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PROCEEDINGS

(Whereupon, the public session commences.)

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

The date is Thursday, September 29th, and the time is 9:38 in the morning.

And we'll begin with the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We'll go ahead and start with roll call.

Vice Chair Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Vice Chair Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We have a quorum.
The other folks around the room today are our legal counsel, Joe Kanefield and Mary O'Grady. Our mapping consultant, Willie Desmond. We have Marty Herder, our court reporter. Staff include Buck Forst our chief technology officer, our deputy executive director Kristina Gomez. Lisa Schmelling is in the back, our public outreach coordinator.

I think that's it for now. With that, we'll go ahead and move into agenda item two, which is map presentations.

And I think I only have one today, so that is Mr. James Kelley, chairman LD 29, Pima GOP.

If you'd like to come up and make his presentation.

JAMES KELLEY: Thank you very much for allowing me -- that's Kelley, K-E-L-L-E-Y -- for allowing me to address the Commission.

This is, this map is being submitted on behalf of one of the citizens in Pima County by the name of Benny White, who has done some amazing work taking from the base draft positions that the Commission has begun to work with.

Were we able to get that loaded at all?

Mr. White's position with this map is that he started with the first constitutional requirements of equal
population, with very little deviation.

One through nine -- Congressional Districts 1 through 9 all are between 708,000 people to the highest number of 711,000 and some change.

We have compactness. We have contiguousness. We have communities of interest.

And to address the minority-minority districts, District 2 has an HVAP of 50.76 percent and District 7 is at 53.65 percent.

When I asked him to address cracking and packing, his responses were extremely intelligent, bringing up basically some of the court cases in the Supreme Court with regards to Section 5 and Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, and Sandra -- and Justice O'Connor's responses to gerrymandering and racial gerrymandering in particular.

Racial gerrymandering pains must be examined against the backdrop of this country's long history of racial discrimination in voting.

Classifications of citizens based solely on race are by their nature odious to a free people whose institutions are founded on the doctrine of equality because they threaten to stigmatize persons by reason of their membership in a racial group and to accite racial hostility.

Thus state legislation that expressly
distinguishes s among citizens on account of race, whether it contains an explicit distinction or is unexplainable on grounds other than race, must be narrowly tailored to further a compelling government interest.

A reapportionment plan that includes in one district individuals who belong to the same race but who are otherwise widely separated by geographical and political boundaries and may have little in common with one another, other than the color of their skin, bears an uncomfortable resemblance to political apartheid.

When racial or religion lines are drawn by the state, the multi-racial, multi-religious communities that our constitution seeks to weld together as one becomes separatist. Antagonisms that relate to race or religion rather to than to political issues are generated.

Communities seek not the best representative, but the best racial or religious partisans.

Racial block voting in minority group political cohesion never can be assumed, but specifically must be proved in each case in order to establish that a redistricting plan dilutes the minority voting strength in violation of two.

And, cases to give coverage jurisdiction carte blanche to engage in racial gerrymandering in the name of nonretrogression.
Racial classifications of any sort pose the risk of lasting harm to our society. They reinforce the belief held by too many for too much of our history that individuals should be judged by the color of their skin.

Racial classification with respect to voting carry particular dangers. Racial gerrymandering even for remedial purposes may vulcanize us into something competing racial factions and threatens to carry us further from the goal of a political system in which race no longer matters, a goal that the 14th and 15th Amendments embody and to which the nation continues to aspire.

I don't think I need to go on.

I'm glad that Mr. White has put this map together, and it is submitted for your consideration.

Are there any questions?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Are there any questions for Mr. Kelley?

(No oral response.)

JAMES KELLEY: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

I think that's our only mapping presentation this morning, which means we move on to agenda item three, which is review, discussion and direction of mapping consultant regarding the development of a congressional draft map based on constitutional criteria.
And as those who have been following us know, at our last meeting on Tuesday we talked about moving forward on the framework for this -- what I'm now proposing we just call for sure EB map, which is everything bagel. We'll just call it EB to make it short and sweet.

And I had a request that we call it that on the, you know, map itself and the statistics and splits page on our website, so that it's real clear what we're talking about.

I thought that was a good suggestion, so thank you.

So the challenge was, as we know from this last map, what it, what it represents really is a compromise map. I tried to take the elements from Mr. Herrera's river district map, what we've talked about in past meetings about having a three border map, and also including this whole counties version that Mr. Freeman has been advancing.

So the idea is that not everybody gets what they want. I think the Rolling Stones said it best. But if we try sometime we might find we get what we need.

And I am hoping that we can actually come to a point where -- it's not a perfect map. That wasn't the idea of it.

There's a big hole in the middle.

And the idea is that the commissioners can all
work together to fill that center.

So we talked about this a great deal on Tuesday. And the idea was that -- Ms. McNulty actually, one of the ground rules for that center was I had suggested that I think it's reasonable that we have at least one competitive district in the Phoenix metro area. I don't think that's a -- anything unreasonable to try for.

It is why this initiative was created, was to create more competitive districts in the state.

So creating at least one is a good goal to have, in my estimation.

And I know Ms. McNulty came up with an opportunity that she had found for doing such a thing.

And by competitive, I mean we're neither -- neither major party has any sort of advantage built in already.

So that's my grand, grand vision for a competitive district.

And I did suggest that that district be called number nine, because we are creating a ninth district, as everyone knows this time around. Why not have that one be competitive straight out 50/50.

So I know that Ms. McNulty had some ideas. She presented those last week.

Mr. Freeman agreed to look at what she presented,
and then see if he could come together, figure out a way to create the rest of those districts around it in Maricopa County.

So that's the, where -- we're going to start today is just to see what we were able to accomplish on that end.

So I'm hoping Mr. Freeman had some time to think about that.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair, first of all, with respect to the constitutional criteria and competitive districts, I don't pretend to know what was in the mind of the voters when they pulled the lever and voted for this proposition or decided to vote against the proposition or just not to vote on the proposition.

All I have in front of me are the constitutional criteria that are written down in black and white. And the constitutional criteria, all of them are to be applied by the Commission. And we are to favor competitive districts to the extent that they don't cause a substantial detriment to the other five goals.

It doesn't say that there shall be one, two urban Maricopa County competitive districts. It doesn't proscribe any specific number of competitive districts.

It could be the case that none of them fall out of the maps because to do so, to construction one, would cause a substantial detriment to the other goals.
I think we need to focus on the constitutional criteria.

We have to be able to know what, in my view, what a baseline map would look like so we can assess whether reconfiguring that map would cause a substantial detriment to us meeting the other goals.

So I think at least that continues to be my focus in constructing these maps.

As to how a competitive district would look, you mentioned that no party would have an advantage.

And to some extent I agree with that, but I feel ill equipped to really measure what a competitive district is, because if I'm going to assess whether either party has a built-in advantage, I want to know what voter registration data looks like for that district.

Because I don't want to focus on particularly the 2008, 2010 election results, which really on Maptitude here, that's what I'm really -- to take a quick and dirty assessment of how the district shakes out in competitiveness, that's all I have in front of me on my computer.

And in my own mind I make a mental adjustment because, as I said before, I think those are outlier years, those are higher watermarks for Republicans. And unless you really can look at the voter registration data for those
districts, I think you end up penalizing success.

If one party -- I don't think that's fair.

Because if one party is able to turn out more of its voters, if one party is able to recruit better candidates or take positions on issues that are more responsive to the people living in the district, they get penalized because they're going to win that election. And then we're going to have that data in front of us, and we're going to have to skew the results to tamp down that, that success they had in a hypothetical future election.

So with respect to the district that Commissioner McNulty constructed, just based on the data that I have in front of me, and putting aside all the other constitutional criteria and just focusing on the competitiveness, yeah, if you look at the 2010 governor's race, governor -- or Terry Goddard wins in that district by a small fraction. If you look at secretary of state, Mr. Bennett wins narrowly.

But I don't know whether that is truly -- you know, I'd like know what the underlying registration data is on that to make that further assessment.

But, moving beyond that, getting to the map and what we need to do.

I did take a hard look at it, because I, you know, I agreed I'll try to work with this map. And in terms of
just filling in the bagel, the doughnut hole here, I mean,
like I said on Tuesday, when I was a little less
exhausted -- no, I take it back, I was a little more
exhausted on Tuesday. I've got real concerns and problems
with simply filling in the hole without looking at the maps
sort of holistically.

Because what we have in -- and I don't know if we
can, can we pull up the -- the screen saver just went on.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: While Mr. Desmond is doing
that, I want to address one thing you said, Mr. Freeman.

I don't know what the voters had in mind either.
And I'm not pretending to know what they really wanted when
they passed the initiative in 2000.

But if -- from the constitutional, the language
says we are to oversee the mapping of fair and competitive
congressional and legislative districts.

So to me, it is a goal.

And so I totally agree that we have to follow the
constitutional criteria, and competitiveness is to be
considered equally with the other five criteria, but only to
the extent practicable and with no significant detriment to
the other goals.

So I think that competitiveness -- just saying out
front that I think it's an objectively fair criteria to be
striving for. I think most people would say -- it also
talks about voter engagement.

   I think voters are more engaged. If they feel
that they can actually influence an election, they're going
to turn out and come vote.

   So I think voter participation is also really an
important area to be thinking about because it is mentioned
in the preamble of the proposition.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair, my comments
weren't made to be critical of what you had said.

   You shared your thoughts, our view in the process.
I just wanted to offer mine as well.

   Here's our doughnut hole.

   And what's apparent -- what might not be apparent
is that CD 4, which is this river district, is short 210,000
people.

   Now this district -- and intentionally so.
This district was constructed -- fell out
basically on all of our what-if maps in one shape or form or
another.

   And we heard lots of public comment about these
people living in these river communities, how that is
a very -- they're very tightly bound together. It's a
community of interest. It's something we need to respect.
We need to put these people together.

   And one thing that -- another aspect of
commonality here is that it is essentially a rural area of the state.

And so it's linked together with other rural areas, Yavapai County, northern Mohave County, part of Yuma County -- we had to -- Yuma County is cut here because of the construction of the voting rights district here. So it has an essentially rural nature to it.

Now, the problem is you cannot find enough voters here in western Maricopa County to give you the 210,000 you're missing.

If you move this line, if you march it eastward and you bring it up to the edge of the Phoenix metro area here, you only get about 50,000. So you're still short 160,000.

At least on my view.

And as I looked at it, I tried to be more and more aggressive to grab more and more voters.

You know, this little feature of the map here, which I call the drain pipe, that's the city of Goodyear. It's a very north-south running city.

And I went ahead and added it to CD 4. It does have -- it's pretty -- if you look at it on Google Earth, you'll see it's pretty -- and/or if you've been there, I've driven through there, it's pretty agrarian, lots of farming there.
This little dip right here is part of Buckeye, which is a very sprawling city here on the far west side. And I added more from Buckeye as well.

And by the way, just as an aside, this little feature here might be something we want to address just because it has a quirky look to it.

And we might be able to smooth that out. And I know I-10 runs along there. That was one thing I looked at.

Can we just pull that line up. And I think that make that line look more similar to the line the Hispanic Coalition drew. But, of course, when you do that, you kind of over populate CD 3, so you have to drain off some more elsewhere.

So, in bringing that up -- and I brought that up, I aim to split the city of Surprise, at least on my working draft. And I know we've heard from the city of Surprise asking us don't split us.

These west valley -- some of these west valley communities expect when the economy returns a lot of growth. They're going to be suburban or urban in nature.

And I got to a point on the west side where I just couldn't justify bringing it in -- bringing the line in any more. Because if we do that, we essentially make this sort of the pie district, which we've heard a lot of people object to. They don't like the notion that urban Maricopa
County is going to be connected to their rural county and will destroy the nature of it.

We're going to -- we end up with a significant percentage of the population of this district being urban in nature.

And as the city grows over the next ten years, it will become more and more urban dominated.

And these folks -- we cannot -- we should not be calling this a rural district or a river district anymore.

It will be sort of the Phoenix district or the west valley district.

So how -- is there another way we could do that?

And the other way -- there is another way we could can do that. We can bring this line as close as we can to the Phoenix metro area, bring it up to the western border of Peoria, bring it -- and sort of down, and wrapping around Surprise, to the extent we can.

But we've got to go find voters somewhere else.

And we can find rural voters to add to CD 4. And at our last hearing I tried to pursue, well, could we put rural, the non-reservation portions of Gila County, that's a little under 50,000, that gets us pretty close to balancing out CD 4.

There's another way to do it.

You can take Coconino County and put the Flagstaff
communities, move them over to CD 4. That will pretty much get you there.

Of course, either one of those approaches you've now underpopulated CD 1. So you've got to repopulate it.

And the approach I think we should take is just go ahead and put western Pinal County, the non-reservation portions of it, back into CD 1. We might even have to sort of trim over here in the southeast valley to bring it as close as we can up to the urban areas. I know right now in this unassigned area, there's the San Tan Valley, there's Apache Junction and Gold Canyon. We have to trim away at that to balance that out.

Then, of course, we're going to unpopulate CD 3 a little bit, so that's where adjusting this sort of drain pipe feature might come into play to balance that out.

So I think we need to do something like that.

Otherwise, bringing this line in, it makes no sense. I really can't support it, because I don't think it would meet constitutional criteria. Certainly wouldn't comport with what we've heard in terms of public comment.

To me there's really no viable way to fill the bagel without making some adjustments and trade-offs to other aspects of the map so that we keep CD 4 rural in nature.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you, Mr. Freeman.

I appreciate you doing that analysis, because I know it's not simple. And there's -- we need to figure out how to bring four up to 710,000.

So there is this rural-urban interface issue as well.

And Flagstaff area is in either one rural district, so to speak, or another.

And which one it goes in, I'm sure they have thoughts on, and other commissioners might as well. And we can talk about that.

The other idea as to what Mr. Freeman suggested is go into the non-reservations portions of Gila or into Pinal, so --

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: And, by the way, Madam Chair.

I know in designing this map, you weren't -- that wasn't -- you weren't intending -- the cutout you made makes sense, but -- so I know you weren't intending to create sort of this issue, but it does exist, and that's what I was trying to go through, different scenarios to try to address it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right. And it does impact other lines. It's not like we can just fill in that white space, unassigned area, and not deal with, you know, not cause adjustments that are needed to the other lines.
So I appreciate that, and it's really a framework kind of map.

So do commissioners -- so did you actually fill in any -- did you just try anything, Mr. Freeman, to present, because I'd be open if you had something in mind we could look at that.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Yeah, I did. And of course I started with the best of intentions that I would write down on a Word document every step I took, but the problem is you get into it, and it's kind of addicting once you get into it, and all of a sudden a couple hours have gone by and I notice I haven't taken any notes.

But I do have a couple maps, and I guess we can --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Let's look at them.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Let's look at them, yeah.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think we should look at them.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: All right. Then that may take a moment. And maybe -- I don't know if we should take a break so --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So he would need to get that from your machine.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Yes, because I --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Well, before we -- but I think maybe we could take a break and Willie could get
that from you and we could set it upon the screen to take a look at.

In the meantime though are there other thoughts from commissioners on this and what we just talked about?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I do have a couple thoughts.

I think that this is not a zoning exercise. It's an exercise of complying with the Constitution and we need to meld the six criteria.

I think that as to the rural district, we can't keep the state from growing and we can't segregate all the rural areas.

I don't think that's a legitimate approach.

And I think -- and so to come at this, and maintaining the ruralness of the districts is not one of the constitutional criteria.

And we've talked a lot about that in this process as if the lines that we draw somehow maintain the urban character -- the rural character of places. They don't.

Places are going to grow, and we need to acknowledge that.

So my perspective is that the western rural district may need to include some of Maricopa County, that it is not a legitimate interpretation of the Constitution to say that maintaining the ruralness, including only rural
areas in that county, overrides the other equal criteria including competitiveness.

So, and I understood Madam Chair that what you your tempting to do in moving us toward consensus was to invite us to complete the districts in that blank area, including one truly competitive district with the others built around it. And where we left it last time, as you said, was that I had proposed something, and Mr. Freeman was going to propose to work around it.

If Mr. Freeman has been unable to come up with any ideas around that district, I would like the opportunity to do that.

I believe that there are sensible ways to do that in the framework that you've proposed to us.

And so although I'm certainly willing to watch what Mr. Freeman has proposed, I would like to take up the challenge and draw a map and present it to you that does, in fact, work within the framework of the compromise that you've proposed.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Freeman, did you have something?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I agree with part of that.

The one thing when we were assuming the maps, one of them was called river district map, and the founding premise of that was to acknowledge the community of interest
along the river. That was these communities are connected and they are rural in nature.

And now true, I mean, the population isn't there, it isn't there, and we have to -- we might have to get some of it from Maricopa County, despite these people talking about their great differences between nature, the area where they live and urban Maricopa County. But I don't think it's really fair for them to do this in a fair way to have this rural district bear all the burden and take all of the west side of Phoenix.

If we can capture some more rural population from other areas of the state to put into four, it's going to be from CD 1, then CD 1 can come in, and they take some of the burden as well by take being some of the far southeast valley and taking more of Pinal County.

So kind of this is trying to seek the equitable balance between the two sides of the state and have them both bear the burden.

As for filling in the rest, I looked at that, I looked at the map, the district that Commissioner McNulty had pre-designed, and looked at ways of filling in the doughnut hole, but I sort of had to wrestle with this first issue, which is repopulating CD 4 before I could really, in a fair way, before I could really get into.

And, I mean, that's a couple steps down the road,
and I hadn't intended to sort of get into talk about that yet.

I wanted to -- I thought it first appropriate to sort of address this sort of this greater macro issue, which is repopulating CD 4 in a fair way.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I would just say that you were very clear in what you said to us last time, that the compromise proposal that you've put forward in an effort to bring the five of us together was that you had taken what you consider to be the best of two different maps and melded them together on this map, with the understanding that we would then work on the middle with one truly competitive 50/50 district. And that was the project that you assigned to us and invited us to embark upon.

I'm understanding Mr. Freeman to be saying that he doesn't want to proceed in this fashion, that he wants to back out of the doughnut hole into the other districts.

I don't think that there's a need for that.

I also think that it's part of a long-standing effort that this Commission has been struggling with for seven months in which we have different perspectives on the importance of competitiveness.

We have a couple commissioners who feel that it only applies if it falls out, as Mr. Freeman has put it.

And we have other commissioners, myself included,
who feel that that was the purpose for which the constitutional amendment was enacted and that it must be given the same priority of as the others.

The reality of the constitution is that it is a -- it is a -- it is confusing and artful at the same time, because what it does is both force and allow us to interpret all the various constitutional criteria in a way that best achieve all of them.

That doesn't mean that competition only applies if it falls out.

There are approximately 32 or 33 percent of this state made up of Republicans, approximately 30 percent of Democrats, and the balance of Independents. It is roughly a third, a third, and a third.

So the chair's, the chair's proposal here to bring us together, which would result in three competitive districts, three districts that could be won by either party, three districts that really would appeal to the Independent voters of the state, is I think an eminently reasonable and fair way for her to try to bring the five of us together.

It's been pretty clear for seven months that we are on very opposite sides of that divide.

Mr. Herrera and I on one side. Mr. Freeman and Mr. Stertz on the other.
We only have two choices here. We either come together at some point or we don't.

And I think what Chairman Mathis has tried to put together and has asked us to do is the only way that we can go forward.

I think it was creative. It was -- it is -- it makes sense. And, but the ground rules were that if we're going to get to one map and we're all going to agree on it, we're going to work the way she described.

And I believe there's a way to do that.

And if Mr. Freeman doesn't or can't find that way, as I said earlier, I want the opportunity to try, because I think this is a good idea.

As I said the other day, it wouldn't be my first choice.

My first choice would be -- would have been to use the Hispanic Coalition For Good Government maps and the river district map, but I'm only one of five, and we're five with very different perspectives.

The chairman has given us a way forward that we can do something good for the state, and we can all five of us, you know, achieve part of what it is that we want, which is what compromise is all about.

So I would encourage the five of us to do it.

If we don't want to do it -- I want to try to do
it. If you some of us don't want to do it, I want to try to do it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you, Ms. McNulty.

Mr. Herrera, did you have something?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, I couldn't agree more with Commissioner McNulty.

This particular map wasn't my first choice, as I made it clear yesterday. I looked over it Wednesday. I ended up voting for this map or for the working -- to proceed with doughnut hole, which I affectionately call the Republican map, because I wanted to get -- what I wanted to do was move forward and see if we can work a compromise.

But, you know, from the beginning when I saw this map, I really thought that, you know, either commissioner -- or Chairwoman Mathis said she based this map on the whole counties map created by Commissioner Freeman and used Commissioner Stertz' main idea of -- or her main objective was to create three border districts.

So those were the two reasons, the two -- the -- the -- the way she created this map, based on those two ideas.

So that's, that's already giving the Republicans a huge advantage.

And now we're limiting the number of -- of
competitive districts we can create because of the way the map is shaped.

We have the Hispanic groups that are completely opposed to this map, said it disenfranchises a group that we're trying to protect because of the Voting Rights Act.

So if Commissioner McNulty truly cares -- commissioner -- Chairwoman Mathis cares about getting this map tasked on -- or to do preclearance on the first time, then this map isn't the way to go.

And it's apparent by the Hispanic groups that are talking to us that have spoken. As soon as they saw this map, about the Native American groups, this map disenfranchises them.

And I'm going to assume there's plenty of people here that will talk about that.

So to me this is not a compromise map. This is a map that favors the Republican party.

It did from the beginning when we created a draft map that had three border districts, and this is what we've gotten.

The people that voted for Prop 106, I'm one of them. I voted for it because I care about competition, and I wanted to get that out of the hands of the legislators, because they obviously have a self-interest, and their self-interest is to keep themselves in power.
So, again, this particular map really is -- is --
it favors Republicans, and what we need to do here is truly compromise.

And Commissioner Freeman, it doesn't appear that he wants to compromise on at least one competitive district in Maricopa County.

Let's forget about the particular criteria and not even worry about competition, and just create maps using other five criteria that appear to you to be more important, which, again, this is not true.

We have six criteria that are equally important.

And at a minimum, for the two Democrats that are on this panel, for a minimum to at least get for us to say, okay, we're not getting what we want so far because Commissioner Mathis sided with the Republicans, let's at least get as many competitive districts as possible. I mean, that's all we can ask for now.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: First of all, the constitution -- the Arizona Supreme Court has said that the constitution means what it says. We have to apply all six criteria.

And the six criteria, competitiveness must be favored to the extent it doesn't cause a substantial
detriment to the other goals.

If we all make some assessment as to whether favoring the competitive district has not caused a substantial detriment to the other goals, I think we invite of legal challenge. And I think we need to make that determination.

But getting back to your point that this is somehow the Republican map, I find that to be ridiculous. I would invite you to point out to me the similarities between this map that is up on the screen and the whole counties approach map that I had developed.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I'm using commissioner -- Chairwoman Mathis' own words.
She used your map, the whole -- this is -- I'm not making this up.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Point out the similarities.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Let me just say her words, unless you're accusing her of lying. She said --
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Here's the laser pointer.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I used the whole counties map as a baseline to create that map, and I used the three border districts to -- as an addition.

Those are her words, not mine.
So if you have an issue with that, bring it up with Chairwoman Mathis.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, before you go and label it the Republican map, you're the one that labeled it the Republican map, so here's the laser pointer, go ahead and point out the similarities between this map and the map that I drew.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: As I already mentioned to you why I am calling it that.

And I'm not the only one, by the way.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, there must be some reason.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I already mentioned that this is why it's the Republican map.

It limits the number of competitive districts you can create. That's -- that's -- that's one big hole.

It creates three border districts.

I mean, those two are huge.

And it limits us what we can do. It does limit us.

As Commissioner McNulty is trying to put together two competitive districts in Maricopa County, which was possible with the river district map.

We created four competitive districts with the river district map.
With this one, I'm lucky if we can two or three. Three if we're -- if, if you guys would even agree to creating three, but two is probably the realistic part.

So, again, I call it the Republican map because that's what Commissioner Mathis was saying. She used your map and Commissioner Stertz' map.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I would like to just jump in there. I did not call it the Republican map.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: No, no, no, no.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I start with counties version 6D. No question. And went from there but --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I'm calling it that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: -- also incorporates the Hispanic Coalition For Good Government, portions of what they submitted to us. It also includes what the Navajo Nation submitted to us. It's a hybrid of their numbers one and two.

It does bring in three border districts. Yes, that was something that Mr. Stertz was interested from the beginning.

It does bring in two rural districts. And to the extent practicable, I know rural isn't one of our criteria, but we did hear a lot from folks in the rural areas. It is clear that their issues are different from urban areas.

It's also clear we have to have equal population
in these nine districts.

And so it's impossible to just create purely rural districts. But to the extent practical, that we can, I think we should.

They face things like 25 percent unemployment rates in some of their counties, and I do believe that they deserve a voice that is strongly based and rooted in their concerns.

So I think that, you know, what we do with the Flagstaff area is going to be big in this in terms of getting up to 710 in number four.

I do think that there's enough flexibility up there to be able to create at least one competitive district, and I think that's a reasonable goal, as I stated at the beginning, and in the Maricopa County area. What we do around that is what I'd like to focus on.

And if we could talk about that, openly, and if, you know, once we see what Mr. Freeman created, I have no problem with then us all talking about that and saying what we agree and disagree with.

And then if it's just something that isn't workable, and he wasn't able to work in a competitive district number nine, I'm happy to have Ms. McNulty take a crack at it and see what she can do with that area.

So, but I think we have to just plow through this
and do it. You know, just do this until we get it done, frankly.

And maybe we'll have to take breaks and once in a while switch gears and go to the legislative, if we reach a point where we've kind of gone as far as we can on this one. But I'd like to at least try and do something with it today.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Chairman Mathis.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I never said you called it that. I said I'm calling it that. Because that's the way I feel. I mean, I hope you respect that. You may disagree with it, but respect where I'm coming from. But I never said you called it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you. I do disagree with it though.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: You're entitled to.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I'd be happy to point out the similarities between this map and my whole counties approach, which, by the way, in developing my thought processes in the map, every instruction to the mapping consultant was a call out on a constitutional criteria and they were rather broad-based constitutional criteria.

There wasn't until sort of near the very end and only to orient the mapping consultant on the urban Maricopa
County districts at a very late iteration that I called out
a street which was to align, to sort of have the districts
built sort of more from the center of the urban area and
out.

And on the other hand, on the river district map,
with the very first iteration, there were street level micro
adjustments to sort of draw a predetermined district, I'm
afraid.

And that suggested a result-oriented process,
which I don't think is right.

But in terms of this map, this line right here,
that looks like a line on my map, except my line ends at the
Pima County -- where Pima County ends right there.

So there's one similarity right there.

And then -- where else?

I guess this line over here, the Hispanic
Coalition map, minority-majority district, which I
instructed to be overlaid onto the whole counties map.

So I guess that line there, maybe up to Buckeye,
is similar to what's on my map.

And, that's it.

So there's the Republican map right there, that
line and that line.

But, in looking at the map, I thought the first
problem that needed to be tackled, wrestled with, was this
rural issue and balancing it out across Maricopa County.

    So that was the first step I took.

    And if we can't -- I thought that was the logical first thing to address.

    And then if we can get that addressed, then we can work on the inside of what remains.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: But, Mr. Freeman, the point of that area was to afford an opportunity to tie the rural district into the middle of the state, to afford as much flexibility to do that as possible, if I understood what Chairman Mathis said.

    It wasn't an invitation to redraw all the districts.

    It was pretty clear two days ago when we left here that that was what -- that was the project, that's -- those were the parameters under which we were operating. And we all hoped that you would come back with something that worked within those parameters.

    Mr. Stertz didn't. He's shaking his head. But I truly did.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, I think the Commission had an opportunity to vote on that. I thought Commissioner Stertz, that was the point of his motion, which was to pretty much lock in the other lines, and the Commission didn't go with Commissioner Stertz's motion, that
I didn't think even a motion was appropriate, but I guess my comment got turned into a motion was that we focus on working with on this map, not lock us in.

And the issue with this map is CD 4 has been left underpopulated by 210,000.

CD 1 is close to balanced.

If it had been -- if the doughnut hole had been sort of constructed such that CD 1 was down 105,000 in CD 1, down 105,000, then I think that would be both of those rural districts then would be coming into Maricopa County to try to make up that population.

I think that would be a little more equitable.

But as it is there's sort of this imbalance. I think it needs to be addressed because otherwise we've got a district that's sorted of a pie that drives into the urban part of Maricopa County.

And one that doesn't.

I think we can fairly balance them and end up with two essentially rural districts, rather than one.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: It was pretty clear with the directions on Wednesday that Chairwoman Mathis wanted Commissioner Freeman to work around Commissioner McNulty's changes.
I don't -- you can play back the -- if we can get it, if during the break, let's read the minutes again, and the minutes are going to reflect that. She was pretty clear on what she wanted to do.

Obviously Commissioner McNulty followed that.

And I wish you would have done the same thing. I think we would have gone further along if that was the case. I assume you didn't do that.

And so what next?

We, as I said before, if a commissioner makes changes to a map, we shouldn't -- should be able to vote on it.

If you want to move forward, I'm more than happy to make a proposal or a motion to approve Commissioner Mathis' changes and then see what happens.

And then after that, those changes are approved, and let's go forward to the next changes.

Because I think that's the only way we're going to keep moving forward. If not, we're going to keep bickering about everything.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I think that would be an unwise approach.

First of all, you're more than welcome to go look
at the record. You'll find that I never agreed to the position of any line.

I think it would not make sense for us to lock ourselves in to the position of any line right now, because every change that we make to the map has a ripple effect and spreads -- requires us to make adjustments to each and every other line to balance the districts.

And that's what I think -- you know, that was the first task I was trying to wrestle with was balance out -- make up this 210,000 person deficit and balance out the rest of the map so that we can proceed to build the districts in urban Maricopa County.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: What we -- actually we said -- I think we were pretty clear that we acknowledge that there was a deficiency in the population of District 4. We were all pretty clear. And we said going forward we would ignore that until we started figuring out what the middle would look like.

And then once we started looking at what the middle of that hole looked like, then we'll start filling in gaps.

I think that was conversation we had Wednesday.

I don't remember you not agreeing to that or
disagreeing to that or -- I don't remember you taking any position that you wouldn't be in favor of that.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: You can say it's pretty clear all you want, but that's not what transpired.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: It's clear. It's clear.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Guys. Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Guys, we need to draw a map.

If Mr. Freeman doesn't want to undertake the exercise, let's see what he looked at, see what he did, and, you know, then we'll just have to -- you know, I'm going to take up the challenge and try to do it and see if that works.

And then we'll take it from there.

But I think what the chairwoman is telling us is we got to get a map drawn here one way or another. We've got clear things to do.

We are going to draw a map. I believe that.

We're not going to get, you know, to the end of this and not have a map.

So let's stop saying the same things over and over again, and do it.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Since I haven't had the opportunity to jump in here, I'd hate to miss this opportunity.

I appreciate the platitudes and speeches from the -- Commissioners Herrera and McNulty, and that this is now some of a bogeyman Republican map that's been put forward, as named by Commissioner Herrera.

I'm wondering, based on that, the idea about as things do move around inside the box of the four walls of the state, that things will need to make some adjustments. I don't think that there's anyone that can believe for a second that those lines -- I'm not -- I'm also not recognizing why you wouldn't want to have that happen, because I think that in the spirit of, as you phrased over and over again, negotiation and compromise, that there are some things that could be positively achieved for the state as a whole.

I think what the chair gave us was a series of brackets to work around.

I think she was pretty clear with how that was proposed.

I think that Commissioner McNulty is right, that two of the commissioners have absolutely been in one direction and two commissioners have absolutely been in another.
Two commissioners have been saying over and over again that we are going to follow the constitution, as it's written, as it was reinforced by the Arizona Supreme Court. That's what two commissioners have been saying.

And I know who those two commissioners are.

Okay. I love the idea of competition. It is part of one of those six criteria.

Commissioner McNulty is right. We need to draw a map.

I've been working on this -- other than four hours a sleep last night, so I'd love to talk about some of ideas I have as well.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great. Well, I look forward to hearing those.

So what I'd like to do is maybe we take a ten-minute break and Mr. Desmond can get the information from Mr. Freeman, we see what he did at least on number four, then we can talk about that, and figure out from there. I don't know if we'll go further into Maricopa County or not, but if there isn't more from Mr. Freeman, we'll talk about what the other commissioners have in mind.

So, how about we take a ten-minute break?

The time is 10:29. And we'll be back shortly.

Thanks.
(Brief recess taken.)

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

The time is 10:57.

And I believe that Mr. Desmond has loaded some information onto his computer that we can bring up, and we'll let Mr. Freeman talk about what he did with number four to bring it up to 710,000.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: What I would also look like to do is -- Commissioner McNulty put together a map by filling in the doughnut hole.

And I think Commissioner Freeman was talking about he'd love to see what the registration data is in that particular district.

I would love to see that as well.

I think let's not ignore the work that she put in, and let's see -- let's honor Commissioner Freeman's request to see what the registration data for that particular area is.

I'd like to see that too.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I believe Mr. Desmond has that registration data, at least on one of the districts.

Right?
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Yeah, I have it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I'd like to see it on every district as we go forward.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: You had mentioned that you wanted to see it on that particular district. I'd love -- I'd love to see it in that district.

And also that's one thing.

The second thing is let me correct Commissioner Stertz that there are five people on the Commission that are following the criteria, not two. I think he misspoke.

So I wanted to make sure that, for the record, there are two Republicans, two Democrats, and One independent. And all five are following the criteria.

We may be interpreting it a little differently, but again we're all following it, so, again, I want to correct Commissioner Stertz.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: All right. With this, the first sort of step I took with trying to repopulate CD 4 was, as I mentioned before, sort of march the line east and get more and more aggressive in terms of putting in what are arguably urban or suburban populations into the map.

Maybe we need to -- that's a good view, but maybe
we need to put census places on, or bring that layer up.

And just as an aside -- well, never mind.

Let's focus in more on the Maricopa County.

Maybe just focus more on this -- yeah, you're
getting there.

Maybe out just a tad.

A tad more maybe.

Okay. So the line -- this is -- I believe this is
the Maricopa County line border with Yavapai County. So
this line was basically pushed east. It's going to sweep up
north Buckeye here.

Now, in bringing the line in, I've split the city
of Surprise. Respecting municipal boundaries is one of the
constitutional criteria, but it's to the extent practicable
so here's the trade-off.

Here's the pulling that language, which we've
heard from the city of Surprise that asked please don't
split us. So it's sort of disregarding that, splitting that
city.

Brought the line down along this arc, which I
believe is a canal, through the city of Surprise.

And then I took, to get more aggressive, this
little cutout, which I believe includes -- brings us over to
Dysart Road, I think, or maybe it's Litchfield Park Road, I
forget.
It sweeps in part of Glendale. Glendale is getting split.

Luke Air Force Base there, this community called Citrus Park, which is sort of suburbia, but to get more population, to bring that in, I pushed the limits and brought those into the river district.

And then that's not nearly enough population, so I included the drain pipe, which is the city of Goodyear.

The city of Goodyear is already being split on this map, so it's -- where we split it right now it seems -- I see the rationale for splitting it there, but if it's going to split, I guess we can split it in other areas.

But I went ahead and drew all that population into CD 4, and this area of Buckeye into CD 4. Just basically took all of that area that was left open on the doughnut hole map and threw that in.

And that was about the limit in terms of push it any further, now you're putting Sun City in with Lake Havasu City. You're putting those voters in there. You're putting the city of Surprise -- it's not -- I mean, these cities, in my view, are intimately tied to the Phoenix metro area. That's what they're about. They're not about the river district.

So that's as far as I thought I could take that line.
And looking at the numbers, that left CD 4 still underpopulated by over 70,000 people, which is a pretty fair chunk of a congressional district.

So, and that was pushing, pushing this to the limits.

I would not favor pushing it any farther.

Maybe if you could just look up, because I think the border there -- here, this border here. I did not split Peoria. So Peoria gets unsplit. Surprise gets split unfortunately.

I prefer not to split Surprise, but that's left unsplit and it goes on up to the Yavapai County line and then continues with the doughnut hole.

So this is all unassigned.

This is CD 7, which is the voting rights district. And this is the district that Commissioner McNulty constructed which cobbles together these communities here, which I haven't addressed yet.

So I just wanted to throw up that map.

That was sort of step one in the process.

How close could we get to balancing CD 4. And I couldn't do it without pushing the line beyond where I thought it should be pushed.

So that's step one.

Nad then I had another map where I took, you know,
on Tuesday, I tried to --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So just those changes brought it up to 710.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: No, it did not.

No, we're still short significant --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: How much?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: It was over 70,000.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Seventy.

WILLIE DESMOND: 71,939.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So what happens if you don't split Surprise?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I think -- I don't think they're gaining -- I don't think too many people live out here right now, so you don't -- you know, I mean, we could keep Surprise whole and just look at how that changes the numbers. I think it's going to make a short, I would guess -- I don't know, I won't hazard a guess.

WILLIE DESMOND: Is that something that I should look at right now?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Maybe you could just grab that, grab that census place, and see how it affects the numbers.

WILLIE DESMOND: To grab all of Surprise, it would add 112,386 people --

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: No, I think the question was
if we didn't split Surprise --

    JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Oh, if we kept it --

    VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: -- and left it in the Phoenix
    metro area.

    WILLIE DESMOND: The other way would add 5,000
    people back to the unassigned.

So 77,000 short.

    VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: So we could very easily, I
    think, keep Surprise whole and clean up that line and maybe
    include Wittman.

    And, but I think we got to balance that district
    now somewhere else at this point.

That was a very aggressive line moving, really
    pushing the limits as far as I was concerned.

    COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. -- Madam Chair.
    I'm curious to know, while we're looking at this,
    if we were to take in -- let's go back in where you just
    were.

If we were to come from the rural area, let's say
    we took Sun City West, we put that in the -- in four.

    WILLIE DESMOND: Sun City West had about 24,500
    people.

    COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. And if you kept
    coming south.

    WILLIE DESMOND: With, like, El Mirage there?
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yeah.

WILLIE DESMOND: That would add about another -- total, that would be 56,300.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And then if you filled in that -- if you went west, took in Surprise and Maricopa.

WILLIE DESMOND: Grab this area, it would be 161,000.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So now we're overpopulated.

WILLIE DESMOND: Now District 4 would be -- roughly 100 and -- about 90,000 over.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. So there's a way to make the population right there, to balance out the population in District 4.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, there's enough population there.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair, there's clearly population there. It's just a matter of are we going to really respect this district and do that.

Now we're getting into the piece of pie diving into urban Maricopa County.

I think in a later step I went ahead and sort of adjusted this line here to sort of eliminate the drain pipe. So we do -- CD 4 ends up losing not a lot, but some more population down there to sort of bring that up closer to I-10.
But, I mean, there's lots of ways to make trade-offs between three and four here, sort of make the line look nice, and also to -- we got to keep the Voting Rights Act in mind as well in the final -- when we get the lines close to final.

So that was step one in the process. And that was the first.

I think I gave Mr. Desmond three maps. That I saved separately. Because I think we've got to explore options, and that's what I was -- this is just an option.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Freeman, let me interrupt, is the line between three and four changed there at all?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: No, it is not.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. So that's the same line.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Right.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sorry, Mr. Desmond, what's population for the census place of Surprise?

WILLIE DESMOND: The entire census place of Surprise?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: I think it's about 118,000. So 117,517.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And that doesn't have Sun City West in it.

WILLIE DESMOND: It does not have Sun City West.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: 117. Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We actually got a lot of comment from folks who said they wanted Sun City West to be separate from Sun City. I'm not sure why, but we did receive a number of comments like that.

I don't want to take a lot of time here, but I do just want to make the comment that when we started this river district notion, when we went out to the river, the concerns were -- that the people expressed were that they had common concerns in connection with living along the river.

And it was designed to be, you know, kind of a western Arizona district, but not necessarily -- not to be a completely rural district.

At some point, for example, on the river district map, I think we had an eastern side, we had come into north Tucson, taken in some urban population.

And certainly on the west side, I mean, there are cities along the river. They aren't big cities, but they're cities and they're growing cities.

So I don't feel it's a valid criteria to require that the district has to be entirely rural in character.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: It certainly isn't, because there are urban or suburban populations, here, even if you go out and look at the river, I mean, Lake Havasu City has an urban component to it as well.

I mean, but the central character of it is this community of interest rural as distinct from urban. And we've heard lots of comment about keep rural districts rural because of various reasons that people have offered, keep the urban districts urban.

So, that's what I'm trying to do.

And I think this one -- this line already to me makes me a little uncomfortable, because there's just areas that just -- I think would be very surprised that they found themselves in a district with -- the next district in connection with Bullhead City and Yuma.

So that was step one.

And I guess we can go look at the next map, which on Tuesday I tried to grapple with this issue as well, and had ideas as ways to sort of balance and shift population around so that two -- the eastern western Arizona districts, which both of which commissioners have at various times referred to them as rural districts, but perhaps they misspoke.
But on Tuesday the thought was -- well, one way to get --

WILLIE DESMOND: Just let me get ready.

And just for a point of clarification, that last version I referred to as EB version 2C.

This one is EB version 2D.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay.

On Tuesday I thought, well, we could grab the rural part of Gila County, except -- you know, basically all of Gila County, keep that whole except for the tribal areas.

Which would split the county.

And that allows you to grab some rural population and put it into CD 4 to help -- it doesn't quite -- it still doesn't quite bring it into balance, but it gets you closer.

On this broad experiment I went ahead and put the Flagstaff communities, Williams, Flagstaff, Doney Park, Munds Park, those areas all together, and put them in CD 4 to help balance. It doesn't -- I think it doesn't quite still balance the population, but that's -- it keeps them together.

And brings CD 4 -- I made a couple of other changes on the south side of the map, so it's not -- we can't just simply look at that number and say, well, this change causes that affect, because now we've underpopulated CD 1.
So you've got to bring that back into a balance. This is part of the shifting, the shifting of the burden, so to speak, from the west to the east.

So to bring CD 1 back into balance, I went ahead and added back in the western part of Pinal County. But that doesn't quite -- you know, except for the reservation areas, that's left in CD 3, that doesn't quite balance it.

So I had to come up here to the southeast valley area, where that line sort of demarks the boundary between CD 1 and the unassigned area, and sort of trim away and -- at the unincorporated areas, trying not to split, you know, cities.

But I ended up having to, and this is part of sharing the burden.

Gold Canyon gets put into the eastern district. And I think I had to take a bite out of Apache Junction and put that into the eastern district.

And that brought CD 1 back into balance.

Of course now we've got the issue of CD 3 being out of balance and that's underpopulated. And that's where I trimmed off the drain pipe and balanced -- it was very easy, that little feature of that, of the original map, it was very sort of easy to make trade-offs between four and three to sort of keep them both in balance.

It doesn't quite get CD 4 into balance, but it's
pretty close. And there might be other ways. You know, of course, I'm limited in what I can do and the time I have and the sleep I need. So I didn't pursue it.

I certainly could have pursued it to get it down to very close to striking range, but it's -- I think it's still --

WILLIE DESMOND: It's 9100, 9200.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Yeah, so it's still got a ways to go. It's still underpopulated by quite a bit, but there might be further adjustments that we can make to other parts of the map to get CD 4 really -- you know, less than 1,000, which I think is pretty close to striking range.

So that was sort of step two in the process, to try to shift the burden -- or to share the burden to make it fair on both these districts.

And that was -- that became my starting point for looking to have more urban areas, Maricopa County could be pieced together.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's a valiant effort. Thank you.

So, I have a question.

What's the purple, I guess it's a census place, up -- between one and -- would that be -- yeah, that.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: That -- I think there's almost nobody living there, so we could easily not split
that.
I forget the name of it.

WILLIE DESMOND: Parks.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Yeah.

There's people who live down here on the south side of 40, but I think maybe there's maybe one or two people living to the north there.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I'd love to see what the competitiveness is of the districts that were changed.

In regards to four, the eastern rural, which is very competitive, the changes that Mr. Freeman proposing makes it a lot less competitive.

You start taking away Flagstaff, which is a community of interest which they wanted to be with the Navajo Nation in District 1.

You take that away and you put them in four.

And then you start adding Apache Junction, which it's not -- I wouldn't consider that a rural area, but I guess you do.

And you put it into one.

So I'd love to see what -- how that competitive district which was in reference to four, a competitive district, what it looks like now.
I would probably guess it is not, based on your changes, no longer a competitive district.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, I would love to see the voter registration totals on that, on those districts too.

And on Apache Junction, I don't consider to be particularly rural, but the whole point was to share the burden.

CD 4 is going to take a little bit of the urban or suburban population. CD 1 is going to take a little bit. But it's going to -- you know, unfortunately those people are not going to be happy about it, but this is to the -- where the extent practicable language comes in.

You know, they're not going to be in a position where their interests sort of detract from the character of the rural nature of those two districts.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: When we had created the river version 8A, one of the main arguments for those two districts was that it was taking urban areas and it was not making a rural district.

So I'm just saying that pouring the same things out in your particular map, just to let you know that it wasn't simple, and creating a completely rural area without getting into any urban areas is probably going to be close
to impossible.

And as you can probably -- now that you're doing this, you probably will now attest to that.

But I -- these changes that you're making, it just doesn't seem like you're taking competitiveness into account at all.

Again, you claim that you are for the six criteria, but it seems like you're completely ignoring competition in the changes that you're making.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: No, I'm not. I'm taking all six constitutional criteria into account.

And I agree with you. It's not easy.

I have been working on this not just recently and for a long time.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: You're right.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: And I know -- I know you didn't mean it that way.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: No, I didn't.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: But I just want it clear for the record, I know we've all been looking at ways to settle this puzzle for a long time and . . .

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

The constitution doesn't say that we have to create two rural districts to the extent practicable either.
That's not one of our criteria.

And the fact is that this district, even with Chairman Mathis having removed some population to afford flexibility to create a district interfacing with Maricopa County, no matter what we do, it's going to be 60 percent or more rural.

So even in the Voting Rights Act districts, and those are, in fact, protected, that is, in fact, a protected class, you know, they don't -- in order to be assured that they can elect the candidate of their choice, they don't get more than 60 percent.

So, um, you know, we're kind of -- I guess if I follow your line of thinking here, Commissioner Freeman, you've saying that folks in rural districts are, you know, in the same situation.

And even if they were, which, of course, they aren't under the law, either the federal law or our constitutional law, they're going to have a very substantial majority in this district.

So I don't think the -- so I can't subscribe to the exercise of going all over the state in an effort to cherry pick rural population.

I mean, for goodness sake, in Tucson we have rural populations, you know, within several miles of the city.

That is the way Arizona is constructed.
And I would also say that even if we could do that, if we could create two purely rural districts, but for the recession, they would not stay rural, you know, for very long at all, because we're a growing state.

We're a Redistricting Commission. We're not a zoning commission.

We can't keep people from moving to these areas.

And so even if we were able to do this, it wouldn't work, because the more attractive areas like Bullhead City and Lake Havasu City and the areas along the river, Kingman, I mean, my goodness, the growth that we've seen there.

You consider Laughlin, Nevada, which is not in Arizona, but it's certainly part of the metropolitan area of Bullhead City, we saw that when we were there. These are urban areas, and they're going to continue to grow.

So I can't sign on to the notion of avoiding the task at hand in order to find rural voters everywhere.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: We've heard a lot of public comment about a community of interest called -- that is rural in nature.

We even heard it when we were down in southern Arizona, people talking about keeping, you know, the rural
area of the southeast part of the state rural in nature and not linking it with Tucson.

I know we've heard other comments as well. Not shying away from that.

But, I think it is a community of interest. It was -- you know, we've heard tribal lands are a community of interest. We've heard from certain cities how they view themselves as a community of interest.

And I think it is.

It was a, it was a -- although it wasn't cited, I guess, implicit in the creation of the river district map was to recognize this very expansive community of interest along the Colorado River and link it up with some other communities.

So I think it is something that the constitution asks us to do.

Certainly we've heard a lot of public comment about it, the rationale of the importance of it, and how if you get too much urban population into the rural district it ceases to lose its character.

The candidate is more likely to come from the urban areas. That's where his -- his or her constituents are close together, they're easier to reach, that's where perhaps the money is, that's where the outreach can occur more effectively, and that's where -- and it may be where
they're from.

And there's some concerns expressed by people in rural areas of the state that there won't -- that the representative won't understand their needs and their interests that are common to them.

And that's why we've gotten this plea again and again, try to keep them rural.

I don't think it's possible to keep them completely rural, but it's -- I think there's a way to sort of have both of these districts share the burden of, quote unquote, burden.

I don't mean it that way, to share the responsibility or whatever of taking on a little bit of the west side and east side of the Phoenix metro area, and thereby keep themselves the essential rural nature of those districts the same.

I think -- well, that's all I'll say to that.

Okay. We got -- where were we?

This -- okay.

There was -- all right.

So I added to CD 4 by putting these Flagstaff communities, keeping them together, and putting them in CD 4.

Then we had to balance out CD 4 by taking out Pinal County and trimming.
Again, here's where the burden sharing is putting some of that suburban population into CD 1.

It probably -- I think it makes it more competitive, that district, and it makes CD 4 more competitive, I think.

But now, okay, we had to balance out the population of three and four here. I think this makes this line closer to the line proposed by the Hispanic Coalition, so maybe that's a good thing as well, although I did not really have the time to really examine closely the stats, so we keep this district in compliance with the Voting Rights Act.

None of the other lines were changed.

So I guess the next step in the process, before I decided to go home, was to look at how to split up the interior.

WILLIE DESMOND: And I am able to generate competitive numbers or registration numbers for any of these.

It will take a minute, but. . .

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great.

WILLIE DESMOND: If you guys --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, we'd like to see them.

WILLIE DESMOND: If you want to see those, I do have them for the initial one and the change to District 1
there, but we can look at those later.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I'd like to see the
HVAP on District 3 too based on those changes you made.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

This isn't the one Commissioner Freeman just spoke
of, but I think it's the same District 3.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Uh-hmm.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: This was the third file?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Draw down on the urban
Maricopa County areas area.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Can you kind of focus on
what we're -- on what changed here?

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure. And I was going to say
that District 3 though is 65.25 percent voting age Hispanic.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And what was it?

WILLIE DESMOND: I'd have to open up -- just one
second.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Again, on that, I mean,
that's an important issue, but that was -- I was trying to
get in to fill the hole at this point and not make the fine
tuning so we're right on those baselines.

But that's a good --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: If you would describe the
change again to me, please.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I'm sorry, what?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: What did you change in District 3?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Oh. Well, to -- because District 3 got depopulated a little bit when we tried to balance out one, when I tried to balance out one, that's when I eliminated the Goodyear drain pipe feature that I call it and had to come into the Buckeye a little more.

And then of course that depopulates four a little bit, but there's ways that you can trade off to sort of make the line.

My focus at that point was to see could I get it all the way up to I-10? I couldn't.

But to make the line look a little cleaner, and perhaps that adds an element to the compactness consideration.

But the populations are there, I think, at this sort of part of the state, where we can -- I think the trade-offs can be made from district to district if we need to make adjustments so that we're complying with the Voting Rights Act.

But that wasn't -- last night that wasn't the primary -- my primary focus. It was trying to get to this point, this unassigned area.

And so all I did was sort of clean that line up so
it kind of had a good look to it and then moved on.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So what is the difference?

WILLIE DESMOND: So CD 3 was 56.43. With those changes, it is now 55.25.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Which is still, I think, too high.

I think the river district you had 53, if I'm correct. I think 53 is a good number. Fifty-five I would consider packing. So...

WILLIE DESMOND: And I believe the current low benchmark is 50.23.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's right.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay. Well, I didn't consider that packing, but I would agree that we can make adjustments to that, I think, with those populations right there, to bring it more closer to the baseline, which I agree with.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Desmond, I think I'd like to ask you to be ready to provide us with another measure if we, if we need it.

We don't yet have the racially polarized voting analysis, but an HVAP, as I understand it, is not the only issue here.
We also need -- the Department of Justice will look at an issue of voting strength, whether we have diluted the ability of Hispanics to select the candidate of their choice.

In Arizona there was a 2010 race between the state mining inspector Manuel Cruz, he was the Democrat, and the Republican, Joe Hart, I think his name is.

It was a no name ID statewide race, and it kind of provides a snapshot if you compare how the candidate would have performed in the new district to how the candidate performed in the original district of whether the change has affected Hispanic voting strength.

It's certainly not an analysis of any kind, but given that we don't have the analysis yet, it might be a useful tool.

Because if the voting -- if the candidate, the Democratic candidate, would have performed less well, then I think that's a red flag that we have voting strength issues.

So I would ask that we look at that with the analysis of HVAP whenever we're doing these comparisons.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. I do have those numbers. All the commissioners do too, loaded up for them.

In this version of -- this will be 2E, which is, I think, the same district as it is in 2D. The Republican in that race got 41.45 in District 3, and the Democrat got
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We need to compare them to the -- it's just the Democratic performance that we need to compare.

WILLIE DESMOND: Oh, I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Because it would be in the district as it stands now. And I'm not sure that this is -- you know, we're really focused on this as a possibility, but I think we may be -- as we go ahead and I'd like to be -- have you -- have that available for us.

What I would be interested in, if you have it there, is how the Democrat would have performed in the district as it's drawn now as compared to how the Democrat would have performed in that voting rights district, how he did, in fact, perform in 2010.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. And then the V2E, the current one, I misspoke earlier, it's 58.54.

If we go back to the original bagel.

District 3 --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We haven't included my -- the fixes to that.

WILLIE DESMOND: That's true. And I can have that version loaded up too.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: All right.

WILLIE DESMOND: Oh, we can look at all three of
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I assumed -- I thought that what I had was the version of the bagel, version two, that had the fixes to the Voting Rights Act districts incorporated.

WILLIE DESMOND: Let me go back and look and make sure I looked at the chart.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Sure.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'm not sure we need to spend a whole lot of time on this particular configuration. I think we're just -- right now we're just looking at what Mr. Freeman drew last night, and I don't think we're --

WILLIE DESMOND: I have -- so before the changes to District 3, the mine inspector's race, the Democrat got 59.13 percent, two way.

With the changes to District 3, it dropped down to 58.54.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That's in the doughnut hole? I mean, that's the doughnut hole map with and without the changes.

WILLIE DESMOND: That's -- that's -- yeah, in the district, the changes you had suggested, it was District No. 3, which is the second majority-minority district.

It's 59.13.
Commissioner Freeman changed that District 3 to balance the population, that number dropped to 58.54.

59.13 to 58.54.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. So we are not only dropping HVAP, we're also dropping voting -- we may have a voting strength issue there.

Could we also, while we're looking at this, look at the river district map?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Do you have that same number for that same --

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, I have that for everything.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And maybe the whole counties map.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So I'll look at river district version 8A, the most recent version.

Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe the Hispanic was 53.49, District 2 there.

I should say these -- the mine instruct -- or inspector is also available on the Maptitude online also.

I need to change the denominator.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Did you give us actual performance?
WILLIE DESMOND: Excuse me?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: In the 2010 race, in the actual CD -- is it CD 2? Whatever the actual congressional district is.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm not -- I don't have that. I can look that number up, but I don't have that.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We need that.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We will need that. So maybe in the break you can pull that all together.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, I don't have the current CD map loaded up is the only reason I don't have that.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. All right.

WILLIE DESMOND: In the river district version 7A, the Democratic percentage was 60.22.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And in the whole counties?

WILLIE DESMOND: Which whole counties?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I don't think that has changed, has it, between 6D and 6E?

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Yeah, there's no material difference.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: The final versions were just
rearranging the urban areas.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Right.

WILLIE DESMOND: Whole counties, District 3 in whole counties.

It is 56.177.

56.18.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. So one thing that tells me is that the -- I mean, the doughnut hole map is almost -- it's very close to the same as the river district map was.

There's a little drop off, but not very much.

The whole counties map is quite a bit lower.

So that would suggest, you know, to the extent that this is, you know, just sort of a canary in the mine measurement that the doughnut map as Chairman Mathis drew it actually probably doesn't compromise voting strength.

But I'd be more concerned about the whole counties map.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Do you have any more questions, Ms. McNulty, on that?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Not on this particular --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: -- iteration.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I agree we need to keep that
in mind. Like I said, that's an important -- it's obviously a federal requirement we -- that is supreme and we have to follow that in any map that we finalize. That's a primary consideration we have to have.

But that wasn't for purposes of getting to where we need to go today, that wasn't the prime focus. It was getting something that would work or almost work in terms of working with this doughnut hole map.

So, the next step, and I'm going to come in a little more on urban Maricopa County, was I left this district that Commissioner McNulty had already pre-prepared and brought forward on Tuesday in there.

I think the chair had asked that it be renumbered nine, but I didn't -- I wanted to do that, but I didn't do it.

Because I started basically first on the west side, what would make a CD that would make sense, building it on this line that I pushed in already, I think, a bit too far.

And actually just grabbing census tracts, you got pretty close to a balanced district by going down the I-17. And so this would be the west Phoenix CD, with that, with that as a divider or approximate divider. You know, obviously to balance it out exactly, we can make some trade-offs in areas that would make sense.
But, so that keeps the west valley together, and, you know, I viewed the west valley as, you know, a distinct area of the Valley of the Sun.

And it's I-17 that's sort of an arbitrary point, but there is a point kind of in that area where I view there's the west side and there's the east side.

Then, the next step I took was, I went to the southeast valley and built -- started building a district, congressional district there.

Leaving this line in place.

And what I found is we run into a problem because there's way too many people down there to make a congressional district.

And you end up with this chunk left in Mesa that has no place to go.

Mesa is already being split once. Now we're going -- now it looks like Mesa is going to be carved up three times. And this chunk of Mesa is going to have to be put with the reservations and Fountain Hills and North Scottsdale and Paradise Valley and the north Phoenix area, linking all these communities together, even though we've got a public comment talking about the desire to keep Scottsdale together, and the fact that Scottsdale is distinct from the northeast valley, and it's certainly distinct from these northern communities up here.
So those were concerns that I had.

And that's kind of where I stopped, because at the next step I think, I would think, would be to try to maybe bring these two districts together, to modify this district slightly, and to see if we can make it, you know, have some other concerns about how this district just looks. It looks a little bit cobbled together.

I guess this is one way to put it, and sort of predetermined district.

I don't see -- we get to a point here of trying to construct around it where I think is substantial detriment language of the constitution comes into play.

I think carving up, splitting Mesa three times doesn't make a lot of sense. Mesa is a big city. Probably has to be split.

But I think we should be minimizing splits to cities and trying to keep them together.

You know, where we split Chandler, I know, is very -- just looking at it on the map, it's split along, I think it's State Route 87, which, which seems -- I would agree seems like a logical place. But I wonder if that makes sense for the city of Chandler, because I think -- and I called a friend of mine this morning actually who is a little older than I am but he was born and raised in Chandler and lives there now. And, you know, that's
splitting the historic part of Chandler right down the middle.

So my thought, you know, Chandler might have to be split, but, you know, and these are sort of fine tuning issues we can -- I know we'll all be addressing on every line, but I question that.

So fundamentally though the problem is we've got a big chunk of population there in Mesa that has kind of had no place to go, and that would make sense.

So I thought in terms of keeping this district the way -- exactly the way it is, I think that becomes feasible to me.

I think on that basis alone.

But I think there are other reasons -- other concerns I have with it, but that is where I came to a stopping point last night.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you. And thanks for working with what Ms. McNulty had proposed the other day.

Ms. McNulty, do you want to walk us through what -- on this map is eight, but what I'm hoping we'll ultimately call nine regardless, just since it's going to be a new district.

I'm just wondering if you could tell us the rationale on that and, you know, where we might be able to
work with so that we're not splitting Mesa three times.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'd be happy to work --
talk through eight, if you could pull it up.

WILLIE DESMOND: I think this is eight.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yeah.

We start at South Mountain, which is kind of a
fixed geographic feature on the southwest side, and include
Ahwatukee and coming east into north Chandler.

Those are similar areas that are aligned in a
number of ways, have commonalities.

We came up into Tempe and west Mesa, which are
along the lightrail, where the lightrail is and will be
built.

They have common economic interests.

We have ASU, Mesa Community College in that area.

Going up into south Scottsdale, which as we talked
about earlier is quite different in kind from north
Scottsdale. It's more blue collar, more in line with the
Tempe, west Mesa, university kind of area.

Moving into the Arcadia area, that
Commissioners Freeman and Stertz know well.

And then up into Phoenix in an area that has a lot
of commonality with the areas to the south. There are a lot
of folks who live there who work, you know, in the
university area. There are a lot of common traffic
patterns, commercial, you know, sharing of commerce given
that this area is combined together. I think the area share
Papago Park, using Papago Park.

I don't, I don't think that the three Mesa
split -- three-way Mesa split really has very much to do
with this, because the west Mesa area is quite different
from the east Mesa. But I know I think we've received a lot
of comment about that, and there's -- you know, it changes
in character, both in terms of community character and
voting character around where the lightrail will end, along
West Mesa Drive or Stapley, in around that area.

And so this district was constructed, put together
based on those communities of interest that work well
together and which are quite distinct from the east Mesa
area.

Now, I see that we have a turquoise area here that
on our map I think was outside of this area.

Is that right?

WILLIE DESMOND: That's the San Tan Valley. I
think that was part of the --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: What is the red, what is
the red line?

WILLIE DESMOND: The red line is the county line.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. All right.

So what is the boundary on the doughnut hole map
or the river district map?

    WILLIE DESMOND: On which one? Or both? I'll start with the --

    COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Let's off start with the doughnut hole, because that's where we were starting from, I think.

    VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: What you'll see is the boundary comes out a little bit here and it sweeps up A.J. and Gold Canyon, and there's lots of unincorporated area here. That ought to balance out the CD 1 that got trimmed away.

    And by the way, this chunk out of Mesa, I mean, that is -- that's an arbitrary -- you know, I kept -- I wanted to keep the remainder of Chandler intact using Commissioner McNulty's. Sun Lakes intact, keep out -- not split Gilbert, not split Queen Creek, not split San Tan Valley.

    Apache Junction already had to be split.

    You know, I guess we can split San Tan Valley or take your pick, either one.

    And then I just sort of moved the line from east to west.

    You very easily could have moved the line from north to south. It left north Mesa, you know, off on its own.
WILLIE DESMOND: So on here, the green line is the initial area done in everything bagel version one. That line came in this version in order to make up the population differential that was created in District 4 at the beginning.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: There's not a lot of people living out here, so that line could be preserved. And it would just require just a tiny adjustment on where this split occurs, whether it's in A.J. or San Tan Valley.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Well, I think there are other -- there are ways to do that that don't involve -- necessarily involve splitting Mesa three ways. And I think we could look at that.

We need to look at, you know, population. And I'd like to look at the way the river district map is configured and the way the whole counties map was configured, but I don't think we need to do that right this second.

I mean, my perspective is that we can find a way to do this if we want to, or we can find a way to not do it if we don't want to do it. And we just have to decide. And I want to do what Chairman Mathis proposed that we do. I believe we can do it.
You know, I don't think we can do it if we take the approach that, that splitting municipalities is inviolate.

I do keep going back to the fact that although you built your whole counties map that way, and we built the river district map based on how we felt communities fit together, when we were done with the two maps, the splits analysis was identical.

So we're going to have things that are split. It's just a question of how much time we all spend focusing on that, to the exclusion of all the other things.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, I don't think it was identical, but --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It was very close.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: And close could be a big difference.

The -- obviously respecting municipal lines, that's a constitutional criteria.

Or to do that to the extent practicable.

It's not inviolate. It's to the extent practicable.

And there's a split there. I mean, I had to -- we had to make that trade off.

Apache Junction is split. We can split somewhere else.
But I was trying to work with this doughnut hole map. And the reality was that there was just too many people down here, way more than a congressional district.

So we end up with splitting -- I see no two ways around it. You've got Mesa split up three ways.

And you're also forced with joining some of this southeast valley population with areas of north Phoenix, far north Phoenix, northwest Phoenix, which doesn't really make a lot of sense to me given the way the valley is put together.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think however you just split Coconino County in half and put Flagstaff in the district with the river, which was contrary to almost all the all the public comment we received.

I mean, we had, you know, the mayor here. We had the Coconino County Board of Supervisors here. We had the Flagstaff Forty here.

We've had dozens of letters from folks in Flagstaff.

We had probably the most well-attended public hearing we've had, by everyone other than the Commission, in Flagstaff.

And they all said, you know, that they wanted to be in a competitive district. They wanted to stay together. They wanted to be with the Navajo.
They don't want to be with western Arizona.

But you just did that, you know, without any thought.

And now we're focused on this little area here, you know, in an urban setting, where -- you know, it's not as if we're building barricades here that people can't get across.

I have a very personal view about this, because I live literally four blocks from a congressional district boundary.

I still shop in the other district. You know, I still see my friends there.

It doesn't just, like, change from night to day once you cross one of these imaginary lines.

And to use that over and over and over and over again as a way to preclude us from getting anything else accomplished is -- is just -- in -- in -- I -- it has no merit.

I understand that you believe it does. But in the big picture, we've got to make trade-offs here.

We really do.

And I don't know exactly what the trade-off is here, because I'm looking at these colored patches and we've done 42 maps.

But I do know and I do believe there is a way to
do this that works that achieves all of the goals. And it's just whether we have the will to do it or not.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: We did hear a lot of public comment from the northern part of the state. There was public comment on both sides of the issue. There's probably public comment on both sides of most issues we face. We have to assess that and we have to make trade-offs.

So, I mean, I agree, there are trade-offs to be made.

In terms of these being sort of arbitrary lines, I mean, like it or not, the constitution says what it says. It says that we're to respect municipal lines. We're to respect county lines.

I mean, the whole counties approach was starting from the big picture working your way in, chipping away at the block, to get to the sculpture, was to start with what geographic -- what constitutional criteria probably defines a geographic area of the largest order of magnitude. It's probably counties.

And so respect county lines. Minimize splits to counties. And sort of build the map from the outside of the state in. And you ended up with -- you -- actually what fell out were two essentially rural districts.

So respect those two communities of interest and ring in this urban area.
I think on the whole counties, the line followed the county line except at Apache Junction, Gold Canyon area where we had to make it -- you know, here's to the extent practicable language coming in -- we had to make an adjustment on population to balance these two districts out. So somebody got split there. But --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm wondering about for number nine, if just working from left to right on that, what that would do. I'm just curious. Keeping Mesa only split once. Can we do that?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Yeah, well, here's where I kind of ran out of time and decided to get a few hours of sleep.

I mean, that was one thought I had, you know, could we make these -- this gap meet in the middle and make more adjustments down here and make some more adjustments up here and reconstruct this district a little bit, and look at the competitiveness and see if it turns out to be a competitive district as well, as a way to sort of bring the two together in a way that makes sense.

Then we could perhaps the other districts in Phoenix would also have a good look to them and be built the way that Phoenix is laid out.

But that's as far as I got at this point.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: What's the population of
San Tan Valley? That census place?

WILLIE DESMOND: San Tan Valley is 81,321 people.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And what's the chunk of Mesa just starting from the line of eight on that map?

WILLIE DESMOND: This area or --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Uh-hmm, the other side. And so, yeah, that, that area that you just had your cursor on.

WILLIE DESMOND: The area of Mesa that's in District 9.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I actually want the one that's in eight.

WILLIE DESMOND: Oh, sorry.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No -- I'm sorry, yeah, yeah -- no, whatever that is, the chunk that's not in there.

WILLIE DESMOND: That it will be ready in one second, so we'll see what we're talking about.

Oh, the chunk that is not in nine, that is in -- that's assigned is -- this area is about 161,000.

This area is about 171,000.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, it just seems like we need to have more of a horizontal approach there.

And work down from there.

But -- what do other commissioners think about this?
I mean, what would you propose we do to try to make it work?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'd like the opportunity to work on some districts that are, in fact, within the hole that you created, and see if there's a way to make that work.

And I would suggest that there's a way to bring Maricopa County in on the west side in that area that includes some of Sun City or Surprise -- west -- Sun City West or Surprise to address that population. That there's a way here to create an east valley district that would work. And then build the two districts in the middle between those.

I think the two, the two compromises, I guess, are, one, we have to recognize that the river district is not going to be completely rural. It is going to have some interface with Maricopa County. And that there is another way to do this.

I mean, there are way -- there are dozens of ways to do these things. We're just focused right now on one that, you know, makes it harder to do the rest. But I know there's a way to do this.

And then do the other two.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: In between.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Sorry.

The river district map on this -- the river district on this map is not completely rural. I mean, it already comes into suburban part of the valley. And --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It was never intended to be completely rural. It was intended to group the communities along the river.

That was the start of it. That was the -- that was the vision.

It was never intended to be rural.

And what we're doing now is we are precluding -- we are precluding ourselves from doing everything else to deep something rural which is not even one of the constitutional criteria.

I mean, the entire western half of the state is not a community of interest.

It may be made up of a number of communities of interest, but it is not in and of itself one huge community of interest.

It's like any other congressional district. It's going to be a bunch of things.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: As we're about to go into lunch break, a couple of quick points.
The river district, if you -- because I looked at this both ways, and we'll be able to talk about this after lunch, the river district, if you -- if Flagstaff goes to the west, there's about seven percent of the population is metro Phoenix.

If Flagstaff stays where it is, it's about 19 to 20 percent comes out of metro Phoenix.

So that's really the -- that's the really easy map to look at.

So -- as a point of comparison.

So rural or metro rural, Commissioners McNulty and Freeman are both correct.

They are both touching, they are both touching and getting population from the districts, depending on -- and whether or not you would want to consider -- I'm just looking at that piece of it.

In regards to the contemplation of what's shown right now as District 8, to be contemplated as to be renamed District 9 at a later date, I'm looking forward to hearing testimony from folks that are -- that live -- I think there's some description of the population living south of Chaparral in Scottsdale, and the characterizations of their lifestyle, I'll be looking forward to hearing this afternoon and having that discussion, and then really delving down to the street level about how that District 8 to be considered
District 9 can be looked at.

I've looked at, at the Mesa three-way split, and I do have, I do have the doughnut hole filled, so we've got -- I'll be able to share some of that thought process this afternoon.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great. Thank you.

So this is probably a good time to take the lunch break, and we'll have a recess for an hour.

The time is 12:05. We'll be back at 1:05. Thank you.

(Lunch recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We'll enter back into public session. The recess is over.

The time is 1:36 p.m.

And we are on agenda item three, talking about the congressional grid map and making adjustments to that based on constitutional criteria.

And Mr. Freeman just walked us through some homework he did, which was very helpful and an interesting way to think about how we can bring up the population in CD 4 on this particular map, which is the everything bagel map or EB map for short.

One of the things that he did was -- in doing so was adjusting that boundary between the two rural districts, rural in quotes.
And what I'd like to do is take that back to where it was, down to the Maricopa County line, and have us try to make up that population by going into Maricopa County as far as we have to to make up the 710,000.

I mean, it's 500,000 or so, but to get it equal to the population we need.

And, you know, granted that does mean taking in urban areas. And there's going to be this urban-rural interface.

But I'd like to see -- my idea in doing this was let's try to carve up Maricopa County alone, just fill the center, and leaving the rest of the lines alone. Later we may have to adjust some of those lines, but I thought one of the things we might do as a Commission is talk about, and maybe watching our mapper go in to Maricopa County as far as he needs to to get that population for four up to where it needs to be, and then talk about some carving up of the center.

Would that work, Mr. Desmond?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, that would work.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Go ahead.

WILLIE DESMOND: The first thing is that we had in the last meeting moved part of Yavapai County, like the Sedona and some of those areas, into District 1.

Would you like to go back to where that was as the
first part?

Because right now as it's currently constituted District 4 is 229,000 underpopulated.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right. I'd like to take the boundary between one and four back to where it was, similar to river district version, because that's how it was originally set for this EB map.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

If we take it back, that will add 18,000 back into District 4.

Now it will follow the county line exactly.

So, I guess the first question is where, where do you want to start.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right.

And so just so we're all on the same page, we're short --

WILLIE DESMOND: Short 211,576 people.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: In what we're calling the river district, which is four.

So can we start moving in on that left-hand side, which I think is what Mr. Freeman started doing, over to the Surprise line.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair, did you mean to switch that line back up north to the county line?
I thought that was sort of the last thing we did on Tuesday was add that nuance so that that line would correspond to the line in the river district map.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes. The line between one and four, that boundary should be similar, the same as the river district version.

WILLIE DESMOND: Oh, it just was. We removed that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: When we did that, it underpopulated four by another 18,000.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right.

Can we -- so you just did that; right? You just made it the same.

WILLIE DESMOND: I just did it back to the way we started.

I -- I'll show you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

I just want the line to be the same as whatever it was on river district 8A down to the Maricopa County line.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. In 8A it was right here, in that it had parts of Sedona and then Cornville and then Oak Creek.

So as it's currently constituted, District 4 is now 229,597 people underpopulated. District 1 is
18,150 people overpopulated.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: So now, going into Maricopa, we need to add 229,000 people in.

Is there any -- I think the -- the logical thing to do would to be start with these large --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: The most rural areas that are in Maricopa County. There's probably not a lot, but you can move in, encroach I guess.

WILLIE DESMOND: How far in would you like to go?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It's going to have -- we're going to have to see.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We need to get the population up to 710, so...

And if, if there are ways to do it by coming into Pinal too, we can look at that.

But I'm just looking for people.

WILLIE DESMOND: All right. Well, with this change, you would add 82,000 people. Does that look like --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And that is --

WILLIE DESMOND: -- a good first step?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: -- keeping Surprise whole;

right?

WILLIE DESMOND: No, Surprise is a little cut over
here. There's about 5,000 people over here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: That's using whole census tracts.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: And I'll do that, and then we can look at adding Surprise back to the unassigned area.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And if you have ideas -- Mr. Stertz mentioned to me that he has also been working on ways to fill in the hole.

And so I'd be happy to hear what your lines are too.

So feel -- anyone jump in on areas that they think make sense.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, in one of the ways that I had reconciled this, I reached your I-10 southern boundary as one of the aspects of it.

So, knowing that that would be a pickup of a certain amount of population, I can then pursue how I got to the rest of it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure. You can feel free.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Willie, are you able to pull up the plan at 9C?

WILLIE DESMOND: I am.

Just quickly, should I keep Surprise whole, or should I leave it split?
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Yeah, I would -- let's try.

WILLIE DESMOND:  Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Since they would like that, I'm sure.

WILLIE DESMOND:  I'll add it up as another layer so we can see it over top of this.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  That's I-10 line is the Hispanic Coalition For Good Government line; isn't what they had said?

WILLIE DESMOND:  Would you like C or B, Mr. Stertz?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ:  C.

WILLIE DESMOND:  Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Is there population to grab on the north and eastern sides of Maricopa?

WILLIE DESMOND:  Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  So can we in -- the idea is to come in on Maricopa to bring population in four up to 710.

WILLIE DESMOND:  Okay.  That grab right there gets about 4600 more.

Excuse me here.

Okay.  So, that change would follow Commissioner Stertz's grab, taking parts of Peoria.

We're back to splitting Surprise right here.
As it's currently constituted, District 4 is 137,000 people underpopulated.

The green line is Commissioner Stertz's line.
And the dark blackish line is ours.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So Commissioner Stertz's line is dropping -- that's this right there.

Okay.

So that -- the brown line is I-10.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Is Goodyear in that -- I'm a little confused by the two lines. Could we go back to --

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So is Goodyear in four or in the unassigned area?

WILLIE DESMOND: In -- the way it's currently constituted, it's in the unassigned area.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: What's the population of that area? What if we just fill in from Surprise south into the -- into Goodyear?

WILLIE DESMOND: If you take these parts of Goodyear, it adds about 67,000 people to District 4.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Try it?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Just keep, keep going.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Filling up the population. And if we get to the point where you have too much, we'll pull back a little from the north.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

The other thing I should say is that we do have to make up some population from district --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We'll get to that.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

So next grab, like, Citrus Park and these areas right here? Or --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Or we, we do what Mr. Stertz tried, which is going south of I-10.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Let me put that line back in there.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I don't know what kind of population is in that area.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Is that within the doughnut hole?

WILLIE DESMOND: That is --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Is that in the unassigned area?

WILLIE DESMOND: No, that's not in the unassigned area.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right. So, yeah, it's not -- so it does affect -- it would affect the lower one, District 3.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think what we're trying to do is stay inside the unassigned area.

WILLIE DESMOND: To do that, it would add about 5700 people.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Should I do that, or -- that is outside of the doughnut hole.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, so let's -- okay. That's good to know. Let's keep that as a thought, and we'll go back to Citrus Park and go back to the doughnut hole area.

And we'll capture those.

WILLIE DESMOND: That would add about 10,000 people.

Also there is some population here that we could grab. But put that with District 4, if you like. That would be Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, and San Tan Valley.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Let's try that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That's all included in my map.

WILLIE DESMOND: So if you moved and grabbed Gold Canyon and Apache Junction, and put them in District 4,
that would add about 54,000 people, which would take us to
about 5,000 -- 4700 we need to make up.

Although District 1 is 1800 people overpopulated,
so that would need to give up some population somewhere.

District 1 is the eastern district.

So --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I suggest we just focus on
what we are working on and deal with those small population
adjustments once we do this.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Well --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Could you hear that? Wow,
you're better than me, Marty. I couldn't hear Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'm sorry, I was suggesting
that we stay focused on building the population to
District 4 and then we could go back and look at the other
smaller population adjustments.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: We're within the broad
margin of error right now. I think is what
Commissioner McNulty is suggesting. I'm not trying to put
words in your mouth.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: But you did it so expertly.
Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: So, I need to add 4700 more
people.

And I guess what I was trying to say is we could
take that from District 1. District 1, one place you could
do that --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Is it within the unassigned
area?

WILLIE DESMOND: It's not, but it just grabs from
districts --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Then we should --

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: -- stay within the
unassigned area.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

So would you prefer to look at that on the Pinal
County side or on the --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Even though this goes
outside the unassigned area, the reason why I chose to pick
up the land south of I-10 is that those are -- they're
natural places where communities are expanding off of the
I-10.

And then off of those areas, and going to the
south, it becomes very uninhabited. There's about 4700
people or 5700 people that live in that large tract of land,
and that's hence the reason why I grabbed that tract.

WILLIE DESMOND: Excuse me. I'm sorry.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Ladies and gentlemen, if you're watching online, do not be concerned.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Everyone's awake.

WILLIE DESMOND: I should cover my cough.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: My goodness.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: But that was one method of being able to capture it, and it is a natural even though it falls outside your current design boundary, it makes logical community sense.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And we're right now short about 5,000.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. And that's 5700, in that area.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Yeah, I'm not sure what that -- what kind of impact that has on three. I can't imagine it would have a lot.

But, is there any other thing to grab, just in the -- within the --

WILLIE DESMOND: You could grab parts of Phoenix right here.

You could take, you know, just a small corner of Surprise. Something like some of the more, you know, I'm
not -- someone else might know better, but I think some of these areas might be more rural, that are kind of on the western sprawl of Surprise.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I'm actually looking at the current congressional map, or at least some outline of it. And these areas are all in this district now. They're all in the rural northwest district.

So I think we would be certainly improving the ruralness of the district over what it is now, but the areas in and around this are all part of it already.

WILLIE DESMOND: Is there any other -- so where would you like me to grab from?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: For the sake of discussion, could you -- everything on the west side of Surprise, I believe the majority of those are.

WILLIE DESMOND: For instance, that's 530 people. That's about 5,000 right there.

So, as it's currently constituted, District 4 now is overpopulated by 260 people.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's much better.

Okay.

So, from there, could we work on the center and see what districts might make sense?

And maybe it's what Mr. -- some of what
Mr. Freeman has presented, what Ms. McNulty has presented, and we'll see if we can actually populate that area in a way that is following the constitutional criteria and make sense.

I shouldn't say populating, but carving it up.

WILLIE DESMOND: The one thing I would recommend is finishing District 1 so that all of the outside districts are --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: -- where they need to be.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We can do that.

So one is right now.

WILLIE DESMOND: One is currently 18,000 people overpopulated.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: The reason for that is because we grabbed these areas just north of, like, the Verde Valley in Yavapai County.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

This is part of the ripple effect that we were talking about earlier.

The -- and there's a couple of different ways to unpopulate District 1. One of them happens to be the recommendation that you'll see on the green dashed line that
I've included down in Cochise County.

Which actually there's two choices that I was looking at making.

One was to capture a population and increase the -- decrease the population in District 1, which, of course, overpopulated District 2, which, again, created more ripples.

Then going back to Commissioner McNulty's desire to stay within the doughnut.

We are also by now significantly underpopulating, by taking lands out of Cochise County, I picked it back up by expanding the lands around Flagstaff, going up and picking up all of the bedroom communities that are serving Flagstaff. Picking up the areas of Cottonwood, the Verde Valley, Camp Verde, et cetera, which balanced out District 1.

Again, we're now outside of your design parameters.

If we want to stay inside the doughnut, we can stay it inside it today and talk about some of these other areas as we look at this either later today or tomorrow.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I'd like to stay in the doughnut, if I can.

But I realize, I mean, everything's -- everything
is tied together.

Ms. McNulty, it looks like you wanted to say
something.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Could we go back up to the
area between Yavapai County and --

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: What if we just go along
the county line there and maybe address the details of it.

WILLIE DESMOND: So if we take that, that brings
District 1 right back to where it needs to be.

Should I accept that?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Why don't we just do that
for the time being and work on this --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, that's an easy fix, and
then we're not messing with the rest of it.

WILLIE DESMOND: Then you have the luxury of
taking some of the more urban areas from District 4, and
putting them back in the unassigned area, putting them back
to the doughnut hole.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: You mean a 18,000 person
luxury?

WILLIE DESMOND: So now District 4 is
18,000 people over.

And you can either -- I guess your two options
would be to take, take some of Apache Junction and
Gold Canyon out of District 4, or to take some of, you know, Goodyear and Surprise or Citrus Park or something out of District 4.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Just what are Apache Junction and Gold Canyon together? Quite a bit more than 18,000?

WILLIE DESMOND: I think they're, like, 70 or 80,000.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. I don't think that would make sense to split those.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

So it's probably from the west side.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I'm sorry, I must have missed a step. Let me get this straight. Gold Canyon and Apache Junction are in the river district or they were put into CD 1?

WILLIE DESMOND: They're in the river district right now.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: I mean, one thing you could do just to make up some of that population and maybe clean things up, I guess I would say we could grab all of Scottsdale, which probably, you know, a few hundred people up here, all of New River, all of Phoenix, just to not split those an additional time.
The reason that split happened is because we were following whole census block groups.

So, is that something that you want to look at, or -- that won't make up the 18,000 people, but it does, when they make the split.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Could you look at northwest Sun City -- you know, northwest of Sun City there, in Surprise, where we're splitting that?

Can we back out of there?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

So now if I put -- if I don't split Surprise, that adds about 5,000 people back to unassigned.

If that's what we want to do.

Okay.

I'm just going to go ahead and clean up some of the borders around there just a little bit so as to avoid any problems later.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: What's the story on Wittman? Shouldn't it be part of all that?

WILLIE DESMOND: Is Wittman better served --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: What is -- I don't know. I don't know what --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: A census place up there?

WILLIE DESMOND: Is it better served in the river district or --
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Anyone in this room who knows Wittman, raise their hands.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Mr. Cantelme.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So maybe it's better in the rural district.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It was a ranch, Mr. Stertz is saying. Now it's part of the urban growth.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. If we grab Wittman, you add 763 people in.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And then what about Peoria? Can we make up the difference there, just readjust that in some way?

WILLIE DESMOND: Let me see if I can grab, grab all of Peoria.

You grab all of Peoria, you get -- this -- five and a half thousand people -- we would have to kind of grab these areas too, because there's little pockets there.

That would add 7400 people.

That adds about 24 -- no.

All right. So right now District 4 needs to give up another 2800 people somewhere.

It has all of Peoria.

All of Wittman.
All of Surprise.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It has it or it does not have it?

WILLIE DESMOND: District -- oh, I'm sorry, District 4 does not have those.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So what about north of New River? Did you add something in there?

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm sorry, on New River?

Yeah.

So add the rest of New River.

That adds about 1700 people.

And the rest of Phoenix.

It's going to grab all of Phoenix. I forgot to tell it source, just four.

One second.

I'll try not to speak.

Okay. So adding those two areas would add about 1800 people.

If you grabbed the rest of Scottsdale, that adds about 4,800, so that's a little too many.

I'll just start with these two.

Moving those two people over.

Okay. So now District 4 is overpopulated by 1,042 people.

I guess one easy place might be just right here.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Question for counsel.

What's our -- I mean, I know we need to get closer in the end, but for a draft map, what's our margin? You know, what should we be shooting for?

MARY O'GRADY: For the draft map, I think, commissioners, it would be within your discretion.

Certainly for today's kind of in-session work, this would be, I think, appropriate.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Are we within shouting range?

MARY O'GRADY: It's within the discretion -- you know, at the end of the day, we need to be within the -- very precise. But as far as when you're comfortable kind of stopping this exercise and filling the doughnut and maybe giving Willie the discretion to look in a general area to equalize things later.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That makes sense.

WILLIE DESMOND: So I would say maybe one more thing, just some ideas.

That's -- so, there's places we could make that population up. Those are both about 1500.

If we'd like to adjust the census blocks, to me that's -- when we do go to equalized population, we're going to get right down to the block level.

And so you can see, like, this block has zero
people, this block has 12 people, this block has 40 people. You know, that's how we get down to the zero person deviation.

If you had any -- I mean, 1,000 is -- when we've been making these what-if maps for you and stuff, I've been trying to keep them under 1,000 when possible.

So if you had any, you know, one more little grab you wanted me to do anywhere, we could do that right now.

I guess just looking at it, there's a little portion of Litchfield Park that looks like it's split. It looks like something like that would be a good thing to do.

That's the type of thing I would look for when I -- if I were to equalize this.

So that adds about 217 people.

And then I'll need to grab the -- that creates a few little pockets of -- people.

That doesn't add anybody, but it cleans it up.

This is a very large census block. No people, but a large block.

So those are the types of things I do.

So now, as it currently is, District 4 is about 825 people over.

District 3 is 938, so there's a -- you're in the margins now.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great.
So from there, commissioners, should we look at trying to incorporate some of what was discussed this morning into that smaller center?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I heard one sure. Yeah, I say we keep going.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I agree.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So, Mr. Freeman, are the things that you talked about this morning that we can then bring in?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, I'm not against the exercise.

The notion of putting Apache Junction and Gold Canyon into this river district gives me a lot of heartburn, and it really makes -- I mean, this map is pretty much shaping up like the river district map did.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can you say that again?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Putting Apache Junction and Gold Canyon, well, I didn't exactly catch that one, the first half of it, putting it into a district that includes, you know, the far west valley and Lake Havasu, Bullhead City, I mean, it gives me some heartburn because I don't think it makes sense to do that.

And it also is pretty reminiscent of how that's
what the river district map was doing it. In fact, that little tendril went down a little farther and captured the San Tan Valley, which I did not think made a lot of sense at the time.

So I have -- as a -- I'm not against pursuing the thought process certainly. But, that gives me some pause.

WILLIE DESMOND: One more thing I should mention is we just changed the version that you had originally proposed.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Uh-hmm.

WILLIE DESMOND: Commissioner McNulty had done a few changes to District 7 and 3 that aren't reflected here in the border of three.

Is that something that you want to look at right now? Or...

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure.

WILLIE DESMOND: I guess the real area of divergence would be District 3 coming straight across here and taking a little bit from District 4.

If we did that, District 4 would then need to probably go in a little bit more somewhere else.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think we did those to correct the voting rights issues. So I think it would be important to build those in.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So if I just do that, just
so we're -- so we don't have to go back and, you know, start
at a different point.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Good point.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So we are making adjustments
to other -- outside the doughnut?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It looks like it.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

Then, then I've got some suggestions to make.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think that was because we
had agreed the day before that we had to fix that imbalance
in the two voting rights districts. That was the only issue
we were addressing there.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: One of the things we also
addressed was expanding the area up on -- around Flagstaff
and picking up the Verde Valley, which we just backed it
back up and splits Sedona in half.

You can't have it both ways, I don't think.

So if you're going to make adjustments in one area
for one reason, we should make like adjustments in the
other.

We're going to find that these maps and these
edges all move, that all of the percentages and quantities
are going to adjust at the same time.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: If we needed to, I don't
think we need to make any changes outside. We can just make
the change within between the two voting rights districts, and can deal with the rest of it later.

WILLIE DESMOND: So with those changes, District 3 is now 56.06 percent Hispanic, and it's 20,000 people overpopulated.

District 4 is about 20,000 people underpopulated. So it's a trade-off between three and four there.

I think initially how Commissioner McNulty had it was that seven then grabbed some of three in order to raise the HVAP there.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Right. And that's the part we need --

WILLIE DESMOND: Then it ended up four versus unassigned again, so I'll go ahead and make those changes too.

Okay. So, now seven is about 1100 people overpopulated, so that's going to need to give up some population somewhere.

I guess the larger issue is that four is now, again, 18,000 people underpopulated.

So it's going to have to go into some of these areas again.

Is there a place that we want to start that?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Just show us the -- sorry.

The populations of these different census places.
What's Peoria.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, I can do that.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Total microphone meltdown.

I was wondering if there's anything comparable to the Apache Canyon -- Apache Junction, Gold Canyon number here. I'm sure there is. What would be comparable if we wanted to just switch those out.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

So now I've added the population --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Think about that.

WILLIE DESMOND: -- to the label.

So Peoria is 154,000 people.

Sun City West is about 24,535.

Over here.

Let's see.

Gold Canyon is 10,159.

Apache Junction is about 35,000 -- not about, it is 35,840.

So if you were to take, for instance, take this area out of four, and add it back to unassigned, that would move 54,000 people, 54,000 people over.

I think that's because there's a fairly large population in some of the unincorporated areas.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. So is it worth just looking then at northwest Phoenix, the part -- or northwest
Maricopa County, the part that's already in that congressional district, and see if we have comparable?

We can either take part of Peoria or we could take all of Sun City, Sun City West, Young -- let's go back over there.

You could just come in from the west there.

WILLIE DESMOND: I mean, Surprise is 117,000 people, so...

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: You could fill up census tracts there, or we could start in Peoria, northwest Peoria, and come in.

WILLIE DESMOND: We could take Peoria. That's got 154, although I think a lot of that is down here.

Would it make sense to move New River or some of those areas to the river district?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: No.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So let's back out that change, go back to where we were.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: No one's seeing anything. And then what are we looking for? How many people?

WILLIE DESMOND: Right now we're looking for 19,000.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Ready to break the I-10 boundary?

You've got population that flares off and it's a community of interest flanking off of I-10.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: But that's 5700 people; right?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That's just the area that I picked.

There's a piece of it, all the way up to...

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: But then we have to re-examine that whole majority-minority area.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right.

We can see what that does to the --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: We'll find out.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: -- HVAP.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I ended up at --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: But then we have to adjust other things to make up for it.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: -- 55.72.

THE REPORTER: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herder. I'm sorry.

THE REPORTER: One at a time, please.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: One at a time, please, everyone.

WILLIE DESMOND: And so that area is about 35,000.
So we can cut that down.

If we want to start with some of the more -- because -- rural areas of it.

That's about 19,700.

That's a very rough -- have to clean up that border if we could, but, yeah.

I mean, I can do it and tell you what the effect is on the Hispanic population, before and after, if that's helpful.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: He's waiting for somebody to say go.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Then my concern is then what happens next.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I know.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Do try to do this, follow the exercise we embarked upon.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: You can always back it back out.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Should we try this and see what happens? And then we'll --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: We're making sausage here. It's not a clean process.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No, I know.

WILLIE DESMOND: That's now -- District 3 is underpopulated at 56 point -- I'm going to undue that for
one second.

    I will redo it.

Actually that change makes that district more Hispanic.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Makes it what?

WILLIE DESMOND: More Hispanic.

But then it needs to go grab population later, so that might make it less in the end.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Would you remind me, we need 18,000 more people or fewer people in the river district?

WILLIE DESMOND: In the river district we need 18,000 more people.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: So with that change, now District 3 is underpopulated.

Assuming we don't want to touch District 7 at all, because that's, you know, the district.

We can take parts of Litchfield Park or Glendale to try to make up that 18,000 and see how that affects the HVAP percentage.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I don't think that makes sense.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Did you say that you think that makes sense or doesn't?
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I don't think that does make sense, but we can try it.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So then adding to District 3 from the unassigned.

So that's 21, let me go for a second and I'll go back.

Okay.

Now the population is relatively balanced. Um, the HVAP is at 55.3, instead of 55.74.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We're going the wrong way.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: You want an increase in HVAP?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Did you say we're going the wrong way?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Which, which -- are we in the majority-minority district or the --

WILLIE DESMOND: The 55.3 is the second majority-minority district.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I don't think we want to be reducing the HVAP in that district.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. That is still well above the benchmark. The benchmark is only 50.23 there.

But it did go down a little bit from where it was earlier.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: But, yeah, it's still
five points higher than the current district -- or the current benchmark measurement; right?

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe so, yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

And I think Mr. Herrera noted earlier he thinks that's too high.

So 55 is too high in his estimation.

WILLIE DESMOND: The one thing I might be able to do is that in doing that last change, because District 7 is a little overpopulated, it might make sense to do the change there.

I would like to clean that line up and stuff.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And, counsel, do you have a recommendation for what target we should be aiming for on these?

I know we have to keep at least the benchmark level, but there was growth in Hispanic population in the state overall, and it's tough for us to know, and I know there's no answer, but --

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, you certainly want to stay at or above the benchmark level.

And I also think it makes sense to look at what the Hispanic Coalition has submitted, so you look at the input you've received, and -- but certainly want to stay above the -- at or above the benchmark level.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Can we also look at how that changes that the state mine inspector snapshot perspective.

MARY O'GRADY: That's a good point.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: The issue in that southern voting district is the voting strength issue.

We've clearly got plenty of voting strength in the Maricopa County Hispanic voting district, but it's not clear that that's going to be a preclearance issue of what the voting strength is of the southern Arizona district.

MARY O'GRADY: That's right. That's absolutely right. There's the deeper analysis to see whether they really are going to be effective.

And if that snapshot is useful, go ahead and consider that.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

So with this change, District 3, the second majority-minority, is 58.93 percent Dem, in the 2010 mine inspector, and an HVAP of 55.25.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Now what's the, the comparison between this district, the Dem performance in the district and the Dem performance in the actual 2010 race in CD 7?

WILLIE DESMOND: So, in CD 7 in 2010, it was 58.8. Now it would be 58.93.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. All right. So we're right on the line.

WILLIE DESMOND: A slightly higher HVAP --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Right. Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: -- slightly higher Dem percentage.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Actually, we do need to -- District 3 is a little overpopulated. I'm going to do that for one second.

It might change slightly.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And what's the benchmark district number for CD 7?

WILLIE DESMOND: CD 7, the -- it was 50.23 was the HVAP number and --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, I'm sorry.

WILLIE DESMOND: Oh, I guess that would be 57.45. And it's now 57.46.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thanks.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. After rebalancing it, the mine inspector percentage goes to 58.97 instead of 58.93. So just a tiny fraction up.

Now, as it's currently constituted, the districts are all roughly within ideal population.

The farthest away is District 7, the voting rights
1 district in Maricopa County, which is about 1200 people
underpopulated.

   Are there any other changes or -- I mean, if -- I
4 think it would be good if there was some sort of universal
5 kind of step forward.

   COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

   CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

   COMMISSIONER STERTZ: You want to start working
9 from the southeast corner of the doughnut?

   CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm open. Wherever you all
11 want to start is fine.

   But I think we should try to come up with a
12 conceptual idea of what that center is going to look like
13 and at least complete it.

   COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That's --

   CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So wherever -- whatever is
17 anyone's pleasure. We can start either corner of the
18 circle.

   COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I just make the comment
20 that it seems that Chandler -- we could take Gilbert and the
21 rest of Chandler, Sun Lakes, the rest of Mesa, and we'd
22 have -- and we'd have a pretty compact southeast --

   WILLIE DESMOND: If this is --

   COMMISSIONER McNULTY: -- metro district.

   WILLIE DESMOND: If this is something that we're
going to start carving up, I am going to save a new version
so as to leave this where it is.

So that will just take one second.

Everything bagel.

THE REPORTER: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, can we just take a
group-time break?

The time is 2:39.

We'll go into short recess.

(Brief recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We'll enter back into public

session. Recess is over.

The time is 3:02 p.m.

And I believe Mr. Desmond is going to pull up the

map, and we'll look at filling the center.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I believe we were going to

start in the southeast corner.

And this is a question for Commissioner McNulty.

In your district, your east, east north-south line

is the 87. And if I'm correct, we've heard testimony that

that wants to -- from Chandler's perspective, wants to go to

the west, to the west, one mile.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Can we drop that in, please?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And let's call it nine.

WILLIE DESMOND: We can call it that.

So the district is this one right here.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Correct, so that would be the east border right there. We can move that one mile to the west --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: In Chandler.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: -- in Chandler.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: To Alma School Road.

WILLIE DESMOND: Do you want to start building this district then?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We're just going to what --

Mr. Stertz is suggesting we're going to tweak the boundary of the Tempe district that you just dropped in, and then he's going to work around that.

So in Chandler we're going to move the southeast boundary, which is now 87, which is Country Club, we're going to move that one mile west to Alma School.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

This isn't really like a -- an actual built-in district at this point. It's just like a line on top. So if it's all right, I'll build a district, quickly, and then
we'll have it to work around.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ:  All right.

WILLIE DESMOND:  And I'll make -- I'll do that Alma School Road as we build it.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY:  Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ:  Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY:  Is that the outline from my map?

WILLIE DESMOND:  Yes.

I'll just call it District 9.

So, now District 9 matches your district exactly, Commissioner McNulty, except for the part in Chandler where it doesn't go farther east than Alma School Road.

It does need to make up about 27,000 people as a result.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY:  So let's go to Mesa.

WILLIE DESMOND:  Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY:  And just -- we're going to go east, not farther than Stapley Road, and just build census tracts.

I think it's one census tract over.

WILLIE DESMOND:  Yep.

You prefer I started up here at the top or down here at the bottom?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY:  I don't have a preference.
I'd suggest starting at the bottom.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Unless you prefer to start at the top.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm open.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Whichever way it works best to get the population for now.

WILLIE DESMOND: That's about 29,000.

About 2,000 over.

I will take that from up here.

Perfect.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So now District 9 is only off by 26 people.

And it is based off of that district you had asked for, but respecting the Alma School Road thing.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: You moved the road to Alma School?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The next change would be that Mesa, the south border of Mesa and Gilbert -- go ahead and...

WILLIE DESMOND: So put it in the new district.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Correct.

WILLIE DESMOND: And you want all of Mesa and
Gilbert going down, or --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yep.

So just go all the way across.

I'm going the opposite direction.

WILLIE DESMOND: I see.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I want to take all of Gilbert.

There you go.

And then San Tan. Fill in the entire -- from that line at the top to Mesa and Gilbert.

WILLIE DESMOND: Gotcha.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Leave everything else in the doughnut.

WILLIE DESMOND: So if we do this, what district number will it be?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I've got that as five, but you pick whatever you want.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. The new District 5, we have 561,708 people.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: You must have missed some then. Scroll up.

Are there still some unassigned?

WILLIE DESMOND: I don't think so, because Gold Canyon and Apache Junction are now in District 4.

I can double check.
I'll just try to grab anything that's not assigned.

No.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Oh, I know why, I'm sorry. You need to go north -- if you would bring up my map, it would make life easier.

Go north on Higley.

WILLIE DESMOND: Where is that?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: On Higley.

WILLIE DESMOND: Higley. That's a road in Mesa?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: Do you know where that is?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yeah, between Val Vista --

WILLIE DESMOND: So I'm -- I need help. Are we grabbing population on the north-south way or --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yeah, you're -- it's a north-south.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: It's right -- see that little notch of Gilbert?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay. Take that little notch of Gilbert up. That's Higley to its right.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So you want to grab everything to the right of that?
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That's correct.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Up to McKellips.

A mile up, take everything.

You'll want to start slowing down.

Is there any way you can turn the layer on that I gave you?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, absolutely.

Okay. I have it there.

So you have -- you want more up there; right?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yeah.

WILLIE DESMOND: That makes sense.

Okay. Take that change and adjust it.

Now District 5 needs to make up 1100 people.

That's very close.

Is there a place you want me to do that now or should we just kind of wait and try to --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That's just a few people.

Let's pick it up later.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Is there another district then that you wanted to look at right away?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Let's go to the one in between, which, again, if you pick up everything within that block, Scottsdale, Fountain Hills, Rio Verde, Maricopa.
WILLIE DESMOND: Just grab it all?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Grab that. That's a...

It actually goes down below that line.

Right there.

WILLIE DESMOND: How do yo have this district numbered? I guess we're missing six and eight.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Call it six.

WILLIE DESMOND: This around the edges here, I'll have to go back, back where you're using your line, because I'm using whole tracts, and it looks like you used block groups.

Six seems to be -- wait a minute.

Six still seems to be a little overpopulated. Not by much, by 14 and a half thousand people.

Where do you think that population should come from?

I'm not seeing any place where I'm off your line, except for down here.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That's why it's over.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, I don't think there's any place.

Let me just make sure there's no place that's unassigned around here.

I don't think there is, but it's got a lot of blocks to check.
There are 50 people that are unassigned. It looks like they're right on the border here.

So, that's nothing major. I can clean that all up. Later.

I guess with that in mind, we're going to have to get -- six is going to have to lose population somewhere along the border between it and the unassigned areas in order to not --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: In the meantime, you want to label the remaining as eight?

WILLIE DESMOND: Eight? Sure.

Anyone have any jokes while we're waiting?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: By the way, Happy New Year to everybody.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. You now have District 8. The only real problem here is that District 6 has about 15,000 people too many and District 8 has about 15,000 people too few.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That's good.

WILLIE DESMOND: I think it may be helpful to just walk through this boundary then on the streets, so you can kind of get a better sense of where it is.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, that would be good.

WILLIE DESMOND: So I guess initially just going north.
Going north on North 59th Avenue.
And cuts over on Thunderbird.
Drives around a little bit. Goes back north on 51st Avenue.
On 47th, up on 43rd Avenue.
Over on West Union Hills Drive.
 Onto I-17.
Then on Thomas Road for a while.
Then it jumps up here.
Comes back down on 7th Street.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Desmond, I think that if you want to the intersection of 101 and Interstate 51, it's to your --

WILLIE DESMOND: Is that right?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The 51. Right there.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And what you can do is bring that line that is the north of the 101, bring the -- right where your hand is right now, bring that vertical line down to Union Hills.

WILLIE DESMOND: Where is Union Hills?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Union Hills is the east-west
You're going the wrong direction here.

WILLIE DESMOND: You wanted to bring this line down?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: No.

WILLIE DESMOND: Oh, I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I want you to be able to grab population out of six and move it to -- let's see -- thank you.

Hang on.

All right.

That's Union Hills right there.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So if you'll go like this --

WILLIE DESMOND: All right.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: -- you'll be able to pick up what you need.

There's about 15,000 folks right there. Pick up the -- there's a bunch of developments taking place here. There's your number.

WILLIE DESMOND: That's 16, 17.

Now we're within --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Within -- now you've got a map nine relatively equal distance.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great. Thank you all for
working with me on that to make it happen.

We need to obviously get it exactly into the right population numbers for each of the districts, and then it would be great to see the splits report on this, you know, the competitiveness, the compactness, and all of it, just to get a sense of, for this map, what that would look like.

But I'd be curious to hear from all the commissioners what areas are still of concern to them.

For instance, I think Mr. Freeman mentioned Gold Canyon and Apache Junction.

And other areas I'm sure people have concerns about.

So I would like it if we could talk about some of those to know what they are.

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Don't all go at once.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm going to run the splits, compactness and competitiveness, right now --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, great.

WILLIE DESMOND: -- so I'll have those in about ten minutes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And I think folks were also interested in voter registration for each of the --

WILLIE DESMOND: Over the lunch break we added that to the competitiveness report.
MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, at some point it would be helpful for the -- I think particularly for the lines between -- for some of these street level lines that were done recently, I don't know that they articulated the connection to the statutory -- or, excuse me, to the constitutional criteria, other than equal population. But that will be helpful to, you know, to the extent that we're splitting to understand why the line is where it is and connect it to the constitutional criteria.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right. Because a lot was done for population grabs today.

But I know a lot of these were based on communities of interest discussions that people have had.

But for each of the nine districts we need to go through all the constitutional criteria and make sure that these make sense.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I would --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I would also think we will be doing a lot of that with the benefit of public comment. This is -- this would be a draft.

We'll get a lot of input from folks.

Ms. O'Grady, I had just made the comment in response to yours that I think we will be doing a lot of that as we go through the public comment also.
MARY O'GRADY: That will be helpful --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We'll be getting a great deal of comment and we will.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Keep in mind that the directive that you had given to us was to work districts around the -- Commissioner McNulty's district. So --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, that's true.

I had suggested that to the extent possible I would like to see -- make it a goal that we try to create a competitive district in metro Phoenix.

And Ms. McNulty did that with District 9 on this map.

And that then the other commissioners worked around that. So, that was factored in from the beginning, along with the majority-minority districts.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I would just add that, that District 9 was put together with the communities within it, based on the communities within it, with those in mind. That's how we are -- that's how, um, how I arrived at those lines. How we discussed it in the group here.

(Brief pause.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I was just asking Ms. McNulty where Fort McDowell base was, because she had been talking
to a lady from there. And I wanted to see where that was put in this map.

And we had noticed that it is in six. And I guess that's where it's attached with Scottsdale in some way, and that's how they want to be.

Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: The Fort McDowell Indian community had requested that -- I think they hadn't made a decision, but they had requested that we show them an iteration of map that included them with north Scottsdale, because of their -- they share a lot of economic development interest with Scottsdale.

And they wanted to see versions both of the south and north Scottsdale.

And we had done a previous version of the river district map connecting them to south Scottsdale, and they were particularly interested in seeing north -- how it would lay out with north Scottsdale.

And I had done that at the last year hearing, but then we had moved to this version of the map, so now this will give them that with this version of the map.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Could you point to it when it's back up to show people?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: When the map comes up.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It's right here. This is not the Fort McDowell Indian community. This is the Salt River Indian community.

What is that blank area there?

Is that Fountain Hills? No, that's Fountain Hills.

So this is south Scottsdale. This is north Scottsdale.

And I think in -- so we -- this has been in a couple configurations. In one configuration it was in the district with south Scottsdale.

In this configuration it's in the district with, you know, the bulk of north Scottsdale.

And I think the comment was because of their, you know, common interests in economic development, they were interested in seeing this configuration.

I think, although I could be wrong about this, but I think we also received a comment that they were inclined to be together, the two communities.

(Brief pause.)

WILLIE DESMOND: You all have one copy of the splits report, the combined components report, combined competitiveness report. And I believe the combined competitiveness report we added columns in for the
percentage of registration by each district.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We need to invest in a stapler.

WILLIE DESMOND: Wait.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Does anyone have any comments on the splits report analysis that Willie just presented? Anything jump out at anybody?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: The first thing that jumps out of me, Madam Chair, is how much like the other splits reports we received it is, how much like the splits report for the whole county map and for the river district map. Very, very similar.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: There are a lot of Independents in District 7.

I don't know why that is.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Based on the competitiveness report, we only see truly one, possibly two competitive districts on this map? That would be two and, um, is it nine?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It would be one, two, and nine, Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I guess one would be.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: One is pretty Democratic.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Well, that's why I said, I don't think that's competitive. That's why I didn't name it competitive.

I mean, Ms. McNulty says it's competitive. I would argue that it's not.

So I'm looking at two and, as I said, nine being I said truly competitive.

Then we have four districts that have over 40 percent Republican registration.

And people have mentioned before, these Independents that are -- they lean somewhere. They lean one way or another. I don't think they're truly independent.

So according to this, I see two competitive districts.

And as Mr. -- Commissioner Freeman pointed out, one is probably more Democratic. That's how I look at it.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I would look at it a different way.

District 1 is index one. It's 50.6 percent.

Average percentage Republican in statewide races, which is, you know, right up the mark.

Index three is 38.2 percent, when you factor in party registration, which is, you know, very close, kind of goes other way just a little bit.

But you've got to remember that District 1 is that
big rural district where registration is often, you know, maintained differently, not necessarily updated.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Sure.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So that has to be factored in --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: But as I stated before.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: -- looks pretty close.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: What we're trying to do with the river district map, version 8A, we were trying to create four competitive districts. I think we're pretty close to creating four. This one, again, you can argue back and forth whether it be two or three.

So that is a concern of mine.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And I'm confused by that.

So index two, average percent Republican in statewide races in '08 and '10.

That column?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I'm looking at the GOP -- just I'm going by registration since -- as Stertz and Freeman do, referred to registration quite a bit, so I'm looking at registration as well.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Go ahead, Mr. Freeman.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: In terms of the election results, again, we're looking at two high watermark years for Republicans and coming up with those numbers.

So I always in my own mind subtract one and subtract -- add to the other in looking at it.

But in terms of splits, I mean, I think there is a difference.

There's many more census places that are put into more than two districts.

And when we look at the way this map shakes out, and I know it's just a draft at this point, or we're not even a draft yet, but we're working on it, it's a work in progress, but you can really walk the halls of congress on the short trip on the Superstition here. Just congressman, congressman, congressman, congressman, congressman.

And that doesn't seem right to me.

Mesa is carved up three ways. Scottsdale is carved up three ways.

We've got this funny feature on this district and this funny feature on that district. And another funny attribute down there.

It seems to be lacking in compactness.

There's been talk of communities of interest. I think now even in this District 9, I would acknowledge that there's some communities there that make sense to me,
putting them together as a community of interest. And I know we've heard public comment on it but, we've heard a lot of about what kind -- public comment sort of drawing the community of interest in a different way.

And perhaps this is my own bias, but, you know, I live there, I'm from there, I've live a great part of my life in that area of the Valley, and, you know, I've had kind of my own sense of how that area fits together as well, so, I don't know, you know, I know this is just the first crack at it, so I don't mean to be -- sound overly critical, but those are some concerns I have in putting this together right now.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Any other thoughts?

How do you propose we move forward then, in terms of, you know, looking at either filling this other ways or -- I don't know if it makes sense to actually go in and, you know, with a fine tooth comb and actually make everything work on this, if there are still major concerns about certain aspects, but I do think it's a starting point at least that we filled it and, and as we know, there are many ways to do it, because --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: -- depends where you start too.

Yes, Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Well, there's not that many.

Because of the brackets that you gave us in the design criteria, knowing that we were only working as an in fill, working around a district, there was only a certain number of ways that you could actually break this apart that truly reflected the energy that we were putting forward as far as the knowledge that we had over the last seven months of collecting public information.

I happen to agree with Commissioner Freeman that having multiple districts as you're going down the 60, going down the Superstition as you're driving through, going through five districts, but it becomes almost impossible to create any other, any other way when you're working within the brackets that we were given to design.

I'm going to suggest that we take another crack at your District 9, and looking at it in a different way, and I think we might be able to find where our communities of interest and our compactness and the squirreliness of some of these districts might break away.

So I'd like to, I'd like to look at that.

I'd also like to not be -- there are other areas within the -- within, for example, District No. 4, where we know that there's going to need to be adjustment up around the Verde Valley and around Flagstaff, going up the 17 corridor.
We know that there was discussion on Tuesday regarding certain aspects of the city of south Tucson, north of that area.

So there are areas that as far as the design exercise that you gave us today, and, again, I applaud your leadership in starting to take this down to the -- to this path, but there were only so many ways to skin this cat based on the criteria that we were given.

So, if we would look at another approach for a District 9, then there might be a couple of other ways of looking at the same -- looking at how to fill this in.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I think -- was District 9 the district that Commissioner McNulty was working with?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That's correct.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: So the -- one of the true competitive districts, you want to mess with that?

I mean, again, you had mentioned that the six criteria were important to you.

And if they are, then competition should be something that we should be considering and not again -- I guess I'm, I'm feeling that you were looking at competition like it's an afterthought.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

Commissioner Herrera, actually I'm not even going to respond to that.

The criteria that we were given to design around to get to this, there's not -- there's just so many ways to be able to achieve getting to our solution.

So if we extract that and look at another solution other than the one for a competitive district, it doesn't follow this design, then there might be some other ways to be able to achieve some other analysis of the district.

But, only so many ways you can do it once you got the bracket set.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So I'm curious though on between nine and five, you know, if you were to just respect that eastern boundary for nine, and then move east from there, so that you're following 60, et cetera, through Mesa, I'm just curious, can something be worked out that way where -- so that you're not splitting Mesa so much.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: For example, if you were able to keep Mesa intact and move, move eastward --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Just keep going east.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Keep going east, you absolutely could in following the 60. The 60 is a natural -- I mean, there's so much around the 60, it's a -- it exists -- I was equating to somebody at lunch today about
150 years ago rivers where we made our design because we populated along them, we used them for transportation, we used them for moving goods and services, now it's our highways.

And we have been talking about transportation corridors for seven months.

And I want to continue to talk about transportation corridors.

They move our goods and services. They move our population. They move you from where you sleep to where you work --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: -- and those are all very important.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: If he's talking -- I'm pretty sure Mr. Stertz is referring to a transportation corridor as the, the lightrail.

I think Commissioner McNulty there did a really good job of explaining why she split Mesa the way she did from west Mesa and east Mesa.

The lightrail goes through Tempe, goes through parts of Mesa. I think it will be extended through I think probably Mesa Drive at one point eventually. So that's why she did -- and if you're using that logic, then that would
make sense that you, that you keep west Mesa with Tempe,
because of that transportation corridor.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And, again, I --

    VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I lived in Mesa, in that
part. And there's a big distinction between west and east,
and I think the people that live there would tell you the
same thing. If you were to talk to them they maybe would
again say the same thing.

    And they probably would agree with that particular
split.

    There's no way to avoid not splitting any of the
cities. I mean, I'm sure you'll agree with it, that some
split cities will be split.

    And for that one, we're using -- we're basing it
on communities of interest, not just an arbitrary split, but
it is a community of interest.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, I think we've
done a good job of keeping Gilbert, Queen Creek, and San Tan
intact.

    I think that we need to do some work on the -- on
Mesa and the Superstition corridor. And not -- and
absolutely taking into account, as we are doing that, to be
testing this against competitiveness.

    I do think that we've got an opportunity to go
east west, through that area, and I want to have the
opportunity to explore it.

But based on, again, based on the criteria that we were given, there was only so many ways to be able to approach this.

This is, this is -- I can't think of any other many other ways to do it this way, so . . .

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: If we go further east in Mesa where the complexion of Mesa changes substantially, then that will no longer be a competitive district.

So it is right now the west -- the eastern boundary of that district is at a point where the complexion of the town changes.

And if we reconfigure it to an east-west configuration, there will be no competitive -- it will lose its competitiveness.

Right now it is about as close to 50/50 as one could practically get.

I would like to spend some time just looking at this map, thinking about it tonight, looking at it by comparison to the current congressional districts, by comparison to some of the other things that have been proposed, looking at it, you know, on Maptitude with our tools.

I -- you know, I think, I have to say I think, you know, this was a good day's work.
We've got a map that in many cases does keep communities together. The splits report looks just like the other two splits reports we did.

And I think it's a good start.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I do too. I would agree with that.

I think it would be interesting for us to think about that Mesa area though and looking at going east west and, you know, getting things like Apache Junction, Gold Canyon and seeing if there's a way to make numbers work starting at the, you know, boundary with nine and moving east.

And I'm not sure why, Mr. Stertz, you started down where you did. There may be a reason for that or whatever, but I was wondering --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Actually when I was designing, I didn't start down there.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I started from the other side.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: You started from --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I started from --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: -- from the edge of nine?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: -- from the edge of -- actually -- yeah, I needed to work around nine.
And once I established my west border, actually I had to start with four.

And there was two choices on four to make, and I mentioned that before lunch, was that four becomes a rural district -- the only way it becomes a rural district where it's less than -- where it's around seven percent coming out of the metro area was that if we captured Flagstaff.

And we've heard enough testimony that Flagstaff really needs to be a community within and about itself, including some other areas that are around it, so that area made sense.

So the only way to do that was to create a rural -- what I call a rural suburban or suburban ranch district, which is capturing everything on the west side of the 303 and some of the urban population.

So that's where my design line had to come.

The only way for me to be able to pick up the rest of that was to wrap around to pick up Apache Junction and Gold Canyon, which from a design and planning point of view operation, and from a political point of view, doesn't make any sense.

But it's there.

I'd rather try to take a couple other runs at this.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: We've got tonight, we've got tonight to take a look at what we've done, our work product for today, and we've got tonight to continue to validate it.

Plus we've got 75 people in the room here that half of them want to give testimony today, and we're going to hear a lot about what we've just done today and about what their concerns are.

And, and we'll be able to -- we're reconvening at 9:00 o'clock tomorrow morning to start this all over again.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I agree. And I think we all need time with it.

Will this it map be up on the website soon?

BUCK FORST: As soon as I get it.

WILLIE DESMOND: We don't have, like, a layout. That will take me some time if that's something we want.

What I could do is give you guys all the Google KMZ file very quickly, e-mail those out, and have those posted on the website, probably before we've even left here today.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. That would be helpful.

WILLIE DESMOND: That is a very easy process.

I'm not sure, but I believe a lot of the public has been using those Google files. That's kind of the easiest way really of investigating what is happening.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's great.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, for the folks that are using Maptitude, the online services, it would be terrific if we could as early as possible today get this posted up so that they can be making their -- any design adjustments that they would be -- that the public would want to be making.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Can we print that? Is that -- that screen shot?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. Will you print that for all of us also?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Thank you.

I'm pretty sure we've seen a version of this map in which Mesa is just split twice. And what I suggest is that we keep Mesa together, we include Gilbert, the balance of Chandler, some of the population of Queen Creek.

Now, what that would involve is probably keeping San Tan Valley together with Gold Canyon or Apache Junction and swinging around and making some further population somewhere else.

I know it would involve some -- but I do think that there would be a way to do that also.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Good. Well, in the meantime this was a really helpful exercise. I appreciate all the commissioners for all the time they took in entertaining this possibility. So we can now all study this tonight and think more about it and figure out what we want to do for tomorrow.

And now that we have a complete nap, we can kind of look at the other areas and think about what needs to make sense -- what needs to change based on the testimony we've heard and if there are other areas that we need to tweak.

So, thank you very much all of you for your help.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Willie, when you do the screen shots, would it be possible to do a screen shot with the, with the -- what I call it my plan with the 9C overlay on it?

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Just for purposes of giving the other commissioners some things that I would want to be discussing tomorrow so that they're not -- so they know which way in preparation for it.

WILLIE DESMOND: I was going do it right now but the printer is out of paper.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So right now we are -- the time is 4:56 -- 4:06.

And we're at agenda item four. And I'm curious to know where we are on legislative district draft maps, if there's any -- if anyone has had time to think about those. Mr. Freeman?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: No. No, I haven't, Madam Chair.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: No.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. I'm seeing nos all around, except maybe one.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I gave Mr. Desmond my -- an outline of my thoughts and a map file.

I'm a little concerned about how many vacant areas and noncontiguous areas there are, but beyond that, that's a start.

And I think -- actually I sent them to Ray. Did he not send them around?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I didn't see them.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Did you guys?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: No.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Well, I did -- I sent them to Ray last night with a request that he circulate them. So
I'll resend them. Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: So we do not have a legislative map to look at; is that correct? An updated legislative map?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's correct.

So, sounds like tomorrow we'll be focusing mostly on legislative since we won't be doing any of that today.

Executive director's report, I don't think Mr. Bladine is here.

I don't know if Kristina had --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Willie says he didn't get it either, so I'll have to figure it out.

Maybe it's stuck in my computer at home and I need to press send again or something.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, Kristina Gomez does have a report to give you, but she had to run out for a moment so she's --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We can come back to her. Thank you.

And same, future meetings, I know that we were to send all of our conflicts for next week to Ray and Kristina.
And they were going to work on a schedule. So they might have more information on that one.

Report, legal advice and direction to counsel regarding attorney general inquiry.

Will there be an update for us today?

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, there may be, but we can do that after public comment.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right. Okay.

Okay.

So maybe we should just start with public comment. And that is agenda item eight.

And I've got a stack here.

This first grouping are folks from Flagstaff that would like to talk to us, and I have first on the docket here, Eve Ross, representing W.L. Gore & Associates and Flagstaff Forty.

And if I could remind the public to be sure to speak directly into the microphone so that we get a -- we can all hear you and to spell your last name for the court reporter. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, if we would try to keep comments within three minutes, I -- because we have a real huge stack today, so. . .

EVE ROSS: I'll be short.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

EVE ROSS: I am short, so it will go together.

My name is Eve Ross, R-O-S-S. 3703 North Colton Ranch Road, Flagstaff, Arizona.

So I'm here representing my employer, W.L. Gore & Associates, and Flagstaff Forty, a nonpartisan business group of which we are a part in Flagstaff.

So I think the question at the end of a long day, at least the question I'm asking myself, is why am I here. What does redistricting matter.

I'm here because my company deserves representation.

We employ nearly 2,000 people in Flagstaff.

We make long-term medical devices.

We are the largest division of a nearly three billion dollar privately held company. So we're a significant economic force in northern Arizona.

Our biggest business concern is recruiting and retaining qualified employees.

So how you might ask does redistricting affect that.

It affects it in two ways.

One is the need for a competitive district.

Our definition of competitive is within five percent, Rs, Ds, and I's, which we believe will bring
the best people and the best ideas into the problem-solving process for both our state and our nation. We think good people and good ideas are essential.

Our second goal, and this relates mainly to legislative districts, is creating a district where our representative will sit on committees relevant to our business interests, ways and means, transportation, education, economic development.

These are committees that matter to Gore and to Flagstaff.

Flagstaff has the highest per capita income in the state, has the highest education level of the state.

That helps us attract and retain people.

But, we need, we need representatives who are committed to keeping that momentum going, who will sit on committees that represent business interests, and be responsive to the Flagstaff business community. As you draw your legislative districts for the state, we ask that you keep the need for business representation in mind, especially in that northern part of the state.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Stephanie McKinney, vice chairman, from Flagstaff Forty.

Our next speaker will be J.R. Murray, chairman
Flagstaff Forty.

STEPHANIE MCKINNEY: Good afternoon, commissioners. My name is Stephanie McKinney, also representing Flagstaff Forty.

I want to first of all thank you for the time that you're taking to do this.

I mean, as interesting it is for us sitting in the audience watching work that you're doing, we understand that it's time consuming and takes a lot of capacity to sit through these things and to come up with decisions that you're making. That doesn't go unnoticed.

I'd like to tell you, first of all, why I'm interested, and I am going to start from a selfish standpoint about why redistricting is interesting to me.

I've been a banking professional for 23 years. The role in the finance industry is basically to be the means that helps economies flow, whether that's lending, whether it's helping people get into their first home or any of those types of things.

That's really critical to me.

If we are not making sure that we're producing companies, that we're not creating opportunities for technology to advance or for people to have a good income to buy a home or things like that, that affects our industry in a big, big way, and also becomes an impediment to helping
our state move forward.

So that is one of the personal things that's important to me.

And now I'm going to come to a little bit bigger level, why Flagstaff Forty is interested in this.

We are interested in not only issues that affect Flagstaff, the northland, we're interested in things that affect the state of Arizona.

We are all connected. Doesn't matter how many lines on a map. As our economy goes, we all go. We all have a place. We all have a role to help contribute to the economy.

So how that intersects legislatively and congressionally is what I'd like to talk to you about. Congressionally we have 435 seats in congress -- I mean congress in congress.

We're talking about the lines here.

There's only 15 competitive districts, out of 435. There's a lot of power. There's a lot action. There's a lot of attention that is paid to competitive congressional districts. What can we produce here in Arizona to attract more of that attention.

We're fortunate that in northern Arizona we have been part of a very large congressional rural district for ten years.
We've seen that pop back and forth from Republican to Democrat, back and forth. But what has come with that is a lot of attention, a lot of funding, a lot of things like that, that really have helped -- not only helped the northland and other areas of the congressional district, but it's helped the state.

So if you can at all possible be able to leave a legacy of having at least one rural competitive congressional district, you would have a lot of people thankful.

When you look at where you started today and sort of where you're ending up, I know there's been a lot of discussion about two competitive -- or two rural districts.

It may not be possible to have two competitive rural districts. I understand that.

If you look at the way the registered voters are across a number of places, it's not going to be possible to produce two.

But if you can at least produce one, I think you'll be doing a lot for our state.

Us in northern Arizona and anybody else who is in that competitive congressional district will be forever thankful.

But I think more importantly you would have done good for the state to keep that level of advantage for us.
In northern Arizona we've spent the last three years -- does that mean shut up?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It's okay, if you want to --

STEPHANIE MCKINNEY: That's okay.

We've spent the last years really building an economic development platform that is based on transferring technology and innovation from our university and other scientific efforts into new businesses. That's really what our role is in northern Arizona.

We've built that platform. We're leveraging what's going on in Northern Arizona University, a 1.4 billion economic impact to northern Arizona, just the university.

But when you start getting down into the discovery that's happening in those labs and with those professors and the types of things that are coming out of that, FD approval for new swine flu tests, identify sources of food contamination, delving into molecular diagnostics, next generation solar technology, all of these are producing actual companies, actual jobs.

I sit on the board of the technology incubator. We produced all over 500 jobs. Not just in Flagstaff. We're producing them up and down the I-17 corridor. We're producing them in Sedona. We're producing them in Prescott. We have a real role to play by being able to actively engage
this economic development platform that we're on.

And we really need to have representatives that really understand that, delve into it, willing to sit on the right committees, willing to make those investments of time and effort.

And, yes, it helps Flagstaff, but it helps the whole state of Arizona.

I mean, some of these things that we're developing businesses for, you know, they have a tendency to help in health care, in helping to find cures for things, helping to develop new motors that are going to be in cars in ten years.

These types of thing are going to help not just the economic platform of Flagstaff, but it's going to help the state, it's going to help the country.

We really need to have people understand that, and who can represent us in that way.

So I really hope that you'll take that into consideration.

And, again, we really appreciate the work that you're doing.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is J.R. Murray, chairman, Flagstaff Forty.
After Mr. Murray, it's Daryl Melvin.

J.R. MURRAY: Thank you, madam commissioner.

My name is J.R. Murray. I'm the chairman of Flagstaff Forty.

It is M-U-R-R-A-Y.

And I live just outside the city limits of Flagstaff at the -- on the west side.

And, first of all, I would like to remind you and those in the audience that Flagstaff Forty has been one of the organizations that began its work five months ago in this redistricting, and we've been following it very closely.

And Flagstaff Forty works in partnership on a statewide level with other organizations to improve the economic well-being of the state of Arizona and also the quality of life.

We believe that working together with our partners GPL and SALC and other groups on the statewide level are needed to collaborate and to work together, to make sure that Arizona comes out of this recession as a leader in the country.

And we've laid a foundation for that, but it's going to take a lot of work.

We also believe in good government.

We all want good government. Flagstaff Forty
wants good government.

And we also believe that we deserve a seat at the table.

And currently we do not have representation directly from Flagstaff.

And it's very difficult to come down to the capital, and work with the legislature, when we do not have our own representation in Flagstaff.

It's been mentioned on a congressional basis that Flagstaff in the last ten years have gone DR, DR, DR. And that works, when we have representation and we're on a first name basis.

We have a lot of issues on a national level in northern Arizona, public land issue, national parks, transportation.

And the need is great for representation from northern Arizona from the rural communities.

When we look at the legislative process that you're about to undertake, Flagstaff is the center of commerce, the center of education, higher education, health care in northern Arizona, transportation with I-40 and I-17, and certainly natural resources.

It's been mentioned how important it is for the representation to have a seat at the table, at the capital, and represent the unique needs of northern Arizona and
Flagstaff.

From a business perspective, we have unique needs. When we are not here, we talk about the great state of Maricopa.

And by looking at the map, and when you talk legislatively, it's going to look the same. An awful lot of concentration and a lot of lines down here in the city.

And even though many, many of you come north to get out of the heat and recreate and to enjoy the cool temps and the recreation, and we really appreciate that, we enjoy it as part of our economy, we want to be with you at the capital, and in Washington, D.C., working together to solve problems.

I employ over 500 employees.

And I'm undertaking a 25 million dollar endeavor with our company. We're going to create over 200 jobs.

Don't think for a minute that you cannot do that without talking to your representative in Phoenix or in Washington, D.C.

So for the future of our state and for our community, which is why I am here today, we do want representation.

When we look at the maps, we want to just make sure that it's competitive, our communities of interest are
there, in north central, northeast, above the rim, a little
to the left, a little to the right, geographically.

That's important to us. And we want the best
opportunity for ourselves.

So when you're taking into consideration your map
making for the legislative district, keep in mind that
Flagstaff has not had a representative in our city limits or
in our greater Flagstaff area for the last ten years.

We have a lot going on up there, and we want a
seat at the table.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Daryl Melvin, from the city of
Flagstaff.

And the next speaker after Mr. Melvin is Elizabeth
Archuleta.

DARYL MELVIN: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and
honorable commissioners.

Again, my name is Daryl Melvin, with the city of
Flagstaff. M-E-L-V-I-N.

First off, I want to thank you all for your
service to the state. It's been quite a lengthy day, and I
understand you're all quite tired from the week and the work
that you're doing.

But I want to express the goodwill from Flagstaff
in the work that you're doing, and we appreciate the
information that you're sharing with all of us, as well as
the comments and taking the information from the general
public.

In Flagstaff, like many rural communities, we
share and we talk often about values.

And the city of Flagstaff, in looking at the
values that the city has put together, its value statement,
which we continue to bring before the Commission, because it
helps us in addressing the details of the different mapping
scenarios that are being presented.

Those items that the City of Flagstaff values
continue to focus around maintaining Voting Rights Act for
the Native American population in northern Arizona without
regressing that population.

Other values that the city considered and spoke to
would be placing importance on maximizing competitive
districts, of which Flagstaff would like to be within one of
those such districts.

When we talk about communities of interest, you've
heard the Flagstaff Forty group talk about transportation,
economics, higher education, governance in natural resources
which include forest health and water issues.

Lastly, we also request that the greater Flagstaff
area be included in a single legislative district.
These are all important values the city continues to share.

When it comes to the details of how we apply these values, some examples would be for the EB scenario map that was presented this morning.

Communities of interest would, for congressional district, include Flagstaff in an eastern district, would be part of what was submitted in our mapping as well as our data scenarios.

And certainly sharing data on competitive districts becomes important.

When we consider the eastern district, examples would be for forest health, the Schultz fire and the Wallow fire, and how the restoration process is applied, that includes congressional support as well as state support.

When we spoke to the Commission, Mayor Presler a week ago, why the western district may not be necessarily a community of interest, she spoke to her personally coming from the Bullhead City area and her great respect for Mayor Hakim, but at the same time recognizing that Flagstaff does not share the same community of interest with the Bullhead City area.

When it comes to higher education, the City of Flagstaff works with public, private partnerships.

Examples that the Flagstaff Forty spoke on also
include the northern Arizona NACET program, which is a business incubator. That's a $500,000 partnership that the city engages in which creates statewide impact in terms of business creation and spinoff.

Other alliances that the city engages in include Northern Arizona University, the community college, as well as the county.

And NAU includes a world-renowned forestry program, which includes the mountain and the rim communities that Flagstaff considers part of its community of interest.

A week ago you also heard from Supervisor Lena Fowler who spoke about the importance of the regional Coconino County impact and about maintaining the cohesiveness of the county.

So in closing, I just want to reiterate the importance of maintaining the Voters Rights Act for our native neighbors in northern Arizona, the importance of competitiveness for Flagstaff, and that Flagstaff be a part of the district, our communities of interest with the rim and the mountain areas, and to keep Flagstaff whole.

And, again, I want to thank the Commission for the work you're doing.

We have seen the proposed draft schedule for some of the hearings coming up, and certainly look forward to seeing you in Flagstaff. And, again, thank you for working
us into that very difficult schedule.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much.

    Our next speaker is Elizabeth Archuleta, board member and supervisor for Coconino County.

    And the next speaker will be Jim Waring.

    ELIZABETH ARCHULETA: Good afternoon,

    Madam Chairman and members of the Commission. My name is Liz Archuleta, A-R-C-H-U-L-E-T-A.

    I'm a member of the Coconino County Board of Supervisors, and I come to you now on behalf of the chair of our board as well as my four other colleagues on the Board of Supervisors.

    I really want to thank you for your service to Arizona, and thank you for allowing me to present today.

    You've heard the perspectives of Coconino County on several occasions, and certainly this is not the first time that we've been before you.

    Today I come before you to express our deep disappointment that you chose not to move forward with the river congressional district version 8A map.

    It contains intelligent components, important --

    while considering the importance of two majority-minority congressional districts and being sensitive to the map proposed by the Navajo Nation and many of Arizona's Indian tribes.
We've urged you to include Coconino County in a district with the northeastern counties of the state.

We believe that the communities along I-40 share many of the same issues, have an economic relationship with each other, and form a community of interest.

Two days ago, this map was on the table as a consideration.

Now, 48 hours later, it is not.

It makes those of us in the outlying areas of the state be at a great disadvantage, even though we've been vigorously engaged in this process from the beginning.

We believe the issues we face in northern Arizona and northeastern Arizona on a day-to-day basis are several and impact the daily lives of our constituents when it comes to water, natural resources, regional economic development, ecotourism, transportation, forestry, ranch and agriculture, institutions of higher learning, rural versus non-rural areas of the county, and tribal nations.

And to some degree, all of these issues impact the entire state.

Some of our regional initiatives that you've heard about from previous speakers include SEDI, which is the Sustainable Economic Development Initiative, of which our entire county and several of the cities within our county are a part of; the Economic Collaborative of Northern
Arizona; the workforce training center of which we're cooperating with Coconino Community College; NACET, which was the technology center; the Water Advisory Council of the Coconino Plateau, of which I'm the past chair, and included Page, Sedona, tribal communities, Flagstaff, Tusayan, and Williams; and the NAIPTA, which is our regional transportation authority, of which I am the founder of.

It has been stated that the eastern rural congressional district in these maps takes in an extremely large geographic area.

And we would agree.

We understand that the population of this rural area requires that the district is going to be large.

We are part of a congressional district right now that is very large.

So we have that experience of communities feeling underrepresented in the district by the sheer size.

It will continue to be a challenge for the congressional representative, and in this case to adequately represent a district that includes Utah, New Mexico, and international borders.

In short, we are concerned that this district will spread the attention and resources of the representative and their staff too thin.

Now having stated my concerns, there are some
aspects of this map that we like, and I would like you to hear those as well.

We thank you for listening, first of all, to our view that we do not share a community of interest with the river communities.

We also thank you for not combining this district with the metro Maricopa County.

We also want to thank you, commissioners, for your expression of support for competitive districts. Competitive districts, as you know, give voters legitimate choices. And while we understand that competitiveness cannot be the main criteria for forming districts, it is an important consideration so as to give the citizens of our state meaningful choices in their representatives, both at the state legislature and in congress.

This district is competitive.

And we are happy that the proposed CD 1 district does meet this request that we have made and that so many others have made.

Lastly, it keeps Coconino County and the greater Flagstaff whole.

As you've heard from others, regional business, economic development, ecotourism, transportation, forestry, ranching, agricultural, and tribal interests are all part of our regional culture.
It is our sincere hope that acting as a Commission you will take into account our viewpoints as you move forward with what you are referring to as the Chairman Mathis EB map.

We have not come to these viewpoints lightly. They are the results of much conversation and deliberation with our constituents and colleagues in the region, even beyond our county and our county borders.

Please do not disregard our deliberations and our voices. We are here representing many.

Of course you will hear from them yourself when you come to Flagstaff next month. And we are looking forward to that.

We certainly appreciate your dedication, we appreciate the staff that you have, and we appreciate the opportunity to provide our perspective.

I'd be happy to discuss any specifics of Coconino County's perspective if you desire. I'm here to answer questions.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much.

ELIZABETH ARCHULETA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker, I mentioned Jim Waring. I don't think he's here. He was here this morning.

Okay.
Our next speaker is Hugh Hallman, mayor of Tempe, representing self.

HUGH HALLMAN: Also here from this morning.

Thank you very much, Madam Chair and members of the Commission.

First, thank you for lots of very hard and really thankless work. This is one of those things that like serving on a school board, once one does it, you begin pondering why on earth you ever raised your hand.

But thank you for doing this.

I'm here to speak primarily on two items. They are the concepts of communities of interest and competitiveness and how they impact Tempe with respect to the proposed congressional district.

Obviously you've spent an entire day working diligently to try to create some new lines. And I'm not in a position, as I'd like to be, to comment as specifically on the proposal that's been completed as of this afternoon.

I do remember from testifying ten years ago both before the Commission and also in the litigation itself that long discussion went into the order in which the priorities ought to be given to the concepts that are in the constitutional construct.

And they are, in my view, still the Voting Rights Act, equal population, compactness and contiguousness,
communities of interest, and geographic features make up the first efforts. And then one starts to tweak those elements of values to reach competitiveness.

That's in some ways the only way one can go about doing that.

And as a result, I'm going to focus my attention on communities of interest, because it's what impacts the city of Tempe and the folks that I represent as mayor perhaps the most.

In constructing a map, the communities of interest that are so distinct that they cry out for changes to the maps that are proposed currently are the differences between the city of Tempe and the city of Phoenix.

I'll just give you two examples because you do have lots of people who yet want to testify, but the two best examples I can give you are plain on their face.

The different interests that exist in the city of Tempe, the city of Chandler, and the city of Scottsdale, from Phoenix, with respect to the operations of Sky Harbor Airport.

Sky Harbor is owned by and operated by the City of Phoenix, and that airport is immediately on Tempe's western border.

The City of Phoenix then spends enormous resources protecting that and using it as an economic development
driver.

But the residents of the city of Tempe and its businesses, pay half the cost of the overflights and the pollution that are associated with that airport.

That's a very distinct difference that impacts significantly our congressional delegation.

And asking someone to represent Tempe, Chandler, Scottsdale, as well as a significant part of the city of Phoenix, in that effort, puts somebody into a very difficult position.

And it will wash out, in my view, the interests of those people who are in the city of Tempe in particular.

I am grateful that you have examined keeping Tempe as a whole together.

That's important for our community.

But the areas of interest and commonality that Tempe have are much clearer with the city of Scottsdale. Even the Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian community, parts of the city of Mesa and the city of Chandler.

The city of Phoenix and the distinct interest driven by it are so significant that -- the airport is one. Let me give you the second.

I also happen to serve as the chairman of the Maricopa Association of Governments.

As one example of the distinct interest that
exists between east valley cities, west valley cities, and the city of Phoenix is given by that chairmanship. All the officerships rotate on an annual basis now, from east valley to west valley cities, with the central city as a separate distinct entity.

The fact that the entire Maricopa Association of Governments representing all the municipalities in this county recognize that the city of Phoenix has a very distinct community of interest from all of the east valley cities and from all of the west valley cities should be sufficient to make the point that the city of Tempe and its east valley or what I really refer to as that central corridor community of interest is very distinct from the city of Phoenix.

So I hope you'll take that seriously in your deliberations.

With respect to competitiveness, I think the proof is in the pudding.

The current CD 5 has been highly competitive. It was held by Congressional Representative J.D. Hayward, Republican.

Who was defeated by Congressman Harry Mitchell, Democrat.

Who four years later was defeated by Republican Congressman David Schweikert.
It is relatively competitive now.
I understand and desire that it remain highly competitive, but please don't sacrifice the communities of interest that are so crucial to those cities to competitiveness and seek to solve that problem differently.

I wish you luck in your work, because this is not an easy job to undertake.

Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

HUGH HALLMAN: Any questions? I'm glad to answer if you had any. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Lauren Kuby, K-U-B-Y, if I'm saying that correctly, representing self from Tempe.

LAUREN KUBY: Good afternoon. Hear me okay?

So, my name is Lauren Kuby, K-U-B-Y. I'm a grassroots activist from District 17 right here, and I'm also the first vice chair of the Maricopa County Democratic Party.

I wanted to tell sort of more of a personal story about competitiveness and communities of interest, but I got my start in politics with JFK. Believe it or not, my parents worked in his senate campaign, and he held me for 15 minutes once. My dad was rushing to make coffee. Didn't make coffee too easy to get in those days.
So I -- that's when I think I got the political bug.

And then I was assisting committeewoman for my dad in Huntington Station, Long Island. And I didn't know -- I thought I had a real title, but then I realized, you know, 20 years later he just gave me that title so I would do all the work for him.

But I'm a 23 year resident of the Valley.

And when I came to Arizona, I really didn't get involved that much. I got involved in presidential years, because I lived in a rather uncompetitive district.

And I kept my activities -- I was engaged by my kids, and they were growing up, and so I got involved in presidential years.

And then 2006 happened.

And there's a lot of dissatisfaction with J.D. Hayworth, as he referred to earlier. And I saw some changing demographics that were taking a district that was not competitive and making it slightly more competitive. Although I might disagree with the mayor that it's in an academic sense competitive in terms of, you know, the Republicans and Democratic differences in registration.

So, anyway, we elected Harry Mitchell. And suddenly we saw there might be a chance.

And I was part of the movement in Tempe to really
engage citizens and fellow activists in a grassroots effort.

I was inspired by Harry Mitchell. We refer to him as the mayor of CD 5.

I joined Tempe leadership. I did that yearlong training program.

I joined the boards of Tempe Sister Cities, Tempe Community Council, and the Valley Forward Board.

I became really engaged in my community, and I owe it to that first involvement in Harry's 2006 campaign.

We've seen these changing demographics, and we see that LD 17 is now, is now technically, you say, is competitive. We're 36 percent Independent, 34 percent Democratic, and 30 percent Republican.

And we're only one of three competitive districts in the state, which is pretty shocking.

But I want to tell you what I've seen competitiveness can do. In my personal life I think I relay that, but also in the lives of people around me.

We have a really -- we probably have the most active and energized LD in the state of Arizona.

We've been told that. Maybe we're just taking compliments too easily.

But we -- I interact daily with people as young as 16 years old who are engaged in our process, with an 86-year-old woman named Beth Hoffman -- she's probably going
for hate me for saying her age over the Internet here -- who
is, you know, engaged in the campaign in knocking on doors
with me almost every weekend.

I've seen a competitive district -- and I am
talking about the legislative district being competitive. I
still say CD 5 is not quite that far.

I've seen how it brings on a higher turnout.

And I see how a community becomes engaged in
politics and becomes more interested in issues to the point
when our current congressman David Schweikert, he comes to
Tempe very rarely, but when he does, it's like, whoa, Tempe,
you really know the issues here, I'm very impressed.

I'll try and make it quick.

I want to also speak to Ed Pastor's district.

We know Ed Pastor represents a community of
interest. His district has notoriously low turnout.

My precinct, precinct 23, is one of the most
highly efficacious precincts in District 17, and I'm really
proud of all that.

And I think competitiveness is what brings
involvement in the process.

So I'm very -- I'm here today -- I took off the
day from work. It's a very hard day for me to take off.
But I did because I'm very disappointed in the movement
within the new bagel map.
I'm very disappointed, and I think that we need to have four competitive districts.

And if we leave this process with three, less than four competitive districts, I think we're going to see that we failed and we're worse off than we were in 2000.

And I feel this is so important that I just urge you to not -- to respect Arizona's citizenry and the 2000 referendum that passed. We wanted fair and competitive districts. And currently as composed we're not getting that.

And also one last thing. The Tempe community of interest, I would beg to differ with you, Hallman. I think there's a great deal in common working at ASU, along the lightrail, students from ASU travel, they're the bulk of the customers on lightrail, the bulk of ridership. And we see that the lightrail has been a big connector with Tempe and Phoenix.

And so I urge you to consider Tempe as a community of interest in alignment with Phoenix and the other areas that you're looking at for CD 9, and to tell you that competitiveness, it's not just an abstract concept to me. It's a very personal thing. And it's changed my life in a lot of ways.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.
Mr. Herder, do we need to take a little break for anything? You're okay? Okay. Let me know.

The next speaker is Barbara Klein, representing League of Women Voters in Arizona.

BARBARA KLEIN: Madam Chair and commissioners and whole staff, just like everybody else, I want to thank you, not only for your hard work today, but for so many days that you've put this in.

I'm representing hundreds of league members around the state, not just one or two districts.

And the League of Women Voters helped write the Independent Redistricting Commission initiative.

They advocated for it. Members stood on sidewalks collecting signatures. They made presentations, editorialized, wrote advertising.

You may not feel that you know what they thought when voters went to the booths and pulled their levers.

We know what they heard. And they heard about competition.

It was even in the title, which, as we all know, that's sometimes the only thing that anybody reads when they're signing their name to those petitions.

Communities of interest have become something not originally envisioned.

Recently in the Arizona Republic, three of the
original authors explained that this criteria was meant to protect true, long-formed groups that are easily recognized, not as a manipulation against competition.

And nor, I have to point this out, nor are the protected groups in our state, Hispanics or Native Americans nor are they communities of interest. They are a protected people, and it falls under a different category.

We are sensitive to the difficulty of this work and to the points that the Republican commissioners have pointed out about certain boundaries and equal population and rural-urban districts.

Obviously the whole basis of the Commission is to abide by the constitution.

However, redistricting is a political thing. Only competition addresses this.

In the 1700s there was a common phrase. It was, tell me where you live and I'll tell you what you think.

Well, this can no longer be counted on to give us good representation.

As our nation and state are more and more politically divided, competition is needed to provide good representation. Not to elect more Democrats or more Republicans, but just to represent more people.

We request that the Commission heed this very carefully.
And we thank you again for all your work.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: You know, I appreciate the history lesson on Prop 106 from someone who was involved in creating Prop 106, or an organization was, so I appreciate that.

That's all I wanted to say.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Laurie Bingenheimer, representing self, from Gilbert.

LAURIE BINGENHEIMER: Good afternoon.

My name is Laurie Bingenheimer, B-I-N-G-E-N-H-E-I-M-E-R.

I come from Gilbert, Arizona.

I know you have the most difficult task imaginable here, but it is such a critical task.

I am speaking simply as an individual. This is my third attempt to come to meetings and listen.

I came to one in July in Mesa. And it was a meeting that started out where there were a number of people who stood up and were so attacking of all of you, and particularly to Chairman Mathis.

And I thought, oh, my heavens, I'm only here, in
the words of my church, to be an observer for justice.

And so I applauded.

And what happened was that people started standing up and coming out of all of the audience to thank you and then to talk very eloquently, from the young to the old, about their need, whether they were Republican or Democrat, but wanting to have their votes count. In talking about being in districts where it really didn't matter that they voted. If they did not vote in the primary, it didn't count. Because coming out of our primaries are the people who represent us.

And that is so unfair.

Because in my place, Gilbert, people do not even care to listen to what I have to say.

And so, my point would be, in a state that's one third Independent, one third Democrat, and one third Republican, no one would think that from outside this state.

Outside this state, we are seen as a radical right wing state.

And yet I know all my friends that are moderates, we believe in compromise. We believe in people not having the answer, but working together.

And that is seriously missing from our government today.

And that, I think, people hear over and over, that
this divisiveness and the nastiness that I have witnessed
that you have had to take is so unfortunate.

So, basically my point would be is that I want to
see at least four regions where we can say these are
competitive areas.

I know that my area is not going to be
competitive, but I have chosen to live where I am.

There are things I can say, having lived in Mesa,
that clearly western Mesa belongs with Tempe.
The center of Mesa is a unique area of its own.
And when you get way over to Las Sendas, it is
another area of its own.

Other than that, those are the things I can speak
to as an individual.

I'm so grateful to hear all the other people
coming forth and so eloquently speaking. And so I will step
down quickly.

Thank you again for your work.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Linda Weitzman, representing
self, from LD 8, Scottsdale.

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

David Cantelme, representing Fair Trust, from
Cave Creek.
DAVID CANTELME: David Cantelme, spelled C-A-N-T-E-L-M-E, from Cave Creek.

Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Commission. Thank you also for all the hard work that you've been doing. I know it's not easy. I have not attended all the meetings, but I've attended many of them, and I know you've worked very hard.

Let me make several suggestions for you.

The first suggestion is a guide for decision making.

I'm going to make two recommendations under that heading.

First is, the simpler approach is the better approach.

When you have an approach that is extremely complex, complicated, wraps around this district, around that area, it's probably not a good approach.

Second, always look for the greater good for the greater number of people.

So if you have to weigh one interest against another, in doing so look to see who's going to benefit the most from it.

And if it benefits more Arizonans to go one way than other way, that's probably the better way to go.

Now, those two recommendations having been made, I
want to point out, that sending Coconino County east does not create a competitive district. It creates, in fact, a noncompetitive district, as at least three members of the Commission recognized this afternoon.

 Sending it west creates a competitive district in the east, and on top of that lets you draw a river district that is wholly rural and takes in none of metro Phoenix.

 You can draw the western boundary -- you have to come into Maricopa County to get your numbers, but you can draw the western boundary west of the White Tank Mountains, which is generally regarded as where the Valley begins on the west side.

 So for everyone who came up from Flagstaff, and I commend them for all the effort, to a person I heard them support competitive districts, to a person I heard them say you should have at least one rural competitive district.

 But if you send Coconino east, you will have no rural competitive districts.

 You will have gone from the possibility of three to two.

 And for all those who have experience with Proposition 106 who have spoken to support competitiveness, they would not agree with sending Coconino east if it creates a noncompetitive district.

 Last, the Valley.
I agree a competitive district can be drawn in the Valley. But it can also be done respecting communities of interest.

The current plan does not do that. There is not a community of interest between central Phoenix and Tempe.

Tempe does not want that in the main. I sat in court when Tempe's mayor testified seven years ago. It didn't make sense then. You heard him say today it doesn't make sense today.

A far superior configuration, which is competitive, would have Ahwatukee with Tempe, with Mesa, with Scottsdale. That will give you the numbers. It will be a competitive district.

In the east value with you have east Mesa, Chandler, Tempe, and some of the other unincorporated areas. That would be a compact district. It would indeed be Republican, but that's the nature of that part of the Valley.

So I would strongly recommend to you -- the mayor of Scottsdale has already said, we don't want Mesa with us.

The mayor of Tempe has said, we don't want Phoenix with us.

It can be done to be competitive without Phoenix there.
Phoenix itself has got a population that entitles it to two districts. All within the city of Phoenix.

You can draw that.

The benchmark district, as you have drawn, and a north Phoenix district, entirely within Phoenix. And if it has too take in any other population, it could get Anthem, Cave Creek, Desert Hills, that area.

And we had testimony that there's indeed a community of interest there. That's not many people, just to come within the perfect equality that's required by the constitution.

So I would support competitiveness. Eastern Arizona as configured is not competitive.

It is a mistake. It doesn't support the constitutional criteria.

And for the sake of giving Coconino County its wish, you displease Mohave County, Yavapai County, Yavapai County, western Maricopa.

If you put those two on the scale, where does it balance? It doesn't balance to send Coconino east.

Thank you so much for the opportunity to speak.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Kim Miller, representing her family, from Phoenix.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Can I make a quick correction?

When I mentioned that District 1 wasn't competitive, I was referring only to the registration numbers.

But if you look at the -- which I don't necessarily favor looking solely at those. I favor looking at the -- a combination of races, be the makeup of '10, and, and taking the, the registration as a -- as another option combining it.

And if you do that, you would make District 1 competitive, based on, on looking at all the criteria.

So I just wanted to make -- I want to clarify that for the record.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: So it's gone from uncompetitive to competitive now.

Just for the record.

Your view of it.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: No. What I said, I, I, I -- let me correct that. Let me say something.

You change your mind as well.

And I -- numerous times.

If that's okay if you change your mind, but if I
change my mine it's not okay?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Sounds good.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Just want to make sure I said that.

What I was doing is clarifying that I'm looking at all the data. Before I was just looking at GOP registration and compared to the other three registrations, which is -- that's not the only thing I would consider for basing it, for basing competition.

And all I'm doing is clarifying.

If Mr. Freeman wants to speak on my behalf, I hope he's not charging me, because he is an attorney, but I know what I'm saying, and I don't need someone to speak on my behalf.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, it goes both ways.

But, Madam Chair, if public comment is going to turn into commissioners commenting and asking -- and I've raised this before. I mean, I've got a lot of comments I would like to make off of some of the public comment that's made.

So, it's not fair, it's not fair to the --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Life isn't fair.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: -- public. Sometimes we allow them to have an interchange with us and sometimes we don't.
And it's not fair if certain commissioners get to make speeches during public comment and others think because it's inappropriate --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I'm not making a speech.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I believe that during this, the only time we're to speak is if we're responding to criticism or if we're directing staff to do something during public comment.

So we should try to -- and I don't think clarification of comments or clarification of past things we've said during the meeting counts during this --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: All I'm trying --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: -- so we should try to --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: David Cantelme referred --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We'll talk about it tomorrow.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: David Cantelme referred to three people saying not competitive, so I was clarifying something Mr. Cantelme had said.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I think I have a right to do it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's true.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay? Thank you.

Our next speaker is Kim Miller, representing her
family, from Phoenix.

KIM MILLER: Thank you, commissioners. And I do want to, again, express our gratitude for your work. And I know this obviously is a lot of work and a lot of thankless hours, and so we do really appreciate your service to the state.

And, yes, I'm just here representing my family and our interest in the area where we live, in the Biltmore -- I've actually lived in the Biltmore, north central, and Arcadia area for the last 20 years.

Almost grown up completely in Arizona. So we know the area real well.

We've lived in four separate homes over the time we've lived in those areas, because we've -- as a growing family, we've had to accommodate that.

And so we've just tended to stay in those communities.

We have really not gone outside of the Arcadia, Biltmore, north central areas, because we really feel that it just encapsulates our community. It's where we -- our friends are. We have our church there, our schools, the sports activities, the stores, my husband's work, and really most of the friends that we are in contact with tend to be in that area.

And so I just -- you know, I think it's so
important really in the legislative are process to have candidates and issues that come really out of our home communities. Candidates that we know or at least we know of.

And we need our legislative process to most accurately reflect the communities where people live and work and serve.

And that's why I'm urging you to also honor the importance of the fourth and fifth provisions of your mandate in this redistricting process. To respect those communities of interest and the city boundaries.

We just have so much in common with these areas, and even along with the areas in north Phoenix as well where we have a lot of family.

And specifically to address the possibility of connecting our area with Tempe and Mesa. Those areas, these areas out here really are completely different, in my experience and most of the people I know.

Even today at lunch I had to use my GPS to figure out what's out here.

And so -- but I started thinking of -- another commissioner made a comment about maybe a lot of families in Arcadia tend to work out in Tempe or they -- there's a connection there.

And I started thinking, maybe I'm unusual in that
sense, but I started really considering the schools. Our kids go to private schools. We have a couple different schools between our five kids. And really most of the families who come to those areas and who are in there really are -- live within that area or even possibly north.

But very rarely do I meet people from the east valley.

It just seems like a very distinct, different community.

So, I just wanted to urge you to consider that. And that being said, I understand you do have to follow the constitution and the rule of law.

And I think there's a reason why the communities of interest and city boundaries are where they are in that list.

I really -- I think competitiveness is wonderful, and I want there to be competitiveness, but not at the detriment of our home communities.

To me, if people want to get involved, then they have a much better chance of getting involved and influencing the political process if they're able to do that with the groups that they are most connected with.

So, you know, if we're invested in our community and our schools and our work, those are the people we're most likely to be able to influence and help to present our
ideas to where we can all judge those.

So thank you very much, again, for your time.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Ken Clark, representing Arizona Competitive Districts Coalition.

I don't see him.

Okay.

Kameron Hawkins, chairman, Arcadia Chamber of Commerce.

M. KAMERON HAWKINS: Thank you, Madam Chair and commissioners, for allowing me to speak today.

My name is M. Kameron Hawkins. Cameron with a K.

As the founder and chairman of the board of the Arcadia Chamber of Commerce, which was incorporated in the state of Arizona, Phoenix, in Maricopa County, in 19 -- or excuse me, in 2006, we formed a community chamber of commerce in Arcadia because Arcadia stands alone and is very unique.

The community is ideal for what it's known for throughout the world.

We have everything, infrastructure, schools, everything we need.

But it is a community in Phoenix, and it is not a community of any other part of the east valley.

I myself was raised in the east valley. I was
raised in Tempe, went to Tempe High.

Arcadia is not Tempe. It is not Scottsdale. It is not even Ahwatukee. It's Arcadia.

So the reason why I'm speaking here today, because I do not see how this community could be in parallel or even an interest of any other community, mainly in the southeast valley.

So I'm not going to take any of your time, but I'm here for your questions.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

M. KAMERON HAWKINS: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Pete Bengtson, representing self, from Pima.

PETE BENGTSON: My name is Pete Bengtson. I'm from Pima County, Catalina Foothills.

You all have heard me speak many times, and competitive districts is my thing.

So, this map is improving. I'm really glad that you're working on one map getting ready to go out for public hearings. But I urge you to continue work on it to increase the number of competitive districts in there.

I'd also like to ask if you can put these two legislative grid maps up tonight so I can look at them and do some work on that.

And thank you very much, and you guys are working
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Are they not on the website?

PETE BENGTSON: I tried to look last night, and I wasn't looking for the legislative maps. I was looking for the -- there's one that you were working on, and I couldn't find it last night.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, okay.

Great.

Our next speaker then is Jana Granillo, representing self, from Tempe.

JANA GRANILLO: Hello. As I was introduced, Jana, J-A-N-A, Granillo, G-R-A-N-I-L-L-O.

I'm a Tempe resident. I'm a native to Arizona. And I live in D 17.

I'm here to talk about or to plead my case and echo what many other speakers have already said.

Basically what I would like is to keep Tempe together, as was said earlier.

Also, in the decision criteria to think about the transportation corridor and how that has the potential for economic development, and some of the leverage that can go on for that particular corridor.

And, number two, again, to echo how important the competitive district is.
I've lived in Arizona almost all my life. Born and raised in Phoenix, and to Peoria. Went to school at ASU, and found myself here in Tempe, and don't -- do not plan on leaving.

One of the great things about where I live is the competitiveness.

I enjoyed being able to put my sign out in my front yard, and my neighbor's competing sign across the street, and also down the corner another sign.

And yet we all get together for our little Block Watch, and together we work on some of our little issues, whatever that is, within the geographic area. And that's just to illustrate on important the geographical area is and how we can get along and how important that is.

Also, as a semi-retired person, I've been able to volunteer in the political process, and do calls and, you know, call people and all those wonderful things. And I am learning about so much of what you all do here, and I just wanted to tell my story about some of the calls that range from why should I vote, because it doesn't make a difference, to, well, I'm just going to vote party lines, to folks that say, well, tell me more about what's going on.

And I think that is, again, reflective of what the political process is.

Being from Phoenix, my experience has been, why
should I vote? It's not going to make a difference.

And if you don't have a chance in pleading your case or representing a certain philosophy or value, then people do get disillusioned and they won't go out and vote.

That's why I think competitiveness is very important.

And, lastly, as I'm learning so much today, I had a hard time figuring out what percentage range was acceptable for competitiveness. Whatever that acceptable criteria is.

And to plead the case again, if we could have as much of that as possible for the state of Arizona and for the future.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Just want to do a court reporter check.

THE REPORTER: I'm good.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: You're good. Okay.

Our next speaker is Betty Bengtson, representing self, from Pima.

BETTY BENGTSON: Betty Bengtson, B-E-N-G-T-S-O-N.

And I too am pleased to see that the Commission is focusing now on a single map for the congressional districts.

I'm not pleased with all of the parts of the map,
but you're continuing to work on it.

But I am concerned about fair and competitive districts.

And I know some people think that it's less important because it's listed as the last goal, but if you have a map that fulfills all the other goals, and it still does not meet the overall -- it still does not meet the overall purpose of Proposition 106 as approved by the citizens of Arizona, which is to create fair and competitive districts.

So we will continue to be watching what you are doing, and I'll be interested to see the analysis, the data on the districts that you've drawn today to see how that all works out.

I'd also like to go back to community of interest for a minute and just sort of remind the Commission and the audience that the requirement to keep a community of interest together does not mean that one district -- that one community of interest gets its own legislative district. It means that you don't split the community of interest.

But one district will have many communities of interest.

It may have a rural community of interest. It may have an urban or suburban.
So, you just remember that single district is not a single community of interest.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Herbert Fibel, representing self.

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: The Reverend Oscar Tillman. Okay. I don't see him.

Julie Chaffin, representing self.

A lot of these folks were here this morning, I'm sure.

And I certainly understand that they can't stay here all day.

Shirley McCallister, from LD 9, Maricopa.

Okay.

Joan Chiazza, representing self, from Gilbert.

I'm sorry, it's John.

JOHN CHIAZZA: Yes, my name is John Chiazza, C-H-I-A-Z-Z-A.

I want to thank the Madam Chair and the district and the Commission for all their hard work and all that you're going through throughout the whole state.

I've lived in Gilbert 23 years.

Both my Legislative District 22 and Congressional
District 6 very unbalanced and noncompetitive. They have been that way for as long as I've lived there.

The Republican incumbents don't really have to campaign, show up at debates, or answer any of their questions on how they voted.

Noncompetitive districts are hurting the true fabric of our state.

This Commission was put in place by the votes of the people.

It is now up to the Commission to recognize where the noncompetitive districts are, come to conclusions, and make decisions based on facts, such as census, voter registration, voter turnout, and most importantly competitiveness.

Any maps that have come forward that do not meet this criteria, especially competitiveness, they should not even be considered.

Drawing up maps that only protect incumbents is not in any way balanced or fair.

By ignoring competitiveness in drawing these maps, the Commission is basically denying the will of the people.

There should be four competitive districts.

Anything less than that the Commission is not filling out their responsibilities and requirements.

Remember your goal as stated on your website.
To advocate four competitive and fair districts in the 2001 -- 2011 Arizona redistricting process, and maximize the number of districts in which either political party or even Independents candidates could win.

Advocate competitiveness is what the Commission should be all about.

Anything less than that is not acceptable and will not be the actual will of the people.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Bill Cheatham, representing self, from Paradise Valley.

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Lucille Sheehan, representing self, from Scottsdale.

LUCILLE SHEEHAN: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and commissioners.

My name is Lucille Sheehan and I live in Scottsdale, Arizona.

First I would like to commend and thank you. I've never spoken before. I'm nervous.

First I would like to commend and thank you for your efforts in taking on this monumentally important and complex issue of redistricting.

It is with all due respect that I am here to say
that I believe this map eliminates competition, at least the way it was when I came in this morning, in most congressional districts.

This decision you are making will affect all of us for the next ten years.

Competition is key in redistricting.
Competition is the only criteria that ensures fairness for the changing demographics that will take place over the next ten years.
We must take the politics out of redistricting.
It seems that some keep wanting to add hurdles to prevent our voices from being heard.
This is a crucial specific moment in our history, and we must collectively encourage engagement through deliberative democracy.

As has been pointed out, the split is a third liberal, a third conservative, and a third independent.
And yet there is one -- a one party majority in both Arizona's house and senate.

We need balanced and fair districts that accurately reflect our state's electorate. When a district is not fair, it causes extremeness in both parties.

In 2010 only 55 percent of the electorate turned out due to one party -- the one party majority and voter apathy. So we have a one party super majority.
When opposite parties’ candidates actually have to compete for the vote, they must talk to all constituents to gain their vote.

Our communities must be represented by people who will work for all of our issues, not just party principles.

We need districts that represent all Arizonans, not just the gerrymandered districts.

Competitive will ensure that we are fairly represented, and I believe that we probably should have four congressional districts.

Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Jim March, second vice chair, Pima Libertarian Party.

JIM MARCH: Hi, folks. I want to tell you a few things I know and then a few things I’ve got this sinking suspicion about.

One of the things I know is that Russell Pearce is in favor of a district that involves -- especially congressional map that involves long strips of districts up and down each side of the state.

The reason I know that is another activist overheard Mr. Mills say on the phone very excitedly before the grid map decision was made, very excitedly, yeah, we’re going to maps that start from the center outwards.
And, as you recall, in the debate over which grid map to use, the map that starts from the center outwards is the one that produced the two big districts either side of the state.

If you've ever wondered why John Mills can be seen wandering around the outer edge of the parking lot with the phone around his ear, now you know. It's from that incident probably.

Another thing I know is that when Mr. Horne's lawsuit first fired up, when he first sued you, there was some question as to whether you guys were going to have to pay your own legal fees or not.

There was actually a vote, if I recall right, among the commissioners. And it split along party lines. And about a week later, the two Republicans reversed themselves and said, yeah, it's not fair to, you know, have us paying our own legal bills on this issue. And I think that's probably the right course. Although from a strictly Libertarian point of view, I don't like public monies being spent on such things. You guys are volunteers. It would be unfair to make you pay your own legal bills. That's understandable.

Now, here's where it all comes together in my mind.

I'm wondering, lately the maps, especially the
congressional map, seems to be veering now back towards something that I know Russell Pearce would like.

I hope to God that Tom Horne's lawsuit against you and the threats of you having to spend your own money and maybe go bankrupt defending yourselves against Horne's legal avalanche is not somehow tied to pressure on how maps are supposed to be written. I hope to God there's no link between them.

Okay.

If there is, maybe you don't even know about it. But maybe that's a question you should be asking as you defend yourself against Tom Horne's legal assault.

You should be asking is this part of a campaign of pressure against us to have maps come out the way Tom Horne and his political ally Russell Pearce want it.

And I can't answer that question, and I doubt you can conclusively. Although you play have pressure one way or the other. I don't know.

But you should really be asking this question in the court process as it goes on. And I hope it never comes out later from some staffer's memoirs at Pearce's office or Horne's' office that, yeah, there was a linkage.

I really hope -- that would totally invalidate everything you're doing.

Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Mary Desio, from Pinal.

I don't see Mary.

Okay.

Our next speaker is Lynne St. Angelo, representing self.

LYNNE ST. ANGELO: Thank you, commissioners. I have one comment.

As I was leaving my house early this morning to come to the meeting, I had someone call me and ask me if I would ask the Commission, and it made me so I didn't have time to go back in and check the website, if the old way of doing competitiveness would also be put up. People are getting confused because the new numbers are very different, and they're having trouble understanding what it all is. And, I don't know, maybe it is up there. And I didn't go back to look.

And I am also hoping that maybe the map that was worked on today, it might be up so we could look at the lines online tonight too.

Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

I'm looking at Mr. Desmond.

WILLIE DESMOND: The Google map is up already.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. The Google map is up
already.

Okay.

Our next speaker is Linda H. Greene, representing self, from Pima.

LINDA GREENE: My name is Linda Greene. The Greene, by the way, is G-R-E-E-N-E.

And I reside in LD 26 in Pima County.

I've been sitting here wondering why I am here, because it's a long trek from Tucson.

This is my fourth time to be here. My third time at the mic.

When I first came and was at that first meeting about three weeks ago in Tucson, I was very dismayed to hear all the public outcry about how ineffective our two congressional districts were and why we needed to have three.

And as I listened to the testimony, and subsequently in these hearings, I have felt very strongly that the rationale for three congressional districts did not make any sense at all.

It does not support the facts on the ground.

The facts on the ground are, that we have had two highly effective congressional districts. We have gotten everything from Washington that we asked for for the border. Out of the two congressional representatives that
we have.

Also from the very effective work of the governor and of our state senators.

The whole argument for three congressional districts was built on a false premise. The premise was that we have a huge immigration problem currently in Arizona and the only way we could deal with it was to create another district rep.

And to do that we created this absurd strip of districts to touch the border, particularly on the west, removing Cochise County from its natural constituencies. As a Tucsonian, I frequently -- I have friends in Sierra Vista. I go to Bisbee often. People from Bisbee travel to Tuesday. We are communities of interest in our current location and activities in CD 8.

To try to say that the people who live in Sierra Vista and Douglas and Bisbee have anything really in common with the people in Flagstaff -- the people in Flagstaff spoke eloquently today as to what their concerns are.

So I came really because the people of Cochise County work and couldn't -- many of them couldn't be here to speak.

But I think you are creating a disservice to put -- to create on a false premise a district that runs
from the border with Mexico all the way north, and to then link the communities of -- along those borders, some of ranchers, Anglos, Hispanics, with the constituencies. So you violate four or five of your six criteria, because it certainly isn't compact. It doesn't link communities of interest.

Yes, you've done some of -- linking some of the northern community of interest, but you have done a terrible disservice to those of us on the southern border by diluting the power that we had.

And I would believe that the Native Americans would also feel that they are going to -- it will be very hard for them in the configuration that you have created to compete with the interest of Flagstaff and the interest of the people that are down in Cochise County.

I'm trying to figure out how it would work.

I thought some very insightful things were said last Tuesday in Tucson as people talked about the ridiculous nature of what you have created on the western border and how hard it will be to navigate it.

It doesn't make sense, and you're dealing with an issue that was false to begin with.

The whole idea of raising rural to the level of the six mandated criteria is ridiculous.

Yes, rural communities are important, but as one
of your commissioners said, they're not going to stay rural. And to raise that value, which is not one of your six criteria, and violate the others, you know, geographical features you're violating, you're violating -- by linking all of the folks on the southern border with the north, you're violating the true communities of interest. You're probably violating -- I don't know what the Voting Rights Act would say, because I think the Native American communities are not going to be pleased when they understand what the impact of linking those communities.

So I urge you to -- you may think I'm making you go back to the beginning, but when the people of Cochise County wake up and when some of the others wake up to what you -- what those maps actually mean, they're not going to be happy with this.

And they may wish that they had their old two very powerful, very politically active congressional districts back.

So I'd like you to consider that very seriously.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Barbara Njos, representing self, from Pinal.

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.
Patricia Hawkins, representing self, from Phoenix.
Mohur Sidhwa, representing self, from Pima.

MOHUR SIDHWA: Well, hello again, everyone. Mohur Sidhwa. You know the spelling.
I don't even know where to begin.
We had two grid maps.
We had thrown this one with the two bizarre looking districts as being just untenable. But that's what we wound up with.

What was the point of going through hearings and us making comments over the last four months?
Because I have been.
I have quit -- almost quit my business to be doing this stuff.

And we come down to this?
The First Nations approached you with calmness and with powerful arguments for their district.

They were ignored.
The border has been and will continue to be a lucrative ping pong ball for politicians. You know that. I know that. And yet it is being used, that little ten-mile stretch or whatever, that is so bizarre.

How can you balance the interest of the northern state, northern part of our state with Nogales. What the heck do they have in common with Nogales, Rio Rico, places
like that?

I don't know.

Or at least the western district. I'm basically really upset about the western, because another thing that winds up happening is we lose clout in southern Arizona.

Once again, the great state of Maricopa has taken over.

Please, sir, can we have some more. Dickens.

I shouldn't have to say this.

And the more equity you're putting into making these maps -- and I know you're all spending a lot of time, and it's mind numbing what you're doing. Thank you. The more equity you put into it, the less likely you are to go back to 7A or to the other maps that we've been working on.

It really does cut the clout of southern Arizona.

Three of you are from southern Arizona. Think about it. What are you doing to us?

Commissioner Stertz sang an aria about the importance of competitiveness.

I wish for him to please sing it and understand it and please make sure that we wind up with at least three to four competitive districts, and really competitive districts.
I know that theoretically he believes it.

You have to put your own political whateveres aside to go for it.

It's really pathetic that we, in a democracy, are clamoring for more than one competitive district.

I saw one, and that's, I think, Mrs. McNulty's. And that's being ripped apart.

I'm sure it will remain competitive, but one? Maybe one and a half? As the demographics change.

Maybe I feel more strongly about it because I grew up in a part of the world where we didn't have competition and where the election results were a foregone conclusion, as they are these days in Arizona.

We live in a democracy, and that's what brought me here.

Don't do this to me. Don't do this to all of us. It really does kill civic engagement. Some people have talked about that.

And it's interesting. People are whining about not wanting to have that side of the street as neighbors, or that side of the street as neighbors in Maricopa County, and there you are paying attention to them, and not realizing that you're making a district going all the way from the northern border pretty much almost to end of the southern border.
Why are we getting such short shift? What don't you like about the southern border?

And this time around, I'm not going to apologize for losing my temper.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Leonard Gorman, executive director Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission.

LEONARD GORMAN: Good afternoon, members of the Commission.

Good to be here. My name is Leonard Gorman, last name, G-O-R-M-A-N, first name, L-E-O-N-A-R-D.

I, as a Navajo person, come from a people that have contributed to this nation abundantly. And have made contributions not only to this wonderful state, but also the states of Utah, New Mexico, as the Navajo Nation lands cover those areas also.

The Navajo people have contributed immensely to the freedom of the American public. The people have been called upon in the World Wars to serve on behalf of the United States government.

The Navajo Nation approved its members to become personnel in the military forces.

And we always champion and admire a good sector of the military population, and that is a Navajo Code Talkers.
Because of the Navajo Code Talkers' service in the military, we are here deliberating, discussing freely our desires and wants.

That's the population, that's the people I came from as a Navajo person.

And we have been here since time immemorial and have been subjected to a lot of unnecessary, I think, policies that have wronged my people and indigenous peoples in this world.

We continue to struggle because of those atrocities that have been committed since the inception of the 50 states in this union, and we all recognize that.

And as a human rights advocate, we struggle to ensure that those are recognized, those issues are recognized and respected.

With that, the Navajo Nation has submitted two congressional plans. NN1 and NN2.

As I watched your deliberation, those two maps are still in play. And is really a -- one of the aspects of the Congressional District 1.

In the Navajo Nations' proposal, we respectfully requested that the city of Flagstaff be a part of Congressional District 1. Because the Navajo people and the Navajo Nation hold the border town communities as a part of their community of interests.
We conduct a lot of commerce.

The iterations that have been presented from the city of Farmington -- I mean the city of Flagstaff, the Flagstaff Forty, we concur with their concerns and their request to ensure what the city of Flagstaff is in District 1, Congressional District 1.

We also make the request that there would be some tweaking that would be put forward in the iteration that you have just completed this afternoon.

In Congressional District 1, the Navajo Nation has repeatedly requested that the Gila River community be a part of Congressional District 1.

In our presentations to the variety, the various indigenous nations in the state of Arizona, we have not received any opposition at all to our two maps, two congressional maps.

And I think that speaks volumes for us as a Navajo Nation and as an entity of -- as a sovereign nation of the world.

So we respectfully request that the Gila River community be part of CD 1.

And I think the tweaking that you have done with the Cornville and also with the Sedona area, there's opportunities that can accomplish a balanced CD 1 district. Obviously there's going to be some more tweaking in the
area, perhaps between the Ak-Chin -- the Ak-Chin community, south of Gila River, and in right in between those areas there's some opportunities to tweak and reach that ideal number.

So, again, to recap, I think that opportunity will provide to the Navajo Nation and Navajo people an increase in the Native American voting age population.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Rica Tracy.

Sorry, Rick Tracy.

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Judy Whitehouse, from LD 15.

JUDY WHITEHOUSE: Good afternoon. Thank you so much for all your work. I'm truly impressed with what you're doing.

I am overawed at my fellow citizens' eloquence and wisdom as they talk to you all today about the -- and their passion about having a democracy that we can count on, which depends on the really important element of competitiveness that makes most difference to me, which is fairness.

We all hate contests where the bully starts ten paces ahead and wins.

I mean, you know, what kind of a contest is that?
So, please, listen to our citizens, the ones from Flagstaff, the ones from Tucson, the ones from Gilbert and Scottsdale, and Phoenix, that's where I'm from.

LD 15 right now is so split up. I'm practically the only member of my congressional -- my legislative district who is in District 5. Everybody else is in four or three. And then some are even in two.

I mean, that is such a crazy district.

Please listen to the wisdom of your fellow Arizonans.

Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Lauren Bernally, representing Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission.

LAUREN BERNALLY: Good evening, commissioners, Madam Chair, commissioners.

As indicated, I'm Lauren Bernally. Spelling on my name is L-A-U-R-E-N. Bernally, B, as in boy, E-R-N-A-L-L-Y.

I come to you to talk about a very important component of the Voters Rights Act.

I have a little bit about myself. I started out as a social worker with the Navajo Nation, and we covered a vast area, beginning way over by Alamo, all the way into Tuba City, all the way up north to Utah area. And I've had extensive experience in working with the people.
I was a college administrator, a hospital administrator, and eventually ended up here with the Navajo Nation Human Rights.

But I wanted to speak a little bit about a component of the Voter Rights Act, a protection, its effectiveness to the voter.

I'd like to talk a little bit about the sense of what it's like to be a voter, a Navajo voter on a Navajo Nation.

Take, for instance, a voter here in Phoenix. They can easily get a mail-in ballot, fill it out, and submit it right away.

But out on a Navajo Nation, that's an entirely different ball game that they're dealing with.

For one thing, they don't have mail -- they don't have post offices readily available.

They don't get mail delivered to their homes.

They live in isolated areas.

They have a language barrier that they have to deal with. They don't read. They don't write English.

Many of them don't do that.

And, unfortunately, many of our young youth, the 18 and above, don't even know how or have difficulty reading and writing as well.

It's very evident in a lot of the proficiency,
English proficiency results that are coming out with our Navajo students.

Some of them don't even have rides when it comes to voting.

So all of these together, when it comes to election day, you have to take into consideration and how this impacts a Navajo voter.

They don't have rides. There's inclement weather. Roads -- out there we don't have roads that are paved. Many of them are dirt. Many of them become impassible when there's inclement weather.

Paperwork is often not accepted at some of these voter sites. IDs are sometimes not accepted by our voters.

The language, again, very important part of our nation is that we speak Navajo.

And many times we do not have the assistance that is needed there when they're voting.

One of the critical problems that we have also is that within the precincts in the chapter voting districts, the lines don't match up.

So we consequently have Navajo voters who have to travel anywhere between 20 to 30 miles just to vote in a chapter election and a state election or a federal election when those election days are held -- when those elections are held on the same day.
All of these factors have to be taken into consideration, and most of these factors, all of them, are out of the control of the voter.

They need to be considered. The percent of the voters, the Native American and the minority-majority districts, to permit Native Americans to elect the candidate of their choice.

So it does have impact. That's what I have to say. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you. That was well timed.

Our next speaker is Carol Berg, representing self, from Maricopa.

CAROL BERG: Carol Berg, B-E-R-G.

I say Maricopa County because my husband and I came here in 1972 and thought Arizona was a great place to live.

For one reason was he had health problems and he felt in Arizona he would be feeling better.

He didn't live that long, but nevertheless we came to this precious state and we liked it.

I'm here to represent the people who are retired, who have retired here, to come to this wonderful place to live.

And I see -- I'm also a volunteer. And that's a
very important part of my identity, to volunteer for the

city of Tempe as a tutor.

I have tutored students from kindergarten to third

grade on reading.

To tell them about democracy and having a right to

be heard is sort of -- they consider that a right, but,

however, I read our newspapers on a regular basis and I

realize that there was a lack of competitiveness in this

state and how people are voting and how antagonistic they

are to each other, there is not a right to be heard.

It is, it is controlled by factors that I don't

understand, and I don't know how to break into it.

But I do feel that if every district, not just a

chosen two or three that people are talking about and say

can those possibly be competitive, our entire state has to

become competitive.

This idea that other people across this country

ridicule Arizona for some of our extreme views, I feel is

something that we have allowed to happen, because we don't

have a competitive proposition, whether it be on one part of

our state with another or areas or one reason or another.

We've got to change that.

So our highest priority in this state should be

education.

Education of our young people, education of our
children, and not just having wonderful universities where people come from others states to be educated and leave, but our students should be -- companies would come here and work and start companies if they realized they had an educated workforce.

We are number 50, 50, in the United States of America for education funding. I didn't make up that. That is true.

We used to be, and somebody else was, another state was down there before, we used to say thank God for that state, because then we're not number 50. And that is not a statistic our state should be proud of.

We've got to develop a group of folks here from elected to our government who care about some greater priorities, other than some of these other foolish things like whether or not we can take a gun into a restaurant.

I mean, it just has got to change.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is William Heller, from LD 10.

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. The next speaker is Randy -- and I just can't pronounce the last name.

Can you help me with that?

Okay. From -- representing self, from Tempe.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, that was easier than I thought.

RANDY KEATING: Sorry. It's some bad handwriting there.

First, I want to thank the Commission for its service.

You guys are doing a thankless job, and it takes a lot of criticism, so about to bring some more, so anyway.

So I looked at these maps, and they appear to be, as the gentleman spoke about ten minutes said, an incumbent protection map.

It appears that this commission has basically reversed course and now is seeking to maintain the status quo.

And I'm pretty shocked by this, because there's been a group of people who spent the last several months demonizing you all personally, demonizing your family, calling you a liar. You know, questioning your integrity.

Even going as far as to put your address out on the Internet as if to invite, you know, some sort of vigilantism.

So when I see this map, I, you know, I have to agree with the other gentleman too. And it's not often I agree with a Libertarian, but it appears that the Commission
has folded under political pressure from the people that
forces the status quo.

And I further suspect this because where are they
today?

It seems that they are probably celebrating in the
locker room with some champagne, because they're not here.

If the maps had looked different, I suspect they
would be here.

But they're not.

Now, another gentleman said that we want four
competitive congressional districts.

And I think four is great. But can't we do better
than that? Can't we have at least four?

It seems to me that we have four now.

I know CD 5 has changed hands a few times in the
last decade.

Ann Kirkpatrick's district has changed.

Gabby Giffords was in quite -- Gabby Giffords was
in a very tough political fight.

Luckily she was reelected, but those are all
competitive districts. So I think to move from that amount
of competitiveness down to just one would kind of be a
slide.

We don't want to see that happening.

Finally I'll say that I think -- I agree with the
woman who spoke that the congressional districts stretching from the southern border to the northern border of Arizona couldn't possibly represent the interests of both the northern Arizonans and southern Arizonans at the same time.

It's just two different cultures, two different landscapes, different geographies.

And, if anything, that would, I think, just dilute the voices of those northern Arizonans and those southern Arizonans.

So I encourage you not to reward the kid throwing a tantrum in the candy store.

If we reward this type of behavior, it just begats more of this type of behavior.

So, you know, you're mandated to give us competitive districts, and I ask you to do that.

If not for the people of Arizona, if not for the will of the public, to do it for yourselves. Think of your legacy. This Commission will be remembered by the maps that it draws.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Marcia Busching, representing self, from Maricopa.

MARCIA BUSCHING: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and
My name is Marcia Busching, M-A-R-C-I-A, B-U-S-C-H-I-N-G.
I live in a Phoenix majority-minority district, District 16. And I first got involved and interested in this after having served on citizens clean elections commission for five years.
I made an application to this Commission and have stayed very interested and very involved ever since.
I've either attended or watched virtually every hour of your Commission hearings.
However, I haven't had the problem of traveling like you have. I haven't had the problem of trying to deal with all the letters that come in and everything, so I really, really, really appreciate the work you're doing and the time that it takes to do it.
I can only imagine how you've given up every single bit of your life other than to this.
Having said that, I want to say that I did watch everything this morning, and I think that you have made real progress today.
I was, I was appreciative of the interchange that went on between the commissioners and actually looking at single maps and moving to draw a map.
And as you go forward, the first point that I want
to make today is that I think that you should take a serious
tought and perhaps -- well, not just perhaps, but actually
direct staff and put on the next agenda to look at the
legislative maps that the Arizona Competitive District
Coalition did.

Because they -- the people that worked on those
maps spend hours and hours and hours doing exactly what each
of you did this morning and what staff has been doing over
the course of the last few weeks.

And they have reached and achieved districts that
meet all of the constitutional criteria in those winning
maps.

I know that for a fact, because I too spent hours
and hours and hours drawing maps using their software.

And I'm fortunate enough to say that I received an
honorable mention for the maps that I drew.

I'm not suggesting that you use my maps, but I am
saying that I do appreciate the amount of time that goes
into it, and how you move from one item to the next item as
you try and meet the population issues and then the numbers
for the voting rights, and everything else that goes into
it.

It truly is a laborious job that takes hours and
hours to do.

And as to the competitiveness issue, I wanted to
just mention -- I've got a couple more points.

And I haven't talked recently, so I'm here.

People say that the competition is last on the list. But keep in mind the Supreme Court said the direction that competition -- competitiveness should be favored unless one or two conditions occurs, does not, contrary to the Commission's assertion, mean that competitiveness goal is less mandatory than the other goals, can be ignored, or should be relegated to a secondary role.

So even though, I know, it's sort of the last thing there, the Supreme Court has ruled that it should be right up there.

The second point I want to make, and I will move along, is I would suggest that you start out and also put on the agenda that each of you list what communities of interest that you think are important as you look at the maps.

And, and perhaps even rank, you know, one or two or three that are important to each commissioner.

And because I can tell you that when you're doing this mapping, if you can direct staff to do specific communities of interest and they can lock those down, and then move the boundaries around based upon that, it really is helpful.

And I have heard various communities of interest
from various of you and of course heard it from hundreds of people in the public. And every community of interest is important, but at some time you have to make decisions, and each of you I know have ones that you feel more important about than others.

So I add that as a suggestion that you possibly put that on the agenda to do as well.

And lastly, I want to say, try and franchise everyone.

I mean, you -- I urge that even in the majority-minority districts, where you're going to have a predominance of Hispanics, don't forget that there's non-Hispanics there too.

And so the whole question of what grade -- what percentage is needed, I urge you to remember that minority of 20 percent, 25 percent, 30 percent, that feel like they're disenfranchised by virtue of compliance with the Voting Rights Act.

So, in summary, have each commissioner express their community of interest; two, look at doing -- look at the winners of the competitive districts coalition, particularly for legislative because there's so many more districts to be focusing on; and, three, do your best to franchise the non-minorities in the majority-minority districts.
And finally, thank you, appreciate it very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is Anita Christy, from Gilbert, representing self.

ANITA CHRISTY: Good afternoon. My name is Anita Christy, A-N-I-T-A, C-H-R-I-S-T-Y.

And I live in Gilbert.

And I'd like to thank you too. Can I buy you a beer?

I'm here as a private citizen, and I'm representing a few of my Gilbert friends.

And I'm also a precinct committeeman.

I do have a map to submit to you. It's been drawn by some Gilbert citizens.

And it's identified, and I have it here, as LD 22 legislative map of Gilbert and southeast Mesa. And I've just used some yellow highlighter to identify the boundaries.

Also, the town council is going to be discussing the redistricting at their next council meeting on October 6, and they may speak out as well.

But this map, it's not perfect. But it does some things.

It meets the numerical requirement.

It keeps all of District 22 within Maricopa
County.

All of it is south of the I-60, which is a natural boundary.

And it takes in southeast Mesa, which has been included within LD 22 for the last ten years.

Like us, they're a newer community. We look alike. We all have HOAs.

The south boundary is similar to the previous LD 22.

There continues to be a small southern portion of Gilbert that is in LD 21.

But in the interest of population, the map that I saw here cuts out portions of the northwest corner. And at the last minute, I heard from some of my friends. They didn't like that one bit, so...

I've got pink highlighter bringing them back in.

I just got a taste of what you guys are going through.

The map with its identification, the clear boundaries, isn't really the biggest issue for Gilbert.

Most critical is representation.

We've seen some of your maps that divide us into four or five legislative districts. And it would be extremely detrimental to us if we were represented by someone who must also represent another community with far
different priorities. And especially if we're the smallest piece.

And here's an example of what I mean.

Even though we are a municipality of 208,000 people, we are the town of Gilbert.

No other community our size calls itself a town.

I'm not going to take much longer.

It is important for us to retain our small town atmosphere and safe neighborhoods.

We also have more children under the age of five than any other community our size anywhere in Arizona.

We do not have much in common with primarily adult or university communities like Tempe or Scottsdale.

So thanks for the opportunity to express my views.

And some of my Gilbert neighbors gave me permission to put their names here as well.

Can I give this to you?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, please. Thank you.

We'll scan that and get it into our record.

Thanks for putting that together.

Mickie Niland, representing self, from Gilbert.

MICKIE NILAND: Thank you. My name is Mickie Niland, M-I-C-K-I-E, N-I-L-A-N-D.

I am also a precinct committeeman in Legislative District 22.
I'm here to say thank you, and it must be a lot of hard work. I can only imagine as we've talked about all these different features that you need to keep in contact.

One of the things as I think of the city of Gilbert is compactness. You know, if we start working on getting everything really competitive, we might start looking split up and everything, as far as a little bit. People call it gerrymandering.

Our district is that we have a very unique community. We are a very family orientated.

And I think it's important to remember the integrity of cities as communities of interest and try -- the map that you had today, we're all in one congressional district. I mean, we don't need to look at the small parts.

But we have seen several maps that divide Gilbert up like a piece of pizza when you get to legislative districts, and I would like to encourage you to keep some sort of integrity in the legislative districts when you look at Gilbert.

And I thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Susan French, representing self, from Scottsdale.

(No oral response.)

Steve Muratore, publisher Arizona Eagletarian.

STEVE MURATORE: Thank you, Madam Chairman,
commissioners.


I live in south Scottsdale.

A couple of points.

One thing I wanted to make clear, earlier
Mr. Cantelme spoke as if he was representing counties like
Mohave. And to me that seems kind of strange, because he
doesn't disclose having contracts with any of those
counties, and yet he speaks as if he represents them.

So that was bizarre to me.

Also I called up the Google maps file that's
posted, and I appreciate that, what you guys were working
on.

And I live on -- but am not a -- I'm not a
Native American, but I live on Salt River Pima Maricopa
Indian community land.

And from what I can tell on that map, where I live
and the entire precinct, Hondah precinct, which is
overwhelmingly Democrat, is linked -- lumped in with
Paradise Valley, north Scottsdale. And that is the
antithesis of linking like communities of interest.

It is insane to be putting those two communities
together.

So I wanted to make that point.

That's really been that long?
Anyways, I also wanted to mention that even though Ms. Busching didn't say that she suggests that you adopt her legislative maps, you should at least consider them.

So, thanks.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Ron Lee, representing self, from Navajo reservation.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, who's keeping time for us?

RON LEE: Yá'át'ééh. Good evening.

Madam Chair and members of the Commission.

For the record, my name is Ron Lee. It's R-O-N, space, L-E-E.

The reason why I say that is because people think my full name is, my full name is Ron Lee. Sometimes they laugh, what's your last name? That was my last name.

Anyway, ahe'hee, in Navajo. And thank you for providing me an opportunity to speak before you.

I'm here on behalf of all of my relations. And you might ask who my relatives are. Well, to begin with, I am of the Salt clan, the Journey People clan, the Black Streak Hair People clan, the Near Water clan, and all of the clans that came before my four clans, and the clans that come after our clans.

So in this way, you might say that the possibility
of having the whole Navajo Nation as my relative is probably close to concise.

It's within this context that I want to come before you to discuss the communities of interest.

(Mr. Lee spoke a Navajo phrase) I have thousands of relatives that live not only on the Navajo reservation, but also in border town communities and other tribal communities through an ameritas and in urban cities. But the majority of my relatives do live in border town communities, such as Holbrook, Winslow, Page, and Flagstaff.

What's caused this migration of many of my relatives into these areas is caused by several reasons, mainly jobs, education, and other opportunities that we don't have on our own reservation.

And a few or a couple of the major factors that took place in our history is the federal relocation programs that took place in 1950s.

Under the relocation and assimilation program, as I know my parents had to go off the reservation into, like, California, to go to school.

And then, of course, the more recent one is the Navajo Hopi Relocation Act of 1974. And that has caused a lot of our people to be relocated in border town communities.

And as a young boy, I lived in Flagstaff while my
father worked at the Navajo Army depot along with -- and that was in Bellemont, Bellemont, Arizona, west of Flagstaff, along with my uncles and grandpas and many other Navajos that lived and worked in that community back in the '60s and '70s.

Before I started school in Flagstaff, I can remember also the exodus of Navajo families traveling from the reservation into Flagstaff on the 4th of July to attend what we used to call the Flagstaff 4th of July pow wow.

And I paint that picture for you to show that there's always been this relationship, this interdependency between the Navajo Nation and the city of Flagstaff, as far as I could remember.

I know this relationship even goes further back during the time when the railroads were coming in. I remember my grandpas and uncles talking about the times that they used to go to Flagstaff to help build and maintain these railways.

While businesses in Flagstaff have come and gone over the years, the relationship between Navajo Nation and the Flagstaff community has remained constant, and it will always be that way for years to come.

I also advocate for K-12 education, particularly those that rely heavily on federal funding due to the lack of tax base on Indian reservations.
And many of those public schools are located on the Navajo Nation. And those public schools are one of the largest employers on the Navajo reservation.

And if anybody has shared with you, of every dollar that's earned through employment on the reservation, 71 percent, 71 cents of that dollar, is spent off the reservation.

And I know that a large dollar amount of money is sent to Flagstaff in that respect.

Not only that, being an NAU graduate myself, there are a lot of Navajos that go to NAU, and other universities, but I think the majority of our people have gone to NAU.

Not only that, I do serve on the Institute for Native Americans. It's a Native American advisory board. We advise the president of NAU in tribal relations. And I also advocate for the Navajo Technical College as well as the Diné College in the past.

And as I said, our relationship to the land, water, and our environment has always been and always will be and is significant because the essence of our survival as a people is defined by our spirituality, our traditions, our religious belief. Therefore we must be allowed to exercise our faith through our sanctuary, which is the San Francisco Peaks.

I'm almost done.
And it is important and it is significant that -- and it is imperative that we, that we continue to exercise our religion by maintaining our relationship with the San Francisco Peaks.

And the best way to do this is to keep the Peaks in the same district as the Navajo, as the Navajo Nation and other tribes.

In your deliberation, I would urge that you carefully weigh this well-established, long-term, personal, economic, educational, religious relationship with the city of Flagstaff and the surrounding communities there, against the idea of merely just picking up people within another district so you can fulfill those districts, so I would urge you to carefully consider these long-term relationships that have been established for years and years.

And that finally I would say that I do support the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission on the Voting Rights Act, the city of Flagstaff, the Coconino County, and Greater Arizona Success, and I believe that the 8A what-if map best aligns with the goals of my relatives from the Navajo Nation. Ahéhee'.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

THE REPORTER: Madam Chair, spell the clans.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can you spell the five clans?

RON LEE: I'll try.
Salt clan.  S-A-L-T.

Journey people clan, J-O-R-N-E-Y, clan.

And Black Street Hair people.  Black Street Hair people.

And finally, the Edge Water people.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Thank you.

THE REPORTER:  Thank you.  Appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Our next speaker is Michelle Melchiorre, from Fountain Hills, representing self.

MICHELLE MELCHIORRE:  M -- Michelle, M-E-L-C-H-I-O-R-R-E.

So, I was coming up here today sort of with all sort of righteous indignation of stuff that I felt like I needed to say.

And I realized that what I'm upset about mostly is me and my voice getting lost in this process.

But where I got lost when I came in, because I came from work, and I'm really late, and I hate when people cash something at the end, but I'm doing that today.

Is I heard someone saying these people came up from Flagstaff.

And I thought, what?

What's that mean?  And I realized that there was a gentleman talking about stuff going on with Navajos and Mohave County, and he said these people came from up
Flagstaff.

You can check the records.

But that profoundly bothered me because, what the heck.

You know, I live in Fountain Hills, and I am not going to pretend that I understand what the Navajo Nation needs or wants.

But I do understand that they came down from Flagstaff to visit you today.

And that was my big indignation in that moment.

But then I had a chance to actually listen to the gentleman that spoke before me, and he talked about his five clans that he's from. And he talked about the sacredness of the San Francisco Peaks.

And I am going to say again. I don't have any right to talk to you about what's going on with the Navajo Nation.

I don't probably have any right to talk to you about anything that's much outside of Fountain Hills actually.

And I will not stand up here pretending that I know what that sacredness means to them, because I don't. So I hope that you will hear those people and hear in their heart what they said and not listen to someone else that's up here representing someone who I don't know what
master he serves. And I don't care.

And God help them.

But let me tell you what I was going to say, and it's really sort of funny, because you -- we have really interesting testimony in Tucson, and I went, and I found the online versions of two particularly heinous testimonies.

And I going to read verbatim this last part.

I am not going to say who it is, and anyone that wants to check this out can go back and look in that meeting.

And this is not my viewpoint, but I am going to say it.

I believe that those people need to realize they're Americans first. I am sorry for the many wars that they have lost, but I think it's time for them to join the United States of America and be citizens.

The first sentence before that was this.

And I'm also very upset when I look at the current map to see the incredible threading of what is done to put the Indian Nations of influence together. How dare you.

That is my righteous indignation.

How dare you.

But, you know what, in the state of Arizona he can say that. In this country he can stay that. Because he's protected for the First Amendment.
And I will fight for his right to say that on any -- in any courtroom, on any bully pulpit that I ever had in my life.

But you know what, it's only his voice. But unfortunately, unfortunately the way these maps are being drawn now, you're giving that voice a right to start this legislature once again.

Because here's the deal. And I'm going to read this other sentence, and this hits home bad.

This is another testimony that happened at the same meeting.

Planned Parenthood comes in to speak, a bunch of baby killers responsible for the murder of how many millions of babies. That's not a person. That's an evil group.

This current legislature has said from day one of this new session they're going after choice. They are going after my right to choose what to do.

I'm old. I'm not having any more kids, but I will fight for every woman to decide what she does with her body.

So if you keep these maps and not give us at least four competitive districts, you're giving these voices the right to say what Arizona is.

And I'm asking you not to do that.

We trust that you're not going to do that.

And that's just for me.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our last speaker is John Mills, representing self, from Maricopa.

JOHN MILLS: Good evening. My name is John Mills, J-O-H-N, M-I-L-L-S.

I am not -- first of all, I represent me, not self.

The issue --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It does say me, but I --

JOHN MILLS: And I'll take my glasses off so I can actually read this.

I took a vacation day to be here all day.

So I don't represent my employer, my party, or my church. All of which have been accused of nefarious dealings before this Commission.

I would like to say I even represent my household, but I'm married.

I represent me and only me.

Now as far as my community of interest, I live up in what is known as the little Deer Valley area, which is roughly bounded by I-17, Pinnacle Peak, Carefree Highway, and 67th Avenue.

We're kind of a homogenous little group up there.

In fact, we even got together -- there was an LDS temple
that a number of my neighbors tried to fight against. They
didn't have any success doing it, and the temple is going
through. But they did get together, and they formed a
cohesive group on that thing.

So I think we're a group that should be respected.
As far as competitiveness, elections are won by
people who show up.

Now, I've heard that districts are so
gerrymandered that they can't get people to register and
they can't get people out to vote.

Now, there's only three offices that are
redistricted. The House of Representatives and the Senate
and then Congress.

So they won't get out to vote for governor, for
president, for any of the other elected officials that are
statewide offices?

They won't vote for school boards, bond and tax
issues?

This is an initiative state, which means that if
you have $2 million, you can play legislature and governor.

I didn't mean less legislator. I mean the entire
legislature because you can get anything passed as long as
you have a catchy sounding name.

As far as this being a great purple state, I think
mauve would be a better thing than purple, but that's me.
Because of the 12 statewide offices that are not redistricted, and everybody votes for, only two are held by one party and ten are held by the other party.

And, you know, that's just the way it's been for most of the elections, for the last ten years that's been the case.

Now as far as competitiveness, another issue.

I've heard it's one third, one third, one third, Republican, Democrat, and other.

Well, that's for people who the word close enough was meant for.

There's not -- there's only 31 percent, 35 and a half percent, and 32 percent. Those are Democrats, Republicans, and others.

In Maricopa County it's 29, 27, and 32.

But when you take the Hispanic communities out, it goes to a 10 percent spread. And in Maricopa County, it's almost a 14 percent spread.

So there is a huge number of extra Republicans that you're going to have to put around in these -- to try to make these competitive districts. And what happens is you create these huge uncompetitive districts, and maybe a couple of competitive districts.

So, finally, I'd just like to say, the Native American population, over the last ten years, the
population grew by about two percent.

And to almost 275,000 statewide.

On the reservation, it's not that much.

It's about 175 from all the reservation systems.

The state of Arizona grew by 25 percent over the last ten years.

And what this Commission needs to do is make sure that they give the Native Americans the same representation they deserve population-wise, one man, one vote, as all the other entities in the state.

And I thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

And I think that's the end of public comment.

We really appreciate everyone coming out today all day. Sorry to those who didn't get to speak who came earlier today, but we have their request to speak forms, and we'll ensure that those get into the record.

I believe there's one other item on the agenda.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, we don't need to --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: -- to talk today on that item.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We'll cover that tomorrow maybe then.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: There's a lot of, you know, talk about the issue of a particular map that you came up with using Stertz' and Freeman's ideas.

And I think those, those, those reasons or those concerns are pretty valid. I mean, someone from Tempe had mentioned that there was -- there's a lot of harassment towards you by the Tea Party members and that particular individuals said it's in your work, and I would tend to agree with him. And that concerns me.

I know that we, as the Democrats, we're not -- we don't harass people.

So you may not take our -- the voices or their concerns as seriously because they're extremely polite and, and they voice their concerns very differently than the Tea Party members did in Tucson.

So I hope that just because they're very mild mannered that you won't take their concerns as serious, because I do see that particular map as being a Republican map. And I even joking called it the everything Republican map, so I may call it the EV -- the ERM map, because I really do feel that way.

And I feel that a lot of people that were here today felt ignored. I think people in Flagstaff felt ignored. The Native American tribes feel ignored.
Hispanic groups are feeling ignored.

So I hope you take their concerns as seriously as you do the Tea Party members.

So whatever that's worth, I need to say that. And that's my -- those are my two cents.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: The laser pointer is still here, if you can identify the differences, the similarities between what we worked on today and the map I worked on. Be my guest.

It ended up today looking even more like what I could sit here and call the Democratic map.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, there's a reason why the Tea Party members aren't abusing this map, because they like this map.

And Commissioner Freeman is supporting this map because it's his map. So of course he's going to support it.

So, you know what, you may disagree with me. That's fine.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: That's my opinion.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Legal counsel.
JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Caution with this. Probably isn't on the agenda.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I agree.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Responding to criticism of the public --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: But it's not fair when one gets to do it and nobody else --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Life isn't fair.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, then I'm going to speak up too.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: So will I.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: And we'll be here really late.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm going to speak about it tomorrow, because I don't agree with Mr. -- what Mr. Herrera says.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I know you don't, but I hope you --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So we have one other agenda item, and I don't know if we're going to cover it today or not. It was the executive director report.

And I'm not sure that Kristina is here, and we can cover it -- there it is.

Okay. Kristina, do we need to cover anything
today that can't wait until tomorrow on the executive
director report?

    KRISTINA GOMEZ: So, the only thing that I wanted
to go over with you this evening was the status of the
second round schedule. But we can do that tomorrow, if you
rather.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: You gave us a copy of the
latest draft; right?

    KRISTINA GOMEZ: Yes, I did.

    And I also e-mailed it to you this afternoon. And
I have better copies for you.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So maybe if
commissioners can take a look at this tonight. And if you
have any concerns, let us know, and we can talk about this
tomorrow.

    Was there anything else?

    And you guys are working on the schedule for next
week in terms of the meetings? Because Monday we'll need to
post by tomorrow morning if we're meeting on October 3rd.

    KRISTINA GOMEZ: Right.

    So we have a location in place already, so we have
a tentative location here in Phoenix, same place.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

    KRISTINA GOMEZ: Fiesta.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Fiesta Inn. Okay. And that
would be Monday and --

   KRISTINA GOMEZ: That would be Monday.

   CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: -- then we'll have to talk
about the rest of the week tomorrow in terms of when we're
all available.

   Okay. Thank you very much. And sorry that got
cut short, but we can -- it's on the agenda for tomorrow's
meeting.

   Tomorrow we meet again at 9:00 a.m.

   And for tonight, that concludes the meeting.

   We'll declare it adjourned at 6:25 p.m. Thanks all for
coming.

   (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned.)
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