how broader we're getting our heads around this how they can be actually executed.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sounds good.
So do you have everything you need, Willie, from Mr. Stertz --

WILLIE DESMOND: I think for those, those two what-ifs, yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: I can just go ahead and say that I should be able to complete those --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: -- in not that much time.

We do have a pretty long gap. Not that I wouldn't mind having an evening off or two, but if there's anything else that you guys wanted to add to my list of things to do, besides the next one.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: The what-if scenario for the river district three versus the four, some changes -- my changes I'm a little concerned with, and is the -- when I -- removing the Maricopa County areas from District 5, so I'm talking about district -- the version four, and go into rural Pinal County instead.

This would allow the district with the Navajos and Apache reservations to take in -- and the Gila River reservation as well, so we want to keep as many of the Native American reservations together.
WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So, can you walk me through that a little bit then?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay. So that's version four; correct?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: So, so removing Maricopa County areas from District 4 — District 5.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And going to rural Pinal County.

WILLIE DESMOND: So, right now, District 5 comes down into Maricopa right here.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Correct. So ... 

WILLIE DESMOND: So you'd rather see that kind of shift down here?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And then going to rural Pinal County.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Again, this would allow the Navajo and Apache reservations to take in the Gila River reservation as well.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And then for District 6, I
had mentioned last time that I want to keep Ahwatukee and the northern portion of Chandler together inside District 6.

I guess this would be -- if Commissioner McNulty would be okay with these changes.

And I have a couple more.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm sorry, I'm just trying -- your last change was?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: For District 6, if you can go to District 6.

To keep Ahwatukee in District 6.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And the northern portion of Chandler together inside District 6.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

So I think it currently is -- Ahwatukee is -- this is Ahwatukee right here.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: So -- and I think Chandler is, by and large, it might dip down a little bit here.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: I can take a look at that.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: So you want to keep all of Chandler --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: No, not all of Chandler.
Just the northern portion of Chandler.

WILLIE DESMOND: I think that change is already reflected, yeah.

This is Chandler, and, you know, current District 6 is the blue area.

The red is -- the red is the river district version three, I believe.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay.

And then we had mentioned that the, that the Arcadia area being in District 6.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, could you -- Willie, can you hold onto that version?

Am I looking correct that Chandler -- can you bring up the borders of the city of Chandler for me, please?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

It's a little -- they're a little hard to see because those borders aren't clean.

But it looks like Chandler is this area right here.

Again, one thing I can do to kind of show you this is to use the redistricting tool, so we'll create a -- we'll say we're moving into a new district, selecting at the census place area.

I have to take a minute to think about this.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, what I'm -- the question I'm asking Willie is that am I seeing this right, the Chandler may be in -- have three different congressional districts?

WILLIE DESMOND: I think it's only in two, because this is the Gila River reservation.

So Chandler kind of goes like that.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I think this is a what-if scenario, so we are doing... .

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: No, I just wanted -- I wanted to, as we're looking at that, as we're trying to drill down on certain of those areas --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: But actually I'm not done. Do you still have questions?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Actually yours. So go ahead.

WILLIE DESMOND: The -- there it is. I'm sorry. That's the boundaries of Chandler.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Again, I was talking about the Arcadia area being in District 6, as I mentioned before. And in District 6, if we can remove portions of --

WILLIE DESMOND: Do you -- I'm sorry, I hate to interrupt.

Do you have borders you'd like me to use for
Arcadia? Because it's not a natural area.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Sure. I can give you my definition of Arcadia.

It may not be the perfect one, but I can say Arcadia, I think, starts at 56th Street and Thomas, all the way down to 40th Street, so following down Thomas, and then go -- on 40th Street and Thomas go north all the way to, I think, Indian School.

Camelback. Thank you.

Camelback, and go -- and head east, and again take up 56th Street there.

I think that area would be the Arcadia area.

WILLIE DESMOND: Since we do have time till our next meeting, I hope, I will try to mock that up and send it to the Commission, see if you can review that, make sure that's the area that you're talking about.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Sure.

And District 6, could you remove portions of east Mesa? That perhaps could be put into District 3.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And those are my changes for -- again, if Ms. McNulty is okay with them, for the -- COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Can I ask a question on that?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Of course you may.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm curious about is this a -- is this particular map something that you and Commissioner McNulty have been working on?

I don't understand why you keep wondering whether or not it's okay with her.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Because the reason I ask is, for example, I wouldn't make changes to your what-if scenario, because I -- for example, let me just give you an example what I'm trying to get at.

So I'm looking, looking at your three border district. I don't really agree with it, so if I started making changes to it, you probably wouldn't agree with those changes. There would be a different version of it.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That would be okay.

I think that this is -- the idea about these what-ifs are that we're trying to determine what the best possible maps can be for the state of Arizona and --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And I agree.

But I want to make sure that -- I mean, we could easily create many different versions of the what-ifs, so I'm trying to limit them to just these handful.

I guess we can create more.

You know, I don't need -- I would -- what I want to do is respect her --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I don't think you need to
I asked Mr. Herrera some questions about this geography and told him I would follow his lead because he knows this part of the world.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Sure. And I would make sure that I -- and that would be for everybody. If Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That's all I needed to know. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: -- if Commissioner Freeman made some changes, I'd -- I would want to, you know, I'd want to make some changes to his version or his what-if scenario, I would probably do the same thing for him.

I am just a polite guy.

I apologize that I'm a polite guy. But I think that's it. I'm just being polite.

WILLIE DESMOND: Can I just get a little clarification on the parts of east Mesa you want moved into District 3?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Can you go into a bigger version -- yeah, can you expand on that?

WILLIE DESMOND: I can turn that.

Maybe it would help, again, if I -- oh, at least according to the census, this is -- the area that turned red is what's considered Mesa.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So Mesa is three districts.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mesa is a big, big city.

So, let me -- so --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Is that orange part Mesa too?

WILLIE DESMOND: Right here?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Here.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Looks like they have a little annexing to do.

WILLIE DESMOND: A lot of these gaps are -- that are unincorporated areas --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Unincorporated county.

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe that is --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Maricopa County.

WILLIE DESMOND: If I click right there, yeah, that is an unincorporated area. That's not part of any census place.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Is it populated?

WILLIE DESMOND: Probably.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That's all right. Don't take a lot of time.

WILLIE DESMOND: Sorry. That is -- there is no population in the area I just clicked on.
Nope.

Forty-seven people right there.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond.

So for the removing parts of east Mesa from six but moving to three, can you go into the parts that are already in the -- the parts that are Mesa or east Mesa that are in District 6?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

Sorry.

It will find it easier.

All right. So, currently this area is all Mesa, and in District No. 6.

So District No. 3 could come up and grab this.

Or if it's -- you mentioned just east Mesa --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, portions of east Mesa, probably get that area right there.

WILLIE DESMOND: So to just kind of extend this part up; right?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you. It makes it easier when you show it like that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Are those all the changes?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: For now.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.
Maybe we should take a break before we add -- see if there's any more what-ifs we want Mr. Desmond to do.

Take a 15-minute recess.

It's 3:09 p.m.

(Brief recess taken.)

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

The time is 3:25 p.m.

And I believe Mr. Herrera finished giving his directions to our mapping consultant on the map he's interested in for the changes.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

And Mr. Stertz gave his.

Any other what-if scenarios that other commissioners would like to see on congressional?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: If there are -- knowing that we are going to be having the opportunity for Willie to be back at his computer working for the next five days, assuming he's taking a night off, if we have more what-if scenarios, there's no reason at all in my mind why we could not submit those, copy Mr. Desmond and the rest of the commissioners electronically.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I agree. Mr. Bladine can help facilitate that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That would be great.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, I think to avoid any open meeting violation, we probably should send them to the staff.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right. Mr. Bladine may need to do it.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I just want to make sure.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other, any other what-if scenarios that Mr. Freeman or Ms. McNulty had?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair, I don't know, Mr. Herrera sounded like he had more changes to make.

I think we should encourage him to make them, just lay them all out on the table right now.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Do you have additional changes, Mr. Herrera, that you want to discuss?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: No, I think I made -- I think I gave them all.

But, again, if -- I think I agree with Mr. Stertz, if something comes up tomorrow, that I should be able to e-mail --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Bladine.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: -- Mr. Bladine with that
information.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah. Okay.

Any other what-if scenarios that anyone would like to see?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Sure, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: On whole counties version three, one of the pieces that I picked up is that -- whether or not you would be able to connect in District 2, pick up all of Santa Cruz County in District 2 by expanding the volume of population in Yuma County into District 3.

I'd like you to take a look at that for me, please.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: District 2.

WILLIE DESMOND: Oh, you want that to go into --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Go ahead and pick up Santa Cruz County.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And then, and then be able to pick up the population that you're losing by capturing all of Yuma County.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: You might have to pick up La Paz as well.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I have a comment on the three border district one, Mr. Stertz.

Is there a way to -- and I don't know if you would be amenable to this idea, but just keeping Santa Cruz whole in that one?

Because the original one that I think got generated split Santa Cruz in half.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Oh, yeah, I'd love to be able to keep Santa Cruz whole, but which would mean wanting to either pulling that in two or one.

And if you pulled it into one, that would also help with the, with the picking up of the pieces on the edges that's off of the edge of that.

Again, I think we're going to -- if the goal is to try to get as many -- from a legislative point of view, working together with county officials, having two congressmen working in a county as small as Santa Cruz is might be a big benefit for Santa Cruz, but the people in Santa Cruz were very hopeful when we were down in Sierra Vista, they asked many times for them to be kept whole and intact and actually tied in with Cochise.

When I was in Cochise County, in Nogales, excuse me, talking with the folks wanting to be kept with Sierra Vista.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So could that be part of
your --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yeah. Sure.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We don't need to do a separate one.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yeah, take a look at that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Uh-hmm.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Okay. Just to clarify, the three border will be changed basically to make it look better up in Maricopa and also to try to keep Santa Cruz whole.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: In either one or two.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah. And the whole counties, we will move Santa Cruz into District 2 and all of Yuma into District 3.

And the river district version four will be changed to reflect the changes for Arcadia, and some of the other parts that I have, to lower the HVAP.

And then move the Gila reservation to District 5.

And also, I think there's -- it's possible I'll be able to also try to do District 7, lower HVAP, and District 9, within highway 101, but that may have to be a separate version. I'm not sure yet.

I'll look at it.

If it makes sense to do those separately, if they kind of conflict, I'll have two versions. If not, I'll try
to make those into one version.

If that's all right.

Are there any other -- anything that I'm missing, I guess?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Any other what-ifs that we want to have him do?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Desmond.

WILLIE DESMOND: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next item on the agenda is number four, review, discussion and direction to mapping consultant regarding ideas for possible adjustments to the legislative grid map based on constitutional criteria.

I don't think we have anything new to look at; right?

But I think Ms. McNulty mentioned she had some comments or questions on one.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I would like to look at option one that you did last time.

WILLIE DESMOND: This is option one. That's been adjusted, again, to not split, so...

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Let's go down south.

Two.

As I was looking at this last night, we've got
San Xavier, which is -- see where it says -- three points, that's part of the Tohono O'Odham Nation, and then this little thing is the Ak-Chin reservation.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes. This was the point I was making after the meeting.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think they should be together.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And then I think we need to -- I'm not sure how we do this, but once we move this into here, I think we need to fix this little area of population.

Need to clean that up.

WILLIE DESMOND: Let me go -- okay.

I believe the way this, this does look so jagged is that this is -- I was using census tract a lot of times, and then trying to reach the majority-minority districts. That's probably why it's kind of going like that.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, just for the record, Commissioner McNulty, you may want to describe a little bit more about what you're asking. I'm not sure it will be reflected in the record based on the description.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Based on me waving the pointer around.

Sorry.
Yes, I'd like to move the San Xavier area of the Tohono O'Odham reservation and the Ak-Chin reservation, move the boundaries so that that's included in the -- whatever the -- you call that grid number that is to the east of that.

And then I think when we do that we're going to pick up some population, we're going to take some population -- some of this Hispanic population here that's in the south Tucson area can come down into this southern district.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. I'll move District 3 over here, so it's with the rest of the reservation.

Then as a result try to, I guess, improve the compactness of this area right here.

Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Then I'd like to go up north to the top of the state, and do the same sort of thing, pick up the Paiute tribes in District 7, this area here.

WILLIE DESMOND: So that all of these... .

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: I can look at that.

Just one thing. The District 7 is already
exceeding the current voting age Indian population.

    COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That's okay. I'd still
like to look at that.

    I don't think that can go too high.

    That's kind of a different issue.

    WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

    COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And then I'd like to look
at keeping Flagstaff together with the Winslow, Holbrook
area along that.

    So maybe taking out -- so including in this
district up here southern Apache County but leaving some of
Navajo County, southern Navajo County into the Flagstaff
district.

    WILLIE DESMOND: Which area?

    COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Right here.

    WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

    COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So we would be moving this
into the Flagstaff district to try to tie -- tie those
together, so the boundary would be more like here maybe.

    WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

    COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So, the other thing I'd
like -- I couldn't tell from the map, but I'd like to -- I'd
like you to look and make sure that Prescott and
Prescott Valley are -- that Flagstaff, this Flagstaff
district does not include Prescott or Prescott Valley.
WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It kind of looked like maybe it was straddling.

WILLIE DESMOND: Let me see if I can.

So we have parts of Prescott Valley are with Flagstaff.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yeah, it just looked like they were being split. I think they should all be together in this 14.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Let me just look at Prescott, just for you.

Okay.

Are there other changes to this?

And I -- those last two changes will sync in well with the next set that's also going to respect municipal boundaries also, to try to keep more of those goals.

Are there other changes to this option one, or do you want me to go to option two?

Would you like me to also verify that these things happen in option two also? Does that make sense?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Sure.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: When do you think the draft that we previously gave you instructions upon will be ready?

WILLIE DESMOND: That will be the next thing I
work on, so hopefully early in the week, Monday, Tuesday morning.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yesterday you mentioned files from Arizona Minority Coalition or something.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah. We only have, I believe -- let me check. I think we only have, like, pictures of their maps.

I don't know that we have map files.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I don't know what those are, but I'm curious to know if we're going to get map files.

WILLIE DESMOND: If I remember correctly, I believe they're planning on presenting next week.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Oh, okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Senator Miranda at the meeting on Wednesday, didn't he say that the Minority Coalition was going to present next week?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I don't recall that.

Is that correct, Ms. Gomez?

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Yes, they did inform us that they will be working on those maps to revise them and they would like to present them sometime next week.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Great.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And those are legislative maps.
KRISTINA GOMEZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. So we can't get map files for those now.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: I was informed no.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. I think we would need that input.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Anything else on legislative that anyone would like to see?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Do you have your marching orders?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah. So, they'll be, I guess, two more versions of each one of these maps.

And e-mail if there's anything you think of or are curious about.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right. And we'll work that through Mr. Bladine.

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Desmond.

We've already covered, I think, item five unless anyone has thought of any other future agenda items.

We laboriously went through our schedule yesterday, so I think our meetings for September are somewhat confirmed and set.

Any other future agenda items from anyone for now?

And this, of course, isn't the last opportunity.
You can e-mail Mr. Bladine with that if you think of anything you want to add.

The executive director's report, number six, we've done.

Number seven, report legal advice and direction to counsel regarding attorney general inquiry.

I'm not sure that there is an update to provide today. And if there is, we would do it after public comment.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, there's no new update to provide at this time.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Which would take us to public comment.

And I have a number of request to speak forms.

And just to remind the public to please come up to the microphone and speak directly into it and spell your name when you start so that we get an accurate accounting.

So our first speaker is Mohur Sidhwa, representing self, from Tucson.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, before we begin, I'd like to make sure that we're limiting the comments to four minutes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Yes, if we could limit comments to four minutes, that would be great.

MOHUR SIDHWA: Mohur, M-O-H-U-R, Sarah with an H,
Sidhwa, S-I-D-H-W-A.

A couple of things that have been coming to mind. One of them was a comment I heard yesterday. I think it was from the mapping people. That data from prisons is very slow in coming and there's a lot of foot dragging at their end.

If I were a betting person, I would have -- I would bet that by the time you get the data it would be too late for us to consider it.

You are a legislative body. Therefore you have the right to subpoena.

So why are you drawing all these beautiful maps? And, yes, there may be 50 prisoners in Wilmot, if that's what you found, but there are over 3,000 plus in Eloy. And registered voters, there are about 1700.

You know, there's something skewed here. You've got to take that into account.

Florence is in the thousands.

And this is something I will be hammering away on, because this reaches into the very heart of our Democratic system of one person, one vote.

So just kind of keep that in mind.

The other thing that concerns me is I think a matter of packing. If one minority district has grown quite a bit and has gone from, say, 53 percent to now 59 percent,
for heaven sake don't overpack it.

    It's okay to bring it down.

    In other words, I have -- this is my personal
thing. If a district -- minority district is all 53,
54 percent, then I will consider it kind of packing.

    So just avoid that, if you can.

    Because we don't want to have that scenario and
thereby have the loss of minority influence on the nearby
district.

    And once again, since I've been following you
around -- and it's exhausting. You guys must be very
exhausted.

    And honestly I appreciate all five of you for
doing what you're doing.

    Thank you very much.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: What I'd like to do is I know
we had entered -- we had asked our attorneys to look into
the issue of the prison population. At our next meeting
hopefully they can give us an update of what they've found
and how we can start addressing the prison population when
we go forward with what-if scenarios.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I think that's on their
to-do list.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Sandra Fischer from LD 21.

SANDRA FISCHER: Hi. My name is Sandra Fischer,

I happen to be the Democratic chair of
District 21.

I am also the chair of my toy drive in
Marlborough Mesa.

I guess I was hoping to see a little bit more
about the legislative maps and seeing a little bit of
difference, so I don't know that I have a whole lot to say
today.

I think you guys really have made some great
comments about these maps and doing the differences. So
what I saw in the website before I came here was not enough
for me to see, but I guess you've come across some new maps,
and you're going to have those out. That's, I guess, more
what I'm looking at.

Because the more important thing for me is always
having it compact, and really -- and competitive.

And I think that's critical being in
Maricopa County, yeah, it is hard to see some of those differences.

And to see some of Maricopa go with -- well, when it comes to congressional districts, to see part of Maricopa go with all these outer rural areas is a concern, because we have so little in common with the rural areas. And it's hard to see where they would have to meet -- where our congressmen would have to meet with his district if he has to go all over.

But then, again, watching you, it's hard to see how you can't include some of Maricopa in some of that.

But, that would be a thing that I would be concerned about when it comes to congressional districts, is how far, how much -- if you can get as little of Maricopa in some of that if possible.

And, again, I think you guys are doing a great job, and I really appreciate everything that you're doing.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Jim March, representing Pima County Libertarian Party.

JIM MARCH: Hi. I am Jim March, last name spelled same as the month.

I really appreciate the comments that were made yesterday. I apparently stepped out of the room. Directing
counsel to figure out what are our options regarding jails. I'd like to very briefly go over what looks to me like four different options.

Option one is to ignore it, which is what they did in 2000.

There's two problems with that.

The jail population disparity has increased in the last ten years. Pinal County in particular has become home to several private prisons, bringing prisoners out of state, so that the geographic concentration of the prisons is increased in the last ten years and the severity of the potential disparity has increased.

So I don't think that ignoring it is just a good idea.

Plus, because it's going to have a disparate impact on the First Nations, their attorneys are going to have a lot to say if it doesn't get fixed.

Plan B is what New York came up with, which is assign each prisoner a known real origin and think of them as a registered voter of wherever they really come from.

If they're in prison in Eloy and they really came from Flagstaff, then they're a Flagstaff voter.

If they're from Mexico City, then they're a Mexican voter, so on and so on and so on.

The problem you run into with that plan is that it
means getting very detailed information out of the various
prisons.

   The private ones and the federal ones in
particular might decide that you don't have that authority.
   Or will it may require coordination with
legislature to create new legislation to come up with that
kind of a plan.

   Now, New York state actually went there, and
they're doing that.
   So it should be seen as an option, but it's a more
difficult one than other choices.

   Next option you've got is to discount the prisons
completely as population for purposes of these districts.
   There's maybe a problem with that too. And it
goes like this. The prisoners don't have a lot of civil
rights, but one of the few they do have is the First
Amendment right to petition for redress agreements. And
some of the people they have the ability to petition are
their congressmen and their state legislators.
   So if you exclude them from those legislative
maps, maybe at least in theory it might be appraised in
court that you stripped them of that particular First
Amendment right.
   So that could get ugly.
   And the last option would be the so-called
tendrils option, or physically redistribute the prisons
across all the districts by doing very strange little border
lines that will come out of, for example, a particular
district the Navajo Nation's in, and one little tendril
might drop down somewhere into Pinal and envelope a couple
of prisons to relocate them up that way.

That type of activity would do slightly obscene
things to the idea of compact and contiguous, but not
really. And it would survive court challenge. And other
than looking bad, it would be completely within the scope of
what everybody knows you can do.

So personally I think that's the option you're
going to be left with, I think.

I would be really interested to hear what options
your attorneys come up with.

My guess is you're going to end up with number D.

Anyways, I hope you -- I hope this sheds some
light on your problem, and I appreciate you working on it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Wes Harris, representing self,
from Phoenix.

WES HARRIS: Hi. Wes Harris, W-E-S, H-A-R-R-I-S.

I live in north central Phoenix.

Yesterday evening I was -- I ran out of time to
talk to you about all the points I wished to make, so I came
back today to do that.

   Numbering CDs and LDs, unless it's by design, numbering all these CDs and LDs differently than we currently have causes confusion, plus it clouds the changes that you are making.

   Before you move forward, I would urge you to renumber them as closely as possible to the existing numbers.

Second, with your gerrymandering to create more Latino minority districts, you've apparently forgotten about the other so-called minorities, Blacks, Asians, eastern Europeans, et cetera.

   You seem by creating false minority districts, you're creating voter ghettos. Which is the opposite, I believe, of the intent of the Voters Act.

   Speaking of Latinos, you always use the term Hispanic to describe this group of citizens.

   If you are truly Hispanic, you have to come from the Iberian peninsula, which means you're either Spanish or Portuguese.

   Unless you come from Mexico and maintain your bloodlines from the Conquistador times, you're not Hispanic. So, by definition, you're not a minority.

   But personally I abhor the fact that we call Latinos or anybody else minorities. I find it distasteful.
And for that matter, any other group that's classified therefore separate them from us, and they become separate but equal, which is what in the '60s we got rid of.

To reiterate my concern yesterday, I abhor your idea of hiring another attorney to represent this Commission before ours and your attorney general.

I also resist the idea of hiring another left leaning professor from Boston to interpret the voters' rights impact of your work.

What have you got these three attorneys for? Isn't that what they're supposed to do?

I suggest that if you need attorneys, that you can hire them by the hour, rather than having them sitting around and answering -- not being able to answer questions that are asked, as they did yesterday.

And I would again like to revisit the university problem.

The university, like prisons, have populations that distort the area that they rest in.

Unlike prisoners, they can vote. And by aligning them with a small area, they exercise unreasonably and on the surrounding community and so perhaps should be separated from that community mainly because they do not fulfill the requirement of community interest, at the very least.

At the very most they are temporary residents in
nature. And the effect they have on continuous population is distorted at best.

If you look at the city of Berkeley as an example, Berkeley is a very poor city. And it's adversely affected by the voters of the University of California Berkeley.

This is also a situation we have with the University of Arizona, and ASU and Tempe and Tucson.

Again, I question your choices of meeting places.

Why are you having four of the next seven meetings in Casa Grande, while only our -- one in our second largest city Tucson and two in Phoenix?

Maricopa County makes up 68 percent of the population, and yet we don't seem to be spending enough time there, in my opinion.

Now, I do have to sit through -- I do not have to sit through these meetings. They are convoluted and inefficient -- except today. Today was a very good meeting.

The last two were terrible.

But I think your contractor is doing a great382disservice and should be terminated.

Sitting here meeting after meeting getting a lesson on how to use a mouse is not my idea of what this is all about.

They should have printed out maps for you and us. I have no map. The only map I have is this one from the
Pinal County Government Alliance.

I'm almost done.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Go ahead.

WES HARRIS: So I would, I would suggest that these -- this particular contractor is the yoke around your neck, and I think you should terminate him and get rid of them once and for all.

And, finally, who is this Hispanic Coalition for Good Government? And where are they? And where is their map?

I haven't seen it.

It appears that they're getting more attention than others.

Is that true?

Have you overlaid the Pinal County map that was issued -- talked about yesterday? Our maps?

I know you can't answer my question, but there it is.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Chris Rossiter from Greater Phoenix Tea Party.

And I'm not usually the one that speaks, so since I'm mostly going to read something, you're probably going to screw that up, so this is a letter that we submitted to the governor yesterday.

It's in response to a -- to the letter that was presented on the back table at the meeting on August 31st at the redistricting meeting.

Honorable Janice K. Brewer, Governor of the State of Arizona.

Copy to the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission.

Dear Governor Brewer, on August 17, 2011, you received a letter from various Arizona legislators, politicians, and organizations which presumed to inform you that members of the AIRC were being exposed to intimidation and interference created by undisclosed politicians and partisans who are allegedly opposed to an independent process to establish, quote, fair and competitive districts, end quote.

At the redistricting meeting on August 31st, 2011, a copy of that letter was furnished to all attendees by AIRC. No letters supporting any other viewpoint were distributed.

This letter, touted repeatedly by Commissioner Herrera as bipartisan, as though that is the
litmus that establishes the moral superiority and value of a political entity, argument, or action, was not merely disingenuous, its origins reek of demagoguery by groups who are hoping to involve your office in an attempt to intimidate and dissuade any further oversight of the redistricting process by a vigilant citizenry which seeks merely to ensure, by their involvement, that this process is as fair as possible.

Since this process began, the so-called partisans who are supposedly opposed to an independent and fair process helped uncover that a potential conflict of interest that was not disclosed by one of the commissioners on her application. It was also learned that a violation of Arizona's open meeting laws may have occurred. That matter is being looked into by Attorney General Tom Horne.

Lastly, it was learned that the Strategic Telemetry -- that Strategic Telemetry, the independent contractor chosen to map the new districts, has no other experience than to have worked for liberal Democrat organizations and candidates throughout the United States.

The Commission has acted recently to increase scrutiny on the communication reporting requirements of this contractor to help alleviate transparency concerns on the part of the public. For that we are thankful, and we will continue to monitor this aspect of the process very closely.
The letter submitted to you on August 17th said that the message sent by voters when they passed Prop 106 in 2000 was to, quote, remove the ability of politicians to gerrymander districts for the benefit of themselves or their political party, end quote.

While that is true, this doesn't dissolve the reasonable expectation that citizens will have to monitor the entity established to conduct redistricting. After all, it would be naive to assume that the newly established process will be perfect and not susceptible to age-old methods of manipulation and corruption. The previously mentioned discoveries seem to bear the wisdom of this out.

Who will watch the watchers? I assure you that we will.

That is the duty of the sovereign American citizen, and we are beginning to take it seriously after too many generations of having neglected it. Our nation is currently reaping the destruction of over 40 years of the erosion of progressivism has wrought on our institutions. It's time to return to our first principles. It's time to the return to the tested things that made us once the most prosperous and free people in the history of the world.

Demanding accountability from those who are supposed to represent us, ensuring that the faith of the voters in this new process is honored, and being intolerant
of corruption at all levels of government was deemed to be intimidation by the author and signatories of the letter you previously received.

Our organization views the insistence of these things as a tacit duty of all Constitution-loving American citizens.

We hope that you share our concerns and will instruct your office to oversee the AIRC and prevent any intimidation, by entities or individuals who commonly employ such tactics, from jeopardizing the goal of this process; a fair and impartial outcome under the law.

Sincerely, Chris Rossiter, vice-president of the Greater Phoenix Tea Party, on behalf of the board of the directors of the Greater Phoenix Tea Party.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Thank you.

Our next speaker is Geri Ottoboni from Pima County.

GERI OTTOBONI:  Commission, my name is Geri Ottoboni, O-T-T-O-B-O-N-I.

Excuse my voice. I was having some room -- I guess I shouldn't be doing that.

I'm amazed that all the other mapping companies who bid on this contract included in their bids a person to do the polarized voting and competitive analysis.
The other companies would have paid that person from the money they received to do the job. No extra money would have been needed.

Surprise. The most expensive company did not include this person in their bid. But they're the ones who were hired.

Wasn't that the Commission -- sorry, wasn't that Commission aware of this when they voted for Strategic Telemetry?

And who is paying for it?

We the taxpayer.

This is the most terrible, horrible economy.

I strongly -- we the taxpayer, I strongly suggest that Strategic Telemetry pay for this subcontractor out of their salary without this subcontractor adding more money to their contract. They should have included their expense in the bid, like everyone else.

Just for your information, to put this in on the record, the Harvard professor is the most expensive person in the United States who does this work.

Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Lynne St. Angelo from Pima County.

I wanted to just comment on the information that was presented yesterday about the data, the voting data from the different years, 2004, 2006.

I do hope that you do include this data. I actually think you should include 2002, since the last Commission, that was included in the changes that were made. All the votes that happened since then that I looked at, if my district was competitive, I looked at the data back to 2002 as well.

It always seems logical that that would be included.

Why that wasn't included in the money, I don't understand.

I don't understand how when I looked at all the other bidders on the RFP, it didn't look like they said they wouldn't include the data and that would not be part of their bid.

They also included, the other bidders on the contract, they included subcontractors. And some of them were for public information, archival public input and comments, coordination of public comments to be incorporated into redistricting scenarios.

And we -- they had Internet mapping applications,
and that was a part of their subcontractors, another one.

Another one had capturing public input and facilitating public meetings and hearings.

So instead of the subcontractors that were included, as I understand it, in the RFPs and the amount of money that the other bidders bid on it, we now have Maptitude that we're paying for, we have Catalyst Secure, and some other staff that have been hired to do that, and now we're hiring Professor King to do the polarized voting and the competitiveness, which was also included as a subcontractor in National Demographics Corporation.

So my concern is that, one, there's now at least four things that I count that aren't included in the contract that we're paying for Strategic Telemetry for. And there's no way that I could tell, based on the budget projection that was presented, where that information is going to be shown so that we can actually see the amount of money that's being spent on each of these.

Especially with if there's an open ended contract to Professor King.

Right now on the legal fees includes Osborn Maledon and Strategic Telemetry as one lump sum for the month of November -- or July, sorry, July, of $66,000. You can't tell what did Strategic Telemetry get, what did Osborn Maledon get.
I didn't think Strategic Telemetry was a legal fee. I thought they were some kind of consultant.

Even on the list of the breakdown on the actual -- this is the actual cost for July, the travel outside was $28.

I've been following you around, and I don't see how that's possible, that a travel expense could be only $28.

So I would like to see how you're going to do the breakdowns so that the public can follow all these different things that are being added to what is now going to be charged for different pieces of the RFP that is not included evidently in the contract already with Strategic Telemetry.

And that I would like to know.

The other thing I wanted to find out about, it looks like the total expenses on the end of July was $260,000. And it's hard to tell, but I thought it looks like the budget was 213,000.

So that means that we're already over budget, and now we're hiring a lot more companies. And I do think that the public deserves to see line item by line item the expenses that are being incurred.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.
My last request to speak form is State Representative John Cavanagh, representing self.

JOHN CAVANAGH: Thank you. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment.

I represent most of Scottsdale, Fountain Hills, and Rio Verde.

And I'd like to briefly comment on the congressional map that was shown -- one of them shown today, and also a legislative map.

On the congressional map, or maps, I didn't see all of them, all of Fountain Hills, all of Rio Verde, and the northern section of Scottsdale has been placed into the more rural fifth congressional district as opposed to the ninth, which is metropolitan Phoenix.

I don't know if that's something that you just haven't gotten around to, because that part of the process hasn't been approached yet, or if it was purposeful in some of the versions.

But I sincerely hope that Fountain Hills and all of Scottsdale and Rio Verde will stay in the Phoenix metro district, because obviously we share much more in common with where we live than a rural district.

So please keep that in mind as you're going through different iterations.

I wasn't aware that you had gone beyond the first
two more chance computer generated grid maps.

So I'm not really sure what the district that I would be living in would like look like now. But in the original grid maps, Fountain Hills was one end of the district, and it looped over Phoenix, through northern Phoenix, and stretched like a ribbon all the way to the west side by I-17.

And clearly not a compact district.

Again, I hope that's something that will be taken care of when you start to talk about compactness. But it would be extremely difficult -- I mean, aside from the fact that there's no -- there are too many communities distinct that don't really interact with each other in such a long district, it would be extremely difficult to represent people along that large a swath. That's an unfortunate reality we have in rural districts where the population is not dense, but there's really no excuse to create that kind of barrier between a representative and his or her constituents in a more dense area.

So I hope that you take that into account also, and I thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any other public member that would like to speak today?

(No oral response.)
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. That takes us to the end of the slips.

And I believe the only item left on the agenda is to adjourn.

And so at 4:11 p.m., this meeting is adjourned.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned.)
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