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PROCEEDINGS

(Whereupon, the public session commences.)

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

The time is 9:20.

Let's start with the pledge of allegiance.

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our apologies for starting late today. We were hoping to stream the meeting over the web, which we've been doing for all our meetings, but unfortunately we don't have the bandwidth this morning in this particular arrangement of this hotel.

So the meeting is being recorded and it will be posted onto our website. I'm not sure when, but Buck will ensure that that gets up there as soon as possible once the meeting has been recorded, and he can upload it to our website.

So apologies for that.

Let's go ahead and start with roll call.
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, Mary O'Grady and Joe Kanefield.

We have our mapping consultant, Willie Desmond.

A court reporter, Marty Herder. So when anyone comes up to speak at the microphone, please be mindful of Marty and make sure to spell your name so that we get an accurate spelling for the record.

Buck Forst is our chief technology officer, and Kristina Gomez is our deputy executive director.

So those are the folks around the room today.

Next item on the agenda -- oh, and let me just say one more housekeeping item.

We're going to go until 11:00 a.m. and have a recess for about 20 minutes to a half hour. And then we'll come back and continue the meeting at that point.

Next item on the agenda is agenda item two, map
I don't know if any members of the public brought maps today to present to us, but this is a recurring agenda item from now until we get the draft maps published and is the opportunity for folks to let us know if they have any maps.

So I don't have any -- I have some request to speak forms, but none of them seem to be regarding maps.

So I'm just checking to make sure.

Okay. No maps today.

So we'll go to agenda item three. Review, discussion and direction to mapping consultant regarding ideas for possible adjustments to congressional grid map based on constitutional criteria.

So I'm sure Willie had a productive weekend of working hard on all the instructions we gave him on Friday. And I will turn that over to you.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. We have two congressional and two legislative maps to present today.

As the criteria become more and more detailed, it does take longer to produce these, to weigh in various factors with each change. So we're not able to have them at the same pace as we were when things such as don't split Indian reservations or try to get majority-minority districts.
Buck, could I ask you, is it possible to turn off some of the lights over the projector to make it a little easier for people to see?

The two congressional maps we have today were changes to the river district, and a combination of the latest river district and the three border district.

So, is there one of those that you'd prefer to start with?

I guess we'll just start with the river district then.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sounds good.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

So, just to go over the criteria for this river district -- and I should note that the files that are going to be available online, when the stream will be available online too, there is a new file included in there that is the criteria. So it's just a brief description of what criteria were used to change this map.

This particular map was changed to include south Scottsdale into proposed District 6.

To remove east Mesa from District 6.

To combine Fort McDowell and the Salt River reservations with Congressional District 6 to make Congressional District 5 more rural so that it goes into Pinal County.
Congressional District 3 should get the arm of
Congressional District 5. That was the Fountain Hills area.
And to move Pinal and Pima Counties into
District 5 from District 3, not including the San Tan Valley
and Queen Creek.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Desmond?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Could you say that last one
again, please.

WILLIE DESMOND: Also to move Pinal and Pima into
Congressional District 5 from Congressional District 3,
proposed District 5 from proposed District 3.
And the last criteria was to make the district
more competitive.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Would it be possible to --
when we get these maps to have those criteria as a separate
page?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, I will add that criteria
page to the maps for Wednesday.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

Are there -- I believe this was a request --
Commissioner Herrera and Commissioner McNulty had asked --
do you guys have specific areas that you would like to delve
into right away?
I should also mention that I started with congressional district -- river district four here instead of five.

Five had some changes to seven to make it go to the 202.

I wasn't sure if that was how you had wanted it, so I left this as version 6A. If that is what you want from me, I'll make another map for Wednesday that is based off of five.

I did make the changes to include the Arcadia area though as part of this one.

All right. Were there --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, can you go into, let's see, Congressional District 6.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Are there areas that you would like to look at right away?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: No. You can just zoom into it. I'd like to see what sort of the boundaries are.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

All right. Starting at the north, one of the changes was to include Fort McDowell and Salt River with it. So those are the northernmost points.

Going down south a little bit, you asked me to include south Scottsdale, which is this area right here, and
also Arcadia, which is this area right here.

Northern boundaries of both of those is Camelback Road.

I'll move my mic over.

So when I turn it's still coming in.

It includes all of Tempe.

West Mesa, as you asked for, or moved all of the east Mesa. And then it goes down into -- it also includes Ahwatukee right here, which was from an earlier iteration.

Parts of Chandler, and then -- continuing down has Black Water, San Tan Village, and all of the Gila River Arizona reservation areas.

We were also able to make it more, more competitive using just that proxy of 2008, 2010 as a judge in this latest iteration.

It is about a seven percent difference between Democratic average statewide percent and Republican average statewide percent from those two elections.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, you talked about competitiveness. I see that there's -- on this version of river district, there are -- let's see, one -- District 3 is solidly Republican, District 4 solidly Republican, District 8 solidly Republican.

And I guess so is nine.

Is that correct?
WILLIE DESMOND: Nine is, depending on your definition.
I mean, it is more Republican. I wouldn't necessarily say it's solidly.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Fifty percent is not Republican?

WILLIE DESMOND: It depends what the criteria you're using. We don't have like a hard --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I know we don't have a definition. But I guess I was getting at that we have District 1 leans Republican.
District 5, that leans Republican.
District 6, that leans Republican.
I think they're all under seven percent differential.
I just want to make a note of that.
Can you look at three as well?

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

District No. 3 now includes San Tan Valley and part of Queen Creek that is in Pinal County, and the rest of -- and then the rest of it is contained in Maricopa, except for a small part that goes into Apache Junction. It includes all of east Mesa, a sizable portion of Gilbert and Chandler also.

Are there specific areas that you'd like me to go
into a little bit further or changes you'd like to see to this one?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I may have some changes. I just want to see if anybody else has any particular areas on this particular version of the map before I make my changes.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Mr. Desmond, just a point of clarification, looking at the splits report, have the columns shifted over? Am I reading it right, that there are five split counties, 25 split census places? Do those columns just need to be shifted over?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, that just looks like a formatting issue.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: And it's actually eight split counties. There's five that are only split into two districts, and three that are split into more than two.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Oh, gotcha.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I don't have anything on this map today. I'll need to study it. I spent most of the weekend looking at legislative maps.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Can you zoom in on District 6?

Thank you.

Go to that arm that we were talking about that includes Arcadia.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Would you like the pointer?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, the pointer would be great.

What I'd like to see -- so, this is, this is the arm being created. I'd like to fill in this arm.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I have some notes. I was driving around this area over the weekend.

So, I live around here. Thomas Road, Thomas Road, I think, is the southern border; correct?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I'd like to fill in, could you fill it in here, I think this is Camelback.

WILLIE DESMOND: That is Camelback.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And what I'd like to do is fill it in all the way over here until you reach -- I think this is the Indian reservation here.

WILLIE DESMOND: No.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: All the way to the right.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, that's -- where is the Indian reservation on this map?

WILLIE DESMOND: If you look to the farther right-hand side, you see the Salt River. It's like the diagonal lines.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: This right here?

THE WITNESS: No, right -- all the way to the right, past Scottsdale.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Keep going. All the way to the right.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Right here?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: The reason I didn't just extend that land is there's a fair amount of population. You had asked for the Arcadia area, and I believe the boundaries of that were 48th Street, Thomas Road, Camelback and then --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: 40th Street.

WILLIE DESMOND: 40th Street, yes.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: All the way to 56th.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

And so the far right vertical line is 56th Street.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: So this is still part of six.

WILLIE DESMOND: That's all six, yes.

And then you also asked to include southern
Scottsdale, and you asked that just for now we use Camelback Road as a — so I took those two areas and put them both, and then just kind of backed down to include all of Scottsdale. And that's where the two met.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Can we do this? Can we take Camelback Road all the way to the Salt River?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah. And the Salt River is included in this district. If I zoom out, you'll be able to seen a little.

If that makes it a little easier.

And then it does include Tempe and then those parts of west Mesa to Mesa Drive, is where that dividing line was drawn.

So, but the first change would be just to use Camelback all the way across the length of Arcadia and southern Scottsdale area.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Well, what I'd like to do in addition to that is take up, see if you can take up all of Paradise Valley -- this is a precinct; right?

WILLIE DESMOND: That is a census place.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Census place. Do you know the name of it?

WILLIE DESMOND: That one is Paradise Valley -- no, that white area, no, that is an unincorporated area.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: An unincorporated area.
WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

So the purplish shaded area is Paradise Valley.

All of the kind of green, olive green on the
left-hand side is all Phoenix.

Again, Phoenix isn't broken up into the
neighborhoods. So Ahwatukee is not identified. Arcadia is
not identified.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Right.

Let me think about that one.

Let me -- what road is this? This is in Mesa.

WILLIE DESMOND: That is Mesa Drive.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Can you move it down further
to Stapley?

The reason I'm asking, the reason I'm doing this
is I think there's a big difference between east and west
Mesa.

And the people in Mesa would agree.

That this part of Mesa up to Stapley is probably
the more conservative part. And the western part of Mesa,
which would approach Stapley, would be -- that community
probably has more in come with Tempe than it would east
Mesa.

So that's definitely a change I want to make.

WILLIE DESMOND: If it's informative, I mean, I
could shade this by the average Republican or average
Democratic percent. You'd be able to see right now.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Do you want to do that?

WILLIE DESMOND: If that's what you're looking for is a --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Sure.

WILLIE DESMOND: -- dividing line focusing on competitiveness.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I understand that that area will be pretty intense population, so we'll get population from somewhere else, but for right now if you could move it.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

As it's currently drawn, the -- if you can read that at all, it's -- I guess the more blue and green it is the more -- the less the average Republican percentage. The more yellow and red, the more Republican it is.

And that is by census block group.

So, it's very possible that individual blocks would have a greater variation.

So I guess you're asking to move it further to the west.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: The reason is the area that I'm sure they're conservative.

WILLIE DESMOND: The areas to the right of the line do appear to be more conservative.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay.
WILLIE DESMOND: Do you know if the boundary is east or west of 101?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: It is -- I think it's west of the 101. And right now I think the boundary we mentioned was Mesa Drive.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Go further west. That would be Stapley.

I think Stapley is the next street over, the next major street over.

WILLIE DESMOND: So, this black line again is Mesa Drive. And the next major street over looks like it's Center Street.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: No. The next one should be Stapley.

Center is not... .

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Is it Country Club?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Stapley is east of Country Club, between -- Stapley falls between Country Club and Mesa Drive.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: That's fine.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm not seeing it yet. I'll look for it.

Mesa. This is in the census blocks.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I see University Drive.

WILLIE DESMOND: This is Alma School --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Alma School. And Stapley is west of -- excuse me, east of Alma School.

WILLIE DESMOND: Is it possible that 87 is actually Stapley?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: No, that is Country Club, because that goes into the Beeline Highway.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

So does Gilbert, I think.

If you want, I could look further west.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: No. That's fine. We can --

WILLIE DESMOND: I'll just turn the streets off.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: We can do this as homework, I guess.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: That's moving six to three.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And what I'd like to do is, let's -- so for three, I don't want to make any changes yet. I think that's the only change I want to make for three.

But I want to go back to six.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: In particular that arm that we were focusing on a little earlier.
WILLIE DESMOND: Right here?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Can you show me the 51?

WILLIE DESMOND: The 51?


WILLIE DESMOND: The 51 is --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: What's over here? What's this area here?

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe that's all peaks. Let me turn the census place. I think this makes it a little easier to see, when they're all shaded differently, a little differently. I'll turn off the individual streets.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And these are the precincts; correct?

WILLIE DESMOND: Those are -- yes, those are the individual census places. So those are statewide.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Correct, statewide.

Is there a voting place by the name of Joshua over here?

WILLIE DESMOND: Possibly, let me go in and turn on -- I'll have to add that layer. Just a second. Yes, that white area is Joshua.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Now, is Joshua part of Paradise Valley?
WILLIE DESMOND: No. It's an unincorporated area.
The county of Maricopa.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: What I'd like to do anyway even though -- go back to the arm real quick.

WILLIE DESMOND: These labels are all different names of the precincts.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: What I'd like to do is -- for District 6 to take up all of Paradise Valley.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And let's include everything in Scottsdale up to Cactus.

WILLIE DESMOND: Up to Cactus?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I am looking at south of Cactus as the downtown area, so I want to keep -- I really do think that the downtown area of Scottsdale, Arcadia, Paradise Valley, Tempe, are -- would be considered a community of interest, and let's keep them together.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

And you want to keep the -- so you're moving, you're moving some of east Mesa, which will allow us to add some population to the district.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Correct.

WILLIE DESMOND: If I do have to cut more, is there another area that makes sense?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: What do you mean?
WILLIE DESMOND: Like, if, for instance, we don't have -- adding, adding all of Paradise Valley and all of Scottsdale up to Cactus, if that creates too large of a district, I need to remove some population. Are the areas of Gilbert, Chandler, or Ahwatukee or another place from District 6 a good place to take that population from?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Probably the areas of Gilbert.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

I'll -- if I have to, that's where I will.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: So that's District 6 and District 3.

What I would like to do is move to District 7. I'd like to put this district back to the lines that were recommended by the Arizona Hispanic Coalition for Good Governing. I think I'm saying it correctly.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. I believe in this version --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: It's exactly the same?

WILLIE DESMOND: It's not exact, but a little closer.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Can we go back to their lines?

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And you'll have to make up
population obviously, if we hold some population.
  
  So you can get population from District 8, from District 4, and District 4 from 3.
  
  WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.
  
  VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And if you can just do -- whatever makes sense. Nothing specific.
  
  But I'd like to -- I think Ms. McNulty, Commissioner McNulty, said keeping the nine within the 101, still doing that.
  
  WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.
  
  VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Not going over that.
  
  WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.
  
  VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: So, I guess you can only go southwest. Is that correct? On nine, to pick up population?
  
  WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, pretty much. Nine does, with earlier changes, does go up pretty far now.
  
  When we moved District 6 up, it took a lot of its population --
  
  VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: But, but it's staying within the 101 though; correct?
  
  WILLIE DESMOND: At this point it does not.
  
  VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: It does not.
  
  WILLIE DESMOND: No.
  
  VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Can we keep nine as
Commissioner McNulty had mentioned? I think she had mentioned last time, keeping it within the 101, and then going, to pick up -- can you pick up population going southwest?

And the reason I say, you know, District 9 is pretty established and I want to keep the urban sprawl away from District 9.

WILLIE DESMOND: No.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And District 4 should not be in Mesa. It's a rural district. So I want to keep District 4 as rural as possible, and have no urban area like Mesa in District 4.

WILLIE DESMOND: Let me look at that real quick. I don't believe District 4 goes into Mesa much.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, I want to make sure that doesn't happen.

WILLIE DESMOND: No.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: When you're trying to grab population, I want to keep District 4 as rural as possible.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: So, now, you can grab -- say, if you need population for District 4 --

WILLIE DESMOND: Uh-hmm.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: -- you can grab population from any area outside of Mesa, the city of Mesa.
WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Any rural area outside the city of Mesa.

I think those are -- I think those are all my notes for river version 6A.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Are there other changes to this one?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: No.

WILLIE DESMOND: Are there other parts that you would like to look at right away or just wait until --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I don't know. If you don't mind, I'll wait until those changes take place.

WILLIE DESMOND: Absolutely.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: So then, if it's all right, I guess I'll go to the next map that we have for today. And then after that I think it would be good if I went over the list of maps that I still have to do for Wednesday, to make sure I've got everything and going in order.

I believe these were all from Friday.

There's some from Saturday that I'll have for Wednesday.

This map was -- is called congressional three border -- or river three border combo version 1A.
So if there's a -- the reason I did it 1A is I was unsure which of the starting points I was supposed to use. I used the most recent river and three border, but if there's an earlier version of either that you'd like, I can make 1B.

Basically what we did is we combined attributes from the river district and from the three border district maps.

This is the first time you guys have looked at it, so I'd be happy to go over some of the areas where you would be curious where the boundaries are, by the way.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Anybody need the pointer?

WILLIE DESMOND: I guess if there's no questions, I'll just start by explaining some of the rationale behind it.

I believe some of the river district specifically references District 4. So I attempted to keep a bunch of that whole as possible. However, the one area where the three border and that differ greatly is that Yuma is kept as a -- as the third district, I guess.

So in this version, District No. 4, proposed District 4, includes all of Yuma instead of just the northern parts of it.

We were able to keep Yavapai County whole and Coconino outside of that, in District 5.
As a result, District No. 2 did lose some of its Hispanic population, so we adopted some of the parts of district -- of the three border district for the definition of two and seven, the majority-minority district.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, I just have a question with this one, with the river district three border combination version.

I don't think it was based on the grid map.

Is that correct?

My understanding is we -- that this one was completely -- we ended up doing away with some of the districts and starting from scratch on this one.

Am I . . .

WILLIE DESMOND: It was based on two maps that were both based on the grid map.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: It was based on the grid map. I'm sorry, I guess I misunderstand when you were creating this one.

WILLIE DESMOND: So this is a combination of the three border district map, which originated with the grid map, and the river district, which originated with the grid map.

It depends on how you define based on, I guess.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Maybe I misunderstood.

WILLIE DESMOND: Are there specific areas to go
into right away?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, Mr. Desmond, I'm curious about the border between four and eight, and just wondering if you could focus in, I wanted to see how -- what kinds of towns are right at that border between four and eight.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

I guess starting at the northernmost part.

In the border between Coconino and Mohave Counties, the border is pretty much just following the reservations lands, so . . .

And the county boundary where possible, so . . .

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Desmond, while you're dropping in blocks, can we take a look at major roadways, interstates?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Start dropping in population centers as well?

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

So, it follows along, and it picks up parts of the Apache.

And then it does dip into Mohave County a little bit there, and it goes back and follows along the border between Coconino and Yavapai County, and follows that pretty much exactly.
There is some split towns that do cross county boundaries.

I guess in the hierarchy of things not to split, I figured it was better not to split counties than it was not to split a town.

If that's accepted, we can make that change.

It just continues, continues there on. Continues all of Yavapai County. And then does dip into Maricopa here.

So, that's Peoria, parts of -- has Sun City West, parts of Wittman, parts of Buckeye.

And then, I believe, it follows Highway 10 out to the Maricopa boundary. And then includes all of La Paz and all of Yuma, going down.

And that's, from north to south, that's the border.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can you just go back, scroll up? I just want to see the four and eight boundary a little more.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

With all the different layers, it does take a little while for the multiple loads.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah.

WILLIE DESMOND: Would you like me to zoom in a little more there?
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So, Peoria is part of four in this? I can't, I can't tell that.

WILLIE DESMOND: Peoria is not part of four. Peoria is wholly contained in eight.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's what I thought. Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: The parts of --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I see.

WILLIE DESMOND: -- that do contain four are Sun City West and parts of Surprise.

And then going south.

So -- can I have the pointer?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Sure.

WILLIE DESMOND: So, and then parts of, parts of Buckeye.

Buckeye is a pretty large, pretty spread out area. So I think that's cut in a couple of the different maps that we've looked at, just because of necessity.

So then it does cut through the heart of Buckeye, and then it follows, again, Highway 10 out to the Maricopa border.

But in eight are Citrus Park, Litchfield Park, parts of Goodyear, El Mirage, Sun City, Youngtown, all of Peoria, and some of, some of Glendale and Phoenix.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Desmond, on your second sheet in regards to the study data parts for the river, river three border combo 1A, your chart for compactness and competitive is incorrect.

WILLIE DESMOND: It is?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Unless it happened to be exactly the same.

WILLIE DESMOND: I see what you're saying. I will fix that. That's my mistake.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, can you remind me what the benchmark is for district -- current benchmark for District 7 is?

WILLIE DESMOND: I have to check with legal counsel. I think it's 57.04.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: 57.04 is correct.

WILLIE DESMOND: The other one is 50.2, I believe.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Its mark is 50.23 and 57.48 -- or 452.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: So this particular version brings down the HVAP quite significantly.

I want to make sure that that, that that is noted, because I don't know if that's -- I think that's going to be
an issue.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I would love to keep the HVAP as low as possible, but that's -- it isn't going to happen. You know, staying at the current levels is probably our best bet or best move.

WILLIE DESMOND: So it would be possible for a, you know, a version 2A to try to bring that up again. Or if you guys want to direct me, I can show you the distribution or something.

Again, with all these varying criteria, and especially scoring some what-ifs, I wasn't able to bring that up and meet some of the other goals.

What I attempted to do here was just combine these in the easiest way possible, and then make sure they're still at least two majority-minority, but --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And I think just quickly I think the issue is, with this particular version, is that the -- that the -- District 2 goes into Maricopa, which takes part of or some of the minority HVAP from District 7.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I think that's the issue with two and seven in this particular version. I just wanted to point that out.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'd also like to make the comment at this point that we have six criteria in the constitution. And three border districts is not one of those criteria.

Increasing the representation of the number of congress people on the border is not one of those criteria. And my perspective is we need to be focusing on the six congressional criteria first.

We can debate whether it's the quality of representation on the border, whether it's having competitive border districts.

We can debate a lot of things about what would strengthen representation of the border. We can also look at congress people all over the country that are involved in border issues.

But I don't want to lose sight -- I understand that these are what-ifs and folks are exploring things, but I don't want to lose sight of the fact that the criteria that we need to satisfy are those in the U.S. and Arizona constitutions.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: This is going to go back to
a couple of -- I'll bring up three issues. One, the adopted grid map where we began had three border districts. That's where we began.

Second, in regards to community of interests, I'll bring forward a variety of different narratives that lead from three ports of entry, three major ports, or our second largest trading partner, all having significance and having a significant amount of community of interest.

I'll bring forward transportation corridors as a community of interest.

I'll bring forward -- none of these will ever mention that it's an independent congressperson that would be representing it.

That would be the basis for, for that, for the view and the contemplation of a third border district.

So I'll have multiple different constitutional criteria that I'll bring forward to support a three border district scenario.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Desmond, I'm curious about river district version five, and how -- and I'm assuming, Mr. Herrera, that that one split Yuma in a place that was to your liking.

Or -- and I don't know if that was the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government's line or if that was yours or not.
But I was wondering if there's just a way to do that three border district and the river district in a way that possibly follows the river district version five, which means Yuma does get split, but still has a three border district option.

WILLIE DESMOND: I think the only possible solution would be to have a very, very narrow third border district in Santa Cruz County.

By and large, the western side of Pima County is -- there's no one there.

The census blocks are huge. So there's not like places you could divide it up.

I mean you could -- it would be -- basically the issue is nobody lives here.

So it's kind of trivial to mark a line.

The reason that the initial split was done is it kind of followed the interstate and included the Hispanic areas here, because there are people in Yuma, and that helped bring up the HVAP in that District 2.

So I believe in one of the whole counties, I think it was version 4A, it did have a third narrow district.

I could bring that up and show you what that looks like to give you an indication.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, please. Just --

WILLIE DESMOND: Other than that --
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I've seen it, but --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, while Mr. Desmond brings that up, I would just like to remind our commissioners that the reason I created -- we created the -- represent the way it looks on version five and on 6A is because of the public comments from Bullhead City, Lake Havasu, and Yuma.

As you'll remember, the tri city leaders were commenting and praising the map from Commissioner McNulty and myself.

So it wasn't something that I created. It was something that the people from those areas want.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'm sure we'll have many more discussions about this, but my perspective is that a community of interest is a group of people in a specific location that share common ethnic, cultural, historic heritage.

I believe that there are communities of interest along that border that have been there for centuries.

And I don't believe a port of entry is a community of interest.

And if we're going to pursue that line of logic, there are two border patrol sectors in Arizona. One is the
Yuma sector and one is the Tucson sector. There aren't three sectors.

And I know we can argue this back and forth, but to my way of thinking, those communities along the border should not be disenfranchised. And that will be an important consideration for my perspective.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair,

Commissioner McNulty, how in the world do you get disenfranchisement out of -- how do you get to that place so quickly?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think it's very simple, Mr. Stertz. We have about 115 or 120,000 HVAP in San Luis and surrounding environs that right now are able to elect a candidate of their choice.

And we have six Arizona criteria in the constitution, two of which are federal. And that goes to the heart of one of the federal criteria.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I'd like to talk a little bit about that.

I mentioned before I am from the San Luis, Yuma area. And putting the San Luis, Yuma, Somerton, and Gadsden in the proposed river district that has Mohave, La Paz with
Yavapai and all of Yuma, just doesn't make sense.

I think we will have an issue with the Voting Rights Act because of the large Hispanic population in that region being lumped into this river district that really -- there's two different groups of people here. There's really conservative area, and that's what I tried to do in my river district is keep those community of interests together, and then keep the high Hispanic population with two, and to fulfill the Voting Rights Act, and also the -- I think this is very similar to what the Hispanic Coalition for Good Governing was wanting, and I think we need to respect that.

I agree with Commissioner McNulty. I think there would be disfranchised voters in that area if we decide to lump them together with the entire river district.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I think maybe then we should rename the river district into the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government district and stop calling it a river district. Because if you're really focusing on what you just described as disenfranchisement and splitting, then it's not really the river district. It's really -- we're designing this around the Hispanic Coalition map.

So I want to make sure -- and I think you're trying to do both things, and I can understand that.
But, but, at the same time I don't want to be so equally dismissive -- I mean, the chair brought the concept of the river three border combo for analysis.

The original grid map brought us the concept of the original three border grid map or districts.

And we are talking about disenfranchisement and serving a particular submittal of documents and maps.

Right now I've got -- my latest count is I've got 178 maps that have been submitted outside of this, without the maps that we're already creating, that we're needing to review.

I know that there are many different iterations which have been proved out by the versions 1A, 6A, all different kinds, that will meet the general criteria of the Voters Rights Act.

If we are going to be designing around the Hispanic Coalition's map, I want to just say that that's what you're doing, instead of trying to create another story around it.

I think you're probably trying to serve both sides. I'm not going to go down that path. But I also don't want to get into a place where we're so summarily dismissing this work product about having three border districts without --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Stertz, no one is
summarily dismissing anything. I simply raised -- I stated my opinion about the criteria that are most important. From my perspective, the Voting Rights Act is the most important criteria that we need to satisfy.

I understand that you would like to create the three border districts for -- and I'm sure it's for a variety of reasons.

My perspective is that a port of entry is not a community of interest.

And I believe that there are other perspectives on community of interest. I stated what those were. That was not dismissing your perspective. I'm just telling you I disagree with you.

And that I believe the Voting Rights Act is the most important thing we need to do here.

The Arizona criteria are very, very weighty, but the law is the law. And the law says the Voting Rights Act comes first. And I believe that we are -- we need to pay attention to that.

So, you can -- you can view my stating my opinion as dismissing yours. That's not the case. We both have opinions. And I've described mine.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair --

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Wow. That was -- jinx.
I'll go with Mr. Freeman. He hasn't spoken yet.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

I don't think anyone should be dismissive, and I don't think anyone is, of anyone's what-if scenarios. We heard -- this is not an easy problem to solve.

We heard public comments in Bullhead City. We heard it in Yuma, in Sierra Vista, Nogales, Hondah, all over the state. We heard lots of different things from different groups and different people expressing their opinion on different ideas.

We heard a lot about the rural versus urban community of interests.

It's not an easy problem to solve. And, you know, I'm interested in looking at all of these what-if scenarios to see which one hopefully maybe can develop into the best map for us or where we can take, as the chair suggested, aspects of two different what-if scenarios and see if they can be put together in some way that would leave us with a good map.

So, you know, we're going to look at this map with a three border districts on the -- that was a creation of an iteration of the so-called whole counties map.

I would like to go back and look at the other map, just to have you zoom in on a couple areas that we were looking at immediately preceding that. I don't want to lose
But let's go ahead and look at that on the screen now, if that's okay with the chair.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: If I can make a quick comment.

Again, I did refer to the Hispanic Coalition for Good Governing. We do need to meet the Voting Rights Act. That's our -- that's our most important criteria. I don't think none of us will disagree with that.

I think that coalition is represented by a variety of community leaders throughout state.

And their map is, I think, fitting in with the comments from the people, on, again, Mohave, La Paz, and Yavapai, that want that rural district, and the people in southern Yuma that want to be -- that still want to be represented and be able to elect someone of their choice.

And that would make sense if they were in District 2.

So, yeah, you refer to the Hispanic -- that particular group, but, again, I'm trying to listen to the people from the Mohave, La Paz, northern Yuma, and their comments that they made, and also listen to the Hispanic groups that still want to be represented. And obviously we
have an obligation to meet the Voting Rights Act.

So I'm trying to balance it out and trying to do everything I can to make sure that we're meeting the needs of the, of the Hispanic population, and also the people that live in that area and in the river district.

So it's not easy to balance that. That's what we're trying to do.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

So the green line represents -- is the whole counties version 4A, which if I could trace back the lineage of that one, started just a map trying to maximize the number of whole counties with as few splits as possible.

It was then changed to not split the tribal lands.

It was then asked to incorporate the Hispanic Coalition's District 2, District 7.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Willie, is that 1A or 4A?

(Whereupon, Commissioner Stertz exits.)

WILLIE DESMOND: The 4A is the black line. Or the 1A.

The combo map is the black line.

The green line is just to show you what a Santa Cruz district would look like. A third border district that's in the center.

So this is -- that objective happened to meet with
the whole counties 4A, which we looked at last week.

So this one is -- we were at the whole counties
three, which did split Yuma, using the Hispanic Coalition.
And included half of Santa Cruz in that district, and half
of it going into -- I believe it's the proposed District 1,
which is Cochise.

And then Commissioner Stertz asked that in order
to, again, maximize the number of whole counties, to include
all of Yuma, that Hispanic Coalition District No. 2, and
also to include all of Santa Cruz and not split that with
the district that was primarily fit the population from
Pima County.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, what is the HVAP
for two? Is that two now?

WILLIE DESMOND: Two is still the one that
includes --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: All of Yuma.

WILLIE DESMOND: -- all of Yuma.

I don't have that sheet with me, and it will --
since this is layers loaded.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I would assume --

WILLIE DESMOND: Do any of you have actually river
4A -- or whole counties 4A? I'm sorry.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes.
    WILLIE DESMOND: Can I borrow that for a second? So the HVAP in District No. 3 is 50.25.
    VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Which is the --
    WILLIE DESMOND: District No. 3 is Yuma.
    VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: District 2.
    WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

    And then the HVAP in District No. 7, again, is 59.17.

    Because Hispanic Coalition's had that 60.2, this was based off of that, with a few minor tweaks. So it dropped about one percentage in this whole county scenario.

    And then I can turn this off again so you can see how it is in this combo 1A.

    We can also do a combo 1B or 2A, depending on how we want to do it, that would have that similar type of district.

    (Whereupon, Mr. Stertz returns.)

    VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.
    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
    VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Now, on this particular version of District 4, the Pai tribes are in four and not in five, so they're separated from five.
    WILLIE DESMOND: In which?
No, in the combo 1A, they are with five.

I can turn off the county line and make it a little easier to see.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay. I see it now.

And in this version, where is the city of Flagstaff?

WILLIE DESMOND: The city of Flagstaff is in five.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Five.

WILLIE DESMOND: This district, this version does not, does not -- it splits -- it keeps Yavapai wholly in four. It keeps Coconino wholly in five.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Are there other questions about the 4A map, or should we -- Commissioner Freeman, I believe you had some questions you wanted to see on this one.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I don't know if the chair has questions on this.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No. If you do, go ahead.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: The map, I'm attempting to talk about adjustments to the whole counties 4A, but I don't want to -- I mean, my thought there was could the congressional district that includes Yuma, could those lines be adjusted to correspond more to the Hispanic Coalition's lines, to perhaps raise the HVAP if that's what's needed with that district?
And then that is going to add population to proposed District 4, which perhaps that would allow you to take out population from the area of Maricopa County, so it doesn't intrude as much in Maricopa County.

WILLIE DESMOND: I think that would be essentially going back to what version three looked like where Yuma didn't have the split going across it. The only difference would be that Santa Cruz would not be a third border district.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: The problem with that scenario would be to keep that scenario viable with the three borders, so that's not possible.

WILLIE DESMOND: No, no, that would be. I'm just trying to clarify exactly.

So, now, would you like -- I can do that as a what-if.

Just wondering where it should fit.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: What are we going to call it? So we can track of these lines.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah. Would it be possible for me to call it --

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I estimate it would be 5A. We keep the A designation to this line of thought. See what I mean?

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Okay.
So there is a 5B coming up for Wednesday, so this would be a 5A. Okay.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Right.

WILLIE DESMOND: Let me just mark that down. Are there other changes to that 5A that you'd like to see?

(No oral response.)

WILLIE DESMOND: Are there other questions about this combo map?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: We're now going back to the combo map?

WILLIE DESMOND: The data table is the combo map right now. The line, the green line was just a layer I added that was -- so the plan that's open is the combo map.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay. Would you please go in and look at the boundary between District 6 and 3.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

So, this District 6 is taken pretty much directly from the river district version five.

And river district version six you'll remember we removed those parts of east Mesa.

So it does have the arm that goes up into, into Phoenix and grabs the Arcadia areas.

And that, again, is this area right here.

So, I think this is pretty much exactly as it was...
in river version five.

Are there areas that you would like to look at right away, or changes to this one that you want to see going forward? Or would you like me to start from scratch again in any way or...

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: This is another one where I'm going to need some time to study and see what -- I can't make changes on the fly.

WILLIE DESMOND: And I can give you the files today, or they'll be on the website also.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments on this, or other congressional maps?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Because these maps are also -- we're also contemplating population, HVAP percentages, HVAP volumes, and compactness, and an interpretation of competitiveness, it will become incumbent upon the Commission at some time to adopt standards and targets and goals.

I know this -- we're not talking about this as being a future agenda item, which I'm not contemplating, but
I'm trying to get an understanding for the purposes of maybe a description from Mr. Desmond what is included as a definition under competitiveness as you currently have it crafted into your work product.

WILLIE DESMOND: I don't have one, is the answer. In the legislative and river six, when I was asked to make them more competitive, that's what I endeavored to do.

So, I attempted there to just bring down the -- or raise the number of ones that were closer spread when possible to make them less of a difference between statewide Republican and statewide Democrat.

There was no, like, end point, you know, to try to get X amount to this level.

I just, where it seemed logical and feasible and not outrageous, just moved the lines to try to make that more competitive, as a relative measure.

And using that kind of on-the-fly criteria, the '08 and 2010 that we have currently loaded up.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: As a follow-up to that, can you give a description of what the aggregate -- what is included in the aggregate for the '08 and '010 elections -- or '08 and 2010 elections?
WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, I can.

So the fields that are included in that are, just working across, the attorney general's race in 2010, governor's race in 2010, the mine commissioner's race in 2010, secretary of state in 2010, the superintendent of public instruction in 2010, treasurer in 2010, the United States Senate in 2010, presidential in 2008, corporation commission in 2008 and 2010.

The averages of those averages.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I -- when I -- when we were talking about this originally, I mentioned that we, for just competitiveness, not for the DOJ requirement, that I wanted to focus solely on 2008, 2010, and then other commissioners brought up 2004, 2006. I think a good compromise is, you know, definitely taking all of them in account and but weighing them for relevancy and recency.

We have four elections, of 2004, there's been a lot of changes in the state since 2004.

I think we should include them, as well as 2006, but I think we should weigh them for relevancy.

I think I mentioned before that, just to give you an example, giving 2010 a little more weight, maybe, you know, 100 percent.
2008 would be -- 2008 would be 75 percent.

2006 would be 50 percent.

And then 2004 would be 25 percent.

I think that would be a good scale and I think a good compromise, because I would not be in favor of giving them all equal consideration, considering 2008, 2010 are the most recent elections.

I mean, this is what we have.

We should be using the most recent data. That would be my recommendation, and I think that's a very good compromise.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: As the discussion is of definitions and not agenda items, I don't think we should -- and counsel could probably concur with me, I don't think we should go down that path today.

MARY O'GRADY: I would concur.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

My goal was just to determine what was included in the document and the data points that you have. And if I could just go through this again so I'm correct.

It's the 2010 governor's, AG, mine inspector, secretary of state, superintendent of public schools, state treasurer.
In 2008, president, United States senators, and corporation commission.

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe the senate is from 2008, not 2010.


WILLIE DESMOND: And I should be clear that there are a lot of different ways to look at these in aggregate.

The way we're currently doing it would be to take -- to weigh each race evenly.

That is, that there are down ballot statewide races where there's fewer votes cast.

So that if you were to take all the Democratic votes for each race and all the Republican votes for each race, and use those to average, that would be weigh more heavily towards top-of-the-ballot issues.

For purposes of this kind of quick and dirty measure, to use the term they used last time, I guess, we took the average from each individual race. So that if corporation commissioner has a third less votes, it's still weighed evenly with presidential or senate or some of the top of the ticket ones.

And we weighed them also evenly across the years, so there is more of an emphasis on 2010, because there was more races then.

There's -- I'd be more than happy to weigh them
any way that you guys direct.

Or also maybe -- maybe it would be good to give you kind of a cheat sheet of the different ways of weighing them together in a statewide average.

So the way this happens, I believe, the statewide average is 56.02 percent Republican in the last two years.

It's possible that using different combinations of averages, still using all ten races but just averaging them differently, would change that.

I doubt it would be a significant change, but it's possible that it would be, you know, a slight variation.

So not to necessarily make more work for myself, but we'd be happy to run those numbers different ways and let you know, I guess, the statewide Democratic and statewide Republican two-way percentages and the different combinations.

And, again, these percentages are two-way percentages.

So it's the Democratic vote over the Democratic and Republican vote, and the Republican vote over the Democratic and Republican vote.

They're not all-way percentages, which would not -- the Democrat and Republican would not add up to 100 then, because there are votes for write in candidates or for Libertarians or Green Party and some of the other minor
parties that are on these races.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Can we -- I think Commissioner Stertz is correct. This is not an agenda item, so we should probably table it, and it would probably make sense for us to table that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: As we drill down to another layer, again, of the data that you're already presenting, I just want to make sure that I have -- we've already identified the data points you go in and how you create the percentages. And you've blended these so it's 100 percent total. You create some sort of a formula that's allowing you to do that.

WILLIE DESMOND: It's simply a two-way percentage. So it's the Democrat or the Republican vote over the total of the Democrat and Republican vote, so that there is no other party included in these calculations.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And in those calculations are you including any voter turnout as it -- in regards -- are you using any other data points to craft this? For example, a percentage of turnout in a particular county of Republicans or Democrats? This is just raw results-oriented
WILLIE DESMOND: Correct.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Then I believe at the meeting on Friday you had asked to also include registration as a measure of competitiveness. And I think we're in the process of doing that.

There is -- I'll let Ken speak to that more when he's here.

I can present more information on that on Wednesday, but I know there are some -- the last Commission ran into some problems using different definitions of active and inactive voters in different counties.

So we're trying to be very -- make sure it's consistent statewide.

And just to give you the process of how that works is typically you have to geocode every voter based off of their interest, which is simply assigning a latitude and longitude to them based off of their address, and then that will allow you to know what census block they live in.

Geocoding is not a perfect science.

So you do have holes there where people, where certain streets, certain addresses don't geocode to the, like, the exact latitude and longitude and then it goes to the next level up.
Sometimes it's the street or the ZIP code or whatever.

So that hasn't been done yet, because we've been pretty explicit in how we do that to make sure it's consistent statewide and doesn't bias any type of address or any type of person.

So we're still working through that right now.

But that will be eventually, hopefully very soon, available on the base files that guys all have and can be used in some of these competitiveness calculations.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you. I appreciate that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Any other comments or questions?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I do have one comment.

I actually think this kind of goes to the heart of the matter that's on the agenda.

And I just want to be clear that my perspective is that, with regard to competitiveness, what I'll be looking for is that all other things being equal the outcome is not -- cannot be predetermined.

And I want a number of different ways of looking at that.

I don't think there's any one way or any one definition. I think it's going to have to be case by case.
I think it's going to require a lot of work. I think it's going to require a lot of measures. And I -- we need to be doing it right now.

So, my request would be that on every one of these iterations that we're looking at now, that we're thinking about that. Because we can't have a situation where that gets relegated to the end.

The Constitution says we are to favor competitiveness as long as it's not to the substantial detriment of other criteria. So I want to do that. I want to favor it as we're looking at these maps.

And if there is substantial detriment, tease that out, understand what that is, and talk about it.

But I want to make sure it's front and center.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I agree with Commissioner McNulty, which is why I've been asking for the most robust set of data we can generate and attach to each one of these maps, each iteration, so we can see things by complete set of election history data and voter registration data as well. The more information we have in front of us I think the better.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments?

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

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I have to agree with Commissioner McNulty that we do need to drill this down. I also want to refer back to that competitive districts should be favored where to do so creates no significant detriment.

We reiterated that about a million times. We don't need to go back over that.

But, when we are talking about the party registration and voter history data should be excluded from the initial phase of the mapping process but may be used to test data for compliance.

That's the real phrase that I keep going back to. And that's we need to define -- we need to talk about one -- the reason I brought up the question about what's included in these data points is that it's clear to me that these are a down and dirty sort of quick analysis, certainly do not include all the data that's going to be able to tell us truly whether or not we've got competitiveness.

So it's going to be incumbent upon us to get that squared away and to create -- and as we -- and I'll move to, the next time when we come up on future agenda items, to talk about definitions, so we can drill these down so we'll got some sort of baseline to reference to as we move forward.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any other comments?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Let's check the time.

10:41.

And we'll be having a short recess at 11:00. So we could start in on the legislative.

WILLIE DESMOND: Can --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Go ahead, Mr. Desmond.

WILLIE DESMOND: Can I go over the criteria I have for the other maps coming up before we go into that --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, please. Yeah, for the other directions we've given you, yes.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: One quick question, Mr. Desmond. Do you have other data points available in your database that you could expand in regard to competitiveness, rather than this quick down and dirty that you have now?

WILLIE DESMOND: No.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: For example, you've got no results of congressional races.

WILLIE DESMOND: No, I -- we do.

The issue with using congressional races is that
they haven't all been contested.

So that areas -- let's say you're drawing a new district that goes half over a district that was contested and half over a district that wasn't. It would wildly skew how the partisan makeup appears to be in congressional.

So far we've only been using statewide as a result of that, because of those were all evenly distributed across the state.

It's possible to look at, at kind of a fairly distributed makeup.

The individual races are all available on the data files.

They're available on the files we've given the commissioners.

They're available on the online districting page and stuff.

But for purposes of, of this kind of quick analysis, we have not used congressional, because it is not a universally populated field.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, Mr. Desmond, would it be any easier to use simply, instead of this aggregate, which is missing a lot of other data, a lot of other opportunity, would it be easier to actually distill it down to something more rudimentary, like registration?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes. Once we have the
registration all matched in. So that's just not available yet because of the difficulties with trying to match people's registration to their particular census block.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So when do you think that that's going to be available?

WILLIE DESMOND: I know we're working on it right now.

I'm not sure though. That's not something that I've been dealing with. That's been Ken and Brad in our office.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: We've got an extraordinarily short wick on this, on this candle, that based on our current schedule we are going to be publishing draft maps a week from Friday, for both legislative and congressional districts.

And it looks like we shall have data that hasn't been assembled yet.

So... 

WILLIE DESMOND: I'll make sure that's a priority.

I believe the reason that this is -- what is available currently is, A, we had this data for the voting rights now since the initial what we were asked to do.

I believe, B, I believe in Ken's competitiveness
presentation, running some of the analysis, it showed that
election results were a better measure of competitiveness
over the last ten years than registration. Although
registration was still a good predictor.

So I'll be able -- and each just -- that file does
take a long time to get it prepared.

So I will -- I'll make sure that's a priority.
And I should be able to report back to you on Wednesday.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And, again, Mr. Desmond, one
of the reasons why I recall the conversation then, that was
one of the -- when I first brought up about 2004, 2006 data,
because he was looking at a ten-year window, and the 2004,
2006 were the first, were the precleared maps were actually
put into place and using that as additional data points.

So, even from Ken's perspective, I think he was
looking at those as being important criteria as well.

So, that's it for that topic, Madam Chair. Thank
you for your indulgence.

WILLIE DESMOND: If there's nothing else about
these maps, I think going forward, there is the
legislative -- the five is what we're going to call it, what
Commissioner Herrera had asked for which would be using the
river district as kind of a rough guideline for the some of
the legislative districts.

I think we're going to work together possibly this
afternoon.

We could have -- I played around with it a little this weekend and was having a little difficulty accomplishing that, so we were going to sit down, and he'll give me closer direction and then I'll be able to work on that.

There is also the whole counties, which is version 5B, which Commissioner Freeman had asked for.

In my criteria I have written on my notes, not my initial notes, the notes I put together when I was making my to-do list, was to include all of CD 1 out of Maricopa.

All of Pinal except for reservation areas in CD 1.

All reservations in Pinal should be in CD 3.

To increase the population in CD 3 with the west valley of Phoenix.

And to unassign all of the areas of five, six, eight, and nine.

And then 5C would take those exact same criteria but reassign five, six, eight, and nine, based on compactness and respect for census places.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: And roughly equal population.

WILLIE DESMOND: Roughly equal population.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: That sounds about right.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

And then also we've just added a whole county 5A,
which would redo the split in Yuma based off of the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government's line, but leave that narrow district that goes north of Santa Cruz in there.

So it would be a whole counties, with the split Yuma, but the third border district in Santa Cruz.

And I think, I think that's it for right now.

Unless there are ones that I'm missing.

And I'm sure there might be more legislatives.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Any other comments on congressional?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Plus what...

WILLIE DESMOND: What's that?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Plus what we did today.

WILLIE DESMOND: Exactly.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

The time is 10:49, so we can talk for about

ten minutes on -- get started on legislative, and then we'll take our recess and come back and continue that.

So, Mr. Desmond, do you want to talk about what you've presented, what you've got prepared for us for today?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

So for today we've got two new legislative options.

Again, there's option one and option two, which follow kind of a parallel tract -- track. I'm in census
geography right now.

A parallel track. Initially they were designed just to create the nine majority-minority district.

Following that, they were altered to not split reservation areas.

Following that, they were changed to respect census place boundaries.

The fourth version had some specific changes dealing with Prescott, Prescott Valley. Just generally, the proposed District 6 that kind of runs in Yavapai and Navajo.

And then this version was taking those ones and where possible making them more competitive.

So if it's all right, I guess we could start with option one, version number five.

Are there places that you would like to look at right away?

I should -- I guess first we could start with the majority-minority districts.

There was, I believe, a lost district here that had been a coalition district. District 29 is now -- it had been just under 50 percent non-Hispanic White.

Now it's just over 50 percent. So it's not technically a coalition district.

I can change it again to try to bring that back
up.

But it's fairly close and would be a hard switch later, so I just kind of left it as it was.

There is, again, the majority Native American district, five, majority Hispanic districts, and then two plurality Hispanic districts.

So instead of there being one coalition and one plurality, now there's two plurality.

Again, what plurality means is that Hispanics are the largest voting block, larger than White.

Not a coalition, which is combination of non-White groups are the largest.

As far as the competitiveness goes, it is, it is not like a bright line definition I used.

As I mentioned earlier I just attempted to lower that number where possible.

So you'll see there is quite a few that are lower than 10 or 15, kind of around there. And more competitive than it was when it started.

I wasn't really sure how far to go or where to stop or what time, so I just tried to not make ridiculous changes that brought it down a little bit.

And I think, if we want to just look at 10 or lower, there's one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine districts that have a split less than ten. And
I am not even sure what numbers are of Republican and Democrat over the ten-point difference.

Again, ten points is just a round number to look at, not a definition.

I abdicate here.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Let's just be clear that ten points is not a competitive district under any definition.

We need to be much closer to zero.

WILLIE DESMOND: Are there specific areas that you would like to look at right away?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The challenge that I have in having any commentary about legislative districts is being handed these maps today. And, one, not being able to review, not being able to drill down, not being able to look at the data pieces behind them.

So I'll have no comments on either one of these until I get a chance to actually review the data that we have been given, so . . .

WILLIE DESMOND: I'd be more than happy to go over them again at Wednesday's meeting. They weren't done until late last night.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Sure.
WILLIE DESMOND: So there's just -- with the small window between meetings, there's just not much time for me to get them to you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: It's no disrespect to you, Mr. Desmond. I know that you've spent all weekend trying to get prepared for what we gave you at 8:00 o'clock on Friday night.

My kudos to you on your work product. But I can't -- there's nothing that I can comment on about what you've delivered.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments from other commissioners?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Desmond, option -- the option one version five, and option two version five, option one we did what?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, we did the same things for both of them.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: So the first draft --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Oh, that's right. Because we started with the two different ways of looking at it.

Okay. So one was splits?

WILLIE DESMOND: The first, the first change to the grid map was create nine majority-minority districts.

The second change was not to split reservations.
The third change was to where possible respect census place boundaries.

The fourth change was some that you had asked for with homework, and Prescott and Prescott Valley and some of those changes.

And the fifth iteration was to make them more competitive.


WILLIE DESMOND: And that was for both option one and two.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Other than it's 10:57.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah. So I think we should have recess, and we'll -- this will be a 20-minute recess, come back at 11:20, so I guess a 23-minute recess.

It's now 10:57. Thanks.

(Brief recess taken.)

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

Recess is over. The time the 11:32.

And we are on agenda item four, talking about those legislative what-if scenarios.

Did any commissioners have additional comments on those? I know we just got them, and so we all want to study
them, I think, more, but . . .

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I would like to -- and maybe some of the other commissioners, and this is really more of a point of reference, is that I had the great opportunity of working in most of the municipalities in Maricopa County, so I've -- I know Maricopa County. I know -- we still maintain a residence in Scottsdale. So not too far from Mr. Herrera's Arcadia district.

So I've got, I've got good practical knowledge of everywhere from Queen Creek all the way up to Sun City. So, as we start drilling this down, I will be bringing forward ideas, and they'll be based on some practical knowledge that I have of Maricopa County areas, travel patterns, that sort of thing, so that when we're having these discussions they'll be based on ten years' worth of experience working in the greater Phoenix metro area.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

I think that raises an important point actually, that, you know, we talk a lot about public input and how important that is, and it is, and we're receiving a lot of it and reviewing all of it, and incorporating it into these different what-if scenarios, and then ultimately the draft map that we create. But I think each of the commissioners
also has obviously relevant knowledge for their -- for where they live.

Some of you are lifelong Arizonans and just have a lot of inherent knowledge.

And I think it's important to bring of all of that to the table too.

So I would encourage folks to speak up on that.

Any other comments?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Maybe it would be helpful to sort of get a start -- start us thinking about how we're going to approach and analyze the maps. If we have Mr. Desmond sort of walk us through some select areas and show us what -- explain his decisions, his thinking process, where he put these lines.

In particular first glance I'm looking at on option one version five, and the area of proposed Legislative District 5, up near the word Yavapai, which is the far eastern point of that district. Maybe -- I don't know if there's something there worth commenting on or not. But just sort of looking at the splits report, there are some split communities. And there's probably some -- there might be some rationale behind that. There might be -- well, there wasn't enough time really to sort of fine grain
it to eliminate all those.

    WILLIE DESMOND: Absolutely.

    Let me get everything set.

    So Legislative District 5, I believe, was -- the reason for this northern boundary is one of the iterations that had us respect Native American reservation lands.

    There is a census tract, I believe, that follows right along this border of the reservation land. However, there is additional lands off the corner of it that aren't square tracts that do not have a kind of a census tract to follow along on.

    So if I'm correct, we just kind of followed the nearest census tract.

    I see that we do have either view split. That was not intentional, and that's something we could easily rectify, I believe.

    And let me put the county layer on top.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: In follow up to Commissioner Freeman's thought process, I think that he might be on to something. And it might be very simple.

    That maybe we start at one and work ourselves to 30, and say how did you discover this, how did you create, what was the thinking process you had in giving us the lines
that we have.

I know that there's been commentary. Commissioner McNulty brought up the river -- the Santa Cruz river issue, making sure that we had inclusion of both sides the river, inhabited river valley in North America, probably something to keeping that intact, so on and so forth.

But from my perspective, and probably from the general public's perspective, it would be good for us to be able to move through these and have knowledge of how we got to this point. It might be good for you to walk us through them.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, you can... CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other commissioners have thoughts on that?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: My only thought is that I think you just told us how you got here from the grid maps, what steps you went through, four or five, so, I mean, you can go into detail if you want, but I'm not sure that will really help me figure out where to go next.

I will at some point have -- I do have some comments today on the legislative maps, but we can do that later.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. And, you know, I'm not sure I'll be able to remember every, every iteration and
line change I've made.

Sort of a combination of going through the processes that have gotten them to where they are and all, but just where they are now might be good to kind of dive into some of the borders and kind of look at it.

Should I continue on with this District 5 then, or do you want to start from one?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The chair's discretion.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah. I don't know if we need to go through every district on this particular map. But I do think that's going to be important when we get to the draft map stage to actually, if there are some decisions that are getting made, that we need to understand exactly how and why they were made the way they were. But maybe for these what-if scenarios, I think we can just talk more generally right now.

Unless someone has a specific question on a particular line.

WILLIE DESMOND: Let me look at the last part of this one, just to answer the original part of the question. You will see there are some split areas here. I'm going to shade the census places again, so it's a little easier to pick them out from one another. So it looks like this does split a little bit of the Chino Valley and does split Williamson.
I'm guessing I just didn't pay as much attention to not splitting those in version number three of option one. And that's probably just an oversight on my part, not a conscious decision. So it's possible to clean up things like this.

I don't think there's a rationale for why this is, except that there's probably census tracts that come in along here.

Yeah, so even looking at the census block group, there's a large of chunk of area that only has 2500 people in it.

So, that's, that's the reason the line follows that way, is just because at some point a tract or block group was used to kind of move things around. Or even in the original grid, it's possible that that was a border.

And then, I guess, just following this line down, it doesn't really split any other areas, I think.

Just have this area, so . . .

Are there other districts specifically that you would like to look at, based off this posterboard, or the compactness, competitiveness, racial breakdowns?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Well, since we're in Casa Grande, why don't we isolate Casa Grande and take a
look at how that's been broken up.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Casa Grande is split here, split in a lot of places, a lot of the maps.

I think that part of this...

I don't have a -- I think part of that reflects -- that District 11 was in this latest iteration change taking some of the population from Casa Grande in an effort to make it, District 11, more competitive.

I could be wrong about that, but that seems likely.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair, it's going to be a point of interest for me which was the new District 11 where it borrows from Casa Grande, it also looks like it gets up into -- it's hard for me to tell in the southeast valley, and it also looks like there's a little spike that goes down into Pima County all the way down to Tucson, it looks like.

WILLIE DESMOND: There is. There is a spike that goes into, into Tucson in order to get Hispanic and basically a Democratic population to make this one more competitive.

It's one of the ones where I did, did endeavor to make that a more competitive district.

I can zoom in on that, if you like.

Eleven does come up all the way down into that.
And, again, that did mess with census place boundaries. You know, the criteria for this particular iteration were severalfold, and I guess because this -- the main focus of this was to be more competitive, I kind of defaulted to splitting things if I had to.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Desmond, what was the prior map? Was it option two version four? Option one version four?

WILLIE DESMOND: Option one version four.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Can you compare them?

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: One thing I'm thinking is, and this might be a comment for Buck, I almost think we need to bring a printer, so that we can print some of these comparisons, for example, so, you know, we understand what we're changing here.

Because I know none of us can just have all of this in our heads. It's just not possible.

If we ask you to make the comparison, you can't save that screen shot, can you?

WILLIE DESMOND: What do you mean?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It would be easier if we just printed it out right as you prepare it.

WILLIE DESMOND: I mean, I could have that as a layer to future ones, instead it would be a separate line on
there.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. I think it should be a separate map.

WILLIE DESMOND: A separate map?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes, that the comparison should be separate so it doesn't --

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: -- distract from the map itself.

WILLIE DESMOND: So this heavy red line is the old district.

So you'll see District 11 did run down into Tucson earlier, but not nearly as far.

This is all added to it, as a result of going farther in.

It needed to give population to those instead of taking from by making it skinnier, so it's more of a finger kind of a going in there.

I know this is a little difficult to see, but -- so this black line represents what District 11 is now. This area represented what it used to be.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'm going to ask you to make some changes for a new version based on version four.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Version -- option two
version four.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.
Should I open up the --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Only when everyone's done looking at this.
But I am just trying to figure out which version I want to use as a starting point.
I know I'll get lost if I use this one. I need to look at -- use what I was looking at over the weekend.
So when people are ready, I'll ask you to look that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can I ask a quick question on this?
The northern border on the Catalina Foothills census place, what is that?
WILLIE DESMOND: You mean like what are these cities?
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Uh-hmm. Yeah.
WILLIE DESMOND: I think it's county line.
PETER BENGTSON: Could it be the forest service boundary?
WILLIE DESMOND: I don't see any sort of street.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Someone said could it be a forest service boundary line.
WILLIE DESMOND: So the county line is up here.
So it's --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, that's the county.

WILLIE DESMOND: So if you look though, all the land though, north of it, up into Saddlebrooke and Catalina, is nonincorporated.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So what is that line? I mean, do we think it's Ina Road?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: It might be an arbitrary line, but that's the case of the Catalina Mountains.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, because it's north of Ina, isn't it? That line.

And what about the western border too. I'm just curious.

WILLIE DESMOND: That's First Avenue, the western border.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Just scroll up, please, to follow that line up.

WILLIE DESMOND: That turns into Christie, or -- yeah, Christie Drive.

And then doesn't look like there's a road at all on the northern boundary, really.

It must -- it's probably just a latitude longitude or something that was originally. . .

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Willie, if I'm correct in what you were showing me, you had to go from -- I'm just trying to get the length and the breadth of what you needed to create by creating block by block by block to create the competition in Legislative District 11.

Can you walk me through how you got to almost south Tucson --

WILLIE DESMOND: It is south Tucson.

Basically it was just -- the first place I started, my first criteria were to look at the current differential between Democratic and Republican statewide percentage. The ones that seemed like they were not 30-point spreads.

I started with some that were in, like, the teens and twenties and stuff, and looked to see if there were areas surrounding those that had either a Democratic area or a Republican area that could be added easily that would make that more competitive.

In this case, if I turn on census block group layer, and turn on streets, generate with that, this goes slowly -- and I'll shade it by percent Republican.

Again, blue will represent more Democratic rather than Republican.
So, initially, it was the border was right here. And because there is some Democratic areas just next to that, I just started going down, kind of block by -- block group by block group, accepting the change, allocating the now underpopulated district a little bit from District 11, until I got it down to a lower level.

I believe that final level in 11 is 8.98 difference.

So it's 54.49 percent Republican and 45.51 percent Democratic.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Willie, could you go ahead and track it from the -- tell me where that corner, which is -- where is it, the intersection of.

WILLIE DESMOND: This is King Parkway and this is --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I-10, Interstate 10. Interstate 10 and Kino Parkway, so Kino and I-10, and could you take me to the northernmost connection of -- northernmost point of Legislative District 11 as you've got it?

WILLIE DESMOND: It looks like the northernmost point would be. . .

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The town of Coolidge?
WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah. Or, it's all of Coolidge, I believe.

South Florence a little bit.

So, yeah.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Desmond, could you turn on the population layers?

WILLIE DESMOND: How would you like it shaded?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: It doesn't matter. I'm just trying -- what I'm trying to determine is that how much -- how much -- this is a rural, urban combination district, it appears.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That crosses over two counties.

And, Madam Chair, the reason I'm trying to ask the questions, I'm trying to get my arms around why this district would ever exist in this configuration, other than to try to create a competitive district.

I can't see any reason at all that it would exist in this configuration.

WILLIE DESMOND: I mean, in the previous version, it was still -- the northern border hasn't changed.

So it's just the southern going down into -- and
that was simply to make it more competitive.

District on the whole being into Tucson and including, you know, the rural areas of Pinal is just a reflection of the grid map, I guess.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: In the goal of capturing -- being able to create competitiveness in districts, are there districts that you recognize as you're now getting a better understanding of the state of Arizona, that lend themselves to be more competitive while still meeting other criteria of compactness, contiguity, and would be able to reflect some sort of community of interest, rather than trying to -- because this is a created district to me to -- this is an outcome-based design. The outcome was is you wanted it more competitive, so you had to create this by capturing spaces and voter blocks that have no relevance to do Coolidge. South Tucson has no relevance at all to Coolidge.

I can't think of any.

Maybe somebody can enlighten me, but I can't think of any.

But are there other ways of looking at to try to get that goal that keeps getting repeated, about trying to create competitiveness?

You find some natural pockets that you're able to do that.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Stertz, I think that's
our job.

I don't think that's the mapping consultant's job, and I don't think they're there yet.

I mean, my -- we've hardly done any work on these legislative district maps. We've made three or four really broad brush changes, and it's going to be our job to try and meld all these things together.

So I don't think they can answer your question yet. I think we need to figure that out.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Well, again, then it takes me back to my original discussion was that there are lines being drawn on a map that we are not drawing that we are being represented that are being based on decisions that we're not making. Therefore I would like to see every single one of these legislative maps drilled down one by one, 1 through 30, to show what all these lines and why they're there.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: But these aren't --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: If not, we should scratch this and we should draw them ourselves.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That's a completely invalid point, because --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: It's not an invalid point. It's a reflection of what you just said to me.

You just said that our mapping consultant is not
to be drawing these maps. It's our job.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: No, I didn't say that at all. I said arriving at a way that the districts can be created to incorporate all six criteria is our job that we need to do by drawing and redrawing and understanding.

So you've made your point that this particular district -- it's not a district. It's -- you know, this particular configuration was put together to satisfy that, and it doesn't work, because there are five other criteria.

And we're going to go through that with every single one, but that doesn't mean to we need to do that -- we just need to keep working with these things to take into account all six to move the ball ahead.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair,

Commissioner McNulty, I don't disagree with a thing you just said.

But my point being is that as there is someone -- as the mapping consultant is becoming more familiar with these blocks, that I would believe that their familiarity of these blocks, these areas, is going to be to an advantage to us.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I hope our own familiarity with these areas and these blocks would be of advantage to us and that we will ultimately be able to give the mapping consultant the direction that it needs to satisfy all six
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So, is your suggestion for us to stop the adjustment process now and for us to walk away and to distill these maps better so that we as individual commissioners have a better understanding?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Exactly the opposite. That we keep adjusting, and considering all six criteria, rather than looking at any of these as static.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: You got me -- got me fumbling over how to do both simultaneously. So I will move on.

WILLIE DESMOND: Are there other areas? Maybe it would be helpful if we put the original grid over the top so you can see how they're different from there.

If not, I can go to other districts.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I have a question, and I'm not sure this can be discussed given the agenda. But just in terms of just how we're numbering legislative districts and congressional districts, it is confusing because everyone thinks of their own -- you know, the current districts as they are currently numbered.

And how -- I'm not sure how the last Commission did that, but is there a way to -- letters -- is there a way to, you know, better reflect this so that it is clear for everyone?
I'd be -- and is that okay for us to talk about the numbering as part of this agenda?

I'm curious what other commissioners think.

MARY O'GRADY: Yeah, Madam Chair, I think you can discuss that if that's part of the what-ifs for reference point. If you have a different numbering system to recommend, that's part of that process.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah. And I don't mean to be throwing a wrench into things since we have these various versions where we've been doing it this way, so we may want to continue on. But I'm just curious what others think. Or maybe there's a way to have an overlay of current districts as they are currently numbered.

Go ahead.

WILLIE DESMOND: We could change the numbers the to letters, and do it uniformly, so one would be A, two would be B.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is that helpful or is that more confusing?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I know I found it difficult at first, but now I'm getting used to these numbers, so it would almost make me more confused, I think, to have to switch to another.

Or if we did, I would ask that we put both.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I'm fine with the way they
are right now.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: That's not to say that when we publish a draft map we might want to think about how we present it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, that's a good, good idea.

When we publish a draft map, it would be great to be showing what the other -- the current districts as they are.

Okay. Any other legislative comments that we want to make on either of these, option one or two?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'd like to -- I do have comments, but I'd like to use a different base map.

WILLIE DESMOND: So should I go to option two then?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think it's version four option two, which appears to be the only map I haven't brought with me, I guess because I had it out.

If you would please put on the census block -- I mean, the census place layer.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And then we'll probably need to see streets at some point.

I don't know if I can do this, because it's just
so -- the grids are so far off from the communities
themselves, but what I want to do is work on the southern
Arizona area and, and create a configuration that I think
makes more sense with how the city of Tucson works or how
southern Arizona works.

So I'm going to be looking at grid two, grid ten,
and grid nine, I think.

And I think I'd like to start with grid two.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: The northwest corner.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: See that go, go further
east a little bit.

We're going to get to that, but let's go east.

Okay. See the pink?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And the green.

I think the pink is Vail and the green is

Corona de Tucson.

WILLIE DESMOND: Does that make it any better?

I made them bigger. It might be worse.

So the lower pink is --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. That's Vail. That's

Corona de Tucson. That's Rick Stertz's head, so I -- move

over.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Can you see?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'd like to move this boundary over here.

WILLIE DESMOND: Uh-hmm.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So that Corona de Tucson is with Vail and Rincon Valley.

This is rough.

I know we'll just have to do this as a beginning and then see where it takes us, I think.

WILLIE DESMOND: Should we...?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And I'm not sure you need to do this right now. It may just drive people insane.

But what I want to do, Mr. Desmond, is I want to bring this boundary, whatever this line is, just as a rough -- and I want to bring it down and under Corona de Tucson, and then pick up the Santa Cruz County boundary and follow that south.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So here's -- let me...?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And so the main impact of that is going to be make Santa Cruz County whole.

So one thing that does for you is eliminates the need to figure out where the Santa Cruz River is, and put it on a map.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Because as I thought about
this I realized that the Santa Cruz River is not just a river. It's a watershed. And that whole community of Sonoita and Patagonia that's in the eastern part of Santa Cruz County I think belongs with the rest of Santa Cruz County.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So, so we're going to be coming down, you know, and then we're going to go back over here.

WILLIE DESMOND: That makes sense.

So then should District 1 make up the population that it's going to lose the rest of Santa Cruz?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: You know, I don't know all those answers yet, and we may have to figure those things out, but for right now, so, yeah, somewhere we're going to have to pick that up, but I don't exactly know where.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So once we get down here -- can you turn on the HVAP layer?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I want to look at the border, east of Santa Cruz County. Not the whole border, just this area over here.

WILLIE DESMOND: So there's the HVAP scale.

And where exactly did you want to look? I can
make this larger also.

    COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Do we have the census places turned on?

    WILLIE DESMOND: Census places are turned on, but they're underneath, so I'll have to move that to the top. It's going a little slowly now. It's trying to display a lot of data.

    So the census place, I can have it uniquely colored and you can't see, with the HVAP underneath, or I can have them just the outline.

    COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. It's not that important, but here's what I want to try. I want -- and this -- those who are concerned about compactness should shield their eyes. Or look away.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: What?

    COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We're assuming now that this is all together; right? Santa Cruz County is all together.

    There are two towns over here. One is Bisbee and one is Douglas.

    And I want you to draw as much -- many of the, you know, alternative to this, to what I'm working on here, something that comes out and grabs those two towns. And not just the towns, but, you know, the little -- the communities.
I don't know -- and when I say not just the towns, I mean not just the municipal boundary of the towns, but incorporate the bulk of the urban population in those two areas.

Now, as we come east from Bisbee, you're going to be hugging the border here I think because you don't want to take in Sierra Vista. And so it's not going to look, you know, compact at all, but I'd like you to draw that and show us the difference in the HVAP and the difference in population doing it the two ways.

So one will be just including -- there you go.

This is Bisbee.

This is Douglas.

And then we're going to come around under Palominas, I think, back over to Santa Cruz County. Just a what-if, just to see.

WILLIE DESMOND: All right.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

Now, I'd like to go back up in District 2 to the northern part of it.

And this little vacuum cleaner here, whatever this thing is.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That has Drexel Heights and Valencia West in it.
WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I want to move those up into three, with Tucson Estates.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And we'll get back to the -- how we tie that into the -- I'm not exactly sure how we tie this in here, but what I'm thinking is we need a line here somewhere, like 22nd Street or somewhere in there, in the southern part of Tucson.

So just hold that thought.

You don't need to find that right now.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So let's go to grid ten, to the northeast corner.

I think this is Houghton and Speedway, Houghton Road and Speedway, approximately.

What I want to do is I want to reconfigure Tucson so it's more east-west than north-south. So that it's more consistent with the way Tucson really is.

So I want to start here. I want to find Tanque Verde Road, and then I want to follow Tanque Verde to River Road, which is a very prominent geographic landmark in Tucson. And I want to follow River Road east.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: To a point, and I'm not
sure what point that should be, but just for purposes of putting something together, I'm going to say Alvernon Road.

WILLIE DESMOND: Can you spell that for me?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: A-L-V-E-R-N-O-N.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Then we're going to come south from there to Grant Road.

And then east to -- or west, sorry, to either Campbell or First Avenue.

And then south to -- you'll see the Barraza-Aviation Highway.

If I need to, I could try to draw this on a road map.

And then follow that to the north boundary at the Air Force base.

Follow that southeast to the north boundary of the Air Force base.

And I don't know if that exactly matches up, but what that's going to do is give -- is create something that includes central Tucson in more of the east-west arrangement than this north-south arrangement.

And then I'd like to go to grid nine, which is right above grid ten.

So the south boundary of grid nine is going to become the north boundary of grid ten.
And then, again, just for purposes of getting
started on the concept, I'd like to go -- we're going to do
the same sort of thing. We're going to take this and make
this more horizontal.

So follow I-10, Interstate 10, northeast.

It may be that you find that -- I couldn't quite
tell whether there's a national forest boundary along here
or some census place boundaries, but roughly I-10.

We're going to follow that northeast until we get
to a point around Linda Vista Road, I think.

And what we're looking for is a -- we're going to
be south of Oro Valley here. So we're going to get Marana
and Oro Valley and Catalina all together. Or most of
Marana. There's no way we can get all of that.

And then we're going to come across.

And that, that is going to become the north
boundary of nine.

Okay?

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And then I'd like to go
back to three, to your first vacuum cleaner.

WILLIE DESMOND: I think it looks more like a
dinosaur.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

And what I want to try and do here is make a
majority-minority district.

I believe there -- I believe there is that population in here.

The east boundary would be something like along the Old Nogales Highway, which is. . .

And then Picture Rocks, I guess this Picture Rocks census place would be a boundary.

WILLIE DESMOND: That would be the western boundary?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Kind of the northwestern boundary.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

So Picture Rocks is included or not included?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Not included.

This was clear in my head when I was looking at the road map yesterday, but. . .

So here are the notes I took, Mr. Desmond. And maybe this makes sense or maybe it doesn't. I can't picture it in my head quite the way -- quite as clearly as it was yesterday.

So the east boundary with 11 would be the Old Nogales Highway.

And then we'd follow the Benson Highway to 22nd Street to Campbell to Grant.

And then I-10 to the boundary of Marana.
WILLIE DESMOND: It sounds like eleven includes --
is more of a north-south district? Because nine and ten are
both east-west districts, horizontal.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Well, I'm not really --
let's move back out.

WILLIE DESMOND: Like zoom out?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Just a little bit.

Okay. Yeah. So ten would be more east-west, nine
would be more east-west, and that there would be a
majority-minority district in here that would become three.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And then --

WILLIE DESMOND: Will that majority-minority
include Tohono O'Odham?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'm not sure.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Maybe you could think about
that.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: The other thing that made
some sense to me was to make -- what's further west here?

Does three go all the way out?

One thing I thought about was that it may make
sense to make this district look more like the congressional
district. But I didn't focus on that, so let's not.
WILLIE DESMOND: So possibly going into Yuma then?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: No, not three. Three is going to be right here in -- three is going to take in this west side of Tucson.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It's going to be -- I believe there's a population there to create a majority-minority legislative district without including this. And that's what I'd like you to look at.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yep.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And I'll look at the map again.

I guess what I need to do is pull this up on my computer the way I had it yesterday and really look at those street names again to track my notes here. But I'll do that, and if I need to clarify, I will.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

And then just thinking about the upcoming week, we will have a lot of time on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. It's possible that I might not be able to have, like, you know, the printout and the completed thing done, but we could go into it with, you know, the rough outline of what you've drawn here and actually do some of the moving of the blocks around in session, if that helps.

I don't know how much actual drawing you guys want
to do at this point while we're in meetings.

But if we get a close view of few things you want
to tweak, that's possible.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That's okay with me.

I don't know the best -- I guess we're all
struggling to achieve the best balance of, given our time
constraints, you know, having you sit here versus just
hammering it out and then us working with you on it.

That's it for -- that took me all day to figure
that out.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Did anyone have other
thoughts on the legislative maps that they'd like to see
next time?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Willie, let's go back to
Tucson for a second.

I think Commissioner McNulty had some great
insights to your approach. I'm looking forward to seeing
those.

The one thing that -- there are large employment
blocks and large residential blocks that all relate to each
other. And they're the Vail area, the Sahuarita area, and
Marana, all have large employment that use Interstate 10,
and working -- there's a large employment either at the
Davis-Monthan Air Force base and at the Raytheon plant.

There are really tens of thousands of people that work -- that live in those three residential areas that feed down to that.

In contacts with residents in those areas, I've heard that they would love to have common representation because they relate to each other.

I don't know how that works.

But while you're considering what you are -- what you just heard from Commissioner McNulty, I'd like you to potentially have that into consideration.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So, Vail, Sahuarita and which?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Marana and Sahuarita are both feeders, both residential communities feeding employment into some of the main areas of employment.

I think as we start to drill down into communities of interest, traffic corridors, and employment tracts are also important.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And I'm sure that there will be many, many different iterations, but I would like to see how what Commissioner McNulty had just outlined for you going east-west, instead of north-south, and how the lingering line as it goes down through Littletown, going
down towards Vail, that truly is -- it's more impactful
going east-west south of River Road.

    I think she's hit it right on the nose there.

WILLIE DESMOND:  Okay.

    I haven't really looked at this option too much.
I could also look at other areas of the state if you have
questions on this.

    We had looked at that District 5 or 6, I think, in
option one.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ:  Uh-hmm.

WILLIE DESMOND:  I can show you the same type of
thing here.

    It follows a similar path by and large, I think.
Has a reflection of the grid and keeping Indian
reservations whole, wasn't too many places to go.

    But whatever you guys want to do.
Are there other what-ifs to look at?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Were there any from Friday's
meeting that still need to be done?

WILLIE DESMOND:  Yes.  The ones with
Commissioner Herrera looking at --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND:  -- following the river district.
We're going to get together to look through some
of those.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Let me check my notes and make sure that was it.

I think that's it for right now.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Did commissioners have any other input on these?

Ms. McNulty. Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Ready to go study more.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: If we can focus on option one version five, what I would like to do is, as quickly as we can, go through each of the districts and just give me the highlights of which bigger cities are contained within those districts, just to give me an idea of, you know, what each district contains, and the bordering, just we need to start, one, go one to two, three, four, whatever order you need to go in.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

All right.

I guess just starting in the southeastern corner, okay, District 1.

It's all of Cochise County. Goes up a little bit into Greenlee and Graham.

It includes San Jose, Graham, includes Swift Trail
Junction, and a little bit of Safford.

Then it goes into Pima, takes a little bit of Tucson, the communities of Vail and Rincon Valley like we just talked about. And parts of Sahuarita, Green Valley, Elephant Head, and down through the middle of Santa Cruz County.

Number two is the other half of Santa Cruz County, parts of a lot of unincorporated areas in Pima, and then runs up into the heart of Tucson a little bit, going fairly north-south.

That's -- right up in here.

District No. 3. That includes all the Tohono O'Odham reservation land, and then parts of Pinal County, including Picture Rocks, parts of Marana, a little bit of Tucson, Drexel Heights, Tucson Estates. Goes into Pinal County, go into Red Rock, including most of Eloy, the western border of Casa Grande, all the way into Maricopa County, getting part of Buckeye and a lot of unincorporated unpopulated area in that part of Maricopa. And then tracing back down following the boundary of the Tohono O'Odham.

Four includes what's left of Pima, an unincorporated area of -- or unincorporated -- very unpopulated area of Maricopa. All of Yuma County, and then parts of La Paz.
I can go drill down specifically in there.
So has a little bit of Parker, includes La Paz
Valley, Quartzsite, Gadsden, Bluewater.
Not sure what the name of this reservation is.
River.
And then it comes back down through La Paz again.
All right. Back to five. Just north.
Five has most of the populated parts of Mohave
County. It goes south of the Hualapai Nation. And, again,
this area is just some tracts that are part of the
reservation that don't necessarily follow a clear census
tract area.
And then it goes into Yavapai County.
And as we talked about before, parts of Chino,
parts of Williamson, and all of Paulden.
Six butts up against five. Has parts of Yavapai
and a good portion of Coconino, south of Navajo and Hopi
nations.
Goes east over to Hoburt, and -- not Hoburt, but
Holbrook and Winslow. Holbrook Winslow.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Been to Alaska lately?
WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, excuse me.
Goes south, includes Linden, parts of Show Low.
And it goes north of the Fort Apache area.
It's easy to understand six, kind of in the
context of seven, which is the majority Native American district.

So, it kind of gets cut off to accommodate that.

Seven, again, is the majority Native American district, including the Pai tribes, the Navajo and Hopi, and then the Apache, Fort Apache, and San Carlos areas.

Eight is kind of an ugly looking district. And that's the result of not splitting this reservation land that dipped down into the middle of it, so it does follow kind of a weird sort of bowl shape, almost, including the rest of parts of Greenlee County, parts of Pinal and Gila Counties.

The northern border is Star Valley and Payson. Those are split. And that's something that we can change.

It follows the county boundary, between Maricopa and Gila Counties.

And then goes kind of over along the border, Maricopa, into Apache Junction. Parts of the San Tan Valley, Florence and -- or San Manuel, and heads back into Graham.

District 9, that we just looked at, is in Pima County. It includes the Catalina Foothills, parts of Tucson, Casa Adobe, Oro Valley, Catalina, and Summerhaven.

District No. 10 is, I believe, predominantly
Tucson, but parts of the Rincon Valley and Vail. Excuse me.

District 11, as we talked about before, is -- goes up, starts in south Tucson right now, because it is now attempting to make it more competitive, cuts through Marana, Oro Valley, goes up into Coolidge.

Twelve is Maricopa and Pinal.

It does go into Maricopa and Pinal, primarily to keep the Gila River reservation together.

It has parts of Maricopa and the Ak-Chin reservation as well as the San Tan Valley, Queen Creek, Gilbert, Chandler.

Thirteen is to its west. Has parts of Goodyear. A lot of Buckeye, Citrus Park, and just a little bit of Phoenix.

Fourteen is kind of -- it includes the rest of Buckeye. And then a lot of area going all the way over to La Paz County. And parts of Yavapai. Again, has Prescott and Prescott Valley.

It follows down to District 15, which includes northern parts of Phoenix, along with Cave Creek, New River, Anthem, Carefree, and then the northeastern part of Scottsdale.

Also the Salt River and Fort McDowell, Yavapai Nation, Fountain Hills.

Goes west to the county line, and kind of takes
that large unincorporated census traffic in the northeastern part of Maricopa as part of 15.

Sixteen then is -- I think the rest of them are pretty much in Maricopa County.

Sixteen is primarily made up of Mesa, east Mesa.

Seventeen is the rest of east Mesa, parts of Gilbert, Chandler, Queen Creek.

Eighteen is parts of -- the rest of Chandler and the southern part of Phoenix.

District 19 is Phoenix, again, Tolleson and parts of Avondale, and is, I believe, the most -- it's the highest HVAP of all the districts. It's 65.98 in this version.

Twenty includes a little bit of Avondale, Phoenix, and Glendale, parts of Peoria, Sun City, El Mirage, and all of Youngtown.

And that is what we're calling what is a plurality district. The HVAP is 45.94 and voting age Hispanic non-White is 42.75.

Twenty-one is just north of there, the rest of Sun City, another -- like the heart of Peoria, and then a little bit of Phoenix.

Twenty-two is further north, and that has more of Peoria and a lot of Phoenix in it.

And then just a little bit of the western side of Scottsdale.
Twenty-three is primarily Scottsdale and Phoenix.

Twenty-four is Paradise Valley, southern Scottsdale, and some of Phoenix.

Twenty-five is the northeastern part of -- or northwestern part of Mesa, and then the northeastern -- northwestern part of Gilbert also.

Twenty-six is half of Tempe, the very western part of Mesa, and then northeastern Chandler.

Twenty-seven is wholly contained in Phoenix, and is another majority-minority district at 56.08 percent HVAP.

And 28 is also wholly contained in Phoenix, another majority-minority, at 51.83 percent HVAP.

Twenty-nine, also wholly contained in Phoenix.

And 30, wholly contained in Phoenix.

But those are not majority-minority districts.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: There's no -- Madam Chair.

The -- here I have the, have the -- what did you have the HVAP again for 27?

WILLIE DESMOND: Twenty-seven, 56.08, option one version five.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I just wanted to confirm.

Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

And you can tell by the numbering, I guess, how the grid map was laid out, what -- starting in the
southeastern corner and going in a clockwise pattern.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Any other questions on the legislative?

Or other scenarios we want to see for next time?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay -- oh, sorry, Ms. O'Grady.

MARY O'GRADY: Just two comments, Madam Chair. In terms of information that might be useful to the Commission, in addition to the split information, I don't -- the information on splits that's currently being generated, I don't know if it would be helpful to you and to the public to get that sort of a list of what's where, when you see this map, the maps, so you could get a cut by district, you know, Flagstaff in is district this, and Prescott is in district that, just so you could tell at a glance, not just if they're splits, but what's where.

That's just a general comment on something that might be useful.

The other, and this kind of follows a comment that I made at the last meeting, although we're still doing the election analysis, there is a sense that we might need an additional coalition district, not necessarily majority
district, but something where there is an opportunity to
elect a candidate of choice.

And so I think that's something to get -- to keep
in mind, if there's a way of getting a coalition district
that, again, may not cross 50 percent, but has a substantial
number of minorities, so that -- and the election history
that would show there is an opportunity to elect.

Just as when I look at, for example, this map, you
know, it has the Native American district, it has what looks
to be four Maricopa County districts with an opportunity to
elect.

I think two Pima County.

And then southeastern Arizona -- excuse me,
southwestern Arizona, at least on the numbers, is
majority-minority. But that's an area where we need to look
at the polarized voting to see if there truly is an
opportunity to elect.

Under the current maps there's also an opportunity
to elect in southeastern Arizona and in the Pinal County
central Arizona, but we don't have that scenario under these
maps.

So if there was an effort to do a coalition
district, perhaps some of those areas might be looked at.

Again, you don't need a full majority.

For example, by concurrent District 23, they don't
need a majority, but there have -- the evidence will likely show that there has been an opportunity to elect a candidate of choice in that area.

So, just something to keep in mind if there is a way of creating a coalition district where there might be an opportunity to elect.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

I think that was a good suggestion on our first comment, with the at a glance part that if Willie can include, like, what cities are in certain locales, certain districts, that would be helpful.

Anything else from anyone?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thanks, Mary.

That should take us to -- so, is there anything you need to summarize on legislative maps in terms of your homework?

WILLIE DESMOND: I don't think so, no.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Great.

And it might be helpful too, I don't know if what Ms. McNulty suggested earlier on this printer issue, if there is a way to maybe work with staff to have a printer at future meetings. But we can talk about that with Mr. Bladine and Buck and others.

WILLIE DESMOND: It seems feasible.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Great. Thanks.

Okay. Item six, executive director -- oh, I'm sorry, item five, discussion and possible action on retaining a voting analysis expert to review, analyze, and recommend action on voting rights issues including polarized voting and conduct analysis regarding competitiveness and other state constitutional criteria as needed.

So a few meetings ago we had an introduction to the voting analysis expert issue.

And our legal counsel did some research and provided us some information and their recommendation on Dr. Gary King.

And I think we had given them direction to reach out to Dr. King and see what his terms might be and his availability.

So, I turn it over to legal counsel.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, we have been communicating with Professor King, and we -- he is available and willing to work with us. And we're working with Ray Bladine, the executive director, so that we can work within our budget, and I think we will be able, we will -- I think we're to a point where that's going to happen.

So I don't have the precise wording of the motion that was -- excuse me, before it was without objection we were directed to follow up with Professor King.
And so today, if we could just get the authorization to execute an agreement, work with the executive director to execute an agreement, we will be done with that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Comments from or questions from commissioners?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I might be misremembering a motion. I thought it was to go ahead and negotiate and try to spell out an agreement that you would get back to us to approve.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, Commissioner Freeman, we don't have precise language to bring back to the Commission, but we have been talking numbers and trying to pin things down so that we can work within the budget. And I think we are there.

And under the -- and since it would be structured as a subcontract with -- I think it would probably be a subtract with Osborn Maledon, was what we've been discussing, we can do that with the approval of the procurement officer, who's Ray, as long as we have the Commission's authorization to do so.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Counsel, do you believe that we need a review by this consultant prior to us issuing our draft map?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, I don't know that we have to have his review, but I think the sooner we get him integrated into the process I think the better it will be. I think it will help downstream the sooner he's on board.

But I don't see this as holding up the work on the maps, but I certainly think it would be helpful to have him on board as soon as possible.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'll rephrase that. Do you think we should have him on board?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, Commissioner Stertz, yes, I think it would be very helpful.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, Ms. O'Grady, are you requesting a motion that we authorize you to proceed?

MARY O'GRADY: Yes. I think that would be appropriate at the time.

And I am sorry that I don't have the language of the prior vote, the direction that we got previously.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think that we need to proceed. I have confidence in our legal counsel that they know how to proceed, and I would move that we authorize them to proceed to get Dr. King on board.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Which is to say that they complete their negotiation and enter into a contract with Dr. King to provide us with the services we need to analyze racially polarized voting.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I second that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any discussion?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, if you could be more expansive to include state constitutional criteria, to the extent that so the Commission has some discretion of using him for those things as well.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'll expand my motion to include that and whatever legal counsel feels is appropriate consistent with our Commission's mission.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Commissioner McNulty, would you consider setting a top set on fees?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I don't know what the appropriate fees are, and I trust our legal counsel to do that analysis.
So as I sit here, I don't have the basis upon which to do that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. O'Grady.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, if the request is that we include a cap on the expert fees in the agreement, we can do so. And then if we want -- if we start getting close to that cap, we'd need to come back to the Commission and get authorization. We can, we can work a cap into the agreement.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Would it be a cap on the expert fees or are you looking for a cap on the analysis?

You know, I don't know that we can cap expert witness fees if we needed to use him subsequently to use him as an expert witness in litigation.

We might be able to cap the initial analysis. Am I misunderstanding?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, it would be a cap for this fiscal year.

And, like I say, if there was a cap, it would just mean that we would need to revisit it and bring it back to the Commission if we wanted to -- if we were getting into an area because of litigation we would need to exceed it.

But otherwise we can just work, if we don't have a cap in the contract, we'd certainly just work with the
executive director and with the budget reports to make sure that we are staying within the budget, the appropriations that we have available to us.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: At the last public hearing, Executive Director Bladine mentioned that there was a range of expenditures for this type of consultant.

And I believe that his numbers ranged from 10 to 25,000.

Is that a number that is -- would be commensurate with what your discussions have been with King for this level of work?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, Commissioner Stertz, I'm thinking it will be more than that, and actually that was for the first fiscal year.

And since the preclearance itself went into multiple fiscal years and they added on a number of experts, the numbers were much higher than that. So I think that we will -- we can consolidate both the numbers for the competitiveness and the voting rights expert.

And I think it will be more than that number that the Commission, this fiscal year.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Ms. O'Grady, do you have a recommendation of what a top separate fee would be that may be included at this time that would get us through this fiscal year?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, Commissioner Stertz, I don't have a number that -- I have -- that I'm comfortable going on record with right now, but I, but I would be happy to get you a number.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, I'm in full favor of getting this consultant engaged.

I am in no way or form comfortable with providing an open end.

So I guess if the maker of the motion would want to amend and set a number of 25,000 as a first pass to be defined at a later date, I just want to set a number now, so that we can work towards it as they're developing contract and scope.

So at least that they can begin to engage.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, I do anticipate needing more than that. And if we can come back to this after lunch, I might have more information that I can give you a number on that front.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Ms. O'Grady, I wasn't
planning to come back after lunch.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I didn't know there was a lunch.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think this is important. I don't think you're prolific spenders. I know you'll manage it wisely. It goes to the heart of what we're doing.

You know, this is not like running the city of Phoenix, where you have recurring expenses that you can gauge. Every day is something new here.

And I just don't think we can do that, and I don't think it makes sense.

I don't think Mary O'Grady and Joe Kanefield are going to waste the Independent Redistricting Commission's funds on expenses that they don't feel are integral to our mission, and I think we need to move ahead.

I would ask that once they have a better sense of exactly what is going to be contained in the analysis and the amount of time it's going to take, that they share that with us and they make certain that this doesn't cost any more than it needs to, but I have no indication that they would do otherwise.

So I have now made a motion that is three pages long, I think.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I want to be able to support a motion, but I've got to -- I would hope that -- I guess my question for counsel is -- because I don't want to vote against a motion that I support only because we don't have a dollar total attached to it.

I can't vote for an open-ended contract.

So I'm going to end up -- if we keep the motion as it stands, I'm going to have to vote no, but that's not a reflection of wanting to engage the consultant and engage him immediately.

When are we going to have an idea and about when -- about how much this is going to go and how much it's going to cost and what the scope of work is going to be?

MARY O'GRADY: If I could call Mr. Bladine and see if, if we can get that cap number, I'm happy to do so today. Otherwise we can revisit this Wednesday.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: There's a motion made and seconded.

Can we vote on that since it was seconded?

Because I do agree with Commissioner McNulty. I mean, I think this is an important piece.

And I do trust our Executive Director Bladine, and also our attorneys, that they'll do everything possible to
make sure that they -- because I think they have been doing that, cutting costs whenever possible. And I don't see this as any different. I think they will do the same thing.

They're good stewards of our taxpayer money, and I trust them going forward, so I think we should move on this motion and start getting work done by -- you know, a little bit at a time. I think this is one piece that we can definitely do, we have before, so . . .

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Can we just hold this in abeyance while Mrs. O'Grady calls Mr. Bladine?

Could you just make that call, Ms. O'Grady? Tell us what our ballpark is?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, sure. We can take a short, five-minute recess.

Okay.

So the time is 1:02 p.m. And we will be back shortly.

(Brief recess taken.)

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

It's 1:15 p.m.

And I believe Ms. O'Grady was able to reach Mr. Bladine, but I don't know the outcome.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, yes, we talked, and we
also re-examined the paperwork regarding expenses from the
last decade that we've been trying to use as a marker to
some extent, recognizing that their preclearance dragged
into a couple fiscal years, and we're hoping to do more
analysis in up front and hopefully get our preclearance done
in this fiscal year.

At the end of the day, what we would recommend
for -- and this is not something that we've talked to
Dr. King about specifically, but a $70,000 cap, recognizing
that we would be using him for making sure that we have the
up front analysis, and that's for this fiscal year.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

MARY O'GRADY: Hopefully we don't reach that, but
that would mean we wouldn't have to come back to the
Commission.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Counsel, when you looked at
the overall costs over the decade, and I know that you're
going to have to do some just quick math, due to -- what I
think I heard you say is that the goal is to front load the
work product in an effort to not string this through --
expenses through the entire decade.

Is that correct?

MARY O'GRADY: That's correct. We're hoping to do
the best job up front that will help eliminate litigation downstream.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And, Madam Chair, counsel, and last decade what was the overall amount, approximately, within a plus or minus $10,000?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, Commissioner Stertz, we have 130,000, and that's the billings that have been identifiable to these particular experts.

There were other experts hired as well.

And my understanding is that some of the expert billings were run through legal counsel at some point, so it may not be showing up in the numbers that I'm looking at.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, counsel, this would be, the numbers you're talking about, would be, for the sake of the public's understanding, is that would be commensurate with this -- with what the work product that these folks put together in the last decade.

MARY O'GRADY: Commission Stertz, yes, but we're consolidating it to a single expert, and we're hoping to get some efficiencies there.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay. So, Madam Chair, if Commissioner McNulty would amend her motion to put a top set on and also to include this as an ongoing line item for our executive director's report, so that we can have a clear
ongoing understanding about what these additional fees are going to be spent so we can keep track of them that way, then I would be able to support the motion.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Ms. McNulty, do you have any thoughts on amending your motion to include a cap, or how would you like to proceed?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I would be pleased to amend my motion to include the cap that Ms. O'Grady has shared with us.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I'll second the multiply amended motion.

Any other discussion?

All in favor?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Aye.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Aye.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Aye.

Any opposed?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. The motion carries unanimously.

So you'll be following up with Dr. King and
working with supplying us more information next time as to
how this will --

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, hopefully the next
time it's incorporating his work into the analysis.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

Okay. So the next item on the agenda is the
executive director's report.

Mr. Bladine is not here today. He's working on
other matters, but his deputy executive director is,
Kristina Gomez, and she will provide us an update.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Good afternoon.

First of all, I would like to start off with the
statistics from our website.

So far we've had 1,000 e-mail subscribers on to
the website.

8300 average monthly website unique visitors per
month.

15,000 total visitors every month. And each
person spends about an average of three minutes on the
website per month -- well, for this past month.

I'd like to discuss the public input that we've
received through our office.

We've received a substantial amount of public
input from the public, which is wonderful.

We plan to have another binder ready for you this
Friday. It's the public input binder, the standard binder, along with additional maps for your individual binders. So you could possibly receive two binders by Friday's meeting.

And currently staff is working this week on uploading all news articles that the IRC has received. We're trying to go back to January of 2011, so you all have reference points to go back and to read all of the articles written about this Commission. And that will be available through Catalyst as well.

And the next item on the agenda is a webinar on online training.

The mapping consultants have been talking to us, and they would like to hold a webinar training online next Tuesday in the evening hours for the public.

The link is online right now, and there are available videos and user guide documents available for the public. However, they would like to do a webinar training online that is -- that's geared towards this state.

So on this webinar, people can register to attend. And this will be a high level review.

They will give you -- you will have access to your log in, to your user name, and overall on how to set up a plan.

So this webinar will help people how to create
their plans, their mapping plans, and how to submit it to the Commission.

This should be only a 20- to 30-minute high level overview of the software with a brief session for questions and answers.

And as I said, they would like to do this next Tuesday in the evening.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. Gomez, would that webinar be available later as something someone can upload if they aren't able to make that time?

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Yes. We are planning on housing it on our website so people can go back and reference this training as well.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Good.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Ms. Gomez, would you be also able to report on how many visits and how many people have actually signed up onto the line online Maptitude?

KRISTINA GOMEZ: I would need to ask -- yes, Willie just shook his head and said yes, so we can provide that information for you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

And next question is, is will -- is there a PDF downloadable document that can be printed by the, by the
individual user that may not be able to drill down their information on the webinar, but would be able to follow it up? Is that able to be put onto our website so they can download and print it ourselves?

KRISTINA GOMEZ: I believe there are PDF user guides available for the public as well.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And those are -- there either are or will be shortly?

KRISTINA GOMEZ: They are online right now.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I would like to see if the information you talked about with the outreach that we're doing, if the people that visit our website or describe that they be included in our website somehow, so people can find out what type of outreach we're doing and the facts that are happening, unique visitors to website, all that information, you know, the public, the number of public comments at each of the meetings.

I think that would be good information for the public to have its hands on. Thank you.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: You tickled a great idea.

Our public information officer and our staff should be driving as much traffic as we can to our website. We -- this website has become incredible, incredibly powerful working portal for many different things, and we should do whatever we can on an ongoing basis through our other outreach to drive people to our website to be able to get them to AZredistricting.org.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Yes, sir.

May I also add that we would also like to utilize Stu as far as to get the advertisement out on our online webinar that is happening next Tuesday.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other questions on the executive director's report? Comments?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thanks, Ms. Gomez.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next item is number seven, presentation and public training session on the use of the online Maptitude program.

WILLIE DESMOND: All right. So I'll be presenting briefly on just some of the basics of the online Maptitude software.

Starting with how you get there.

So if you go to the IRC's website,
AZredistricting.org, you click on the maps tab, and then select online mapping. It will open up a separate browser window where this program is housed.

For first time users, you'll be asked to create a new user name.

You'll type in your desired name, your password, confirm your password, and enter an e-mail address, and then, you know, fill in the letters to prove you're not a robot or something, I guess.

You'll then be sent an e-mail confirming your account.

You'll click log on, and you'll be ready to go.

So, I have a user name.

I'll log on.

And actually -- give me a second. I'll log back out and show you also, just to answer Commissioner Stertz's question, and point this out. There's some excellent resources right here on this page.

You have the quick start guide, which goes through step by step how to do things. I highly recommend reading it before you begin.

Additionally, there are some training videos that -- I think there's eight of them. Probably takes about ten minutes to watch them all, back to back.

They're excellent intros into some of the
different things you're going to want to do. Everything from how to create a user name to how to actually build districts and check it, run reports, and all those things. And then there is an online manual that is pretty extensive.

Answering questions on what to do.

So I would recommend that anyone who's interested in really using this software check some of those things out. And I think they'll find it very helpful.

So once you're ready, you log in.

And the way this works is you can open up your old plans, ones that you've been working on, or you can create a new one.

When you want to create a new one, it's very simply you click new plan.

And then it asks you what would you like to base this new plan on.

Currently loaded are four plans that will always be on top. As users create their own plans and try to share them with everyone in the state, those will also be in here, but these four will always be on top.

We have four starting places. There's blank congressional and legislative plan, so the state with absolutely no districts drawn.

And then there is initial plans based off of the
grid maps.

So I think just for the sake of training today what we'll do is start with the congressional grid map plan. So you click on that, and it tells you which template you want to use.

You hit create. And it will ask you what you want to call this town -- what you want to call this plan.

So I'm going to call it Willie's CD map, and I'm going to date it.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Willie, I just want to interrupt you real quick here.

The maps that we've got for starter maps, if someone wanted to choose a map, for example, river district version five as their base map, do you have the capacity to do that through this portal?

WILLIE DESMOND: We have the capacity to put that on there, although we have not done that yet, just because of the large number of what-if maps and because of the fact that they're kind of always -- there's new ones a couple times a week and stuff.

I think if there's specific ones the Commission wants, we could put those up.

If we start getting down to, you know, fewer,
fewer types of them, and, you know, the changes become
csmaller and more specific, put those up too. But right now
wwe haven't done that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So you name it, and you
hhit okay.

And it opens up the map.

And you'll notice a lot of this looks very similar
to the program that I have been using. It is very similar.

So I guess for the purposes of an introduction,
I'll just kind of go through what all these things are and
hhow to navigate the map.

The -- I guess where you see everything is in your
map view, which is obviously the large map.

Unlike the desktop version, you cannot select
which layers come on and off.

They're set to auto scale, meaning that as you
drill down, as you zoom in, different layers become enabled.

You have a map legend, which can do things. It
can help you create themes. It can help you see what layers
are available.

So right now at this level we have the county is
showing, those are the brown lines. We have the county
subdivision, the dotted lines. We have water areas, which
you can see a few of them here and there. And you have the
heavy district line as it is.

If we drill down more, you can do that using a plus magnifying glass.

There's two ways of magnifying. You can either click, or you can draw the box.

Similarly, if you want to zoom out, you can click or you can draw a box.

So that's a little less intuitive, zooming out.

If you -- let's say you zoom in. And then you zoom in again.

But you preferred the last level of zooming in, this back to previous map location button takes you back to the last place you had the map focused.

By clicking that it will go back one step doing it.

If you click the one next to it, it's called the display initial map, that takes you back to whatever the plan looked like when you opened it.

So in this case we opened it with a full view, so it takes us back to that.

One more piece of navigation. If you zoom in, or any level, and you just want to pan, you use the little pan tool that's shaped like a little hand. And you click it and you hold it and you drag it wherever you want to go.

You'll only see what was in the window for a
second, and then it will take a second to think, and it will redraw the map reflecting your change.

The last navigation thing in the map window is the information button.

The information button can be used to mean quick information about wherever, wherever it is that you want to click.

So this particular area gives you the name of the voting district, tells you what proposed district it's in, what the area of that district is.

Tells you what census block that is, what county subdivision, and which county.

So that is how you navigate around the map.

As I mentioned earlier, when you're zoomed in, you have different layers.

So at this layer the blue lines are the voting district.

Let's say you wanted to look at the individual block, the block group or tract, you do it again. You zoom in a little more.

So, let's look down here. Casa Grande. That's where we are.

So, now, if you notice in your layers tab, your map legend, you can see that you have, in addition to voting districts, you also have census place and census block.
If you wanted to look at some of the different themes, you can, you can tell it which theme you'd like to choose.

So if you wanted the percent Hispanic, select that.

Click redraw map.

And it automatically shades the map percent Hispanic based on your smallest level of geography.

If I were to zoom out a little bit, so that census block is no longer visible, now it's displaying it as, I believe, census tract.

If I zoom out even more, now it looks like it's at census or county subdivision.

Let's do it one more time.

It's still shaded by county subdivision.

So, those are the themes and the layers.

If you want to remove it, just click none, and click redraw map.

Okay.

Some other things to keep in mind, you have a data table down here that has information on each one of the districts as they're currently comprised. That will be changed as you draw and change your districts.

So it gives you several data fields.

The population, the deviation.
On our grid map, there's no deviation. District 5 has one additional person. So that's still zero percent deviation.

Eighteen plus population, percent 18 plus, percent Hispanic, all the different racial categories, and then all of the different election results we've gathered so far.

As we continue, we'll be adding things to this. Registration once that's available. '04, '06 elections. That's what you guys would like. But they're all available right now.

I think for the purposes of quick overview, it would be helpful to see how to change these lines.

So what I'll do is, once again, go to Casa Grande and play around here a little bit, just for the sake of examples.

So if I zoom in.

We're going to start to work with the redistricting tool box, which is right here.

Again, you can move these around, put them however you like to see things.

You have a pending changes window.

We have a layer window.

So, the way that the redistricting functionality works is you choose your target, so you can choose a new
district, you choose to unassign an area from a district, or you can say you want to put things into an existing district.

Let's say that we wanted to include more of or all of Casa Grande into proposed District 3. We would choose the target district of three. We can say source -- there are two options there. If it's a place where there are two districts that are kind of right next to each other and you only want to take it from one, you can choose your source. Or if you want to say take it from anything that's available, you can choose all.

In this case it doesn't really matter because two is pretty much our only option. But I will select two. And then lastly you have to select what layer of geography you want to be moving. So we have the option of voting district, which is the heavy line. Census place, which is kind of the light blue line behind it. County subdivision, which is a bigger kind of brown line that you don't really see here much. And then county. But say we wanted to do it at voting district.
Now, if you wanted to do it as a smaller level, if you wanted to do it at tract or block group or block, you just need to zoom in more on the map.

And then those will become visible, and you can select on those.

So, the first thing you need to know is how to select districts.

So you have the pointer tool.

And this allows you to click on the map, and select, in this case, voting district.

And it will highlight it red.

That will be a pending change.

Now, in your pending changes window, you can see what that will do.

That will take 4,958 people out of District No. 3 and put them into District No. 2.

You can see the makeup of those people.

And then if you choose to accept it, you click this green check box. And it will actually redrawn the line and it will recount your data table at the bottom.

And if you are unhappy with that change, you click this pointer with the little red X and that cancels your pending change.

Your other selection options are the circle tool.

By this you click and drag out and it draws an
increasing circle.

I believe the way this defaults is anything that is touched by the circle will then be included in your selection.

I'll cancel that.

You have a shape tool, which allows you to click different points around.

Again, select anything that is wholly contained or intersects with that shape.

Lastly you have the line tool, which allows you to just a draw straight line, and any level of geography that is intersected by that line will become included.

And you just double click at the end, and that's what ends the line.

That was all at the voting district.

Let's say we want to move all of Casa Grande into District No. 3.

We're looking at census place, use the pointer, click on Casa Grande.

Okay. That looks good to me.

So now I'm going to click steps.

And now the district is -- got a little bit of a jagged line. It's got some holes in it I'll have to clean up. But you can see it's moved that district line.

You can also see at the bottom that moved 48,571
people from District No. 2 into District No. 3.

So now District No. 3 is overpopulated at 758,000 people.

And District No. 2 is underpopulated, 661.

If you wanted to clean this up and take care of these little pockets, the way again you do that is you have to zoom in more.

And so now that we can see census block, we can select on that layer.

So I'm going to change my selection layer to census block and use the pointer tool.

I'm going to check and use the shape tool. I'm going to draw a shape around here.

Take care of that area. I think that looks good, so I'm going to accept that change.

District line is still a little messy, but it's getting better.

Accept that change.

And that's basically the way that you can change the district lines using this.

And there are a couple other things I'd like to just highlight about this software in general.

Number one is that pending changes are not saved if you close your window.

Those are pending.
But there is no save feature on here.

How this works is that it automatically saves every change you've done.

So you're able to go back, and if your computer crashed, and you opened it back up, you would be at your last place.

You don't have to worry about saving your plan. It would continually save it, so that if you log in and log out, you will be right where you left off.

So let's say you wanted to go through and you wanted to alter your plan but you didn't want to, didn't want to mess it up too much. You can use your last plan as a template to create a new one, so a later version of it, that you can, you know, mess with and not have to worry about losing where you were.

So I would say if you're happy with how something looks, and you want to use that as a kind of a jumping off point, I would create another plan then.

You can do that by going to your plan manager.

Create a new plan.

And it will allow you to select your other one as the starting off point if you shared it.

Or, I'm sorry, you go -- you click on your last plan.

So I've got Willie's CD map on 9-12-11. I like
that. I've going to copy it.

And it's going to ask me to -- what I want to call it, so I'm going to call this one V2, version number two.

And it will open it back up.

And if I don't want to lose where that is, I'll have that saved and now I have another version that I can keep adjusting.

Also available are some of these features up here.

I'll go through them.

Your plan manager, like we just looked at, is where you, is where you select which plan you're working on. It allows you to open a template that we've provided, a template that someone else has shared, or a plan that you've already worked on.

Plan settings allow you to lock different districts, if you've really happy with how they look and you don't want to run the risk of having them accidentally get broken up at all.

You have reports that you can run.

You have a report on population summary, a report on measures of compactness.

If you look at measures of compactness, it defaults to the Reock test. And the reason it does that is because it's a fairly fast one to generate.

Some of the compactness reports can take all night
to run, even desktop versions.

So this does have the Reock available.

It also has population summary reports, where you can select whatever columns you're interested in.

So let's say we wanted to look at how many Hispanic voting age population is the non-Hispanic White, Black, Indian, Asian, Hawaiian, other. Click okay, and it will generate a report for you, and tells you what each one is.

Plan integrity is something that will be very useful to you as you're nearing the end of your plan.

So the first thing you can do is you can find unassigned areas.

Since we started with the grid map, there are no unassigned areas.

Just for the sake of showing you though, I will quickly designate something as unassigned.

I've chosen the county subdivision layer.

I'm going to take -- let's just take a little piece.

So now there's a big chunk of unassigned.

So if I go to plan integrity and I click find unassigned areas, it will show me there's one unassigned, 2,096 square miles. It's a pretty big chunk of unassigned areas.
I click on that, and then I click the little find button, and it will zoom right to that place.

And there it is, the part of Apache County that is unassigned.

For the sake of the next one, I'm going to reassign it, but I'm not going to assign it to District 5.

Just assign it to District 1.

I'm going to click up here.

We're still at the county subdivision layer, so it will resort that whole area.

For a smaller selection we have to click different parts of it.

And I am going to click okay.

So now there's a little, a little section of Apache County that will be in District 1 where it should not be.

So now I can go up here back to my unassigned.

And I can refresh it, and it will tell me if there are any areas unassigned.

And there aren't.

So it will close it. All areas of the state have been assigned.

If I go to plan integrity and I click on noncontiguous districts, it will think for a minute, and if finds there are two parts of Congressional District 1 that
are unassigned.

The first one is the larger, so that's most likely the main district.

The second one is much smaller, so that's a little chunk of it that's floating off, that's not touching. It's not contiguous. It's not one single shape.

So if I ask it to zoom to that, it will zoom right back here.

Now I have the option to either find out why it's not touching one, and link it over, or I can assign it to the area that's surrounding it, which in this case is five. So I'll do that.

Now it's back to the way it was.

All right.

And if I refresh the noncontiguous areas, I'll find there are no areas with noncontiguous areas. And that help box will be closed.

Moving along the top, there is the find feature. It allows you to look up addresses or districts.

You have the view, which tells you which of these tables you're seeing. You have the pending changes. You have the districts table, which is on the bottom. You have the map legend, which is also on the bottom.

If you want to print the map, it allows you to -- it gives you a layout of exactly what you're looking at, and
you can print that.

If you wanted to e-mail the plan, you can send it to someone with a message.

You can send it as a Maptitude redistricting file or as a shapefile if you want to open. You can send it to yourself if you're interested.

Okay. Share plan is if you created a map that you're happy with and you want to share it with people. You click share plan. It allows you to write in a little description of your plan, you know, what you tried to do or what it's called, and you click okay.

So we'll just call this Willie's training map.

Click okay.

And a copy of my plan has been stored on the server, and others -- other users can now see it.

So when they go to plan manager, they click new plan, now you have a map shared by William Desmond called Willie's CD map.

So, others can see your map then.

Like I said, there's a chance hopefully there will be lots of these maps on here.

The four that are -- the two grid and the two blank will always be on top though to make it easy for users to see those.

Let me go back to my plan.
You also have -- I should mention that sharing the plan does not submit it to the Commission.

The Commission can see it then, but it's not an official submission.

If you want to do that, you have to click submit plan.

And it asks you to provide a little description as to why, why this plan is important or what you were trying to do with this or whatever your goals were.

We ask that you include your contact information should we have questions or if you would like to present it or, you know, any sort of feedback in their e-mail. So we can contact you.

And that's how it will be submitted to the Commission.

Then you have, you know, help and contact us and log out.

And I think if you guys had any questions, I'd be happy to answer them about this.

If not, there's just a few other things I'd like to say about it.

First of all, right now it does not have the Native American reservation lands as a layer.

Noticed that, we were going to fix it this morning, but when we went to do it, there was actually eight
people logged on at the time, and so we didn't want to boot them out.

That change will be happening tomorrow morning. We'll do it at 6:00 a.m. east coast time, so between 3:00 and 4:00 a.m. here, the site will be down tomorrow morning so we can add a Native American layer to it.

It should only take five minutes, but we don't know. Just in case, we'll say for the hour it will be down.

People are logging on. And there will be a webinar next Tuesday, I guess, that will be available to the public, where you can ask questions. If you're unable to attend or follow along with that, we will be posting that to the website as a video so you can follow along and watch that.

Does anyone on the Commission have any questions about it that I can answer right away?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I do, just a quick one.

When you were demonstrating how to move one area to another and then you did the cleanup exercise, what creates those pockets? It is just unincorporated lands?

Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: In that case I had selected census place, so that's a very jagged kind of layout where, you know, it's annexed certain areas and certain areas are unincorporated and those types of things.
When you, you know, do it on census block group or county or other layers, that's much less likely to happen. But it is possible that you'll select a bunch of individual census blocks and miss, you know, a narrow one that runs along the river or something.

You won't quite notice it and you won't be able to tell, so the finding unassigned or noncontiguous areas -- like on the plans I submit, I always have to run that. Sometimes I might miss one or two.

Usually they have a very small population.

They're just little slices of land that you miss the first time around.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any other questions for Willie?

Maybe we could put something on our website, Buck, that just lets people know that the site will be down, not that most people in Arizona will be up at 3:00 in the morning, but, just in case, might be -- a note if that would be possible.

Thank you.

That was excellent.

I wish more people -- I wish all these chairs were filled so that they could have taken advantage of the training in person.

But, again, this will be available via video, even
I thought we're not streaming. People can hopefully pull that up.

I encourage the commissioners to let folks know about this training that's happening on Tuesday too.

Any other questions on this item?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Thanks a lot.

The next item is number eight, discussion of future meetings and future agenda items.

And I think Ms. Gomez was going to lead us through this, because we have so many meetings scheduled, to refresh our memories.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Yes, we have lots of meetings scheduled.

So our upcoming meetings for this week is September 14th in Casa Grande at 9:00 a.m.

September 15th at the Phoenix Heard Museum, starting at 12:00 p.m. This is the meeting with the Intergovernmental Tribal Council.

Followed by September 16th. This meeting was originally planned to be in Casa Grande here. However, we had problems finding a meeting location in Casa Grande, so we have a tentative meeting location in Phoenix right now at the Fiesta Inn. And this meeting starting at 9:30 a.m.
We are looking into finding a closer meeting location off of the I-10 for folks coming from Tucson and from the southern part of the state, so we will keep you updated on if we can find a meeting location that's closer off of the freeway and that isn't in the center of Phoenix.

Next week, September 22nd is in Casa Grande, at 1:00 p.m., and September 23rd in Casa Grande at 9:00 a.m.

And any questions?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Just a second.

Maybe.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: September 22nd?

So far we have Casa Grande at 1:00 p.m., and September 23rd, Casa Grande, at 9:00 a.m.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And then I think you had mentioned to me that the meeting at the Heard Museum we need to conclude by 4:00 p.m. due to the venue.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Yes. So far it appears that we do have to end at 4:00 p.m.

However, I spoke with Mr. Bladine, and he is working with the tribal council to see if we could possibly go into 6:00 p.m.

So we could maybe end at 6:00 p.m., but he is working on that right now.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

So then if he isn't able to succeed in that, we
could possibly go to another venue if we felt the need to do that.

But do commissioners have thoughts on that?
We'll be starting and going most of the day on the 14th, on Wednesday.
And we'll have an hour and a half, it sounds like, before the tribal folks come to visit us that day because we start at noon, right, the 15th.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: They come at 1:00 or 1:30?
KRISTINA GOMEZ: Last I heard it was at 1:00.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So maybe we have an hour there to do some work before they come.
And then I would guess that would take at least a couple hours once they're there.
And then the 16th we're starting at 9:30 in the morning and going as long as it takes.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

It's hopeful that we'll be able to just stay there until 6:00 in case folks want to continue the meeting with Commission business.
So hopefully Ray can let us know soon.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Would you like us to send you all an e-mail?
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, that would be helpful.

Next week, I'm also just wondering, do we need to meet any other days besides the 22nd and 23rd, because that's Thursday, Friday.

Like Wednesday, the 21st, at all? Does that make sense?

I know our goal is to get those draft maps done and --

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair, I'm out of state on that day. I wasn't before, but I moved something back because I thought that other commissioners had a conflict on the 20th and 21st, so I scheduled some depositions on those days out of state. I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No problem.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: But I was relying upon what I thought was the conflict schedule as of, I guess, last week.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No problem.

So I guess that the option of Saturday meetings, I know everyone likes those. The 24th, but I don't know --

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: The 17th in Tucson.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: 17th?

Oh, I'm gone. Sorry.

I mean, you all could meet actually too. There is the option of if there's a quorum of folks.

But I'm out of town the 17th.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: The Stanford game motivated me on that one.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And the 24th too is a Saturday option. I don't know if that's an option for anybody.

It doesn't look like there's much option next week.

Well, I guess then there's the 19th; right? Monday.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: That's not an option for me, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: May I make the suggestion that we leave open the following week of the -- starting the 26th, to be used as a flex week, non-scheduled week, and not schedule any public second round hearings until the week of October 3rd, leaving us the opportunity that if we do not -- are not able to feel comfortable in completing our work product and having the draft maps done by the schedule, which right now is tentatively set, that on the 23rd of September we would be publishing our draft maps, if we left ourselves the following week to -- open and not schedule anything.
Because I know that Ms. Gomez is about to start locking into contracts with locations.

And if we get close to this and say, well, we could surely use a couple more days, we're not quite ready, it might be prudent for us to have an extra week just blocked open.

That's for the rest of the Commission to determine.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Sure.

Any thoughts from other commissioners on Mr. Stertz's suggestion?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN:  Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN:  That sounds like a prudent approach to me, and I am generally open the entire next week.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Thank you.

Other thoughts from folks?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY:  Madam Chair, that makes sense to me.

I'm open between now and Christmas.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  I remember.

So we'll keep -- Mr. Herrera, did you have anything on that? We'll keep the week of the 26th open for possible meeting dates for ourselves.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, the only -- my concern, we already pushed the date -- moved the date it was originally scheduled, I think the week of the, the week before, we were supposed to be going out in public, showcasing our map.

And then we pushed it to the 26th. Now we're going to move it again.

So, again, we gave Strategic Telemetry a deadline, and we want to make sure that we keep that deadline, but we also need to help them stay on track.

So, if we keep moving it, that's not going to help them keep the deadline.

I want to make sure if we do that, something has got to give.

Either we do less public hearings, and right now I think we have 25 scheduled, so we either lower the number of visits we have -- or I guess we have to be thinking about, we have to be thinking something has to give if we start adding more time to our -- for us to develop or take more time on the draft maps. Something has to give.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Just as a thought.

I was going to suggest that if we're able to publish the draft map on the 26th, that's the -- my
suggestion was really more so that if we have some fall over
not to schedule anything from the public's perception --
perspective and for locking in dates, but if we're able to
publish earlier, the 30-day window of public review does not
necessarily have to coincide with our outreach.

We can be -- 30-day public review starts the day
that we publish the draft map.

And the public review could be -- can flex on
either side of that time frame.

So, I just don't want to be locking in dates at a
public location -- at a location with the expectation that
we're going to be trying to cram in to get a draft map
published, because the only reason we're going out for
public outreach is to have commentary on the draft map.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I would also think it would
be very important for each of us to commit to be available
the week of October 3rd, so that we -- if we aren't there,
we can hammer this out.

By available, I'm thinking every day, that at
least for part of the day, so that we can give instructions
to the mapping consultant, they can work, and then we can
come back the next day and work on what they have done.

Seeing as the availability next week is limited.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So you're saying the week of
October 3rd; right?

Because Mr. Stertz had said the week of the 26th is what we're thinking about as a week where we might need some additional time, and not starting our public hearings that week, which would mean we'd start them the next week I would think.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: The week of the 26th, yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Have you started to book any venues for that second round, Ms. Gomez?

KRISTINA GOMEZ: I have spoken to a few cities, but I haven't been able to give them a confirmed date.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: So that's been my biggest problem.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Now, I appreciate what Mr. Herrera is saying. I don't want and I don't think any of us want to be pushing back time lines, but we also want to have something available for the public to comment on, and we need to make sure that we have two draft maps available for people to do that.

So, and we may not need the whole week either. It could be that we can actually publish the first part of that week of the 26th.
So, and given that next week we only have the 22nd and 23rd available, unless we decide we want to have any meetings where just a quorum is present, it would require commissioners, you know, one or at least one commissioner missing meetings.

Does anyone have any thoughts on that?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I don't think that works, because then we have to bring whoever the commissioner is that wasn't available entirely up to speed. I really think we need to all be here watching the process. That's the only way it works -- can work.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

So it's sounding like that what you presented, Kristina, the 14th, 15th, 16th, are all -- the next three meetings, then the 22nd and 23rd. We've all agreed to leave open the week of the 26th as possible meeting dates, if needed, to complete the generation of the draft maps.

Which would mean we'd start sometime later that week with the second round of hearings, which would mean maybe possibly that weekend, September 30th, October 1st, for the second round of draft hearings -- I mean, second round of public hearings.

But we'll have to see, have to see what kind of progress we make this week.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Ms. Gomez.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Is it possible to get a confirmed date, so I can at least start plotting and making some phone calls?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I would like to say yes, but I'm wondering can we see how we do later this week and then give you a sense of that?

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Okay. That's fine.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thanks. I wish I could tell you more definitively.

Any other agenda items that we need to ensure are on these future meetings?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Now would be the appropriate time to discuss the conclusion of starting to drill down on definitions and conclusions of what we look at as specificity behind competitiveness, a directive to the consultant, if we are going to choose to use compactness using all three of the tests that they've recommended, just so we need to give some solid direction to the consultant about how and what is included in regards to criteria.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

And our agenda for the 14th is already posted. But, that could go on the 15th.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Before we put that on the agenda, we need to see the -- we need to get '04, '06 information.

We need to see the formulations that Mr. Strasma is preparing.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And, Mr. Desmond, you said that would be available the end of the week.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'd like to push that next week.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: We can push that to next week.

WILLIE DESMOND: The voter registration data will be in -- will be available by the end of the week. I'm not sure when the '04, '06 will be ready yet.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, okay. Voter registration is the end of the week.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think we need it all, because I think what we had talked about, at least what I'm concerned about, is having available a number of formulations that we can look at in the same way as we look at compactness.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: To determine whether the districts can elect a candidate from either party. That's my bottom line.
WILLIE DESMOND: All right. I will attempt to get a progress report on the '04, '06.

I know it's been a little slow going just because we're so busy with polarized voting analysis, with '08, '010, and all the what-if maps and stuff.

So, but I'll let you know later this week where we stand with those.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Great. And so that would mean the 22nd, I guess, would be when we would discuss that item that Mr. Stertz raised.

Okay. So we'll plan on that for the 22nd.

There was that transparency issue that was on our agenda from last week, and we had scheduled a meeting for late in the afternoon due to posting requirements that we cancelled, because we thought we'd be done sooner than that and didn't want to have to force everyone to wait around until 4:50 p.m. came around today. So we're putting that on the agenda for, I guess it will be, Thursday's meeting at the Heard, because Wednesday has already been posted.

Any other agenda items anyone can think of that they'd like to see?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think we just need to focus on these maps.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Okay.

Any other comments?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. The next item is possible executive session item.

I'm not sure if there is an update that we're going to be -- any new information?

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, we have no new update on the attorney general investigation.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So we probably don't need to -- any, anything from commissioners on that one, anyone needs to say?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So we are at -- I'm sorry, Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I might want to ask counsel a question related to that. So if the other commissioners would indulge me on that, so if we could do the call to the public and then --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: -- we can come back for a brief executive session hopefully.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We can do that.

So we'll take the next agenda item, which is call for public comment.
And I've got a few request to speak forms here.

Five.

Just a reminder, to come up and be sure to speak directly into the microphone.

And if you could limit your comments to four minutes, that would be great.

Pete Bengtson, representing self, from Pima.

PETER BENGTSON: My name is Peter Bengtson, B-E-N-G-T-S-O-N.

I got my idea from one comment today from Chairman McNulty (sic).

The question of three border districts has always kind of bothered me, and I am not sure -- and as Chairman McNulty said, that's not in the six goals. That came up at the Nogales -- or I first heard about it at the Nogales hearing.

Excuse me.

Where a lot of people wanted border districts to give, as I understand it, more political clout to the border issue, which doesn't seem to me to be a community of interest.

One of the things I wanted to draw your attention to was the August 17th meeting you had up in Phoenix. It was a Professor Jennifer Steen, from the political science department of ASU.
She had some good measurement ideas, which is something I'm really interested in.

One of the items she talked about was community of interest.

And as I recall, and I don't remember her exact words, but she was using the community of interest that it should be important from a voting standpoint, is communities of interest that -- people who would be voting in other elections should be together in a community of interest.

I live in Catalina Foothills. I stopped using LD 26 because of all these new numbers. But Catalina Foothills is a suburban district, where I heard lots of people talking about communities of interest.

You know, where, excuse me, where they go to church, where their friends live, where they shop, where they recreate.

When you decide where to go to church, the voting district doesn't make any difference. You choose it for something else.

Same way where your friends live.

You visit them because they're your friends, not because they're in your voting district.

So I think it would help you a lot if you would come up with a tighter definition of what is a community of interest, from your standpoint, and that would eliminate a
1 lot of communities of interest which don't bear too much
2 resemblance to voting.
3
4 Thank you.
5
6 CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.
7
8 Our next speaker is Jim March, second vice-chair
9 Pima County Libertarian Party.
10
11 JIM MARCH: Thank you, Madam Chair.
12
13 Jim March, second vice-chair Pima County
14 Libertarian Party.
15
16 The last name spelled the same as the month.
17
18 Madam Chair, about a week ago, roughly, you heard
19 presentation from your lawyers, and Mr. Kanefield was
20 speaking, about the safest thing to do regarding the prison
21 issue.
22
23 And my first comment on that is it leaves
24 everybody unable to provide a truly accurate map, because
25 the decision you seemed to make was we will ignore it for
26 now and we'll do some hand waving at the end of the process
27 and kind of sort of balance them out to some degree, unknown
28 to the members of the public.
29
30 Again, it leaves the members of the public unable
31 to provide effective input into this Commission. And I have
32 to, I have to word my objection to that.
33
34 Let me show you something else I object to.
35
36 I'm holding an article.
You've heard me talk about Fair Trust and their refusal to mention who their financial backers are.


And the authors are David Cantelme, who is paying his bills from Fair Trust, and Joe Kanefield, your attorney.

I've been worried about what kind of funky contacts are being made behind the scenes, and here I'm holding, you know, five, six pages worth of evidence of pretty strong context.

And I have to ask: What the hell is up with that?

The next thing I'd like to talk to you about, unfortunately I was hoping I wouldn't have to go here, but this is not my first go-around with Mr. Kanefield.

Right now, as you know, there's a lot of weird stuff going on with Quartzsite, Arizona. Pretty much everybody in this room has at least some suspicion that there's corruption going on. There was some very funky election results being managed by the La Paz County Elections Office where Quartzsite is located.

Well, five years ago I was an official election server for a political party at La Paz watching their pre-election L & A test.

And I was never locked out of the observation
process as badly as I was in that election, in that event.

I wasn't -- the central tabulator was in a closed
room, no windows, locked door. Never seen that in any other
county. They remain the least transparent.

Mr. Kanefield was there managing the Secretary of
State's Offices pre-election L and A test, logic and
accuracy test for the systems.

And I asked Mr. Kanefield, you know, this level of
lack of transparency doesn't comply with Arizona law.

Oh, he had no problem with that. None whatsoever.

Couple years later, a group I was involved with
sued Pima County, Arizona, for withholding election-related
public records.

What -- multi-year lawsuit over that one.

We finally won.

But Joe Kanefield, head of the elections division
at the Secretary of State's Office, fought against us on
that. He lost that one. He was on the losing side.

Folks, I've seen this guy make mistakes. I've
seen him make serious mistakes. Where public transparency,
where fairness are concerned.

And what he told you last week was to ignore the
prison issue, thereby effectively diluting public comment.

We can't accurately make maps. And asking you to seriously
disrespect the concept of one person, one vote, which I'm
going to argue is your single most core responsibility.

   It's one person, one vote.

   He asked you to ignore that.

   Well, he made a mistake when he did. And it ain't the first mistake he's made.

   And I'd like you to think about the mistake in judgment alone that this article represents.

   Come on.

   Think for yourselves and do what's right and not what a hack like him tells you to do.

   Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Lynne St. Angelo, representing self.


   My first comment is I hope that somebody does ask for the August actual expenses.

   I know you have a lot of things on your plate, but since it's now in the middle of September, I would really like to see as the public what the actual expenses were for the month of August, especially now that you keep adding more and more things to the expenses that will be coming forward.

   The other comments I have are on the data.
Competitive -- evidently communities of interest have been kicked to the side, because they don't even seem to come into the equation anymore.

The only thing that is discussed is competitiveness, and you don't have a definition.

No definition, however it really is being defined. It is being defined every single time you get together and talk about it. And today Mr. Herrera, Commissioner Herrera, said it was 50 percent was a solid Republican precinct because it was 50 percent.

So is that going to be your definition of what is competitive, that it has to be less than that to be competitive?

I think that you really do need to say something and have a definition, making it very vague, and yet you're referencing it all the time is, is, you know, you're creating a fluid definition that meets whatever you want it to be.

Especially since this has become the number one criteria over and above everything else that you seem to be talking about, except the Voting Rights Act.

And based on much discussion, there is on this one criteria.

Which, again, was the one that was supposed to be applied if it didn't affect the others, but now it seems to
be the one that is applied first above all others.

So I would like to see it defined.

I think you need to define it.

Secondly, the data that is being used to come to the competitive number, to me this needs to become a highest priority for you, even before drawing any more maps, because every single map you look at you're looking at this competitive number, but the data is heavily biased towards the 2010 election results.

This bias would not be there if the voter registration numbers were being used, but the problem is that the Independent, no party registration, if you use voter registrations only, then you're not including them.

So I see the election -- the rationale for using election data, but that is no reason to ignore the voter registration data completely.

Which is the most current information.

That is the most current data available is the voter registration rolls, even more current than the 2010 election results.

So I would recommend that you do use the voter registration data, and that it would be on every map especially now that the public is going to be drawing maps.

I would like to see it now that I'm drawing my maps.
Third, you're using seven races in 2010 election. And you're making them all equal weight and adding two races in '08.

So that seven races in 2010, two races in 2008, the weight given to the 2010 election is a 3.5 to 1 advantage over the election results in 2008.

The only way to make this less biased is to take the 2006 and 2004 data, the exact same races, and give them the exact same weight, and then average them all together. Otherwise you only have, in my opinion, the voter registration numbers that are unbiased to go on.

And so I would say maybe -- I do realize that Mr. Desmond has a ton of stuff on his plate, but maybe he could get someone to help him put in the data for those two years.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Onita Davis, representing Smart Girl Politics, from Pima.


I'm becoming increasingly concerned about the discussions by the Commission about the minority-majority districts that do not have more than 50 percent minority voting age population.
These districts do not fall under the Voter Rights Act, protected district that must be preserved to prevent dilution of that group's votes.

And according to the Supreme Court decision on March 9th, 2009, called Bartlett versus Strickland, a case was decided by the U.S. Supreme Court by a plurality decision that a minority group must constitute a numerical majority of the voting age population in an area before Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act would require the creation of a legislative district to prevent dilution of that group's votes.

The decision struck down the North Carolina redistricting plan that attempted to preserve minority voting power in a state legislative district that was 39 percent minority.

You might say, so, Onita, what's your point?

Well, Arizona has Legislative Districts 25, 27, and 29, that are less than 50 percent, and are what you are referring to as coalition districts.

These districts do not fall under the Voting Rights Act based on this Supreme Court ruling from 2009. And I hope that this Commission is keeping this in consideration as they're looking at the new district lines.

In other words, we don't get so carried away that those suddenly become protected districts when, in fact,
they should not be.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

And our last speaker is James Kelley, representing LD 29, GOP.

JAMES KELLEY: My name is James Kelley, K-E-L-L-E-Y.

Well, here we are again.

And thank you so very much for allowing me to speak.

A quick overview.

Nationwide redistricting is taking place.

And I honestly, in my following of the other states, I don't think any Commission has taken as much abuse as you have, as a whole, and I don't think any district or any Commission has had as many challenges as you have.

God bless Arizona and our independent streaks.

There are a couple of things that I want to address.

First is, of course, I wanted to follow up on coalition districts.

I think there are numerous opportunities in the state of Arizona for coalition legislative districts. And I think we have opportunities in southern Arizona, particularly in Tucson, with those.
It -- there is an intuitive gut feeling that in central Tucson that we have numerous ethnic coalitions. And they are not necessarily Hispanic majority.

We have large Vietnamese populations, Pan Asian populations, from southwest Asia as well as southeast Asia. We have a large Asian population that is in terms of the old Soviet Union and Russia, as well as European immigrants coming from eastern Europe.

We have large pockets of population of African Americans.

So, and they all live fairly close to each other, within central Tucson.

And, I believe, again, that those are opportunities for coalition districts.

As much as I dislike having to go against the intuitions of Commissioner McNulty, Tucson is not an east-west city.

Tucson is a horseshoe, in many respects.

We have five different very distinct communities, with very distinct economic centers, education centers. For example, in northwest Tucson, you have Pima Community College as an education center, and yet you have large shopping areas for employment, and you have Sargent Controls and you have Coca-Cola and Pepsi and a lot of other things up there in the northwest in the Marana area.
Then as you come around the horseshoe, you start looking at Catalina Foothills, which doesn't have large employment centers, unless you count lawyers, but large residential areas.

And then, again, as you come along the east side, you're not looking at large employment centers. You're looking at large residential centers.

Until you get to the southeast, when we start looking at the science tech part, where we see Davis-Monthan, Raytheon, and TIA.

Then we have central Tucson, primarily university centric, university government centric, whether it be Department of Homeland Security, whether it be city and county government, state government, or the university of itself.

And then you horseshoe back around, and now you have the west side. On the west side you have large Pima County or Pima Community College presence as a -- as both an educational institution and as an economic center.

From on the west side you've got two campuses in the St. Mary's area.

You have another campus at the Desert West campus off of Lindsay and Mission, in that area.

So, again, we horseshoe around. You have this huge population in the center that has a historical
boundaries. River Road to the north, about 22nd, I think you could dip down as far as Valencia, on the north portion of Valencia, and on the east side you don't get much further east than about Craycroft, one of the old city of Tucson boundaries.

Because once you cross Craycroft, you're looking at a whole different community of interest, whole different economic centers again.

So, that boundary tends to be River to Valencia, Craycroft to the west side, whether it be -- you want to go west to Nogales Highway or you want to go further west to 12th Avenue or just beyond I-10.

I think that is where your opportunities are for those districts, for legislative districts.

Prison population. I do believe that this Commission made a definitive decision about prison population and how it's counted.

It's counted for population purposes, but it's not counted for voter purposes.

In terms of the voter database like HVAP and things like that. That's my understanding.

Is that not correct, that the decision -- well, I'm sorry, you can't answer my question.

And, finally, was there anything else? I think that was it.
Again, congratulations on at least making the attempt at a three congressional district border.

I think it's important to the state, the whole state of Arizona, and it puts everybody -- everybody's got skin in the game, because all three districts have to reach up and grab something out of Maricopa.

Maricopa has been -- this has been a Maricopa County centric state for so long, with five, six congressional districts centered around Maricopa County.

And the donor districts of the outer Arizona and southern Arizona get the shaft.

So I think if we do go to three border districts, and we make it work population-wise, I think everybody's got skin in the game.

I think our state will be better, and I think our military and economic interests of Yuma, Fort Huachuca, and DM, I think that will also bode well for Arizona and its economy and quite frankly the national security of the United States.

Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any other final -- I think that's all of the public.

So there aren't any more request to speak forms, so that makes sense.
So with that, we'll go back to agenda item nine.
Report, legal advice and direction to counsel regarding
attorney general inquiry and related litigation, including
discussion and possible action regarding expenditures for
legal representation.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm sorry?
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I move that the Commission go
into executive session for the purpose of obtaining legal
advice and possibly giving direction to counsel on the
subject matters listed on agenda item nine.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Is there a second?
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Second.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: All in favor?
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Aye.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Aye.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Aye.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. The motion carries
unanimously. We'll go into executive session once the
public clears.

And thank you very much, public, for coming and
commenting today.
It's 2:39 p.m.

(Whereupon, the public session recesses.)

* * * * *

(Whereupon, the public session resumes.)

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

The time is 3:11 p.m.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Do I need to repeat that?

BUCK FORST: No, I heard it. You're good.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

At the end of our Commission hearing on Friday in Tucson, commissioners came out of executive session and took a vote on whether the Commission would authorize expenditure of funds to pay -- to retain and pay for individual counsel for three of the commissioners.

The Commission voted three to zero in favor of that motion.

I did not vote in favor. I did not vote against it. I guess I regard it as a present vote or an abstention.

And I believe that -- immediately after the
hearing, I believe my rationale for not voting was incorrect. And I would ask the Commission to please allow me to vote aye in favor of that motion.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I would like Commissioner Freeman to explain his change in a little more detail.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I'd be happy to.

In executive session, I was really tired on Friday, so I'll try to be cautious.

I believe I said publicly that my rationale was that in my view -- my thought was that the strategy would be to try to minimize and diffuse the situation with the Attorney General's Office as quickly as possible.

And that sort of infused the rationale for my decision to take the approach I've taken.

And I thought it would be inconsistent for me to vote in favor of that motion given that position.

On the other hand, as I said publicly on Friday, I respect and understand and believe that the other three fellow commissioners have good grounds to take the position that they've had, that they've taken in this matter.

And I believe that there are -- that my analysis at that time, Friday evening, was perhaps incorrect, that
actually was inconsistent for me, given my respect for my other three fellow commissioners' position to not vote in favor of it. So that immediately upon leaving the hearing I felt, I felt badly that I had not voted aye. And so that's why I'm here asking for everyone's permission, Commission permission, to have my vote be recorded as aye.

Does that help?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: That helps.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Any other comments or questions?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Without objection, I would suggest we accept Mr. Freeman's desire to change his vote to aye.

This is based on the vote that was taken Friday evening regarding authorizing the Commission to expend funds to cover legal counsel for the three named commissioners in the AG lawsuit.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman -- I mean Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I will concur and agree, and will modify my abstention or no vote to also vote in the affirmative, pursuant to the pleasure of the rest of the
Commission.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Do I just do another, without objection, or can I include Mr. Stertz?

MARY O'GRADY: If there's unanimous consent of the Commission, if there's no objection to Commissioner Stertz's request that his vote be changed to, yes, then, as long as that's clear in the record, you can do it together or you can do it separately.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So I'll just restate that.

Without objection, I would suggest we accept the desire of Mr. Freeman and Mr. Stertz to change their votes from Friday evening's motion to aye from abstention.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I'm -- I am in support of this motion, but I want to clarify that they are changing their vote is really showing that we have legitimate reasons why we didn't cooperate with the AG's office.

So they may differ from us in terms of our decision why I decided to cooperate, but this is a sign that they do support our decision to not cooperate on the AG's terms only.

I thank both commissioners.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.
So hearing no objection, the motion carries that we will be changing their votes for the record from abstention to ayes --

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, it's not really a vote since there's no motion on the table. Since there is no objection, the votes of Commissioner Stertz and Commissioner Freeman will be changed to reflect that they are supporting the authorization.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you. I misspoke.

Thank you.

Okay. Any other comments?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I move to adjourn.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Then we have to second it, don't we?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I second the motion to adjourn.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

All in favor?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Aye.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Aye.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Aye.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any opposed?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. This meeting is
adjourned at 3:17 p.m.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned.)

* * * * *
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