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CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Good morning.

This meeting of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission will now come to order. The date is Tuesday, September 27th. The time is 9:27 in the morning.

Let's begin with the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge was recited.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We apologize for this delayed start. We were never able to get the Internet streaming going, so we're recording this and we'll post this meeting, the recording, up on our website as soon as we can.

Let's begin with the call to order.

Vice Chair Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Vice Chair Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Here.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We have a quorum.
Other folks around the room today is our legal counsel, Joe Kanefield and Mary O'Grady, our mapping consultant, Willie Desmond.

Our staff is our chief technology officer, Buck Forst, our executive director Ray Bladine, and our public information officer Stu Robinson. And I believe we have some public information coordinator folks today. Shane Shields and maybe anyone else. I'm not sure.

And then we have a court reporter, Michelle, who will be taking an accurate accounting of everything that's spoken here today. So when you do address us during public comment, please be sure to speak directly into the microphone and to spell your last name if you would so that we get an accurate spelling in the record.

So the next item on the agenda is our recurring occurring, map presentations. This is the opportunity for anyone in the public to present map concepts to us, and I think we have a couple today.

Our first one will be from Christine Bauserman, and I believe there are others coming with her. Citizens for Common Sense Redistricting.

CHRISTINE BAUSERMAN: Christine Bauserman. Christine with a c-h, B-a-u-s-e-r-m-a-n.
Can you hear me?

And they were going to pull up the map for me.

Okay. Hi. I've been here a couple of times. You've been asking a lot lately who are you and what are you -- and I can't see when it's this close.

I am a citizen here in Arizona who have always paid attention to politics but didn't really get involved until last year and I like maps. Okay?

So I got involved in this. I came to the very first meeting here. And I was more concerned -- I'm a computer programmer -- with how the mapping system would work because I would like to get into that from a technical perspective.

And I met Steve Muratore and talked all about that and how databases work, because I believe databases are the key.

So I came to the meetings and started getting into the meetings and I was doing a lot of research online. I actually have a great PowerPoint presentation about communities of interest from a Hispanic group.

And I went to an LD -- I'm a registered Republican. I voted Republican for the second half
of my life. I started out voting for Democrats. I'm kind of like Colleen. We were all young once. And I went to an LD meeting and said, hey, does anybody want to get interested in this? I went to a -- set up a meeting at a coffee shop and had 20 people show up.

Then I set up a second one. I had 17 people show up, and I just gave them the facts of here is what the Constitution says. Here are items. Here is how we define things. And people were interested in it.

So the one meeting here in Tucson I had, I was out in the parking lot and I actually had people coming up to me telling me thank you for having me come to this meeting, if you guys can believe that. The one where we sat for five hours, because they feel they are part of something important, something constitutional, and they realize that.

So just to let you know, that's kind of -- we really are just a group of people and, yes, most of us Republican.

Okay. So these maps, the congressional maps.

Yesterday Colleen came up with this map,
and I don't like this map. Commissioner Freeman stated we don't want people to look at this map and think it looks ridiculous. I think this map looks ridiculous.

Okay. Anybody down in Douglas does not want to be represented by somebody north of the Grand Canyon. I noticed if you fold this map in half, you have almost one whole area in this map.

Another point of view on it is if you look at the representation, a congressman goes out to D.C. for three days and flies back. You have one whole day of travel going from here to D.C.

Where are they going to live? If they live in Pinal County, are they going to go ever to Sierra Vista, which is what, a five- or six-hour drive? Are they -- if they live up in Flagstaff, are they ever going to go to Sierra Vista? I don't think it works.

The point of view about the rural people being split up -- and I understand this is really difficult for you guys because I have played for hours with these maps where you have this little map and you're trying to put 2,000 people there and you click and it takes this chunk and it's 200 people and your chunk -- and you have this blob and you
I still need 2,000 people. And that's a problem in this state because of its size.

I went to a thing one time with school bus routes where they were begging don't pass a state law on school buses because we live up here where we have three-hour routes and we're going to have to incur an expense that we don't have. And the same thing kind of applies to you guys.

There's not a lot. You are going to have big rural districts no matter what you do, but that doesn't mean you want to group them all together. And Commissioner McNulty said that yesterday.

You know, I was up in Casa Grande one time there was a guy who was from out in the rural area but he was in there for the job. And a lot of our towns are people who are from rural areas. And I've made that point before where I know a lot of people who live in Sierra Vista but they live in Pima County but they have ranches in Sierra Vista just because that's where their jobs and schools are.

So I don't necessarily think that means that the rural people all want to be together. And then I wonder how much representation they will have because they will just be sitting in a seat in
congress because they will have no power of any sort.

At this point, I think you guys have created every conceivable version we can have of a map. All right? I hear Strategic -- and I'm a mapper and I know the data. I hear Strategic Telemetry one time looking at you going I think we already have this.

Okay. Yesterday when Commissioner Stertz asked to put Santa Cruz -- I'm sitting on my computer at home and having multiple screens scrolling through the map. Hey, I find, it's there in version 6d or something. We have created that.

So at this point it's almost like you guys need to lay it out all of these maps and figure I want this, this, and this. Like, you know, the chairwoman said, let's get one map and fight over the lines. But we need to do it.

So with all of that said, I like river district 7a. I have looked at this data and looked at this data. This is the best we are going to get. I personally approve river district 5. We have seven solid Republicans and two Democrats. If you guys want to give me a gift, that would be my gift.

I don't think it would make it through
court. I mean, realist -- there's political realities and there are realities here, and that map isn't going to make it through court. But that map -- I think we should actually go between 5 and 7a because of Pinal County.

We have a seat because of Pinal -- and not just Pinal County. When I started this, the very first meeting I ever came to, I went and put on an LD map how many people you got to lose and how many people you got to gain.

It's pretty obvious that all of this comes from the center of Arizona. All of our growth is the center. They deserve a seat. That's where everybody is moving and that's where the future is going to keep moving.

All of the numbers need to be -- it's Gilbert. It's this whole area. It's just like carve them out an area. And you guys kind of did that on 5 and somehow you swung around some different things and ended up with this other map, but at least on this map Pinal County is mostly intact.

I think if you talk to most people in Saddlebrooke/Oro Valley, they want to be in Pinal County. That's where the seat of power is going to
1 be. That's where your people are going to be.

2 I also believe legally 7a has got the
3 best chance through court.

4 If I am -- I am capable, because I'm an
5 engineer, of stepping back with no emotion and
6 making analyses of people and of businesses. This
7 map has shown a progression from day one where when
8 they put this in court and they get all of this
9 stuff, all of the hours of stuff, they are going to
10 show step by step by step progression.

11 Do we need to still fight to make some
12 changes? Yeah. You know, we want to be really fair
13 in three borders. Yuma deserves a border going down
14 that highway that they want. I think that would
15 help the Hispanic community because it would give
16 them a voice, it would give them a vote. It would
17 free them to vote and not feel they are under the
18 power of the cartels.

19 If you want to do something for the
20 Hispanic people, that's what America is about. And
21 I care about the Hispanic people. I have a -- my
22 goddaughter's mother is from Nogales and I get
23 together with their family and I would like her to
24 have a vote.

25 But I think that would be fair and the
Pinal County would be fair.

I like the CD 1 on this. I'm from CD 1.

Okay. Anyway -- so that's it.

The legislative maps.

Oh, here was another point I realized yesterday. Here is grid map 1. Your new map from yesterday looks like a revision of grid map 1.

So please don't tell me we're going to go through all of this now again with grid map 1.

First of all, constitutionally you were supposed to vote on a grid map and you did, 2.

So to go back to 1 is what this looks like. You know, that just doesn't seem right. And like I said, 2 we have every possible scenario. It's like a tree. We have the thorn from there, we have the branches.

Legislatively, again -- and I have a lot of people speaking with my group. And this goes back to the issue of Cochise County saying they didn't want to be split up. If you're from Phoenix, Cochise County previously in LD 30 was split down the middle with Sierra Vista, the city.

So when they came to you saying we don't want to be split up, they meant they didn't want to be split down through the middle legislatively. And
you guys are kind of applying that to the congressional and they are going to come speak to that, too.

Because I called some people I have down there and this word is spreading. I'm, like, hey, do you guys want to be with Eastern Pima County or do you want to be with Grand Canyon.

We are more like that, but that is what they meant by that. They seriously did. They want to be intact as a community.

So I like -- most of these legislative maps are pretty good for me. And like I said, I have a lot of people, it's just -- you know, look at the communities of interest that we've defined a lot in that area.

I said that the one time I saw a change was made where -- like that little part of Santa Cruz that Sonoita/Elgin, they really -- the mountain is there. You might not know that and they belong over there. Rita Ranch, that whole little Eastern Pima County.

I noticed Rita Ranch has been cut out and that was one of those things where they should have fought the city for annexing it because it doesn't belong there.
So anyway, now I have a bunch of people who are going to speak after me. Who is going to go first? Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

And if you would state your name and spell your last name for the record.

GLENN LUNDELL: Good morning. My name is Glenn Lundell. That's Glenn, with two n's, and the last name is L-u-n-d-e-l-l.

I live down in Green Valley.

A little tough act to follow because mine is much simpler than this, and I think because -- I'm fairly new to the process myself. I've lived in a whole bunch of states. And the reason I happen to support the idea of community of interest is because that's what I've looked for whenever I've lived in different places. That's what I did when I came here.

I retired when I came to Arizona. Moved to Green Valley. I've done a lot of different things and all kinds of industries and government. But I was looking for something where I was living where a community had something where it meant community. And I found that in Green Valley.
Green Valley recreation is roughly the boundaries of Green Valley. So we have all of these things. And this ties into Sahuarita as well because that town, of course, grew and grown and has grown and probably will grow. But it lives in the same millieme, you might say as far as the people from Green Valley because educationally, the Continental School District, which is Green Valley, feeds into the Sahuarita School District for high school and things. All of this ties in. The chambers of commerce have joined together. So it gives a community of interest that falls in there.

The different social service organizations, private and nonprofit, ones are tied in and most of them are based in Green Valley and have been there but they serve the entire community. So it creates a community of interest that way. That's why those things are important to me.

As a matter of fact, this has extended itself all the way over into the areas to the east of there because as Sahuarita extended, many of us do things that go into that area.

Further, as far as just one last thing as far as the Green Valley community of interest, the Pima County supervisors were considering splitting
up Green Valley. After they looked at it and heard from the people, they went back and put it back together again as far as the district that feeds Green Valley.

So it looks like others have looked at that same thing. And it just is the most important thing to me, and that's why I'm speaking here.

I'm fairly new to it. I'm one of those that happen to show up at the meeting Christine was calling them and I got interested in this because I saw a whole bunch of things that were starting to disturb me as far as how it might break up.

So I go along with what she said. I looked at what Christine had to say before me and I certainly concur with that and thanks very much for the opportunity to speak.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you for coming.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Just for clarification, is this the same group that's --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, this is all part of Citizens for Common Sense Redistricting.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: All right. I
KATIE MILLER: Good morning. I am Katie Miller from -- M-i-l-l-e-r. I am from St. David in Cochise County, and I've worked very closely with the representatives down there when they were running for election. And the fact that we have two representatives that live four miles from each other and are in two different legislative districts within the same county is a bit ridiculous.

I agree with Christine in that we don't want -- we want to be -- Cochise County to be complete and compact but we also understand that we need to have population pulled from Eastern Pima. But I do not want my representative having to cover from Southern Arizona all the way to the northern border. That is just a bit out of whack, as far as I'm concerned.

We want our communities of interest to be together. Eastern Pima, including J6 -- J6, Mudscow, Rita Ranch, Vail School District. It also doesn't make sense to split up a school district when you are talking about representation because then it just makes a whole other ball of wax.

So we want to be compact and have communities of interest in the same area, and that
does not include Flagstaff and Grand Canyon.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

WILLIAM SOBECK: Good morning. My name is William Sobeck, first time here, and I live in Corona de Tucson, a community.

I'm very concerned about community of interest because on the LD 30 as we are now, I got one map that actually cuts off 50 houses which are at the end of Houghton Road and splits our community. We have a gas station, a couple barber shops, we got our post 109 down there, and you've taken it.

And the back end of the mountains, they are in another legislative district and it gets very confusing for these people.

We run all the way out to 83. Those people out there are in the rural community but we are all together. We all shop probably up at Fry's, which is in Rita Ranch. It's 13 miles up the road, no matter how I drive, to get to the store for groceries.

A lot of what I'm seeing here -- the 7a map is actually -- I agree with Christine on that. That works for me. I can't speak for everybody. We
I have -- as of last night I counted the maps. There's 41 maps as of August 31st. After the three today, we're up to 45.

I used to work in engineering. This is to me getting extremely confusing. It would be great if the board could come up and pick five maps to work from and we can do adjustments to them. But as it stands right now, every day it's another set of maps. This one moves and that one moves. I don't know which maps you've selected to actually use.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

MARGARET BURKHOLDER: Hello. My name is Margaret Burkholder, and I'm the president of the Vail School District governing board.

Thank you so much for allowing me to come and speak with you today.

I had spoken with Christine about these and she asked that I come and speak with you and share the school board perspective.

School boards, especially outside of Pima County and Maricopa County, define communities. Community is based on, you know, who is your football team and who are you playing on Friday
nights. That's how we define community.

And looking at some of these maps, I'm concerned when my community of the Vail School District is we're looking at having two different representatives representing our community.

So when we speak of communities of interest, I really think it's important to look at school districts and how they are governed.

And from a pragmatic perspective, I'm elected at large. I have to represent all families within my I think thousand-square-mile border of our district and I'm responsible for everybody in that district and I have to get to those.

So looking at this congressional map where you have the Grand Canyon down with Douglas, how could one person possibly represent that community well? I'm not sure they could.

So when you're looking at the maps, I ask that you consider communities of interest, especially school districts and those in rural communities, that you keep those communities together.

And a little bit about me. Grew up in Cochise County, so an Army brat there and Fort Huachuca. That's a whole lot more in common with
Southeast Pima County and Cochise County. There's a lot in common.

So if Cochise County wants that solidarity, I don't think they would mind bringing in some of us from Southeast Pima County. But that's a lot of camaraderie between those counties.

So thank you very much for allowing me to speak.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

CHRISTINE BAUSERMAN: Did you have guys any questions for the me?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any questions for the group?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, Christine, if you don't mind talking about who makes up part of your group. Because I want to see -- I mean, we always talk about the people who come in support of a map, but I want to know who are these individuals and.

CHRISTINE BAUSERMAN: I started at a LD 30 meeting, which is a very legislative meeting on the east side of Tucson. And like said, I just went there and made an announcement and actually had a
piece of paper and people wrote down their e-mails
and I e-mailed them with where the place and time
was going to be.

And like I said, the first meeting had 20
people show up and the second meeting had 17
different people show up.

And then there's been a core that has
kind of grown from that, and it's been mostly a
social media, like e-mailing.

So they are just -- a lot of them are
PCs, a lot of them aren't. And they are friends of
friends.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair,
follow-up question.

The makeup of Common sense Redistricting,
are they mostly Republican, Democratic?

CHRISTINE BAUSERMAN: I would say mostly
Republican.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: And they support
river district, that version 7a?

CHRISTINE BAUSERMAN: Well, we don't want
like a hundred percent support it.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Sure.

CHRISTINE BAUSERMAN: I think that's the
map that makes the most sense on the data. It's
fair. It gives competitive districts, it gives solid Republican districts and solid Democrat districts. And overall, the data is the best data.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Now, have you taken a chance to look at other ones?

CHRISTINE BAUSERMAN: Yes, I have looked at them. Everyday that you guys create them, I'm at home and I pull them up and I look at the data and I Google them and I look at the lines. And it's mostly for Southern Arizona.

How Phoenix -- the exact lines -- and that was my point is let's start there and fight over the lines. Let's have a good battle. You guys are kind of getting good at that. Move those lines where we want them. But to me, that's a good start.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I appreciate that.

CHRISTINE BAUSERMAN: I bet you do.

Any other questions?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much. Our next speaker is Richard Lunt, Greenlee County Supervisor, representing Eastern County Organization.

RICHARD LUNT: Good morning. Richard Lunt. L-u-n-t.

Boy, I don't envy you guys. Everybody
comes up here is going to have a different opinion.

   Of course, we feel -- and we've
introduced a concept to you last Thursday of the two
rural districts and then the rest in metro
districts. And mainly yesterday you asked Tommie
Martin to -- how competitive these were and so you
should -- each of you should have received a
handout. And we listened. We took our consultant
back and you're going to find they are pretty equal.

   In fact, the -- our plan provides for two
rural districts. Districts 4 and 5 provides for
seven metro districts: Districts 1, 3, 3 -- 1, 2,
3, 6, 7, 8, 9, has two Hispanic districts --
majority districts of District 2 and 7 and has three
border districts, one of which is rural, District 5
and 2, which are metro District 1 and 2.

   There's less than 1 percent of the total
population deviation among all districts.

   Both the rural and five of the metro
districts are competitive. That is the Independent
vote could swing each district either Republican or
Democrat.

   The Hispanic majority districts are more
heavily Democrat but still with a sizable
Independent influence, sufficient to make them
competitive using the registration as a measure of competitiveness. And that's what you asked for yesterday and that's what we provided.

We believe and our consultants believe that our proposal of the Eastern County's Organization, it will pass the six criteria, which you are -- need to meet to be constitutionally valid. And so we've done a lot of the research for that.

I know your time is precious. You know, as far the size, you know, each of the rural districts should not be a problem. Four district -- District 4 is less than 400 square -- 40,000 square miles while District 5 is 60,000 square miles.

These areas are one-tenth of the size of Alaska, which has one representative; one-third the size of Montana, which has one representative; and one-half the size of Wyoming. All of these states have a single congressional district.

We believe in the congressional representative equity for both the rural and the metro areas of Arizona.

And once again, thank you very, very much for your time and I'm open for questions.

We are listening and that's why we
provided the information on the competitiveness that
you asked for yesterday from Supervisor Tommie
Martin.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any questions?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Mr. Lunt, just so
I'm clear, this information goes with the map that
Supervisor Martin gave us yesterday?

RICHARD LUNT: Yesterday.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And do we have
that Mr. Desmond?

RICHARD LUNT: You should. We introduced
it.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: We probably don't
need it up right this second. I just want to make
sure that you have everything you need so you can --

WILLIE DESMOND: I have to check with
Buck. They said they gave him files yesterday. I
just have to print -- I'm not sure if it's the block
equivalency or just the printout. I don't know if
we have the ability to load it into Maptitude yet.

RICHARD LUNT: We did send that to you
last Thursday and then -- yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: I thought yesterday's
was a new version, though.
RICHARD LUNT: No, that is it.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: And we'll get that loaded up then.

RICHARD LUNT: Sorry about the confusion. I was under the understanding that you had all of that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

RICHARD LUNT: Once again, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much. I think that concludes anyone talking about specific map presentations.

So the next item on our agenda is agenda item 3, which is review, discussion, and direction to mapping consulting regarding the development of a congressional draft map based on constitutional criteria.

And I believe Mr. Desmond did some additional work in the dark of the night because I received an e-mail at 4:23 in the morning from him. I think we all did.

WILLIE DESMOND: So for today we have three additional congressional maps.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: There are two changes to
the whole counties maps that Commissioner Freeman
had asked for. The first of which dealt with
reconfiguration of the districts in Maricopa County,
changing what was version 6e into 6f to split that
district in more of a north/south as opposed to an
east/west. Or no, to split it into an east/west
from more of a north/south using State Route 87 as
kind of the border there.

And then additionally there is a 7e,
which is also based on 6e but changed around the
borders of District 4, you know, the kind of rural
western district so that it didn't dip into as much
of some of the towns in Maricopa County as much.

Then there's also revisions to river
district 7a kind of all around the state. And that
is now version 8a.

So I would be happy to go into any one of
those, whichever you guys would like first.

Commissioner Freeman, would you prefer --
do you want to look at both of them right away or 6f
first or 7e first?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I'm glad Mr. Desmond
got these revisions put together and I'm glad I've
I got the printout, but I can tell you I was up late and early in the morning trying to work on the map you threw out yesterday.

So I'm going to file these away for now. If we need to go back to them, great, for future reference, but I don't need to look at either one of them. I would rather focus on the donut map at this point.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So then I guess we'll go to the river district 8a.

Commissioner Freeman, if you want to explain your criteria --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Herrera.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm sorry. Commissioner Herrera, I'm sorry, if you want to explain your criteria or else I could go through the --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: If you don't mind going through.

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

So starting with river district 7a, the map that was just up on the screen earlier, I was asked to move the Fort McDowell and Salt River Indian communities -- let me bring it up.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, that would be good.
WILLIE DESMOND: Again, this will be up on the website today, I think as soon as Buck is able to get online at all.

All right.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: This is river district version 8a.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Congressional, right.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Congressional.

WILLIE DESMOND: So the first direction was to move all of the Salt River and Fort McDowell Indian communities along with all of Carefree and all of the city of Scottsdale north of Chaparral Road into District 4.

Next we moved Apache Junction and San Tan Valley and some of the areas east of that along with Gold Canyon.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: If you don't mind going over the criteria because I think Mr. Stertz had a good point trying to explain when we made changes to our proposed maps that we focus on the six criteria.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And, Mr. Desmond, before you go on in step one, I just want to make the comment that the reason for that change was that the Fort McDowell community had requested to see a map that put the Fort McDowell community in the Salt River Indian Community with north Scottsdale and they also wanted to see a map that put those communities with South Scottsdale. So what we were trying to do was create two versions for their benefit.

WILLIE DESMOND: So going back to step one -- and I'm just going to read the criteria as they were sent to me.

This move will make Scottsdale only split into one district and be divided north and south at Chaparral Road. Will also ensure that the Fort McDowell and Salt River Indian communities are with the majority of Scottsdale and Fountain Hills, which was their desire.

Step two --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I'm sorry -- I'm sorry to interrupt again, but just to clarify, they hadn't made a decision about that yet. They had just wanted to see it displayed in the two different ways. I don't think their leadership has reached a
conclusion about which way they would prefer, if either.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Commissioner McNulty is correct. I probably should have worded it differently. It was a version of a map that they wanted to see.

WILLIE DESMOND: Step two was to move Apache Junction, the census tracts east of San Tan Valley into District 4 also make the census place of Gold Canyon whole inside District 4.

This move -- this will move all of the suburban areas in Pinal County into one district and will add 23,000 people from District 5 to District 4.

Criteria here was mixed. Apache Junction, Gold Canyon and similar tracts to the east whole inside of a district rather than being split.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Just a quick clarification or adding on that Apache Junction and Gold Canyon and the other tracts that were put together and made whole, it is a community of
interest and we wanted to keep them together as opposed to splitting them. So it goes to communities of interest.

WILLIE DESMOND: Let me grab one that has a clip.

All right. Next was to move the Gila River Indian Community from District 6 to District 5. This will leave the district -- this will leave District 5 short and District 6 short as well.

This will create one less split of Pinal County and increase the American Indian percentage in District 5.

Now, the criteria here is it adds rural population in District 5 and also adds another tribe to the district.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Again, clarifying that this is something that the Navajo and the other tribes wanted, to increase the Native American population in that area. So it was to accommodate their request.

WILLIE DESMOND: The next step was to move northwestern District 6 boundary north of Thomas west to Central Avenue and 7th Avenue along
District 7's border and take it north until approximately Northern Avenue. District 6 will now be fully populated and District 9 will be underpopulated.

The criteria here is this will give District 6 equal population while moving in common areas of Arcadia east and Central Phoenix together.

Step five was to move the remainder of Oak Creek and the remainder of Cornville into District 5. This community is currently split between Districts 4 and 5. The remaining people should even out District 5's population.

The criteria here is this will make the two towns whole within District 5.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Again, talking about communities of interest and keeping them whole as opposed to splitting them.

WILLIE DESMOND: Step six was to move the remainder of Oro Valley into District 5 and the Catalina Foothills and Casas Adobes whole into District 1 and keep Catalina whole within District 1.

Next was to remove the remainder of
Graham and Greenlee Counties into District 5. These changes give District 5 and District 1 close to the ideal value.

This will make Oro Valley and Catalina Foothills and Casas Adobes whole within their respective districts. This will also make Graham and Greenlee Counties whole within the District 5.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So, Mr. Desmond, do you mind just for this hometown crowd, just drilling down into where that dividing line is in Tucson?

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thanks.

WILLIE DESMOND: So that's the whole census place.

I'm happy to go into Tucson a little bit more closely.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure.

What's that line, the east/west line in Tucson that goes straight across? Just wondering what street that is.

WILLIE DESMOND: It is Grant Road.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Grant.

And then you can come out.

So then follow Grant Road just east and tell us where it goes south and then jogs over.
WILLIE DESMOND: Sure. It goes south at North Tucson Boulevard and goes back east at Speedway Boulevard. It dips back south then at Country Club Road. Follows Country Club Road until it hits 22nd Street. Goes east again until it hits Alvernon.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Alvernon.

WILLIE DESMOND: Alvernon. It's very small. It goes south -- I'm not sure what -- that's not really following a road. This must be an unincorporated area.

If anyone knows -- it goes south until it hits Irving Road. Comes back west and hits South Alvernon again.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Then it follows I-10, it looks like. I'll zoom out a little bit. Follows I-10 for a ways and then goes back west at Los Reales Road and then it goes south not on a road just kind of what's probably a census tract or census block dividing line.

A slight jog at Southwest Gas Road and then south on South Swan Road until Old Vail and then goes back west on Old Vail until Country Club again in which case it goes south until some point.
here where it goes over, not on a road, then it goes around the border of Sahuarita.

   Let me zoom out again to give you a little reference to where that is. Then it just follows the border of Sahuarita. Pretty much the border of Green Valley but not entirely.

   CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

   WILLIE DESMOND: South around the bottom of Green Valley. Splits Elephant Head and then keeps all of Santa Cruz in that district, which is the District 2, which is a majority-minority district.

   Did you want to see, like, the northern split or is that --

   CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure, just to get a sense of how far north it's going.

   WILLIE DESMOND: So then District 1 --

   let me zoom back out.

   So District 1 is everything to the east of that line. All of Casas Adobes and all of Catalina and then everything else east along with all of Cochise County.

   District 2 is everything west of that line going all the way up into -- into Maricopa in order to create the voting rights' district over to
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And then District 5, which is the -- kind of the western rural district picks up in Pima County. It picks up Oro Valley, Marana and groups that with Oracle and Saddlebrooke and that goes all the way north up with all of Graham, all of Greenlee, all of the Apache and Navajo, Gila, and Coconino County. Then the only other place that gets population is it takes a little bit from the corner of Yavapai, which is I believe just Sedona and then a little bit from Mohave to accommodate some of, like, the Pai tribes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

Moving on on criteria, then, step 7 was to fill out District 9's population by taking the western boundary through District 8's portion of South Glendale and Peoria to pick up the entire town of El Mirage but leaving Sun City in District 8. In other words make up the number of people to balance the population by picking up El Mirage, parts of Glendale and Peoria while ensuring that Sun City remains in District 8.

The criteria here, where this will make District 9 within 1k or so of people from the ideal
population and add more areas of South Glendale and Peoria into the district along with El Mirage, which has similarities with other parts of the district.

Step 8 was to use -- or all of the districts except for District 4 and District 8 should be close to the ideal value. Use Grand Avenue/US 60 as a way to split District 8 east and west.

Move the western portion, roughly 182,000 people, into District 4. Take the remainder of District 8 and all of District 4 portions of Pinal County, San Tan Valley, Queen Creek, Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, and all of the Maricopa County portions of Districts 4 that is east and south of Maricopa, Cave Creek, Scottsdale, Fountain Hills, New River, and Fort McDowell and Salt River Indian communities.

The criteria here is this change will improve the compactness of District 4 while also improving its conception as a western Arizona district.

This change also keeps most of Scottsdale and Fountain Hills inside of District 8 with the Fort McDowell and Salt River Indian communities. It also connects areas of North Phoenix, Cave Creek,
and Carefree with similar areas where areas of
similar growth in suburban Pinal County.

And those were the criteria I used.

I did have one question. I followed the
directions as best I could. And I'll ask on -- you
didn't mention Anthem as a part that should be
included in 8. When I added it, it made the
population very close, so it seemed like a natural
-- otherwise, the line would have jogged around
Anthem. So I think that was probably intended but
maybe just left out.

The one question I had is there is a
slight population imbalance, about 7,000 people,
that I didn't want to correct without asking how
that should happen.

So if you look -- District 5 is about
7,000 people underpopulated. District 6 is about
7,000 people overpopulated.

The easy way to do that would be just to
have 6 give some directly to 5, because they do
touch. However, if you don't want to split -- you
know, if you don't want 5 to go into Chandler or
into Maricopa, you could probably pick it up
somewhere else farther west and then transfer that
population over. So I wasn't sure how you wanted to
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: This is the first time I've seen this revision, so what I would like to do is I'll look it over in a little more detail probably tonight and maybe I'll be able to send you the stuff you need probably by tonight if not by tomorrow morning.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. And it isn't like a major population. I mean, if you just -- if you took this little portion of Ahwatukee or something that's right north of the Gila Reservation, I'm sure you can make up the population just in this little wing or something.
But if you didn't want to -- if you wanted to keep 5 completely out of Phoenix, then you would have to go somewhere else probably.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Just a couple more highlights.
I wanted to follow Commissioner Freeman and his whole counties map and this particular map has nine counties that are unsplit. Two of them --
three of them are in two districts and three of them
are in three or more districts.

So it's pretty similar, again, to the
whole counties map. And this particular map creates
two majority-minority districts at the
53.49 percent, which is above the benchmark for
number 2 and one at -- number 7 -- District 7 -- at
60.25, which again, is over the benchmark.

And in terms of competitiveness, which
we're not quite done yet, but this particular
version creates three solidly Republican district
over 60 percent and two solidly Democrat districts.
Three pretty competitive districts and we are trying
to work with 9 trying to make 9 competitive as well.
So our goal is to create four competitive districts
out of this map.

And again, this map was based on a
coalition of Hispanic Coalition. The Native
American tribes, I think based on NN1, if I'm
correct, said they -- what they ended up doing in
this particular version is trying to increase the
Native American population for this particular map.
That kind of accommodates their request.

So what I would like to do going forward
is change the name of this map -- and I know it's a
small step, but I would like to do that by calling it the river district/Navajo Nation proposal version 8a going forward, if we can do that. I know it's a little long, but I definitely want to recognize the importance of the Navajo Nation and wanting to accommodate their interests and their desires to be in a rural eastern district with as high population as Native American as possible.

WILLIE DESMOND: If you send me the changes for balancing the population, I'll change the name then.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Perfect.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Desmond, could you take a look at population densities? I'm trying to -- I'm looking at the areas of Coolidge, Casa Grande, and Maricopa and the areas of Marana, Casas Adobes, Oro Valley, Saddlebrooke, and Oracle. The two areas that are crossing over the Pinal and Pima border and the areas of Pinal County to try to get an understanding of the population density in those two areas.

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

If you'll just bear with me for a moment.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: At the same time will you be able to look at registration simultaneously or is that another layer you'll have to turn on?

WILLIE DESMOND: I don't know if I have registration loaded up right now.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So it's a scale where anything that is --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: What I'm looking for is if you capture those areas and created just a general block and not some sort of a range of definition of density but how many folks are living in the areas that are touching out of this very large district, how many people are living in an extension of rural -- excuse me, an extension of urban Tucson including Marana, an extension of urban Casa Grande and an extension of urban Phoenix that are touching this district?

I'm trying to find out how many folks are coming into the rural district that are actually part of the urban expansion population.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. From District -- in District 5, which is that eastern rural district, from Pima County comes about 12.78 percent of that
total district is from Pima County. So Marana, Oro Valley make up about 12 or 13 percent of the district. From Pinal County comes about 26 and a half percent of the district.

So I guess those two would be, you know, about 29 -- or 39 percent of the district comes from Pima or Pinal.

I can look specifically at some of the areas of Pinal because I know there are more -- if you look at Coolidge and Maricopa, I can tell you those.

Pinal -- Casa Grande makes up 17 percent of the district. Maricopa makes up 14 percent of the district and Florence makes up 12 percent of the district. Saddlebrooke makes up 4.6 percent and Coolidge makes up 4 percent.

So the majority of the Pinal population is from those five areas.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And of Maricopa?

WILLIE DESMOND: Maricopa County makes up just a tiny fraction. Of the total district, it's .35 percent. So about half a percentage of the district is from Maricopa County.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So you're at about 40 percent of the overall --
WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, somewhere around there.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Rural district is 40 percent of it is actually touching urban centers?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, it's touching Pima and Pinal County. I don't know if that's urban or rural.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Thank you.

One of the advantages of this configuration I think is that in District 5, we have several population hubs and I probably will leave something out, but just in brief, we have the Northern Arizona Flagstaff area, we have the Native American areas, we have the Interstate 10 kind of southeast area here that includes Northern Pima County and Pinal County which does have increasingly issues in common and then we have the copper corridor areas.

So although it is a large district geographically, there are a number -- four at least significant communities that comprise it.

So I think that's helpful in terms of
representation -- or would be helpful in terms of representation because you don't have just a series -- just a huge area with a -- what you have instead is some things that tie hubs together within it. And I like that about this.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: And another point, this particular version of the map with District 5 creates a pretty competitive district. So whoever is elected in that particular district would have to really be representing everyone in that district, not just a certain group, because it is competitive and with some changes, we could make it even more competitive.

So whoever is elected would represent both -- all of the hubs, as Commissioner McNulty described, and would represent them well because he or she would have to in order to get reelected.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Mr. Desmond, would you focus in on the urban Maricopa County area on that map?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.
VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Maybe out just a little bit.

Could you turn the census places on?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

Is there a specific area you want to me to zoom in on?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, can you change the color of the district lines so they stand out more?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

Did that look all right on the screen?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: It's still tough for my eyes.

WILLIE DESMOND: Let me make it thicker, then.

Is that better?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: So it looks like we still have -- North Peoria is cut off here, North Phoenix is cut off, Sun City, Surprise is cut off.

Could you change and just color code the proposed districts? No need for census places.

Here is something else. This district here, District 8, has a compactness problem. That does not appear compact to me.

And as we've seen, it kind of just lumps
together these northern stretches of these various towns as it travels across the top here and then plunges down to get San Tan Valley. That's a concern as well.

I know it was said communities of interest were respected and I suppose anyone could make an argument probably about anyone -- anything being a community of interest, but I recall in various hearings and based on my own experience living virtually my entire life in the Valley is there is a strong tie between the I-17/Carefree/Cave Creek and the North Valley, and that's being severed there. There's also a strong sort of West Valley presence as well that's carved up a little bit.

So, I mean, I have some concerns about that. I think my intent, based on our hearing yesterday, was to try to move forward on a common map. So I did invest some time, but if that's not the direction we're going to go, maybe I should go back to my whole counties map because I did put a lot of time in on that developing that map and it was looking pretty tight and pretty good, in my opinion.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, I would say, no, that's not the direction I want like to go. I
would like to get to one map.

   So my hope is that we can all work off of one. This is why we created -- I created this one yesterday, and I know it's not fully formed yet, but the hope was to take the best elements of all of these maps that you guys have been working on. And granted, we can't do it all but I'm trying to incorporate as much as I can into one map so that we can all start to work off of one map and move lines accordingly then, you know, as appropriate.

   And we're trying to get to one draft map so that we can then take that out to the public for comment. And so it's not going to be the final map that we take out on this second round of hearings, it's going to be a draft map. And we need to get that draft map completed. And the only way I see doing that is if we are working off of one map so that we can start to make those minute adjustments as necessary to incorporate so that we're not splitting a community of 50 homes off the end of Houghton Road and things like that. And we can only do that once we get to one map.

   So to -- I really appreciate Mr. Herrera's work on the river district version 8a, but I am hopeful that we can start to bring that
into another map, the one I created yesterday, and see if we might be able to come to some agreement, at least on where the common features are.

We all know there's that center that still needs to be filled in, and it sounds like Mr. Freeman is working on that piece and others may be as well, but I'm happy to start to take elements of what you guys have created and put that into that center. And there's a lot of flexibility there.

As we know, District 4 on that bagel map is short 200,000 people and the reason for that is there's a lot that can be done to -- at that interface between Maricopa County and the rural -- the river district 4.

So we just need to figure out where those boundaries are, how far in it comes. And I would like it if we could start doing that. And maybe it's done in the meeting itself, but --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I'm happy to support your map, your version of the map, if it can create four competitive districts. Then I would be more than happy to support it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And that's great.
If you're able to create -- there's a lot happening in the center. There's a lot of open space that if you're able to create more than one competitive district -- my goal yesterday was to at least create one because I think that's definitely reasonable and doable. And if you're able to create more than that, that's wonderful.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair, before we leave this map, I have a couple of thoughts.

I would prefer to work off this map actually because I think it has a lot of -- it accomplishes a lot of the things we need to accomplish.

I recognize that District 8 is not a perfect square or a perfect circle. And what I would like to see us do is work on that and work on some of Mr. Freeman's concerns to see if we could address those by adjusting District 8 and District 4 and District 5 either before we went out with a draft map or during the public comment phase.

I think this map addresses -- as I said, does a good job, at least for a draft, of wrestling down to the ground a lot of the issues that we need to address.
Having said that, if the vehicle that we wind up using is the bagel map, I would like before we turn to that to look more closely at Districts 6 and 9 on this map so that we can see how those compare with what we might do on the other map.

So, Mr. Desmond, I would ask you to show us essentially what comprises the Tempe, South Scottsdale, East Phoenix, Ahwatukee, Arcadia area on this map and then also what comprises the district north of the majority-minority District 7.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yep.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I would agree with Commissioner McNulty's comments. I would prefer this be the draft map. I think this is workable and, yeah, we have changes to make and I understand that. That's why it's a draft map.

So that would be my preference. Again, if we go any other map, whether it be your version of the map, again, it would need to meet -- for me to support it, I would need to have created four competitive districts, which we can do and we should do for the citizens of Arizona.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.
Other comments?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair, in regards to the creation of four competitive districts, do we have -- Mr. Desmond, do we have the data loaded for 2004, 2006?

WILLIE DESMOND: Not yet.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Not yet.

So right now we are working off of a very limited data set in our analysis. Is that still correct?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, limited in '04, '06.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Limited in '08 and '10, correct?

WILLIE DESMOND: 2008 and 2010 and registration.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And registration?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So registration has been blended in, too?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Based on the criteria that was described by Mr. Strasma last
week, correct?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah. If you look at
the competitiveness reports that are at the end of
the packets now --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: But those still
don't include '04 or '06?

WILLIE DESMOND: No, we haven't been able
to finish getting those sorted out yet.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay. So they are
general benchmarks that we are using without using
any '04 and '06 statistics; is that correct?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And we're still
only using the limited data in regards to the
elections for the '08 and '10 elections, correct?

WILLIE DESMOND: Limited how?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Meaning that we've
got seven elections in '08 and two elections in '10.

WILLIE DESMOND: I think it's ten
elections total, but that could be --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Or three in '10.

WILLIE DESMOND: Something like that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Seven elections in
statewide elections in '08 and three elections in
'10.
WILLIE DESMOND: I think the way the competitiveness report has it now, is it's a slightly different average. So that it's the 2008 races all averaged. So that's half of the number and the 2010 races all averaged, so that's half the number and then those averaged together.

So to try to compensate for the sake that one year had more races. So they are -- each year is given equal weight now in this.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: But still we're not taking into account '04, '06?

WILLIE DESMOND: No.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Personally I think if we're going to go down the path of trying to work on the river district 7a or 8a, as far as -- if we're going to start to work on that, I've got issues on every corner of it.

As you well know that -- if that would be a starting place for me, we're going to have issues on -- just about all the way around. That's why I was really encouraged yesterday by the chair's submission of a blended map to -- as a starting point for moving forward.

In regards to the whole counties map, if we are going to go down that path, I would like to
start exploring -- if the Democrats are deciding that they are going to move forward on a recommendation on the river district, then my recommendation to Commissioner Freeman would be to start to bring up all of your points on the whole counties map and start to defend them as the -- as Commissioner Herrera just did in his 8a map and take them piece by piece about how the connective tissue works in the constitutional criteria.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I would note that the bagel map that was created yesterday started with whole counties 6d. It didn't start from anything like a grid map that we didn't already -- that he we had rejected. It was whole county 6d was the start of that bagel map.

And again, there are many adjustments that need to be made. And I would be happy to work through with Mr. Herrera what needs to be adjusted in his mind to make it a more palatable map.

But Mr. Stertz said it correctly, I was trying to bring both together -- we've all talked about the importance of communities of interest and we've tried to preserve those in 6d.

We also kept the tribal nations whole. The Navajo Nation proposal is part of this bagel
map, so is the river district, so is the concept of three border districts that's been raised.

And again, there's a lot to still be done in the middle and that's where I would like us to focus.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I know you say you based your -- the bagel map or donut map -- we should pick a --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Churro.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Churro.

But in looking at it last night and early into the morning, I mean, there are -- as you say, there are elements of the river district map that end up getting incorporated into it. You even had one of the -- a third district touch the border, so it even touches upon the concept that Commissioner Stertz was advancing.

And in looking at it, it certainly presents a whole new array of trade-offs that with the development of the whole counties map, you know, the one thing I liked about it, and perhaps I was getting attached to my map, is that as a difficulty arose, there seemed to be sort of elegant fit to
resolve it.

That's not to say that won't happen with this map, because like you say, there's lots of maneuvering room in Maricopa County to do that.

So if we are going to try to work together on a consensus map, I do think we should -- no one is getting exactly what they want on that one, except for perhaps the chair --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Exactly.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: -- to move forward on the churro map.

So I did put some time in to try to see if we could repopulate CD 4, which was missing 210,000 and then see what we could do. This was done, like I said, in the wee hours of the morning.

So that was my intent based on our hearing yesterday, was to try to do that.

With whole counties, you know, I eventually got to the point with that map where I ringed the urban area of Maricopa County with mainly rural districts except for the Pima County district.

And then what I was having Mr. Desmond go through and construct in different configurations the congressional districts in urban Maricopa County.

And with compactness in mind, that's
constitutional criteria; with trying to keep municipalities whole or at least minimize splits to municipalities, that's the constitutional criteria; communities of interest as well to see what -- if what the more -- if there was a more competitive district that would fall out of those various looks.

And we had gotten up to the point where I, for the first time, called out a street to sort of reorient the map in a north/south configuration sort of with -- at the center of the area or maybe slightly east of center, Scottsdale Road.

That's where I was going. We can do the same thing with this churro map, donut map. It might be worth our while.

In developing whole counties, you know, I -- in approaching this problem, it's a difficult sort of issue to tackle. You got the whole state, you got large rural areas, you got concentrated urban areas. And my thought was, the way to begin chipping away at that block is just take the constitutional criteria that calls out a -- that describes a land area that's of sort the same order of magnitude as the area of a congressional district, and that's counties. That is a constitutional requirement, that we respect
So that was the first instruction and then we kept tribal lands together, we created the majority-minority districts and went on through that process. And each direction was to employ a certain constitutional criteria.

And I get somewhat concerned when, you know, on the river district map, I think the second iteration of that map was making street-level changes in urban Maricopa County with no real discussion or basis being called out for it. And now we're hearing that there should be -- there must be four competitive districts.

Maybe there should be. The Constitution requires that we favor the construction of competitive -- districts that are competitive to the extent it doesn't cause a substantial detriment to the other goals. But it doesn't say four, it doesn't say three, it doesn't say one, it doesn't say nine.

That's something I think we need to look at how we construct these districts by applying the constitutional criteria and then see what configuration works best for competitive districts.

That should be the approach we take and
that's what I think -- the approach I think we should take in terms of filling in the hole in this bagel on your map, Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would like to go back to my request that we look at District 6 and 9, but before we do that, the river district map took a different approach than the whole counties map because it was built based on communities of interest up rather than whole counties down.

It considered the constitutional criteria as well but started from the perspective that communities should be grouped together, kept together, grouped together.

And I will just say before I leave this that the end result, when you look at the splits analysis between the whole counties map and the river district map, is virtually the same in terms of communities that -- and counties that are split.

So we have a big state. Wave a lot of criteria to take into account. And however we do it, we are not going to be following all of the preexisting lines.
But the perspective on the river district, now I guess slash Navajo Nation proposal, was to build it from communities up.

Having said that, I also spent a lot of time last night looking at the Phoenix metro area as the chair requested. And it's -- and I believe it's the case that when we reconfigure the boundaries as we have, we eliminate the opportunity to have a District 9 in the established neighborhoods of Phoenix -- which I would like to look at now, Willie.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: -- that is an -- over time could become the fourth competitive district. And the reason that I want to look at that is I just want to understand the -- you know, the difference in the boundaries.

So we can look at -- I believe what we've done is because of the way we've done the border, we've kind of had to move the -- Because we've done the border district, we've had to -- in order to satisfy the two voting rights district, come into -- farther into Phoenix with the result that we have captured more of the population from those established neighborhoods that
might have been the foundation for 8 and emerging competitive District 9. And those instead are pulled back into the majority-minority district.

So I think when the chair said yesterday that she was hoping for at least one or perhaps more competitive districts within that blank area, I believe that one can and should be drawn and -- very much along the lines of the District 6 that would include --

Well, we can go through that, and I think I've given you an outline of it that you can pull up when we get to that.

But in terms of the District 9, we're coming too far north with our majority-minority district, I believe, to make that work. Now, maybe we could keep trying, but it seemed to me that that may no longer be practical.

So what I did was focus on a competitive district more like 6 that includes Tempe, Ahwatukee, South Scottsdale, East Phoenix, Camelback, West Mesa.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So I guess just looking at what comprises 9 now?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Yeah. I would like to look at -- what I would like to have in mind
is the difference between the north boundary, the
majority-minority district on this map and the
change to that on the comprised map that the chair
offered.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And one of the
things I think that we also talked about doing is
balancing the population a little bit between the
two majority-minority districts on that map. And I
forgot what the numbers of those are. 3 and 7. 7
in Phoenix and 3. So we'll need to be looking at
that in order to do that also --

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: -- at that
boundary.

WILLIE DESMOND: So should I bring up the
bagel map, then?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Well, I would just
like you to zoom in and show us what the north
boundary on the majority-minority district is on
this map and the south boundary of the central --
District 9 and just show us generally what part of
town that is.

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

So in this -- let me just zoom out to the
statewide to give everyone a reference.

The second majority-minority district besides the one that's in Central Phoenix is this one that runs from Yuma to Santa Cruz County and comes up into Maricopa a little bit.

And so we'll look first at where that comes up into Maricopa, I guess.

So it comes up into Maricopa on the western edge, takes a good portion of Goodyear, Buckeye --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Where is Buckeye?

Would you please --

WILLIE DESMOND: Buckeye is this shape on the edge.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I just want people to see where that is because we'll get back to that.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

So it takes, you know, the lower half of Buckeye and Gila Bend and Goodyear and then going in a little further, it takes in Avondale, by and large, and then just a little portion of -- I think that's Glendale but it might be Phoenix. Those two colors always come out nearly the same just by the way the computer assigns the random colors. So it takes a little portion of Glendale or Phoenix right
here.

And then District 9 touches in that little area of I think is Phoenix but may be Glendale and then takes kind of the western part of Glendale, El Mirage, the southern portion of Peoria, Northern Glendale, kind of Central -- this part of Phoenix -- I don't know if that would be considered Central where those lines are drawn -- and follows basically as has been discussed, the 101 this way and then it follows along the border of Scottsdale, along the border of Paradise Valley, and then again through Phoenix.

I can zoom in closer and see where this goes through Phoenix if you would like.

So it follows -- once it leaves Paradise Valley, it follows Lincoln Drive.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I don't think we need actual street level, but I just wanted people to have a sense of the part of -- where in the world -- what we are talking about.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Then did you want to look at District 6, too?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Yes, just generally.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So then District
6 comprises the other parts of Phoenix that are incorporated in the Hispanic Coalition's district. It takes all of Tempe, South Scottsdale, Ahwatukee. It doesn't include Guadalupe. North of Chandler and then kind of West Mesa, is District 6.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. So can we look at the compromised map?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Do we want to take a ten-minute break and come back and we'll discuss that comprised map? That will allow Buck to begin streaming the meeting.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Great.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: The time is 10:51. We'll take a ten-minute break.

Thank you.

(A recess was taken from 10:51 a.m. to 11:15 a.m.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well enter back into public session. Recess is over. The time is 11:15, and we are on agenda item 3 working on the congressional map.

And just finished looking at some river district version 8a, and I believe the next item was going to be bringing up the bagel map.

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

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Quick question for Mr. Desmond.

In an effort to expedite the concept of moving forward certain districts that may work well, that may be integrated into a variety of different maps now -- I'll take, for example, the river district. Just the one -- the west border.

Do you have those in a configuration that you can extract that district within and by itself?

WILLIE DESMOND: Not -- no. I think that's something I could do, but I don't have that, like, just on the fly, do it right away. If there was some that you wanted me to work on over lunch going forward, I could probably get them so it will turn on, turn off. But I need to play around with it a little bit.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair, that might be a recommendation that I might like to pursue, that as we develop districts that we feel have got strong merit, that as we are working through these iterations, we are able to drop those that do make sense that have met the constitutional criteria in its baseline design so that he could look at those and say drop this district here, drop
the next one next to it, find out how the lines over
touch each other and then make those subtle
adjustments going forward.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, if that's
possible to do, I think that would make some sense.
Like a puzzle piece and then we put that into the
bagel map. But I'm biased.

So are we finished with this one? Was
there anything else you needed?

WILLIE DESMOND: I think Commissioner
McNulty still was curious to look and see how this
map stacked up with the bagel map, just to see
where -- because District 3 in the bagel map was the
second majority-minority, comes into Maricopa a
little more, just to look and see where that differs
from the Hispanic Coalition -- or this map.

So I got that ready over the break. I
can turn that layer on.

So right now, the dark blue layer is the
river district 8a's line. And this District 7 is
the river district's District 7. And that's taken
from the Hispanic Coalition's map, I think nearly
verbatim.

When I turn on the bagel map, you can see
that it does take some of the Hispanic population
from that District 7.

Commissioner McNulty, is there specific things you wanted to look at there or is that --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: No, I think that's good. I think I understand.

What I would like to do is look at the donut hole. In the interest of time, I had -- I worked on two things and I would like to just share those and then I think Commissioner Freeman worked on some things. Let him share his.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And can I just briefly say a few things about this map?

We introduced it yesterday. This is what I'm calling the bagel map. There's a number of names, donuts, churros, but we started with whole county 6d version and then adjusted CD 1 to capture some tribes in the northland, kept Coconino County whole and then adjusted CD 2 downward to the border to create a third border district.

And the idea behind all of this was to try to bring the two versions together. We've talked about three border districts, we've talked about two rural, so I was trying to make all of that happen on one map. And, of course, keeping Indian communities whole, respecting majority-minority two
benchmark districts, and then leaving this hole in the middle to kind of work with all of Maricopa County in a way that made sense.

So it allowed for a lot of flexibility there. And the map is not complete by any stretch of the imagination, but at least it tries to bring these different versions and concepts we've all been talking about together.

WILLIE DESMOND: So here is the -- here it's called the congressional 3 border churro 1 donut version 1a from -- going forward, I'm just going to call it bagel.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah. It's the everything bagel.

WILLIE DESMOND: Everything bagel.

Now, Commissioner McNulty, did you want to look at the file that you had given me?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Yes.

I gave Mr. Desmond two files. One is what I view as the Tempe -- I'll call it the Tempe competitive district for shorthand and I think it would fit into the -- pretty much in the same area.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So just as a point of clarification for everyone, I loaded this one today and from now on I will refer to your like
fork of the bagel maps as "b." So this is
congressional bagel version 2b. I'll leave you with
"a" and then whoever else has other ones, we can
have "a," "b," and "c" to kind of keep track of
different splits in this, if that makes sense.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. Sounds
good.

WILLIE DESMOND: So this is version 2
since it was built off of version 1 and it's "b"
because it's the one you had submitted.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: All right. I'll
try and remember that.

WILLIE DESMOND: I can help remind you.
I think I can keep that all straight.

So here the blue line is the county line.
Kind of the black line is your lines, Chairwoman
Mathis, and the red line is Commissioner McNulty's.

I'll make this line solid and see if that
makes --

So I guess there's some areas of
diversions here in District Number 7 and District
Number 3 that you just showed me.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Let's get to that
later.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Let's look at the red line that is east of 7 right now.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Should I turn on the census place, then?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Sure.

WILLIE DESMOND: How do you want to do this?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Census places are good, especially those fancy colors that you do. So now I can't see it anymore, but essentially what this does is it takes Ahwatukee -- could you show where that is?

So we have South Mountain, which is a landmark that everyone knows at this point I think. We have Ahwatukee, North Chandler, South Tempe, West Mesa, which is kind of that -- that area along the light rail, we have ASU, we have Mesa Community College, South Scottsdale, which is a different kind of socioeconomic area than North Scottsdale and then we have some of East Phoenix in East Camelback together.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: What's the border in Scottsdale?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: The border in Scottsdale I think is Chaparral Road.
WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So Ahwatukee would be grouped with North Chandler and South Tempe and that comprises the Kyrene school district. That's a legislative district now I believe and demographically and socioeconomically they are very similar.

And as I said Tempe and West Mesa, they share the light rail along Apache Boulevard in Tempe and Main Street in Mesa. And the new economic development along that area kinds of ties them together. Mesa Riverview and Tempe Marketplace are both in that area.

And as we've talked about quite a bit already, West Mesa is quite different from East Mesa. In West Mesa there's a growing Latino community and it's more aligned I think with the areas of Tempe and Phoenix than East Mesa and Gilbert and Queen Creek.

Then we have the South Scottsdale, Tempe, Arcadia area that Mr. Herrera is very familiar with, has talked a lot about. That area is similar to North Tempe, and the Arcadia area of Phoenix, includes Papago Park that borders -- touches Tempe, Phoenix, and Scottsdale and then moving kind of
northwest we have Arcadia, Central Phoenix, and Camelback east, includes much of the Urban Village of Camelback east, Arcadia and East Phoenix.

So the census places are Tempe, Ahwatukee, part of North Chandler, West Mesa, South Scottsdale, and East and Central Phoenix.

So that -- and that is similar to the same area that was in the river district but it excludes Paradise Valley and includes some of the areas in East Phoenix that I talked about.

Then we also looked at balancing yesterday -- or we talked about balancing the HVAP between District 7 and 3.

And my understanding from Ms. O'Grady is that we can do that on a statewide basis, but nevertheless, I've made a couple of suggestions about how we would do that that I gave to Mr. Desmond that would take in some of the more heavily Hispanic areas around the core of --

Is that 7, the one in Phoenix 7 -- and then balance out the population in 3 by pulling in some of the more heavily Hispanic areas in Buckeye. And I think we achieve a closer balance in HVAP and we also balance the population, at least pretty closely.
So I think Chair Mathis had said that she was hoping to see a truly competitive district, which is to say a district Metropolitan Phoenix, that could be won by either party, where either a Democrat or a Republican could win, where we could have a good, balanced race, and I think this would achieve that.

I know you haven't had a chance to run the numbers on that yet. We could look at the numbers on the river district map because I think they would be similar, but my hope would be that we would include this in the bagel hole and run the numbers on that.

And I guess I would just say as a final comment that I really do prefer the river district map. You know, I'm from Tucson and although my personal -- what I personally think has very little bearing on this, I guess I get to make -- I get to at least comment that I feel an affinity to Cochise County and East Tucson and I think it makes a lot more sense to have them together than to have Cochise County tied in an Eastern rural district.

But I also recognize that there are five of us here, and in the interest of trying to work off one map, this would be my -- and I also think we
are missing a real -- an important opportunity by not focusing on that District 9 and giving the people of Maricopa County the opportunity to have two competitive districts.

I think that would -- it would be a same to let that go. But again, I'm one of five, and if this is the direction that we are going to go in, I would request that we include this competitive district in the bagel hole and that we adjust the population in the two minority-majority districts -- majority-minority districts and then we would ask our counsel to take a close look at the majority-minority districts and do the analysis.

Once we have something you can actually start to analyze. And that's one good thing about arriving at one map is you can start to do the analysis.

That's all I've got.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Again, I'm going to echo the comments made by Commissioner McNulty that I would prefer the river district 8a -- version 8a to go forward, but since we are talking about
this -- the donut hole map, the issue of the border
district that is going from the northern part of
Arizona all the way down to the southern part is a
big issue.

I think people in Flagstaff, Coconino
County, and the Navajo Nation will have a say on
this. Having a border that covers those rural areas
going to the border will mean that the people in the
northern part will be -- the border issue will
probably dominate that particular district, border
issues.

There's no -- we all understand what
happened from SB 1070 and the polarization that's
going on around the state. So I would be very
concerned alienating those people in that community,
Flagstaff, Coconino County and the Navajo Nation.

So I would propose that when we move
forward with this particular map that we eliminate
that third border district or at least for it not to
go all the way down to the border. Because again, I
think the people in Flagstaff, Coconino County, and
the Native tribes will have a major wish with that
and we need to respect the communities of interest
and their opinion because they are a pretty
decent-sized population there.
So that's one of my major concerns with that particular map, but I have more, but that's one that I wanted to address now.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. I don't have the Navajo Nation's two proposals in front of me, the hard copies. Is there a way to pull those two up? I would be curious to see what that is for District 1 with an overlay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So the blue line is counties. This pink line, this whole area, that is Navajo Nation.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So doesn't that have a border?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I think they created two different versions. Indian 1, from what I've understood is their -- which one is this?

WILLIE DESMOND: The blue one is NN1. I'll turn on this one.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think they had said they referred NN2.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: NN2.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So NN2 stops at the Cochise County line. But it's the one that reaches in and grabs Oro Valley, right?
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So it doesn't touch that.

I'm wondering which map I'm thinking of where District 1 includes Oro Valley and --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: River district.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, it's river district. Okay.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: But, again, I think this would be their preferred map. But I don't want to speak on behalf of the Native American tribes. We have representatives here. I prefer that we hear from them.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So the other comment is what Ms. McNulty said about the second border district and feeling an affinity towards Cochise County.

There's a way to adjust the District 2 so that -- you know, can grab parts of Cochise County for sure. I don't know if you could grab more than that, but you could go into Sierra Vista and get some of that. It all just depends on the numbers and how we want to do it.

But again, I do think three border districts can make some sense. It's a 389-mile
border and I think border issues are a big deal in
this state, no matter where you fall on the
political spectrum, and having a third voice in
Washington I do think does add some heft to the
discussion.

So --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And it's not that
representatives from other parts of the state
wouldn't represent the border well or don't care
about it just because they aren't touching the
border, but I do think there is some gravitas when
your district touches the border, even if it's a
piece of it.

Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, and I spoke
about that yesterday when I asked Mr. Desmond how
many people were in that particular -- in that Santa
Cruz area, and there's 5,000 people that are
touching the border.

And I really -- as I said before, I
really feel that was just created for the sake of
creating a border district when we could have easily
absorbed it and worked around that.

Again, the issue of the borders is an
important one, but it's something that we all deal with, whether you live in Phoenix, whether you live in Washington State.

I think all representatives, federal -- U.S. and senators I think care about the border. That's an issue that we all care about, not just if we create three congressional districts on the border, that's not their problem, it's the -- a federal issue.

So why -- if that's the case, why not create four border districts. I mean, based on your logic, if it's really that important, then we should be creating more border districts for more representation. And that logic doesn't seem to be working.

According to me, that really isn't a good logic to follow. Having two representatives like it is now, I think that works. And the three, again, it does not make sense to me.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Others?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Just on that point, Madame Chair, going back to the public comment and
constitutional criteria, Santa Cruz County is split by a pretty significant geographic feature, and I think your lines that you drew kind of followed at least one of those features, and that would I think in terms of weighing the criteria, splitting a county, we also have to consider geographic features, and I think that would give some justification for that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can you explain that again, the geographic feature?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, one of the constitutional criteria that we are to follow is to follow geographic features. In Santa Cruz County, when we were down in Nogales, we heard people talking about it that people on the other side of the mountain are really separate from people on the west side.

And so in creating that third border district, you split Santa Cruz County, but I believe, although I'm not sure, that we'll find the census tracts sort of line up on the geographic feature. I was just supplying a constitutional basis for the way those lines were drawn.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, thank you, that is true. I was trying to follow -- do this
urban/rural split in Santa Cruz because we did hear some input that they are different and tried to keep those apart. And I used census tracts at the border going up and then over to I-19 and then essentially up and hitting I-10 and then following I-10 up to the northern border.

You know, other thoughts? If people are feeling like they like river district version 8a -- I know Mr. Stertz said he would have a lot of changes that he would want to make to that in order to make it more to his interest and maybe he would like to talk about some of those.

But I'm flexible. If we want -- I just want to work on one map. That's I guess my goal. If people like the donut hole or bagel hole concept, we can do that. If it's going to be better to work off river district version 8a, we can do that. But I would like to choose one.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Just a quick comment.

I think I agree with you that we should choose just one. The only problem with that particular map you're proposing is it's not
complete. It is not a complete map.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's right.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: And we've been working on river district 7a since we started proposing -- well, since we came up with a grid map. So we've been working on that particular map. It's been a while now and we've gone through different changes of it and we'll continue to make changes to it.

I understand that Mr. Freeman and Stertz have issues with it, and I understand that, and they should. And we will -- we can work with them on those changes.

I don't think that that -- this particular version of this map is that far off. I don't see it that way. I think the changes that they want to make or proposing, we can work on them.

But I think that's a more workable map. It's complete and with all due respect to your map, it is not complete.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right. And that was intentional.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: So to me, if we are going to work on one map, which is something I would propose and I would agree with you, is that we move
forward with river district 8a and start making the changes. It will be -- even if we adopt it as a first draft, it's a first draft.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's right.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: After we come out with public comment, we will make additional changes to it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Comments from others?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: There are, I think that someone said earlier, 41 complete maps that we have. So whatever the number is, we've got lots of maps that are complete.

You have been -- Commissioner Herrera has been working specifically on the river district map and been doing a series of tweaks based on criteria that he feels is important in achieving the goals that he's desiring to achieve. I can recognize and appreciate that. I can appreciate all of the hard work that's been put in.

I think that when we are starting to look at our core communities of interest, then we're saying it's the first nations' desire to have
continuity and continuousness among all of the
Native lands, that's a community of interest.

A community of interest is going to be --
I mean, we've right now received one proposal from
the Hispanic Coalition regarding the districts that
are now numbered 2 -- the old 7, the old 4,
eventually.

We've received one submittal
legislatively from the Arizona Minority Coalition,
which took actually four legislative districts and
brought them down to three.

So there is a -- there are lot of other
-- there's a lot of other testimony that we have
received from groups that haven't come forward as
coalition that have provided maps to us besides the
maps that we have been creating ourselves.

So I'm all in favor of moving forward
with a starting point, and that's the reason why I
suggested to Mr. Desmond if we can have some areas
where we say, okay, I'm okay with -- there's been
sufficient testimony that Flagstaff wants to remain
in one district or Flagstaff wants to remain in
another district.

We have had conflicting testimony now
from the Board of Supervisors from Mohave Country,
one that Bullhead City wants to -- that the river
district be created and now they've come forward
with a request to not have any connection with any
large municipality and to remain independent.

So we've got conflicting testimony coming
from conflicting groups. It's going to be incumbent
on the five of us here to be able to come up with
the best shot that we've got.

I've got more issues with -- there's
certain areas of the river district map that I can
absolutely live with. There's areas in it that I
am -- we're polar opposites and will never come to a
consensus on.

There are some other maps I have got a
lot of appreciation for. For example, the original
river district 3 border combo map, it actually
created a ninth congressional district which
absorbed the area where we had the largest amount of
population, which was the south sign, San Tan
Valley, and Casa Grande.

It met the requirements, it meets the
design as Mr. Desmond just put up for the first
nations' designs for the northeast corner. It had
some adjustments that would need to be made
regarding the Hispanic Coalition's map, but it did
meet criteria for preclearance process.

So I've got a lot of things out of that map that I think have got great appeal to it. So I think what the chair, if I can understand you clearly, that you're trying to get to one of those blocks of this puzzle that we can all agree with and then move forward and fill in the blanks in between?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, that's true, but what I was trying to do is bring everybody's ideas into one map. And so that's why the three border two rural concept came about.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Now, Commissioner Stertz has mentioned that he has some particular issues with this particular map, river district version 8a, but I haven't seen those, he hasn't sent anything to me, not that I'm aware of. And I would like for him to put his thoughts together in writing and send them to us and then for us to start working on those changes.

Again, he has issues with it, he's already expressed the, but I would like for him to send me those issues so I can work on them.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair, I'm
not sure if that's the appropriate protocol for what you're attempting to achieve here.

Is it your desire to have the Republicans and the Democrats go off in a corner somewhere and to compare notes and then come back to you? I don't think that's --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I didn't say go off in a corner. As I said before, I think we are all pretty clear when we send any changes, we send them to Mr. Bladine and then Mr. Bladine sends them to all of us.

I'm not asking you to meet with me in secret. But what I'm asking you is you have issues with this particular map. I want to hear them. I want to hear what these issues are and let's work on those issues. That's all I'm asking.

Because I think this is a workable map. And if we want to go -- and go forward with one map, I think this is the map to go forward with and make those changes or recommend those changes you're proposing and let's see what we can do.

You keep saying that there are -- that we won't be able to meet eye to eye, but I have no idea what your changes are. So I don't understand how you can automatically discount that we can't meet in
the middle without first proposing them to me and then we can go forward.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So, Madame Chair, am I correct that I'm to make a proposal of changes to Commissioner Herrera to accept my changes?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I don't understand why you're asking the chair. I'm asking --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm just wondering if there's been a protocol change that I'm unaware of here.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I don't understand the protocol change.

You were -- there's some issues on this map that you like, there's some areas that you like, there's some areas that you don't like. So let's work on the areas you don't like and fix them.

I don't understand why there is a change in protocol when I'm asking to work with you and let's work together on making a map that we can both -- all five of us can live with.

I don't see that as a change of protocol.

I'm asking for your input because there's five of us and we all, at least three of us, have to vote on this map -- on a map.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. That's why I
I would really like to work off of the map I created yesterday --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I would prefer not to.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: -- because I think it brings both sides together in a way that -- you know, we can work from one and then adjust it accordingly. So that's my view.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair, I don't see it that way.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I know how you feel. I know you don't.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: You exercised some leadership yesterday and over the weekend in developing a map that you would like us all to work on.

Is -- I think it borrows some from the whole counties approach, but it's not the whole counties approach, at least in my thought process. It has a lot in common with the river district map. There's -- the differences are not too significant. And you're one of five commissioners, so you get to have your say and input, too. The rest
of us have been developing these maps and you're the one to bring some balance and move us forward together.

So I would like to go ahead and give it a shot and see if we can work on filling in the donut hole together so we can get this one finished.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

I would, too, but I would like all five commissioners to feel like they have input into this and can -- that's the whole reason for, you know, this big open area in the middle of the state that we can work on together.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair, as I said before, I don't feel like I'm having any input on this. I feel like you based this map off Commissioner Freeman's map and you said so numerous times.

So to me, I feel like we're already in a disadvantage when you have created your version of that map based on Republicans on the Republican map and I feel like you're trying to appease them way too much. And.

As a Democrat, two -- you have two Democrats on this Commission and because we haven't been boisterous and trying to intimidate you, I
really do feel like -- to me, that that's -- I will not be ignored.

    So I don't want to be ignored, and so I feel that -- but that's how I'm feeling. I'm feeling like our thoughts -- at least my thoughts aren't being considered.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And I will not be intimidated.

    VICE CHAIR HERRERA: And I don't want you to.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And that's not the situation at all. I'm trying to bring together the two maps -- two kind of versions, those whole counties version and the river district together. The River district on my map looks like a lot like the river district on your map, at least it should be -- you know, it's that part that we don't have the actual interface into Maricopa County yet. I was just leaving that flexible so that Maricopa is white and we can -- you know, we can move those lines in to match exactly your river district and we can also adjust -- there's some changes in the Flagstaff area with maybe Verde Valley that probably need to be looked at going into the 3 border 2 rural.
The big difference is, obviously, the three border and trying to make that third border district. And how we do that, whether we take in parts of Cochise into that border, which means splitting that county up in some way, carving some piece out of it to make a longer piece there, if it made sense -- I don't know that it does, but I think having -- again, I think three border district makes sense. But I would like to hear from anybody else, too.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Desmond, what is your time frame in breaking up -- if we give you a list of the -- of certain districts that we want to you extract out to create as sort of design puzzle pieces, what would be the time frame be for you to do so? Let's just say that there's 10 or 15 different blocks that we could overlay on top of each other.

WILLIE DESMOND: I think I could have -- I'm not sure how to suppress all of the other lines right away. What I could do is make one -- you know, the one district you care about like a filled in -- but somehow transparent and that would be the
only one so it would kind of easy to see that one sticking off from the others. And I can do that right now on the fly.

If you give me a list, I bet you I could get a lot of that done over lunch or something. But I haven't gone through that process, so I'm not totally sure.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair, in an effort of time, based on schedule today, we've got a natural break coming at 1 o'clock.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Is it -- what is your -- what are your thoughts on taking public comment at this time? I know there's many things out of order but there is a natural break that may cause us to -- and I'm wondering whether or not there's some homework that we could give in the short term to Mr. Desmond to create these blocks.

Because I think that what -- again, I'm hearing is that there's certain blocks that everybody is very comfortable with moving forward with that could probably be comfort among all five of the commissioners and there's others that are less comfortable that would want to create some -- that may have enough similarity if we overlay them
that we could really drill down to what those
similarities are to an agreement and then to discuss
how we get to bridge that to a place of compromise.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I don't know how
long that kind of thing will take. We've got about
an hour and ten minutes before 1 o'clock when we'll
need to break and we've got a number of public
comment sheets.

And it sounds like there isn't really
going to be talk on legislative maps today because
we really haven't had time to analyze the changes
from yesterday.

So -- go ahead.

WILLIE DESMOND: I could try doing what
Commissioner Stertz asked for right now if there's a
particular district you want to see.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I think it would be
more than that. I think that I would like to -- the
chair's comment on the thought of public comment,
we've got a lot of public here today. And I can
give you a list of all of the districts based on
each map and say, for example, on -- just as an
example, I'll give you congressional 3 border
version -- I'm not sure with the version is.
Version 2 -- hold on. Let me pull it up. Pick
out -- create blocks for Districts 9, 8, 5, 7, and 6.

WILLIE DESMOND: I mean, I can --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I could be wrong, but I think one of the things we are trying to do is arrive at one map, not ten more maps. I'm not sure that there's any -- I mean, if what we are trying to do is reach agreement among the five of us on one map to move forward with so we move on and work on the legislative maps, I just don't think that's going to work because we are not going to come to a consensus if we start breaking it apart.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I agree.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Having said that, I guess I have three or four thoughts.

I would like to use the river district map. I think it's the best integration of the ideas that I have. If -- but, you know, I think there are -- if there are only two votes for that here, then we're going to need to move on to another possibility.

If the other possibility is the bagel hole map, then I would like to see Mr. Freeman plug in his thoughts on the bagel hole map because I
think he gave us thoughts -- or he developed thoughts and I also think it's really important all of these folks have come out to talk to us and I know we're going to take a rather long break and I would like them to have the opportunity to talk to us and not have to come back.

So my suggestion would be public comment, break, Mr. Freeman's perspective on the donut hole and further discussion among the commissioners about what to do next, is my thought.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Commissioner McNulty, one of the reasons why I picked the blocks that I had chosen were because they appeared to fit almost naturally into the -- into certain spaces as they occur in the bagel map.

So I was trying to actually shortcut some of the process by creating districts that would actually fit.

But I'll leave the discretion to the chair as to what the next --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I agree with Commissioner McNulty on that, that creating more -- the block ideas is an interesting one and -- but I
think it's going to just add a lot of time to the process that -- I think we really actually do have things that are very similar between the river district 8a and 3 border 2 rural. Granted, it's not a complete map that's clear, but that's clear. But the whole idea is for us to complete it in the middle.

And if, you know, we want to use the river district 8a 4 and 5 exactly as they are and get those into the 3 border 2 rural to see what that looks like, except on 5, you know, cutting it at Cochise because I still say that it should come all the way down to the border.

I also agree we should get through public comment because we are going to be breaking at 1:00 and we've got a number of sheets in front of us.

So do commissioners -- what is your pleasure? Would you like to vote on one of these maps to move forward with? Do we need to do that?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would like to see what Mr. Freeman has in mind before I vote on it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: In terms of the
concept, though, of us filling in the middle
together, that's what the vote would be on. Whether
we are trying to make the bagel map work and move
forward with it and all work on that together or we
do river district 8a.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So you're just
proposing that we would start with the bagel hole
map -- I really think we need a different name. I'm
sorry.

We would start with that map not as -- we
would not be voting on that to be our draft map, we
would be agreeing that we would focus our efforts on
that map?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, that's correct.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think you're
telling us that you're not -- Mr. Freeman's -- I
would make a motion that we use the river district
version "a" map.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I second that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any discussion?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: All of my
discussion has already been.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Mine as well.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Mine, too.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: All in favor?
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Aye.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any opposed.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Nay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Nay.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Nay.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Having done that --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I will propose that we -- I'll rename the bagel map to the reality map.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I object. It's a compromise map.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The compromise map or how about the moving forward map or the -- you can name it whatever you would like. I was being a bit factitious.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Let's give it an objective name to be determined later.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: To be determined later.

I would move to approve the congressional 3 border 2 rural, one bagel as it's described -- or 3 border 2 rural district map affectionately known
as the bagel/churro map to be used as our baseline
design map to move forward.

    COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would request
that we -- Mr. Stertz to revise his motion to say
that we would focus our efforts on that map as
our -- as a working draft. I don't want to suggest
that that is, in fact, going to be the baseline
draft.

That we focus our efforts in an effort to
develop it into the draft that we release.

    VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I agree.

    COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And I'll leave it
to you to figure out what I just said and say it
more succinctly. No, I'm going to leave it to
Mr. Freeman to see if he can --

    VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: No, I know what you
are getting at because we are going to need to have
some flexible, particularly with the population
deficit in CD 4 to make that -- to bring that up to
the 710,000.

    We can't lock ourselves in to where the
lines are right now. There may need to be some
fine-tuning on that.

    But I think -- you know, I don't want to
play the grievance game here. I know Commissioners
Herrera and McNulty worked very hard on developing their map, I worked hard on developing the whole counties map.

I think we were all warned a long time ago, don't get wetted to a particular map that you might be working on, and I was a little guilty of that.

So I don't think I'm certainly getting everything I wanted, but I'm willing, so we can move forward together, to focus on that map. And that's what I'm trying to do and that's what I intended to do coming into today's hearing, was focus on trying to work with that map. I think that's what we should do.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Given that, is there any other discussion?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: There's no second to the motion.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm sorry, what is this -- can we repeat that?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Can you revise it?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'll revise the motion to read that we utilize the congressional 3 border 2 rural district map affectionately known as the bagel map to use as our --
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Working draft.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: -- working draft criteria for adjustment to come to resolution which will be then published after the adjustments as the congressional district draft map.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would request that we end that after "working draft." Working draft, period. And if Mr. Stertz is agreeable to that, I would second his motion.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: No, I'm not agreeable to that. "Working draft" is too vague and it reeks that we are going to go backwards again and I don't want to do that.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: If we're looking for a compromise, I think -- again, if I vote, I think Commissioner McNulty's recommendations are right on. We have two commissioners here who are making -- at least one commissioner who is making a simple recommendation, and I would agree with her. And again, if you want to go forward with this map, which I'm okay with, with certain exceptions, we at a minimum should at least have a motion that we can all agree on.
VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair, I don't think we should get too hung up on a motion on this. I think we should just -- if we all agree that we're going to go forward and focus our efforts on working and developing this map, then let's do that.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: If that's a motion, Mr. Freeman, I would second it.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Let it be a motion.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any discussion?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I would be -- I'm going to be voting in favor of this particular draft. But again, I would like to voice my concerns about this map being based on the whole counties version, I think it was 6a. So there's some things I feel like we're already in a disadvantage, so I wanted to make those comments again for the record and go forward.

Okay. Thank you.

Any other discussion?

All in favor?

("Aye.")

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any opposed?
Okay. So we'll focus our energies, efforts on this bagel map and get to work on that center part especially. And as I said, I'm happy to adopt from the river district "a" any of Mr. Herrera's suggestions for that border between 1 and 4 and anywhere else on the map, too, that he wants to talk about or Ms. McNulty.

So I would like us all to come together and work on one, and I think this will be a good way to do it.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: First, I want to commend you on your leadership in taking this to this next level. And I'm looking forward to working together with all of the commissioners to bring this draft map design to a close.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you. Me, too.

Vice Chair Herrera: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

Vice Chair Herrera: I don't have -- I haven't had a chance to -- even though I examined the map to come up with any --

(Interuption by the court reporter.)

Vice Chair Herrera: Thank you.
I will be reviewing the map in a little more detail today and I would like to see if -- I know Commissioner Freeman has his own ideas and I don't know if Commissioner McNulty does, but I don't as of yet. So what I would like to do is propose some changes for tomorrow's meeting for this particular map. So that's what I plan on doing.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I've already proposed my changes for this map, and I'll say right now it's the only way I'll support this map, is if there's -- a competitive district -- if that competitive district is part of it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. And you have the directions on that competitive district that she drew?

WILLIE DESMOND: I do.

Just so I understand, I guess, going forward, are we going to have different versions of this that everyone is kind of working independently or is every change going to happen together?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's a -- what are your thoughts on that?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: My thoughts -- I would like to see the changes that Mr. Freeman has
proposed, and I would like to see that today, and I
would like that to be built into the map with the
changes I've proposed that we can look at.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: And that might be
difficult to do because if my proposal -- and keep
in mind, this is just a first crack that I worked on
last night and this morning. But if my conflicts
with yours, how do we address that? I think we
got -- unfortunately, we go to keep track of these
various proposals.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think we should
talk about that today, then, because if we can't
reach agreement on that -- if we can't reach
agreement on that issue, then we are not going to
reach agreement. So we don't need to go through 12
iterations. I know right now that that's how I feel
about that issue.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm wondering if we
can do this, you know, in session where
Mr. Freeman's proposal for his center is presented,
given to Willie and he can get it into the map and
then it's presented for all of us to see.

I don't know if he's -- if you would be
willing to work with what Ms. McNulty already
submitted as one piece of your center.
VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Just at first blush, that would change my map. So I would have to redesign it to accommodate that, and I would have to take a look, which is I wouldn't mind seeing this map with the -- that portion of the donut filled in to see how it impacts what I did last night.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair, I would ask that we ask Mr. Desmond to do that, that we include the changes to balance the two majority-minority districts and that we include that Tempe area.

WILLIE DESMOND: What I can do is take what you gave me and make that into, like, just a layout like we have been doing.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would like you to include it in the map.

WILLIE DESMOND: Include it in the map going forward on all --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Yeah, yes, I would.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I just want some clarification. When Commissioner McNulty is proposing her changes, which I agree with, that will
be -- what version will that be?

    WILLIE DESMOND: That's what I'm trying
to I guess figure out here.

    VICE CHAIR HERRERA: And I want to make
sure that when Commissioner Freeman makes his
changes, is that going to be a different version?
Because then we're back to square one.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: What I was
requesting was that Mr. Freeman build this district
into his changes and work around it.

    VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I would support
that.

    VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: So it's basically
take it or leave it?

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I think we are
getting to the place where we should -- we need to
track changes from this base map that we have just
approved as our base design map and those changes
are going to have a series of compromise that we
should work out in public.

    And if you're saying instead of looking
at the blocks, as I was trying to do, let's start
giving direction to Mr. Desmond and say I want this line to work this line. And if it's an uncompromising place for any of the commissioners that they are locked into a place, then that's why you are in this seat. You are the tiebreaker. So if we've got two districts that don't marry well together, then Commissioner Freeman is right, it becomes a take it or leave it.

But who is going to make that decision is going to be based on -- and I'm hoping that we can have more of an active discussion here rather than a drop it into mine, work out all of your stuff around it approach, that we could be a little more proactive than that.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair, I didn't mean to suggest that -- use that phrase in a pejorative sense.

I would like to look at it and study it. And my map -- what I did last night, I did not attempt to balance the majority-minority districts, so that's an issue I still have to address.

I'll also tell you in trying to repopulate CD 4, I couldn't get to balance. I got it to within 14,000. I figured that was in striking distance and I stopped because it was pretty late.
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I understand the problem. That's why I would ask that we build in my changes, then I would request that Mr. Freeman look at them in the interest of compromise that he would work around them.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I would be happy to look at them.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And what I have done is I have -- as I said earlier, I have not attempted, because I don't think it can be done, to build a second competitive district in Phoenix in this configuration.

I have, however, put together what I believe to be responsive to what the chair requested, which is a truly competitive district in that Tempe area, and I believe it to be in a place that makes a great deal of sense that we have looked at really for the past month as we've gone through this process.

And I'm not trying to say take it or leave it, but I am trying to save us some time and say that if we don't have a truly competitive district in Phoenix, and I believe that that's where and how it makes sense, that I can't support this.

Now, I'm just one commissioner, and I
understand that, so that's not a threat, it's not anything other than a statement of fact. But to me, that's absolutely essential.

And what I would like to see is for us to -- and I think there's a great deal of flexibility in the rest of the hole for a compromise to be achieved to address the issues from your perspective.

I know you've talked a lot about going north/south, that you were concerned about the 101 issue, that you don't see those the same way I do. And what I'm saying is, okay, I'll work with you on those, but what I want is a truly competitive district for the citizens of Phoenix and I would like to start -- I would like the map to show that and to build around it.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I agree with Commissioner McNulty, but what I would disagree with her on is that we can create -- we should try to create two competitive districts in Maricopa County for a total of four competitive districts, and I think we can do it.

We're going to have to make some changes,
but I think we can create two in Maricopa County with some minor changes. Well, maybe not minor, but we can definitely try it. I don't think we should give up on that idea.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Well, I think that would be great if you can figure out how to do that. What I wouldn't want to do is dilute this one because I want them -- I want it to be a real competitive district. I don't want it to be the situation where we have two districts that aren't truly competitive.

So if there's a way to build one in Phoenix that -- in addition to the Tempe district, I'm all for it. But the way I look at that district, it's a 50/50 district. It really is what -- it defines -- it is what competitiveness is.

We could have two -- if we have two good qualified candidates there, Republican and Democrat we could have -- you know, we could have the kind of race that people deserve, the kind of race that we are trying to draw these lines so that people have and that's what I want.

So I know we want to get to public comment. I'm tempted, you know, to keep talking about this and actually make a motion, but I'm not
going to do that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, what I think I heard is some compromise with Mr. Freeman and you to work together, at least in terms if he would look at what you created on that competitive district and see how that might work with the rest of the open area.

Is that correct, Mr. Freeman?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I'm happy to look at it. And I think we do need to consider how it fits in with the rest of the map because to favor the competitive district, we have to be able to make a determination that it doesn't do substantial detriment -- cause a substantial detriment to the other five goals we need to follow.

So we need to sort of -- I would definitely consider it and see how we can build around it and to see if we can go forward with that district.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great.

And just to reiterate what I said yesterday, I would like to see a competitive district, at least one, in the Metro Phoenix area and I think we've got one in Metro Tucson on this map and we've got a competitive district in the
rural area. And I think, you know, having at least three competitive districts in the state is warranted. And if more can be created great, as long as it's not to the significant detriment of other goals and to the extent practicable, I'm all for it because as we have talked about, we are to oversee the mapping of fair and competitive congressional and legislative districts. That's straight from the Constitution and we should all remember that.

So with that, I think if we have some agreement to move forward with those changes where Mr. Freeman is going to have some ideas for the -- filling in the center and he'll look at what Ms. McNulty suggested and see if that can be incorporated into one idea, I would like it if we could all then make adjustments to one map. I think it would be simpler for the public, for all of us, and for our mapping consultant.

So I really appreciate everyone in your comments today. They are all listened to and considered, and I don't want anyone to feel like they don't have a voice on this Commission.

So with that, let's move forward.

Mr. Desmond.
WILLIE DESMOND: I'm just -- so what do I need to have for tomorrow?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: You need to prepare a map that includes -- you need to give Mr. Freeman, which means you need to give all of us, the donut hole map with the two changes I made built in.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And you can call that v2b, you could call it whatever you like --

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: -- as long as we all have it.

WILLIE DESMOND: I will prepare the block equivalency, give you all of that before you leave. I will work on the packet for that, including that district, and try to e-mail that to you today or tonight and have that for you tomorrow.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That would be great.

WILLIE DESMOND: And then if there is -- so you guys can all examine Commissioner McNulty's changes and then perhaps tomorrow, if you guys want to come to consensus on whether or not that's included or not, we can go forward from there and include that in future ones or we can keep playing
around for whatever needs to be done.

But just for tomorrow, that's all you guys need, correct?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: The sooner the better.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I have a list of donut hole adjustments as well --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: -- that goes so far as to include some modifications in Cochise County and the Santa Cruz district as well as inside Maricopa County.

So how do you want me to convey those? Do you want me to convey those to Mr. Bladine so those are included --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, what I'm thinking is it might be good to start with one option and maybe we work in public in a meeting as opposed to each trying to create the best ways to fill that in. Because otherwise I think we end up with different variations again.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So we're starting with Commissioner McNulty's or Commissioner Freeman's?
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Kind of both.
Mr. Freeman, I guess, has some ideas for filling his -- complete ideas for that center. Ms. McNulty suggested one particular district and he was willing to look at how that might be worked into his complete center. And we'd talk about that tomorrow once we see what that all looks like.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I think it would make sense -- I think that you had mentioned that we have one commission making changes one at a time. I think if we all start to make changes it might get a little confusing and if we have to -- I would assume it will come to a point where maybe Commissioner McNulty makes or recommends some changes where there's two or three commissioners that don't agree with those changes, that maybe we should vote on those particular changes.

We are going to have to do that eventually. I think that's probably the quickest way to move forward. That's just my recommendation.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I tend to think a consecutive approach might be best now that we are in this phase.
Would you be willing to --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm going to say this here: I agree with Commissioner Herrera.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, great.


CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Desmond.

WILLIE DESMOND: I just wanted to throw in the possibility that if Commissioner Stertz has changes he would like to see, one thing we could do if we have time this afternoon would be to make those changes and then you could go home with both those changes and Commissioner McNulty's changes, look at those tonight and then make a decision.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, we'd need to talk about them -- if you have them ready to go after when we come back at 3 o'clock or something, we could do something like that.

WILLIE DESMOND: I could put them together so that you guys would have both to evaluate tonight, just to say save us a day --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure.

WILLIE DESMOND: -- from, you know, another carryover night or something like that. I'm trying to speed this long.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That would be good.
Anything to move this along.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Just to -- I want a clarification.

You said there would be two versions of this map. One would be Commissioner McNulty's changes and one would be with Commissioner Stertz's recommendations?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair, I thought what we were trying to do was stick with one map. And the first step would be -- I believe that Commissioner Freeman agreed to look at the changes he made in an effort to build those around the competitive district changes and we could see whether we could reach consensus on that.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: That's right.

I also want to think about the nature of that district as well. I know Commissioner Herrera and I live in that area. I'm also from that area and I know we've heard some public comment going all around that area going different directions. So I have to think about that as well. But the simple answer to your question is, yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Again, I would not want two different versions of this map out. Again, if we are going to be doing that, let's go back to river district version 8a.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I don't either.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: It's a good idea.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So we are going to move forward with those two for now. Is that okay, and then at 3 o'clock we'll come back.

Do you have time to do that while we're away?

WILLIE DESMOND: Do what, exactly?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: What if Mr. Freeman has conceived of, including Ms. McNulty's, seeing if that can be worked into his --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I don't think he's conceived of it yet.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It's not --

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I haven't -- I could walk through what I did last night and this morning to show you the approach I took to try to make up that population deficit, but obviously -- like I said, I didn't make the changes to the two voting rights districts that need to be made and I didn't
have this particular district built into mine, which means that affects everything basically that I did.

So I really need -- I need those files and I need to go think about them and play around on Maptitude and come back tomorrow or whenever and see if we can slog through it.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I think it would make sense if the changes that Commissioner McNulty is proposing are made first, since I think she's ready to make those changes, and then we look at those changes and agree or disagree to those changes. And then whomever is next makes -- if we approve those changes, then we make additional changes.

But I think having two people make changes at a time, to me I find that confusing. Again, let's just do -- Commissioner McNulty has her changes, which she has already given to Mr. Desmond, let him make those changes, let him give us that map with those changes and then let's see if we want to move forward with those changes or not.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can those changes be made today before the 3 o'clock or no?
WILLIE DESMOND: I can hand them out today over lunch, you can play with them. I don't know if that's enough time for everyone to evaluate them.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No, it wouldn't be but we could talk about it at 3:00, like, just having what she gave you in the map and seeing what that's looking like.

WILLIE DESMOND: I mean, we could do that right now.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair, I just want to bridge a piece of caution and then I think we should just jump off this topic and move on to public comment, that the whoever-gets-there-first, vote on it, try-to-vote-it-in, I don't think that that's what you're suggesting, Commissioner Herrera, but we want to walk cautiously down that path, that it's incumbent upon us that there are multiple ways of getting to district design that meet with all of the six criteria.

We've already talked about this ad nauseam. I don't want to revisit it again, but I certainly do not want to create a -- the design of a particular district that meets the opportunity for
competitiveness that we have to back into the
criteria of how we got there in the other designs.

And I don't want -- I know that you are
not suggesting, Commissioner McNulty or Herrera, so
I don't want to have any reason to debate that. I
want to just caution us as we go down the let's-pick
one, whoever-got-there-first vote on it and then
work around it process.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: If you don't want to
do the let's-pick-on-whoever-got-there-first, again,
let me remind you that this particular map was based
on the whole counties. Not river district, the
whole counties.

So you're already at an advantage. So
all we are asking is for -- Commissioner McNulty has
put some thought into it. She already has those
changed. Let's see what they look like.

I'm not asking for those changes to be
approved. All I'm asking is for changes to be made
and for us to look at them. That's it.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I have no issue
with that.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: That's all I'm
asking.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Put them on paper and let's look at them and let's start fleshing them out.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think we need to do this in session. I do not see the ability of us to give you directions and then come back the next day and then we talk about it. I think we are just going to have to hammer it out all in one -- in session.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So I think at 3 o'clock we come back and try to see what we can figure out.

But in the meantime, we'll do some public comment, as much as we can get through, until 1:00 and then have a break until 3:00 and then come back and then just start pounding away.

And I apologize, public, we have a lot of public comment today. I really appreciate everybody coming out. I know all of the commissioners do.

It's 12:25 p.m. and we'll just start moving through these as best we can and we'll do as many as we can until 1:00.

Let's try to limit comment, if we can, to
three minutes each and it will maximize the number of people we can get through.

Our first speaker is Richard Elias, co-chair for Hispanic Coalition for Good Government.

RICHARD ELIAS: Good morning, commissioners, and I appreciate all of the work that you do and I know it's been difficult, at best. Personally I would call it the (speaking in native tongue) but it's a little hard to say, so I'm going to leave it alone.

For starters, I would like to make note of a letter that was sent to the Commission from three elected officials in Yuma. And since that time, there's been more than 500 letters submitted to the Commission regarding Yuma and splitting Yuma in a realistic way that would give Latino populations a chance to elect somebody that reflects their particular perspective. I think that's very important.

I have the letter here. For the sake of time, I'm just going to go ahead and submit it and ask that you all take a -- read it. I was going to try and read it into the record, but I think it's better if we just submit it and make sure that you all get a chance to read it.
We continue to ask you to support the maps that were submitted to you for the two Latino districts here in the state of Arizona that are currently protected by the Voting Rights Act.

My family has been here in Arizona seven generations. We've lived in Tucson for five generations. We entered what is now the United States through Nogales, came up here.

My first relative in Tucson was in the first attachment of soldiers that was sent to the Presidio. We then moved out to a ranch in Solbury, which is north and west of Amado and ended up coming back into Tucson after losing the water rights. The typical story of a Chicano family in the Southwest.

Along that way, we've come to learn that the core of Tucson, older Tucson, really makes up a community of interest and it extends over to the university and out to the west far past Tucson Mountain Park.

The map that you are considering right now disenfranchises that community completely. And that's a tragedy.

The people in the city of South Tucson have very little in common with the Catalina Foothills. That is not a community of interest.
Whereas the people who surround the University of Arizona have a much closer relationship with people on the south side due to relationships with Sunny Side School District, with Tucson Unified School District, with Kino Hospital, with the biosciences center that's being built on 36th and Kino. Those are real communities of interest, not arbitrary ones. We need to stay in that realm of what is real.

The map that you are considering right now also splits the Pascua Yaqui people in terrible ways. The people who are Yaqui in South Tucson, Marana, Old Pascua and the New Pascua Reservation would all be divided.

Seems to me that that is not one of the goals that we have, but the Yaqui people are a little hard to understand because they live in a more urban kind of setting. They are not folks who live typically out on the reservation. Very different kind of population.

The affected voting-age populations get changed around dramatically in these two Voting Rights Acts districts. The Southern Arizona district, the HVAP then becomes too high, frankly, and has the effect of putting too many people and
cutting out a large group of people who have voted
typically with the majority there in what is now CD
7. That's a problem.

In Phoenix, the number goes down from the
threshold that they have for the district up there
in Central Phoenix right now. Those are both errors
that I think need to be fixed.

The issue of the three border districts
continues to be problematic, and I think
Commissioner Herrera is absolutely right, it's
arbitrary.

Just in today's Arizona Daily Star, there
was an editorial that was first published in the
Washington Post that talks about the border control
being the best it's been since the Richard Nixon
administration.

I think that says that people, and
particularly people in the majority party of
Congress right now have had a say-so, because that's
all they've wanted to talk about is border security.
They have not talked about resolving the problems of
the people who live in this country and hide in the
shadows. That is yet to be resolved. It will be
resolved. They are here. They are not going
anywhere. Those are difficult, difficult problems.
But along that same line with the border, you look at our border communities and they are heavily Hispanic populated. To split them up further disenfranchises them and puts them in a position where it's going to be more difficult to elect people who can truly represent them.

I think those are the most important things that I have to say to you right now. I am concerned about the direction that we are going. I had hoped that we would continue to work together with the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government and the maps that we submitted.

That does not appear to be happening at this particular juncture. I'm sure you're going to hear from a lot of people today who want to see us move in that direction, and I'm sure that those 500 letters from Yuma also represent that as well.

So I appreciate all of the work that you've done, but I hope we can make these kinds of corrections to any map that is eventually agreed upon because we are putting ourselves at risk for preclearance by the Justice Department.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Representative David
Patterson, State Rep from LD 29.

DANIEL PATTERSON: Daniel.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, I'm sorry, Daniel.

DANIEL PATTERSON: Thank you, Madame Chair and commissioners.

I am Representative Daniel Patterson from here in Tucson, the current District 29.

I want to start by sincerely thanking you and the staff for an incredibly difficult, complex, and thankless task. So I recognize that you've been working literally around the clock on this thing.

So on behalf of the people of Arizona, I think you all deserve a sincere thank you for doing a very, very tough job.

I want to talk today just briefly in very general terms about what competitiveness or a lack of competitiveness, what is the real-world effect of that at places like the capitol, either the U.S. Capitol in Washington or our state capitol here in Phoenix.

And your work here is critical. The work that this Commission does, and whatever gets approved eventually, is going to make it or break it for fair and competitive elections in this state.
through the year 2020, at least. That is -- I cannot overstate the importance of that.

In addition to having to clearly comply with the Voting Rights Act, which is a very big issue here in Pima County and other parts of the state, I think that clearly has to be your number one responsibility, to comply with Voting Rights Act.

Closely behind that, though, I think the will of the people is for competitive districts, and not just where they are convenient, not just where you can find consensus to agree on competitive districts. This is something you may have to disagree on.

It's always a great goal to strive for consensus on a board like this, but it may not always be achievable. And you're going to have to find a solid majority for competitiveness.

That is what I hear over and over and over again from my constituents. And it would be easy for me to ignore them because I currently do not represent a competitive district. I would like to.

A lack of competition, at least at the state level where I'm familiar and serving in the
State House of Representatives, it harms the public interest. It allows -- number one, it limits who may run. So you can have good candidates who are going to choose not to run simply because they live in a district where they think it's unobtainable to even win an election based on the makeup of their district, but more importantly it allows elected officials to ignore far too many of their constituents, to serve only a very narrow set of primary voters. And I see that all the time at the state capitol. All the time.

A lack of competitive districts in Arizona, which is what we have now by and large, it leads to a lack of competitive ideas at the capitol.

And what I do specifically mean by that really? You will have members who will be elected, get into chairmanship roles on committees, bills that are very important or very good ideas may not even be considered simply because of that elected official's somewhat callous concern for that majority of their people.

So I just want to impress upon you that competitiveness is what the people want. That's why this Commission was created. And I think that has to be -- I think that has to be your number one
goal.

And there are very really world effects on what gets done. If people of Arizona like what's going at the state legislature now -- I don't think they do. I don't hear very much approval for the Arizona legislature which hurts a little bit since I serve there, but lack of competitiveness is the reason for that.

Finally, I want to just quickly agree with my friend, Richard Elias, who I think addresses some very important factors on the Voting Rights Act. And even though most of my comments here are aimed at the makeup and the effectiveness of the legislature, which could be improved through competitive districts, I don't see a good reason for this third border district. I'm concerned about what that can do to the voting power of communities here in Southern Arizona.

It appears it was created for these purely political reasons, and obviously, this is a political activity here. But I really just -- I was looking for a good reason for this third border district, and I so far haven't heard it.

So I would encourage you guys to continue to work on those congressional maps, to think long
1 and hard about whether that's the best place to draw
2 a new congressional district in Arizona.
3
4 So, again, I thank you for doing the hard
5 work here. I want to communicate that
6 competitiveness is key, and I hope there can be a
7 least a three-member majority on this Commission
8 that will stick to what the people want, which is
9 competitive districts.
10
11 Thank you very much.
12
13 CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.
14
15 Out next speaker is Linda Horowitz, representing self from Pima County.
16
17 May not be here.
18
19 Our next speaker is Mohur Sidhwa, representing self.
20
21 MOHUR SIDHWA: I've been following the
22 Commission in earnest ever since that fateful day at
23 Pima Community College when -- after those colorful
24 characters had made their statements, I went to the
25 chair and told her how proud I was of her, although
26 I didn't know her from Adam, that she took it and
27 kept her dignity intact. I'm not sure I would have
28 been able to. And I thank you for that, both as a
29 woman and as somebody who lives in our country.
30
31 I am concerned about the three border
districts. I see cracking. I've been concerned about packing, now I'm seeing cracking of the Hispanic population along the three districts.

If you only have, say, 5,000 people near the border, you're not really going to pay attention to them. I know you're not. But just a thought.

And this donut hole map is too new for us to really look into and examine what may come out of it. And so we've gone through hearings -- I've gone to most of the hearings that I could, not just the meetings, and I feel like it's -- this is cynicism of putting us through it because we haven't had much time to really examine this current map.

There are two major communities of interest in Arizona, major, and I'm not talking about bridge clubs and where you go to worship. One of them is the first nations and the other is the Hispanic community.

And this donut hole map really does kind of tear into what they had wanted for their map. It does address some of it, but not entirely. Pascua Yaqui is one them. Just a thought. You may want to reconsider that a little bit.

Seems like we have lost the river district. So be it. But let us not get so bogged
down by finding a compromise that we let go of some very basic principles.

So that's kind of what I wanted to say. Let's not get bogged down by the concept of compromise to the extent of really giving away the store.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is William Sobeck from Corona de Tucson.

WILLIAM SOBECK: Madame Chair, I had my speech before.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

Tom McConnell, representing self from Pima.

TOM MCCONNELL: It's McConnell, M-c-c-o, double n, e, double l.

Just wanted to, again, thank you -- that was quick.

Thank you again for your service. I think we hear a lot about public service and we see now what service really means.

I wanted to comment, first of all, on the criteria in competitive districts. I think that is clearly something that you should be maximizing to
the extent you can do so. I recognize that it's a
difficult set of trade-offs that have to be made.

And as a confession, I'm a former -- or
recovering GIS consultant, so I'm sympathetic with
what Mr. Desmond is going through these days.

I think perhaps we are not paying enough
attention to the criteria that counties should be
maintained intact wherever possible. And this came
up in particular -- I was at a meeting at the Marana
Library and showed some of the maps that had LDs and
CDs that crossed -- that essentially took Marana and
folded into a Pinal County center district.

I just wanted to say that out of 30
responses, it's 30 zip in favor of not doing that.
Most of us who live in Marana feel that we are not
really part of Oro Valley. I rarely go there. I
have never been to Saddlebrooke. I'm sure it's a
lovely community, but I have no need to go there.

I-10 is essentially our Main Street, and
almost all of our economic activity is focused on
Tucson. We travel to Tucson for almost all of our
activities. We are involved in economic development
in Pima County and we pay taxes in Pima County and
would prefer to remain part of that county.

Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Hyatt Simpson, representing self from Tucson.

HYATT SIMPSON: Thank you for this opportunity, and thank you all for the work that you are doing. And it's got to be incredibly hard and you probably wonder often why you signed up for it.

I live on the east side of Tucson metro area, and I'm retired and I vote --

And I'm sorry, I didn't give you my name. Hyatt, H-y-a-t-t, Simpson, S-i-m-p-s-o-n.

In the legislative district that I am in, I feel discouraged when I vote because I do not feel that my vote counts for much, as the district seems to be strongly skewed towards one party.

And so it's, therefore, important to me that when you redraw voting districts, that they be competitive. And I would argue that they be competitive on the basis of performance rather than just registration. And then I feel that there's a chance that everyone's vote will count.

And I had a few more things that I wanted to say about my feelings about the Tucson area and where I live and how important Central Tucson is and so forth, but to keep this short -- this is my first
meeting and it's a lot to try to grasp in a very little bit of time. But the map that I saw today was a three-border district, are really unacceptable on all of the points that I wrote on my green sheet that I wanted to speak about, and that was communities of interest and competitiveness and compactness and the geographic features.

All of these points, the competitiveness, that if you have three border -- three-border districts, it's going to dilute the clout of the border communities.

The communities of interest -- I used to live in Northern Arizona. I worked for Northern Arizona Council of Governments and I was also a city council member in Flagstaff. And I can tell you that that area that you have drawn, which is essentially geographically half of the state or more, is impossible to try to cover in any kind of their way. And I can tell you that when I lived in Flagstaff, I didn't think much about this part of state. And now that I am down here, I can see how incredibly different it is culturally, environmentally, just so many different ways.

We have this fabulous desert and up there we had the wonderful forests and the mountains and
the Grand Canyon.

And then compactness -- well, again, just try and cover that whole area is -- I mean, it's absurd to think about one person doing that.

So I just would urge you to rethink that whole area that you put together and what kind of sense it really makes.

And I know that you are having a hard time balancing all of the things that you need to consider, but look at that area and think about trying to travel it.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Rebecca Spann, representing self from Pima.

I do not see her.

Johnny Williams.

Okay. Tim Sultan, vice president of the SAB Negotiation Group.

Sheila Tobias, representing self from Pima.

Keith Bagwell, representing self from Pima.

Roger Salzgeber -- sorry if I'm messing that up. I probably am -- representing self from
Tucson.

ROGER SALZGEBER: Do you want me to spell it?

THE COURT REPORTER: Yes, please.

ROGER SALZGEBER: Roger, R-o-g-e-r, S-a-l-z-g-e-b-e-r.

I'm not really used to speaking in public, but I came here today because I want to support the creation of competitive districts.

When Arizona passed Proposition 106 to form the Independent Redistricting Commission, you guys, and take control away from legislators concerned with creating their own safe districts for reelection, a major objective in my mind was the prevention of gerrymandering and to form as many competitive districts as possible.

And to be honest, I think you guys have fallen a little short. In my mind, only two of the nine districts exhibit competitiveness, and that's only about 22 percent and I think you could do better.

Creating as many districts as you can with the same communities of interest, in my mind, is another way of saying safe partisan districts. When what we really need is more elected officials
who can compete for the votes of the entire community rather than a narrow interest of a small group.

I believe the problems of intense partisanship and gridlock can only be overcome when more competition is introduced into our elections. After all, isn't competition the cornerstone of the American way of life?

So I thank you for listening to me and allowing me the opportunity to speak.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Dr. Ray Graap, representing self from Pima.

Okay. Linda H. Greene, representing self from Pima.

LINDA GREENE: Is this on?

Okay. It was difficult back there to hear some of the speakers, so I just wanted to be sure that people can hear me.

Thank you all for offering the public an opportunity to comment.

I was very impressed with what Richard Elias had to say about Tucson's communities of interest. I couldn't say it better. I don't think
there's anything more important for you in terms of being in touch with reality as you do this than to take seriously what Richard Elias had to say about what the current plan might do to dividing up some of these natural communities of interest that Tucson represents.

I also came to speak in support of more competitive districts. I do not understand why there's talk about -- it seems like you're settling for three competitive districts. That seems extremely arbitrary to me when, again, I think there's been some things very eloquently stated about what the problems that currently exist in the state of Arizona because of lack of competition. So I don't need to say it again.

But I would like to say all the research that is done by the League of Women Voters and by others who look at voting patterns say that the biggest reason for voter apathy is lack of competition in districts. If people, again, don't think their vote counts, if they think their district is heavily tilted towards one party, they don't bother getting involved.

And I think that is one of the reasons that Arizona is now in a race to the bottom. All
the statistics coming out of the state of Arizona are extremely depressing. We are compared with the most poverty-ridden states in the Union. We are compared with only the states that do not have competitive, educational programs and with dollars spent per child on education. We know this is true.

We know that Arizona, according to what I have read lately, is the only western state that is losing ground now coming out of economic recovery. The other states around us have been pulling ahead of us. Why is that? Why does Arizona keep getting in this race to the bottom?

Well, I think it's because we have lack of competition in our legislative districts, particularly, and also in our congressional districts.

And so the people don't get involved. Community leaders are not able to stir up people's interest in the major issues that we should all be concerned of.

So I think it should be, however you turn this map, if there should be many more than just three of our districts competitiveness.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.
Our next speaker is Andrea Dalessandro.

ANDREA DALESSANDRO: I'll spell it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Representing self from Sahuarita.

ANDREA DALESSANDRO: It's Andrea Dalessandro. D-a-l-e-s-s-a-n-d-r-o.

I want to thank the commissioners and their staff for -- because your task is daunting, and I do appreciate your service.

I want to talk about communities of interest first. The people in the Green Valley/Sahuarita area live there because of its proximity to Tucson.

We are actually a bedroom community -- I should say communities to Tucson. Our hospitals are in Tucson. Just this morning I visited my dentist on -- in Tucson on Swan and my specialist, my periodontist, my endocrinologist, and my gynecologist are in Tucson. My husband, Marine Corps veteran, goes to the V.A. in Tucson as well as to some of his specialists.

I have a Green Valley address but I am a resident of Sahuarita. Sahuarita is one of the few incorporated areas in Southern Arizona, and I think it's best to keep the town of Sahuarita together in
any map that you consider for them to have a
stronger voice and have legislators or Congress
people be accountable to them.

As a region, we operate very closely with
Green Valley. And I do say sometimes I'm from Green
Valley and sometimes from Sahuarita. In fact, we
are very aligned with charitable organizations as
well as the business community. In fact, the name
of our business community is the Chamber of Commerce
of Green Valley and Sahuarita. And I had to look to
make sure I was putting the right town first.

More is not always better. I favor two
districts on the border. In Sahuarita, we wanted to
have our own library a couple of years ago and we
had to go to three different supervisors on the
County Board of Supervisors, and it was really hard
to lobby three people. I think two stronger voices
are much better.

I feel that divide and conquer might be
the rule rather than -- I think it's better to have
two districts on the border and have them be
accountable. This also affects the military. I
feel strongly that both Davis-Monthan and Fort
Huachuca should be in the same district to give us a
strong accountable voice to the Armed Services
I also feel that there are other issues that pertain, especially to Southern Arizona, whether it's the military and security, border issues, and water, and I do feel very strongly to have two -- so not to have diluted voices.

Please follow the Constitution, but in closing, please give serious -- very serious concern for competitiveness because I think Arizona deserves better than what we have now.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Roger White, representing self from Tucson.

ROGER WHITE: Roger White, just like it's spelled. Just like it sounds.

Madame Chair and commissioners, first of all, I would like to thank you all for the public service you are doing here today. Too often that goes unsaid. I know how difficult your task is, so thank you.

I had hoped to address this Commission before today regarding your -- what you've referred to as your donut hole map that you introduced yesterday for the first time very late in the
process.

I had hoped to comment on that prior to this Commission taking any action on that map. Clearly that's too late now.

I would like to address the reasons why.

First of all, I'm an attorney. I'm not here in any representative capacity, other than myself. But in my career over more than 20 years, there was a time I did a substantial amount of election law cases, including Voting Rights Act compliance. So I know what you are dealing with trying to come up with these maps.

Now, Madame Commissioner, I've heard you describe several times this morning that your donut hole map was an attempt to fuse together the various incompatible maps into something that is a compromise.

As someone who has done a substantial number of mediations and settlement conversations over the years I can tell you that's a critical thought process error that can't be done to bring people together into a compromise.

I know that's a natural inclination for people to do, but it always results in a flawed process. In fact, I was thinking about it when you
were describing it. It reminded me of the creation story where after God got finished done making all of the creatures of the world he had some parts left over so he threw them all together and made the platypus. So if you are looking for a name to call your map, I would suggest the platypus map.

It's not going to work. Based upon my past experience and knowledge in this area, even without the Phoenix area being filled in, I would suggest to you that your District 1 on your map is fatally flawed just looking at it without even seeing the details on it. Anybody doing compliance work would look at that and tell you that's a big red flag.

There was discussion this morning from, I believe it's the competitive districts group that was here this morning, describing how Cochise County should not be included with the Northern Arizona tribal lands. And even though we come from different sides of the political spectrum, I totally with their testimony this morning. They are correct, those are different communities of interest. They should not be combined like that.

The discussion of the map this morning, I believe it was -- it's been renamed now, hasn't it.
The map 8a which you're now calling the river district Navajo Nation map I believe is correct, that map actually comes very close to where you should be working from. It needs some tweaks for jurisdictional boundaries.

As somebody who has reviewed these maps in the past a number of times, that map, you can -- if you're working from that map, you can come very close to where you need to be making the minor tweaks you need to make to comply with DOJ compliance for the congressional maps. And I hope you get to the legislative maps eventually.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker, and it's -- let me get the time. It's 12:58, so we're going to have to end this at 1:00. I still have a number of request to speak forms, so if you're willing to come back at 3 p.m., we'll be on to -- continuing our work with the congressional adjustments. So public comment will be coming at the end of the day. So I apologize that we can't get through everybody right now, but we have time for one more.

Wanda Pike, Common Sense Redistricting, representing self.
Okay she's not here.

Camy Juarez, representing self from Tucson.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Steve Arnquist, representing -- oh, I'm sorry.

CAMY JUAREZ: I'm kind of short but I'm here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm sorry. I should have looked up.

CAMY JUAREZ: Madame Chair, commissioners, good morning.

First and foremost, as everyone else before me, I would also like to thank you for the work that you are doing, and I would like to acknowledge the difficulty of reaching some of this consensus, like a lot of other people before me, but I would also acknowledge the time constraint that you are working with. I know that you have kind of a broad window, but it is shorter than we all think.

To that, I would like to speak to first and foremost who I am and where I come from.

I am at a unique position in that I have been in Pima County and Tucson for the last 20 years. The 20 years before that I spent in South Yuma County, in San Luis, Arizona, and that's where...
my family is still. Our roots are there. My parents were Mexican immigrant farm workers all of their lives, and our roots are there. I say that again. Simply because these are members of these communities of interest that keep popping up in these conversations and these comments and these are folks that slowly but surely we've become a bit more empowered and more enfranchised, if you will.

These maps that we are talking about, the donut map, the bagel map, whatever you want to call it -- I'm calling it a pizza map just because of all of the different divisions and pieces of pie that everyone is looking to get.

And I simply address that not to be disrespectful, but to bring up the point that there was -- Supervisor Elias mentioned the many letters that you have received. Mine is still probably sitting on my desk ready to be mailed to you as well as a few others that I've managed to secure, but primarily, there is a lot of voices that are not here that have not made the call to the audience, and these voices I also assume will be heard or will be read, at least in the form of a letter.

And these voices are my brothers and sisters -- literally my brothers and sisters. I
don't mean that like in the cultural concept, but
also other members of the community that aren't
typically heard that are margin lines, that are --

I mean, my background is in urban
planning, regional planning, and community
development. And working in that field, I can tell
you, and I'm sure you all know, that the
participating -- public participation in forums
likes this -- just looking around the room, you're
going to see that there are fewer faces from the
minority groups here than there are the majority.

This is the state of Arizona, and this is
the task that you have all have signed, is to try to
divide that even, equally.

And by looking at these maps, by looking
at these maps that you have now settled on I guess
since yesterday and moving on into today -- I was a
bit confused as to the motion process that happened
earlier, but it was explained to me that -- it seems
like it was a fair and rational thing.

Wow, that was three minutes?

Since I'm the last one, I guess I'll go
a little longer, if you don't mind.

But these dividing these communities of
interest does a few things, and I'll close with
that. It divides the natural or jurisdictional boundaries. People talked about living in Sahuarita, in Nogales, in Santa Cruz County, Yuma County north and south, Yuma County -- dividing those along -- creating divisions along those boundary lines, it divides those communities of interest.

It also dilutes the efforts of a developing population. A population that has slowly come to -- my family before me, my brothers and sisters, of the seven -- of nine of us, seven of us have college degrees. The generation before that did not have that.

And so slowly but surely you have populations like my population, Mexican/American population, that is slowly coming into a situation where it's equitable, where we have determined our own destinies, if you will, just like everyone else in the American history.

So yes, the history of America is based on competitiveness but it's also based on trying to support the little guy or the little gal, if you want to be politically correct.

So the last two things I'll mention here as well as dividing communities of interest, you are
ignoring -- and I don't mean that in an accusatory fashion, I want to state this. You are ignoring the future potential of other up-and-coming minority populations.

I say that because I want to move away from the political realm of it, although I'm sure that it's political as well. But I also want you to keep in mind that you are not just dealing with legislative districts and congressional districts, you're dealing with people. People that want to be empowered, people that want to move up the ranks, if you will, to try to get to a place where they can also achieve the American dream.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

The time is 1:04 p.m., and unfortunately, we are going to have to go to recess now. We'll be back at 3 p.m.

And thank you all for coming today. We really appreciate it. We still have those want to speak, you can come back later this afternoon.

Thank you.

(A recess was taken from 1:04 p.m. to 3:24 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Recess is
over. We'll enter back into public session. The
time is 3:24 p.m.

An we were in the midst of taking public
comment up until the recess in the first half of the
day but now we're back onto agenda item 3 because we
thought we could work through maybe some of these
adjustments to the bagel map together, that that
would probably make the most sense as to opposed to
them coming up with different versions that everyone
has to track and follow.

So if it's possible, I would love it if
any commissioners -- and I think Mr. Freeman maybe
had some ideas. I don't know if he's ready to talk
about any of those now. And I know Ms. McNulty did,
but I thought we could at least start with those and
see if we wanted to address the inner circle area
first. Or if others have other ideas, I'm happy to
entertain them.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.
VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I would be happy to
walk -- sort of walk through my thought processes
last night as to how to approach filling in the
hole.

Obviously, what I did has now been
affected by what Commissioner McNulty has done, so I'll have to reconsider, but I think the principal challenge is that CD 4, that river district, is short 210,000. So it's a matter of getting that population and how that's done. And if that -- perhaps it might be useful to have that up on the screen as we're talking about it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It would. And one of the ideas would be to follow the river district version 8a, the boundary between 4 and 5 on that map and have it at least match -- I would be open to having those match as far down as you want to take it, because as I said earlier, there's that -- I think that area around Flagstaff/Verde Valley that might be different between those -- the two maps as they currently stand.

And if you want to make -- if we would all agree that maybe river district 8a boundary, we could take that down as far as we want.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I'm not sure if that's going to do it for us.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, it won't -- it won't be 210,000 people for sure. I don't know what it would do population wise.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Maybe if you could,
Willie, back out a little bit.

All right. So here is the area of Western Maricopa County that's right now unassigned. And this area is really lightly populated, rural agrarian. And so to try to recapture -- this is CD 4 up here, which is a congressional district that goes to the westward to the Colorado River, and that was the starting point for one of the what-if scenario maps, is identifying that river community as a community of interest.

And then that obviously doesn't comprise 710,000 people for congressional district, padding adjacent territory to the east that is essentially rural in nature to comprise the so-called river district.

So this is the district that's short 210,000 people. So if we take this boundary of unassigned and move it east, and I think I, at first cut, moved it right up here to the -- where I'm moving the laser pointer that takes it to the eastern edge of Goodyear, western edge of Goodyear and sort of north/south. And I don't know if all of this is going to work as we go through it live, but I think you're looking at adding -- doing that maybe 40, 45,000 people is all. You don't -- not quite
close to getting there. But Mr. Desmond will tell us.

WILLIE DESMOND: So with that selection right there, the areas that are in red, if that were to go to District 4, it would be 51,505.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay. A little more.

Another thing I did is sort of cleaned up this issue here with this little loop down that gets all of -- Goodyear is not -- the city of Goodyear is split -- maybe scan down a little bit because I thought it was split. Part of it is split off.

So Goodyear is split. So because it's being split once, I figured let's split -- originally I thought maybe we could do it along the Salt River or State Route -- I forget the number -- 85, perhaps, that goes along there and then bring this up as well for something -- this is going to be a next step down the road to try to capture more territory for CD 4.

So if we were to add -- I'm not going to be able to re-create every step here on the fly, but that's going to add some more territory.

Then if you look on Google earth, this area right here, this is Citrus Park, this purple
square and this white area, it's all farming, agrarian land. It really extends -- it's rural in nature. Extends almost to the 101.

In fact, if you've ever driven north on the 101 to the Cardinal's stadium or to see the Coyotes, you'll see farmland on both sides of the 101, even, but I did not go as far as the 101, but sort of captured this sort of cut-out here to get some more population but not going into Surprise, at least not yet.

Then I think this blue -- this brown patch is a part of Glendale that's actually Luke Air Force Base and there's some -- I think some homes over here. So I basically took all of that as well, once again, trying to grab as much population as possible but also keep the essence of this sort of low population rural or agrarian in nature.

So I don't know what that potential change brings us up to.

WILLIE DESMOND: Right there we're up to 76. If we take a little bit more of Buckeye -- go up a little bit more.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Yeah, well, we haven't even got into where I was going split Goodyear. That's going give us some more -- you
might just take a rough cut there and add -- if you
were to follow my pointer just straight across here.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm just going to accept
this one change. We can always go back.

Does that look right?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: It's not going to
match what I have, but why don't we go ahead and
accept it to see how much population that adds.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. That added about
90,000 people making District 4 now about 46,000
people short.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay. Well, I end
up giving some of it back in the version I have, but
we're getting closer.

Goodyear, I've been through there
recently. It's an agrarian area as well. So it's
not really like adding dense, urban population to
this essentially rural district.

So that was sort of the first cut at
trying to grab more population, but we're still
short almost 50,000. So if you zoom out, the other
grab we could do is take the rural -- or take Gila
County, the nonreservation portions of Gila County
and add that into CD 4 and we could also take -- as
in I think the -- well, not whole counties but maybe
in the river district version, this portion of
basically unoccupied Maricopa County, sort of square
that off and clean it up.

WILLIE DESMOND: So if we do Gila County,
that's 40,000.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay. So now we're
really close.

WILLIE DESMOND: Now we're down to a
difference of 5,252.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: But, of course, now
we've depopulated this Eastern Arizona district by
that amount and we've got to reclaim that.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: So that's where --
if you go -- I went south to Pinal County to reclaim
that and reclaimed that from the nonreservation
portions of Pinal County.

And then this area up here where San Tan
Valley is included in the Phoenix metro unassigned
area, I didn't go into that census place, but I sort
of -- there's not a lot of population there, but I
kind of -- I think I ended up having to put Gold
Canyon into the eastern district and sort of cleaned
up that line.

WILLIE DESMOND: So having moved that
kind of rural part of Northeast Maricopa, you're now
down 612,000 -- or 612 people deviation. So you're
just about right there on 4. Moving Gila County,
you're now 40,000 short on District Number 1. So
if --

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: So this has a ripple
effect because we're going to get -- I got that back
in Pinal County, then, of course, that affected the
minority-majority district. So I had to go back and
adjust that boundary between CD 3 and CD 4, in that
Buckeye/Goodyear area to even out the population.

WILLIE DESMOND: So with that, taking
some of San Tan, some of Apache Junction, all of
Gold Canyon, very rough here, that's about 27,600.
So you would still need to make up about 14,000
somewhere else.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay. I don't know
if I -- well, I don't have that map up, but I took
it from -- if you pull back on Pinal County --

WILLIE DESMOND: Oh, I see.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I took it from down
here.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: That's the
nonreservation portion down there and kind of
brought it back to the county line, to extent practicable.

So then this left -- this District 3 depopulated but we could get that back by adding part of South Goodyear and pushing this line in Buckeye up closer to the I-10 as a boundary.

And when I went through all of those steps -- I might have missed one -- I eventually -- I actually did better right now than I did last night, but CD 4 that was depopulated by -- it was 210,000 underpopulated, I got it to within 14,000, which I figured was within striking distance and essentially kept it rural in nature, rural agrarian. Very little of Phoenix metro of any significance included in that.

WILLIE DESMOND: So if I was able to then take this area, I guess, of Eloy and stuff, do that, I think we're going to be somewhere around 7,000 short, 8,000 short still and then that will be short in District 1 and then District 3 again is 32,000. So that does have, like you described, the ripple effect.

So District 1 needs to grab some people from somewhere. That's possible to take kind of the area maybe that's next to San Tan Valley, not on the
incorporated areas, but also possible, you know, other places taking some population from City of Maricopa or something.

Then District 3 -- if I just -- District 3 is then about 32,000. Not many people down here in Buckeye, but that adds about 10,000, then you have to take some in Maricopa somewhere.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Or you can push this up in Buckeye up towards the I-10.

WILLIE DESMOND: So then, again, you're going to be taking some from 4 again, so 4 has to go back up.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Right, and you probably end up 14,000 short like I did.

But, of course, we could find ways to go in or just accept the fact that we're going to need 14,000 people from the Phoenix metro area and go into that CD 4.

It's just -- that was the approach I took to try to repopulate CD 4 and try to keep it's essential character the same.

WILLIE DESMOND: The best way to think of it is the unassigned area is going to have to give 210,000 to some district, whether or not that's given partly to District 3, which is the
majority-minority coalition -- or the
minority-majority district or 4 or 1, the two rural
districts. I guess that's the hard part for you
guys.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So I'm wondering on
river district version 8a, if the eastern
boundary -- or just we'll call it the boundary
between 4 and 5 on that map can be replicated to
match on the other map and seeing what that does to
any numbers, whether it's population or -- it seems
like we should follow that line. It mostly does
already from -- it sits around that Verde Valley
area.

WILLIE DESMOND: So maybe I need to go
back to where we were. But the river district 8a,
the places where that makes up the population -- I
mean, it takes a lot of the rural part of Maricopa
but then it also goes in and -- let's just see, it
takes portions here of Phoenix and Peoria. I think
that accounts for some of the -- its population and
it comes in on Surprise, takes some of Goodyear kind
of like I'm doing now.

We could take that --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can we just follow
that same line between --
WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And just replicate it on to the other or not.

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure. Sure.

I'm not sure how you guys -- just practically speaking, how you want me to be doing this. I created a new bagel version 2c to give Commissioner Freeman the "c" designation for his. And I'm not sure if this should go back to "a," because that's the one you're playing with. If we want to keep one that's -- I don't know how to like -- that all agreed upon. You know, one that there's no disputes and then the other side ones are ones where you're playing around with it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's a good point.

What do people think about that?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair, I had understood that what we were doing was we were going to take the map that you created and we were going to, without adjusting the other districts, propose ways to complete the hole -- to complete the donut hole. And I think that would include -- I guess it would include bringing 4 down into Maricopa County at some point.

But I did not understand that we were
each going to be doing separate maps adjusting all
of the boundaries. I thought the next exercise was
to attempt to reach agreement on how that empty area
was going to be completed.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I wasn't
planning on having different versions either. I was
hoping that that's why we were all working in
concert at the same time in real time so that we
could maybe just deal with one version at a time.

But -- so to me, I would like to see the
line replicated from 8a -- river district version 8a
to the bagel map so that at least that boundary is
the same as it is on that down at least to, you
know, this -- you can see the exact area on the two
maps. There's a very similar notch coming out. So
-- and then start to adjust around this border of
Maricopa County.

But I don't see how we do this separate,
like individually with different versions outside of
this room.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I don't either.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So I think we have
to power through this, as painful as it may be.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: My only point is
that I had understood the exercise to be that we
were going to fill in the hole, rather than we were going to adjust all of the boundaries.

I mean, I don't have any problem. It seems like -- don't you have the ability to just show us those two lines on top of one another?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, they are right now.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, that's not entirely true. Right now what we have is the changes that we just went through with Commissioner Freeman and the blue line is the river 8a. That might not show up great.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So would anyone be opposed to us just copying that same boundary at least, you know, up until --

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: The difficulty that presents, though, is that sort of locks us in, because in adopting the boundary in the river district map, CD 4 is shedding I believe even more population. And so that means to bring CD 4 up to 710,000, we're really going to have to take a lot of population out of Phoenix and put it in the district
with, like, Havasu City and Bullhead City. And I
mean, I've got some concerns there, given what we've
heard and how it would change the character of that
district.

That's the problem. That's why I worked
through that in that clock-like way to try to get --
keep CD 4 as rural as possible.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So -- but how far
down on the river district version map do you see
agreement, at least in terms of being able to follow
that line? How far south?

Could we at least get to a point where
they are more similar? Because they look pretty
similar up until one little area.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think maybe if
we move the Verde Valley from one to the other, then
we would need to make another trade-off perhaps
somewhere in Gila County to bring population back
in.

WILLIE DESMOND: So currently in that
area -- that's another area of divergence right
here. The donut/bagel/churro map follows just right
along the county line and the river district 8a dips
into Yavapai County, grabs Sedona, Oak Creek, and
Cornville.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: What's wrong with following that line? I don't think Commissioner Freeman makes the decisions in all of this. We all have an equal vote on this.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's right.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Commissioner Freeman may disagree. I disagree with him. So eventually, as I said before, we're going to have to start making decisions and it might not always be 5-0 and we're going to have to move forward.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I agree.

Can you explain that, that dip in your river district version 8a took and why, that particular --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Are you talking to me?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah. The dotted line is your --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Correct.

Can you zoom in a little closer?

I think the --

Is that Oak Creek and Cornville.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, and Sedona.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And if it was just for population balancing reasons or just to make up population?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: No. I think in the changes -- this has been a while ago, so let me go back to when we moved it and I gave --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: What's the orange census tract, I'm sorry, up in the right-hand corner.

WILLIE DESMOND: Right up here?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Uh-huh.

WILLIE DESMOND: Munds Park.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: We talked about moving two towns whole within District 5. I think they were split and Cornville and Oak Creek should be together, and that's why we ended up doing it that way, trying to keep them whole in the same district.

WILLIE DESMOND: And I think what happened originally was there a population imbalance between those two. Sedona had asked to be with Flagstaff. Sort of the natural place to fix that, but then it did split Cornville and Oak Creek, and that was corrected in the latest iteration.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So is there
an issue with following the river district line on
that to keep those two communities whole.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I have no issue.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I wanted to have a
clarification of that.

As we were moving lines on the
donut/bagel/churro district map, as we move one
line, all of the lines are going to come into play.

So Commissioner McNulty had said that we
were only going to be looking at filling in the
blank. And I think that that's -- we're really
looking to make adjustments. We're going to end up
making adjustments everywhere.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right. And so
that's where I kind of felt like to the extent we
can follow the river district line down, I would say
we do that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: To Maricopa -- to
the border of Maricopa County makes perfect sense.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. And so if
we're willing to go that far, if everyone agrees,
and then from there we'll have to see what we want
to do.
So at least could that line be mimicked from river district 8a to the churro map all the way down to Maricopa County line?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: If that's the only difference right there, what we're looking at.

WILLIE DESMOND: That's the only difference.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's it.

WILLIE DESMOND: That's it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Well, that was easy.

WILLIE DESMOND: Just a -- I still just want to make sure.

Is there one map that we are all working on together that that's the one that I edit and that's kind of a change we've all agreed on at that point?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think we need to get to one map. You know, we're on one map now but now we need to move forward on one version. And if people end up, you know, going home and thinking about this and they are working at home and they think, oh, I've come up with another solution, we can certainly present it in session when we are all together. But I would rather not have 6 -- 3a, 3b,
3c for each commissioner.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: The changes that Mr.--Commissioner Freeman proposed, I haven't had a chance to review them. So I don't know if I agree with them or not. So I would not agree with making those changes until we actually look at what they look like.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I agree. None of us--we can't--this has to be approached holistically because everything effects everything else. And so--and we haven't done analysis on it, but if we could start--if we could fill in the rest of the map and then see where we are and what we want to do from there, I think that's the best way to go forward.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: But what you're saying is you would like to start by just cleaning up that one line on your map?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I wanted to get that done. And now we can work on Maricopa County.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. I don't have any problem with it at all. My only question is--and I don't think we need to deal with this
right now, is if we have a resulting population imbalance, then at some point we'll need to address that. But I don't know see any need to do that right this second, why we can't just flag it. Doesn't look like it's going to be huge in any event.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Well, it's good to know that the only difference between 8a and the churro map is that one little corner that we just took care of.

So now that line is exactly the same on those two versions down to the Maricopa County line. I just want to point that out for everybody.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Did you say the only difference?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: On this -- on the difference between -- they are different numbers on the two maps. Between 4 and 5 on the river district and 1 and 4 on the churro district -- churro map.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Okay. Thank you for clarifying.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Does anyone have an extra copy of the churro map? It's the same
person who took my glasses earlier.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: There you go.
    COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Thank you.
    WILLIE DESMOND: So just so I'm completely -- I want to make sure I've got this all clear.

    I went back now, so I went to -- I created a new map. It's called congressional bagel version 2a.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.
    WILLIE DESMOND: This is kind of the master one that we are working on, and we will just continue working on this one. And then should we need to split, we could do that at this point.

    Commissioner McNulty has a 2b she asked to look at and you guys -- I'll have stuff presented on that tomorrow, but that's not been incorporated at this time.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.
    Mr. Stertz.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay. I'm now confused. We are doing individual commission --

    WILLIE DESMOND: Well, that's what I'm trying to see.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: He's trying to get
that out of us.

    I would say no, I would not want to do that.

    WILLIE DESMOND: So then do you guys want to decide on those changes now or is that something you want to wait and decide on --

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think we should -- we have to put the pieces together and then see -- run the numbers, see what's, you know, wrong, what's right and see what we can agree on. Because I don't -- unless somebody has a better method for doing this, I don't think it's helpful to come up with a bunch of versions.

    VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

    VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I don't have a problem with coming up with different versions if we decide to look at them individually and vote on them. If Commissioner McNulty has some changes that she is proposing that will fix this void and we look at it tomorrow -- let's just say we get the draft tomorrow, Willie presents it to us, we should be able to vote on it and say, you know what, I approve it, no, we don't, and take a vote and then go to the next one. The next one is the same thing. That
would be Commissioner Freeman. If Commissioner
Freeman is proposing changes, he has his own
version. If we approve it, then those changes would
go to the main map.

I think that would be the way to work it. I don't see any other way it will work. I think
this would be the best way.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: As I understood
where we were, you had asked us to propose changes
for the interior of the hole. And so I proposed the
competitive district in a way to rebalance the two
majority-minority districts and we were going to put
that on -- put that into the map so that
Commissioner Freeman could take that away and
consider that when he -- which he agreed to do in
building the rest of his proposal around it.

So that's -- I thought that was what we
had come to this morning. I would be more than
happy to propose what I laid out earlier right now
and go through it, but I thought we were going to
follow it -- the procedure we had talked about a
little earlier.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I agree. It's just
in terms of filling that -- the donut hole, when I
approached the problem last night, I felt that I
needed to make adjustments outside of it to capture
each rural population to do that. So that's what
I did.

And just for this afternoon's purposes, I
just want to sort of walk through the rationale, the
approach, to sort of recapture that 210,000.

Now, as Commissioner McNulty said, she's
got a proposal -- well, she's made an adjustment to
the minority-majority districts, which we now all
have and she's got a proposal for one of the urban
districts, which we all have.

So I would like to go back and look at
filling that donut hole. But to do that, what I
might end up doing is doing a similar approach to
keep that CD 4 rural.

And, you know, I think Mr. Desmond should
keep a master, sort of the working map, singular,
one map that we are working from, but I think that
-- you know, the problem is every time we make a
change, it affects the rest of the map.

So there may be commissioners who come
back at a hearing and have a proposal or have a map.
If I have time, I'll try to do the map. I might
not. I might just be giving instruction.

So that might be sort of a subversion that is looked at and either adopted or not adopted or we go back to it three steps down the road or something like that.

But I think one master map, you should keep that and that's sort of the agreed-upon map as it goes forward or backwards.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I've been thinking about what's transpired today to try to understand how we got to this process that you presented yesterday and approved today.

I sort of looked at the last -- the process that we've gone through not only learning about the state, learning about the districts, learning about the areas, collecting a tremendous amount of community input, letters, testimony, knowledge of the maps, knowledge of map making, street-level understanding that we've gone through an incredible learning process to get to a variety of different maps that have been presented.

And that your goal of creating this bagel
map was to say -- was not to have us start back at zero, but to take some of the most tangible things that we have learned from and start to work ourselves from what we know and we agree upon to a sensible and logical conclusion.

And the sensible and logical conclusion I'm seeing -- and please correct me if I'm wrong -- I'm thinking that you're wanting to -- for the public and the Commission, to be in the sausage factory together, sort of watching this sausage being made. And that it might be a messy process and there's going to be some pluses or minuses as we're going, but if we're going to take what we've all learned and put it into actual practice, that's the only way --

And I think there's going to be a series of maps that are going to go up on the screen that are going to be just looked at, analyzed, and summarily disposed of and then some of them integrated.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's true. I don't feel like we can get to done unless all five of us are sitting at the table working with the mapping consultant to get this to closure.

So I -- it is a messy process, but I
I don't see a good way around it. And if there are better, more efficient ways of doing it, I'm open to that. I just -- I don't really see how we ever actually get to approval of a draft map if we keep going down different paths. Because if each of us comes up with a different version for filling the hole, then we're going to -- I guess we could do a vote on each of the five or something like that, but it seems like this is going to be some give and take throughout this process and I think it has to be done in person.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And, Madame Chair, I think -- personally I think it would be very healthy for us to have that sort of dialog because it goes back to my discussion last Thursday which was as we come up with a district that we particularly like, as you have along this border line, that there is justification for it, we have logical reason behind it. We -- it has merit. It has -- it's met constitutional testing, as we are understanding it to be. And it's going to make it easier for us to quickly get to an agreement of how we want to move forward on these.

And I think that all of the state is going to go -- is going to be touched by this
process. And I think that if we just do it openly 
and fluidly with the things that we've got -- 
there's areas that there's passion about. There's 
areas that very easy to discuss, like the discussion 
that you just had.

We'll passionately come to a conclusion. 
We'll passionately lay out our debate about what we 
feel. And then if there are areas that we cannot 
come to a general consensus, then we'll go to a 
technical vote.

I think that way we can move the ball 
down the field or else we're just going to keep 
going back and forth over the 50-yard line and we 
are not going to be able to get to the end zone.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair, I 
think that's a good way to describe it.

I had understood that what we were doing 
here was following your lead in taking some of the 
best aspects of the other maps and that we were 
going to complete the donut hole, that that was 
going to be our focus.

And that -- and the reason that I agreed 
to go ahead with that was because of the attributes 
that you had collected here, the two 
minority-majority districts, which are not the
districts that were proposed by the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government, but which, nevertheless, at least appear worthy of analysis for preclearance purposes.

The competitive district on the east side of the state, a truly competitive district, a rural district on the west side of the state that addresses the issues that we heard in public comment that was the basis for the start of the map, a truly competitive district in Southern Arizona, a competitive district in urban Phoenix, and then the rest of Phoenix built out around it with a view towards reaching consensus on this in the very near term and moving on to the legislative maps.

I would not support -- I don't think we have time for a process where we go back and forth across the 50-yard line on all of these lines all over the state. I think that we're going to -- we need to finalize a draft map. We need to send it out for public comment.

And I know we're going to get a huge amount of public comment on the error of our ways, which I think is what Mr. Freeman had said, and we will keep working on it.

But for the time being, I had understood
what you were asking us was, as I said, to follow
your lead on the broad brush of this map to focus on
the white part and to fill that in. That's what I
signed on for and that's what I would like to do.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. That's -- you
summarized that very well, Commissioner McNulty.
That is what I had in mind.

The question is how do we move forward on
filling that white area in, whether we can all do
that in public together or not. And that's where
I'm looking for input.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Well, I've done my
proposal. And I'm willing, just from my own
perspective, to do a couple of things. To let
Mr. Freeman work around it and to bring back his
ideas and whoever else wants to bring back their
ideas on the donut hole and then work them through
here or, you know, I can just walk through what I
proposed right now I guess.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think that would
actually be helpful if you would do that and then
Mr. Freeman will have a good sense of where your
thinking was in creating that and then that will
allow him to work around it, if he can, and see
where the pressure points are.
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. All right. Would you put that up Mr. Desmond?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I would just note, I don't think we have any legislative map discussion, correct? So this is why we're spending so much time on congressional.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I have notes everywhere.

Should we do the majority-minority tweaking first?

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

Did you want to start with District Number 7 or District Number 3?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I want to start with the one in Maricopa County -- well, in Central Phoenix.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. District 7.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. For some reason, I can't keep all of these numbers straight.

Okay. So we're going to take in -- we're going to go to 75th Avenue, which is kind of on the northwest side. You can see that, the deviation between the brown and the red lines.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: This is the majority-minority district?
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: This is the Phoenix -- the South Phoenix minority-majority district.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So this 75th?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: That is where --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So we're going to increase the HVAP a little bit in 1 and decrease it in another and even out the population.

And again, I understand from counsel that we don't actually have to engage in this exercise right now because it's a statewide analysis, but I think it makes sense to do it anyway, at least a start, so we are as close as we can get for purpose of doing all of the racially polarized voting analysis and so forth.

MARY O'GRADY: That's a good idea.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So in the donut map, grid 7, which is the Phoenix grid, has an HVAP of 56.64 percent and the congressional district has a benchmark of 57.45 percent.

On grid 3 in the donut map, we have an HVAP of 56.43 percent and a benchmark of 50.23 percent. So what we're doing is bringing those a little closer together and adjusting for
population.

So having said that, the boundary is moved west from 75th Street, which is the north/south brown line there just parallel to the red line to 83rd -- not street, 75th Avenue to 83rd Avenue between Van Buren and Camelback. And those census tracts are in the low 70s of HVAP.

And then we go up to the corner there, the northwest corner at 91st Avenue and we take that border up to Northern, which is the red line and we bring -- we follow it all the way across to 7th Avenue and then we take 7th down to Indian school east to Central and south to Thomas.

So once we've done that -- actually, before you do, that just kind of follows along.

So now what we've done is we've got a population imbalance with some in Arizona majority district by virtue of what we've done here. So to fix that, we're going to go to Buckeye along I-10 and we're going to move that area, which is actually fairly high HVAP into 3, which balances out the population and it increases -- let me see. I typed out -- it increases the HVAP in 7 to pretty close to the benchmark and then it decreases the HVAP in 3. I think it's down to 55.74.
And this is -- you know, this is going to take a lot of analysis and a lot of public comment, but I think that at least evens those out a little bit.

Then on -- so that's all in that area. And then the other proposal is in the Tempe area. If we go to South Mountain, Ahwatukee -- so this area essentially comprises three legislative districts: 11, 17, and 20, I think which are fairly competitive legislative districts now and includes Ahwatukee, which is the brown, moving east, North Chandler and South Tempe.

And the boundaries of that are all, you know, natural and geographic boundaries. There's South Mountain kind of on the northwest, there is the Gila Indian River -- Gila River Indian Community on the south, there's I-10 Chandler on the east side. Together these areas comprise the Kyrene School District and they have, you know, kind of common economic issues.

Then moving a little bit north from there in the same area, we have Tempe and West Mesa, which we've talked a lot about. And there they -- one of the many things they have in common is that they are along that portion of the light rail, which is, you
know, promoting economic development and they share that in common.

Arizona State University and Mesa Community College are both in that area. Not only are there students in that area but there are people just like in the area I live in who work at the universities and who live in surrounding parts of town.

And as we've also talked about quite a bit and gotten public comment on, West Mesa is quite different from East Mesa. It's increasingly a Latino community. It has more in common with Tempe than it does with East Mesa.

Then moving a little bit north, it includes South Scottsdale, Tempe proper and Arcadia, it includes Paradise Valley and the areas just south of Paradise Valley that are very similar to Paradise Valley.

As I think I said earlier, this Papago Park is -- actually, that's northwest of there.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So the boundary in Scottsdale is Chaparral?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: The boundary in Scottsdale is Chaparral to the southeast corner of Paradise Valley and then it dips south just a little
bit to take in an area -- what is that area called?
I know it has a name. Don't you have a name for
that?

WILLIE DESMOND: It's along Camelback.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: It's like Paradise
Valley.

Then it goes back up and it follows the
boundary of Paradise Valley and it takes in a
portion of Camelback east, all of Arcadia, and all
of East Phoenix. Areas again, I think where people
who work at ASU and Mesa Community College live and
commute back and forth to --

I think it would create a truly
competitive district. It wouldn't be a leaning
one-way-or-the-other district. We can look at that.
But I think the performance in the legislative
districts that exist there would bear that out and
suggest that that would be the case.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And if you were all
open to this concept of -- and I had said this
yesterday, again, if we can create a competitive
district, at least one in Metro Phoenix, I think
that's desirable and worth exploring.

I propose we call that CD 9 because we
were correcting a new district in this go-round.
And to me, why not have one that's -- where either major party has an inherent built-in advantage. So to me, 9 should be that competitive district. If one were to be able to be created without -- you know, a detriment to the other goals that we'll have to consider.

So I would propose calling that 9, if that's what you're saying is the competitive district in your concept.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. I can stop calling it something longer. I'll just call it 9.

WILLIE DESMOND: The other thing I was thinking might be useful for you guys -- I'm trying to cause as little confusion as possible.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Good.

WILLIE DESMOND: Everyone who has been following along is probably used to these numbers now, but for the second round of hearings, we might want to switch to letters when we introduce these. When we finally do have a draft map, use letters instead of numbers so people that haven't been watching this closely. Just one thing to consider.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: What about that one? I know the last Commission, I think did do something like that where they used letters instead of numbers
just so people weren't tied and getting confused with their current congressional number. But --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: What happens with the changes proposed by Commissioner McNulty?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So are you finished, Ms. McNulty? So you've talked about 7 and 9.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Was there more?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: No, that's all I had, and I was hoping we could incorporate these in a map so that the group could work on filling in the rest of the donut hole in a way that is complimentary to.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: You guys spoke about the creating at a minimum one competitive district in that area. And it seems the way this map is configured, I think that would be the only option, I think. I could be wrong.

So why don't we document those changes, put them in the map you created and then go again -- adopt those changes that Commissioner McNulty made
in your version of the map and then go forward with the rest of the changes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We can do that but I want Mr. Freeman to have the opportunity to see if he can then work around that -- those lines. So I think they sort of --

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: That was my understanding of what we were going to do. And I want to look at this district and the adjustments to the minority-majority districts, make sure they meet the constitutional criteria and also see if, you know, we can build in the other district.

I am -- the one thing that concerns me in terms of filling in the donut hole, there was reference made to the rural CD 4. And if we're strictly tying our hands to only limit ourselves to the donut hole, CD 4 isn't rural, it's got a big chunk of urban population in there with the rive district.

So that's something I think that we need to grapple with.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So would it be possible for Mr. Desmond to, using the changes that Ms. McNulty just proposed, provide versions of that to all of us so that then I guess Mr. Freeman
can --

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I've got it. He's loaded it on my machine.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Great.

Wonderful.

Do we want to talk about that now, your changes, or is there more that you need to do first on your own?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I would prefer to take a look at it either tonight or tomorrow. And, you know, I did walk through the rationale of what I did last night and basically kind of -- I think we added this district, if this district is added, that kind of changes perhaps the analysis. I would rather take a look at that tonight.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So do each of the commissioners want to get at least the version that has Ms. McNulty's changes on their computers in case they want to do their own analysis, too?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I do.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So can we get that loaded on to our -- I do as well.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Is it your --
you've outlined your idea about having one competitive district in the Metro Phoenix area and Commissioner McNulty has created a particular design, which we are going to review in private; is that correct? Is that what we're --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, and in public tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Is there a reason why we can't talk about what we're going to do with the rest of the donut hole?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Not at all.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: All right. Which may or may not fit into Commissioner McNulty's scheme, but I would like to -- I would like it start to outline some of the areas for filling in as well as outlining some discussion that may or may not fall into play with Commissioner McNulty's concept of only looking at the donut hole but also looking at the discussion points that took place earlier today regarding the I-10 corridor on the west side of the Tucson metro district and also the commentary that we had heard this morning regarding Cochise County being inclusive in the eastern district.

So that's my view that all of that is -- my understanding is that all of that, as we start to
move these lines around and we start to aggregate, this information is all going to be applied.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I don't know if I would like to agree with that because I just feel like -- I mean, of course, it's -- we're open to the ideas and discussion, but I do feel like the way the donut map was created was starting at 1 and moving around in a clockwise manner to complete those. So they are all sort of balanced and tied the way they were.

The -- in 2 -- and I'm not sure where you're referring to and maybe we'd need to go into great deal on to exactly on what those lines are and have Mr. Desmond go through what's what, but there was some, you know, thought following the census tracts and I-10 essentially out to the freeway and then including the community of interest of Saddlebrooke in that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, I didn't think we were going to make those kinds of changes. Because if we are, if that is on the table, then I would like to make my own changes to the border as
well. And my changes would be following the recommendations of the Hispanic groups that have approached us.

And you had mentioned on numerous occasions that you want to meet preclearance on the first try.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Correct.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: And the last thing we want to be doing is alienating the individuals that may have a gripe with us in front of the Department of Justice because of Section 5 and some of the issues that they disagree with us on.

So I have big issues with the way we designed the three border districts. So if we're going to start doing that, making changes to the border district as we have approved them, then I also want to make my own changes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So, yeah, I would prefer if we could, to the extent possible, the extent practicable, we keep that the way it is for now.

And, obviously, this is a draft map and we're going to get tons of public comment on this and hear from people, what they like and dislike about the map.
And so I think I would prefer if we focus on the center of that donut hole area first and then try to get that done. And then if there's tweaks elsewhere that makes some sense based on some public input we've received, we can talk about those, but for now we can focus on the center.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I think the logical next step would be for Commissioner Freeman to load the changes that Commissioner McNulty had proposed and then make his own changes.

For to us start making when we haven't even -- I haven't seen the map at all. I don't have a version of that map on my computer. So I can only visualize what she has spoken of. So I think the next step would be, again, for Commissioner Freeman either tonight or tomorrow work on his changes based on the changes that Commissioner McNulty had proposed.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I agree with that. And I think that's the plan. Mr. Freeman is going to come tomorrow hopefully -- sorry to give you --

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, tomorrow might be another issue for me. But I suppose we'll get to
that later with future meetings and agenda items.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So Mr. Desmond, can you give us copies of at least what we've done so far on the bagel map so we can each put that on to our computers?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

Just, again, I hate to -- right now the District 4 as it is, is currently 229,000 underpopulated and that's result of this one change up in Yavapai County.

I just want to make sure that that change will be reflected in all future maps. Is that something you guys are all comfortable with?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I'm comfortable with that. We can address that later. I'm fine.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Then I will get this map and Commissioner McNulty -- the changes Commissioner McNulty asked to look at uploaded onto your computers.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Good. Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So, Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I understand -- and honestly, Commissioner Freeman, I would welcome an open debate about discussing the southern border and
Hispanic Coalition deliverables that we have seen on the southern border. I'm concerned -- I'm concerned if we're going down the path that we are fixing these border districts as they are currently outlined and we're not going to approach those before we go to draft, that we're only going to fill in the donut hole, that we have certainly not met this significant amount of our constitutional requirements in one and deliberations and discussion, and I'm assuming that that's not the chair's intent.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No, it's not. And I would think that once the center is filled, that we would need to go through each of the districts to talk about the constitutional criteria for each and ensure that we have met those for the districts as drawn and adjust as needed.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So if I'm correct again, that there are multiple ways of getting to a competitive district in Maricopa County and Greater Phoenix area.

Is there -- right now we're only doing the review of one commission's submittal.

Is that the best approach at this time?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm not sure I know
what you're talking about.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Well, what we're doing is we're -- Commissioner McNulty has put forth a recommendation for one competitive district as a design as designed -- just outlined which is going to be distributed for review tonight.

Commissioner Herrera is recommending that after we review it and if it is acceptable, that we vote on it and move forward, that those lines become fixed and that we work the rest of the map around it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, and I would not -- if that's what Mr. Herrera is suggesting, I'm not sure, but I would say that it has to be done holistically. And we need to look at what Mr. Freeman can do around what Ms. McNulty just suggested and see if we can make that center fill in and work and make decisions as we go if it's not working.

So I wouldn't propose locking us in in any way to -- just based on one district alone. I don't think we can do that. It's not the way the map works.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And following up on that, I don't want to give the appearance that this
is an outcome-based approach where we have designed
a competitive district that we are going to vote on
and then to design the rest of map around.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's correct.

It's not an outcome-based approach, but I did
express the goal that -- personal goal that as a
Commission we should try to -- to the extent
practicable and not to the detriment of the other
goals --

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That's target of
our constitutional --

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: -- create at least
one competitive district. I think competitive
districts are very important and that it's not a bad
goal to have.

    VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

    VICE CHAIR HERRERA: May I remind the
commissioners that it was Commissioner McNulty and
myself who were not in favor of this map.

Commissioner Freeman and Stertz were very happy with
this map and very eager to vote for it and
Commissioner -- Chair Mathis voted along with
Republicans.

    So this -- nothing is -- this is
something that us -- we -- I think it was yesterday
was the first day we have seen this. This map took
me by surprise. I was not aware of this map.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: So we're trying to
do everything we can to complete this uncompleted
map. I chose not -- I chose to go along because I
thought that we could fill in that particular donut
hole with at least one competitive -- for us to get
something we want -- that the Democrats want, which
is competition. And I hope that's still the case.

I just wanted to make that clear, that
Commissioner McNulty and I were -- this was not our
map.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would just like
to add that this District 9 that we're calling it
now is based on community. It is a competitive
district but that's because of the way the
communities are. So it's not at all result
oriented. It makes perfect sense whether or not
competitiveness was one of our criteria. It just
makes fundamental sense.

It's also the case that there are myriad
ways to do this in Phoenix and we have eliminated
one of them by virtue of the way we have adjusted
the majority-minority district.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: This isn't my map either and I voted with the chair to get us to work on it because I thought it would be in the best for the Commission to start working on one map. And it doesn't have some of the features that my map did.

And I think we need to complete the map using the six constitutional criteria, and I'm going to look at the districts Commissioner McNulty has proposed and see if we can fit together this map in a way that Arizona fits together and meeting the constitutional criteria and if that district doesn't cause a substantial — if it actually meets with the constitutional criteria, recognize communities of interest, and doesn't cause a substantial detriment to the other goals, then the Constitution will require us to favor that district.

So I would like to take a look at it and I think that should be our next step.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. I agree. Any other comments on this?

Do you have anything you need from us?
You're going to give us copies of how it exists so far?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: And then I guess I would just say that tomorrow we can play through any things you want to look at and hopefully reach some agreement on a few of them and keep moving forward.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That would be great. And -- yeah.

Any other comments on congressional.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: My only concern is that I've been talking about the issue with the Hispanic Coalition not agreeing with the way this map was drawn out, and I want to see if our legal team can work Strategic and also the -- anyone that needed to work on -- make sure that we are doing with this particular map isn't going to cause any type of issue with the Department of Justice. That worries me and I want to make sure we address this now.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, it's the number one thing we have to comply with, so it
worries me as well. It's my number one to goal, to achieve preclearance on the first try.

So in crafting these, I certainly was not trying to do anything that would harm those in any way and try to preserve those two minority-majority districts.

We followed the Yuma split, which was the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government proposal. And so we'll have to see, you know, overall once we get all of these districts in place, what we need to do to adjust them to ensure that we are not in a Section 5 violation territory at all.

So -- but I would think that that analysis would occur after we at least get the full map to a state where we think the lines are somewhat, you know, set and we can then ask legal counsel to give us that analysis.

Any other thoughts?

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Desmond, for getting that done for us.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair, before we go on to the next agenda item, may I ask how you see tomorrow based on that it's 4:30 today and we've got -- the starting block is 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right. Well, I wanted to talk about that because we have the executive director's report. I want to hear what the issue is with tomorrow's meeting that we might have.

I'm not sure there's any update on the Attorney General investigation.

There will be.

I'm just trying to get --

JOE KANEFIELD: Sorry, Madame Chair.

This evening or tomorrow?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Today.

JOE KANEFIELD: Just a very short update.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So we will be having that. We still have some public comment forms to go through.

So let's talk about -- is there anything on the executive director's report? I don't know, Mr. Bladine.

There you go. Sorry, I didn't see you.

RAY BLADINE: I was hiding back there. I just have a quick couple of things.

And you're right. We're fine for tomorrow for our start time. I think maybe got the -- notice got posted about 9:11, so we wouldn't
be able to start tomorrow until 9:11.

Then today we had a real tough problem with the Internet connection here and I think we got it posted about 9:25. So Thursday and Friday, both of those meetings are posted at 9:25.

The only other item, which means we would have to be for Thursday, we would have to be 9:25. Friday we'll be all right because we're a day ahead to get the 48-hour notice.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. You're going to have to start from the beginning because I'm confused.

So tomorrow, Wednesday, is up in Phoenix, Fiesta Inn?

RAY BLADINE: Is in Phoenix, Fiesta Inn in Tempe. And we show the meeting from 9:00 to 5:00. Actual start time would have to be 9:11.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. And then the next day?

RAY BLADINE: The next day is also in Phoenix at Tempe. Again, 9:00 to 5:00, and we were only able to post from here at 9:25. So that's closer to a 9:30 start.

And then if I'm thinking right, Friday also at Tempe Fiesta Inn. We posted it for 9
o'clock, and I think we have more than 48 hours, so we could start at 9 o'clock on Friday.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

RAY BLADINE: And other than that, we are updating the spreadsheet with the times you've provided us and what we have. And I think Anna may have sent that back out to you today to take a look at. So we'll have that updated by Thursday for sure so that we can be looking at dates for the following week.

And Kristina is still working on second round public hearings. And it sounds like some of them are falling into place. So that seems to be going pretty well.

And other than that, I don't have anything to report.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So perhaps we should talk about tomorrow, the agenda items for future meetings as part of this.

It sounds like there might be something, Mr. Freeman?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, what I was going to propose, Madame Chair, is that we cancel tomorrow. And the reason is for me to -- when you proposed this yesterday, I worked almost all night
to try and come up with some scheme to make it work. And it's been -- I know other commissioners have spent long, hard nights working on developing these maps.

And today we've got something else to consider and, you know, I'm going to get home to Phoenix by 8 o'clock. My head is going to hit the pillow and we have another hearing.

So I would certainly benefit from a day to take a step back and look at this map in a way that -- to finalize it in a realistic way. It would also give me a chance to look at what Mr. Desmond prepared on legislative maps as well, which I haven't had time to look at.

I know Commissioner McNulty and I both developed the dueling maps again, but we want to try to come together on one map. And I think both of our maps had some issues in terms of certain districts being out of round, so to speak, and both of us have lacked minority-majority district. Those are issues we both got to tackle.

So that's kind of hard to do on the fly, particularly on the legislative when it's a very complicated 30-piece puzzle.

So that would be my suggestion, that we
take tomorrow as sort of a work study day and then
come back on Thursday.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other comments from
other commissioners?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would agree with
that. I keep promising to pull together all of my
thoughts on the legislative map. And if I had the
day tomorrow to do that, that would be extremely
helpful. If we come in tomorrow, I'm not going to
have much time, again, tonight to do that.

What I would like to do is pull together
those thoughts, look at the changes that have been
made based on Mr. Freeman's map, see if we have any
areas in common ground, see where we don't, and then
be in a position to have some discussion about how
we get to some common ground on those maps.

And I think we need to do that in fairly
short order. I think the only way I can get myself
ready to do that is to have a good solid block of
quiet time studying and finalizing my thoughts on
those maps and my thoughts on the maps that
Mr. Freeman has proposed. I expect we all might all
benefit.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any thoughts?

Commissioner Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Ditto. This would be a situation tomorrow that if I don't have enough adequate time to prepare, it doesn't matter how good the maps may or may not look or how researched they may or may not be, I've got to vote against them because I'm not going to be able to do the research to say that I can support it.

So I need -- we need some downtime for ourselves -- as a Commission, we need some downtime to be able to review this stuff.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So we already have a majority. There's three and Mr. Herrera is out of the room, but he probably agrees as well that he would like time to review, but we can ask him when he comes back.

So what would that mean, Mr. Bladine, if we -- and I guess legal counsel. I don't know how canceling a meeting works, if we did something like that and if you have reservations or not.

RAY BLADINE: My past experience in canceling a meeting is you send a notice out and say that the meeting is canceled and probably would be good to post at the location of the meeting that the meeting has been canceled. We would, of course, send it out to everybody on our list and issue a
press release as soon as we can. Maybe the legal
staff has other -- but that's been in the past what
I'm familiar with.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Was there anyone
planning to give a map presentation tomorrow?

RAY BLADINE: I believe there was one
person, but I would think we could get it
rescheduled to Thursday. It was an individual. I
don't remember a group presentation for tomorrow.

And we can certainly -- we think someone
would understand that in doing the mapping, you have
to have time to do the mapping and would understand
if we put it off until Thursday.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair,
particularly we will be in Phoenix Thursday also, so
it won't require any travel that wasn't --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera, while
you were away, we were talking about possibly
canceling tomorrow's meeting.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Commissioner Stertz
told me already, and I'm going to agree with
whatever he says.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Wow, I wish it was
always that easy.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Four border
districts?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: No, six.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So legal counsel, is that okay? Is there anything from your end that we needed to be covering tomorrow?

JOE KANEFIELD: Madame Chair, we don't believe there's any legal issue that would prevent from you canceling the meeting.

The only issue that we would perceive, one that Mr. Bladine has already raised, is that the noticed meeting -- getting notice to the public that it's canceled. But I'm sure that Ray will do his best to get that notice out there. But there's always a chance that folks will plan to show up at the meeting.

It's not really a legal issue. It's something -- other than trying to contact everyone, get it on the list -- or get it posted on the website and posted at the actual location.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: The other idea I guess would be to meet for just part of the day, if we wanted to do that half day or something.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would rather work on the draft.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Half day, might as
well be a full day. Full day is going to be --

Madame Chair, I guess you're looking at -- you're
looking to the left and right. It's a bunch of very
tired people who have got a lot of work in front of
them to be able to get prepared. We're going to be
much more efficient if we take tomorrow off, get our
act together and then move through this.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair, I
think it's settled. We'll be off tomorrow.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Mr. Desmond.

WILLIE DESMOND: Just -- if any of the
commissioners have things, I'm not going to call it
a "what-if" they would like to see on the bagel map,
but any scenarios they would like to see that I can
get that to you guys tomorrow so that it will be
fully researched and hopefully added to Thursday,
just feel free to send anything to Mr. Bladine and
just so we can keep the progress going, I guess.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, that would be
good to do.

Okay.

RAY BLADINE: We'll, go ahead and proceed
to make notifications and plan on posting at the
location tomorrow.
And I did forget one thing. I do want to introduce Karen Rod Herman who just joined our staff. Karen will be helping us through the public hearing process as we go into round two and has been helping us today greet the public and hand out forms and we're really glad to have her part of our staff.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great. Thanks, Karen. Welcome. Thanks for helping us.

RAY BLADINE: And thank you very much and I will get to work.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great. Thanks.

So our goal on Thursday, then, will be to talk about both congressional and legislative.

Do you think we'll be in a position to do that, Commissioners? I'm really asking commissioners more than I am the mapping consultant.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I would think congressional. We shall see on legislative.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. If we could strive for trying to move some of that legislative forward, that would be great, too. But I agree, I would like to get congressional put to bed, if we can. So let's try to focus our attention and effort there while we're on this work study period. And then whatever time is left over, spend on the
legislative and not with your families.

Okay. Next item on the agenda is the Attorney General inquiry, but we'll skip that and go to public comment so that the public doesn't have to wait for any executive session that might transpire.

So I'll start with where I was before. And if any of these folks are gone, we'll just move through them. And to remind the public to please come up to the microphone and speak directly into the microphone and spell your name so that our court reporter gets an accurate accounting.

Should I -- do you need a break first, I should ask you, Michelle. That might be a more natural breaking point.

So we'll take a ten-minute break and the time is 4:47 p.m. and we'll come back soon.

Thank you.

(A recess was taken from 4:47 p.m. to 5 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Recess is over. The time is 5 p.m., and we'll go back to public comment. We'll start with Keith Bagwell, representing self from Pima County.

KEITH BAGWELL: My name is Keith Bagwell. It's B-a-g-w-e-l-l.
I'm here in support of the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government map. I think that's -- it complies with Voting Rights Act and with other state or pictures on this. And I think it's the best map I've seen so far.

I do want -- what I'm here really to do, because I've submitted comments online, but I saw this new map that came out yesterday and I have some strenuous suggestions to this, and I want to just deal with a couple of them.

First of all, the -- I don't like having three congressional districts on the border. This does -- I see no reason for this whatsoever except to water down the Latino vote power because, obviously, near the border the population of Latinos is much greater.

So if you divide those into three instead of two, it waters down their voting power, and that's not, I think, anything we really want to do, at least not anything I want to see.

The other problem I have with this map is -- one of the other. I have several, but the only other one I want to address right now is how it moves the line over for what is labeled on here as District 3, which is a -- you know, bulk of what is
now district CD 7. And it moves the line in Tucson very far to the west and that takes out a lot of people who have, you know, communities of interest together.

A lot of people in Tucson, south side and around the University of Arizona, have interests in common with the other people in the rest of that district that they are being separated from.

You know, these people have been in the same district for a long time and we are able to elect people that represent us and we want to be able to continue to that.

These people -- there's a lot of communities of interest involved here in terms of Latino populations and their families and how they relate to others in the rest of this district.

There's also those of us who are white folks who live near the university around that area, or downtown area in historic districts that are very heavily racially mixed.

We have been -- you know, we have a lot more in common with the people on the south side and the west side than we do with the people on the east side of Tucson. We don't have anything in common with them and would not be served to be in their
Another aspect of this is -- another community of interest in this area is the union density. Union membership density is much greater in the south and west parts of Tucson.

If you put a line in the middle of them and you put some of them over in one district and some in the other district, again, this is dividing a community of interest. It's not a good idea.

And the last -- the other thing about this map is it divides the Southern Arizona, Tucson, Pima County into three pieces instead of two. Again, that weakens us. And there's a big shift in this of clout in the CD 7, or 3, as it's labeled here, to West Maricopa.

And we, you know, would like to have our voice. We don't have enough -- those of us who live in Tucson, don't feel we have enough voice at the state legislature and congress or anything and we would like to have more, not less. So we see this as reducing our voice.

So I have a real problem with this map. I don't think it's a good map at all. And if you're going, you know, to have only one map to work with in the future, I hope it's a different one from this
one.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

KEITH BAGWELL: Any questions?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I should have also said at the beginning of public comment, we're going to limit comment time period to three minutes each, and there's -- Buck will be timing it. And that's what we did earlier, so that's what's fair to what happened earlier in the day. I just forgot to say that at the beginning.

Our next speaker is Tim Sultan, vice president of SAB Negotiation Group, representing self from Pima.

TIM SULTAN: Hello. Thank you for giving me a chance to talk. My name is Tim Sultan, S-u-l-t-a-n.

And I'm just speaking on behalf of myself, I'm not representing any organization or anything. And you've had a long day, so I won't take much of your time, but I just wanted to thank you for your work. You guys are really piling into a lot of detail as volunteers and I appreciate it, and I know a lot of us do.

Just one thing I wanted to mention as a
citizen, one thing that's important to me is having competitive district. I hope you'll consider that as more important than one of the last considerations. Because I think that when you step back and look at the 30,000-foot view, that's really what we're all about, is trying to make competitive districts so that every local representative -- every local citizen might have a chance to represent us.

So that's all I just wanted to say. Please keep it as competitive as possible.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Steve Arnquist, representing self from Pima.

Carolyn Campbell, representing self from Tucson.

I'm having trouble reading this, but Matt Skroch, I'm not sure, representing self from Tucson.

Okay. Barbara Tellman, representing self from Pima.

BARBARA TELLMAN: I'm Barbara Tellman, T-e-l-l-m-a-n.

When I walked in this morning and picked up this map, I looked at it and I said, "This can't
be serious." And I showed it to various people and they said, "Oh, no, that's not a serious map. No one could take that seriously."

And then I found that you had adopted it as your base map without even having any public comment ahead of time. I was really disappointed in that. I think this is really a terrible map.

The idea that someone could represent everyone from Douglas up to Jacobs Lake is absolutely ridiculous.

I heard somebody justify the separation of Santa Cruz County this morning by saying there's a geographic barrier between Nogales and Sonoita, Patagonia area. Yeah, there's some little hills.

But really does that geographic barrier matter nearly as much as assuming that the people in Patagonia have something that doesn't separate them from Saddlebrooke? This is ridiculous.

It's sort of a farce to say that this is really three districts along the border because you only have a few thousand people in a very short mileage in that border connection.

It does make sense to say it's a three border district if you're just talking about, number one, its borders are Utah, New Mexico, and Mexico
and it touches on Colorado and comes very close to Nevada. I can't imagine anybody trying to represent this kind of a district. It's absolutely absurd.

And if you were to put -- take Cochise County out of that district, as some of the other maps did, and move the line in Pima County west, as some of the Hispanic groups have suggested, you could easily adjust the population and not divide Santa Cruz County and have two border districts that make a lot more sense and have people feel that they are really being represented.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Maddy Urken, representing self from Sahuarita.

MADDY URKEN: Hi. My name is Maddy Urken, M-a-d-d-y, U-r-k-e-n, and I from Sahuarita.

First, I want to thank you again for all of the hard work that you guys do. Is absolutely awesome.

I would like to comment on the possibility of having a congressional district that extends from the northern -- our northern border to our border with Mexico that I believe Ms. Tellman, I
think that was her name, was commenting on that. I mean, logistics aside, I would hate to run for office in that district. You would never get out of your car. It's just totally unrealistic.

But more important, the concept of community of interest becomes almost meaningless in a district like that. I mean, the district includes Chinle and Sierra Vista. It just does not make sense. The community of interest criteria is dealt such a blow in such a district because the specific interests of the communities on the Mexican border will be buried if those folks are in a district that goes way up to the north.

I would also like to address the issue of competitive CDs statewide. I'm certainly aware that competitiveness may have to yield to other criteria in some districts, but the goal of creating only a couple of competitive districts in the whole state, that's just not acceptable to somebody who wants to see a representative functional and effective legislature. You can't have that with just one or two competitive districts. It boggles the mind.

Finally, from this outsider's point of view, you seem to have had a very productive session.
this afternoon. I am concerned about the concern that Commissioner Herrera expressed regarding yielding to pressure on the part of the chair to striving and frequent and constant pressure, and I know that you know that your job is much too important to yield to anything but good analysis. And I thank you again for all of your hard work.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Leonard Gorman, executive director of Navajo Nation Human Right Commission.

LEONARD GORMAN: Good afternoon. My name is Leonard Gorman, L-e-o-n-a-r-d, G-o-r-m-a-n, and I represent the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission. And good afternoon again, members of the Commission. It's good to see you down here in the south part of the state.

Navajo Nation just simply wants to go over its particular maps again, Indian 1 and Indian 2, as it was a part of the discussion this morning. Predominantly, the Navajo Nation's position is to ensure that there is a robust Native American population in the district in which the Navajo Nation is located. That is the primary
Competitiveness is not necessarily a part of the Navajo Nation's objectives in both the legislative and also the congressional districts, while we realize that those are some of the aspects of redistricting.

For the J map, as we refer to Indian 1, we see that we had a 21.54 percent Native American voting-age population.

For Indian 2, we had the opportunity to look at incorporating the Gila River Indian Community, which brought us to a 20.83 percent Native American voting-age population.

And we had the opportunity to present these maps at the last meeting last week in which there was -- no opposition has been expressed by leaders of the indigenous nations in the state of Arizona. So nobody is opposed to these two proposals.

Subsequently, we had the opportunity to review the map that has been forwarded as 8a as in contrast to the 7a map in which we also see that there is a comparable Native American voting-age population of 20.72 percent. And that's more comparable to the Indian 2 proposal that the Navajo
Nation submitted and certainly there is a lot of support from the Navajo Nation for both Indian 1 and Indian 2.

So there is a preference in seeing that. And when you look at the new map that has been drawn as a donut map, I think there's an opportunity to look at the possibilities of incorporating the Gila River Indian Community in the current map, which has an VAP population of 19.65.

So -- and we realize that there's also -- a lot of concern is being expressed by the folks down here in the southeast corner of the state of Arizona. As we expressed many times, Navajo Nation supports the ideas of communities of interest and certainly if those concerns are being expressed, the Navajo Nations supports those concerns, too.

And finally we also wish to express concerns about legislative district. Briefly, there's a map that has been circulated labeled as version 6b. The Navajo Nation would have a very hard time supporting that type of map simply because it reduces the VAP numbers for the Navajo American voting-age population from the previous threshold to a 52.65 percent.

Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is Melanie Nelson, representing self from Pima.

Okay. Our next speaker is Eduardo Delci, representing self from Nogales.

Thank you very much Madame Chair. My name is Eduardo Delci. Eduardo, E-d-u-a-r-d-o, Delci, D-e-l-c-i.

I'm a fourth generation Arizonan, USA citizen by birth, and a retired higher education counselor.

Please find the following information, which I gave to your staff to provide to each one of commissioners, in the statement that I am about to read.

Santa Cruz County Arizona borderland region. I would like to stress that Santa Cruz County should be placed in one complete community of interest tied to the southern and southwestern area of Pima County to include the entire southwestern borderland boundaries along the border with Mexico.

This area would maintain the Native American, Tohono O'odham, Pascua Yaqui and Cocopah Nations and the Hispanic communities as contiguous communities and communities of interest within the
communities of Santa Cruz River Basin and the southern borderland region.

It also embraces the integrity of the minority communities' vote, supported by the Department of Justice. This would adhere to mandate the Voting Rights Act of the Nation.

Santa Cruz County also maintains contiguous communities along the Santa Cruz River Basin, which includes populations with a rural to semi-urban basis of southern and southwestern Pima County. Splitting this geographic region would be -- would do extensive harm to the environment -- environmental region impacted by Santa Rita, Patagonia, Tumacacori and Huachuca Mountain Ranges, which also feeds into the Santa Cruz River Basin communities of Rio Rico, Tumacacori, Carmen, Tubac, Sonoita, Elgin, San Rafael, Patagonia, Patagonia Lake, Kino Springs, Buena Vista, Guevavi, Calabasas, Amado, Arivaca, Canoa and Sahuarita. The social, linguistic, cultural, economic, education and environmental values are closely tied to the lives of the citizens and the residents of these same communities. In addition, I-19 also lends to the cohesion of the geographic region along the economic base of the borderland region.
Santa Cruz County ties to South and Southwestern Pima County, would also adhere to the competitive districts concept, approved by the Arizona voters, upon the establishment of the AIRC of 2000. This concept is key to the development of Arizona’s voting districts for the next decade. This concept would also be reflected with the current CD 7 and LD 25 delineations, provided that Santa Cruz County is not divided or split, but maintained as one whole political entity, separate from the gerrymandering currently attached with Cochise County. Maintaining the competitive district concept provides for greater voter value when Santa Cruz County is counted as a borderland region contiguous with Pima and Southern Yuma Counties along the Arizona/Mexico borderland region. This would also include the Pima County communities of Sells, Sasabe, and Ajo. And in South Yuma County, the communities of San Luis, Somerton, Gadsden, and South Yuma.

Cochise County would also appear to be more contiguous with Graham and Greenlee counties -- I'm sorry, Graham and Greenlee Counties plus the other borderland regions. They are also rural and agricultural communities with similar linguistic and
cultural ties, sharing similar geographic mountain ranges that compliment their development.

Upon reviewing the preliminary maps, I would concur with the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government's definition of the redistricting maps submitted for review.

I appreciate this opportunity to speak before the Commission and would also like to take this opportunity to condemn the efforts of our Arizona Attorney General and his tea-bagger extremists in trying to intimidate the Commission and the valuable work that you are doing for the state of Arizona.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much. Our next speaker is Angelica Alvarez.

Angelica.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I think that particular -- actually, she's here. I'm so sorry.

ANGELICA ALVAREZ: Okay. So first off, I would like to thank you guys for giving us the opportunity to make public comment about this.

My name is Angelica Alvarez. I was born
in Tucson at the University of Medical Center. I was raised in Somerton, and I recently moved back to Tucson to attend the University of Arizona.

Somerton and Tucson -- well, mostly the University of Arizona and the west and south side of Tucson are my communities of interest because these are the places where I was raised and where I'm currently growing up. And so these are the parts where me and students from the neighboring towns of Yuma, which is Gadsden, San Luis, and Somerton are all coming to get education.

It's very different for all of us because now we have a new community to adjust to, but I have friends, family, and my school.

My mother visits often from Somerton and we have family and friends throughout Tucson, mostly in the west and south side. This is my community: Somerton, U of A, the west and south side of Tucson. So I would like you to please consider keeping Somerton, Arizona, and the University of Arizona in the same congressional district.

This is not just my experience. Many have come before me and many will continue to come. I'm glad I'm not alone. I actually have a whole bunch of students and friends and people that I know
of who come from Somerton, Gadsden, and San Luis and Yuma who share the same beliefs, but unfortunately were not able to make it.

So thank you for your consideration.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Jim March, second vice chair, Pima Libertarian Party.

JIM MARCH: Thank you very much.

Well, as the Libertarian in the room, I guess it falls to me to say things that sometimes make people uncomfortable, and so I'll say these four words. Russell Pearce is corrupt.

Russell Pearce is not a very nice guy. He's not a guy that can be politically trusted. And there are people in this room, among them the FAIR Trust guys, Mr. Mills, who are here at his request, here to steer this Commission in a direction he wants and towards his agenda. And what I urge you to do is be very, very skeptical of that agenda.

Mr. Stertz, I'll make a quick remark to you.

You're publically perceived anyway as being Russell Pearce's personal nominee to the
Commission. And I feel for you because I was exactly where you're at now about nine years ago.

I was an activist in California fighting a situation where sheriffs were selling gun permits for campaign contributions. Sheriff's had personal discretion over who got to carry a gun and they were using that privilege of theirs to squeeze money out of people.

And I was going up and down the state talking about this. I had a website gathering data on this. And I was told by the NRA to back off on the Republican sheriffs. In turn, that was at the request of the Republican state legislature. I was being asked to quiet my efforts or go along with what I perceived to be -- I still perceive to be -- corruption for political gain.

And I think someone has put you in that same situation. And you need to think about whether that's a good idea for the state in general and whether that's a good idea for you personally and for your credibility and the credibility of the entire Commission.

I think there's some very dark agendas going on in this room. I've said that before. Now I'll say exactly where it's coming from: Russell
Pearce and people around him.

And what I urge you to do is not cut a deal that makes Pearce and his political allies happy at the request of everyone else in Arizona. Because if you do, you will be doing this state a great disservice. You'll be doing the credibility of this Commission a great disservice.

My personal belief is sometime between two and five or six years ago -- year from now, somewhere in there, I think Russell Pearce will probably get convicted of some, probably petty corruption, but probably less corruption than he's actually involved in and he'll be discredited.

And if it's seen later that this Commission put in a completely pro-Pearce agenda, or even mostly pro-Pearce agenda later, then the actions of this Commission will be discredited along with him.

And you know, that sounds like a really radical statement, but look at how many governors, just to name one office in Arizona have been convicted of crimes either during their leaving office or after they leave office. The numbers are really bad.

So I ask that you really think about who
is pressuring you and their credibility and your
credibility, and I ask that you look at those
pressures with a very skeptical eye.

And I know it's not very political to say
it. Most people come up here and say what they
want. I'm telling you what I don't want, a Russell
Pearce-dominated process. And unfortunately, the
events I've seen today seem to point towards that
happening and makes me nervous. Real nervous.

I've only been -- I'll say this -- I've
only been in the state since 2006, so I'm not going
to push a particular map on you. Okay? I don't
have the contacts or the knowledge of how this state
works to do so. But I know what not to do, and I
urge you not to do it.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is
Lynne St. Angelo, but I don't see her.

Oh, I'm sorry, you were behind the
podium -- representing self.

LYNNE ST. ANGELO: Commissioners, thank
you.

St. Angelo, S-t, period, A-n-g-e-l-o, and
I'm going to speak about the map -- the new map and
my little part of the world, which is Saddlebrooke,
Oro Valley, and Marana as a community of interest.

And I think maybe some of the commissioners misunderstood what that little community really is like because South Tucson and Nogales and Patagonia is not exactly part of what we would consider our community of interest.

Instead, Casa Grande is much more similar to our community. In fact, I was going to come here and actually say that I -- a second look, I kind of liked the river district map 7a, and then I understand there was one this morning but there's no map handed out for that river district 7 -- 8a that then also gave Scottsdale what they had asked for, which was their community all held together.

And that map is actually much better, in my opinion, for Saddlebrooke, Oro Valley, and Marana because we are right at the border of Pinal County. And all of our growth is north along Tangerine. At the Tangerine is a growth corridor, a business corridor, where Oro Valley and Marana have joined together as business partners to make that a really industrious part of the very northeast side of Pima County.

And it actually -- Marana is a little tiny bit, I believe already over into Pinal County,
and all of the growth is north into Pinal County, both for Oro Valley, Saddlebrooke, and Marana.

Plus, there is a corridor, a transportation corridor going down I-10 just north going toward Picacho Peak that is going to be -- I believe, ground is breaking this fall where there's going to be another transportation hub, which will also then develop right along there right into Marana and right into that edge of Oro Valley.

So that is what I see from the map today. I think the other maps actually represented my little community of interest much better.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Alice Roe, representing self from Tucson.

Our next speaker is Virginia Pesqueira, representing self from Nogales.

Good afternoon. My name is Virginia Pesqueira, that's V-i-r-g-i-n-i-a, P-e-s-q-u-e-i-t-a.

I am from Nogales, Arizona, although I was born and raised here in Tucson. Go Wildcats.

My comments are similar to those voiced earlier today regarding the reconfiguration of some
of the maps, the earlier maps, I believe.

Two southern border districts will suffice. More than that will reduce the compactness/contiguous features and especially communities of interest, which constitute underrepresented populations.

Another item is that Santa Cruz County should have or should be in only one legislative district and only one congressional district. It's a tiny county and we should not be split up.

So please consider the changes and secure a better future for Arizona and it's various culturally diverse communities.

Thank you very much for the work that you have done, that you are doing, and that you are charged with and equally goes to the staff members of this whole entity.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is James Kelley, LD 29, chairman Pima GOP.


Again, thank you very much for letting me address the Commission again.

First off, I want to commend every single
one of you. The work that you did today was outstanding. You are moving forward. You are getting down and drilling down to what needs to happen. I'm just so proud of every single one of you. And I swear, I am going to write a letter to the governor and we are going to get every single one of you a medal. Something, you know. Of course, the minute you wear it, you may get rocks thrown at you later on. I want to thank you for the work that you have done.

One of the good things about this baseline draft proposition is that you are now moving from the impracticalities that were not working to something that is practical and is and will work for you.

One of the concepts of competitiveness that I think everybody has -- not just the commissioners, but I think the general public is starting to understand about competitiveness, in order to maintain the two minority-majority districts and they not be packed either above where they are at today or below where they are at. In other words, we can't pack them and we can't crack them. We've got to have those two minority-majority districts, that that is what affects your ability to
create competitive districts more than anything else.

I think people are finally coming to the realization that the populations on the east side of the state of Arizona are the -- in terms of the square mileage of that District Number 1 is still less than the entire state of Wyoming or the entire state of Montana or the entire state of Alaska and they only have one representative that somehow manages to represent that huge square mileage.

So the acceptance of that district and that there's going to be one representative for that rural district with the rural community of interest that do extend from the border, the northern border all the way to the southern border, I think that acceptance is finally starting to sink in not just amongst the general public but also amongst the commissioners themselves.

Ideology is not going to solve these problems. Mathematics is going to solve your problems. And you have now gotten down to the actual practicality of the mathematics of our population, both our first nations' population, our Hispanic voter-age population, and the manner in which our population clusters and unclusters in the
various parts of our state.

    We are unique, but we are getting there, and this map, this base-draft-map concept is going to move us forward.

    And I am so very, very proud of the statesmanship that every single one of you have exhibited in drilling down, working on getting that donut hole filled and protecting the two minority-majority districts, giving representation to that rural -- large rural area on the eastern side of Arizona and understanding the need for three congressional districts on the border and representation that it will give for us in Washington and what this will do for Yuma and hopefully our transportation future in Yuma, Casa Grande, from the border of Mexico to the Canadian border, these are all important concepts that are going to play into the future of Arizona for the next ten years.

    Thank you for thinking of Arizona. Thank you for thinking of the whole state and not just your own selfish little interest groups.

    Thank you very much.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

    Our next speaker is Pete Bengtson,
PETER BENGTSON: Good afternoon. My name is Peter Bengtson. That's B-e-n-g-t-s-o-n. I live here in the Catalina Foothills, Pima County, and I'm just speaking for myself.

I'm glad that you're concentrating on one map now rather than the variety of maps. Unfortunately, I don't like it very much, but that's what we're here to do, is to work on this whole map and improve it so that everybody can be satisfied with it.

I wanted to read you one thing. You've heard this before, but the Proposition 106 starts out with the purpose -- I'll skip the first part. But the whole purpose of 106 is relating to ending the practice of gerrymandering, improve voter and candidate participation in elections by creating an independent commission of balanced appointments to oversee mapping of fair and competitive congressional and legislative districts.

I would also like to mention that people have got the -- I know the commissioners don't have that, but the general public has the idea that competitive districts are, you know, at the bottom of the list and so that's the last one you need to
think about.

But I was at one of your meetings up in Phoenix when Mary O'Grady gave an analysis of the a legal situation with the past Commission, and I believe there was Supreme Court decision that said that those last four goals are equal; the compact and contiguous, the following state county lines, and communities of interest have some words like as far as practicable and communities -- competitive district is the last one. It says not -- so it doesn't adversely affect the others.

But apparently, the Supreme Court said they were all equal in value, and I'm a firm believer in competitive districts. So I urge you to really work on that.

You're putting together one map but we need to see which of these districts are competitive districts in addition to equal population, how competitive.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Geri Ottoboni, representing Rancho Vistoso HOA.

GERI OTTOBONI: I'm not quite that tall.

It's Geri Ottoboni, O-t-t-o-b-o-n-i, and
I just want to make one comment about the Proposition 106.

I believe it says along as it didn't have a detriment against the competitive district -- as long as it didn't have a detriment against the other four sections, which includes communities of interest, even though it's listed at the top.

But anyway, my concern is communities of interest, and the major growth is towards Pinal County. Oro Valley, Marana, and Saddlebrooke should be with Casa Grande.

Marana is on the border, Arogrande, which is their building -- and there is going to be a lot of construction done up in that area -- and also up on the Pinal County border. Also that train switching station will be near Picacho Peak, which will be creating growth and jobs.

So we really have no commonality with Nogales whatsoever.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Mariana Spier, representing self from Tucson.

MARIANA SPIER: Good afternoon. My name is Mariana Spier, S-p-i-e-r, and I do represent
myself. Thank you for allowing me to speak. I'm a little nervous. It's my first time.

And thank you for your service.

Somebody mentioned earlier that competition is a way of life in the U.S. I'm an American citizen by choice, and I don't want to even start trying to explain what it means to live in a communist country where your voice cannot be heard.

It's very important for me and my voice to be heard and everybody else's voice to be heard.

Following the same train of thought, I think it's important that our congress people's voice to be heard in Washington.

And I look on this map, the breakfast map, and I'm looking at District 1, the way it is here. I see two major issues that face Arizona. One is the border issue and the other one is the nations, that I understand that just reinforce their desire to be together and they want their voice to be heard.

And I worry that one person representing District 1 may not be able to fight for these two different -- completely different issues.

Also I realize that two major military bases in Southern Arizona look to me to be in two
different districts, 1 and 2.

Also I would like that one person from Arizona to be able to be the voice, a strong voice for military personnel, veterans, and all of the economic issues related to these operations.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Senator Frank Antenori, representing self from Pima.

FRANK ANTENORI: Thank you, Madame Chair.

For the record, Frank Antenori. Last name is spelled A-n-t-e-n-o-r-i.

In the spirit of full disclosure, I am a state senator from District 30, and I am exploring a bid for congress. So all that of is in the open. So everybody knows why I'm here, and I am here for self.

You guys are looking a lot of issues. I know the numbers kind of get in the way of trying to concrete the competitiveness and fairness.

I have changed my position on competitiveness by looking at recent migration, immigration into certain areas of the state. I think that's a good idea. I think competitive districts are fine because they change every two to
three years anyways because of the economy.

So I don't know how you're going to predict competitiveness for ten years. I think that's a challenge that's virtually impossible, but you should strive for it. I think it's something to look forward to.

What I would like to give you is a perspective I've had as being someone who has run for office and held office for over four years.

There are a lot of issues in Southern Arizona that both bring Southern Arizona together and divide Southern Arizona. Probably one of the biggest ones is water.

In the last couple of years at the legislature, this has been a big issue because you have the Colorado River as a major water issue, you have the San Pedro River Basin, and you have the Santa Cruz River Basin and then you have something that runs right through the middle of them called the Central Arizona Project that mucks up all of them and creates hassles with regard to water allocation and a hundred-year shared supply that affects growth and building and the industry and the economy in the southern part of the state.

I would recommend that you look seriously
at having as many people as possible both at the
state level and at the federal level representing
those interests because water wars in the next few
years, particularly with regards to our neighbor in
California, are going to be a big issue as we
renegotiate the Colorado River allocation, it's
going to be a big deal to have strong representation
in Washington to defend this state against
California trying to take our water.

We also have issues with the border,
obviously, the big issue in Arizona. We technically
have three border sectors, even though there's only
two in the state. You have the Tucson sector, the
Yuma sector and basically what I call the Tohono
O'odham sector which is unique part of the border
where the reservation covers both the Arizona side
and the Mexican side of the border that is a unique
entity. They need special representation, and most
likely having as many people represent them as
possible would help.

We have hubs that I call -- you have
education hubs, mainly U of A, ASU, NAU, you have
economic hubs from industry and defense clusters
where you have Boeing up in the Mesa, you have
Raytheon down here, you have GD out in the Sierra
Vista area and you have military clusters, you have the Davis-Monthan/Yuma cluster -- or excuse me, the Davis-Monthan/Fort Huachuca cluster, you have the Goldwater/Yuma cluster, you have the Luke cluster.

When you deal with base realignment and closure and you've got billions of dollars that pour into the state in these industries, you better have at least three congressmen representing those and as many people as you can fighting for them to keep those bases open. And putting them all into one congressional district weakens that and will hurt the economy. They need to be broadly and strongly represented.

You have -- in addition to defense, you have tourism. The tourism industry in Southern Arizona is different than that in Northern Arizona.

You have trade corridors. One speaker spoke about inland ports in the Picacho Peak effort that's going to go in. All of these have to be considered. And having as much representation in Washington and Phoenix representing the interests is better. That works. By consolidating them all into one district, you weaken, in my opinion, the strength of representing these vital interests in the state.
And last, as a politician, I spend -- and this is not an exaggeration -- 800 bucks a month on fuel traveling my district. I put 36,000 miles on my truck just this year traveling what is District 30, which is the ninth largest district in the state, which is basically the southeast corner of Arizona.

When I looked at this map, with that huge district, I said, man, that is a nightmare. And the folks down here in Sierra Vista, I can tell you are not going to be represented well by the guy that gets elected that lives in Flagstaff at all. He would never see Sierra Vista.

It is a nightmare for me driving District 30 trying to be in three places at once in one day. And I would suggest using a star-type system to grade the districts on a scale from 1 to 10 in drivability where if you start in a corner, drive up, drive back and forth and how long it would take and how many miles it would be to drive that district, and that would be what I consider a compact and contiguous district because there are no major highways on the east side.

In order to get up here, you have to drive through five other -- maybe six congressional
districts to get to the other end of your congressional district. It just make little sense.

I think that, you know, as someone that tries to be, like, in eight places at the same time, you're going to make life very difficult for somebody to adequately represent the interests of that very large and diverse district.

And I would say that the folks down in Cochise County with a lot of cattle ranchers and agriculture and the port in Douglas don't have a lot in common with the folks up at the north end of the state and their interests.

So looking at the economic factors, future growth -- I mean, I've seen this here in Southern Arizona, you have large growth in Marana, Oro Valley, Sahuarita, Vail, and Corona de Tucson, you have the declining population in Central Tucson. So trying to calculate population growth has just got to the monumental task.

But what I would just leave you with is if you would consider -- you know, if you want to be represented aggressively by somebody, try to make it manageable for them to travel their district and meet with their constituents when you draw these maps.
The first guy that talked, I'm with you a hundred percent. He was dead on, and I think he made some great points, so I ditto that.

So thanks.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Herminia Cubillos, representing self from Tucson.

HERMINIA CUBILLOS: My name is Herminia Cubillos, and I guess I need to spell my last name. C-u-b-i-l-l-o-s.

I think Mr. Ed Delci said really everything that I wanted to say about the redistricting part.

I am originally from California and I was all impressed with what Arizona was able to do in terms of its Latino population. It isn't until recently that California now has a strong representation of Latinos in their legislature and in their congressional offices.

I am a supporter of the Hispanic Coalition Good Government districting map. I think that that is necessary to keep the kind of political and cultural ties that this state has.

The one thing that did scare me a little bit was that I do live by the University of Arizona
and have lived there for over 20 years. And to 
think that my district will go to the east side is 
like heresy. It's totally different community.

We function within the center of town.

We function in the west side of town. We function 
in the south side of town. It's diverse of 
opinions, of professions, of families, and we must 
keep that community intact because it's been that 
way for the past 20 years.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Alonzo Morado, 
representing self from Tucson.

ALONZO MORADO: Good afternoon. My name 
is Alonzo Morado. It's A-l-o-n-z-o, Morado is 
M-o-r-a-d-o, and what I want to say is that Arizona 
is almost 38 percent minority and, you know this 
Commission is -- we're been talking about two
minority districts and stuff. We should be fighting 
for four, but I'm here to support the Hispanic 
Coalition map that they presented to you because it 
guarantees us at least those two. And what you are 
trying to do guarantees us zero as far as the maps 
that I see.

Having three congressional districts on
the border doesn't make sense because it just
divides a population into too many pieces and stuff.

I get real scared when I hear Republicans
talk about the Voting Rights Act and compactness
and/or cracking and stuff because that's exactly
what they want to do. They want to compact us or
they want to crack us up and stuff like that. So I
don't believe anything that they say in regards to
those issues.

The thing is, that what we have given you
as a map for those two congressional districts meets
Section 5 and Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and
stuff and that's what you need to be looking at.

It's important for you to understand that
in this state where we're 40 percent of the
population, Native American, African-American,
Asians, Latinos, you know, we should be looking at
four congressional districts. We are asking you for
two. And I will be embarrassed if we don't get
three from you guys.

So it's important that we keep our
borders with the two congressional districts. We
need to think beyond the leaders that we do have
right now and to see how can we elect the next
generation of leaders also. That's what you have
before you and stuff.

So it's very important for you guys to look at these maps carefully and not break them up and crack them up as much as you're looking at cracking them up.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

On you next speaker is Michaella Millican -- if I'm mispronouncing, forgive me -- representing self from Pima County.

MICHAELLA MILLCAN: You did great. It's Michaella Millican. Last name M-i-l-l-i-c-a-n.

So I'm here today to talk a little bit about how I support the Hispanic Coalition submission for their maps, and I have a couple of things to say about that.

I think some of the things that everyone has been saying really boil down to what the priority should be when we are drawing these districts. And I feel like the population and the communities that have deep rich history, that should be the priority. That the Voting Rights Act is something that we need to hold dear, and we absolutely as a community, as a state cannot go backwards on that sort of thing. We can't
disenfranchise voters. And that's exactly what the
map that was submitted yesterday would do.

I really feel like it would, based on --
there is going to be a large population, a majority
of the HVAP voters that would move upwards towards
Maricopa County instead of down here in Pima County.
I really feel like that's not the representation
that they deserve.

I lived in Northern Arizona -- well,
northern for here -- in Maricopa County for most of
my life and then I made the excellent change to come
down here to Southern Arizona. And I'm going to be
honest with you, it's a different world. It is.
It's a really-community rich, wonderful place to
live. I've had a great experience. And I feel like
dividing that or changing that and disenfranchising
these communities is not going to serve Arizona well
in the future.

For the future of my children and my
family, I want them to know the history and to have
the same interests in the place that they live and
love to live in.

So I just really support the Hispanic
Coalition. And I know it's a place to start, but I
feel like it's an important place to start with our
priority, right? Let's start with the Voting Rights Act. Let's get it legal. Let's have it pass the Department of Justice test and then let's make the tweaks we need, but let's not start with the map that was submitted yesterday because -- I mean, if we're going to start there, we need to change quite a bit to make sure that it's really not going to disenfranchise communities.

I know I'm going to get cut off, but the three districts on the border, I haven't heard a compelling reason why you would do that because it's going to cause the same problem, it's going to dilute the vote for the largely Hispanic communities that live along those borders. Having two gives them a stronger voice, they can be heard. You know, and I really feel like dividing that up isn't going to serve those communicate well and it's not fair.

So thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaking is Maya Castillo, from Tucson.

MAYA CASTILLO: Maya Castillo, last Castillo, C-a-s-t-i-l-l-o.

I live in a family house. It's over a hundred years old. My family has more than a
centuries' worth of ties to downtown Tucson, to the west side, to the south side, all of way to the Mexico border.

When I saw the donut map that was released yesterday, I was honestly horrified that my neighborhood could be removed from its current district and grouped in with, for example, the Catalina Foothills area. There's nothing wrong with that. Nothing wrong with the Catalina Foothills area, but my family, my neighbors have very little in common with that area of town.

I think that the donut map will separate my community, will do great harm to the voters who want a congressional representative that represent us and my interests.

I support the Hispanic Coalition -- the Hispanic Coalition map. I support the creation of competitive districts, and I really truly support maintaining our communities of interest, and I strongly urge you to do the same.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

On you next speaker is Brian Flagg from Pima.

BRIAN FLAGG: It's Brian, B-r-i-a-n,
Flagg, F-l-a-g-g.

I live in the city of South Tucson. I've lived there for 27 years and it's a one-square mile city just south of downtown. Like we have our own firefighters, our own cops, our own mayor and council. It's about 5,000 people and it's really, really poor.

The average family income in the last census figures, the average family income was 14,900 a year. So we are really poor.

I live and work at the soup kitchen and business is booming, I'm sorry to report. So it's really poor there.

I really like living there, but you know what, my understanding is the map you've been dealing with for the last few days has the city of South Tucson hooked up with places like Vail and the Catalina Foothills and places like that.

Well, those places have absolutely nothing to do with our existence in South Tucson.

So I see that as a real problem.

So I would hope that you would, like, look real long and hard at the Hispanic Coalition map, and I would hope that you would create as many competitive districts as you possibly can. And I
really hope you do this because my understanding is
if you don't do stuff like that, you end up in court
and then I have to come back to things like this and
we've got a lot of work to do. I mean, you probably
do, too. So I would hope it can be done right the
first time.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Am I allowed to address an aspect of that
or no? Because I just do want to make the point
that actually South Tucson -- it might help that --
I don't know how easy it is for you to pull up that
dividing line just so people can see it, but South
Tucson is in the other district. It's not in with
the East Tucson or Catalina Foothills.

BRIAN FLAGG: District 7 works really
good for us as it is now.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is
Katya Peterson, representing self from Pima.

KATYA PETERSON: Good afternoon. And I
would just like to thank all of you for having this
hearing here in Tucson. Feels very important to be
here.

I was born here, raised here in Tucson
and I went to the University of Arizona. We
currently live in a University of Arizona neighborhood, and that's just a little small detail, I understand. This is a pretty personal response to this new map.

My mother started our family business in downtown Tucson 80 years ago. Today, as a business owner and as a concerned citizen, my family feels still extremely connected to downtown, to the University of Arizona, and to the communities around the border and beyond.

I believe personally that we are best served by the map supported by the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government that continues to respect our district so that it continues to include the University of Arizona, those communities, and downtown and this is what I believe. And I appreciate being given the time to say that.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Steven Valencia, Chair, Jobs with Justice Coalition, from the Tucson Chapter.

STEVEN VALENCIA: Valencia, V-a-l-e-n-c-i-a, first name is Steven.

I just wanted to make a few points. And
the first one I would like to make is that I really
like the work of the Hispanic Coalition for Good
Government and the map that they have presented. I
think it does everything that the Voting Rights Act
demands us to do in respect to Sections 5 and 2 and
the spirit of the law itself.

I think that in many respects, you know,
they -- you know, I'm from East Los Angeles and
there was a master planner by the name of
Constantino Doxiadis, and he was a master planner
and he developed concepts of human settlements.

Well, right here in Tucson, you know, the
downtown area and the university areas are very
distinct communities of interest, have been so, and
that's the way the whole city has been developed.

And so I'm here to say that one other
thing that happened in my hometown in East Los
Angeles is that a community was separated and
segregated and discriminated against because of
physical boundaries in the way of freeways. It
tic-tac-toed the area where I lived and it actually
segregated huge families of the community.

So I would like to see -- I was -- I
just -- you know, I'm up here and I'm kind of
shaking because I just saw the map that has been
proposed by this Commission. It's terrible. It's something that we couldn't -- I couldn't live with. There is no way I could live with that.

And so in the way of, you know, fair representation and in the way of equality and in the political arena, I would say that we have to go back at least to the baseline of that map that was proposed by the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government because we're going way off, way off course here. So I just wanted to throw in, because we're going to be faced for ten years with these same boundaries, and I think they are simply terrible.

So let's get to work and do something a little bit different and get away from the political parts of it and get to what they said about the mathematical questions about voting.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Augustine Romero, representing Hispanic Coalition for Better Government.

AUGUSTINE ROMERO: Hello, my name is Augustine Romero, R-o-m-e-r-o.

Thank you. As somebody made mention
earlier, thank you for holding this session down in Tucson, Arizona. It's important that you do that and shows good faith that you're doing that.

I'm a native Tucsonan. I grew up just on the other side of this park, which is known as Valle Central. I spent of all my time there in terms of growing up my first 20 some years before I got married and left the house.

And as people have spoken already, that area connected to the downtown area, connected to the University of Arizona area really is a very homey kind of place.

When you think about home -- sometimes people when they think about home they think about a house with grass and a picket fence. Well, I think about my neighborhood where there's no sidewalks, even today, and my great-grandmother's neighborhood over in -- behind Cajillo Street where there's still no sidewalks there either, and then in some areas where -- University of Arizona where they are just building sidewalks in now.

I mean, it's sort of connected. What I mean by that is it's personal. People have come here and talked to you today about things that are personal to them.
This idea of politics is very personal. This idea of who is going to represent us in the future is very personal because it comes down to our families. It comes down to my children. It comes down to the children of people in this place.

And what I'm hoping for is that as you consider whatever it is you're going to consider in terms of the maps you're going to consider, please do one thing. Rise above the politics. Rise above the politics.

In my belief, in this great country of ours, we are about inclusiveness, we're about equality, and we're about justice and promoting more of that not relation of that.

How do we get there? How do we promote that? How do we ensure that the experiences our children and their children -- they experience a better America, a more just, a more inclusive, a more equal America? Rise above the politics. And in that, my friend earlier, Alonzo Morado made mention that as you know, per the Department of Justice, all you do -- all you're required to do is preserve the two majority-minority districts.

But as Alonzo made mention earlier, do
more than that. Take Arizona to a better place.
Make it truly more equal. Make it truly more just.
Make it truly more inclusive and get us a third
minority-majority. And the best case scenario, as
he made mention, get us four. Okay?

Thank you for your time. I know you have
a tough task in front of you, but as I said earlier,
please rise above the politics, ensure greater
inclusiveness, greater justice, and allow us to
preserve our homes and our communities of interest,
and most importantly, help us create a better place
for our children and their children.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Matt Skroch --
forgive me if I'm mispronouncing -- self from
Tucson.

MATT SKROCH: Madame Chair, members of
the Commission, my name is Matt Skroch.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm sorry.

MATT SKROCH: That's okay everybody does
it. I'm used to it.

S-k-r-o-c-h.

And I appreciate the opportunity to be
before you here.
I wanted to start off with a comment, it's a comment that I've made a lot of times over the years living in Tucson here. I tell visitors from out of town and family that Tucson is the smallest big town that I know. And a lot of people echo that sentiment here in the central part of Tucson.

It feels like a small town and it is amazing for those people who live in the central part of Tucson how many times you run into people you know all over the place.

And when I say -- and we've got about a million people here in Eastern Pima County, and obviously that's not very small.

So when I refer to the smallest big town that I know, I'm really referring to a geographic region that's connected in so many ways that I'm not going to be able to cover, from the U of A community through downtown to the west side. In so many ways that core community is connected and bound. And it actually goes beyond. It transcends cultural bonds. It really is a feeling of belonging within the city.

We have a bicycle community, a very strong bicycle community here in Tucson that lives and works within that region, the U of A, downtown,
west side community, the historic neighborhoods within this region are intertwined and connected in myriad ways with such a rich history.

And we have a lot of people that live and work and commute within this area. We kind of refer to the rest of Tucson -- not in a negative way, but it's a different place. And I would like to see that core community that's more recently even been more strongly connected with the new integration of the modern street car. I would like to see that community retained in the same congressional district because I feel like it is, for the most part, a place that has one voice, one soul, one city.

The other comment I wanted to make relates to Cochise County. And I look at that District 1 -- and I've worked and traveled through the existing District 1 today and talked with a lot of people there, and I shake my head when I think about the difficulty of representing a district that large.

I believe it's the largest congressional district in the contiguous 48, aside from the one state representatives -- or from the one representative states.
And I'll just finish up really quick.

And adding even more land to District 1, essentially half of the state, when you got nine district total, doesn't make a lot of sense to me. From the Grand Canyon, tribal interests, the rim, all the way to the border is just way too much for one district, and I hope you'll consider that.

Thanks for the opportunity to speak with you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Carolyn Campbell, representing self from Tucson.

CAROLYN CAMPBELL: Thank you.

My name is Carolyn Campbell, and I want to thank you for all of the work that you have been doing most of the day. But I will say that I haven't been involved in this process or following this process except really through the newspaper and having gone through trying to look at the maps, I can't really comment specifically and honestly. The maps are kind of confusing looking at them on the website. It's hard to make heads or tails of them.

But listening today, I believe that a map sounds like that reflects what I would like to talk to, the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government map.
But I saw a map I believe in the newspaper a few weeks ago that really hit a core with me and motivated me to come down here and speak to you, and it's about a community of interest. I've actually heard had a few people this evening talk about not so much this morning, but -- and that's a community of -- a culture and historic part of Tucson that I'm a member of, and I believe it was a very, very cohesive group.

I have listened to many people that are in natives of Tucson. I've been in Arizona for 30 years. My community of interest until adulthood was naval bases, which was a cohesive community of interest or a series of naval bases.

And since I've been in Tucson, I have lived in the historic neighborhood of Feldman, northwest of the University of Arizona. And I think the cohesiveness binds us together as a community, as a desire to protect the urban core, the older, founding neighborhoods.

And in particular, I wanted to talk about a subset of that which is the historic neighborhood surrounding the University of Arizona and then kind of working out from there.

I had served for a time on the University
of Arizona and City of Tucson campus community relations committee, which was all of the neighborhoods around the university, all of them being historic neighborhoods.

And as we worked through some of the issues with the university in particular, there were issues of parties and trash and noise and those kinds of things, but by and large, the issues that we were always addressing and that we always worked together on was preserving the historic and cultural integrity of our neighborhoods.

And I think that's a big point that keeps us together around the university and working west. Let's see, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven neighborhoods surrounding the university in that process and then working downtown with Armory Park and Presidio neighborhood, west towards Menlo Park and Bario Hollywood and then moving south from there.

I've worked on issues with the city of Tucson, Pima County with the legislature, the federal government and just preserving the integrity of our urban character, our cultural and historic roots is something that I feel very deeply about and I think I share that with my neighbors here in
I really hope that you can keep us all together in the district that we're in currently. It's been working very well.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker, and actually final speaker, is Barbara Mendoza, representing self from Santa Cruz.

Not final.

BARBARA MENDOZA: My name is Barbara Mendoza, M-e-n-d-o-z-a. I'm from Nogales, representing myself and in support of the Hispanic Coalition maps.

I think as we talk about this redistricting and we talk about the common interests the different areas have, Nogales has so many ties to Tucson that I hope that it's not forgotten within this redistricting chore that you have to do.

When we start from the border, we have the port of entry and Interstate 19, which is certainly important both to tourism and commerce both in Nogales and in Tucson.

The Santa Cruz River is an important and crucial water source for both cities. We understand
the uniqueness of this water supply and how 
essential the continued flow and environmental 
protection of this supply is.

    Health systems in Nogales and Tucson are 
connected. The quality of our life in Tucson is 
extremely dependent on that continuation of that 
connection. And it's so important that we be able 
to keep the tie with Tucson.

    Public education remains to be the choice 
and is really the only available in our area.

    The University of Arizona has a silent 
campus in Nogales. We are thankful for that 
connection and support for our students and the 
quality of life down in our community.

    We're more than just a border. We're 
people living and striving for a better way of life. 
We're small but our connection with Tucson gives us 
hopes and dreams for our children that we don't 
always have in Santa Cruz County. And we have so 
much connection with that very tie, through both 
family ties, cultural, and traditional.

    And I hope that you don't forget this as 
you design your congressional districts because 
Santa Cruz County and its residents have a lot to 
offer and they, too, want a voice in our government
and continued quality of life that resembles similar
to yours.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Desmond, can you
pan out so at that Nogales is shown, too? Santa
Cruz County in general.

Just curious.

Okay. The next speaker is Sheldon
Gutman, representing self.

You'll have to tell us where you're from, too.

SHELDON GUTMAN: Thank you. I'm from
Tucson.

I would just like to try to respond
briefly to some personal attacks made on a few
elected officials, one from a Libertarian against
Russell Pearce who is running for reelection now.

And I thought that a Libertarian would
have some deference to Mr. Pearce, a long-time state
legislator, in business for most -- business
interests, expansion and getting business started
up.

And I'm really concerned about -- this
personal attack. And Libertarians are presumably
pro-life, religious freedom. I'm sure Mr. Pearce is
like that.

I also would like to refer to kind of the personal attack against Attorney General Tom Horne. He's simply looking at the state law, if there's a significant bias on the part of any member of the Commission. He's using his authority the legal way.

And talking about Marana, it's great to see them -- Marana expand business ventures. A railroad junction, of course. I'm a little leery of Marana in the sense that it was a tentative plan at one time or another to build a spring training baseball stadium there, according to Tom Tracy. That was a few years ago.

The mayor of Marana recently said, well, we'll get -- we're thinking of a plan to build a facility on Tangerine Road.

Anyway, it will be a big legal fight if they try to take further -- the effort to take spring training from urban Tucson.

I see a member of the board of supervisor is here and has jurisdiction over the county baseball stadium and we hope he's he keeps in mind how to get spring training back, like when the Diamondbacks were there.

And I have a -- just like to congratulate
Carolyn Campbell said how to restore districts on occasion when necessary. I appreciate her comment in that regard.

Thank you very much for your time and attention.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you. That's my last request to speak form.

Is there another one?

BENJAMIN BROOKHART: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

BENJAMIN BROOKHART: My name is Benjamin Brookhart, spelled B-r-o-o-k-h-a-r-t, and I live in Tucson outside of the city limits in the Picture Rocks community.

First, I would like to address, Madame Chairman and Commission, and say that I appreciate the difficult task that you all are taking on to view the balance of representation that affects all citizens of the state of Arizona. It's not just any one individual community, it's affecting us all as citizens of this state.

And I also want to point out as a citizen, I believe one of the most important issues in mapping out Arizona's representation is the area of like interests, communities of interest, area of
community like interests, that they remain intact because there's nothing worse than being disenfranchised when you split those up when dealing with your mapping.

And then the last thing I want to point out and the most important is the three districts along the southern border makes the most sense, and it does for two specific reasons.

One, you have three voices along the border, not two. That increases our representation in the U.S. congress as well as to represent the entire state.

And two, it gives more direct representation upon the part of those who live in those specific areas.

So as long as we maintain control of representation of community like interest in those areas and we measure that out based on population, I think that would be in our best interest both for those locally, statewide, and nationally.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

And if you'll fill out a request to speak form, Mr. Bladine has one.

BENJAMIN BROOKHART: Yeah, I did.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, I'm not seeing it.

Thank you very much.

I think that was the last speaker.

I don't want to assume.

Okay. Seeing no one else coming forward, thank you very much, everyone, for your comments. This was almost like a public hearing, I have to say from our first round. We had a lot of input today and we appreciate you all taking the time to tell us your thoughts.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I think it's pretty evident from today and in going forward that we'll hear a lot of public comments about a particular map that are pretty negative. And I will say a poorly crafted map and one that I don't particularly like, I stated my reasons.

I mean, we even have Republicans, Democrats, finding something against this map. And you're going to hear more of that. And I'm sad about that.

I mean, we had a map in the river district that was even supported by Lynne St.
Angelo, for crying out loud, and she's by no means a liberal. We had other people, Republicans, that supported this map and we ended up compromising, I'm going to use that word in quotes, on a map that really doesn't -- it came out of nowhere.

And I'm going to urge the people that opposed this map, which are plenty, to talk about it, how the Hispanic population is disenfranchised by this map and other people are disenfranchise this map. And I would encourage people to encourage people to come to these hearings, we got one on Thursday, and talk about why you don't like a particular map and what changes need to be made because we need -- me -- I'm including myself, I thought we did a pretty good job on putting together a map that obviously didn't work. So I'm encouraging people that are out here to gather some support against this map and talk about why you don't like it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great.

Other comments from other commissioners?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I've just got a small one.
As we move forward as we are going through this map -- and I'm not going to question your intentions about why you voted for it, but you did vote for it -- this map moving forward. And let's not lose sight of that.

As we move forward as we have lively discussions on trying to make the best possible map for all six and a half million people in the state and all of the interested parties that we have here.

So if there are things that we disagree with, let's state them and vote that way. And if there are things we agree with it, let's state it and vote that way.

But to try to recreate that statement -- I'm hoping that that's not what you're trying to do. I recognize that we've heard some testimony today, but I also don't want to lose sight of the fact that if you didn't like it, you should have voted against it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I would also just like to say the map did not come out of nowhere. It came out of -- it was a combination map of the two tracts that we were going down and so by no means did it come out of nowhere. So I would have to respectfully disagree with Mr. Herrera on that.
comment.

Is there any other comment?

Okay. Hearing none, we will move on to the next agenda item, which is 7, report legal advice and direction to counsel regarding Attorney General inquiry, and I do understand there is an update.

JOE KANEFIELD: Yes, Madame Chair.

Briefly, I just wanted to update the Commission on the action today taken by the counsel for the Commission.

A lawsuit was filed in Maricopa County Superior Court against the Attorney General. It's a declaratory judgment action and special action. It alleges two counts and it relate to the Attorney General's investigation and his civil action against the three named commissioners to compel them -- each of them to testify.

In this complaint filed by the Commission, the -- there is two counts. The first is one that alleges that the general powers of the Attorney General to investigate and enforce violations of the open meeting law do not apply to meetings and members of the Commission.

The investigation of the Commission by
the Attorney General is therefore in excess of his authority and in violation of the constitutional independence of the Commission.

The second count relates to legislative privilege. In this count, we allege that the investigation seeks the production of documents and seeks to compel testimony from commissioners about their district mapping work and deliberations, which intrudes on legislative privilege enjoyed by the Commission and its members.

Consequently, we are asking the investigation be declared unlawful and in excess of the Attorney General's authority.

We will also shortly move to consolidate this matter with the pending matter before Judge Fink, as brought by Attorney General Horne, because we believe the issues are common and they should all be resolved before his investigation goes further.

You're updated. If you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any questions for legal counsel?

Okay. Thank you very much.

And that brings us to the end of the agenda, which is adjournment, item 9, and so at
6:27 p.m., this meeting is adjourned.

    Thank you.

    (The meeting adjourned at 6:27 p.m.)
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