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P R O C E E D I N G S

(Whereupon, the public session commences.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Good morning.

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

Today is Wednesday, September 14th, and the time is 9:15.

Let's start with the pledge of allegiance.

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Let's go ahead 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.
And other folks around the table today are our legal counsel Mary O'Grady and Joe Kanefield. Our mapping consultant, Willie Desmond. We have a court reporter, Marty Herder. And Buck Forst is our chief technology officer. Our deputy executive director, Kristina Gomez. And Ray Bladine, our executive director, may be here as well.

And our next item on the agenda is map presentations.

I have some request to speak forms in front of me. This is a recurring agenda item for anybody who would like to present maps to us during this phase of our process. And I don't have any that say mapping, so I'm wondering if there's anybody in the audience who had anything for me, for us?

Okay.

So we will move to agenda item three, which is review, discussion and direction to mapping consultant reviewing ideas for possible adjustments to congressional grid map based on constitutional criteria.

And I know we have some maps in front of us that Mr. Desmond did, based on our instruction from our last meeting.

So I'll go ahead and let him tell us what he's
WILLIE DESMOND: Thanks.

Okay. For today I have three completed maps. Pretty simple. Whole counties version 5A, 5B, 5C.

5A, I believe, was asked for at Monday's session. It kind of followed up the discussion of the three border district, river district combo map that we had looked at. And the question came up of making the third border district run through Santa Cruz County as it had in the whole counties version 4A.

So this one was updated to redo the split in Yuma County that the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government had asked for.

5B was one that had come up following last week Friday's meeting, and had some changes relating to Pinal County and some others that I can go through. And left the four districts in Maricopa that were not voting rights districts blank.

And then 5C was the same thing, but just I was asked to take a first crack at dividing those up based off of census place and some other major geography.

Also for today there is the river district, the changes that were asked for at Monday's meeting. I wasn't able to completely finish it. I had some questions.
If we get to it, and Commissioner Herrera would like, you can bring it up and you can give me further direction on how to complete that for tomorrow's meeting.

And I don't have any of the legislative maps updated yet.

Commissioner McNulty had asked for some changes, and I just didn't get to them yet.

At Monday's meeting it was mentioned that, you know, a little more time to digest might be helpful, so I was thinking if we wanted to we could go through them again today a little bit and just see if any other commissioners had other what-ifs or what they would like to see happen there.

So, if it's all right, I guess I'll start with 5A. But I'm happy to start somewhere else if you guys would like.

All right.

I do want to point out that there are new charts and information attached to these now.

These reports are available on the website. Buck has the files. I believe that are going up as we speak, so they should be going live very soon.

So now in addition to the map layout, the racial table, the compactness and competitiveness table, there is a criteria page, there is splits report, that's about one or
two pages, and there's a long plan components report.

What this does it gives you -- district by district it tells you which counties are in that district, how much of the county is in the district, and how much of the district that county comprises. It also does that for census place.

So looking at that, it will let you know what's really comprised in the districts and how much of a -- if you're interested in how much of a district a certain area is, you know, an urban area that might be very small geographically but make up 50 percent of the population. This is a helpful tool for that.

So those are available on the website. I would encourage people to check those out. I think they're going to be very useful going forward, so...

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Desmond.

WILLIE DESMOND: Uh-hmm.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: On the whole counties version 5A, is the criteria page -- it says on be mine version 5B, but I assume that's just a typo and it should be 5A.

WILLIE DESMOND: That is just a typo.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: So, Buck, if possible, if you
could go into the map criteria, in the 5A, and just change
the title to say version 5A not 5B, that would be -- before
putting it on the website to avoid any further confusion.

I assume you'll want to see what we're doing.

Can we get the lights dimmed on this corner
possibly?

Okay. So whole counties version 4A, which was the
starting point for this, had taken the split in Yuma and got
rid of it, so that all of Yuma was included in proposed
District 3, which was the majority-minority district in the
south.

And extended District 2, which takes part of
Tucson and the eastern part of Pima County, and put it
straight through Santa Cruz County, thus creating three
border districts.

For this version, the only real change was to redo
the split in Yuma, and then to take that population that was
lost from District 4, and -- or that was given to District 4
then, and remove as much of Maricopa as possible.

I guess it would be easiest to see that if we go
into Maricopa.

Now, are there specific things that commissioners
would like to see right away?

If not, I can also show you the border district
that runs through Santa Cruz County and up into Pima County.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Could we take a look and see where District 4 intersects with District 8, that boundary?

WILLIE DESMOND: District 4 does come into Maricopa.

This border I didn't really change much. So, it does endeavor to keep whole census places where possible. It does go up into the north, so it has parts of Peoria and it does have parts of Phoenix in the very northernmost region.

But that is, I think, fairly sparsely populated. And if this was something that we wanted to move forward with, it would be possible to reconfigure this and kind of clean it up or make it look better.

I'd be happy to hear any changes you'd want for a future version.

If you'd like, I can go through the actual cities that are -- I don't know how well everybody can see. So that might be helpful.

So, it kind of goes up to avoid going into Goodyear at all.

Does include Citrus Park right here.

It follows kind of an outline of Maricopa. I'm not sure which one this is.

It has about half of the southern part of -- or the northern part of Surprise, Sun City West, parts of
Peoria, and a little bit of northern Phoenix. And it has a fair chunk of the -- of Buckeye additionally. The border is Highway, Highway 10, or Interstate 10, running out to the county line. So that everything north of Highway 10 in Maricopa is part of four. Everything south of it is three. Until you get, you know, into the city a little bit more.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: And the border on District 3 is the Minority Coalition's border all the way around, or have there been some changes?

WILLIE DESMOND: There's -- it's the Minority Coalition's border through Yuma, so there have been some changes. Also Minority Coalition has a border that splits Santa Cruz on the eastern edge too.

I can add that layer so you can see where it's divergent, if that's helpful.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Sure.

WILLIE DESMOND: We're saying Minority Coalition, but it's the Hispanic Coalition, just to clarify.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Right, sir. I'm sorry.

WILLIE DESMOND: So, it does follow their border by and large. Follows it through Yuma. Follows along I-10
just like they had.

It diverges a little bit here in, here in Buckeye.

It goes a little bit farther south in Goodyear.

Follows it out on the same line through Avondale.

This -- our version does not include Tolleson as theirs does, so there's a divergence right here.

But then you get into Minority Coalition -- or Hispanic Coalition District 7, which does largely follow the same, same border.

The only difference being the Tolleson area. A little bit in Glendale and Avondale.

Change this.

And then I guess it would be helpful if we looked -- you can see the other places where it kind of splits.

So, running through Pinal, they have it taking a little less of Pinal County.

We had to make up that population when we left Santa Cruz whole.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'm willing to share.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Can you take me to -- zoom in on District 4, around the Coconino -- Flagstaff area?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.
Is that what you're ... 

Flagstaff is wholly contained into five.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: In five, okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: So the line does go right down the Yavapai and Coconino County border.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Is the entire city of Flagstaff in five?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And can you go to the Pai tribe?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, they are also in five. Because this was -- so the Pai tribes are.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And how far does District 3 go into Maricopa? What parts of Maricopa does it go in?

WILLIE DESMOND: District 3 comes up -- it's parts of Goodyear, the southern part of Buckeye, Avondale, and then a good chunk of Tolleson, and some of Phoenix, right down here.

This is Tolleson, Avondale.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay.

You know what, I know we've been -- I know Commissioner McNulty has been talking about looking at competitiveness based on -- I think right now you're looking at 2008, 2010 information.

And the particular map creates three solidly
Republican districts with 60 percent, two between 57 and 59 percent, and two between 52 and 53.75. So four, I would say, solidly Republican districts -- five, and two leaning Republican.

And the only two, excuse me, the only two districts that are Democratic are the two majority-minority districts.

I just want to point that out.

Obviously it's a concern.

WILLIE DESMOND: I haven't used competitiveness at all. I'm not trying to maximize --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I know that, but I'm just using it based on the numbers that you've given us.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Along those lines, it's interesting to just look at the evolution of HVAP on these different versions, because the river district/three border combo version 1A, and you look at that, we had Mr. Desmond do that, in District 3 was 18.78 percent voting age Hispanic.

And then you go to 4A and it's 50.25 percent.

And then this 5A today, it went up in District 3, to 51.37.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, what is the benchmark for District 3?
WILLIE DESMOND: Assuming District 3 is the lower one, I think it's 50.8.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: 50.8?

MARY O'GRADY: 50.23.

WILLIE DESMOND: 50.23.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And the other one is 57.45?

Okay.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: This 5A, version five of the whole counties map, isn't exactly my baby, but I just wanted to sort of walk through the thought processes on this what-if scenario.

This what-if scenario began with our grid map, and the first instruction was to draw congressional districts to try to maximize whole counties. That's one of the constitutional criteria.

So that map was developed.

Then, since we had to develop -- satisfy the Voting Rights Act, overlay the Hispanic Coalition's two majority-majority -- majority-minority districts onto that map, and then also to adjust the map to keep Indian reservation lands whole.

So that, and I think as a corollary benefit to that, since we're trying to keep whole counties whole or
minimize splits in counties, we respect the sort of urban/rural concerns that we heard a lot about, keeping rural districts rural and not having urban populations, a segment of them, intrude into the rural district.

So we end up with a map that splits counties only where necessary to keep Indian reservation land whole and to satisfy the Voting Rights Act, and, of course, in high population areas such as Tucson and Phoenix where we're going to have to make these splits.

It did not try -- it's basically an approach that begins from the outside of the state and sort of works into the urban Maricopa County areas, and it, you know, hasn't looked at issues yet like, you know, other communities of interests that need to be respected and the competitiveness issue.

As for the competitiveness figures we're looking at, at least from the non majority-minority districts that are being constructed, because I view those -- that data as skewed, because we're only using 2008, 2010 data at this point, and I think there are a couple of, I think, outlier elections such as the presidential election where it had some senators run for president and I believe there was a corporation commission race where the Democratic candidate unfortunately passed away shortly before the election and I think that probably skews the result of that election, if
that's being factored in.

I know when I look at the numbers, at least for the non majority-minority districts, I make a mental adjustment in my head and sort of discount the Republican figure and bolster the Democratic figure.

I'm looking forward to seeing, you know, additional data on the competitiveness factor so we get sort of a more robust data set as we analyze these going forward.

As for version 5A, I mean, this was a request to sort of try to take the -- I believe it was by Commissioner Stertz to sort of take a prior version of the old counties -- prior iteration of the whole counties map, and change it to create three border districts. Which it does.

And it obviously there would need to be more massaging of map and further iterations to see if we can get a workable map out of this.

I mean, as for today I'm more focused on 5A and 5C that I asked to be constructed, and I don't have any specific changes at this point on this map. But if any other commissioner does, I mean, don't think it's proprietary on my part. None of these maps are.

So I won't be giving any instructions at least right now as to further changes on this map.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments on 5A or adjustments that we would like to see Mr. Desmond do for the next version?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Should we talk about 5B and just the criteria that -- 5B and C? I don't know how different they are, let's see, in terms of the criteria.

Does the public have these criteria sheets in terms of what changed?

WILLIE DESMOND: They're on the website.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: They are going there.

They don't have the copies of the maps that are represented today available at the meeting.

They'll be available at the next meeting.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, should we talk about 5B and C?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

Can I just briefly just, I guess, just show the Santa Cruz area, because this was talked about in that combo map with the other way of having three districts.

I guess just the only thing to point out here was that Santa Cruz was whole in the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government's map, however it was included in part of three, the majority-minority district.
In this version, to make the third border district, it's grouped with two.

I guess that's the only thing I wanted to say here.

So I think if we're going forward, there's two options with the three border. It's either to keep Yuma whole or Santa Cruz whole. Seemed like the only feasible options to get the third district in there.

But I will go to 5B.

So the criteria for 5B were to remove all of CD 1 from Maricopa. There was a little corner of it that was in Maricopa. To make Pinal County wholly contained in CD 1 except for the reservation lands.

The reservations lands in Pinal County were supposed go to CD No. 3.

In order to make up some of the lost population that CD No. 3 lost in Pinal, it was supposed to grab it in the western area of Phoenix.

And as to unassigned Districts 5, 6, 8, and 9, in order to kind of give us a blank slate to start drawing districts in the Phoenix metropolitan area, so...

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Mr. Desmond, I apologize for interrupting you.

What you've put up on the screen does not exactly look like what I have in my hands.
WILLIE DESMOND: Oh, you're absolutely right. I'm sorry.

I had one of the criteria a little wrong, so I had another version of that I was working on for a little while. This should match what you have.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Is there a place I should start with this one?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, on this one, I think one of the tweaks was to, I think you mentioned it, to put Pinal County in District 1, except for the reservation lands. And it looks like that's been done. And then to make the border between one and the disaggregated area follow the Maricopa, Pinal County line.

And then to the extent District 3 got depopulated, to have that district reach up slightly into what was District 8 to reclaim that population.

But I think in looking at it what we find is that -- and perhaps you could focus in on that area, the intersection between one and the disaggregated area in the southeast valley.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.


WILLIE DESMOND: Just bear with me one second. I'm going to add the reservation area to look at that also.
Okay.

So, in that area, you'll notice that District No. 1 now follows exactly along the county line.

So that Apache Junction and Gold Canyon are in District No. 1, but no part of Maricopa is.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay. And then what I'm seeing is that on the stat sheet District 1 is now -- ends up overpopulated by 42,000 approximately persons.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: And so, again, I have to emphasize that this is the whole counties approach that I, when I went through a little earlier, it was not attempting to really look at communities of interest, and of course there can be tweaking and fine tuning and adjustments made, and even with respect to the voting rights districts.

And so -- and I know you created a version 5C to sort of show us how the urban Maricopa County districts might shape up when you filled that in based on our grid map starting point. But we have to fix this issue that's too much of an overpopulation.

I guess what I would suggest that this be the first area where we're sort of getting into deviating from this strict whole counties approach, is go ahead and see if we can -- if District 1 can shed population from the Apache Junction, Gold Canyon area, which you could say does
have a strong connection with Mesa and Tempe and the sort of southeast valley, and put that into the disaggregated urban pot, so to speak.

And so we get District 1 back to proper population allocation, or close, within striking distance.

WILLIE DESMOND: That makes sense.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: And then -- and maybe you can zoom out to show the urban Maricopa County area.

So, yeah, we've left seven, which is the majority-minority district, in there. But if you were to mentally exclude it, we've got sort of the urban Maricopa County area that's sort of disaggregated, but it is in a way a sort of -- it has a certain degree of compactness to it in and of itself.

So, what I would suggest for version 6B is to go ahead and, so we're consistent in our lines of thought, you know, remove population from here, until -- from here being Apache Junction, Gold Canyon area, and see if we can get District 1 back within striking distance.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: And, again, that population that's lost goes into this disaggregated hopper, so to speak, and show us that or show me that hot map for version 6B.

WILLIE DESMOND: That makes sense.
And this is a -- just a quick grab right there, in that red area, represents luckily 43,685 people.
So fairly close to the 42.
So I think that's a --
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay. There you go.
And, I mean, this area in Apache Junction -- that border, I guess, could be fine tuned later, but for purposes of the next cut, let's give that a try.
And then so that will be 6B.
And then 6C would be then be to overlay our grid map on the urban Maricopa County area, and then adjust those lines to sort of create the additional congressional districts with, at this point, the thought being compactness and respect for municipal lines.
WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Does that make sense?
WILLIE DESMOND: It does.
So I think it would helpful for me going forward if I could show you how I did the first pass at 5C and --
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Sure.
WILLIE DESMOND: -- give me some direction as to if that's the approach you would like taken.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Sure.
And before we sort of leave that, at least on your 5C, looking at the stats, and I do think it's kind of too
early to look at this with the data we have, but, you know, when you look at the non majority-minority districts, I mean, we've got three districts at least that's within striking distance of being considered competitive, or at least that weren't competitive, and we even one of the majority-minority districts that could be considered competitive actually. So that's four of the nine.

So at least, there's something good that perhaps could develop out of this.

WILLIE DESMOND: So this map is exactly the same as the 5B, except that I took a first pass at redividing up that unassigned area in the districts.

If you'll notice the data table, because that unassigned area was a little short on population, Districts 8 and 9 are both underpopulated.

The ones we had, I guess the Apache Junction and that unassigned area has enough for four full districts.

The next pass we can hopefully eliminate that.

So, I guess what I would be looking for with this one is just you can follow my methodology and tell me in it intuitively makes sense if I'm doing the right thing. So...

So I shouldn't say I did not do these in order of the number.

I did them starting down here.
I numbered them kind of based off of how things have relatively been numbered before, but I -- the order they were done was first I drew six, then I drew five, then I drew nine, then I drew eight.

So -- actually I drew six, five, eight, nine.

And if I turn off this shading, back on the census place, I think you can kind of see my thought process.

So starting with District 6, what I did was I started by keeping all of Sun Lakes, Chandler, Gilbert, and Queen Creek together.

Then I extended straight up into Mesa, to just round off the population to get the 710,000 we needed.

Following that I took -- I took all of the rest of Mesa, started with that, included all of Tempe.

The part of Phoenix, I guess, Ahwatukee, that is left hanging off by the Hispanic Coalition District 7, added that.

And then I just kind of worked my way straight up taking south Scottsdale, Paradise Valley, and parts of Phoenix.

I would have liked to not split those, I guess, but since they're all large enough that they need to be split, I didn't worry about that too much.

I did include the Gila River and -- or Salt River, I'm sorry, and Fort McDowell reservation areas in this
district.

I attempted to just kind of go straight across into the top of Paradise Valley, because that kind of lined up with Salt River.

So I guess the last place I made up population was, was down here, and this followed tracts and then I think block groups were to get it right to the 710,000.

I think I ended up being fairly close in District No. 5.

Yeah, it was only 70 people off using kind of large chunks.

Then, with the rest of the unassigned area, Districts 8 and 9, I started by trying to keep all of the, the census places on the western side of the unassigned area together.

And then couldn't decide between trying to keep these three together in with nine or these three together with eight. Since this area up in the northern part of Phoenix seemed kind of lightly pop -- like, not as densely populated as the southern part, I decided to try to keep all those, all those areas together.

So I wrapped up, grabbed these three, and then went down into Phoenix to the point where I got fairly close on population and had -- just using census tracts.

And then for District 9, I included -- on the
unassigned area I just followed the border of Scottsdale and
took the rest of Phoenix that was left.

And that also includes, I guess, the
Fountain Hills area and the part of Rio Verde that was in
the unassigned, in the, um, the county land there also.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: And I don't disagree with
your methodology.

And there's lots of ways you can assemble these
pieces.

So, I guess go ahead and do that with 6C and just
to see how the first pass looks.

But, I mean, if pursuing this down another
iteration, and we're getting into more of the nitty-gritty
of adjusting for, you know, still respecting municipal lines
but also looking at communities of interest and seeing which
combination works the best and would favor competitive
districts as well.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

And, yeah, I mean, some of the -- it's possible
that we can keep, you know, more of the Scottsdale area
together, if we, you know, move some of these into four.

But I guess that would be probably for a later
version.

Right now I left the unassigned completely as it
was.
So, there's places where they were split before that that's how it was, so I just didn't change that.

Are there any other questions on this particular map? I can zoom in on any more detail that anyone would like or answer questions.

I think, also if there's any other changes you can think of right away to either of the reports or the packets that we're putting together right now.

I think I've, I think I've incorporated a lot of the things you've asked for, so let me know if there's anything else that would be helpful to you as you're trying to evaluate these.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Willie, your data charting map for your percentage of population and percentage of district is great.

How difficult would it be to add the percentage of Hispanic voting population as another column?

WILLIE DESMOND: That would be not that hard. So we can do that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: As at a glance, this is a great working tool.

Thank you for your indulgence.

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.
And I should say that was all Ken.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Ken, if you're watching, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So is there anything else that we'd like to see with 5C or other what-ifs or -- questions, comments on congressional?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I'll just make the comment that I view this from a different perspective. I don't see county lines as the over arching goal here, respecting county lines.

My perspective is more to start with the communities in Arizona as I see them, and build from there, together with the Voting Rights Act.

So it's just a comment.

I see a lot of things on this map that to me just don't jive with the way I think Arizona fits together.

But we'll talk about those things more later, I'm sure.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I, you know, I also recall hearing a lot of public comment about people being concerned about keeping their counties whole.

And I think this approach sort of serves that
interest as well, respecting county lines as a constitutional criteria in and of itself.

Where we've heard people talk about -- you know, a lot of these counties cover large geographic areas and a lot of them are rural. So that's a side benefit as well. We hear about the rural/urban split, so that's a corollary benefit of this approach.

I think.

And, you know, counties have -- people have grown, the governmental units have grown up within counties, people have organized their lives around counties, I think.

That's one of the reasons why it was included as one of the constitutional criteria that we need to look at.

So, this is a what-if scenario that we sort of -- I've sort of been pursuing and walking down this path. And it was with the thought being if we start from the outside of the state and work inward, which of the constitutional criteria would be a good place to start to sort of chip away at this -- the block to see if we can get, you know, a good looking end product out of.

So I, you know, I pursued the whole county approach and, you know, I think there is some -- to me I see some good aspects to doing this.

And I would acknowledge that this is not close to the end product.
There's going to be a lot more thought that needs to be put into it to drill down more on communities of interest, and, you know, there may be some fine tuning. We started -- I started to doing fine tuning today to try and equalize the population in one by putting part of Apache Junction, it looks like, into the urban Maricopa County area, even though that Apache Junction is in Pinal County.

So, I'm interested in this approach, and I think I want to follow it a few more steps down the road. Maybe down the road there's ways we can borrow from other, you know, other scenarios that other commissioners may be pursuing. And I would certainly be open to that to see if we can do that, but right now I'm sort of following this whole counties -- so-called whole counties approach, and, you know, I think starting to get to a point where, you know, I'm going to be looking at other factors as well to see if we can get -- further develop the map in for the right iterations.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, I do have to echo Commissioner McNulty's comments about the whole counties. I think there are people living in counties that are bordering -- you know, they live in one county but they
border -- they live not too far from another county, they probably have more in common with the border next to them than they do with the, than they do with the current county they live in.

So I'm not -- I know this is a what-if scenario, but, again, I got to stress that there's people that are -- communities of interest are indeed that really do have more in common with the bordering county than they do with the urban county that they reside in.

So I just want to stress that we did hear that during public testimony.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I think the adjustment that will be made to put A.J. in with the urban Maricopa County area illustrates that point perfectly.

That there's a community that's right on the border, and perhaps has more in common with the other county, so that was an easy place I thought to make an adjustment, to sort of break in a small way from the whole counties approach to get CD 1 -- the population of CD 1 in balance.

So I agree with Commissioner Herrera. There may be areas around the fringe that where we need to do fine tuning, and that's something I think that would comment on
further iteration of this what-if scenario.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: If we can -- I know that Mr. Desmond had questions about river district 7A.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I have just general ideas of how to fix some of the issues that you were -- with the open population.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Before you leave this, can I ask a quick question?

On this, on either 5A, B, or C, I just would like to zoom in on the northern part of Pima County. I wanted to see what you have going on there.

WILLIE DESMOND: Which county?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: 5A, B, or C.

WILLIE DESMOND: Which county did you want to zoom in on?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Pima.

WILLIE DESMOND: Oh.

So, the line I believe tracks largely with the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government's line. Includes all of Marana in District 2, all of Picture Rocks and Avra Valley in District 3, goes through Tucson, kind of splits it down the middle, includes all of south Tucson in District 3.
Some -- it does seem to respect census places to some degree.

Actually to a large degree.

I can go specifically into Tucson or something if you wanted to see streets that comprise it or --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No, just the northern border area.

I just wondered what's going on up there. Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: I can zoom in a little more.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So Saddlebrooke is in Pinal on that one.

I should say a different district. It's always in Pinal.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, so in this, this one, because it does go right along the county border, Saddlebrooke's in one, and the rest of -- and all of District 2 is in Pima County.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's sort of an example of the whole community of interest thing. We've heard a lot about Saddlebrooke being with the other communities of Oro Valley and Marana area, so -- but these are what-if scenarios, so, thank you, Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I --

Mr. Freeman has explained his thinking, and I want to make one more comment about mine.
As I said earlier, I don't see maintaining county lines as the overarching driving force here.

I understand that that is the driving force of this what-if scenario.

And that it's only that.

And that he's going to be working on other issues.

But, as I said, I come at it from a different -- a more holistic perspective, I think, where we deal with the federal criteria, the Voting Rights Act, and the equal population, and then incorporate the other four criteria in a more holistic way, where we don't wind up looking at competitiveness at the very end.

I think we have a thumbnail tool that we're using for competitiveness, and I understand it's not a complete tool, but it certainly is enough to give us a sense of things.

And so what I'm going to be looking for is building districts that start from the perspective that we're looking at communities in Arizona, we're looking at competitiveness, and then we're respecting these other things to the greatest extent practicable.

But I want to build up from the people, rather than from the county lines.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I don't want us to get too wrapped up in the names we're giving these what-if scenarios.

We have the so-called whole counties approach. We have the river district approach. We have the three border district approach.

These are terms of convenience that we're giving these so we can sort of sort them and keep track of them. I mean, sure, this, this what-if scenario began with this whole, you know, minimize splits and counties approach, but that started to -- we got away with that -- away from that with the next iteration, which was apply the voting rights criteria and look at the Hispanic Coalition's designs on two majority-minority districts and put that into the map.

So now it becomes sort of a Section 5 map.

And then we sort of also get into communities of interest and voting rights concerns with keeping tribal reservation lines.

So we're applying all the criteria and seeing what's possible, and I think it's important that we try to do that because we need to create a baseline approach and see if we can, you know, maximize our respect for the constitutional criteria and see what different combinations of maps we can put together that do that, and then favor the
one that, you know, that is going to give us more
competitive districts.

So, you know, we call it the whole counties map,
but I don't view it any more as the whole counties map.
It's that was the sort of initial premise or starting point,
as we moved the grid lines, the lines on the grid map, but
now I view it as something much different now, and it will
continue to evolve and become different.

And we're just calling it whole counties, you
know, so we can keep track of this line of thought and these
what-if scenarios.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Before I ask Mr. Desmond to
go to the river district version 7A, I'd like to make a
quick comment about the whole counties five -- actually all
the whole counties.

Yeah, I want to make sure that the issue of
competitiveness is not an afterthought when we start -- when
we are designing this, because I really do believe, although
it's the sixth criteria, that's not the numerical order. I
think competitiveness is equally as important as the other
non -- the other four criteria.

But even if you look at the, at the, at the issue
of competitiveness the way it's ranking now, with only 2008,
2010 numbers, in my -- you know, obviously as I mentioned before, that my preference would be to focus on 2008, 2010, but I'm willing to compromise and look at 2004, 2006, and as I mentioned before that weighing them for relevancy and recency, if you do that, these competitive -- the competitive scale wouldn't change that much, I don't think, if you used the ranking system.

So I really do believe that when we're putting together these types of maps that competitiveness needs to be in the forefront, that we need to be looking at this.

And, again, I respect Commissioner Freeman talking about the different criteria that would be included if we decided to go forward with 2004, 2006, if we would decide to weigh it, which I think we should be, as a way of compromise, these averages would not change that much.

So on these maps for the whole counties, there's a huge disparity between Democratic competitive ones and the Republican ones.

So I want to make sure that we keep that in mind, and hopefully we'll in the next couple meetings will be deciding how to go forward weighing competitiveness.

If nobody has a comment, I would like to go forward and look at 7A.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I have a comment on that.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Commissioner Herrera has repeated his view that we should look the more recent elections only or as a compromise weight them differently. And I've heard that before, and I'll just repeat what I've said before.

I would actually be weighting the 2004, 2006 elections more, because I view them as more of the norm than the last two elections were, where we've had a presidential election with a senator from the state running, the Republican party, and we had some hot button issues that really drove some increased voter turnout, particularly on the Republican side.

So I think it skews the results.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Sorry, lost my thought.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Been there.

I just want to remind everybody in 2008 of the congressional races, there were five Democrats that were elected and three Republicans. In 2010, there were five Republicans and three Democrats.

And the only two -- so what we've got is the blend, it would have been, and we've been told historically that those were, quote unquote, noncompetitive districts.
The two districts that held on actually were the, as purely Democrat districts, were four and seven.

But they swung in one, they swung in five, and of course eight held as a Democrat seat.

I'm real comfortable -- and nothing changed between those years, just the politics that was changing and the people that were running.

I'm a huge fan of competitiveness.

I just want to know what the data is that supports it.

It's real easy for me in my view is that giving equal population to the extent practical is the easiest piece of this criteria. It's just carving it up.

We did that already. We did that in the grid maps. The grid maps, both legislative and congressional, gave us equal population.

So from the grid maps alone we met that criteria.

The next piece is that we're determining this based on Voting Rights Act.

We've had, I think if my math is right, 22 different iterations that all, each one of them, and very close one way or the other, met the criteria for congressional.

Each one of them I think Strategic Telemetry has come forward with maps that actually met the criteria.
Very close within percentages, and very close within different areas.

We are not -- I think that the idea about driving anything by a particular line on a map as far as a county's concerned, it is one of a variety of what we have as seven more, eight more individual criteria within the next four that we need to determine how we're going to do this.

They weight themselves.

They respect each other.

This is going to be a moving target process.

We're approaching this from at least three different ways just on the congressional maps right now, and we haven't even started drilling down on the legislative map, which in my opinion is going to require three times amount of energy that we're putting into the congressional because we're going to look at 30 individual maps instead of just nine.

If we're going to meet these deadlines, we've got to start drilling down on these definition what we're really going to focus on and start making adjustments that are going to reflect communities of interest, competitiveness, county boundaries, visible geographic features, cities, towns, undivided census tracts, all this data. And we're still looking at this in the macro level.

So I think, Madam Chair, as I'm just wanting to
wrap this up and go to Mr. Herrera's commentary on the next maps, we need some time to digest and really bring back some ideas not only congressional but really start drilling down on these legislative maps, because we haven't spent any time talking about those.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: On the naming issue, Commissioner Freeman, this exercise has been based on not splitting counties up until this time.

So I think the name of this map, at least so far, has been accurate.

And my only point is that the whole counties are one of -- one part of one criteria. And just from my perspective, they aren't the unifying force here or the unifying concept.

I really do think that's the people of Arizona and the communities of Arizona.

And so I'm looking to build from that rather than from a perspective that starts with maintaining particular lines.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: And, with respect to that, with the very first iteration of the whole counties
approach, we split counties.

Because we had to do that to respect the Voting Rights Act.

And we split counties to keep tribal lands whole.

So counties get split there.

But I think it's important that we try to see what's possible, because while we have to favor ultimately competitive districts, we also need to determine whether to do so would cause a substantial detriment to the other goals.

So I think we need to know what out there is possible with respect to the five other goals, so that we can then make that determination have we caused a substantial detriment to the Commission's job to meet those other goals.

So I think that, that this approach does not preclude competitive districts by any means, but it sort of, it sort of helps us see, at least with one scenario, with one what-if scenario, what is possible, what baseline is out there.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: The reason why I keep bringing up the issue of, you know, weighing these four
elections, a lot has changed in 2004, 2006. This state has
taken a huge turn to the right. You almost don't recognize
the state in 2004, 2006.

   So that's why recency probably trumps going
talking about the data was skewed in 2010.

   Well, the Democrats, as Commissioner Stertz
mentioned, the Democrats had a pretty good election in 2008.
   They won five congressional seats out of the
eight, so they had a pretty good year.

   So that's why I think basing it on recency is
probably the right way to go.

   And, again, a lot has changed, so, again, we're
going to not necessarily have to come up with definitions,
which I wouldn't recommend, but coming up with measurements
is probably the way to go, and that we need to do sooner
rather than later.

   So, that's all I want to say about that, because I
really do think I've made a good point on why we should be
weighing -- why it should be weighed from the reverse of
Commissioner Freeman stated.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I think I made a pretty good
point too.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I just want to remind
everybody, and my fellow commissioners as well, that party registration and voter history shall be excluded from the initial phase of the mapping process but may be used to test the maps for compliance with the above goals.

That's outside of our six side criterias. It's not -- we should not be using data points as part of our design criteria. We're to be using them as testing models.

And I get really concerned, and I keep -- I'm going to make this a continuing part of the record that we continue to take fractionalized pieces of data and use this as a decision makers, as well as political climate, as a design criteria, or that there is a political motivation to reset the basis that was just explained by Commission Herrera to reset this to a different state. I've got -- our criteria is not designed around that.

We're supposed to create districts that -- I think Commissioner McNulty named that probably as clearly as anybody, in your earlier explanation, I think there are supposed to be maps that -- maps that look like the communities that the representatives are going to be elected to them represent.

They don't want to be -- I mean, what we saw a couple days ago was we actually saw a legislative map that to create competitiveness had to create this finger down, and you were aptly correct in saying, yes, we don't want to
do that.

We want to create communities that will cross over county border lines, as the chairman just explained that, it's crystal clear that the population that lives up in Saddlebrooke, other than a couple of folks that have said they don't want that to happen, the majority of folks want Saddlebrooke to be with Oro Valley.

That's going to cross over a county line.

We know that, you know, communities of interest tie themselves together.

We want those communities to tie themselves together.

But if we do this the -- if we do these maps first, about the data points that are coming from -- that we are supposed to be using to test our designs first, we are doing a disservice to the other layers of our constitutional mandate.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I just note, I can't go with you there.

In my mind, we need to use the data points to get a sense of whether we're accomplishing the goals. They aren't separate things. They're part of the process.

We're not making any decisions right now.

But I don't agree with Mr. Freeman that we look at the degree to which we can maintain county lines, and then
if we want to draw a competitive district and that results in one more split in a county that we've done substantial detriment to a constitutional criteria.

We're supposed to favor competitiveness unless it creates substantial detriment.

And that's one of the criteria that I want to be factoring in right now with all the other state criteria, including county lines and municipal lines and communities of interest and geographic features and so on and so forth to try and achieve a workable whole.

But in order to get a sense of whether we are moving ahead on competitiveness, we need to look at thumbnail sketches of what measure that.

That doesn't mean that we're using it to make a decision -- we're making -- doesn't mean we're making any decisions right now, but we absolutely need that information as we're moving forward. And we need to do it now, not a month from now.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I know this is a last thing -- but this is the last thing before I go into 7A.

You know, I think that when you take the election results and you have them favor competitive races, like, for example, Commissioner Freeman keeps bringing up the senator
that passed away that was a Democratic candidate for
Corporation Commission, but if you weight for
competitiveness, it would remove outliers like in that
particular race.

   So, and I understand his concern, but if you weigh
competitiveness and you remove the extreme, I think we'll be
in a position that we're comfortable with.

   It will remove, you know, those outliers that skew
the data.

   So, again, I really strongly favor us coming up
with a criteria for weighing competitiveness.

   And I think we need to do. We need to look at all
the information.

   And I think we owe it to the people of the state
to make sure that we're looking at all the information and
how we look at it in terms of how we weigh the information
that makes sense and do the right thing for the state.

   Because, as I said, I've been listening to all of
the meetings, and competitiveness is an important issue for
the people in Arizona.

   And whether you're Republican, Libertarian, a
Democrat, Democratic voter, you care about competitiveness.

   And as I do.

   And I think, I -- I'm going to say it again, I
think weighing for relevancy -- because the population has
changed immensely and grown dramatically since 2004.

So using 2004 data would definitely be skewed if we weighed that more heavily than 2008, 2010.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: If you want to talk about adjusting for outliers, then that would be the 2008, 2010 election cycle, which were both good years for Republicans. Republicans increased their majority in the state legislature in 2008 and then again in 2010 to historic levels.

The -- as I recall, back in 2008, the Democratic party wasn't exactly happy with, with that outcome of that election, and I think they tried to -- there was some shake-ups, so they made some adjustments to try to deal with that the next go-around.

So these were both big election cycles for Republicans in this state, which is why I would like to see a more robust data set.

I also don't think we should commit ourselves. I think as Commissioner McNulty said, we want to look at various evaluation criteria, and past election results aren't the be all end all in my book to assessing whether a district is competitive.

I would like to see voter registration information
in these districts as well.

I think Mr. Strasma, when he gave his presentation, noted that there was, there was a rough correlation at least between registration data and whether the district ended up being competitive over the last few election cycles.

So that might be another approach that we take as well.

We're -- the team is working on crunching those numbers, and we'll have that data soon, so I look forward to receiving that information.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Voter registration data is not a true and accurate measure of competitiveness. I think Mr. Desmond mentioned that the other day. Election results are definitely a better measurement of competitiveness than voter registration.

And another thing though, we, we -- the Republicans had a really good year, election year, in 2010. And you guys were really proud of it that the state is turning more Republican. And you should embrace that and not walk away from it.

You can't say that was an off year.

No, that was a pretty good year for Republicans,
and you can't discount that.

And you shouldn't, that that -- I mean, the state is turning more conservative, it appears that way, and it wasn't an anomaly.

So I think running away from it is -- it just -- it makes no sense to me.

I mean, you guys are very proud after the election results and showing -- letting us all know, including Democrats and other voters, that, hey, you loss, get over it.

You know what, that's fine.

I'm over it. Let's use those results.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I hope what transpired in nationally in 2009, 2010 was an anomaly. I think there were some national issues that perhaps, and I'm not an expert in this area, had some influence on what happened in Arizona.

But getting back to the issue of voter registration issues, I'd like to go back and review Mr. Strasma's power point, because I definitely recall that he threw up some rough numbers showing voter registration data and how it correlated when there was a balance or a near balance in the Democratic and Republican numbers that also seemed to correspond to a district where the outcome
was in doubt and there was some transition from Republican and Democratic representatives in those districts. So I think there was a correlation that he showed there, which is why I'm interested in seeing that data as part of a more robust evaluation tool.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I'll have -- can we move into --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is there anything else, anyone else?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: No.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Other than I may need to run to the restroom.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Well, let's check the time. It's 10:25. We can take a five-minute recess and come back at 10:30.

So recess is starting. Thanks.

(Recess taken.)

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

Our recess is over. The time is 10:37 a.m.

So I think we finished the 5A, B, and C discussion, and we were going to turn it over to Mr. Herrera for a river district congressional map discussion.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

I was just thinking, during the break I was thinking about my research statistics course during graduate school, and I was thinking about when we talk about outliers and we did measure some of the races.

And I don't remember -- ever recalling having -- my professor having an outlier be an entire election. Usually an outlier could be one or two anomalies, but an entire election, you can't -- I don't know. I just, from my memory from my course, and I was paying attention, that I just using a whole election or two elections as outliers, my professor would frown on that.

Again, that's just me.

Let's go to river district map.

WILLIE DESMOND: All right. So this is a work in progress for tomorrow.

The reason I am looking at it now is I had a few questions about how to proceed further.

So the issue is that, if you pay attention to -- particularly to the data table, District No. 4, which is the river district, is underpopulated by about 81,000 people.

District No. 3 and District No. 6 are both overpopulated.

So District 6 has about 53,000 extra people.

District 3 has about 35,000 extra people.
So I guess my question is: Where do you want me to grab population to add into the river district?

And, you know, you can shift it around. You can give six to nine to eight to four. However you want to do it. I just...

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I just have some rough idea, as I mentioned, rough ideas what I would like to do is give you a broad overview of ideas I have now and then possibly next meeting give you something a little more detailed.

Because I think that the population, we -- when you start taking away from the number eventually one of them is going to be skewed, if I read it that way, which I think based on my changes District 5 may be a little bit skewed.

But what I can do, I can give you the changes that I have now.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And then give you some more detail Thursday, which is tomorrow.

WILLIE DESMOND: So for tomorrow do you want me to have presented like it's completed and we can going into it again and make a 7A?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Correct.

And, again, this is 7A; correct?

WILLIE DESMOND: This is 7A, which is for tomorrow, so that tomorrow --
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Suppose --

WILLIE DESMOND: -- 7A with the changes we figure out today, and then I guess for a later date it will be 8A?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Why not 7B?

WILLIE DESMOND: We've been going up every time. So, 7B would be if a different commissioner had changes to it --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: That makes sense.

WILLIE DESMOND: -- if they wanted to --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Sure. So let's go to District 6. We'll start there.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: It was -- you mentioned it was overpopulated by 3,000.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: So what I would like to do is lose some of the population from south Chandler and Sun Lakes, roughly the area south of Pecos Road and north of the Gila River Indian community.

So you take that population, and move it to District 3.

WILLIE DESMOND: Move south Chandler south of what, of what?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: So it would be the areas of south Chandler and Sun Lakes.
The area south of Pecos Road and north of the Gila River Indian community.

So it would be taking six to three.

Again, balance the population from four to three.

So what you can do is you can move population from Pinal County portions of District 3 to District 4.

WILLIE DESMOND: What's it on -- I'm sorry, so that area would be go from -- if you're look right now, that's this area that's in -- you're talking about in District 6; correct?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Correct.

WILLIE DESMOND: So.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: These are broad changes, and hopefully that makes sense to you.

WILLIE DESMOND: I -- that does make sense. I just don't know -- I think we would have to move that -- so we'd move that to District 3 then.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Correct. But we're talking about District 6 for right now, moving into District 3.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So, I'll take the 30 -- the 53,000 away there.

So then it will be District No. 3 will be roughly 81,000 over.

District No. 4 will be roughly 81,000 under, after that change.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, then let me make this change.

So now you can move, with the changes I propose, now it means you can move the population from the Pinal County portion of District 3 to District 4.

And you may have to go to District 5 a little bit, which is okay for now.

What I'll do is I'll look at fixing District 5 at the next meeting.

It will skew District 5.

WILLIE DESMOND: So, one option, I guess, would be then to have District 5 take those areas from six in Pinal County and then have four take part of five.

Would that make more sense? Or would you -- so, if I turn this shading back on, I think it will be easier to see.

All right. So this line is the county line.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Correct.

WILLIE DESMOND: What you've asked me to take is to take areas in six and give them to three.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Correct.

WILLIE DESMOND: And then give this area in three to District 4.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Correct.

WILLIE DESMOND: So one other option will be to
give this area to District 5 and then give some of the
northern parts to District 4.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: But I think that would change
some of the changes.

WILLIE DESMOND: So you want this --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: That's the only problem.

WILLIE DESMOND: So I'll just draw like a
little. . .

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I want to get rid of that
arm, I guess, is what I'm. . .

WILLIE DESMOND: I'll draw a little arm down, I
guess, then from four to grab this area.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: It will be one straight arm
going down.

WILLIE DESMOND: So in order for this to become
part of four, it needs to come down.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: That's fine.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And then, I guess, next --
the meeting tomorrow I'll give you're more information on
ways to fix District 5.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So I will make those
changes.

I'll give enough of District 6 to 3 so that six is
even. And I'll just remove the population from Pinal County to three. So it will be possible that three will still be overpopulated.

I'm not sure how much population is down there.
I can tell you really quickly.
Okay. So if we remove this portion of three from Pinal County and give it to four, that is 84,000 people, so that will put four a little over.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: By how much?
WILLIE DESMOND: It will depend on how much it takes to draw the arm coming down.
Let me just do a rough grab and we'll see.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Willie, while you're doing it, just tell us what you're doing, you know, kind of because we're struggling with this every day just to get familiar with this quickly.
Tell us how you determine that population in the arm.
WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Just step, step, step, and then what you're going to do.
WILLIE DESMOND: All right.
So the first thing I'm doing is I'm looking to see if I remove District 3 from Pinal County, give that population, this, to District No. 4, to see how much, how
much that is.

So the first thing I'll do is I'll set my target -- and this also works for anyone using the online stuff. It works very much the same way.

So I want to set my target to District 4, so this will be allocated to District 4.

I'm going to say the source is District 3.

And then since I want to take everything from the county, I'm just going to select the selection layer of county.

If I click here, it will grab all that area from District 3 that's in Pinal County.

And then my pending changes window tells me that 84,655 people.

Now, if I wanted to add to that selection without actually -- I'll commit it for right now just for the sake of doing this.

So I push the green check button. And now that moved that whole area to District 4.

So you'll notice District 4 has a chunk down here and then the rest is the river district at large.

Next what I'll do is I'm going to take some from district -- my source -- my target will still be District 4. Now my source is going to be District 5. Because that's where it has to cut through.
So I'll change the source to District 5.

Again, this is just very, very rough.

I'll use census block, because it's the smallest and I can just grab a chunk real quick.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I know that three will be overpopulated right, can you...?

WILLIE DESMOND: Three will be underpopulated by about 3,000 people maybe.

And then five will be a little underpopulated also.

So four will be overpopulated.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Can you swap in between three and four and make it equal?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, you just have to tell me where you want.

Should I pull that from -- like, so if you -- if we -- let me first answer this, this first thing I'm trying how to do this.

So if I just draw a little box right here, it will grab all the census blocks that are in there.

And you see that's about 2700 people.

Now, if I was doing this, I would probably clean that line up and try to make it -- maybe I would use census block group, and if we zoom in a little bit you'll see that a little better.
Remove the shading again. Then turn on the block group line.

So, I would probably -- what I would probably do is take these hunks, and then -- because this is a very large block group right here. I can even take that as a whole or I can split that up into the blocks that comprise it.

So either way it's going to move 3,000 additional people to District 4.

So then to -- actually, possibly a few more, depending on how much that is.

So I guess your question about then balancing four, and three, what would be helpful to know is where in -- how you would like that balanced on four to three.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Four to three.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, but would you like four to give up some of Apache Junction then, or would you rather have it come at a different place?

So you have two options of balancing it. You can balance it here in Pinal at the Apache Junction area, or you can also balance it down here in, like, the San Tan Valley.

So one of those would have to go back to three, either part of the San Tan Valley or part of Apache Junction.
Do you have a preference?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Can you go back to Apache Junction again?

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

So currently this is all District 4.

And then this is three. It runs up against the county line.

You could grab a little bit, a little bit somewhere here. I'm not sure where.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: For compactness, which would make more sense? Apache Junction?

WILLIE DESMOND: It's only going to be a few thousand people, so it doesn't -- for compactness, I mean, they're both going to be splitting a -- they're going to be crossing the county line.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Don't want to do that.

WILLIE DESMOND: And both going to be splitting a census place.

So it's six of one, half dozen of another.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Let's go into Apache Junction.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

So to balance, I'll move the line a little bit to Apache Junction.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And then, again, on Thursday
I may have some more changes.

I may undo what I just did. Let me think about it.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. All right. So then for tomorrow I'll make these changes.

Are there other questions about this one?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: What are all the white areas? They're not census areas. They're, like, unincorporated?

WILLIE DESMOND: Unincorporated areas.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Just, I'm sorry, but in that little area of Apache Junction, go back to the census block to the view you were just looking at.

Okay.

Now, are those block groups or --

WILLIE DESMOND: The blue lines are block groups.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. And what's with the -- pick one and what's within it.

Yeah.

WILLIE DESMOND: You see the white area, that's the block group.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Right.

WILLIE DESMOND: Has a population of 2200 people, 2,058 are White.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Does it have -- what's
within the group? Census blocks?

WILLIE DESMOND: Individual blocks.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: How many blocks are there?
Does it tell you?

WILLIE DESMOND: I can zoom in.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. All right.

WILLIE DESMOND: There's not like a hard and fast rule.

I'm just going to select that.

Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. All right.

WILLIE DESMOND: So, within this block group, which is this square, there is -- I'll make this line a little heavier so people in the audience can see.

I'll make the block group a lot heavier for the sake of ease of seeing it.

So the dark lines are the blocks. This kind of heavier blue line is the block group.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So the best way to determine the population of that area when you're trying to equalize population is not to count those all up, but to use that tool that you used to draw a box around it, make -- so if you make census -- if you make block group your operative field, what do you call it, your layer?

WILLIE DESMOND: If you make block group your
selection layer.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Your selection layer. And then you use that tool, just do that one more time, if you would, please.

WILLIE DESMOND: It might make it, it might make it helpful if I just show you all these real quick.

So, let's just for the sake of seeing this, if I select at the block level, I click right here.

See there's the little red block. Okay?

If I change my selection layer to block group, and click on that same place, it takes that area, which is the block group.

If I change my selection layer, the census tract, click on that same spot, it takes another block group and adds that.

The next highest is, I guess, the census place, in this case. The unincorporated areas it wouldn't be. If I click right here again, it'll take all of Apache Junction and add that.

The next highest level would be county.

So if I click right here, it'll think for a minute, because it's lot, a lot more, but it will take all of Pinal County then.

So when you're trying to move areas for purposes of me building these what-if maps, I usually start with a
rough grab of tracts.

When there's directive to move whole counties, that's a lot easier. I just take the whole county.

Then when I try to balance it a little bit, I go down into the block group level.

And then where appropriate, usually more so just to make things look cleaner, if there's, like, a tract that sticks out a bunch, I'll cut that in half. I use blocks.

And then when we actually get to the draft map, when we have to use a zero percent population deviation, we'll be using the block level to find, you know, the block that has 18 to move it to one, and removing one that has 35 to another, to really tweak it to get to zero population deviation.

But that's how the, how the levels of selection work.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: With each choice the population is going to be shown in the pending changes box and it's going to show you what the population of the area that you've selected.

WILLIE DESMOND: It'll show you, yeah, that red -- for that red area, it will show you how many people are in there, how many came from which district and how many they go into.

And I've just been handed a note that all these
maps are online now, so anybody watching on the live stream can follow along a little easier.

But not this one isn't because it's not ready to be presented yet.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Can we go back to the map again and look at San Tan?

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And then . . .

WILLIE DESMOND: So if I zoom out a little bit, you'll see that, that this is all going to be in District 4 now.

So if District 3 needs to grab a little bit more of it, it could, it could take some from here, take part of Queen Creek or something.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Can you swap -- instead of Apache going into three, let it be San Tan?

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure. And would you prefer it to be San Tan Valley or the rest of, like, the Queen Creek area?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Just San Tan, right now the San Tan.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. And it will just be a portion of it, because there's -- it's only going to need a
few thousand.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay. Thank you. I think those are all the changes on seven.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Anyone want to create a 7B? Okay.

And just a public service announcement too. We are going to have a webinar this coming Tuesday evening. And if you're not signed up to receive automatic notifications from us, please do so. You can do that on our website at AZredistricting.org.

And a notification will be going out with the URL address for tuning into this webinar.

But, again, it's going to be Tuesday evening, and the time will be 7:00 p.m. Arizona time. And you'll be receiving instruction on how to do the online mapping software that is currently available.

So any other congressional comments before we move to the next agenda item?

Oh, Mr. Desmond?

WILLIE DESMOND: So, just to clarify, I believe that this river 7A is the only map that you've asked for for tomorrow.

Does anybody else have anything else, congressional-wise, that they're waiting for?

Yes. Yours.
Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

So our next item on the agenda is --

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, Ms. McNulty.

MARY O'GRADY: No, it's me. Mary.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, I'm sorry.

MARY O'GRADY: I have a question. Some of these are showing splits of tribes. And like this one shows a split of, I think, Tohono and Hualapai.

Are those -- and I'm thinking tomorrow when we present we will be at the tribal council, and so there might be some focus on where the tribes are and why are there splits.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes. Let me. . .

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Good thought.

WILLIE DESMOND: Let's take a look at that real quick, and I think I can explain that a little easier.

So, which one showed a split that we can look at?

MARY O'GRADY: Well, I was looking at river version district 6A.

I don't know if that's the same one you've been working off of, but it showed a split of Tohono. It showed that being in two. And Hualapai being in two districts.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.
Let me go through -- so if I select.

I believe that's due to the fact that -- if you look the Tohono O'odham, there's two large chunks of it. There's obviously the main part that's right on the border and there's the other portion that has about 1800 people that's closer to Tucson.

Additionally, there's some small reservation lands kind of up in this area.

And I'm not sure exactly what the population of those are, but we can look really quickly.

When we haven't been splitting reservation lands, I've been viewing that as one contiguous chunk of the reservation land hasn't been split, so that none of these pieces are split in half.

But it is possible that there's some small, like, tracts of land that they might own that are not with the main part.

That's something that we can adjust if it's -- if we get feedback that, yes, indeed this tract is very important to put with the thing.

But if you'll bear with me for one second, I'll let you know the population of some of these.

I suspect it's not terribly high.

So in this whole -- on this one down here, there's a few hundred people, it looks like.
This one in the middle has zero population.
Zero population.
Zero population.
Zero population.
No population.
So the only, the only population that's in this portion is this one. And it looks like it's divided into a few census tracts.

So, right here has 87, 59 people, 109, 90. So there's a few hundred people there.

And it's not intentional to break them up. I think it's just kind of a little blip that's easy to miss, I guess.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can you go back to that screen where it did show the majority of the Tohono O'odham nation and to the right?

I just wanted to see how big that Pascua Yaqui piece is.

Yeah.

So the Tohono O'odham sits over the Pascua Yaqui? Or how does that work? It's, like, abutting to the north.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Pascua Yaqui is north of Santa Vera.

WILLIE DESMOND: 7,000 people here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And is that piece, that
little arm that sticks up, that's definitely part of
Tohono O'odham and not Pascua Yaqui? Because I thought they
had two reservations, but. . .

WILLIE DESMOND: Pascua Yaqui is right here.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right.
WILLIE DESMOND: And they might have.
I think that's it.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's it.
It's all contiguous.
WILLIE DESMOND: Seems to be.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.
WILLIE DESMOND: We can definitely ask for some
clarification on that tomorrow.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: How many people in Pascua
Yaqui?
WILLIE DESMOND: 3400 -- or 3484.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.
Do we have a map? Would it maybe be a good thing
to have a map for tomorrow, since we are meeting with
intertribal council, that shows all the reservations?
WILLIE DESMOND: We met with someone from the
tribal council yesterday.
I believe they're going to have copies of the
three maps that you have for congressionals today which do
outline the reservation areas.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Good.

WILLIE DESMOND: And also the two legislative from Monday.

Ray can probably speak more to this.

I think the either idea is that those at least allow them to see the areas, maybe point out considerations they'd like.

RAY BLADINE: I think we also talked about having just an overlay of the reservation areas as it pertained to what you came up with today, so they'd have the most current maps. And I believe our goal is to get them to them sometime tomorrow before the 12:00 o'clock start time, because they also have a meeting in the morning.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Would it be possible to have a poster size of any of that?

WILLIE DESMOND: We can make a poster size of, of the -- yes, I mean, just a blank map with counties and reservation lands?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I think that would be good.

WILLIE DESMOND: We can do that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Desmond, do you have
mapping data on all of the villages in Maricopa County as they're defined?

WILLIE DESMOND: The villages?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: There are villages that are subareas within communities that actually have outlying boundary areas, that have their own -- they don't have legislative control, but they do have management control.

WILLIE DESMOND: I do not.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Is that something that would be -- as we're going down the path of building out communities of interest -- and I'm just looking at some of these maps. We've got certain villages that are split.

I know that there's going to be -- that you having that data would probably be important to you as you move forward.

WILLIE DESMOND: I can do a check and see if that shapefile set are wildly available -- or widely available. Another option would be if -- I mean, it might be kind of piecemeal, but I'll take a look into that and let you know.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Any other comments or questions?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. That will conclude the
congressional discussion then for today.

And we will go to item four on the agenda, review, discussion and direction of mapping consult regarding ideas for possible adjustments to legislative grid map based on constitutional criteria.

WILLIE DESMOND: So, I don't have any new legislative grid maps.

My thinking was we'd either review the ones that were presented on Monday or else Commissioner McNulty had asked for some changes.

The other option would be to work through those changes as a group, so I can really understand exactly what's going on there.

So actually move the districts right now.

But I'm fine with either. Whatever you guys would like to do.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I also have some more thoughts about continuing on north from the changes I gave you, which I could kind of outline for you, if you want, and then you could do them all together.

WILLIE DESMOND: Would you like to do them right now or would you just like to tell me them?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'd like to tell you them, rather than make everyone sit through it.

I'm happy to do either one.
WILLIE DESMOND: It's up to you.

If you think it would be helpful to see the process as I go through and I actually make the changes, I can do that.

It might be easier for me, just so I know exactly what you -- but I'm perfectly happy to take notes and then come back here with something either tomorrow or Friday.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: One of the things I'm going to be doing is over the, over the weekend leading up to next Thursday's meeting is putting together a series of notes regarding whatever the latest map that we have to move forward to get to Mr. Desmond.

So I just wanted to make you aware that I will be crafting up sort of a laundry list of adjustments and changes and a narrative that I'll be sending through Mr. Bladine to get to the mapping consultant for adjustments.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: For both congressional and legislative.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I wouldn't mind seeing those
changes, Mr. Desmond, if you don't mind making those. I think just to see what you're doing, if you could just be as detailed for us as possible, see what changes you're making, so we can see them.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So right now this is -- just for point of clarification, you wanted me to make those changes to option number two; right?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Option two version four.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Right.

WILLIE DESMOND: Let me make sure and double check that that's what I have.

So that is, to go in this plan, and I'm going to start making any changes you wanted to start with.

So, down here in, in Pima County.

I should explain the color schemes right now. I can turn them off.

The little flecks of different pastel colors are the different census places.

And then underneath that, if I turn that off, is census tracts shaded by percent HVAP.

So I wouldn't normally work with both of those on at the same time. So I'll remove, I guess, both of them and we'll start fresh.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think the census places
would be more helpful, because that's what I was looking at.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

So, I believe the first note I have from Monday's meeting was that Legislative District 2 should not include current into Tucson, and I should keep Santa Cruz County whole in Legislative District 2.

So the first thing I would do there is I would set my target to District No. 2.

I would set my source as District 1.

And I would say my selection layer is county.

So I'll click on Santa Cruz County.

I would see that my pending changes window indicates that I'm about to move 22,972 people from District 1 into District 2.

So if I accept the change, up here, District 2 went from being underpopulated by 218 people to overpopulated by 22,754.

Now, where is Tucson?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Northwest.

Just south of -- I think it's grid ten.

See the pink?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That's Vail.

And the little green . . .

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So first thing I would
probably do then is select the census place, and I'll change these so that now one is getting current with Tucson.

   Click right here.

   Commit that change.

   Move that over.

   Now since it's a noncontiguous area, I'll first look and see how the tract looks to see if that's a good way to link that in with the rest of District 1.

   A pretty big tract.

   So I think I'll just accept that change in order to keep things moved at the largest level possible.

   So --

   COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Now you want to -- you see where it says Littleton.

   WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

   COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Just bring that boundary straight down and point that into -- so you want -- yes, that, that you want to put that in one.

   WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

   COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I want to put that in one for the moment.

   WILLIE DESMOND: So one, we'll go back up here and get all this --

   COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes. Yep.

   WILLIE DESMOND: I'll, again, check to see if the
census place does -- it does. Is it that about what you wanted?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. I'll accept that change. And now District 1 has that. You also had put Drexel Heights and Valencia into District 3. Are there other changes down here that you wanted to do or should we go to that?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Let's go to that. This is just a rough start, so...

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So those are right here. So, again, I'm going to change my target to District 3. Just going to first just check and see what a tract would do.

So those seem to grab pretty well on the borders I'm working on. So that's what you're looking for right there?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: District 3?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yep.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'll commit that change. Now District 3 has those.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: My next direction was, LD 10,
Tanque Verde should go to River Road, go east to Alvernon Road, go south to Grant Road --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Not quite.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. This would be good for you to walk me through this one.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. Before we leave, let's go to the north, just west of Drexel Heights, the northernmost area of what is now two.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Just east of Santa Vera, which is the green.

So you want to go over in here.

I want to see where the boundary is there.

WILLIE DESMOND: Here?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: The boundary between, I guess it would be, two and ten.

I'm a little bit handicapped because I brought the wrong glasses, so I can see everything close to me but nothing up there.

WILLIE DESMOND: If you want to, you can sit next to me, and you can see on my screen.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. Can we have the streets?
WILLIE DESMOND: I'll zoom in a little more. And I'll move them so that they're on top of census place.

Okay.

And I can -- if I zoom in more, I'll be able to read the labels.

If you want to go to -- to this area right here?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: Or, I'm sorry, this area. Ten.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes.

Refinery Way.

I've never heard of that.

WILLIE DESMOND: Refinery Way and then 86.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. So how much population are we over here, or under?

WILLIE DESMOND: So District No. 2 is currently 24,000 people underpopulated.

District No. 10 is 2500 people overpopulated.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So if we move the boundary of two north to around 22nd Street.

Here's 36.

Let's just try that.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. I'll at this point try to grab by census block group.

Actually tract might work.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We found the solution here, guys. Each of us needs Willie all day every day.

WILLIE DESMOND: Everybody needs me.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Sitting next to us.

WILLIE DESMOND: This isn't exact, but to give you a rough idea.

That moved about 13,000 people over.

If I zoom out --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: What if you just keep coming over to --

WILLIE DESMOND: West or east?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: West, because we want to, we want to take in this... .

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm going to go to the block level now.

Okay. So that's 17,000 people.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: We still need about 7,000 more.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: All right. And I don't know where to get them.

So can we just --

WILLIE DESMOND: Save this?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yeah, save this for now.

And I want to zoom out and look at what we have for two right now, just generally speaking.
WILLIE DESMOND: That was for two.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Now two is about 7700 people underpopulated.

There's a little pocket there that I have to clean up in a minute.

If you look at our whole data table, this is -- three is overpopulated by about 39,000 people.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. So there's --

WILLIE DESMOND: So two can grab some of this and make a population.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Before we do that, it was -- let's go -- and whenever anyone gets really sick of this, just let me know, because I can give Willie my list here.

Let's go south, all the way south. Remember we wanted to do the little arm that grabbed out and reached Bisbee and Douglas?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Maybe we could just do the real broad, and, you know, not worry. . .

WILLIE DESMOND: Do you want two to --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. So two would come east along the border and would take in Naco and Bisbee, so it would be really close to the border.
We don't want to include Sierra Vista.
Come under Palominas.
And then do the same sort of thing for Douglas.
WILLIE DESMOND: Too much?
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yeah, too much.
WILLIE DESMOND: This is where it gets real exciting.
There is a -- technically a line that runs right here, so we couldn't -- that is contiguous.
Let me grab all of that.
I'm going to go -- I'm going to commit those changes, and I'm going to switch this to census place.
And now back to census blocks, so that I can make this, again, contiguous.
That is a contiguous shape, so that would work, although there is an island here that would need to be also selected.
So I'll commit that.
And now we have --
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: What are these? This, this?
WILLIE DESMOND: Those are census blocks groups --
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Let's fill that all in, make it a little dome, because we need that whole population center there, all those guys.
WILLIE DESMOND: Now, see, this one is a little bigger. Do you want me to take this area too?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: No.

Okay. Yeah, that's a start.

So that's kind of the idea that we capture the, you know, the majority of the population in the Bisbee, Douglas metro areas, and pull them into two.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So we may need a cleaner way to do that.

And how much population is that?

WILLIE DESMOND: That moved about 7,000 people, and now two is only 128 people underpopulated.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. So we're kind of close.

WILLIE DESMOND: Close.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: All right.

WILLIE DESMOND: When we grabbed Douglas, we overpopulated.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Should we grab Douglas --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Grab Douglas.

WILLIE DESMOND: All right.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We don't want to leave Douglas behind.
I don't think we want that one.

WILLIE DESMOND: Very close.

So the census block is fairly large, because there's not many people.

Go back to one.

There is this little area of --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Let's leave that in one.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

And there's a little area inside there. And two.

Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So let's go back up to south Tucson now.

How far off are we?

WILLIE DESMOND: Now District No. 2 is overpopulated by 18,000 people. And District No. 1 is underpopulated by 36,000.

So if I go back into south Tucson.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

So this is where I don't think it's fair to make everybody sit through all this. So should I just describe generally what -- and I can give you more detail with -- to answer any of your questions, but then everyone doesn't have to sit through it.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Can we maybe at least have that portion of the map up, so we can look at it as you're
describing your changes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes, that's what I was
going to do, have the map up and kind of generally describe.

I'll go over what I, what I had asked for last
time we met and met anew.

And then I may have to clarify in my own mind, and
for Willie, so he can actually do it.

But the next idea was to go back to Drexel Heights
and Valencia West.

WILLIE DESMOND: All right.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And put the streets on it
so I can see them.

Okay. And go over to I-19, in this area.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

This is I-19.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

So, the concept is that there -- that we would
take the -- this southwest Tucson population and make a
majority-minority district, which would become three.

So this -- so three would become a more compact
district in the southwest part of Tucson, that would be
majority-minority, and it would, it would be roughly from
this, the Old Nogales Highway, which is just east of I-19
here.

WILLIE DESMOND: That would be the east border?
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That would be the east border.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And then it would come along the Benson Highway.

WILLIE DESMOND: That's on the north or the south?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That's on the -- sort of northeast.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: To 22nd Street, or thereabouts, which would be -- which was that boundary that we just made of two.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: To Campbell or First Avenue, which are parallel major streets.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm sorry, so --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So we're coming up here.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And we're going to hit 22nd Street.

WILLIE DESMOND: So this is actually -- I'm sorry, it's the --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So we're going to be taking --

WILLIE DESMOND: Western border, not eastern.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It's this border that would be taking some of this population and putting it into three.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So this, so this little arm that's sticking out -- maybe I should have the pointer. So this would become the new border, somewhere in here.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And the population west of it would move into three.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: The boundary would come up -- from 22nd Street we would go to -- I guess we would have to go west to -- or east to Campbell.

WILLIE DESMOND: So you're talking about three now, or two?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: This is the east boundary of three.

I'll draw it for you.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It's hard to see from here. Because what we're going to be doing essentially is taking this area.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And making three.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We're going to go up to Picture Rocks.

What's a little unclear is what happens in this part of downtown Tucson.

That's what I'm being unclear about. And I can't without having a map in front of me.

But the idea is we come up along here. Some of this population that's now in two goes into three.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And then follow I-10 up, over to Picture Rocks, down and around and back to where we started.

WILLIE DESMOND: What if I zoom out a little bit.

District 3 currently goes --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: District 3 is currently really big.

So the concept is that this becomes a majority-minority district right here.

Then this, I still have a, a thought that this should look more like the congressional district.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: But I -- so you could try that. You could make, you could make south Yuma and
the T.O. reservation, kind of put that together as a
district, but from it remove this area.

WILLIE DESMOND: So, I'm sorry, I'm a little --
would it be helpful if I showed you real quickly -- just
temporarily remove all of that from, from three, so that
three would then -- I would have to add this area and the
reservation back in, but three would then come back up here
to Picture Rock.

That would remove 21,000 people.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: And that's -- we'd still need to
remove people.

Three would still be about 18,000 people
overpopulated.

So if I just go ahead and do that.

And then to avoid any confusion.

Add that back to three.

So now three is, is much smaller.

This area is all unincorporated.

And if we go back into this area, three still
needs to lose population somewhere.

So three is still above 18,000 people
overpopulated.

Now that can come from here. If we turn the
streets back on we'll -- you know, we can remove everything
that's east of the I-19 or the Old Nogales Highway, if that would be helpful. If you would like to keep some --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Let's try it. Let's try that.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

I'm just going to, I'm just going to give it to unassigned. So I'm not giving it to any district right now.

Now, three is roughly at the ideal value. It's 333 people under what we would want. And it includes south Tucson right here, and this area.

Does that --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So let's -- now let's go to grid ten. And maybe by -- maybe we can back into it, just, um, the northeast corner --

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: -- of grid ten. I think was about Houghton and Speedway.

So what I wanted to do was find Tanque Verde Road, and continue -- and follow Tanque Verde Road north and east to River Road.

WILLIE DESMOND: Tanque Verde Road is right here.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Would you like to extend down --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Let's do that for right
now.

Let's go up to Tanque Verde Road.

Obviously this is going to need a lot of refinement.

WILLIE DESMOND: In those cases, census block group was --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And then we're going to follow this, Tanque Verde Road, which is south of the Catalina -- thing that says Catalina Foothills there.

WILLIE DESMOND: Uh-hmm.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We're going to keep going east --

WILLIE DESMOND: West?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: West, I'm sorry. Yes, west.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Until we find River Road. So we're going to need to move the map over.

WILLIE DESMOND: Do you have an idea where?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It should be in here somewhere.

WILLIE DESMOND: And this is Sabino Canyon Road.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: You're going to have to zoom out.

Zoom out.
There's your tool bar.

It runs right along kind of the base of the Catalina Foothills and the north side of Tucson.

It's Main Street.

It's probably --

WILLIE DESMOND: Yep. River Road.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So -- okay. So what we want to do is we want to connect up from Tanque Verde Road to River Road.

I'm not sure of the best way to do that in terms of, you know, streets, but that's going to be the north, the north boundary.

I would just follow this Catalina Foothills line.

WILLIE DESMOND: So, if I understand correctly, you just want ten to take all of this back.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yep, yep, Yep.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. That's easy enough.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And then, and then we're going to go as far along River Road to Alvernon.

Which is going to be right about, I'm going to guess, right about here.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. I'm going to accept that, and I am going to move that back.

So now ten follows the Tucson border.

And you want to remove some of it and go to where?
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So we're going to -- let's find Alvernon, which is going to be right kind of in the middle of town here.

So it will be one more. It will be over here.

Okay. All right. So this boundary is going to come down.

Alvernon to Grant.

WILLIE DESMOND: Let me assign it so we can see easier.

To Graham?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: To Grant.

WILLIE DESMOND: Grant.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: General Grant.

WILLIE DESMOND: Is that north?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That is north of here.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. So this is going to become the boundary of ten.

Then we're going to go west on Grant.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: This is going to be the boundary between ten and nine. We're going to go west on Grant, until we get to, let's say, First Avenue.

Which will be -- what does that say?

WILLIE DESMOND: I think we already have that.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. Well, that's cool.

Let's do that.

(Whereupon, Mr. Herrera exits the room.)

WILLIE DESMOND: So you want this all to be in
nine then? This is ten.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: This is going to be --
yeah, so what's north of that will be nine.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'll just accept that. So if I
zoom back out, this all is still ten.

So I'm going to give that to nine, and I'm just
going to take it from ten.

Okay.

And this area is all unassigned.

So I'll just take that unassigned and give it to
nine.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Give that to nine.

WILLIE DESMOND: There you go.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. So then down here --
so what do we got in ten now?

WILLIE DESMOND: So now ten is 55,000 people
overpopulated.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

Okay. I don't know how to fix that right now, but
we'll -- let me -- maybe you could print this just so --

okay.
All right.

So then the next idea was -- so we need to work on this central area here to equalize the populations in these, in these areas.

What I had in my notes was that we would -- this would come down to the base, that we would follow the Barraza-Aviation Highway and then along the north boundary of the base.

And that would become the south boundary of ten.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So why don't we just do that, seeing as we're --

WILLIE DESMOND: Sounds good.

So what will be the south boundary?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. The south boundary, there's a, there's a -- something that I think on the map will be called the Barraza-Aviation Highway that comes into central Tucson.

See where it says Pima there?

See this?

Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: So I will move --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So this boundary, the south boundary of ten, is going to come down along Aviation Highway.
WILLIE DESMOND: So I'm going to grab, just so I can remember where I'm going.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: But not up this way. Down this way.

So we're not going north.

This boundary is correct. It's about 22nd Street. But the southeast boundary. So all this area in the northeast part of that square is going to get pulled into ten.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: From Aviation.

Madam Chair, would you just like me to give these directions to Mr. Desmond off line?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think it's helpful.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. I'll keep going. It reminds me when I was about five and used to play with blocks at my grandfather's house.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think it's helpful to be going through this exercise, and you seem to have done some thinking about the legislative map, so -- and it's an area we all want to spend more time on, so let's say we proceed.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Desmond, while you and Commissioner McNulty are going through this, do you have
access to the neighborhood association maps for the city of Tucson?

WILLIE DESMOND: I don't.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay. Just like the villages in -- those are areas that you're going to want to start to collect.

There's 153 of them.

WILLIE DESMOND: Do you have a -- is there a place you recommend starting to look for them?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm going to try to find a source for you, Mr. Desmond, to get you a list for both the villages, and I know that there's some -- I know through Maricopa County website you'll find them, and through the City of Tucson neighborhood resource office you'll be able to find the neighborhood associations.

WILLIE DESMOND: That would be very helpful.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: These are not homeowner associations. They're actually designated blocks and areas within the community that have got -- that are within themselves communities of interest.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's a good idea. Maybe Tucson Association of Realtors, is that what you said? Their website might have info.

WILLIE DESMOND: So now ten as it is is currently
62,000 people overpopulated.

Where would you like to remove that population from?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: What is this area, the little central . . .

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe that's an unassigned area.

(Whereupon, Mr. Herrera returns to the room.)

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, that is unassigned.

As it is, currently two is overpopulated also.

But three is about perfectly populated.

So, something is going to have to take that area, two or -- it's currently between two and three. So if it goes to three, three is going to need to lose some somewhere else.

Two already needs to lose some population.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Where's the base? Where's the Air Force base?

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm not sure.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Let's see.

Right there.

WILLIE DESMOND: Do you know the roads we're looking at?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Davis-Monthan Air Force Base. So that's it right now.
Okay.

So let's go back to -- so I want that to be the south boundary. So that's right.

What's this here? This is --

WILLIE DESMOND: That's, I believe, Grant -- no, 22nd.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. So that's okay. So let's. . .

I'm not sure. I know it works. I just can't reconstruct it right this second.

So let's just hold that thought, and let's go -- let's keep going north.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Just out of curiosity, how many are in the census place of Catalina Foothills? What's the population?

WILLIE DESMOND: 50,796.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. So the south boundary of nine would become the north boundary of ten.

WILLIE DESMOND: Correct.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So we would bring -- we would come along River Road, and then somehow we've got to figure -- and Grant Road, we've got to figure out this population sharing thing.

And then we would come over to I-10.

WILLIE DESMOND: You want nine to go over to I-10?
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yeah.

WILLIE DESMOND: So how far --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Or let's go -- you know, whatever these census places are. It doesn't have to be right on I-10. Maybe along these areas.

   And we want to go north to about Linda Vista, which is -- what we want to do is come across the north side of the Catalina Foothills and under Oro Valley, so the line is going to be somewhere. . .

(Whereupon, Mr. Stertz exits the room.)

WILLIE DESMOND: So that's currently 29,000 people moved over.

Nine is though 67,000 people short.

And if we remove any of this, it's going to be much shorter.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. So then we'll go over here.

WILLIE DESMOND: Should I -- would be helpful if I took these areas out of nine first --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: So you want that to become unassigned or part of another district right away?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Part of.

WILLIE DESMOND: Eleven?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Eleven, yeah.
WILLIE DESMOND: So all of Catalina and all of Oro Valley go into 11.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: Summerhaven and unincorporated can stay --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That can go -- probably go into 11.

There's not much population there.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So at this point, nine is right here, and it is 116,000 people underpopulated.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. So we're going to come west here.

Have we found Linda Vista yet?

Yeah. Include that. That's fine. And just keep coming west.

Well, no, we don't want to -- that's part of Oro Valley.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'll remove it.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Would it, would it be helpful if we just took all of --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Uh-hmm.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Let me do that.

That added about 66,000 people in.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: What were you looking for?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, we're about 50,000 short in nine.

I would say that in ten you're about 62,000 over.

So if it's possible --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. So --

WILLIE DESMOND: -- you can dip down into ten a little more here.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: All right. Somewhere here, and I'm not sure the best way to do it, we're going to equalize that out.

So this, what is the -- see where it says 77?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yep.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I don't think that finger belongs there, so we want to...

WILLIE DESMOND: That's part of 11.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. That should be part of nine.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

All the Flowing Wells.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes, Flowing Wells should be --

WILLIE DESMOND: This area?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yep. They all go together.

WILLIE DESMOND: That adds 28,000.
A little more.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Just follow I-10 and pull everything in. And if it needs to straddle I-10, that's fine.

But follow it fairly closely.

WILLIE DESMOND: Now nine goes across I-10.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It shouldn't go that far. We just want it to.

WILLIE DESMOND: Would you like that to become part of three then, or would you like that to be a finger coming down from 11?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We want no fingers.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. No fingers.

I'll give that to three then.

Okay. Now, nine comes up, and nine now needs about 19,000 more people.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. We want to get rid of a little ribbon there.

You may, you know, you may have to off line just go into these smaller units of geography and clean that up.

WILLIE DESMOND: I've gotten pretty good at that.

So, now nine is still 19,000 people underpopulated --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: What's ten?

WILLIE DESMOND: And ten is 62,000 people
overpopulated.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Well, obviously we need to move some people from ten into nine.

We should do that in here.

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, that's our --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Oh, that's our majority-minority district.

Okay. Somewhere in this area where we have the boundary between the --

WILLIE DESMOND: Would you rather it come from Catalina or past Grant --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: No, we're going to follow River Road. That's an important geographic feature. So it need to be in this Grant area here, I think.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Well, let's -- first of all, let's. . .

Okay. So, now, nine is 18,000 people short.

Doesn't have to be perfect, because it's legislative, and there is a little bit of leeway with deviation, but --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We have a lot of work to do on this.

And let's not worry about that right this second.

But obviously we're going to equalize the population here between these three districts.
WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Between three, ten, and nine, so that it works.
And let's keep going north.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. So -- so, then the next area north is 11; right?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So the north boundary of nine becomes the south boundary of 11.

WILLIE DESMOND: Correct.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So let's go back over to this Tanque Verde area where we were at.
And there's -- see where it says Tanque Verde.
There should be a road here called Redington Road.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. And you want that in one?
Or that's currently --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I want that to be the boundary between 11 and 1.
So we're going to take in this north Catalina area into 11. Not much population there.

WILLIE DESMOND: Which road are we looking for?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Redington.

It's going to fall -- it's going to be --

WILLIE DESMOND: Is it a north-south?
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: No. It's not in the city.

So let's come back out.

Let's try that there.

No, that's the Catalina Highway.

So it's north of that.

Go up to the county line, the Pinal County line.

(Whereupon, Mr. Stertz returns and Mr. Freeman exits the room.)

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It will intersect the county line at some point.

Let's find that later.

So what we're going to do is we're going to start in the...

WILLIE DESMOND: Just as a point of, so we know what we're studying, so ten goes down all the way up to Casa Grande, and it is currently 61,000 people overpopulated.

So ten needs to lose somewhere.

It couldn't lose -- it could give population to one, because one is underpopulated now by 36,000.

But why don't you --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I just can't tell you as I sit here. I would have to sit here and look at this more closely.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Because at this point it's -- when we start moving the population around, it kind of needs to work with the overall concept.

I think if we just start -- if we just move the population for the sake of moving that population, without having it be consistent with the concept, then we're not accomplishing what we need to accomplish.

WILLIE DESMOND: So just --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So you're going to find River Road, and you're going to follow it up to the county line.

Not River Road -- Redington Road. And that's a kind of a north-south. It's a -- yeah, that's it. Okay.

(Whereupon, Mr. Freeman returns to the room.)

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So that's going to separate 1 and 11, for purposes of this exercise.

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe that's Redington Road right there.

I'm trying to keep track of where that is.

I just want to check one thing.

Does it go up?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It goes up to the Pinal County line.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm not sure I'm following it.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We may need to -- it should
keep going straight up. And if it doesn't, then that's what we should do. We should go straight up to the Pinal County line, kind of following.

WILLIE DESMOND: So I'll move this back to one. Okay.

So that -- now we have -- this is -- to add all this to 11.

But does that make sense then? That that's this line right here.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yeah, maybe, as a starting point, yep.

WILLIE DESMOND: So I'll quickly add all this stuff.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Would you like one to remain -- Tanque Verde to remain in one or do you want that to be some part of 11?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Let's leave it in one.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: For now.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So, there's still some cleaning up to do.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That's an understatement.

WILLIE DESMOND: Roughly what you were looking for there.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. Now let's go north here, into Pinal County.

Oh, boy.

WILLIE DESMOND: Do you want me to zoom out?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yeah.

WILLIE DESMOND: So -- so you can get your bearings again.

So now 11 is everything that's north of Tanque Verde, Redington Road. And then Oro Valley and Marana, I believe, is all the southern portion of this district.

And it's currently -- 11 needs to make up some population.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. So the idea is that -- let me just orient Willie on a road map here.

I should have done this earlier, pulled this out.

(Brief pause.)

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Let's come east along -- west along the county line.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Until we get to 79.

Well, actually until we get to Saddlebrooke. So we need to -- obviously we need to include Saddlebrooke in 11.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Then once we get over to
79, we're going to choose an imaginary line, just for purposes of this draft, about halfway between 79 and I-10. So what we're doing here is kind of putting the 79 together with 79 and the I-10 together with I-10, and we're going to come northwest.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And we're going to include in 11 the communities of Red Rock, Rillito.

WILLIE DESMOND: Red Rock?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: They are a little bit south here.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

There's Red Rock.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. We're going to include that. We're going to include Arizona City.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: This whole, this whole area.

WILLIE DESMOND: Eloy?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yeah. Eloy, Toltec.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Now you're going to have a very, very jagged district for a second as I commit these changes. Obviously all these unincorporated islands need to
be moved into -- you'd also like, what else?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: The north boundary is going to be -- we're going to move Casa Grande into 12.

The north boundary is going to be just under Casa Grande.

And then we're going to bring it back kind of on a diagonal to where we started from to include this whole I-10 corridor, all these emerging communities here.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

I'm just going to clean up 11 real quick just for the ease of looking at this and show you what else you want.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think we want to come over to Chuichu.

You know, that'll be -- so this whole area and Maricopa -- let's take Maricopa and Stanfield and include that in 11 also.

WILLIE DESMOND: The issue there is splitting the reservation.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: No, we're not going to split the reservation. We're just going to pull in Maricopa and Stanfield.

WILLIE DESMOND: So then go through parts of -- because also Maricopa is in reservation so -- oh, it's not actually. It's between.

So, but -- you want to kind of go up around --
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yeah, up around Casa Grande.


Now I just grab part of Casa Grande, just for sake of...

I'm -- now 11 is still 63,000 over, so I'll go into Maricopa and see what that is.

That is 43.

Okay. Now if I zoom out, I can show you what we've got kind of.

Whatever you want.

So, 11 now has these areas, Saddlebrooke and Oro Valley, runs kind of up along the northern side of I-10, and then kind of goes around, around Casa Grande.

So it's a very narrow joint here, and then also grabs Maricopa and has some unincorporated land over here.

And it needs about 19,000 more people.

I can either get those down here, try to include both sides of I-10, or I could grab parts -- more parts of Casa Grande or more parts of Coolidge.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I don't think we want to do that.

You could go south.

Obviously this needs to be cleaned up quite a bit.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, so we can do that --
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We'll figure that out.

WILLIE DESMOND: I can do that pretty quickly.

If you'll hold on for just one second.

So this is all 12.

Now you can see, 12 has Casa Grande and 11 has,

has all this area that goes up into Maricopa.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

All right. So probably going to want to include

that.

But let's just go to the last piece, and then we
can go home, and I can figure out --

WILLIE DESMOND: For tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yeah, or for the next day.

Okay. So then let's go back to San Manuel and

Mammoth, which are southeast here, the south.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Which are now in eight, I

think.

WILLIE DESMOND: Farther south.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: No, farther north.

(Whereupon, Mr. Herrera exits the room.)

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. All right.

So here's the idea for what grid 12 would become.

We have the copper corridor on the east, we have

sort of the old established but growing communities in Pinal
County in the middle, and then we'd have the kind of agricultural and emerging Gila River communities on the west.

So we would start --

WILLIE DESMOND: Do you want me to go back?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes. To San Manuel and Mammoth.

This becomes part of 12, up to the San Carlos reservation.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Okay. I can clean that up.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

Then we're going to keep going north along the west boundary of the reservation. We're going to pull in Kearny, some of these copper communities here, Wheatfields, Copper Hill, Globe, Miami.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Superior.

Can you pull it down a little bit so we can see.

WILLIE DESMOND: Oh.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. Now let's come over here.

We'll kind of just fill that in.

We're going to include Florence, which is -- we'll have to go to the west.
WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Florence, Coolidge, Casa Grande.

WILLIE DESMOND: You want all this to be in 12?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Twelve. Yep.

Come up as far as Queen Creek, and then up the Maricopa County boundary there. And that's where we'll stop.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

So you want it to be --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So it's going to --

WILLIE DESMOND: That's already in 12.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: So now if I --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We're going to take -- see how Queen Creek is split, and we're not on the Maricopa County boundary, so we want to follow that. Everything south of it is going to be in 12, and north of it is tomorrow's homework.

WILLIE DESMOND: Let me just grab this and see what that does.

Now there is -- Queen Creek is a good example of a place that splits a county boundary.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Would you like to split it or
1 would you like to add this to --

2 COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I don't think I want to
3 split Queen Creek.

4 WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So I'm going to grab the
5 rest of that then, and then it will dip in.

6 COMMISSIONER McNULTY: The purpose for that is
7 that I think we're transitioning here from, you know, this
8 rural to the very densely urban.

9 WILLIE DESMOND: That makes sense.

10 COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So the idea is 12 is going
11 to kind of follow along the densely urban area and include
12 within it these older growing communities and this
13 agricultural area over here that includes Sacaton and
14 Santa Cruz, I think on the Gila River reservation.

15 WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

16 COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Then we're going to come
17 down and include all of Casa Grande.

18 WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

19 COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Back to where we started,
20 which will be -- this southeast point should be the
21 confluence of Highway 79 and 77 in Pinal County.

22 (Whereupon, Mr. Herrera returns to the room.)

23 WILLIE DESMOND: Seventy-nine and . . .

24 COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Have to go east,

25 San Manuel.
So that all gets kind of pulled into --

WILLIE DESMOND: So you want that to be part of 12 then?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. The one issue right away is that 12 is overpopulated, so it's going to need to give some of that up.

Would that make more sense to do up in this area?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: For right now.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Let me -- let's just assign this to nothing. And we'll -- so right now 12 is 44,000 people over.

I'll move --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I want to keep Globe with the other copper communities south of there. So I have to figure out how to do that.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, I think that's too many people.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: So they -- those three kind of corners have too many, I think.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: What's the best way for you to give this to me so I can work on cleaning up the population issues? Do you just want to after we're done
here load it onto my --

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. And then I can study it, and I'll try and give you better directions.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can we load that onto everyone's actually?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It's a really rough start, but the idea is that we have, you know, kind of reorienting things and try to keep some of these communities together, and build off that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great. Yeah, we appreciate you doing some homework.

Are there other legislative map ideas that anyone wants to discuss now?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is there anything, Mr. Desmond, from your end on legislative that we need to follow up on?

WILLIE DESMOND: So, I guess for tomorrow I won't proceed more on this. I'll kind of let everyone play with it tonight, and we can talk about it tomorrow or on Friday and go from there.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: So then just for tomorrow, I'll have the river changes, and then I assume I'll be able to get to the whole counties changes, because tomorrow is an afternoon meeting, I think, so I'll have the morning to work on all that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right.

WILLIE DESMOND: So I'll have, I'll have those for tomorrow.

And then if you guys want to think more about anything else you want, possibly for Friday, but certainly for next week, there's big gaps, so we can really, you know, get specific if you want, or see a lot of different versions or, you know, just think of anything that you're going to be curious about, since it is enough time.

I'll be sending you guys things, I guess, on a working basis throughout that week, so we can have some feedback from Mr. Bladine, I guess.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Good.

WILLIE DESMOND: But I think that's... 

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. O'Grady.

MARY O'GRADY: I just had a question, if I may, on this.

I just wanted to get reoriented in terms of the southern Arizona voting rights districts, and where the
tribes, where the tribes are, so we have...

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: The concept is that the Santa Cruz County district would be a voting rights district. That now that it includes the whole of Santa Cruz County and would also include Bisbee and Douglas -- or might, I don't think it needs to, then the three, number three, which was a really big district, would now be a smaller district geographically in southwest Tucson that would include that densely populated minority area, and that would become a majority-minority district.

And then the tribe, I haven't, you know, I haven't figured -- my thinking is that that would be coupled with south Yuma in a district that looked a lot like the congressional district but that excluded the HVAP population in southwest Tucson which would become a majority-minority district, legislative district, in its own right.

And I understand I don't have the population numbers right at all, but that's the thinking.

And it's just based on looking at this, the blocks and stuff, it looks like the population is there to do that. It's just going to take some more work.

MARY O'GRADY: Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, do you think we
can make changes that Commissioner McNulty recommended today, if possible, by 9:00?

WILLIE DESMOND: So, I'm sorry. . .

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: The changes that Commissioner McNulty and you were going through.

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, my plan was to try to clean this up just a little bit, especially like the stray blocks I can remove.

And then just load this up as it is right now on all of your computers.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: If that would work.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: That would work.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Anything else on legislative that anyone wants to raise?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Thanks, Mr. Desmond.

The time is 12:24 p.m.

And I asked other commissioners how we want to proceed.

It doesn't look like actually there's a lot left on the agenda. Those are the two big agenda items, because we already covered five, unless there's any new information
that we were going to be getting.

 Okay.

 And six, the executive director's report, there isn't anything new today.

 And then discussion of future meetings and future agenda items.

 We know when our future meetings are. We're meeting two more times this week, tomorrow and Friday. Next week, Thursday and Friday. And that, of course, will be a recurring agenda item on all those meetings.

 So, I don't know if there's anything new with getting anything on the attorney general inquiry from legal counsel?

 (No oral response.)

 CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And so there's call for public comment. So --

 THE REPORTER: Madam Chair.

 CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes -- sure.

 Okay. So let's take a just five-minute recess, and then we'll come back and do public comment. And then I think that kind of ends the meeting.

 Thanks.

 The time is 12:25 p.m.

 (Brief recess taken.)
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Okay.  We're going to enter back into public session.  Recess is over.

The time is 12:40 p.m.

I understand that our streaming went down, but we have been recording the rest of the meetings so that that will be available and uploaded as a recording.

So with that, commissioners, just before I go to public comment, was there anything else anyone wanted to raise with regard to future meetings and future agenda items?

And we'll have two more times this week, of course, to also talk about that.

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Okay.  Hearing none, we will go ahead and go to agenda item nine, which is call for public comment.

And I have three request to speak forms.  If you could limit your comments to four minutes, that would be great.

Our first speaker is Jim March, second vice-chair Pima County Libertarian Party.

JIM MARCH:  Madam Chair, I'll just say four words: Giant Arizona-shaped dartboard.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Okay.

JIM MARCH:  Nothing further today.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: All right.

Our next speaker is Linda Greene, representing
self, from Pima.

LINDA GREENE: My name is Linda Hall Greene. I'm
a registered voter in Congressional District 8 and
Legislative District 26.

I've been politically active most of my life.

I am first want to speak very publicly to
congratulate you all for the time that you're giving to us
as citizens in Arizona.

That is an extremely important task that you have
before you, a very, very complicated one. It's very easy
for me to see.

I particularly want to congratulate you on the
civility with which you speak to each other, and the respect
that each of you shows to one another when you have comment.

And I hope that the public will use you as models
in the future, both in the state legislature and in our
congressional district when we have our opportunity to
speak.

I thank you very much for this.

I want to speak on -- I have in my hand
Proposition 106 and the mandate under which you all sit in
those chairs.

Because I think it is important to remember what
the opening paragraph is, because I'm going to speak on
one of those categories of competitiveness, which has
been referenced several times today.

Proposing an amendment to the constitution of
Arizona amending Article IV, Part 2, Section 1, constitution
of Arizona, relating to ending the practice of
gerrymandering and improving voter and candidate
participation in elections by creating an Independent
Commission of balanced appointments to oversee the mapping
of fair and competitive congressional and legislative
districts.

And so if there's any weight to be given besides
your other criteria, I think it is spoken clearly that
competitiveness has to be seriously considered in all your
deliberations.

And I know that this is going to be addressed more
further in more detail, but I hope that you will be keeping
that strongly in mind, or I think the public will be very
disappointed in whatever your effort is.

If we do not result in the state of Arizona with
more fairly drawn competitive districts, I think the public
will not have been well served.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Wes Harris, representing self,
WES HARRIS: Good afternoon. It's Wes Harris, H-A-R-R-I-S.

I'll pick up where I left off two meetings ago. I did not make the last two meetings, and I see you've made quite a bit of progress.

I commend you for that.

I also echo the previous speaker's congratulatory remarks, because I think you are doing a great job. And it's a very difficult one at best.

I would remind you that I've spoken about this once before, and that's the open meetings laws and the ability to have discourse between those of us who go out of our way to travel this far to talk with you, that we ask a question, I think that would be nice if you would respond to it.

I know -- I did have occasion to talk to Jim Lynn, (sic) who was the chair of this committee ten years ago, and he indicated to me that discourse was something that they did then.

So I had expected it to happen now.

Now, as far as competitive districts are concerned, I think the basis should be more than just one election.

And I know that you're moving towards that. And
the more information you get, the better off we are in assessing that.

And to the previous comments, fairness is what this all about.

That was why you were created.

And I did detect the issue of gerrymandering, which I think I just witnessed a little bit of, if I know what gerrymandering is all about. That looked a little bit like it.

So I would urge you not to do that. And to be fair, and understanding that when you create a minority district -- a minority-majority district, that you're disenfranchising the minority in that district for all time.

And we've created what I call, and I've mentioned it before, voting ghettos.

In other words, people who are in the minority will not leave that area, much like the Native Americans will not leave their reservation.

And we don't want to create a bunch more reservations throughout the state, at least I would hope not.

It's very difficult to follow what you're doing when we don't have the maps that you're working on.

And I would hope that if you would get those maps published before the meeting, so we can see what you're
talking about.

And, finally, the village boundaries that you want from Phoenix, just go on Phoenix website, you'll pick them up.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Maureen Bayardi, representing self, from Phoenix.


I appreciate having the opportunity to speak in front of you. I'm not a professional speaker, but I am a registered voter with great concerns.

I would like to speak about the communities of interest.

I feel that that's the most important issue, and with that then follows the geographic feature which satisfies another criteria for the Commission.

I live in an urban area that is close to a rural area.

I like this being that it gives me and my family and my grandchildren an opportunity to visit the friends that we have in that area. Our children are exposed then to a rural area with the animals and the horses in this time of great stress.

Because we are under a lot of stress. Even the
children.

My little grandchildren say how come things are so bad?

You can't even turn a television on for them to listen, because all we hear is bad news.

When we visit our friends in the rural area, they experience a sense of calm, and the stress is released from them, at least for a period of time.

With this body in mind, I think it's extremely important to keep these areas intact. We are to be community, not broken up.

And the cities have moved out, and this is happening everywhere. And I hope you take that into great consideration and not to break us up.

Thank you very much for listening to me.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

That concludes public comment.

So unless there's anybody else who I missed.

RAY BLADINE: I've got one. I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, okay. Sorry.

Lynne St. Angelo.

RAY BLADINE: I'm sorry, Lynne.

LYNNE ST. ANGELO: That's okay.

Good afternoon, commissioners.

I want to talk about some things that came up at this meeting, and one is on the issue of measurement of competitiveness. Because you are making judgments on competitiveness.

And right now the measurement that is being used -- and there's a lot of time spent on this, and so I just want to clear up what an outlier is.

And sometimes it's different than what we learn in school to the real world. It's very different in reality.

And this is one of those cases.

A good example of an outlier election was yesterday in New York District 9, where a Republican was elected to replace Representative Wiener. It hasn't happened in that district since 1923 that they elected a Republican.

That would be considered a real outlier for New York.

And so what we have in Arizona is we had that same kind of thing happen in the last election, in the 2010 election, where there was a big sweeping out, even in southern Arizona, of a lot of seats that were held traditionally by one party over another.

And the way that this happens is voters, typically you get a lot more voting, more people come out in the
presidential election cycle, and fewer people come out in
the off year, second year, the 2010.

So 2008 you have a lot more people voting. 2010
you have a lot less people voting.

Unless, the people in 2008 who voted one way got
angry about what happened in those two years, and it wasn't
what they expected, and then they come out in huge numbers,
again, not equal to a presidential election year, but more
than they would normally come out.

And I think that is what we saw happen in the 2010
election.

But how you have your data right now that you're
looking at for competitiveness heavily weights the 2010
election, basically making the mine inspector race equal to
President Barack Obama.

You've equalized those two races, and you can see
just by what they are that that couldn't possibly be true,
either the number of people who voted for that race or how
that voting happened.

And then you've also in the way the data is taken
is you have the governor, the secretary of state, the
attorney general, you have five -- or seven of those races
in the 2010 election compared to only two races and made
equal.

So you have nine races all equal, like the mine
inspector is equal to Barack Obama's race, and you can see that that doesn't make sense. That isn't even anywhere near equal.

So you've heavily weighted 2010 election, which would probably be considered by most people an outlier election, even across probably the whole country, that that was kind of a sweeping out election year.

So I would recommend that you either -- there's two ways to approach it to make it equal. Either make two races out of the 2010 election and two races in the 2008 election and choose the governor and whatever you think is the next biggest race, attorney general or secretary of state, and make those two equal to the president and senate race.

And then two races from 2006 and two races from 2004, because, again, when you average those, then you get that outlier effect minimized in the average.

That's just how the data works.

So I would suggest that you try to do that.

The voter registration information doesn't show turnout. However, it is a measure of how people see themselves in the electorate.

And so it is an important measurement tool that I think you should have in your information as you're looking at competitive districts.
The other thing is that communities of interest, I do believe, are the most important things.

But Commissioner McNulty said something that concerns me on communities of interest.

It was communities as I see them.

But I thought it was supposed to be communities of interest as the public sees them, as we see them, as we are telling the Commission how -- what our communities are like, not how just one person on the Commission might see a community.

And that I think is more fair and also you would agree is what Proposition 106 was about.

The other thing is that competitiveness and Proposition 106 said it was to be applied if it had no adverse effect on the other criteria, which automatically makes communities of interest to be applied first, and then to make sure that it's competitive if it has no adverse effect to the community.

But to split a community in half to make it competitive cannot be in agreement with Proposition 106.

And that's what I have to say today. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any other members of the public?

(No oral response.)
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Given that, the only item left on the agenda is to adjourn.

So the time is 12:54 p.m., and this meeting is adjourned.

Thank you for coming.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned.)
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