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PROCEEDINGS

(Whereupon, the public session commences.)

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

The time is 12:21 p.m. Today is Thursday, September 15th.

Let's begin with the pledge of allegiance.

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, it's great to be back -- well, our first time actually here in the Heard Museum, but I've been to the Heard Museum before. It's a lovely facility, and we appreciate the opportunity to meet here.

We have a number of guests around the table that I'll introduce.

First our legal counsel, Joe Kanefield and Mary O'Grady.

Our mapping consultant, Willie Desmond.

We have a court reporter today, Marty Herder.
Our chief technology officer, Buck Forst.

Kristina Gomez is our deputy executive director.

She's moving around the room.

And we have two public outreach coordinators with us today, Kristi Olson and Lisa Schmelling in the back. So feel free to talk with them if you need any assistance throughout today.

We'll go ahead and do the call for order now.

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 our next item on the agenda is map presentations.

If there is any member of the public who has a map to present today, feel free. This would be your opportunity to do so.

We do expect to be receiving some input from some of the Inter Tribal Council members today, but I am of the understanding that their meeting was running a little bit
late, so they'll be coming in later to the meeting, so we may be coming back to this agenda item.

But I thought for now if there was anybody in the public present who would like to come up to the podium, they are welcome to do so.

Okay. And seeing, hearing none, we will go ahead and move to agenda item three, and we'll come back to map presentations later.

Review, discussion and direction to mapping consultant regarding ideas for possible adjustments to congressional grid map based upon constitutional criteria.

I think commissioners will be moving to this table since it will be projecting up here, and that way we can see the screen better.

I think our mapping consultant has left the room.

WILLIE DESMOND: Turning the lights down.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, great. He's turning the lights down for us. Great.

Okay. So we're starting with congressional maps as per usual.

And Mr. Desmond, it looks like he provided some new maps for us to all look at.

These are the what-if scenarios that we've all been talking about.

Where would it make sense to start? We could do
the whole counties or the river district. Anybody have a preference?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: No.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So let's start with whole counties.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. There's two whole county maps, version 6B and 6C, that don't vary too wildly from what we presented yesterday. There was just a small change in moving Apache Junction into the unassigned area.

Just to kind of go through the -- how these maps came to be, I'll start with whole counties map was first to take the grid map and adjust it in order to minimize the number of counties that are split by congressional districts.

The second iteration was to respect reservation land.

The third was to adopt the Hispanic Coalition For Good Government's lines for CDs 3 and 7.

The fourth was then to make some changes dealing primarily around Maricopa County.

The fifth was, again, to kind of do those. And at this point it was split into 5B and 5C.

5B leaves the non-voting rights district that are wholly contained or nearly wholly contained in Maricopa County unassigned. Kind of leave it as a blank slate.
5C, I was asked to take just a first pass at dividing those up based on principles of compactness and as few splits to minor civil divisions and others like city boundaries.

So, again, for today, version 6B is very similar to yesterday. However, the unassigned area was about 40,000 -- 48,000 people short of being able to comprise for whole congressional districts.

In order to make up that population, we did reach out and grab a little bit from Pinal County in the Apache Junction area.

So, I will open that up, and then we can go through some of those changes.

Okay. So the real change from yesterday to today was that this area, Apache Junction, was now incorporated in this unassigned area.

We were able to capture all of it and then make up a little bit more population with some of the more densely populated areas that aren't part -- that are just part of the county though.

Do commissioners have particular questions or things they want to highlight or me to show them on this map?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I guess what I would have is a request with respect to the whole counties, so-called whole counties version 6C.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Maybe we should bring that one up, the way we built those districts.

WILLIE DESMOND: And, again, this is the same map. It just has a -- I took a crack at assigning that unassigned area.

For today, I did number them in order that I drew them, so it went five, six, eight, and then nine.

Which was the same order I went in yesterday, but the numbering convention is slightly different.

Buck, can you turn up the volume so they can hear in the back a little better?

All right. I'll turn on the census place layer again to make that clear.

So, which changes did you have right away or things that you wanted to look at right away?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, in moving the lines to construct these districts in the urban Maricopa County area, it's my understanding you started from the southeast corner, basically, and that's why you numbered them that way, so you constructed five and six.

And did you construct nine and eight, or did you
construct eight and go back and construct nine?

    WILLIE DESMOND: I did eight first.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Could you zoom out, please?

    WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

And my thinking was the reason I jumped over to eight first was to try to keep as many of those communities not split as possible.

    I was afraid that if I drew nine first I would have population -- but, again, I could redo it in a different order if you like.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, that might be my request.

    Do you think if you started from the west valley and worked your way around to the southeast valley do you think you would have a different looking map?

    WILLIE DESMOND: Potentially, yes.

    What I would probably do is -- it's not that hard to do this. We can walk through it right now. You can see my rough move.

    But what I would probably start with is assign all of these areas first the new district.

    I would come straight across over, and then I would have to decide whether -- whether or not to grab central Phoenix or to take the northern areas.

    I would want to make sure that I left these areas
The reason I did it this way also is just that I was only doing two splits through Phoenix. I didn't want to have it, like, pieces of all three, or possibly four, going into it.

But that would be an easy what-if map for me to do.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Then that would be my request, that you go ahead and rebuild them, I guess, to keep the nomenclature assist, I don't know what you would suggest, maybe version 6D perhaps.

WILLIE DESMOND: Excuse me?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Maybe make it version 6D.

WILLIE DESMOND: That makes sense.

Are there particular considerations you'd like to see?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I think the consideration at this point in the game, for this iteration, would still be the same, which is to try to construct compact districts that minimize splits, municipal lines, to the extent practical.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Equal population as well.

WILLIE DESMOND: And I think we -- the unassigned area was very close to the magic number, so I think the
population deviation is very slight on these.

Yeah.

Are there other considerations that you would like to see on this map?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Desmond, I'm looking at the splits analysis on this map and the one that goes with version 7A.

WILLIE DESMOND: Uh-hmm.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And I'm noticing that they're almost all identical. That on the whole counties split analysis, there are two counties that -- two less splits, but other than that these are almost the same.

Is the best way to -- for us to understand the distinctions in terms of communities between these maps to look at the plans that's attached to each of them, would that -- or is there a way to compare them to one another, not, not in a narrative way, but in the sense of a map?

WILLIE DESMOND: I mean, I could over -- I could have two sets of lines, one that would be colored from the whole counties and one that would be from the river 7A.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I would like you to do that, not right now, but in a way that we can study it.
WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I also think it's the case that we haven't yet -- on the central part of the state, my goal is to create two competitive districts in that central part of the state.

And when I mean competitive, I don't mean seven points or ten points. I mean that there are districts in which, all other things being equal, the outcome of an election, of a congressional election would not be certain.

So, and I had asked Mr. Strasma to be looking at competitiveness. And I know you guys have a lot on your plate, but that's still foremost in my mind. And I would like to be thinking both about how these maps are different and asking you to help us understand that and about how we can achieve that on either map.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

I guess just initially to help you study it, I have a couple ideas that might work.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: The first would be I could help you load up both plans into one common map on your computers so you can look at your computers.

The other thing we might be able to do is just make a big, like, wall-size layout and have those printed up
tonight so you could each take one home tomorrow, I guess, and that would have both sets of lines and you could study it.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'd like you to do both of those things.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That would be helpful to me, seeing as we both seem to be either proceeding on each of these, I'd like to understand how they relate to one another. And I think we've reached a point where it's time to gain that understanding.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

And then as far as the different measures of competitiveness go, I'm not sure if we'll have the '04 and '06 ready for next week, Thursday's meeting. We're working away on it.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I understand that. We've got a thumbnail right now.

I'm not asking you to do that any more quickly than you can do it.

I'm just saying that that's what I'm going to be looking for in the central part of both of these maps.

WILLIE DESMOND: The one thing I can say we will have ready for next week Thursday's meeting, and I know Ken is planning on being here so maybe this is something that he
could present on, would be kind of similar to his last competitiveness, but just kind of different ways of weighing the different races and the registration data that's now ready to go.

And I'm not sure if this is possible, but I know we had talked a little bit about using different correlations to check different combinations of results and registration to see how they correlate elections that went both ways in the last, last cycles.

So, so if it's all right, I think we can try to have some sort of presentation about different ways of blending election results and registration for next Thursday or next Friday of next week.

Would that be helpful?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think it would be.

I don't think -- I think we're all going to have different ways of looking at that data, but I think one thing that we probably all agree on is that we want to have all that data so we can each do our own assessment. And then the five of us just have to, you know, work through how we reach agreement on the best way to approach all these criteria in terms of each district.

But you presenting us with those alternative ways of looking at it I think is essential.

WILLIE DESMOND: There's, like, an infinite number
of ways you can --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Doesn't have to be infinite.

WILLIE DESMOND: That'll be --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: You do have to choose, like, the four or five most illuminating.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

So I think there's some very -- and one thing that might be helpful with those is also just to note, like, the statewide percent Republican and statewide percent Democrat under each.

You might find that they're a lot closer than you think they would be, different blending. You might find there's some wide variation --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: You can explain all this during your presentation.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yeah, we'll look forward to hearing that.

But I just am -- I'm trying to get -- I think we're all, you know, moving ahead, and I think at some point we need to really be clear about what our objectives are in order for us to get to a result. And so I'm just, I'm just offering that.

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

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Desmond, do you, in the current datasets that you have, do you currently have registration data for each one of the districts as you currently have them outlined?

WILLIE DESMOND: I do not have that currently. We have the registration data matched to base files.

I have not had a chance yet to go through and update the data on my personal machine and create a report to give you.

That's something we could have for starting next week going forward for all of them, if that would be helpful.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: A couple of things I would like to have you do is to go back to the last two three border district maps, the one that was the combo and then version three, and prepare all of the same support data that you've already created for the current river district and whole county maps.

The second is, I've got a -- some -- after we go through the maps that you're currently presenting, some commentary and some thoughts on the three border districts that I'd like you to explore.

And lastly I'd really like to see registration
data broken out outside of anything else, just pure
registration, per congressional district and per legislative
district, as we're making these analyses as well.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

That will make sense. And I think for the
registration, what we would have would be, I guess,
five columns for that. One that would be, Democrat,
Republican, and Independent percentage, and then one that
would be just Democrat and Republican percentage as a
two-way percentage.

Does that make sense?

A two-way percentage would be -- both cases they
would add up to 100.

So the Democrat, Republican, and the Independent
percentages would add up to 100 one set and the Democrat and
Republican percentages would add up to 100 percent in the
other set.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The Democrat and Republican
you have to make some assumptions because you'd be excluding
31 percent of the registered -- registrants in the other
category, which is Independent and other.

And what I'm looking for is to -- if I look at a
district in the river district version 7A, District 4, I'd
like to see how many currently, as far as the 2010 data,
current Republicans, current Democrats, overall population
we know because that's constitutionally driven, and then Independents.

And we have to make the assumption that there are subgroups in the Independents, as far as Green Party or other parties, those could be contained into an other outside of the Independent, because there is Independent registration and then the Greens and others would be combined in an other category.

Unless the commissioners could see that they would like to see that data spread further than that.

But that is one of our testing criteria as Commissioner McNulty has alluded to. Not only are we looking at results, broaden -- getting the broadest amount of datasets possible for us to look at this to then drilling it down to the next level is important, but also just pure registration is very important as well.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Just to clarify, we'll go back and look at the last two three border district maps. There's two different types. We'll take the latest version of each.

On the split plans components reports that you're getting now for those, and also create a registration report and have that ready to overlay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Perfect. Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: And then can I just ask one more
1 question about comparing the river 7A and most recent whole counties?

Would you prefer the whole counties that has an unassigned area or the one that has me taking chunks in Maricopa and creating districts?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: The chunks one.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Okay. So for that one, I'll use, if it's all right, I'll use 6C, the one that you have today.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: The one that we were looking at, the one that we were looking at with the districts in Maricopa County.

The other thing, Mr. Desmond, that I would like to understand with regard to the three border district maps is the impact of gathering up all of that HVAP in the center of the state and how that affects what's, what's happening in is central Phoenix.

I'd like to see the changes between -- well, I'm not sure we're far enough along the process to understand the differences in the various maps.

But I'd like you to -- I'd like to be able to see clearly the difference between -- the impact on doing it that way in Maricopa County, versus the river district configuration, versus the Hispanic Coalition For Good Government configuration.
WILLIE DESMOND: Why don't I -- I'm not sure what
I can have ready for tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It doesn't need to be
tomorrow.

WILLIE DESMOND: If -- why don't we do a similar
thing that we're doing for the river and the whole counties
and print out a wall-size map where we have multiple layers
of the different what-if maps. And then that would be a
static thing, and you'd have varying levels of how much you
can read down to the street level, because it's just going
to be a wall-size printout.

But I think the big picture thing -- and I can
show you how to load those all up on your computers so you
can compare them in Maptitude also.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: You raise a good point
because I don't think a wall map is going to be helpful.
What we're looking for there is detail. What we're looking
for is street level.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. I'll play around with that
making sure that it's as detailed as I can. If it's doable
on the wall size, I will have those -- I will do a wall-size
just so you can see like an overall snapshot of the state
and some rough areas in Maricopa and the Tucson area with
the cutouts.

And I'll -- we'll see how that looks and go from
there.

But I will also load those up in the commissioners' computers or help you get them loaded up so you can compare and contrast different plans.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: To the extent that the wall size helps us focus on where to look, I think that's useful. But we've got to be able to go street level on all of this now.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Can I ask a question about where we are on the -- when we see in our -- over the next couple of weeks some analysis going back on the voting polarization work, the data -- that other set of data that we've now engaged a consultant for --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Good question.

Does legal counsel have any guidance on that in terms of Dr. King and what kind of results we're going to get from him and when?

Is he already started, or how is that work coming along?

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, we are working with Professor King.

We hope to have some guidance for him and get back to the Commission next week.
We've asked -- we have been speaking with the mapping consultants and counsel, and of what issues we want him to focus on, and we hope to have some of that information, hope to have him begin researching and looking into that information by next week.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That would be great.

Yeah, it's a good question, because I was concerned -- I was wondering how this works with him, if he is going to be acting as kind of the third-party independent verification of the analysis that Strategic is already doing, and if so, if he's kind of looking at if he's going to be giving him these what-if scenarios, or if his role really comes in to play when we actually have draft map ideas that we're -- you know, that are beyond what-if scenarios, that are, you know, more fully fledged, so to speak.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, that's our understanding of how he can be best utilized.

At this point there is some analysis that he can do to help and provide some guidance to the Commission before you get too far into the final map. This map-making decisions.

But, of course, after the decisions are made then he will be reviewing those maps in more detail during public commentary by more input for the Commission before the
Commission adopts them as final maps.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And will he also be looking at the maps that are getting submitted by the public in terms of just analyzing them? Or how does that work?

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, that would be at the discretion of the Commission.

There is analysis that we would -- if the Commission would like him to perform, he can do that.

But, of course, we want to use his services judicially so he's focusing on analysis that's going to be helpful to the Commission.

Obviously he can't analyze every map or else -- so that's, I think, the best way to do it.

If we -- the Commission gets down the road of fine tuning some of these maps, and we can have him start looking more carefully at some of the areas and do the analysis.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Just sort of building on that, we -- over the weekend we had a submittal from the public of a congressional map that ostensibly created three minority-majority districts or at least three coalition districts.

And is that, look to the advice of counsel, is that the kind of thing that we should be having analyzed?
JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair,
Commissioner Freeman, I'm not sure I caught all of that.
Were you asking if we should have him look at making the determination of how many majority-minority districts are required under the current numbers?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Should it be tested? Is that something that we need to put in our record that would ultimately go up to show that, you know, this map was presented by someone from the public, and I don't know if he represents a group, but we did analyze it and made a determination that in order that the two minority-majority district proposals are the ones that we need to go with to comply with the Voting Rights Act.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair,
Commissioner Freeman, I think that would be appropriate so that we would get on record that our expert has reviewed the maps for compliance with the Voting Rights Act and believes that they do comply.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments or questions?
(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So, Mr. Desmond, you have everything you need in terms of the whole counties version and the steps that we've asked you to take?

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe so.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.
Should we look at river district 7A?
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Before we do that, are the maps online?
WILLIE DESMOND: Oh, Buck.
I think he's telling me ten minutes. They're being transferred right now.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.
WILLIE DESMOND: And, again, the maps are online and there's also, if you look at some of the Microsoft Word documents, there are the splits reports, the Excel documents, the splits reports, the plan components reports, the racial breakdown, compactness, competitiveness, all those supporting materials are also available online in addition to the maps in various forms.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay.
WILLIE DESMOND: So this is the river district version 7A.
The changes that have been made since last week -- or this week Monday, are just the ones we discussed at yesterday's meeting.
So, it's harder for me to do this too.
We started with river district 6A, used
Stapley Drive, not Mesa Drive, as the border between east and west Mesa.

CD 6, all of Paradise Valley, and all of Scottsdale up into Cactus Road.

In order to eliminate some population, we removed some of Gilbert.

We went back to the Hispanic Coalition For Good Government's proposed District 7, for CD 7.

Kept CD 9 within Highway 101.

CD 4, we removed from Mesa and made as rural as possible.

CD 6, we gave south Chandler, south of Pecos Road, and Sun Lakes into CD 3.

Gave areas of CD 3 and Pinal County to CD 4.

And we used the San Tan area to balance population where needed.

So, would you like to zoom into Maricopa or is there some other thing that you would like to look at?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, if you don't mind going through the changes.

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

So I believe District 4, where we left off yesterday, was underpopulated.
In order to remedy that, you had me include this area of Pinal County, the San Tan Valley, and some others. And in order to do that, I had to extend down from Apache Junction.

I think -- and then it also -- you had three take a little bit more of six -- or six take a little bit more of three, so that six was then overpopulated by the same amount that four was underpopulated.

And that's where we grabbed this. And even then -- evened out the population.

CD No. 7 is also taken directly from the Hispanic Coalition's proposed District 7.

And if I turn on the streets layer and zoom in a little bit, you'll see that District 9 I was able to keep within the 101 as you had requested.

So, it's a little hard to see, but it does run right along the 101.

Are there questions?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, if you can zoom in on the Maricopa County districts and just look -- if we can look around the border areas.

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: On there.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

I'll start with District No. 7. That's the one we
took from the Hispanic Coalition.

   Basically it has all of downtown Phoenix, I think, or the lower part of Phoenix, except for Ahwatukee, down here.

   It goes over and grabs Guadalupe, and then comes up into Glendale a little bit.

   I'm not sure what street that would be.

   Okay. So it goes straight up along the border with Tempe.

   It runs up South 48th Street then, until it hits, what, 89.

   Then it continues up 143, until it hits McDowell Road. And then goes west until it hits 40th Street, and goes north until Thomas Road.

   And goes west again, all the way across, until it hits Central Avenue, where it goes north again to Camelback, and north on 24th -- I'm sorry, or North Seventh Street.

   West on Betham Home -- Bethany Home Road. West until it hits North 43rd Avenue, then north until Northern Avenue. West -- it does have a little detour here. I believe that's probably to equalize population or something.

   West on Northern Avenue, and starts to go back down along 71st Avenue, Orangewood Avenue over, and then south down 75th Avenue.
Then it goes further west again on Bethany Home Road, to 99th Avenue, where it goes south.

And for anyone watching the live stream, the maps are online.

Continues along 99 Avenue. Incorporates all of Tolleson.

It goes west on Van Buren until it hits 102nd Avenue.

And then it goes back east on 85, down 99th Avenue to Lower Buckeye Road, south on 107th Avenue until it hits -- I think that's South Mountain.

And then finally it follows -- it's not really -- it follows Carver Road.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: That is District 7?

WILLIE DESMOND: That is District 7.

I'll just zoom out again so you kind of get your bearings.

District 7. That's the majority-minority district.

I guess next we can go through District No. 6.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Is that the level of detail you were hoping for.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Exactly. Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: So, again, that shares its
northeastern -- or northwestern boundary with
District No. 7.

I won't necessarily go through all of those areas
again.

But then starting over here -- let's see.

I think that's not really a road. It's just the
border between Avondale and the unincorporated area to the
east of it.

So it runs south until it -- just kind of another
unincorporated area. A street there. Goes south at the
Pinal County line, all the way down to -- there is the top
of Maricopa the city.

Runs right along there. Again, it's not really
following a major road or anything, just more of a boundary
that's reflected in the census place.

And it follows the outline of the Maricopa area.
Over -- goes north of Casa Grande. Goes -- dips south right
here where there's really no population, and then follows
kind of the border above Coolidge, and incorporated area of
Blackwater.

Starts to go north then around the edge of
Blackwater, staying -- keeping Florence in District 5.

It goes up into the San Tan Valley, and then goes
back west just below that.

Then it goes north along the -- a portion of
Queen Creek Road -- or Queen Creek. That's currently divided because it happens to be partly inside, inside Pinal County and partly inside Maricopa County.

I've looked, and I think there's not a very large population that lives right here.

And then it goes, goes back west right along the Maricopa, Pinal County border, so below Gilbert, below Chandler, below Sun Lakes, above Goodyear Village, so Goodyear Village is included.

It goes north right along those areas again.

And aside from the municipal boundaries, I'm sure there is a road here.

It's 88th -- it goes along 88th Street.

All along Chandler, north until it hits Pecos Road.

And then it goes east again.

So it incorporates the area of Chandler that's north of Pecos Road, until it hits 87th, up to Chandler. And then it follows Union Pacific Road up to Ray Road, and goes east on Ray Road until it hits Maricopa Road. Goes north, kind of following the border between Chandler and Gilbert.

Goes north until it -- I don't know if this is a major road here. It's more of a boundary between the two cities.
Continuing north again, not along really a main road, but more just along the border of the two municipalities.

And then, again, up 87 along the border.

Now, Mesa and Gilbert, over so in it incorporates the Mesa area.

I think at one point you asked to use Stapley Drive. This little area right here was probably just to balance population.

So there was one block of six that does not go -- a block group, I'm sorry, that does not go to Stapley Drive.

But it's north in Mesa, up to Stapley Drive, all the way until it hits Phillips or Stapley kind of ends for a portion right here.

And then goes north on Horne northeast, or Horne northeast, over to McDowell.

This is where when you zoom out you'll see it follows the border on north Mesa. It does have a little portion of north Mesa. And that's because it has the Salt River reservation wholly contained, and that portion does cross the border into east Mesa.

It includes all of Salt River, all of the Fort McDowell area. It goes north following along the reservation line, excluding Fountain Hills.

It goes along the reservation until it hits
Scottsdale.

I'll go through those borders with you.

In Scottsdale it follows -- I don't know which road this is.

Oh, it's this road. I don't think that's actually a road.

I believe that's like a river or something there, a natural, a natural boundary that runs through, until it hits Cactus Road, goes west on Cactus, all the way -- see it goes from eight and nine go along the 101 there, so it goes past the 101 there, now bordering with nine.

It goes west on Cactus Road until it hits Scottsdale Road.

Goes south on Scottsdale Road to Cholla Street, and then, again, south at 64th Street.

And then west along the border with Paradise Valley. Follows the border with Paradise Valley.

Just runs all along Paradise Valley, until it goes over here, and this is Lincoln Drive, but more importantly Paradise Valley.

And then once it leaves Paradise Valley, it follows 40th Street south until that hits McDowell Road.

And then District 7 to the west of it.

We kind of already went through that, that portion.
So I believe at some point you had asked me to draw Paradise Valley and then the Arcadia area, which is kind of right here too.

So, again, I'll just -- I'll zoom out so you can get your bearings a little bit.

So, we started over here.

We started over here, in District 6. Went all the way down, following the reservation, up Queen Creek, back up around Mesa.

Oh, that's three, I'm sorry.

Below Sun Lakes, Chandler, through Mesa, along the border with Gilbert, take the Fort McDowell up, and then down to south Scottsdale, Arcadia area, and then back down on the border.

So I guess next would be District 9.

This one should be pretty easy.

So if I turn on the streets layer again -- just a second, I'll move this individual streets and highways.

You can see the entire northern border of nine runs right along the 101, as you had asked. The eastern border follows right along six, so along Paradise Valley through Scottsdale.

I can go through those borders again, although we did see those.

And then along the border with seven here, which
I'd be happy to go through again.

The one portion we haven't looked at would be the border it has with eight on the western side, so I'll zoom in there, and we can look at that.

So it diverges from the 101 just north of where Peoria ends on Bell Road, and goes east on Bell Road until it hits 75th Avenue, goes south there, all the way down to pretty much where it hits 73rd.

And there's a little border here. That's probably to balance population. And follows that down -- I'm not sure what road this is.

And then it follows Olive Avenue west. Drops down south on 83rd Avenue. Goes back east on Northern Avenue.
Drops back down on 75th.

And then again it follows the border with seven that we've already looked at, to Orangewood, 71st, and then Northern Avenue by and large for a lot of it.
Back down on 43rd Avenue. Back east on Bethany Home Road.

Back down on Seventh Street. East on Camelback, down on Central, until Thomas.

And then it runs along Thomas until it goes back north on 40th Street, you know, Paradise Valley. We just looked at along Paradise Valley.

On Paradise Valley.
Along Paradise Valley, then along Scottsdale.
Then it takes portions of northern Scottsdale, up on Scottsdale Road over on Cactus, until it hits the 101. Then it does the 101 all the way up and over.

We could do the same thing for the whole river district, but that might take a while.

Are there other things to look at right away in Maricopa County?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: The particular version of river district 7A, in looking at competitive based on the information we currently have, which is the 2008, 2010 information, so it creates three districts that are 60 or more percent Republican and, one, two, three that are 52 to 56.48 Republican.

And then not receiving minority-majority districts solidly Democratic.

So I guess what I'm getting at is we're getting it closer to competitiveness based on the current information we have.

And I think that Commissioner McNulty made a good point on the issue of the unsplits and the districts.

Even though we didn't -- we have the keeping counties whole in the back of our mind, we were still able
to get pretty close to the old districts, so that, I mean, it's, again, I hope of pleases Commissioner Freeman, because this wasn't, you know, the -- although it's one criteria within another criteria to get the -- it's an important thing to consider, but, again, I think we did a pretty good job of keeping it pretty close to the whole districts.

I want to reaffirm what Commissioner McNulty had pointed out.

I think that's it for me, unless anybody has any questions on 7A.

WILLIE DESMOND: Are there --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I do have a question on -- in District 5, where are the population centers that are loading District 5?

WILLIE DESMOND: I guess the best way to answer that would be the, the components report.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So if I'm reading this right, you've got 15 percent of the voting age population for District 5 is in Casa Grande.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yep.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Fifteen percent is the Casas Adobes district of Pima County.

11.62 percent is in Oro Valley of Pima County.

10.7 percent is in Marana of Pima County.
And we've got 12.58 percent in Pinal County in the
town of Maricopa.

And we're connecting -- so we're connecting -- out
of Pima County, we've got close to 38 percent of Pima County
is actually in a district connected to the northeast corner
of the state.

Am I reading that right?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah. Yes. That's correct.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: So just looking at this, the
district is comprised of, I think, 11 counties.

Of those, it's 100 percent of Coconino,
100 percent of Navajo, 100 percent of Apache, 100 percent of
Gila County.

It's about 56 percent of Pinal, about 13 percent
of Pima, about 5.4 percent of Yavapai.

It's 10 percent of Graham County. It's 35 percent
of Greenlee. And then just a tiny fraction of Mohave
County.

And it must be in Maricopa, but that's probably
like a little hanging block or something, since zero percent
of Maricopa population, that's zero percent of the
district's population.

I guess for this one and the whole counties, some
of these small splits probably would be the result of
reservation lands.

But then, you're correct, I guess the main -- so Coconino represents about 20 -- or 19 percent of the district, Navajo is about 14 percent the district, Apache is about 9 percent of the district.

So that's 42 percent in those three counties.

And then Pima and Pinal have 28 -- 29 percent, and then 18 percent of the district.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Obviously there's a, there is a result orientation to the design of that district that I can't get my arms around.

And maybe someone can explain to me how I'm going to be able to talk to people in Oro Valley and tell them that their Casas Adobes, which is in urban Tucson, is connected somehow to Window Rock and how representation for that district would work.

I can't get my arms around it.

So maybe I can -- we can have some dialogue about how that works.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Now, we -- what we wanted to do is create two rural districts in District 4 and
District 5.

The district -- rural District 4 was created based on the testimony that we heard in public hearings, Bullhead City and also in Yuma, and then so we wanted to do District 5 -- created the District 5 based on the testimony we heard, again, in the public hearings where we wanted to keep District 5 as rural as possible and stay out of Maricopa County.

So, again, this is based on public testimony that we heard throughout that area.

So, again, doing everything possible to keep four as rural as possible and five as rural as possible.

And making five -- the western rural district is solidly Republican, and what we wanted to do was make the District 5 as competitive as possible, based on the data we have.

So hopefully that kind of helps.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Desmond -- Madam Chair, Mr. Desmond, could you go back to the connection of District 5 to, I guess, District 4, as it sort of loops in and touches District 3 in Maricopa County?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

I can -- so, I don't know which is easier to see.

So five comes in and has Gold Canyon, and then --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Splitting Apache Junction.
WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

Although I'm not sure --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And as you're driving, and as you're driving out to Gold Canyon, you're actually going -- you've got three congressional districts that are literally within miles of each other.

I'm just trying to understand how that -- what that connective issue is that makes, other than looking at trying to get -- I understand Commissioner Herrera's concept of hearing testimony about rural districts.

The -- I still need to have an understanding about how Oro Valley connects to Window Rock, how that, how that, from a representation point of view, how that works.

It looks like we're trying to create a district here that is doing something that is trying to get to a result.

And I don't think that that's what our goal is.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I guess I'm not understanding that last comment you made. Can you explain what you mean by that?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Well, we're creeping and creating these jagged lines and picking up voter blocks and areas that don't really have any relevance to each other
from communities of interest.

So, the communities of interest discussion seems to be taking a significant back seat in where we're moving towards in this particular iteration.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Stertz, if I could, if I could make a comment on that.

I think what we're trying to do is pull together a whole lot of criteria and look at different ways of doing that.

And I don't think any district comprises a community of interest.

Each district will comprise a number of communities of interest. And the hope is that each community of interest has an opportunity to express its voice with other communities of interest, and that, as a whole, we try to find a constellation of districts that best satisfy all of the criteria.

So, I don't think that there's going to be a case where -- I don't think it's necessary or would make sense that Oro Valley is in a community of interest with Window Rock.

They may each be their own communities of interest, and they would each get to, you know, have their voice in a district which serves -- which addresses all of the criteria.
So, you know, I guess if your comment is that it's result driven, I'm sure a lot of what, you know, everyone is working on is designed to achieve a certain result which in their minds is important.

And that's what we're all working towards is to try to find something that addresses all the criteria that we can all eventually support.

That doesn't mean that each district is going to be made up of like communities.

I don't think that's possible to do and still achieve what we've been assigned with achieving.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

Now, let me explain further. The -- you know, we're trying to create nine congressional districts of 710,000 roughly population.

So not all the areas within the district are going to look the same.

Now, what we're trying to do is keep as many of the communities of interest together.

Now Saddlebrooke, Marana, Oro Valley is a community of interest. And they all -- if I remember correctly in public hearings, they wanted to stay together.

They are together in District 5.

Now, to be -- I think that's more important
keeping communities of interest, not breaking them up,
as opposed to keeping communities of interest like minded --
excuse me, not breaking them up is probably more important.

So if Oro Valley, Marana, and Saddlebrooke were
cut in half or they were in a couple districts, I think that
would be not respecting communities of interest.

I think what we did here in District 5 was
definitely respect communities of interest by keeping them
together.

They may not have a lot of in common with some of
the areas that are within District 5, but, again, that's,
trying to create nine districts with 710,000 population,
it's going to be impossible not to go into Pima County in
District 5. It's going to impossible not to go into
Maricopa County.

So we're doing everything we can to keep it as
rural as possible and keep communities of interest whole
within the community -- within the district.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Desmond, how -- what is
the population of that piece that dips into Pima County?
The Marana, Oro Valley, Casas Adobes?

It looks like it's not all of Casas Adobes.

Is there an easy way to --

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: -- grab that?
And I guess add Saddlebrooke too to that, if you don't mind.

Sorry.

WILLIE DESMOND: That's 127,000 people there.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Plus Saddlebrooke.
WILLIE DESMOND: 137,000.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: 10,000. Okay. Thank you.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: If you look at the -- if you look at the map, again, the public comments were taken into that report when we put this together.

I mean, you look at the river district that we created, and I think we're the only what-if scenario that was praised by the tri city, tri city leaders in the area.

People in Yuma, again, are well represented in four, with the communities of interest intact.

And the border districts, again, based on public input, and you look at five, based upon the input, people in the Coconino, Flagstaff area wanted to be together with the tribes, and the people in Saddlebrooke, Marana, Oro Valley, wanted to be together, and that was public testimony.

So I think we're doing a good job on this version of the map putting communities of interest and public comments into the work we're doing.
So I think we're headed in the right direction.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

Yeah, it's not an easy problem, because we heard a lot of public comment.

We heard a lot of public comment about Marana, Oro Valley, Saddlebrooke.

We heard a lot of comments about don't put us with Pinal County, keep us with Pima County, that's where our interests align, that's what our community of interest is.

So it's not a very easy problem to solve.

Also with respect to how we respect or disrespect the communities of interest, obviously if you divide a community of interest, I think you've disrespected it in some sense in that sort of policy behind -- one of the policies, I think, behind respecting communities of interest is that when you divide a community, you put those two or three or four, whatever, segments of that community into various different districts, that community becomes a very small percentage of that overall district, and you effectively lessen, diminish their voice.

The representative might not be as responsive to the interest of that community if they're only a tiny portion of their district.

Well, similarly there's another problem, I think,
that -- or another concern, consideration to take into account with respect to putting -- you may keep the community of interest whole, but if you put it with another population that has -- so dominates them and has such a different interest, the same problem arises.

Those people are less -- perhaps less likely to be heard by their representative.

And I think that's -- I don't know for sure what was motivating the people in Saddlebrooke and Marana to make the comments they did, a lot of them, on that issue, is they perhaps felt like, you know, they would be dominated by Pinal County and the other districts that would be included in this proposed district, and their voice would be so tiny that it would not be heard.

They felt more comfortable, I believe, being included with Pima County and Tucson. That's where they're connected with. That's what they're engaged with.

And they're more likely to be heard in that kind of scenario.

Just going back to the whole counties what-if scenario, I mean, every -- you know, basically the thought process I had was sort of start with the outside and work our way in.

And perhaps one of the toughest nuts to crack would be the urban Maricopa County area.
And every instruction as to the initial adjustment of the grid map given to the mapping consultant was based on a constitutional criteria. That was the instruction. It was to apply this constitutional criteria.

And we got to a point where we got this sort of island, this enclave within the state, the urban Maricopa County area, that then needed to be divided up.

Maricopa County cannot help but to be divided up.

And what my point with Mr. Desmond today had asked him to create a 6D is there might be various ways it can be divided up, and there are communities of interest to be taken into account.

I have not asked him to account for that right now, although I'll note that in taking the whole counties approach, I think as a corollary benefit we ended up in large part respecting the urban, rural community of interest that we heard a lot about from public comment.

But I wanted to see how different ways those pieces of Maricopa County could be assembled, because my thought was the next step would be to then drill down on the communities of interest and make instructions based upon those recognized communities of interest, see how the puzzle could be fit together in different ways, because then another important constitutional criteria that we must satisfy is to favor the map that yields the greatest number
of communities of interest.

    So that was my thought process there.
    So I did not begin, you know, with the
    instructions to the mapping consultant with street level
    changes to the map.
    It was apply this constitutional criteria, this
    one, this one, this one, trying to be somewhat systematic to
    try to chip away at a very complicated problem and boil it
down to something that we can work with.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: You know, the issue that
diluting voters' rights is a good one, and I think
Mr. Freeman made the point for me when I was talking about
the three river district.

    When you break up the border -- excuse me, the
    three, the three border districts, that loses strength.
    And that's -- you know, Mr. Freeman said it better than I
could.

And so my argument is, you know, you put Cochise
with Window Rock, you know, you have two areas that don't
really have anything in common, you dilute the voting
experience.

    So, I'm going to go back to talking about the
    river districts, and comparing it to the three border
districts, and see where some of the -- what the differences might be.

But I think Mr. Freeman made the point for me of why the river -- the three border district scenario is -- there's something -- you know, there's some flaws with it.

And, again, Mr. Freeman made the point for me, and I thank him for that.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Equally important then would be putting Cochise with Tucson that there might be an issue there. Because we have a rural area of the state that conceivably could be dominated by an urban area.

So I agree. That's a consideration that we should be looking at.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm curious, would it be possible to draw District 5 without dipping into Pima County and also excluding Saddlebrooke?

Is there a way to pick up that 137,000 by going further in west on the line up, you know, further on up towards Maricopa land? Just wondering.

Would that work at all? Would you be open to that?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: You know, um, Madam Chair, the -- I -- it would be a completely different scenario, a
version obviously based on 7A.

And I wouldn't be opposed to it.

The only, the only thing that I want to stress is that we want to make District 5 as competitive as possible in the district.

Rural District 4 is highly Republican, and you should, you know, help us out a little bit, the Republicans, the Democrats, a little bit of a treat, by making it somewhat competitive, and that's what we're trying to do.

I really do think that competition is important. It's one of the six criteria. And as long as it doesn't dilute the competitiveness of the district based on the information that we currently have.

So I would be -- love to see that scenario.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So, Mr. Desmond, could we do -- would that be a 7B or an 8A?

WILLIE DESMOND: It would be a 7B.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, is there... VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Buck, I need some help with batteries.

A few hearings ago, I set up I think it was a 6B, to the river district. Just so we keep it clear, maybe if I make further modifications, I'll just keep calling it B to whatever version we're at, and you would be C.

So we won't have a 7B right now. That might be
confusing. But we'll have a 7A and perhaps a 7C.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'm sorry, I didn't --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Go ahead, Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I didn't follow that. Are we each going to get our own letter? Is that what you're suggesting?

I just want to understand.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We're trying to where the letters are different commissioners' versions of whatever version we're talking about.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So do we each get our own letter -- I just want to know what the naming convention is so I understand going further. I didn't quite understand what you just said.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Desmond can explain the naming convention.

WILLIE DESMOND: As I understand it, it goes up in a number when it's a later version of the same general, like, idea.

When there's a split, in this case a split to keep Oro Valley and Saddlebrooke and the rest of areas in Pima County, out of five, that's like a split, so that would be a different letter.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. I understand that part.
So going forward, if we have five different iterations of seven, for example --

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: -- is Scott going to be B and Colleen is going to be C and Jose is going to be D and I am going to be E and Rick is going to be F, is that --

WILLIE DESMOND: I would --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: -- that how you're going to do it?

WILLIE DESMOND: -- prefer not because for whole counties Commissioner Freeman has B, C, and D.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Well, just think about that.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We're going to need some coherent way to do that that we understand.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

If I could just show a map and ask for a little clarification on that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

I don't mean to interrupt you, Mr. Desmond, but I do have a question for Mr. -- Commissioner Herrera. I think he just left.

I'm trying to get an understanding about the overall general design criteria that there is a desire from
public comment in Bullhead City and others of a continuous rural river district, commentary from Flagstaff and the Verde Valley that they maintain a continuity with the northeastern Arizona tribes, and maintain a rural district, so two truly rural districts is what you are overriding design criteria.

I'm trying to, trying to get the bigger pieces.

Am I correct in that?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I apologize. I was getting cookies.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay. In public interview and in commentary, you said numerous times about that -- of two rural districts, one on the western border and one -- one going from the northwestern corner and one from the northeastern corner, moving down, some iteration thereof, where you've got two rural districts, make that primarily rural districts; correct?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, that's correct.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And the Bullhead -- and the public comment that you heard in Bullhead City, which I witnessed via online streaming, you were there personally, and then you got subsequent accolades in the Tri-Valley News for the two, for the two that were there representing that the concept of a river district was really popular.

Because I read the article. In fact, I read it
again this morning just to make sure I knew what I was reading.

Because you keep saying that they gave you accolades. It was about --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Not just me. It was also Commissioner McNulty.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Exactly, the two that were attending in person.

So that the river district was real important.

And so you're designing around two rural districts, one from the northwest, one in the northeast, that Flagstaff and the Verde Valley wants to be in the northeast district, and -- am I correct?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And Prescott wants to be with the northwest; correct?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Correct.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

And your view is that connecting the northeast to the southeast corner may be too large of a district to maintain itself.

A lot of the other comments that we got was that the idea of a spoke design, which is that a series of rural districts that needed to touch large, large population centers to balance their population was something that we
should try to work against.

Because the representatives end up coming from the large concentration of population and serve their constituents' needs more highly, especially where there is a larger volume of political contributions that may not becoming from the rural sides.

Is that -- would that be -- am I contemporaneously outlining what you've heard?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Commissioner McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'm sorry, go ahead.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: No, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I lost track of that. I'm sorry.

I -- we've heard a lot of things, I think. And we've got three volumes of binders of stuff.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Well, actually we now have seven binders according to last report.

I'm trying -- what I'm trying to do is that you had -- we have been talking about these overlying design criteria that you have from the 30,000 foot macro view.

And I am trying to say if those are needing to be achieved, let's work towards those.

Because there's a bunch of different ways to be able to achieve the same goal.

Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: May I ask a couple questions?

WILLIE DESMOND: Can I just clarify one thing first about the change to the Oro Valley, the rest of Pima County?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Uh-hmm.

WILLIE DESMOND: So, if I zoom out, I just need to know.

So if I take that out of District 5, I think I'll probably have to give it to District No. 1 in order to keep District No. 2 a voting rights district.

So in that case, District 1 will be overpopulated by about 140,000 people.

Would it be okay to take different parts of Pima County, or would you rather I start with Graham, District 1, and then drop down into Cochise as far as I need to, in District 1?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It would be okay to take other parts of Pima, just to see.

I'm flexible. I don't have any agenda here. And it was just to see if there's another way to accomplish those 140,000 people, putting them in with District 1, and is there a way to bring the population back up that's needed.
WILLIE DESMOND: I mean, it might be possible to make District 5 the border district, I guess.

I think off the top of my head we lose that 137,000, I think that's close to what it is in Cochise, but I could be wrong.

So I will, I will remove those areas of Pima from, from five, and I'll give them to District 1. And then I'll make District 1 smaller, going through, through other areas I guess.

I just wanted to know if you wanted no part of five to be Pima or not.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: If you see multiple ways of accomplishing this, I'd be open -- I would be interested in seeing what, you know, a couple different versions might even be.

But the idea was to, you know, just take care of that bump as well as Saddlebrooke and try to include them with the rest of whatever is in Pima.

Because Pima is split already, it looks like.

WILLIE DESMOND: We could do that fairly quickly right now or together.

I don't know how many options --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No, we'll go ahead and --

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. I will play with that and let you know.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: Go ahead. Sorry, Commissioner McNulty. I didn't mean to interrupt you.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: No, that's all right. That's kind -- I have a similar question.

What's the population of Graham and Greenlee right there?

WILLIE DESMOND: Of Graham?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Of Graham and Greenlee County that are within one.

WILLIE DESMOND: That are within one?

37,000 people.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So essentially if you were to move those into one, and move Oro Valley out of -- in that area out of one, you'd need to take another 100,000 people out of Pima and Cochise County and put them where?

WILLIE DESMOND: Into District 5.

So if District 5 gives up the area it has in Pima County and Saddlebrooke -- and then if I just, just briefly if I show you this. This is 169,000. If we take Cochise, that would be I think about 30,000 over.

So District 1 would then be underpopulated. It would need to either -- it would only be this one little chunk of Pima County and then Saddlebrooke, so it would need
to grow into five then, either, either taking some of, like, I think it's Gold Canyon here.

No, I'm sorry.

So I would have to take Oracle and San Manuel and things, scroll up, to make up that population.

Or else it could, it could not give up all of Cochise County.

So I could take, you know, just a portion of Cochise that would, that would then keep one the --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So you're saying you would put all of Cochise County and all of Graham County and all of Greenlee County and half of Pima County in District 5.

WILLIE DESMOND: I would say, if we remove those areas, we need to make up that population.

It takes all of Graham and all of Greenlee and still needs to make up 100,000.

And that can either come in a portion of one that's in Pima, kind of coming down the -- so if I just cancel this.

So it would, it would -- well, let me -- it will just take a second, and we can play with this.

So it would either -- I guess, it would either come down here in Pima and then grab parts of Tucson, I guess, coming from the back.

Though then one would have like a long finger
sticking down into it from five.

Or it would take all of Graham, all of Greenlee, and then parts of Cochise, and that would, that would allow you to equalize the population you're going to lose when you give up Catalina, Oro Valley, Saddlebrooke.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: How many people are in Cochise County?

WILLIE DESMOND: 131.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: 131,000 people in Cochise County.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, voting age -- not voting age. Total population.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: What's the population of Santa Cruz?

WILLIE DESMOND: Forty-seven.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm open to other commissioners if you have thoughts on how we might do that. It's not my personal version. I just wanted to see what we might accomplish.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: If you would take -- you
would be able to combine Greenlee, Graham, and Cochise and put those into five, pick up the populations going from Oracle in and pick those up into a new District 1, and connect to Santa Cruz.

I know that you're going to lose HVAP that you need in two.

Will you be able to pick up that in western Maricopa?

WILLIE DESMOND: Western Maricopa.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Western Phoenix.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm not sure if that would -- how much, how much HVAP you lose by losing Santa Cruz.

I believe this line was from the Hispanic Coalition, so then -- you would have to take it probably from seven, and then you're kind of moving everything.

It would, it would have a ripple effect, I guess, on how things go.

I would be happy to explore that as 7D, to make --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I think I'm F, in my -- however you want to.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Stertz is F in our new nomenclature.

WILLIE DESMOND: So I will make 7F that would have -- that would create then, again, three border -- no.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yes.
WILLIE DESMOND: Three border districts.

I think we have something very similar to that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: You do.

WILLIE DESMOND: Would you like to go back and see that one quickly or . . .

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: No, because I think that the -- Commissioners Herrera and McNulty have spent an enormous amount of time on, on four -- three, four, seven -- six, seven, and eight up -- and nine up in Maricopa. Instead of moving those around at this time, I'd just as soon see what we can do to make that a rural district, which I think makes sense, and to get Pima County and its relationships together.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

I guess my question then is that District 2 is going to have to grab from District 7, 8, or 9.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That's correct.

WILLIE DESMOND: And then where would you like those to make up population going forward? Because then those will be underpopulated.

I'll take a crack at it trying to keep seven, eight, and nine as they've laid it out, I mean, to minimize the changes to those, I guess.

If that's all right.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.
WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments?

So it sounds like you're going to create a 7C and a 7F.

WILLIE DESMOND: I guess if we're giving you guys letters, it would make more sense just to use your initial, last initial, so it would be a 7M and a 7S.

No, there's two Ms. Never mind.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'm sorry, we were joking about our letters.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We could do first initials, first name initial.

WILLIE DESMOND: If it's all right, I'm just going to not give you guys letters.

Just every split will get the next letter that's available.

So I'll make it a 7C and a 7D.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sounds good.

Okay. Any other -- go ahead, Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Desmond, the -- what's the population of the little -- see where it says Pinal, and there's a little cul-de-sac there? What is that area? What is the population there?

WILLIE DESMOND: Is this the area, like the Casa Grande area?
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: You know, I know we're all trying to figure stuff out, but I really think taking a huge arbitrary hunk out of Pima County is just a blind alley. And I'll just say that.

I don't think it works. I don't think it makes any sense.

You know, we can have Mr. Desmond spend time on it if he wants to but --

WILLIE DESMOND: Which population? I'm sorry, I didn't --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: You're there. You're there. That little cul-de-sac, what is -- so that's Casa Grande and part of Coolidge.

If you drew a line -- well, what's the population of Coolidge in that? What's that census place population there?

WILLIE DESMOND: There's 11,000 people from District 5 and Coolidge.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And what's the population of Eloy below it?

WILLIE DESMOND: Eloy is 16,000.

Of that, 24 people are in District 5, that little, this little part right here.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments or
questions on congressional? This version?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: No.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Did anyone have any other ideas they want to give to Mr. Desmond for homework?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I do have some, but I have to excuse myself, take care of some personal -- I mean, no, my mother was just taken to the hospital. So I need to call my sister.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We will take -- it's a good time for a break, a 15-minute recess.

The time is 1:56 p.m.

Thank you.

(Brief recess taken.)

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

The time is 2:21 p.m.

And we're going to go back on our agenda to item two, map presentations.

As I mentioned, the purpose of this meeting today was to hear some input from the Inter Tribal Council, and I have a whole list of folks who are going to come up and present some information to us.

And I will start with that now.
Our first speaker is from the Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, the executive director, John Lewis.

And to remind everyone who comes up to speak, please be sure to speak directly into the microphone so that everyone can hear you well and to also spell your name for the record so that our court reporter gets an accurate accounting.

Thank you, Mr. Lewis.

JOHN LEWIS: Thank you.


The Inter Tribal Council of Arizona welcomes the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission to Indian country. We sincerely appreciate your willingness to meet with leaders in the Indian tribal governments in Arizona.

We particularly appreciate your meeting with us in this place, the Heard Museum, which celebrates the accomplishments of Indian tribes and the culture of Indian people.

As you know, Indian tribes are governments in every sense of the word. Indian tribes were recognized in the constitution of the United States when the constitution was written.

Treaties, the highest law of the land, and laws too numerous to count, have created a special contract with our many sovereign nations.
Indian tribes and tribal people are very sensitive to all issues that involve our right to participate in this great democracy.

We are the first people of this land, and we have been the last to achieve the right to vote.

Indian people were not recognized as U.S. citizens until 1924.

After a long struggle, that day our leader such as Dr. Carlos Montezuma, a Yavapai Indian from Fort McDowell, congress passed the Indian Citizenship Act.

Still that did not give us the right to vote in Arizona.

It was not until 1948 that the Supreme Court of Arizona ruled in the case brought by Mr. Harry Austin, Mr. Frank Harrison, both from the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, that Indian people were recognized as having the right to vote in Arizona.

The story doesn't end there.

We continue to resist the various barriers that would diminish our legal right to fully participate in the political process of this state and to elect representatives of our choosing.

In the current effort to redraw the boundaries for Arizona's nine congressional districts and 30 state legislative districts, the first priority for tribes is to
ensure that our respective reservations are not split among
districts.

We would like to thank each of you, your legal
counsel, your mapping consultants, for your continuing
support of this principle.

The constitution requirements for redistricting
are clearly consistent with this principle.

Under the Voting Rights Act, one state legislative
district, the current District 2, qualifies us as a
majority-minority district because of the presence of Indian
people.

In the current District 5, Indian people count for
one in every six people in that district.

There must be no retrogression when new lines are
drawn.

Although not specifically mentioned in Prop 106,
tribes are governments and like other governments are not to
be split among districts.

Our reservation areas are clearly communities of
interest under any definition of the term.

And ensuring that they're -- that no reservation
is split among districts, please pay particular attention to
the fact that for several tribes all their lands are not
contiguous to the main reservation areas.

The close examination of the maps will review
these cases.

When requested by the tribal governments involved, we also urge you to keep tribes that have lands near each other and that share similar interests and issues within the same district, both congressional districts and state legislative districts.

And finally, we support your efforts in both the first and second round of the public hearings to bring the hearings to Indian communities.

We are happy to join with you in outreach efforts to ensure that tribal officials and tribal members participate fully in these hearings.

Thank you again for meeting with us today and respecting our unique status as governments of our respective tribal nations.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you, Mr. Lewis.

Our next speaker is from the Hopi Tribe, the chairman Leroy Shingoitewa.

LEROY SHINGOITEWA: Good afternoon. Thank you very much for allowing me to come before the redistricting committee to give you the Hopi Tribe's concept.

We have not officially done a resolution, which we are pending on doing very shortly.

But in looking at the maps that have been
displayed today, the Hopi Tribe feels comfortable with the concept under District 5 of joining both the Navajo Nation, the White River, Fort Apache, as well as San Carlos.

I think for us especially because the Hopi Tribe has lands within this area that we have now purchased and have made part of the Hopi reservation. Our lands now go all the way down through Springerville, into Winslow, and partway into Flagstaff.

So based on what we -- what I see on the map, this reinforces the concept that the lands for the Hopi will be made whole.

Regarding the state of Arizona, as I looked at the various configuration again seven, which was prepared on Arizona districting of a seven, which encompass again the White Mountains of San Carlos and Navajo and Hopi. That would also still compose the total lands of Hopi.

One of the things though that I think would be added to that would be we would like to include the sacred peaks of San Francisco, Nuvatukaovi, as to be part of that district, so that, again, these are lands that are very sacred to many of the tribes in that area.

So based on what you have before you and what I'm speaking presently that what the Hopi Tribe has discussed and talked about, we will feel very comfortable in looking at that type of configuration.
And, again, I want to say thank you to you for the work you're doing.

I know it's not an easy job. And I know you're not the most popular people in the world right now.

But the fact is that you have taken on a job, and for those of us that are the native people in the state of Arizona, and we've been here for a long time, and we want you to understand, and the state of Arizona to understand, that we are citizens of this state of Arizona. And because of us, many of the lands that are here have become sacred to not only native but all to the people of Arizona.

And, again, like I say, we're like you. We're the citizens of the state, and we are not moving anywhere. So you're going to have to put up with us.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you, Chairman.

Our next speaker is from the Colorado River Indian Tribes.

T.J. Laffoon, councilman.

T.J. LAFFOON: Thank you, commissioners, for allowing us to speak on behalf of the Colorado River Indian Tribes. My name is Herman T.J. Laffoon, councilman.

And our issues today that we addressed are looking back at the district and splitting our decision to move into District 5 with the Mohave County. And our concerns are the
Colorado River Indian tribes are a minority group, which must be protected under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

And as we stressed in those, those are being amended in a breach of the progressional act 1965.

CRIT also is currently in District 7, which includes a significant Indian population, and seven tribes Ak-Chin, Cocopah, Colorado River tribes, Gila River, Pascua Yaqui, Quechan, and Tohono O’odham.

Through all of this, all of the commissioners must understand that CRIT is moving out of District 7, which we are opposing, and into district with specifically lower Indian population.

This would have the effect of dissolving Indian voting strength, and it's prohibited under the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

To include also it is important to note that none of the commissioners are from rural counties.

Two of the commissioners are attorneys.

None have a background that include work with tribes.

Again, the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

And we like to thank you for giving us an opportunity to speak on our behalf of our concerns about the redistricting.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much, councilman.

Our next speaker is from the Ak-Chin Indian community, Delia Carlyle, councilwoman.

DELIA CARLYLE: Good afternoon. My name is Delia Carlyle, D-E-L-I-A, C-A-R-L-Y-L-E. I'm currently a council member of the Ak-Chin Indian community.

My council currently doesn't have a formal proposal to act on, but we are reviewing all the recommendations that have been submitted.

And to be quite honest, they're mind boggling. So I can understand the challenges you as commissioners are going through.

But we also want to comment that we share the same interests, concerns as what the tribes regarding not splitting up the reservations and trying to keep the communities, communities of interest intact as much as possible.

Although my community is next to the city of Maricopa, we still consider ourselves a rural farming community, so those are part of our interest we have with several others as mentioned earlier in District 7.

We -- I do want to make a point of correction on the maps. To some it may not seem like a major issue, but
to us, it is.

Several -- I should say many years ago our community had a secretarial election where the name Maricopa was removed from referencing Ak-Chin. And we still see that name.

We sent letters to the census.

And obviously the Bureau of Indian Affairs was aware of this change.

And it's nothing against the name of Maricopa, because it's also the name of another tribe. However, we are, you know, distinct, unique on our own, and just wanted to point that -- correct that error in seeing that the map still references us as Maricopa Ak-Chin reservation.

And also with the state proposals being submitted and being reviewed, we're also dealing with the fact that in Pinal County, obviously because of the growth in Pinal County, we're also looking at proposed maps regarding the two new additions -- the additions of two new supervisors. So with the -- working on those -- while doing those proposals, as well as the state proposals, for a little tribe that we are, it can be quite -- it's an interesting, interesting process.

But just like others before you, I do want to thank you for taking on the challenge. Rather, I, I don't think I would want to be in your shoes right now.
But I would say that when I disagree with any of the rest of any of the games we see lately.

So, again, thank you. And I appreciate the time for the comments.

And at such time when the council -- my council is doing what they come to a final formal decision regarding the redistricting, we will be sending you the information.

Thank you again.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you, councilwoman.

Our next speaker is from the San Carlos Apache Tribe, Steve Titla, attorney.

STEVE TITLA: Good afternoon, commissioners, Madam Chair.

I'd like to thank you for all the work you all are doing in covering the state. And you've been doing a good job.

Your attorneys are the preeminent attorneys of voting in the state, so I commend them.

And your mapping consultant has been doing a good job on the mapping that we've seen so far.

I've been looking at the congressional grid maps what-if scenarios that we have here on 6 -- or 5A, 5B, and 5C, and -- but I don't have any statistics though.

Maybe somewhere we didn't get copies of the statistics. So I'd like to take a look at the statistics in
those areas.

But I just wanted to say that I'm an Apache from San Carlos Apache reservation.

And the tribal council has not taken a position on any of these maps yet, but they hope to produce a map in something they can support very soon.

My observation on the, on this process is that I think that, as I said in Hondah, I was in Hondah, a couple of you two were there. And I don't think there should be any split in the reservations as far as the mapping goes.

I saw where one of them does that.

I think five -- let's see, a second.

5B, I think.

Or one of them, I can't -- I don't remember, one of them splits part of our reservation off.

And I think that the reservation should be all kept together.

I wish you were working on the county maps, because in the county we are -- San Carlos is split into three counties.

We are in Gila County, Graham County, and Pinal County.

And then our relatives to the north of us, White Mountain Apache, is in three counties too. So White
Mountain San Carlos are in six counties right now.

I don't know who drew those maps or when they were drawn, but I think that really diluted our vote in the county area, but I wish that you were working on that. I know you don't, but that's something that we can take a look at later maybe.

But as far as the community of interests, we are, I think, the original communities of interest.

I've been looking at the definition that you have of communities of interest, and the Apaches have been in our area since time immemorial. And all those areas that are state lands now, the eastern boundary, New Mexico and Arizona is all aboriginal Apache lands. So those are communities of interest, and I would hope that you can think about that and look at that and make sure that our communities of interest remain intact.

As far as I think that it should be a rural district at the same time also.

I don't think that the -- I've been looking at these maps, and they extend into the cities.

I don't think that our district should go into the city. Because if that happens, then the city people are going to dominate our district. And I don't think that they will represent our interests in the rural area, the rural reservation area. So I want you to think about that, that
any district that we have that you draw out should not extend into the city, Maricopa County, or Pima County or any other city.

We should remain a rural district.

So, as we go forward here, we support you, Madam Chair, in your work, and your attorneys and your counsel. And I hope you do a good job here, and we wish you good luck here, and thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you, Mr. Titla.

Our next speaker is from the Pascua Yaqui Tribe, Luis Gonzales, councilman.

LUIS GONZALES: Good afternoon.

Thank you for giving an opportunity to speak to you again.

But, I'm Luis Gonzales, one of the Pascua Yaqui council members.

Also here emphasizing and also stressing what my colleagues, the trial leaders mentioned, maintaining and keeping intact all the reservation that we have in the state of Arizona.

And we have the Pascua Yaqui. I do emphasize that we have one reservation which is in Pima County, Pascua Pueblo. But we also have our constituents, our membership, up all the way from Tucson to Eloy, Coolidge, but the highest concentration is just about 15, 17 miles
away from here, which is Guadalupe.

And Guadalupe resides right now in Legislative District 16 on the easternmost part.

And the community of interest that we have in Guadalupe is with the South Mountain area as well too.

We also share a lot of interest not only within our religious, the majority of Guadalupe people being Catholic.

Also schools, we've gone to school, community has gone to schools in the Phoenix area.

But also in Guadalupe we also have a satellite community college as well too, which is South Mountain Community College. But, and that's within District 16.

And now coming back to District 27, which is in the Tucson area, Pima County, I would like the Commission to really emphasize and keep intact District 27. We do have our reservation now on District 27, but we also have three other communities within District 27.

And one is which is old Pascua, which is on Oracle and Grant.

But I do the want to emphasize and want for you to consider to maintain and keep those districts intact as well too.

And also with my colleagues here, maintaining all the reservation intact and not being split.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is from Hualapai Tribe, Chairwoman Louise Benson.

LOUISE BENSON: Good afternoon, commissioners. My name is Louise Benson. I'm the chairwoman from the Hualapai Tribe.

And --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: One second.

LOUISE BENSON: Can you hear me now?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes.

LOUISE BENSON: My name is Louise Benson. I'm the chairwoman for the Hualapai Tribe.

And on behalf of the Hualapai Tribe, we have already been approached by the Navajo Tribe, and the council has taken action to support the proposal of the Navajo Tribe.

And I know that there's a lot into this, and I have just come aboard, and I hadn't really gone over all the issues to make a good recommendation, other than I said to my council that we need to look at both sides of this issue, because there's a lot into it.

But, anyway, our council have supported the proposal of the Navajo Tribe. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you, chairwoman.
Our next speaker is from Navajo Nation, Leonard Gorman, director of the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission.

LEONARD GORMAN: Good afternoon. I'm over here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh.

LEONARD GORMAN: And we'll project our map on the screen, both the congressional and the legislative maps.

I just wanted to start off with thanking you for the opportunity to provide this presentation. And certainly it has been a rigorous process for the Navajo Nation, primarily because we are involved in the Arizona, New Mexico, Utah portions in the southwest region. So please bear with me if I interject New Mexico maps in here.

And while the screen is popping up.

Okay. On your website, you do provide the maps that are being provided by folks, organizations as you've gone around the Arizona.

And we see the Navajo Nation's map is provided as one of the maps.

We want to submit two additional maps.

I think we haven't had that opportunity to provide the electronic version. So before we leave today, we'll do that, and we'll share those maps with you.

But we'll give a presentation on the legislative map first.
And this is the map that the Navajo Nation legislative body supported a couple of weeks ago.
And we have been sharing this map with a number of indigenous nations within the north region of the state of Arizona.

And some of the issues that we have in regards to the standards and our aspirations to ensure that those are a part of the redistricting process, our community of interest, and also the Voting Rights Act of 1960s.

In the community of interest aspects, the border towns. Border towns are a significant trade areas for the Navajo people.

And some of the issues that come up oftentimes of course is Navajo people are not tax paying citizens in the state of Arizona.

That is totally untrue.

And I think probably the same holds for the rest of the state of Arizona and the rest of the United States. There are persons and even nations that do contribute to the tax base in various ways.

As an example, and I think the Hopi Nation chairman had presented an idea also. The nation has purchased lands, often the prescribed trust lands. And these lands are tax base lands in the state of Arizona.

So, for example, for the Navajo Nation, we have...
lands right north of Winslow, in this green area, this green shaded area here.

That's Navajo trust land, Navajo Hopi land in which is taxed.

So Navajo Nation government contributes to the tax base, in not only Navajo County but also Coconino County.

Likewise, the Hopi Nation contributes to the tax base in Navajo County and also Coconino County. So there is no way for anyone to say that indigenous nations and indigenous peoples do not contribute to the tax -- property tax base in the state of Arizona.

This -- that's a fallacy.

Because this is proof on the screen that we do pay for this tax base.

In the, in the Flagstaff area we also have ranch lands that the Navajo Nation owns.

It's also tax based land, this area here.

This is Fernwood precinct and also Fort Valley precinct.

And it encompasses what was referred to by the Hopi Nation as the sacred San Francisco Peaks.

So Navajo Nation owns that land.

So Navajo Nation has requested the Redistricting Commission to ensure that that land is a part of the legislative district in which the Navajo Nation is
located, the land in this area.

The other land that's owned by the Navajo Nation is in this region here, the western part, next to the Hualapai Nation.

This is a Big Boquillas Ranch.

It's also a tax base for the state of Arizona.

So the Navajo Nation has impressed upon the Commission to include these land areas to ensure that they, that they are a part of the district in which the Navajo Nation is located.

The other part is that these border towns, the city of Flagstaff has been gracious to accommodate in many respects.

In particularly in the area of economy, commerce activities.

Navajo Nation has worked with the City of Flagstaff folks in trying to come up with a plan that would be amenable to both the Navajo people, the Navajo Nation, and also to a certain extent perhaps the city government.

There has not been any formal decision, as we understand it, from the Navajo Nation's perspective, that the City has not made any formal decision on such a plan as this. And we have a heard a variety of responses whether the city of Flagstaff should be broken in half or the city of Flagstaff should be out of a district in which the Navajo
Nation is located.

I don't think there's been any specific decision. I don't know the representative from the City of Flagstaff would be in a better position to work on these comments.

However, from the Navajo Nation's perspective, the city of Flagstaff has about 7,704 Native Americans in that city.

It's a very strong concern to the Navajo Nation that these individuals need to be counted for when we talk about community of interest.

Secondly, the city of Flagstaff is one of the, one of the hubs as far as the economy, the commerce aspects is concerned.

Navajo Nation, Navajo people contribute substantially on a daily basis to the city of Flagstaff's retail economy.

And that's where from the city, from the Navajo government's contribution, just the government alone, on a year and a half time frame, the Navajo government has spent over $13.6 million in commerce in that community.

For the city of Winslow, again, there's significant Native American population in that community.

There's 2670 Native Americans accounted for in that community of Winslow.

There's a Winslow west and Winslow. All together
it's 2670 people.

Navajo Nation government has contributed on a one and a half year basis $1.3 million to the city's economy, retail economy.

For the city of Holbrook, there are 1,332 Native Americans in that community.

The Navajo Nation on a one and a half year basis as contributed $5.3 million to that community.

The point that I'm raising here is that the Navajo Nation, the Navajo people, do commerce activities, economic development activities with these communities off the Navajo Nation.

In that respect, we have a strong community of interest. We have a dependency on one another. The communities depend on the Navajo dollars coming into that community. The Navajo people depend on the goods and services that are provided by these communities.

As you can see, that's a very strong connection between these communities. And note that there's some maps that you've drawn that leave out these communities along the incorporated areas.

I need you to take serious consideration the relationship that we have.

And all of those Native Americans that are in those communities, they're property owners. They're
taxpayers. They are tax based for those communities too.

    Predominantly they're Navajos in these communities.

Some of these Navajos that live in these communities have been under the forced relocation activity enforced by the federal government. They had no choice but to move off the Navajo Nation and oftentimes into these border towns.

So, the other aspects of community of interest is, again, back to the sacred sites.

This land area here, the green area with the forest service in the middle, Navajo Nation Espell Ranch encompasses the entire area surrounding the forest service.

And it borders pretty much the city of Flagstaff on the north side.

So Navajo Nation and the Hopis have a very strong interest in these lands.

And then the other aspect is the Voting Rights Act.

Section 2 and Section 5 has been iterated before. Section 2, no dilution. Section 5, no retrogression.

Native Americans in the current District 2 make up about 63 point -- about 64 percent Native American population.

Navajo Nation is asking that the
Redistricting Commission to respect that number so that when
the plan that comes out in which Navajo Nation is located
that we meet that 64 percent Native American population.

And that translates to approximately 60 to
62 percent voting age population.

So Navajo Nation as a part of litigation in many
respects has demonstrated to the courts that in order for
Navajo people to elect someone that they feel that best
represents their interests, they must have at a minimum a
60 percent voting age population.

Simply because Navajo people are younger,
oftentimes their voting performance is not as high as other,
other ethnic groups in any state. And that's common among
Native Americans.

And oftentimes there are some issues that
resolve -- or revolve around those concerns.

This peak area, these peak land areas here are the
Hopi land lease areas that they're concerned about.

And we have had an opportunity to discuss this
map, legislative map, with the Hopi Nation, with the City of
Flagstaff and other parties, to come up with a map that
would work for the northern region of the state of Arizona.

So you'll see that in this area, this pink land
area in the southwest corner of the Navajo Nation, we
weren't able to include all of the Hopi land lease area,
primarily because of the voting blocks are configurated in a way if we were to pick this area up, the district would run in this direction.

So this is a plan that makes every effort to include the Hopi land areas. And like in this area, we did include the Hopis and the other ranch lands that's been referred to is in the Springerville area, Eager area, down in this region here.

We did include a majority of the Hopi land lease area, but we didn't include specifically this area, this pocket of land here, west of Eager.

So, if we can accomplish it by running the district around in this area, encompassing all of this lease area.

So, we wanted to have an opportunity to present this map to the folks in the audience, and including the White Mountain Apache and also the San Carlos Apache Nations. And the Navajo Nation has had an opportunity to sit down at least three times with the San Carlos Apache Nation to discuss these matters, and also has had an opportunity to sit down with the White Mountain. And hopefully that with this presentation to the people in the audience, that we will also have an opportunity to engage further dialogue with these two nations to come to some -- perhaps some consensus.
As far as the congressional district is concerned, the Navajo Nation has also been very concerned about the congressional redistricting. And we have come up with two plans.

This particular plan is on your website. We call it the Navajo Nation Proposal Indian One. Indian One, the effort is to look at the feasibility of having to ensure that there isn't a majority-minority district.

And this particular plan incorporates approximately or a number figure-wise 25 percent Native American population.

And there's going to be plenty of time to tweak this proposal, but as we tweak and tweak and tweak, this opportunity becomes a minority-majority district including ex-Hispanic population in this plan.

And we realize this particular plan may be far reaching, far out there, that it really dominates the Democratic party, and we have an opportunity to discuss these matters with some of the party folks in the Democratic party.

This is one plan that the Navajo Nation supports.

The other plan that is being put forward by the Navajo Nation representative is Indian Two. Indian Two is probably more favorable.
Part of the scenario here is making the effort to ensure that we maintain the Native American population. And in this respect we were able to bring about a 23.46 percent Native American population.

And realizing that there's going to be more tweaking and more effort to work on this, and this is a plan that the Navajo Nation has supported as an endorsement as a place to start, and with the council's orders we're able to work from these plans and start working on some compromise and negotiations as we go along.

So, thank you, in conclusion, for having to come back out to Window Rock area in the Navajo Nation the early part of October. And we've made reservations for the Commission to come out to Kayenta, and also the Window Rock again, I think, is October 5 and 6.

And we appreciate you coming back out again.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you, Mr. Gorman. Thank you very much.

I have a question.

Can you show us on the map the San Francisco Peaks, maybe on that legislative map, so we have a good sense of where those lands are?

LEONARD GORMAN: I believe this area here is the forest services land in which the forest service has
responsibility for to maintain those land areas.

This area outside is Navajo Nation Espell Ranch.

So the San Francisco Peaks is in this area here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any other questions from others?

Are these maps available on our website?

BUCK FORST: Yes. The ones from him right now?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes.

BUCK FORST: No. I can put them up quickly.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That would be great.

Thank you.

LEONARD GORMAN: And we'll work with your staff to be sure that we provide those digital copies before we leave. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our court reporter is rebooting.

(Brief pause.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. I think we're ready to go here.

Our next speaker is from the Tohono O'odham Nation, Chairman Ned Norris.

NED NORRIS: No Power Point. Nothing for me.

Good afternoon. Welcome to Indian country.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

NED NORRIS: I say that for a number of reasons.
You know, we heard the executive director of, I forgot, Ned Norris, Jr., N-E-D, N-O-R-R-I-S, J-R, chairman Tohono O'odham Nation.

I say that because earlier we heard ITCA director John Lewis talk about tribes being here for forever. And we always say we've been here since time immemorial.

And with or without, we're still going to be here until time immemorial, whenever that ends up coming up.

And I wanted to just take this opportunity and share some thoughts with you on behalf of the Tohono O'odham Nation.

The nation is located in southwestern part of the state of Arizona. We are 2.8 million square acres small.

And I say that because when you think about all of the tribes in the state of Arizona, and our forced relocation to where we exist today, our tribal lands extend beyond where we're -- where we ended up being forced to be located at on our federal reservations.

And I stand here before you, and I feel that you -- all of you honestly believe that and understand that. And we appreciate.

But I think it's important for us to remember that and understand that further, because we talked about keeping the tribes together. We talked about the idea that some tribes may be redirected or relocated or redistricted into
And I think for the most part most of us tribal leaders came up here and stated that we wanted to somehow keep the tribes in a unified way.

But the Tohono O'odham Nation, we have about 30,000 enrolled tribal members.

We're -- we have about 75 miles of international border to the south of us.

And even today we have about 1500 enrolled Tohono O'odham citizens that live in Mexico, not necessarily because they want to live in Mexico, but because when they established the international border, they ended up in Mexico.

They cut them off from the Tohono O'odham Nation where it is today.

And even today we have about nine tribal communities that still exist in Mexico.

And so we have a vested interest in what goes on in Mexico, because of that tie, because of that relationship.

But we also have a vested interest with all of our tribal communities, our sister tribes, the Ak-Chin O'odham, the Gila River O'odham, the Salt River O'odham, because we all believe we are descendants of the Hohokam.

And so I share that little bit of our O'odham
history with you. And what I would like to say is that it's critical that we keep the Tohono O'odham Nation whole.

And when possible, we try and link tribal communities together so Indian country maintains a strong voting block and potentially elect fellow members.

The nation is unique as it is on the front line of border policy.

And we continue to play a significant role in protecting the United States homeland.

It is important for the nation to be connected to congressional and legislative districts that understand culture and understand political border issues.

The Commission has discussed the concept of setting up three border congressional districts.

We have a fundamental concern with this. This makeup would significantly alter the nations' influence by combining population centers in urban Maricopa County with border communities.

The nation prefers to maintain a similar congressional footprint that combines parts of Pima, Yuma, Pinal, and La Paz Counties, and a portion of Avondale in Maricopa County.

So, at this point, this is what I wanted to share with you, and I thank you for the opportunity to stand before you and share these thoughts with you. The
Tohono O'odham Nation looks forward to continued dialogue with the Commission and looks forward to the opportunity to really to define more clearly some of the issues that I've laid out for your consideration.

As people have said, you have a tough job.

You have a thankless job.

But those of us in elected positions know we all have thankless jobs as elected officials.

We're damned if we do and we're damned if we don't.

But that's the way it is.

You have your work to do. I commend you for doing this work. And I look forward to the opportunity to have a working relationship with you all on this issue.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you, Chairman Norris.

Our next speaker is from White Mountain Apache Tribe, Vice Chairman Timothy Hinton.

TIMOTHY HINTON: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

My name is Timothy Hinton. I'm from the White Mountain Apache Tribe. We live on 1.6 million acres.

And we have the Navajos to the north and the San Carlos to the south. So on this redistricting, we as a
government body and the tribe has been looking at it from
every angle to see which will benefit us. We live on top of
the mountain where we share the economy with our surrounding
communities there.

So it is going to be a tough decision for us to
make economy-wise.

But in the legislative and the congressional side,
like one of them said, it's good that we don't divide the
reservations. Because to the east of us, we have the
Yavapais and the Tonto Tribe.

And today I want to thank you for helping us here.
And I would like to see another native sitting right there
at the table towards us also, if it's possible.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is from Colorado River Indian
tribes, Dennis Welsh, treasurer and councilman.

DENNIS WELSH: Thank you very much. I just want
to add on to my colleagues' -- excuse me, I just want to add
on to my colleagues' comments from earlier.

But it's nice to see my brother Ned,
Tohono O'odham, on his comments mirror ours.

For the last, last eight years we've been in the
same congressional district. It's been very nice. For the
first time in history, I believe, we have a voice in
It's been very positive.

We have seven tribes communicating with one congressman.

I think it's a great thing, seven tribes and about 28 percent of the land base of the state is communicating with one congressman. Oftentimes our voices go unheard, and I think congressman get confused when you talk to them about different issues.

But with our current congressman, and any future congressman, you have seven tribes, from seven different regions talking the same, the same talk, whether it's water, whether it's development, whether it's state laws, taxation, but I think it's good that we have one unified voice.

As far as other things that we have in common with our other six other tribes, is we have water issues that are very similar. That's a big part of a -- I think it's very important to the state of Arizona.

We apparently have about 28 percent of the land base of the state of Arizona belongs as Indian reservation. Of the water rights, 2.8 million acre-feet of water that the state has, the Colorado River and the Gila River alone have one third of the water. So I think it's very important for the future of Arizona when planning our water resource in conjunction with the state as well as
protecting our own interest that we have one congressional
district and we can speak to one congressman in a unified
voice so there's no confusion, there's no breaks in
communication.

I think it's good now that we come to one
congressman and talk to him about our issues, whether it's
water or whether it's taxation or whatever.

I think it's really -- I think we have a good
working relationship as well.

I think our relationship with other tribes has
also been improved drastically.

So I just want to thank you very much for your
time and consideration. And just remember that I think your
job is easy actually, because you heard from our colleagues
down south, and the other tribes you heard today, I'm sure
you will, and I'm sure you heard them a couple months ago,
that we want to remain where we are. We all want to be
together. So I think it's pretty easy. Probably your
easiest task.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Joe Sparks, attorney,
representing ITCA and Tonto Apache Tribe.

JOE SPARKS: Thank you. My name is Joe Sparks.

My address, 7503 First Street, Scottsdale, Arizona. And I'm
counsel for Inter Tribal Council. I'm the new guy over there. I've there been 41 years.

And I just wanted to make a few clarifying points to the panel, the Commission, that might be helpful in your overall perspective.

I don't envy the attention that you sometimes feel in meetings that you attend or the pressures that people attempt to put on you for various reasons.

From my perspective, I'd just like to make a couple points.

First of all, I'm not a Tonto Apache, even though a lot of you might think that I am.

But the Apaches in the room will tell you that I'm an Apache on the inside, and I speak the language. English is my second -- actually third, because I'm from Missouri, and Missouri is my first language. One that's not spoken well in this area.

As for the mark on the map, Tonto Apache is one of the five treaty tribes in Arizona.

There are five. Navajo, Tonto Apache, Yavapai Apache, San Carlos Apache, and White Mountain Apache. Together they have five treaties with the United States.

And before the United States, those five tribes had treaties with Spain and the Republic of Mexico.

So they go way back in terms of this neighborhood.
When the various parts of Arizona, before north and south Gila River were brought into the union, the United States jurisdiction, by the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and the Gast treaty, those jurisdictions and boundaries were artificially set. As Governor Norris spoke to you about, the folks that ended up south the border, they didn't end up south of the border. They started out there, and the border changed.

Likewise with the Gila River. You know, you probably see it today if you drive south across -- south through the state.

It's that sand rut that crosses the interstate under the bridge near Gila Buttes.

It used to have water in it.

And when it did have water in it, it was the boundary between the United States and Mexico after the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. And all the Apaches had to do -- I mean, part of that treaty was United States was supposed to keep Apaches north of the river, but all they had to do was take one step and they'd be south of the river and in Mexico.

So when you hear those old stories about when the Apaches used to go Mexico after the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, all they had to do was walk across the creek. And it just wasn't that far away.
All these boundaries being fluid ended up having an influence on the way the jurisdictions work within the United States and within Arizona.

During these conversations, there will be people who tell you, particularly some county people will say, you know, those tribes, they don't pay taxes.

And you heard the gentleman from Navajo speak about the contributions to the tax base that the Navajos -- the Navajo Nation and the Hopis make in northern Arizona.

There's a couple of reasons for that, that issue, but for the women on the Commission, I'd be, I'd -- even though you weren't there, I was, when you had to be a White landowner and taxpayer to be able to vote. And if that were still the case, you folks probably still had the day off and not have these kinds of responsibilities.

That wasn't right then, and it's not right now.

However, in the state constitution and in the Federal Enabling Act, bringing Arizona into statehood, Arizona promised in the constitution not to tax the Indian lands.

And there's 75 million acres in the state. Twenty-five million of it, in round numbers, is Indian land. Fifty million is not Indian land. And the way the tribes look at that is they paid in advance real estate taxes with the 50 million acres that they don't have now.
Anyway, it's a constitutional statement. It's a constitutional fact.

However, there are rights-of-way, pipelines, transmission lines, water lines, electric lines, railroads. And all of those crossing the 25 million acres of Indian land result in the payment of taxes under the state system, which the state collects and allocates out to the counties.

They do not provide any of that money to the tribes across which those rights-of-way go.

In terms of the Voting Rights Act and the Civil Rights Act, this is an older than dirt statement.

I worked for the Senate in 1965 when the Voting Rights Act, and Civil Rights Act in 1964, was passed.

I was standing in the rotunda when President Johnson signed it.

I worked on the Voting Rights Act. And from '65 through '72, when those Voting Rights Acts were being -- and the Civil Rights Acts were being implemented, we worked very hard, because Arizona just didn't fall off the turnip truck into a situation where it was with southern counties in terms of its difficulty that minorities were having in voting. It really had its own specific history of discrimination.

And its specific history of discrimination was
most pointed at Indian tribes.

For instance, when the statehood hearings were being held, White males were counted as a person for purposes of constitutional requirements for statehood, Hispanic males were counted as two thirds of a person, and Indians weren't counted at all.

That made its way into Arizona politics until 1919. The official policy of the state of Arizona, its state legislature, was genocide as to the Apache people and the Navajo people.

That was the policy in writing of the state.

And so when Mr. Lewis spoke to you about the history of the effort to get to a position where Indians could actually vote, even after they attained citizenship, it was still a very difficult struggle.

And you might think that this particular group of people, Native Americans in Arizona, are particularly sensitive, and may be as sensitive but less -- you might say less -- more civil and less vociferous than some of the people you encounter.

They still feel passionately about the right to vote.

And even after the right to vote, and even after the Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act, we still have very difficult times.
And with the right to vote then came the effort to prevent the vote.

And with the prevention of voting being laid aside on several occasions, then the effort to gerrymander the vote so that the vote of the Indian people would be diluted or made meaningless.

That's a very difficult thing that the tribes have had to deal with.

And in '72, '82, '92, 2002, all of the time we've had to remind those people who were trying to draw the districts, for whatever reasons they drew them, they didn't work out well for tribes.

And we know that you're trying to do that, and we're really grateful for you and the effort that you make to do that.

But why are Indians so passionate about the right to vote and their communities of interest?

Because as a point of law, Indian tribes and Indian affairs are under the absolute plenary control of congress.

No people in the United States are more directly impacted by the action or inaction of congress than the tribes.

They are directly under the control.

And therefore they are extremely sensitive about
whether their congressional delegations are responsive to them and know where they live and care what they do, understand their unique position in U.S. and Arizona history. It's very important. No people in the United States are more directly impacted by their congressional districts and by the congress of the United States than Indian tribes.

They -- well, all of us are, but that is pointed. It's in the constitution, and the Supreme Court cases are full of it.

I don't say that the Supreme Court's full of it. I'm just saying the cases are full of it.

And so they are, you know, they are very, very sensitive to their congressional districts.

Finally, one point about the Tonto Apaches. There needs to be a little bitty speck on the map where Payson, Arizona, is in Gila County.

That 500 acres or so of the Tonto Apache reservation is on the south boundary of the town of Payson.

Their cultural community of interest and their territorial lands are contiguous to the White Mountain and San Carlos Apache.

Their relationships as a familial matter, cultural matters are with the Apache people there.

Just in terms of, of economic activity, even
though they're one of the smallest tribes in Arizona,
they're the largest employer in Gila County. And San Carlos
Apache is the second largest employer in Gila County.

And so sometimes it is lost in the rhetoric about
what important economic interests and what important
economic contributions the tribes make to their counties and
to the state.

They don't speak loudly about it, and they don't
wag it around, and they don't throw it around politically.
They simply do it.

And from a time when they had no employment to the
time of full employment, for instance, for the Tonto Apache
Tribe, has been that period between October 6th, 1972, and
today, from no employment to the largest employer in
Gila County for Tonto Apache.

So, to the extent that you can preserve the
community of interests for the, for the tribes, we encourage
that.

And we encourage you not to take the temptations
that some might offer you about the way of the wagon wheel
or the spider web might be very helpful to some interests in
the state, but it simply has been used over and over to
dilute the vote of the tribes or to split or to separate
their voting interest one from another and within their own
jurisdictions.
Finally, the jurisdictions of tribes over the
25 million acres is under federal law and under the
treaties, and each of the tribes have something very similar
to a treaty if they don't have treaties with the
United States, about the exclusivity of the jurisdiction the
tribes have over the reservations.

And that is one of the problems that has existed
over a period of time since Arizona statehood. Because some
of the leaders of the state being uninformed about that or
resentful about that have tried to ignore it, dilute it, or
destroy it.

Their communities of interest and their ability to
regulate and manage the lands within their reservations is
exclusively theirs, and we would be grateful to the extent
that you can work with them to preserve their communities of
interest in terms of the congressional districts and their
legislative districts.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

That is all I have in terms of request to speak
forms from folks representing any of the tribes or the ITCA.

Is there anyone we missed that would like to
address us now?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.
Well, first I'd like to thank John Lewis, the executive director of ITCA, as well as Norris Nordvahl who helped with arrangements today.

And of course we're hugely appreciative to all of you who came and gave us testimony today. We really, really appreciate it.

Just speaking for myself, hearing from Native Americans and, and learning more about your cultures, your history, your beliefs, is one of the things that I think makes Arizona truly special, and it's one of the reasons I moved to this state. So for me it's an honor to hear everyone today.

And I know that some of you weren't quite ready with your proposals and that some of that is still in development. And you're welcome to come back any time, of course, and provide testimony.

At all of our meetings we'll have an opportunity on the agenda for mapping presentations.

So if any of you decide later you'd like to come and make another case or give us additional information, you're welcome to do so.

I would ask other commissioners if they have any comments or questions before we move forward.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I will also say thank you for taking the time with us today and for giving us your comments. You know the state, as you've said, better than any of us do.

And in helping us with comments, you help us understand not only your own communities but the state as a whole.

So I would encourage you, as Chairman Mathis said, to continue to provide us with your input.

I'd also like to say that we've been doing this for seven months, and this is the first time anyone has even offered us a cookie.

We really appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I ate two.

Any comments from other commissioners?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Echoing everybody's comments, thank you, everybody, for the participation that you've given.

It is crystal clear that it is incumbent upon each one of us as commissioners to absolutely respect the commentary that was brought forward today.

You are, you are the original owners of all of this land that has been carved up over history. And I'll
share off line stories with some of you about my heritage
growing up in Wisconsin, which is coming from a little bit
different place, actually from the Ojibwa Nation. So I'll
be looking forward to having commentary with some of you
about that.

So, again, thank you all very much for being out
here today.

And I agree with the cookie comments.

So if anybody else is watching out there, when you
want to get our attention, cookies are a good way to get to
it.

So thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think we have a few members
of the public -- did you want to say something, I'm sorry,
Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I too echo the comments of my fellow
commissioners.

And it's really an honor and a privilege to be
here with you.

I was born and raised in Phoenix, but I spent
a lot of time growing up in the White Mountains and
hunting and fishing up there and I've spent a lot of time up
on Indian lands and enjoying the beauty and majesty of it all.

And it was, you know, when I was appointed to this Commission, one of the first thoughts in my head was the opportunity to get out and across the state and be with people of different groups. And really the highlight was to get up, up where we ended up going, at least for the first round, which was to Window Rock and Hondah. That was a really special trip for me, and I think for Chair Mathis as well.

And so I want to thank you.

I really appreciate the input.

I think we all need to take it to heart, and I think we are trying to do that.

So I appreciate everyone's support and input. And please continue, because it is like people have said, this is a very difficult puzzle to solve and we need all the help we can get.

Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any other comments?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. There were a couple members from the public who, I think, wanted to comment on tribal issues, and so I thought I'd bring those into the mix
right now.

We'll still have a public comment period at the end.

But Jim March, second vice-chair from Pima County Libertarian Party, I think had a -- wanted to address this topic.

JIM MARCH: Thank you very much.

Just to introduce briefly, in addition to being second vice-chair of Pima Libertarian Party, last year I was the election observer for the San Carlos Apache Nation for one of their tribal elections. So the tribal government of San Carlos knows me fairly well.

Thank you.

If there's a presentation, I'd like to play, if we could, my concern, and what should concern the tribes, is that if the redistricting involves the prisons in an incorrect fashion, it will dilute the -- sorry -- if the -- how do I put this -- if the redistricting process concerning the prisons -- go back to Page 1, please.

If the redistricting process concerning the prisons is handled incorrectly, it will dilute the voting power of the First Nations, all of you.

Let me show you why.

This is a map of your tribal lands.

It's very similar to the one right behind
Madam Chair.

Next page, please.

Okay. This is Arizona's prison population as of 2000.

The orange dots are state prisons.

Blue dots, kind of hard to see with this lighting, but there's blue dots scattered throughout here, are federal facilities.

Yellow are mostly private prisons.

Green are county jail facilities. And we're not worried about those. Those should be counted much like pretty much every other resident, because those people aren't going to be in there that long.

Okay. If we can go to the next page. This is the killer.

None of these prisons, especially not the big ones, are anywhere near the tribal lands.

This is the tribal lands map overlaid with the prison locations map.

Now, what this means is if they do a district around Pinal County, which has a particularly dense population of prisons, if they do a district with a lot of prisons around Pinal, people in that area will be effectively voting for themselves and a certain percentage of a prisoner who cannot vote.
In other words, if a district is supposed to contain 100,000 people, but 20,000 of them are prisoners, then the remaining voters of that area have effectively a super vote.

And because none of the prisons are on tribal lands, none of them, then you're going to have a problem, because none of the tribal voters are going to get that kind of a supercharged vote.

It's not going to happen.

Now, especially not since a lot of the communities of interest as you have been describing are going to be drawn pretty much right around a lot of the reservations, and that means no prisons inside your boundaries.

There's several different ways of fixing this, but it looks like the only remaining avenue to fixing this problem would be to take the district numbers that they already have, they know how many districts for congressional and legislative they're going to have. And let's say we're going to have ten congressional districts. All right? How many are we going to have? Eleven, I think it is? We gain two?

Uh?

Nine.

Okay. So we're going to have nine. So one, two three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine.
We simply then assign a certain number of prisons to each of those nine districts, almost irregardless of geographically where they are.

In other words, we just balance out the prison populations amongst those nine, and we're going to have to draw some very funny map lines where one of the northern districts lacking a prison will have a tendril coming out of it and it will envelope certain numbers of prisons where nobody votes.

Everybody understands that.

But, for purposes of balancing out the prison population among the various districts, you'd have to do that kind of a funky map trick, if you want to call it that.

Now, that is a thing that this Commission can do to rectify this problem.

So far the vote has been that they're not going to, that they're going to do the same that the Redistricting Commission of 2000 did, which was more or less ignore the prison population, except that there have been some vague claims that they need to balance it out just a little bit at the end somehow.

But if they don't do that as thoroughly as they need to, then the First Nations' vote is going to get diluted over anybody else's.

Because you got no prisoners to supercharge your
I know that sounds really weird, but you folks in this room and the tribes you represent have more standing to complain about this before the Commission, and if necessary before the courts later, than anybody else.

Now, I'm almost finished here.

Everybody in this room has got an agenda. That's understood.

I'm going to tell you right now what my agenda is. I represent the Libertarian Party.

I'm also very involved in election integrity across the state.

And one of the fears I have is that a supercharged voting district around Pinal County, which is especially prison dense, might get created that is essentially the wholly-owned legislative or even congressional district owned by Correction Corporation of America, CCA. And I got a problem with that concept.

When I was a political activist in California, I watched the California public sector Prison Guards Union do some very ugly things in term of lobbying. Lobbying for extended sentences, more people in prison, for longer periods of time, against things like drug law reform or all kinds of other stuff, just to increase their job security by putting more people behind bars.
I don't like that.

And the weird thing is because Arizona and California are whacky world opposites in some fashion, instead of worrying about public sector employees' unions here in Arizona, we're worried about a private corporation that represents the same kind of interest, an interest to put more people behind jail -- behind bars.

So I don't want to see a prison dominated district appear anywhere in the prison dense corridor between Maricopa and Tucson, and especially Pinal County in between.

I don't want to see that.

But the people who should be objecting the hardest, and have the best standing to object to this, are the First Nations, because you're not going to have the super -- you're not going to have the supercharged voting power that derives from having a bunch of prisons as nextdoor neighbors, it turns out.

I know that's a really weird thing to have to worry about, but that is effectively what's going on.

I'll lay out one more concern.

At a previous meeting, the Commission put up a map showing how many prisons were in Arizona. And it was way underrepresented.

Something -- the data was presented to you, Madam Speaker, had only two prisons in Pinal County.
I'm sorry, I know that's wrong. I know that's wrong.

So I don't know whether it's by mistake or by somebody's agenda, but there is a problem with the information that's been presented to the Commission so far on prison numbers, prison population, densities, where they are.

And I think not enough attention is being paid to the inherent discrimination in the process that will be created if prison-dominated districts end up being created. And that's something you should all be concerned about.

And that's all I've got to say. Thank you very much.

If you want to drop me -- give me your e-mail address, I'll be happy to give you the raw data I have, such as these maps.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

I have a couple request to speak forms from some folks who presented already. But if they would like to say something again, please let me know.

This is Herman Laffoon from Colorado River Indian Tribes.

HERMAN LAFFOON: Spoke already.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.
And same with Leonard Gorman, did you want to address us again, or is this just repetitive?

LEONARD GORMAN: Repetitive.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Great. I think that's it from request to speak forms.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, Mohur Sidhwa, sorry, representing self, from Pima County.

MOHUR SIDHWA: Are we there now?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah.

MOHUR SIDHWA: As circumstances would have it, I had two points I wanted to make. Both of them fit in at this time period.

One of them was the concept of one person, one vote that emanates from the 14th, 15th, and 19th Amendments of the constitution.

And the moment you have prisons in an area and prisoners are not allowed to vote, then it's certainly dilutes the votes of the areas that don't have prisons.

I was going to talk about that, but Mr. March certainly did.

Last week -- I think it was last week, that Commissioner Herrera made a very astute observation about being somewhat skeptical vis-a-vis mapping suggestions made by entrenched interests and those people who are incumbent
so it is tailored for it.

I don't know where the dickens the idea for three border districts came, but that's the most ridiculous idea, because it removes what little clout the border area has by splitting it further.

If you look at the population density of the border area, you are trying to figure out -- I mean, looking at Santa Cruz County, and those areas really are not very popular -- population dense, and you have to be forced to go into places like Maricopa County.

And I don't see what -- this is, like, maybe Thomas Road would have with Rio Rico and Nogales, frankly speaking.

And when Chairman Norris spoke just now, it suddenly hit home, my God, this really dilutes the tribal votes also.

And it's kind of cynical to want to divide the southern border counties into three.

As you know, politicians go to where the money is and where the votes are.

Those area do not have the votes. They're too dense -- they're too thinly populated, and they're not certainly the bastion of big business either.

Something to keep in mind when somebody is singing you songs about having more representation, you need to be
aware that if you're getting most of your or a large chunk of your finances as well as voters from, say, a small area of Maricopa County, it is an insult to people not just of the northern tribes that wind up getting split but also of the border area.

So, please, I know this idea is delightful to a couple of people who want to run in that district and want to make it noncompetitive, but don't do this to the First Nations and don't do this to competitiveness.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

And I think that's it for comment on this agenda item.

So that will take us back to the agenda, which I need to find.

THE REPORTER: Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, we'll take a quick ten-minute break, recess.

And the time is 3:48.

(Brief recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That concludes recess.

The time is 4:13 p.m.

And we will now go into the next agenda item.

Actually, I wanted to see if -- before we moved on to legislative grid maps, I'm not sure we have a lot of
discussion, because we did discuss that thanks to
Commissioner McNulty yesterday. She had given some detailed
instructions to Mr. Desmond, and we all have that on our
laptops now with a new map version to look at, a what-if
scenario.

I personally haven't had time to review that in
any kind of detail, but if others have, we can, we can talk
about that.

Was there anything else, legislative grid map
wise, that anybody had today?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: A point of clarification, we
do have now available to us the map that was discussed
yesterday?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes. Well, the one that
Mr. Desmond put on our computers last night, that -- those
were those changes that Commissioner McNulty had suggested.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Yesterday's changes have not
been implemented yet; correct?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I don't know that. We'll
have to ask Commissioner McNulty and Mr. Desmond.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I saw that too, but I believe
it was version five maybe on it.

I did not see your district that you constructed
where we were supposed to shut our eyes for the compactness
issue.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yeah, I don't see it either.

WILLIE DESMOND: I did not create a layout for the reports or anything, because it's -- from the districts of overpopulated and underpopulated. It was kind of a work in progress.

I thought once you guys had a chance to review and to kind of direct me further to make it a little bit more complete, I'll create a formal layout and run all the reports and stuff for it.

So it is exactly as it was when we left it yesterday. I haven't touched it since.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I guess that answered my question.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

So, and we each have on that our computer, that work that was done yesterday. Okay.

And so I -- if anyone wanted to discuss, wanted to discuss any aspect of that, if you all have any time.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: All I know is that the upload for the computer, or for your laptop, I've not had a chance to review it.

I haven't had a chance to review it. I know it
was uploaded to our laptop, but I've not had a chance to
review it. So what I'm hoping to do is this weekend go over
more of the information that we've been getting, including
that particular map. I have nothing either.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I do also.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I would agree with that.

Hopefully, I'm not sure, I'll ask Mr. Desmond on
this, tomorrow we'll be getting some more data as well on
these maps that we can use in our analysis; is that correct?

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe we might have it
tomorrow. We have to write a report to incorporate the
registration information.

I'm not sure ready for tomorrow, but I know from
next week forward we'll have that ready to go.

We have that information added to the files. We
haven't created anything to generate it by each one of these
what-if scenarios.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Desmond, did you say
next week?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

Should we discuss what we will do tomorrow?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: That's a good question.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I know I'm going to need
time with the legislative map to --

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Me too. And I know
Commissioner Stertz has a family issue too that I do want to
be somewhat conscious of.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Sorry to hear that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, we were -- and maybe
this should be, it's one of our agenda items, is discussion
of future meetings and future agenda items.

Is it okay for us to discuss that now, legal
counsel?

It's okay if I discuss future agenda items and
meetings now, if we jump ahead to that?

So we can -- it kind of ties into this whole, what
we're going to ask our mapping consultant to do.

So tomorrow's agenda is pretty much the same as
today's.

The only additional items was Mr. Bladine was
going to provide some more detail on the budget.

Oh, he's right there.

And also the transparency issue discussion.

RAY BLADINE: I believe that's the only two items
that are different than this agenda.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, can I suggest
that we have a work study day tomorrow? I think we had
considered leaving tomorrow open for that.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I am open to that suggestion. I don't know what that would mean legally if, you know, we're cancelling a meeting, just so that we can do our own work, or how would something like that work?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, you can cancel a meeting. You just need to post it, but it can be cancelled.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: My only concern is that there are two topics, two items, the transparency issue and the budget issue that keep being postponed. At least the transparency issue.

So I'd like to talk about it, get it over with, and see what decisions we make based on our conversation. It'll be tomorrow.

I prefer if we have it as tomorrow's starting agenda.

Now, it's understandable that it would probably be that that would be the only two topics we discussed. At least we'd get them out of the -- sort of cross them off. I would love to do that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Comments from other commissioners on that?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'd just as soon not have to come to Phoenix for those two agenda items.
I'd rather put them on for Thursday or Friday.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: That's what I was thinking I would prefer to do, for the Tucson commissioners.

RAY BLADINE: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Bladine.

RAY BLADINE: A little bird reminded me that on the director's report we also had discussion of second round public hearings and when we would start.

There could be -- that was one of the things that we had to talk about on Friday.

However, we also could ask for each of you to indicate what your preferences are and try to work something out that way.

And I did send out to you, probably all didn't see it, but this morning while you were on your way here, a revised list of the next two weeks, to try to have you look at it.

And so we can have you look at that and respond to me and then we can try to get something organized.

So I'm not saying we need to be, but that's probably a thing we need to try to solve.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is it true now that we can't all get together Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of next week; right? There were issues.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: That's correct.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So Thursday is our next opportunity, the 22nd.

RAY BLADINE: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is there a way to do a telephonic meeting tomorrow? I don't know. Can you convert a normal meeting into a telephonic one?

RAY BLADINE: I'll let the attorneys get their mic on, but we did post it as one or more. I don't know whether it needs to be posted more than that. I will let them answer.

But we have posted always that there would be a possibility of one or more commissioners would not be present at a meeting. Whether that would cover -- I would guess we'd need to have a couple people together at least in one place, so that's -- but then the meeting's already posted for -- I'm thinking out loud -- posted for Fiesta Inn.

I guess if we had some people at Fiesta Inn and then had other people calling in, that would probably work, but we'd have to have -- we'd have to go with the posted meeting and then at least have a few commissioners at that location for the start.

Am I correct, counsel?

They're nodding yes.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Now, we have the meeting scheduled for tomorrow at 9:00 o'clock.

RAY BLADINE: I believe it's 10:00 o'clock.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: 10:00 o'clock.

Would it be possible to move the location to somewhere -- you know, maybe the Evans House and have one commissioner there -- I'm happy to be there, so we can not incur the cost of the Tempe Fiesta Inn. I'm assuming we've already committed to it.

RAY BLADINE: We have committed to it, and that's the advertised location, so I don't -- I think it would be, if not legally impossible, physically you'd have to notify everyone.

We really would have to do something and start something at the Evans House, do a telephonic meeting, and then adjourn when that's done -- not at the Evans House, I'm sorry, at Fiesta Inn, and then adjourn when we're done.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I can be at the Fiesta Inn tomorrow morning at 10:00 a.m.

I'm just concerned that we need to be focusing on the maps and doing our homework on the maps and thinking about how we can looking at one another's maps and thinking about how we might be able to come together. And I think all of that really needs to be our first priority. I, you
know, I don't think Mr. Bladine needs to be -- I mean, he can put the budget or some outline of the budget, and that can be available at any time.

I think that I don't know any more about second round hearings today than I did at the beginning of this week.

I might next week once we've actually, you know, devoted a great deal of time to try to bring this congressional map to some closure and work on the legislative map to make a bunch more progress on that.

So I'm not sure how much additional information we can give you tomorrow morning that we don't have as we sit here right now.

But having said all of that, I prefer to be in the room than on the phone.

RAY BLADINE: Madam Chair, I was reminded again by the little bird that we did have one item on the agenda of having a county supervisor make some comments about mapping in the Flagstaff area.

But, again, I'm sure we can contact them and explain that we'll be more than happy to reschedule that.

I'm sorry to keep doing this to you. Every time you seem to get somewhere I throw a monkey wrench. But we can certainly make that work.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Would Mr. Stertz be able
to -- would he be able to be Skyped in if we did have a meeting?

Or, I don't know if it's possible from Mr. Stertz's end either, so -- or if would that just be telephonic or . . .

RAY BLADINE: I believe the capacity is there to Skype Commissioner Stertz in.

I believe it's on -- he has it on his machine. And if we're doing one Skype, I'm pretty sure we can do that. Much more than that I would be hesitant to comment.

But I also hear you as a Commission saying you really need more time to do your mapping studies, so, you know, the main thing that you all, as you all know, do is get a map and get it out there on a schedule that works for all of you, and that should be your priority I would think.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It is our priority for sure. I'm trying to balance that with the fact that we already have a meeting scheduled for tomorrow and whether it's worth canceling or not.

I'm wondering if by allowing the three of us, Freeman, Herrera, and I, to be at Fiesta to actually be present, and if Ms. McNulty, that way she wouldn't have to drive.

I know she said she'd rather be there in person.
But if she wanted to be change her mind on that she could be Skyped in from Tucson and then have more independent study time instead of driving time, but. . .

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'll be here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And, Mr. Stertz, what is your take on whether -- on your participation?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, there's -- it would be -- the two pressing issues that we'll have tomorrow are that we are asking -- that there's a supervisor that's making a presentation, and that we -- this would be now the third time that we've delayed the transparency issue.

Is that correct?

RAY BLADINE: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Because right now we have no changes on legislative, Willie will be picking up whatever he can pick up based on his personal capacity between now and 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.

I might make a suggestion that if it's -- if it meets with the supervisor's capacity, the -- that the issue regarding transparency be moved up to the first agenda item Thursday of next week.

I would like to be, I'd like to be here to participate rather than being phoned in.

I don't know -- this has to do with an emergency that just came up with my mother. And first -- to be
honest, my family comes first.

And if her health deteriorates, I intend to be with her tomorrow.

So that may mean that I will not be able to participate at all. My schedule will be in the hands of her health.

So, at the same time I want to actively participate in the discussion regarding transparency.

So, Madam Chair, I'll leave that up to your judgment.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, I think we should then go ahead and hold the meeting tomorrow.

We may end up tabling that agenda item again so Mr. Stertz can participate.

If there's a chance that he is able to dial in, he can, and we'll decide at that time whether or not we want to move that agenda item.

But we'll go ahead and proceed as planned tomorrow.

We probably need to talk about the following week, so the 22nd, 23rd, we're meeting, and you're looking at Wild Horse Pass, I think.

RAY BLADINE: That's correct. We have gotten a good rate there, and I believe Kristina confirmed they had the Internet access we needed, so we could do that for next
Thursday and Friday.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. And then -- so then the following week.

So that would be Monday the 26th.

I think we all agreed that we would try to hold as much time as possible open that week.

Would we want to -- can we maybe talk about our schedules then and what might be possible?

RAY BLADINE: And I did send you out a spreadsheet this morning that you can all look at and fill in if there's any conflicts you don't know about.

I didn't really have any -- I think I had one conflict in that week at this point, the 26th. My conflict was on the 26th.

So it looked like the rest of the week was -- is okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. I didn't see that e-mail.

So I -- and we'll be talking about this tomorrow too. But if everyone could come prepared to talk about when our exact meeting times might be on the 26th to the 30th, that would be great.

RAY BLADINE: Madam Chair, I'll bring copies tomorrow.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great.
Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, out of respect for Commissioner Stertz, I would not want to speak about the issue of transparency tomorrow. I think we need to table that. I would love for him to be here in person.

Even Skype or telephonic, it really isn't as productive. I've done it a couple times, and I didn't see as much value as I do being here in person, so I think the conversation needs to be with him here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

Okay. Future agenda items. Anything that we need to be --

RAY BLADINE: Again, I thought maybe we could talk about that tomorrow.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

RAY BLADINE: And I sent you my updated list. Again, I was sending it as you were probably all coming here. And I'll bring copies of that tomorrow.

But I'd ask you to just -- if you know of things that I missed, please put on that list. So I was going to use tomorrow to kind of get us back in terms of schedules and what we have going on.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

And as long as you're standing up there, do we want to do executive director's report? Is there anything
RAY BLADINE: I would -- a couple of the items we just did cover, as I mentioned.

I would mention that we have had -- Buck has been working on -- it's some technical trouble with our server and how it works and accepts public comment.

Several times Buck has thought he had it solved and it was solved and then it came back. I think right now it is solved.

But part of the solution is going to be actually moving to, we believe, a different server that can handle the capacities that we've had.

So if you have had, and we have, complaints about people not being able to leave information on the website, we're aware of it and we're trying to get it fixed.

At the same time, a number of people have tried to forward us e-mails and have forwarded us e-mails relating to communities of interest.

And I think since our web page isn't reliable to accept the data, myself, Stu, and Kristina have been getting e-mails directly.

And some of them -- it's hard to tell you how many, but there's been quite a few. I would guess my personal in box maybe had 50 or 60.

And I haven't checked today.
So we do have a lot of people expressing interest in communities of interest.

And when we can sort out, we're all sending them to Kristina to go through, and we'll let you know what those numbers are. And I think that's pretty much what is going on this week and is going on now.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Other questions for Mr. Bladine, or comments?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: If I'm not able to attend tomorrow in person, if there are any physical documents that are going to be delivered, I know we discussed having full-sized maps that Willie is going to put together, that we can make arrangements to get those to me.

RAY BLADINE: Certainly.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Now I also understand there was another three-ring binder or a couple other binders that are being prepared for us. When are those going to be ready with the current update added?

RAY BLADINE: Tomorrow. And so you're not going to come just so you don't have to carry the binders, I'll bet.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That's it.

RAY BLADINE: We'll see that they get to you.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair. Yeah, Mr. Bladine, I think it was when we talked about the update on the outreach that we've been doing for the website, through Twitter. And I would like to see if that particular update can be done at least once a week. Because I think it's a pretty useful tool that we're relaying to the public and it's one that I'd like to have updated at least once a week.

RAY BLADINE: I'm being reminded it is on my list for tomorrow to update you.

I think I have citizen input. I also have it here. But to give you the updated numbers we have for update on Twitter and Facebook, and hopefully maybe -- I don't know that we would be able to get you the number of people that have contacted us by e-mail by tomorrow.

And we are trying to keep track of that.

There -- sometimes there's a little bit of a lull in between. But whenever we start to get something significant, we'll certainly make sure you're aware.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: The phone calls that are made from the public, how are those -- are they logged? Are
they -- especially if they're making comments about a map or something of relevance, how is that information kept?

RAY BLADINE: I'll let Kristina answer in more detail.

But basically a call that asks to relate information to the commissioner, if -- we probably would first refer them to you can do that on the website.

If they don't want to do that, then I would think we would probably be taking a note and putting it in the file.

But let me ask her to verify.

She said I was right.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you so much.

RAY BLADINE: We do try to keep track of information that's directed to you versus information asking questions that were answered or things like that.

But we do document anything that someone wishes to make sure is in the file or to the commissioners.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, I do commend, again, the staff and the work that they're doing. Especially with the outreach with the public, whether it be phone calls that they accept, e-mails that they go through. It is such an important piece, and I want to commend the staff for the work that they're doing.

It is, it is vital that we, that we track that
information and record it, because we do use it when we're putting together maps. This is vital information, and I thank the staff for all the work that they're doing. Especially with these.

RAY BLADINE: Thank you, commissioner, Madam Chair.

I know the staff, all of us, enjoy working for you and feel we're doing important work, and we will continue to do our best.

I'll tell you this week poor Anna has come down with the flu, so we're one key person short. And that tells you that we're not overstaffed. We're staffed about right. So we'll be glad to get her back.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I echo that too. I just received feedback this morning from some folks, Greater Tucson Leadership, where Kristina and Ray had gone and presented on behalf of the Commission, give them information about what redistricting is all about. And they were highly complimentary of the presentation and how pleasant you both are and how much you smiled actually is what they commented on.

And I think that was neat, so thank you.

RAY BLADINE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Keep smiling.
RAY BLADINE: I try not to smile so much, but I don't think I can.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Anything else from other commissioners on the executive director report?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Get your flu shots.

RAY BLADINE: Amen.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's right.

Okay. Thank you.

Just going back, looking at the agenda, we have the legislative grid map based on constitutional criteria if there's anything to discuss there, but I'm not sure there is.

It says item five, discussion and possible action on retaining a voting analysis expert we covered already. That occurred a few meetings ago, but it's been on here because of posting requirements that we have 48 hours in advance. We wanted to just cover our bases and make sure that if we needed to have more discussion or action we could.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: So, Madam Chair, so there is nothing new -- there is nothing new to report on item five; is that correct?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Not that I know of, on the voting analysis expert from legal counsel.

Do I have another old agenda?
Mr. Herrera gave me this agenda.

This is an old agenda.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I am so sorry.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: This one is for me.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I blame him.

So scratch that, for the record. Not the person, I blame him, because I still do.

The fact that the voting right person, that's an old item.

Okay. So, so, wow, this is a lot different.

So executive director's report.

Number six is legislative.

Seven, future meetings.

Eight, report legal advice. Okay. We'll wait on that before, because I want to go back to these first two, three, and four -- well, three and five on review, discussion and direction of mapping consultant regarding ideas for possible adjustments to congressional and legislative maps.

I just wondered if based on the feedback and input we received today if there's anything we'd like to talk about as a commission and/or provide to Mr. Desmond as another what-if scenario or version that we'd like to tack on.

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

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yes.

I think the information that we got today was invaluable.

I think that we should take a look at what happens on the congressional side of integrating the two maps that were delivered to us today, called the Navajo One and Navajo Two.

Tries to begin to explore what that -- how that would affect the way that we're reviewing the congressional districts.

WILLIE DESMOND: Is there a map that you would like added into?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'll leave that to your discretion.

What you'll determine after you drop it in is you'll determine some natural, natural line progressions.

WILLIE DESMOND: So, so just drop that into the original grid map.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yeah, I'd say you drop it into the original grid map and begin to adjust from there.

Madam Chair, the only reason I'm being so generic in this is because not having the opportunity to study what was just delivered to us today, what I'm am aware of is that there is some real impact to what was delivered and we
shouldn't miss the opportunity to make a full and complete study of that, as we have with the other submitted maps that we've received from other coalitions.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Agreed. And I think it was important to talk about this today, just because we have pretty much a week until we'll be discussing these again. Because I don't know if Mr. Desmond will be able to do that tonight or not, but . . .

WILLIE DESMOND: I doubt it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

We'll see.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'll try.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Now, I think we've talked about this before, where we can during this recess communicate to Willie using Mr. Bladine.

I would recommend that we continue to do that. I assume we're going to be doing a lot homework, and if something comes up, we have some great ideas, to forward them to Mr. Bladine, and there's no reason we shouldn't be sending ideas during this break.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right. And that's a great point. And I would hope that each of the commissioners will continue working on this individually and supplying any
ideas to Mr. Bladine that he can then communicate to the rest of the commissioners as well as Mr. Desmond.

WILLIE DESMOND: And I can be sending you guys these as they're developed, so you have more time to work with them.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That would be great.

WILLIE DESMOND: And not just waiting until next Thursday.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Helpful. Okay.

Any comments, anything else on congressional or legislative maps that we want to talk about?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: The next item on the agenda is number eight, report, legal advice and direction to counsel regarding attorney general inquiry and related litigation.

Is there anything that we needed to cover today?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. That takes us to call for public comment.

And I've got a few request to speak forms.

I just want to make sure.

Our first speaker -- and, again, just a reminder to speak directly into the microphone and to please spell your name for the record.
Wes Harris, precinct captain LD 6-28, from Phoenix.

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

I keep whittling -- is that better? You want me to start again?

I keep whittling away at these little concerns of mine. And if I had known cookies would be so good, I would have brought them the first time.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I'm sorry, Madam Chair, I can barely hear him.

WES HARRIS: I mentioned this last time, and I think the time before, about current maps.

If we can get -- I mean, you can get them. It would be nice if we could have them, because we're looking at a map. The ones I got today, they weren't anything similar to the ones that you were talking about this morning.

And it would go a long ways, because part of my concerns are about the ranking of community interest versus competitiveness, and community interest outranks everything I've read. And I don't pretend to be an expert on redistricting, but everything I've read on it puts it at the bottom of the list, not at the top.

And so community of interest to me is paramount.
And today I looked at a map that had P.V., Paradise Valley, separated from Scottsdale, and north central Phoenix.

And those are communities of interest. At least I live up there, so I think I can attest to that. But I don't know, that wasn't the map that we looked at today, so, or yesterday.

And, I don't know, you're doing such a great job with this thing, and it's extremely complicated.

It's like three dimensional chess.

If you can play three dimensional chess, you can do this job easily.

But not many of us can do that.

One of the issues that's missing is the geographic topographical data.

And you can spend an awful lot of time creating all these districts, and then suddenly they don't fit, because you've got a mountain or a canyon or a river or something else in the middle. And it's like the Arizona strip.

I mean, you can't get there from here.

You got to come around this way. You can't get there from this way.

So, you know, those are things that you really have to consider.
And I would urge you to do that.

The last thing I want to talk about is the relevance of LDs to CDs.

I've noticed on many of the maps that we've been privileged to get, that we see that effort with the legislative district, of course that's very important to me, and it crosses over lines with CD.

So we'll have two congressmen working within our own legislative district.

So I urge you to try to put the legislative districts within the congressional districts where at all possible.

It will make a lot easier on those of us who are in the LDs.

And I had one other item. I can't remember exactly what it was.

That's good enough for now.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Matthew Capalby from Greater Arizona Success.

Is it Capalby or Capalby?

MATTHEW CAPALBY: Actually the accent is on the pal. It's Capalby.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Capalby. Thank you.
MATTHEW CAPALBY: Again, my name's Matthew Capalby. I reside at 3070 Troxler Circle in Flagstaff, Arizona.

And I am working with a group called Greater Arizona Success which is focused on redistricting in the areas outside of the Phoenix and Tucson metropolitan areas.

Actually like to go back a couple of hours to discussion previous to the tribal presentations regarding some of the communities of interest in rural Arizona.

And to Commissioner Stertz, I can understand how it would be difficult to associate Florence with Window Rock or Flagstaff, along those lines.

But throughout my travels over the last six months, and reemphasize this point I made at a previous meeting, is there is one common consensus among rural Democrats and rural Republicans. The only thing we dislike more than each other is Phoenix and Tucson, with all due respect.

And also there is an overall consensus that they do want to maintain their rural sensitivities and communities of like interest. Especially our maps, the Greater Arizona Success maps, are reflective of recent public comment at IRC hearings, especially in Pinal County where they do want to remain rural. There is concern within, for example, Gila, Pinal, some of the adjoining
counties and such, that they may get swallowed up by an over undue influence by one of the metropolitan areas if they have to share congressional and/or legislative district with them.

So just to reemphasize our points, we're focused on the creation of two solidly rural Democrat -- or I'm sorry, or Republican, but rural congressional districts, and two -- or, I'm sorry, eight solidly rural legislative districts.

There has been overall consensus, both Republican and Democrat, to that effect. And we just want to reemphasize that point.

While it is difficult, again, to make arguments, as I stated earlier, with Florence and Page and such, there is that consensus. They want to remain and have influence in a congressional district that isn't dominated by either Phoenix or Tucson.

So I just wanted to emphasize that point.

As always, I appreciate your efforts. I know it's difficult.

And I am always available for questions or additional comments.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, could I ask
Mr. Capalby a question?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Of course.

MATTHEW CAPALBY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I know you gave us maps in Casa Grande.

Did you give us block equivalency files or map --

MATTHEW CAPALBY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: -- manipulable versions of those maps?

MATTHEW CAPALBY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And do we have the most recent versions of your maps, or have you made some changes to your map?

MATTHEW CAPALBY: Well, actually on the legislative, we've been in close contact with Mr. Gorman, from the Navajo Nation.

We are going to adjust maps due to recent discussions with Coconino County, City of Flagstaff, and the Navajo Nation, to adjust our map to include the peaks in with the Navajo Nation or the predominant tribal legislative district.

But other than that, we're not proposing any other significant changes either to the data or to the maps that we proposed with that one exception.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Thank you.
MATTHEW CAPALBY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: May I also ask you a question?

MATTHEW CAPALBY: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The submitted maps that were provided to us through the Flagstaff City Council approvals, are those the same maps that you are referring to?

MATTHEW CAPALBY: No, no. There actually are significant differences between the City of Flagstaff maps and the Arizona Greater Success maps.

And this is a point of reference, Tuesday night the City of Flagstaff voted to reconsider those maps. And we think they're going to be more in keeping with the Greater -- we're hoping at least, will be more in keeping with Greater Arizona Success maps.

Because there was some push back from some of the cities along the river, to the City of Flagstaff, to the effect that it would prevent the river communities from creating a solidly rural non-Phoenix district on the west side, if -- due to the fact that the City of Flagstaff's map included all of Yavapai County. It made it problematic.

So the City of Flagstaff is reconsidering, and we're awaiting decision this next Tuesday when they're able
to vote on it. This last session was a work session that they had.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: As a point of clarification, it was the urban Tucson -- part of urban Tucson being connected to Window Rock that I couldn't quite make the tie together on.

MATTHEW CAPALBY: Yeah, the Oro Valley connection too is a bit of a challenge.

But we were able, looking at the Voting Rights Act issues, with Hispanic Coalition's proposals, which we also incorporated in our maps as well as the Navajo Nation's proposal, we -- that was how we were able to make the numbers work.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

MATTHEW CAPALBY: At that point.

So I understand your concern and challenge. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

Sorry, Mr. Capalby, I have one more question.

So your maps address the Hispanic Coalition For Good Government issues also?

MATTHEW CAPALBY: Yes.

We, we included or adjusted our map to reflect the Hispanic Coalition's map and also the option B of the Navajo Nation's proposal.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: The one we received today.

MATTHEW CAPALBY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So NN-B -- NN2.

MATTHEW CAPALBY: NN2.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

MATTHEW CAPALBY: Yeah, we put NN2 and the Hispanic Coalition For Good Government in their proposal. So those are both reflected in the two rural proposed congressional districts.

I'm trying to cover as many bases as possible.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Thank you.

MATTHEW CAPALBY: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: I can step away now? Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think so.

Next speaker is Cathy Schwanke, representing self, from Desert Hills.

Forgive me if I'm mispronouncing.


My comments are in reference to the LD what-if map option one version five.

And the way that the new boundaries are, they place us, my town of Desert Hills, which we're not really a town. We just pretend that we are. And we're on the map.
And that's why we're a community of interest and I come to you today. But it places us into a new LD called 15, according to the option one map.

    Now, if -- I just saw this new one, option two.

    If option two places Desert Hills in with the new LD 22, then I don't have any problem.

    But, concerning option one, our rural area of unincorporated Desert Hills has much more community of interest with city of Phoenix along I-17, just going down south, or north, than such -- well, community of interest as far as like doctors, my church, the airport, entertainments, Diamondback baseball, airport I take my husband all the time to. Much more in common going down south, the way our district is presently, than what option one seems to show, causing us to be in new District 15 going east to Cave Creek, Carefree, Scottsdale, Fountain Hills, and down south towards Tempe.

    Now, I downloaded something off the Internet called commandments of redistricting criteria, and that kind of helped me form my comments so I can make them shorter.

    And some guidelines were given. It says try to avoid bizarre shapes.

    Well, option one to me is somewhat bizarre in the way that the new District 15 starts way over here by Biscuit Flat, and where I live Desert Hills, and goes way
over here, taking in Scottsdale, Carefree, Cave Creek, then south all the way down, Fountain Hills, southern Scottsdale, down to Tempe.

So to me to try and not avoid bizarre shapes, that would be something to point out.

I never go this route.

I -- closer to I-17, so it's more natural for us in my community to hop on the highway and go south.

Then as far as trying to keep the district compact and contiguous, option one is actually less compact and contiguous.

The old way was better.

Then as far as recognizing existing district boundaries, option one actually recognizes other district boundaries more than my own.

Then another point was, as far as recognizing natural and manmade boundaries, my natural manmade flow of community interaction is south along I-17, not to the east by Carefree and then east south to far away southern Scottsdale and Tempe.

Option one cuts us off from I-17 right here at Carefree Highway.

And it keeps us, Desert Hills, it keeps us in with Anthem.

And you may not know this, or realize this, but
where I live just south of Anthem, my community of Desert Hills, actually there's already a manmade boundary separating Anthem and Desert Hills where I live. There's a barbed wire fence and a security gate. There's more security here than there is on the southern border. There's signs posted every practically 10 or 20 feet, about do not cross. It says due to safety concerns, bicycle and pedestrian access will not be -- will be terminated 2009. It's only access for bus, fire, and police. So right there is a manmade boundary cutting me off from my neighbors just two streets up. And so this, this is not good then, because it puts us up with Anthem. There's already a manmade boundary. And then this option also cuts Desert Hills where I live from my southern Desert Hills neighbors. So there's a manmade boundary cutting me from my Anthem neighbors just two streets north, and then this option one cuts me from my southern Desert Hills neighbors, forcing me to go this direction which I don't even commute that direction.

So those are just things I needed to point out. Then as far as trying not to split neighborhoods, again, just to help you understand, Desert Hills is not --
that's where we live. It's a community.

It's not a real town. We pretend that we are.

The ZIP code is 85086.

We're locked in with Anthem, New River,

Desert Hills.

But, again, option one will cut -- it says not to
split neighborhoods. It actually cuts our neighborhood.

I have more access to the neighbors south of

Carefree Highway where it cuts --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

Unfortunately I can't see your map, and we'd like
to limit the comments to four minutes.

CATHY SCHWANKE: Oh, okay. And this is my last
comment, just to emphasize the point that this, option one,
and I would like to leave this map with you, but this option
one does split a neighborhood, the neighborhood of Desert
Hills along Carefree Highway.

Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Barbara Klein, president
League of Women Voters of Arizona.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, can we limit the
comments to four minutes? I think that's adequate.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure. And we have just two
more request to speak forms after Barbara, so if you go over four, it's okay.

BARBARA KLEIN: My last name is spelled K-L-E-I-N.

And, Madam Chair and commissioners, I know you're tired, and I appreciate you still listening to me. And I hope I don't put you to sleep by reading, but I'll be much quicker if I do read, so bear with me.

Amidst all the drama surrounding the Independent Redistricting Commission and the required details of redistricting, we seem to sometimes forget what lies behind it all, the real goal, or what it's supposed to be.

The general goal of districting is supposed to be to ensure meaningful representation to the greatest number of people.

That's the goal of the Voting Rights Act, to protect against racial gerrymandering.

And I don't want anybody to gasp, but racial groups and tribes of the First Nation are not actually communities of interest.

And I say that because that's a lesser designation.

They are a protected people, a federal designation. They're almost like a super community of interest.

Their concerns, as well as Hispanics, are part of
the Voting Rights Act, its concerns that must be respected to avoid racial gerrymandering.

And I know the Commission is taking this seriously.

But the second thing we have to protect against is political gerrymandering.

This is a harder thing to accomplish and harder to prove if you don't do it. But to borrow an old line, you know it when you see it.

One of the only ways to ensure that you do protect against political gerrymandering and at the same time represent the greatest number of voters is to provide the greater number of competitive districts as possible.

People express their clearest interest by the way they vote, not just where they vote.

That's why the League of Women Voters supports more competitive districts.

Under our current election system, this is the best we can do to represent the most people. It's the core of what your responsibility is about.

It's not a tagged on criteria of lesser importance.

We ask that you define competition early in the process and make sure the definition is objective, as we are aware that there are less than objective ways to count the
same thing.

Competitiveness should not be based on national waves, but on race-by-race possibilities consistently.

Consult those who can give you reliable and effective measurements -- or methods of measurements, excuse me.

It may be difficult with all the problems that are in front of you, but we ask you to remember that your real job is ensuring meaningful representation to the most Arizona voters.

Competition is one of the only ways to accomplish this.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Kelly Townsend, co-founder of Greater Phoenix Tea Party.


Greater Phoenix Tea Party is just that. It's a greater Phoenix, but we have groups in every area. So today I'm here to represent groups in the east valley.

And I may be mistaken, but I think that there's only been one meeting that you guys have held in the east valley; is that right?

I think there's only been one, and I happened to miss it.
I couldn't get to it.

So, they -- their first concern, the folks that I talked to, is that they haven't had a voice, because they -- a lot of them are working and so in 48-hour notice go over to Casa Grande or downtown Phoenix is nearly impossible for most of them.

So the request is to please schedule at least one more meeting in the east valley so that they can now comment on the boundaries and maps.

Regarding the east valley, another thing they're asking is that you honor the town boundaries.

And we are excited about the training that you're having on the 20th so that we can actually present a map to you and learn how to do that so you can manipulate it without me just drawing lines. We want to be able to present something to you.

But today I just wanted to throw something out there as an idea of congressional district and legislative district.

From what I understand on legislative districts, it has to have, am I correct, 213,000 in it, something to that effect.

The town of Gilbert is the town right now that I'm just talking with that's most concerned. And their population is 208, which is close to that amount.
And there's some county islands, and the question of what the population of the county islands is still out. I've heard anywhere from 8,000 to 35,000, so that's something you guys are going to have to tweak.

But primarily -- we understand that some of Gilbert will likely be having to come out if that's the case, if it's over the 213. But we're asking to keep Gilbert intact as a legislative district if at all possible.

And like I said last time, that one of the most obvious places would be south of the 202, in the new communities and that area, if you had to break some off.

As far as the congressional district goes, my understanding is that 710,000, and I was told down to the person, like you have an error of one, so that's going to be tough, but we did some math. Gilbert, again, 208,000, plus maybe, say, 27,000 in county islands.

Plus east Mesa. You guys had talked about you wanted Mesa Road; right?

So east of Mesa Road calculated up to 400,000, for example. I'm not sure what that difference is west of Mesa Road.

So say 400,000 east of Mesa Road.

Queen Creek and Gold Canyon and those all add up to approximately 710.

The reason why I wanted to mention Queen Creek
versus Chandler, one, you'd have to split Chandler, and
we're asking to keep as much as possible the integrity of
the towns.

But, two, Queen Creek and Gilbert have a heritage
of agriculture. And so there's a lot of interaction between
Queen Creek and Gilbert. And it's that community is almost
one.

South Gilbert especially and on into Queen Creek
is all new development, all came in in the housing boom.
And similar, whether it's the new tract homes or the
agriculture, rodeo, all that kind of thing. So that is one
community from Gilbert to Queen Creek.

Gilbert to Chandler, it's a huge divide in those
two communities. So I would say down Gilbert Road, and it's
is a little bit of Gilbert's boundaries kind of go a little
bit, I think, past Cooper Road, and it changes as it goes
south, but down to Pecos or the 202.

And then, again, Gold Canyon and east Mesa are
kind of together as well.

So we can put that map together for you if you're
interested the next time we come back when we have access to
Maptitude, I think it's called.

So that's the bulk of what I wanted to say, as far
as that goes.

I wanted to put a word in for the whole county
maps. I've been looking at that.

I was kind of concerned about the river district map that you showed last Thursday. I think it was version five. It had Gilbert, Mesa, those areas all split up into three congressional districts and even four legislative districts, which as a community out there and being part of that, like I said last week, that doesn't even feel good. That doesn't make any sense to do that.

And then, finally, I'm a little concerned about a lot of people want to communicate with you via e-mail. I didn't realize they could call you.

I wonder about the volume of your e-mails, if you're able to look at those.

And, you know, I've been encouraging everyone to come and speak, but, again, everybody has to work during these hours.

So I'm a little concerned about the integrity of e-mails getting to you on time so that you can see them, and to nail the problem with the server.

And then phone messages, I just would like to know if there's any way we can be assured that if I tell people, send an e-mail in, that you guys are going to get it and on time.

So I don't know how you can increase our confidence in that process, but that's a little concerning.
I can't tell them to do that because I don't feel comfortable that you're going to get it. So if there's any way you guys can provide to us a way to know that that is, in fact, getting to you, I appreciate it.

And I think that's it for today.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I would like to ask a question of Ms. Townsend.

The split that you talked about in Mesa, west Mesa and east Mesa, that, that particular scenario you described, the river district, I think most definitely in 7A, where did you get that information that the people from that area would be okay with that split?

THE WITNESS: I'm speaking on behalf of Gilbert. If you have to split Gilbert, if that's the direction you guys are going, then it -- you know, that was -- I was just basing it off of what you had recommended. Because we want to be about compromise.

You know, if that's what you're looking at.

And someone else had said Alma School, another person said Dobson, just in that general area. Just geographically you have the city center right there, and
then you have one side and then the other.

And so if you want, I can start putting my feelers out and see how people want to react to that idea and get some feedback.

But, again, the best thing to do is to have another meeting out there, and if you have time.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Just a reminder that, as I mentioned before, there's many ways to contact the Commission. People don't have to attend in person if they don't want to. I understand people work, but there's many ways to contact --

THE WITNESS: What's the most efficient that you're going to get it, you're sure you'll get it and you're going to see it? What would you prefer?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: You know what, should we ask Ray Bladine or Kristina?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure.

Mr. Bladine, I had a question on that too.

I am curious. If someone sends an e-mail into our website, and I know we've gotten lots of those, do they get an automatic reply that their input was received, or is there a way to achieve something like that so people know that at least the submission went through?

RAY BLADINE: Recently, because we've had a large number, I personally when I got one just said thanks for
your comment and then forwarded it on to Kristi. And Kristi Olson then puts it in the log and a copy of it in the books that you all get when you get the books.

If someone asks us to specifically e-mail something to you, then we do specifically e-mail that to you.

But I don't think that in all of the cases we send a note, you know, send it back that, yes, we have it.

But we log it and send it to you, but I'll let Kristina talk about that.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Every single e-mail that we receive through our website, I do respond to each person.

So that's what I do on a daily basis really.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great.

Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: The -- so my only concern is that I want to make sure that the people that are e-mailing us are getting a response that they -- whether it be an automatic response sent automatically when they send an e-mail to the IRC saying that your information was received and these are the steps that we'll take, I think it would be make -- be very helpful if we explain to the sender of the e-mail what we plan to do with that information.

KELLY TOWNSEND: My big concern is that you guys are getting it.
You know, I'm happy that they're going to get a response that it was received, but will you guys see it?

I can't imagine you will have time to go through all those e-mails.

So how are you -- maybe a spreadsheet that you have staff person, this person wants this, this e-mail, and then you can at a glance still, hey, we're getting a lot of comments on this issue, whatever.

Do you have any kind of system to where you're getting that feedback, or is this just going to go on the record for possibly in the future.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's something I can respond to a little bit.

We have this document management system, electronically called Catalyst, that has been helping us manage the large volumes of information. And each of the commissioners has his or her log on to access the system and can pull up, what I understand, to be any piece of submitted documentation, whether it's an e-mail, a map, whatever.

KELLY TOWNSEND: Who can pull that up, the public or you guys?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We can, the commissioners.

It's for the Commission to manage this -- all the input that we're receiving.

And then our staff has also created these large
binders of just hard copy.

And is that of everything that's in Catalyst too?

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Yes, it is.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It's the same. Okay.

So we have some huge binders, I think seven now, that we're going to be having, and we're -- they're constantly updating that information.

We get the electronic much quicker than we get the hard copies, but nonetheless.

KELLY TOWNSEND: This may be uncomfortable, but are you guys by law required to keep every single one? Because I know, like, the voting score cards or whatever have been asked -- Andy Biggs has asked for those and how to get them.

I'm a little worried, you know, so how can you convince us that everything is good, it's all going to be there, and everything is accountable?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I can't comment on that, I don't think.

So any comments on --

KELLY TOWNSEND: Are you guys legally required to keep every piece of communication from the public?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah. The records are retained as public records, so, yes, we are required.

Anything that the public is submitting, we keep.
KELLY TOWNSEND: Super. That's it.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: I still have to respond to about 50 people from late last night and this morning, so, but I did forward the e-mails to our staff, so it's going to be uploaded on Catalyst and coded, and it will be copied as well, so...

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

RAY BLADINE: My comment was normally I don't get 75 e-mails a day, or in a morning, and I have been getting that the last several days.

It's obvious some of the e-mails are from the same person more than once.

It's obvious some of the e-mails go to me and they go to Stu and they go to Kristina.

So those we are having a hard time responding to, but what we are doing is forwarding them all to Kristina to record.

I mean, sorry, Ms. Olson, Kristi Olson, to record.

And she's the one that does record them, so that all will get to you. But in the last several days with this huge influx, we have been behind in answering those.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Again, Madam Chair, I think doing the automatic response and letting people know what to expect when they send an e-mail, is probably a good idea as
opposed to having them individually respond to them.

   Unless they have questions.

   But if they're making general comments to the Commission, it would make sense if it's just a detailed -- I hate to say generic, a detailed generic e-mail that lets them know what we plan to do with this information, I think it would be very helpful.

   It will alleviate your concerns, Ms. Townsend, and hopefully your concerns and any concerns anybody else has regarding the information that they're submitting and that they're being heard and recorded. So, again, I stress the -- I stress probably doing that.

   CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

   Mr. Bladine.

   RAY BLADINE: That is what we're doing.

   When I get, when I get a letter, I write -- usually I -- depending on what it says, but I'll write back, thank you for your information, we have recorded it, and we will see the Commission gets it.

   Now, I haven't done all of those that have come in.

   If Kristina gets them off the web page, she does the same thing, but she was saying she's 50 behind, so -- and I'm sure, and I'm double check this, but when Kristi Olson gets it, she also does the same.
But if somebody says, well, I sent one in yesterday or the day before, they probably haven't gotten a response because we've been overwhelmed.

But I agree. We do try to acknowledge everything that we get in, and we -- you know, and some of them I will get more -- if somebody writes me a real letter, I will write them a real letter back.

If someone writes me a form letter, I have a little thing that says thank you for your comment and we will forward.

So I'm trying to be as responsive to the people who sent it to us as they are to us. And that does take time.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And just a clarification question, when that input does come in, e-mail, map, whatever, it gets scanned as well, and then put into the Catalyst system; right?

RAY BLADINE: And that's when I, when I get it in my personal e-mail, and this has just recently happened, I have been responding to it and then sending it to Kristi Olson.

She scans it and gets it in the book.

I think what I will start doing is just forwarding it to Kristi and let her respond and put it in the book. And that will save me a little time.
But we do want people to know that, yes, we have it, it is documented, and it will get, it will get to you. And as you pointed out, Madam Chair, you get it both hard copy and also in Catalyst that you can search.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any other questions on that topic?

I would also like to make a public service announcement.

Thank you, Ms. Townsend, for reminding me of this.

But September 20th, there will be online webinar that anyone can log into and learn about how to do mapping using the Maptitude software. And that's going to be this Tuesday evening, at 7:00 p.m., Arizona time.

And just -- is there anything new on that, on our website?

I don't see Buck -- Buck's right there.

Is there anything new, Buck, on our website regarding the URL that people can tap into to get to the webinar for Tuesday evening?

BUCK FORST: No, there is nothing new, with the exception of the blast e-mail that was sent out yesterday in regards to signing up.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So a blast e-mail went out to anybody that's logged -- that subscribed to our website.

BUCK FORST: Correct. You know, I also wanted to
comment on the public input site. Once the public actually
prints the -- either the public input form or the contact
page, there is a thank-you page that says your comments have
been received, by the IRC, thank you for your comments, have
a nice day.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's automatically
generated.

BUCK FORST: Every time it's successfully
submitted, yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great.

BUCK FORST: It's not an e-mail. It's just
another page of the website that lets them know it was
received.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Got it.

BUCK FORST: But, I mean, the page doesn't
currently have any information about how the information is
being processed.

And I'm happy to add that, if you'd like me to.
Like I said, right now it just says, your comments have been
received, have a nice day.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I think we should -- I
think it's a good idea that Mr. Herrera had of maybe just --
you don't have to go into any great detail, and we can talk
about the language, but just about what happens to their
input from there that it is scanned and put into our system.
BUCK FORST: I can do it. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We'll talk about that.

Thank you.

Okay.

We have one more request to speak form.

Mike Flannery, representing self, from Yavapai County.

MIKE FLANNERY: Mike Flannery, F-L-A-N-N-E-R-Y.

Thank you, and I'll try to be just as brief as possible.

About a week or 10 days ago I addressed you, and I stated then that you would be receiving if you hadn't received a letter from Supervisor Chip Davis, District 3 of Yavapai County, who represents the Verde Valley, who organized a joint letter from all of the communities from the quad city and the Verde Valley stating that they wanted to stay together.

I was somewhat surprised when I heard today that there was a division of those communities, and the Verde Valley wanting to go one way and the quad city another way.

So I contacted Mr. Davis' office, and, and a letter was sent to you on August 31st, attention Anna Garcia, and you should have received it.

The exception to that was that there were, I believe, three communities that had not had an opportunity
to put that before their councils at that time.

They have sent to you under separate cover letters state exactly the same thing. So in all, you've had it from all of the communities, with the exception of one, which was Sedona.

Sedona is a different community, and I don't mean that derogatorily.

They are split. They are part in Coconino County and part in Yavapai County, and so they chose not to participate in that.

So I just wanted to, for the record, make that clarification, if I could.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Anyone else from the public that I missed?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

I think that takes us to item ten on the agenda, which is adjournment. And the time is 5:24 p.m., and this meeting is adjourned. Thank you for coming.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned.)
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