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CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Good morning.

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

Today is Friday, September 30th, the last day of September, and it's 9:15 in the morning.

Let's start with the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge was recited.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We'll start with roll call.

Vice Chair Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Vice Chair Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commission McNulty.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We have a quorum.

Other folks around the tables today are Joe Kanefield and Mary O'Grady, our legal counsel.

Our mapping consultant, Willie Desmond.
Our chief technology officer, Buck Forst.

We have a court reporter recording today's events, Michelle.

Folks in the back of the room, there's Lisa Schmelling, our public affairs coordinator, our public information officer, Stu Robinson, and Kristina Gomez, our deputy executive director.

So with that, we'll go to item 2 on the agenda, which is map presentations, and I think we have two today.

The first one is Leonard Gorman, executive director from Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission.

WILLIE DESMOND: We're still trying to get the map ready for them.

Is it possible for them to go second?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure.

We'll go to the other one first. That's James Kelley, chairman LD 29 GOP, and it's a map presentation for legislative districts.

JAMES KELLEY: Good morning, commissioners, Madame Chair, thank you very much for allowing me to address the Commission again.

This morning we are presenting an idea for legislative districts, the 30 legislative
districts. That's a statistic display and it gives you an idea of what we're looking at.

There are three major points on this map that I would like to direct the Commission's attention to.

Number one, there are four districts where the Hispanic voting-age population is greater than 50 percent of the overall voting-age population of the districts.

That would -- I believe that's 28, 2, 3 and there's one also -- there's another one in Maricopa County. So we have two in the south and we have two in Maricopa County.

These districts are well-balanced with very little deviation. Constitutionally, if it needs -- if you need to adjust, then there are opportunities for adjustment in these districts.

Again, it gives four legislative districts on the border, but we believe it's important to the overall health of the state of Arizona.

And the urban areas are well-represented in 9 and in 29, those being the heart of Tucson and the heart of Maricopa County.

Are there any questions?
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any questions?

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think we have some questions.

Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Kelley, thank you for having this prepared.

Do we have this available on something other than a static image?

JAMES KELLEY: Yes, it was e-mailed through the AIRC's Maptitude process to -- wherever it goes to, I think Mr. Bladine or to the AIRC.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And what is the group that you represent?

JAMES KELLEY: I represent Legislative District 29 for the Pima County Republican Party.

I have been working with numerous people in creating maps. Sometimes I have to fight with my own party with what maps we want. And I have made a lot of personal compromises to get to where we are at. Mr. Benny White is the one that did the number crunching and the analysis for this presentation.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: In this map, does it meet the Voter's Rights Act?

JAMES KELLEY: It does.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And does it meet balance of population?

JAMES KELLEY: It does. There are some -- there may be some districts that need to be tweaked and adjusted with some population centers in and around the borders of their district.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Did it start from the original grid that was approved by the Commission?

JAMES KELLEY: It did. It started with -- divided it up into the grids, throwing in the populations that were necessary and then adjusting from there.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And in regards to Pinal County, how many districts is Pinal County broken up into?

JAMES KELLEY: It looks like two. 11 and 8.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you for the quick recap without me having to turn my head.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other questions? Okay. Thank you very much.

So our next presentation will be from Leonard Gorman, Executive Director Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission.
LEONAR GORMAN: While he's getting the map working, Madame Chair and members of the Commission, good morning.

My name is Leonard Gorman, L-e-o-n-a-r-d, G-o-r-m-a-n.

While the map is being projected on the screen, Navajo Nation has presented numerous times in the past couple of weeks regarding the congressional districts. And as we noted during the public comments yesterday evening, that we would take an opportunity to look at tweaking the CD 1 as you had considered yesterday and have available on the website.

The map that I have given to you is now being projected on the screen is to add the community the Gila River Indian Community to CD 1. And obviously, there's going to be some tweaking that needs to take place when we do that. And definitely we are concerned about the Voting Rights Act for the Hispanic population.

Voting Rights Act compliance for proposed District 7 and District 3 are of primary concern for the Navajo Nation also.

So when we look at the tweaking from the current map that's posted on the website, you have
Hispanic voting-age population for District 3 at 55.32 percent. The proposal that we present to you with adding the Gila River Indian Community into District 1, the Hispanic voting-age population will be essentially the same as the 55.32. It's going to be 55.47 percent voting-age population in District 3.

District 1, as we had indicated before, Navajo Nation's primary interest is to ensure that there's a robust Native American voting-age population in that particular district.

So in District -- Congressional District 1, as it would be tweaked, Native American voting-age population is going to be 20.83 percent, which is an increase from the year 19.65 percent in voting-age population.

Both the District 3 and District 1 are within the reasonable deviation. District 1 would have .13 percent deviation. District 3 would have the negative .04 percent deviation.

So Navajo Nation has indicated before that as -- has made presentations to a variety of indigenous nations and leaders in the state of Arizona and we have not received any opposition to this proposal, Indian 1 and Indian 2.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much.

Any questions for Mr. Gorman?

Okay. Thank you.

I think that's all we have for mapping presentations today.

We have other one.

WES HARRIS: May I revisit my map?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure.

WES HARRIS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: This is Wes Harris, representing LD 6-28.

WES HARRIS: My name is Wes Harris. It's W-e-s, H-a-r-r-i-s.

I think for the record I live in Moon Valley, which is District 6, which is north of North Mountain, Central Phoenix. So I have no axe to grind on any of the Indian reservations nor do I have any axe to grind in Yuma.

I presented a map in Casa Grande last week, which I thought satisfied the requirements -- or the requests of a number of different fashions in the state, one which would be the Native Americans, who I sat through the Heard Museum presentation and I listened to each representative come up and say
they wanted to be together.

And so I put together a map that put them all together, which gives them a greater voice with one congressman than to be split up into six or eight divisions.

I also sat through yesterday morning's meeting where you really worked very hard to try to figure out where you were going to get the rest of the population for District 4. When, if you had dropped down and picked up Yuma, who has indicated they do not want to be separate, they do not want to be part of Tucson -- and correct me if I'm wrong, but that's what I remember.

If you pick up Yuma and put it in District 4, then you don't have to pick up portions of the population in Maricopa County. You can augment the district -- minority-majority district by just going up into the Surprise area. Surprise has a big population of Hispanics and would, I believe, satisfy the requirement.

The problem with keeping this District 3 like it's the Holy Grail has complicated the entire issue, as we've gerrymandered District 9 all around that to try to make something out of nothing.

And I really would urge you to go back
and look at that map that I presented because I think it solves all of the problems and satisfies more people than it doesn't.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

I think that concludes mapping presentations, so we'll move on to the next agenda item, which is review, discussion, and direction to mapping consultant regarding development of the congressional draft map based on constitutional criteria.

So those of you who are following us closely know that yesterday we spent almost all day working on the congressional EB version map, which is online. And at the end of the day Mr. Desmond supplied with us a splits report, an analysis of what those lines meant from a variety of different measurements.

And commissioners -- we all wanted to take some time with that and look it over. And we just heard this morning, too, from the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission, they've told us -- they told us yesterday as well about this tweak that they would like made.

So I would just open it up now to the
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commissioners to maybe give me your thoughts on what you think we should do today on that congressional map and any discussion or comments you might have.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: The changes that Commissioner McNulty had proposed to -- I think for filling in the donut hole, District 9, I do like those changes and I would like to see if we can go ahead and approve them today so we can start moving forward with the congressional map and hopefully get this done and then start working on the legislative map.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: The only thing about that is that the map has to work wholistically. So locking in any lines on any of the districts, I'm a little concerned to do just because I feel like there may be a need to, you know, move something even one street over or whatever it is to satisfy constitutional requirements.

So that would be my only concern. I think the framework that has been laid out, it's very workable and set.

We talked about yesterday there may be other ways to work on the hole in the center that we
filled in. I know that some commissioners did express some concern about certain parts of the East Valley.

So that would be -- that's my only hesitation with locking in a certain district in a certain way.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, I would agree with you, but you gave us those parameters and you created that map. It wasn't us that created that map, so we need to work around your criteria, which was to work around that uncompleted map or that donut hole.

So work on it -- working on it holistically doesn't make much sense now when we are only trying to complete the donut hole, we're not starting from scratch.

So that's why I was saying -- you know, the other parts were put in and now we're trying to complete a missing piece, and it would make sense to start completing that missing piece by adding that change that Commissioner McNulty had proposed.

So that's why I would say that it makes sense doing it that way since that's the way the map
was completed. It's not meet. And I think you suggested not make changes to the areas outside of that.

Am I still correct?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, until we had the center complete. And so --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: That's why -- we want to complete the center but --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right, and we completed the center but now just -- are there any little tweaks that we think need to be made such as taking into account the testimony we've heard from Navajo Nation a number of times? And I think there's just some cleanup in general that has to occur probably around the map to make everything, all of the numbers work properly.

In fact, I talked to Mr. Desmond last night and he's suggesting that there's probably an hour's worth of cleanup, at least, on just lines around the map.

But anyone have any other thoughts on this?

Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair, these were my thoughts last evening as I looked at it.
And I have the Constitution open in front of me because that's what I was going through as I thought about it.

We have to have districts that comply with the Voting Rights Act, that's first and foremost. And I think we've developed a proposal with a view towards doing that. And we have done preliminary analysis of it that suggests that the HVAC -- HVAP -- HVAC is air conditioning, and I do a lot of leasing work. So I talk a lot about HVAC.

So HVAP is maintained or increased and voting strength is maintained or increased. So I think this map addresses those issues. I think it's a good, solid draft from that perspective.

The next perspective is that we have to have equal population for the congressional maps to the extent practicable.

Now, there's federal law that tells us we don't have much wiggle room there, and I think we've spent a lot of time trying to get these districts equal in population to the extent practicable. And I think that's probably an area where Willie can help us tweak some once we get the donut hole completed and maybe we could do some of that now. Maybe that could continue through the comment
But again, I think we've taken a lot of care to look at that constitutional criteria. The next is that districts shall be geographically compact and contiguous to the extent practicable.

Now, I have to say to the extent practicable. What does that mean? Here is what it means in my mind. It means -- and they are all qualified by that condition.

So it means that each of these you do to the extent it's practicable in order to satisfy all of them.

So we come up with a -- you know, an end result that, to the extent practicable, does all of these things but there are going to be compromises on all of these things also.

So I think we've looked -- everything is contiguous, I think. We have done a great deal of thinking about and talking about compactness of districts.

So yeah, I think it's good draft in that perspective.

The next is district boundaries shall
17 respect communities of interest to the extent practicable.

My take on communities of interest is that a community of interest is a group of people in a specific locale that shares cultural and historical heritage and that as a group, participates in the specific process with regard to issues that are relevant to the -- you know, the level at which we are dealing.

And I think that's one of the challenges of this process is that on the one hand, we are really trying to build districts that make sense in terms of population, but on the other hand, not every community is a -- not every city or town or group of cities of towns is a community of interest within the meaning of that statute.

And I think we are trying to do both here and I think we've gotten feedback about what folks feel are communities of interest. And as I said, I think we've looked hard at it at two levels. At the kind of mega level of trying to make districts make sense and then at the more targeted level to look at are there specific communities of interest that should not be split.

One that just jumps out in my mind is
Saddlebrooke because we've heard so much testimony about that. It wouldn't make any sense to draw a district line that splits Saddlebrooke in half.

At the same time, I don't subscribe to the notion that the whole northwest Tucson is a community of interest, Saddlebrooke and Oro Valley, Catalina and Marana.

Those towns, you know, comprise lots of different people and lots of different interests.

So that's just my own perspective, but again, I think that in putting these maps together, we've -- and we all view this differently. But my point is in putting this together, I think it's based on a lot of thought that we've each given with regard to our respective -- individual perspectives on how that works.

And then the sixth goal is to the extent practicable, competitive districts shall be favored -- and I stress that word "favored" -- where it would create no significant detriment to the other goals.

We talked yesterday about the fact that this was in the preamble of the Constitution. This is what it was all about. I believe this is a very significant part of our charge.
I was looking this morning at the voting results from the ballot initiative in 2000. And, you know, this wasn't a squeaker. It was 56 percent of the vote to 43 percent of the vote in favor of a Proposition that would create fair and competitive districts.

So I think that, again -- and the Supreme Court that said -- this is of equal priority with the other districts.

So I think it's our job to do this to the extent practicable, which is to say, in the same way as all of the others, to merge it into our consideration of all of the other criteria, but we can't ride roughshod over the other criteria.

And again, I know we have different perspectives about how we should be interpreting what that means and whether or not we are riding roughshod. I don't believe we are at all.

I think that this map is a compromise, from that perspective, which on a commission like this I think makes sense. And I think we've given a lot of thought to that.

So in terms of -- with that background, in terms of where I would like to go from here, I would like to continue with what Chairman Mathis
proposed. I believe it's critical that we have two minority-majority voting districts that work or that give off every indication that they will work when we do our deeper analysis.

Obviously, if we do deeper analysis on any of these issues and we find out we have issues, we'll address those. That's what this -- that's what's the comment period would be about.

I think it's critical that we maintain the integrity of three competitiveness districts that we've built based on -- and around the concepts of community generally and of communities of interest, more specifically.

And I think in order to get to the finish line, that we -- I'm open to working within the donut hole, for example, to address the district in Southeast Mesa, as was discussed yesterday.

My only personal perspective is that I could not support a map that moves that district into the Tempe/Arcadia/South Scottsdale competitive district. But I certainly could support moving that district outside of those boundaries to make -- you know, to remove the second split of Mesa.

And I think, you know, that would make sense. It may make sense within the parameters of
what we are trying to do here, as Willie suggested, clean up, you know, from a -- I don't know, a compactness perspective. Maybe that little chimney district. I don't know if there's any way to do that.

But again, I kind of think those things can happen during the public comment period also. And I'm sure we'll continue to work on that. Because as we get comments about the map, I'm sure we'll need to continue to do that.

So those are my thoughts.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

That was a great summary of how we came to create this map.

Other comments from other commissioners?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I think with respect to creating these maps -- I mean, the Constitution gives us the direction. We need to focus on those requirements. It is now in a license to just draw whatever we want and it's not a license for us to draw favored districts first and sort of back out the justification for them later. Each line must be moved based on a constitutional principle.
You know, as a -- I'm a lawyer and I'm a litigator, and I often -- talking with colleagues, you know, will talk about a case in a generic sense and will sort of give our pitch on why we think -- what good arguments we have. And when the other person you're talking to says -- gives you a counterargument and you have to say, yeah, but I've got an explanation for that issue and then they will hit you with another counterargument, and you say, yeah, but, I know that but I've not another explanation. If you get too many of those, "yeah, buts," your case isn't very good.

And I think with respect to competitiveness, we are charged to favor it. The Arizona Supreme Court has said the Constitution means what it says. But that language, you know, to the extent there's no significant detriment to the other goals, is an important one.

And one of the constitutional criteria that Commissioner McNulty -- I don't think she missed it -- I was looking for my laser pointer -- maybe she did, is respect for municipal boundaries. And in this map -- you know, okay, this competitive district that has been constructed, we split Mesa. Well, yeah, but we're supposed to favor
competitive districts. We split Mesa again, yeah, but we are supposed to favor competitive districts.

At some point that language must have some meaning. And I don't think splitting Mesa three ways gets us there. I don't think a short drive on the Superstition and you travel -- walk the halls of congress and go through five congressional districts really passes constitutional muster.

I don't know in terms of the compactness criteria. We got some funny-looking districts here in Phoenix metro area. I don't understand why some of these lines are drawn the way they are. You know, that's a concern for me.

Could we work on this and try to fix it? Could we address that chunk of Mesa that needs to go up north and looping over this competitive district into Central Phoenix? Perhaps. We could try. But I think -- and I think we would need to get this into shape so that it passes constitutional muster.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I just wanted to add I appreciate Mr. Freeman pointing out that I did not -- I skipped over the respect county and municipal lines and geographic features. And I
intended to make the point that we spent a lot of time looking at that in developing this map. And every time we've done a splits analysis, it has essentially come out the same way.

So to the extent that we need to do that to the extent practicable, I think that the very detailed splits analysis that Willie has prepared for us has been really useful in showing us that no matter what way you do this, you're going to be splitting some things. And we have really tried to couple up with alternatives that -- I mean, we've spent hours and hours trying to come up with alternatives doing those splits that make sense. That isn't to say that there aren't other ways to do them.

And I think the Mesa situation is a good example. I think we can approach the splits in Mesa from a result-oriented perspective and say that those splits result from trying to maintain the competitiveness of a district next to them or we can just fix that.

We can, you know, recognize that that's part of a holistic problem, that we have seen maps in which Mesa is in two districts. So it's really not a consequence of gathering the communities next
to them in a way that gives those people competitive congressional race.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Desmond, can you zero in on the Metro Phoenix land? Then folks can see the situation.

So what I was talking about yesterday is, you know, could we start at the border of District 9 as drawn and move east along Route 60 and just, you know, grab population in a way that allows us to obtain a district that is more contiguous within Mesa and we don't split it as much.

And then we've also talked a little bit about this issue with the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission. And there may be some additional, you know, tweaking we would want to do there.

So I would like to hear from other commissioners as to how we might do this in a way that is meeting our constitutional criteria.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The exercise that we went through yesterday had two criteria to it.

The exercise that we went through yesterday had two criteria to it. One, was the goal was to fill in the donut hole, which included
expanding the population in CD 4 because it was short a little over 200,000.

And the second was to design around a district that Commissioner McNulty had created that was, quote, unquote, competitive.

The issue of competitiveness, we're still on the bubble on because we are still looking at a very small data set and not inclusive of the '04 and '06 data, which is still being married together.

Would those -- if we would take out the second of those two criteria in filling in the donut hole, which I did last night, I redrew an entirely different map filling in the donut hole, which looks significantly different, which went through every single one of the constitutional criteria and came up with an entirely different design.

But by working around this district that sort of trickles it's way along for a particular reason -- and we know -- I sort of -- I really get to hesitate when I hear at the end of last night's meeting very adamantly opposing the concept of this map and then the very first start of today it's like let's approve this piece of it. I hesitate to even consider going that fast.

So I think that you are taking the right
approach, can we another way. The answer is we can find a couple of other ways. The idea of competition -- does competitive districts create a higher level of impact on the quality of the representatives that come out of those districts?

We know that. We know that when we've got -- when we've got predetermination coming out of primaries for who the elected official is going to be, we know that we have a weakened representation.

But to create a district and then to have to be forced to design around that district, which is a very creatively designed, that your -- the District 9 that Commissioner McNulty came up with was incredibly creatively designed.

There can be a lot of different speculation as to the reasons why that district was created. But you can back into the creation of that design with all kinds of support of, yes, that there is a light rail that connects it, yes there may be a community of interest because some people drive from here to there.

There may be some more darker interests or darker things that might come into play about why that district was created.

There are other -- other competitive
districts that can be created and designed within your donut. And I would like to take away from -- take away the opportunity to say that if we go down the path of approving this created district, we can be rest assured that the darker reasons of that design are going to come forward.

And I don't think that we should have the opportunity to look at moving your concept forward a little bit more clearly.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I would like to hear what those dark sinister reasons are.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, let me also just jump in a minute because I want to just clear the record on what I had set out as framework on this EB map.

I had said, you know, I would like to see a map that has three border districts, two rural preserved majority-minority districts, preserve and keep Indian reservations hole to the extent possible and then finally, since we are creating a ninth district in this map due to our population growth over the last ten years, to create a competitive district.
I feel like that ninth district, that would be neat if it were, you know, set out as a competitive district.

As Ms. McNulty said, the preamble of this whole proposition is to create fair and competitive congressional and legislative districts.

And so to me, making that a goal is not a problem. It's kind of why we are here. And I agree that to build it, you have to do it in a way that isn't to the significant detriment of any other goals.

Ms. McNulty took that charge. She had created obviously her own donut hole area. And as part of that, created a competitive district.

A competitive district in our definition right now, at least what mine was in terms of giving everyone this charge, was just a district where no major party had a significant built-in advantage, and preferably no built-in advantage at all.

And based on the analysis that Mr. Desmond did on that district, on number 9, it's straight up competitive, 50/50, which I think is wonderful. I think America loves competition, and that is what we are about. And to have a district that we are creating new for the first time is not a
bad goal to have, to have that one be competitive
and one that's winnable by either party, depending
on the candidate and what people think of that
candidate.

So I don't think there are dark and
sinister forces afoot at all. I think all five of
the commissioners are very hard working and are
trying to do the best they can to balance six
competing criteria equally and it is not simple.
And we're also trying to take in all of the public
input we are getting and incorporate that into the
map too, to the extent practicable and all of these
other phrases that are in the Constitution.

So, you know, I do take -- I take
Mr. Stertz's comments a little -- I don't know how
to phrase it, but I don't like that. I frankly
don't think that that's a fair statement. And I
like to think that we are all trying to do the best
we can with what's in front of us.

So I would like to see if -- you know, I
would be happy to see what you created. And if you
created a competitive district, great. That would
be interesting to put up there.

But I think that the framework that we
set out, we were able to work with yesterday and
actually fill in that center and do it in a way that met the constitutional criteria.

So granted, there may be some better ways to do certain things. And I liked Mr. Freeman's comment yesterday where he said, you know, let us have the public tell us the error of our ways.

We're going on a road show with these draft maps for over two weeks and everyone can tell us all of the things that are wrong with it and what they think needs -- you know, if there was a neighborhood that got lopped off somewhere that needs to be with another census tract or census place, that, you know, we can make those adjustments and we will.

This is a draft map that we are trying to get input on. So it's certainly not the final answer, but it's -- I think it's a great start.

So you did pull up that for us, and I'm just curious -- maybe Mr. Freeman and Ms. McNulty, all of you, frankly, just looking at that District 5 and 6 and wondering how we might do those differently if we wanted to make Mesa a more contiguous east/west-orientated district instead of having that line coming down the middle in 5 and 6.

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

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Just as a point of clarification, I said that I did not want the impression that there may be any, not that I was giving any examples of.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: In regards to this as a design -- I worked on this last night. And the only way that I could have this work was to go into 9. And without being able to go into 9, it's extremely difficult unless you pull 5 further south and pull 6 further south, which puts more of Maricopa County into -- we end up splitting cities out in the West Valley.

So where you -- what ends up happening is that you start splitting Surprise, which we've been told by the mayor and council of Surprise and lots of testimony that they do not wish to be split, which, again, would be difficult to -- the reason to give justification why half of Surprise would be represented by the same representative that's representing the west side of the state and so and so forth.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It may be --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So it ends up --
everywhere you try to go, there's -- unless we've got the opportunity to move into 9, we end up with less and less options.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Maybe what we should talk about is the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission piece first and get that dealt with and see what commissioners think on trying to bring in the Ak-Chin and Gila communities into District 1 and what that would do to the map.

Mr. Desmond, can we sort of take a look at some of that?

WILLIE DESMOND: We can take a look at that.

I'm just wondering -- on here it looks like Ak-Chin is kept with Tohono O'odham.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, is it?

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe so. Okay.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think that's what Mr. Gorman had said yesterday that they were going to propose. And I'm --

WILLIE DESMOND: So we would just be moving the Gila River.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Great.

MR. KANEFIELD: All right. So taking the Gila River Reservation and adding it to District 1
from District 3 shifts about 11,765 people over.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: It looks like you grabbed Gold Canyon as well.

WILLIE DESMOND: Grabbed where?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Or is that color scheme? It looks like Gold Canyon is the same color as the --

WILLIE DESMOND: I think that's just the color scheme.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: How many people is that, Mr. Desmond?

WILLIE DESMOND: That's about 11,765.

Not about, it is 11,765.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: It doesn't necessarily impact -- there's few more areas that are then affected. In Coolidge, 11 people.

The district is still contiguous when you do that, but now District 3 needs to make up population. So the easiest would be to take it right back from 1 but we could also kind of, you know, kind of pass it along.

So I guess places 3 could pick up -- where it runs along the border of 1 would be down
here in Casa Grande or Maricopa or some of the unincorporated areas down in there.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ:  Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ:  We can achieve many of these goals but we are breaking out of your donut hole. So if you're giving us the opportunity to branch out of the donut hole, then we can achieve some of the goals that you have.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Yeah, I guess it would depend on the definition of branch out. Where and what?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ:  Well, we're out of the donut hole now.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  That's right.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ:  You've given direction to make that move. So what ends up happening is that -- because I've gone through this exercise -- is once you start rotating down, you create a district that moves its way -- allows Mesa, Gold Canyon, Apache Junction to actually connect, allows the 60 to connect, brings the district down south.

Instead of using the area that was just added to 1, it becomes an extension of 5 and goes
into Pinal County. And it actually works. Works for communities of interest, it works for transportation corridors.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Do you want to walk us through what those are? Just tell that again.

WILLIE DESMOND: Should I undo this change to the Ak-Chin? Not that Ak-Chin, the Gila River or is that the first step --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No. What do people think about the Gila River Indian Reservation?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think it makes a lot of sense. I also think that's something we could do in the public comment period because I am a little concerned that even though it appears to be a small change, we could spend the day kind of trying to figure it out and then we're going to get a lot of public comment and -- I do think it brings us off our parameters, and the parameters that you designed were designed to get us a map done.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I agree. You had asked us to work on that donut hole. What I don't want to do -- and I actually agree with Commissioner
Stertz, even though this change -- I probably would tend to agree with this change, I would suggest that we not make the change now and start focusing on completing the middle of the map and agreeing there and then when we do the bring this up to the second round public comments, let those comments be heard.

Because we're still going to make changes to the map.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Uh-huh. No question.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: And what I don't want to do is start making changes that will change everything else around the area that was already created and then have to mess again with the inside.

So I'm fine with taking those comments into consideration and then just go back, as had you directed, just finishing the middle and then going forward with the legislative map.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The idea about following public comment and the amount of -- volumes of input that we received both in writing and in verbal testimony, certainly did not create a single map. We know that. We know that we'll have
public comment that -- we've heard public comment
that Flagstaff wants to be in the west district,
we've heard public comment that Flagstaff wants to
be in the east, we've heard comment that Pinal wants
to be -- you know, have areas together. We have
heard comment that we can -- we're going to have to
decide on which public comment that we are going to
apply to.

But this donut hole that was created to
fill in is -- and the one competitive district
within that donut whole certainly does not recognize
all of the public comment and all of the communities
of interest that we have heard testimony and were
given counsel about.

So we are going at this, and I'm
concerned that we're designing this on a
results-oriented process. And we've now designed
it, we filled in the donut hole. We've given it a
competitive district and we can sort of back into
the communities of interest that we have to be able
to justify the design, but I don't like that --
personally, I don't like that process. And because
we are working within these fixed perimeter lines,
this is the result that takes place.

And if we are going to stay within those
lines and if that's the direction of the chair to be able to have this move forward, then that's the direction of the chair because we're going to end up having a split on that thinking process.

I happen to -- we went through the exercise yesterday and if we are not going to be able to look at other things -- we just heard testimony today from someone that has been giving testimony to this Commission for the last six months making a request.

And -- but again, it would be breaking out of the parameters of what you gave.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: When I think both Commissioner Freeman and Stertz have used the results-oriented process I would say the same thing about the three borders. I think we are backing into that. Commissioner Stertz, from the beginning, even before we started drawing maps, he already knew he wanted three border districts.

So I would -- he talks about that but he's -- I can easily accuse him of that and have justification.

The map that was created -- or that
district that was created, District 9, which makes it the only competitive district in Maricopa County, was created based on public comments.

Now, we can't take everyone's comments into account. But we can do our best, but as you know, Commissioner Stertz, there are so many competing communities of interest. It would be nice to be able to create a district for every community of interest but that's not possible and you know that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Of course.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Wait. I'm not done. What we need to do is just do our best. Do our best to use the six criteria and create fair and competitive maps.

So when you say that we're backing into this or -- you're not -- you're not telling the whole picture. You're not telling the whole story. Commissioner McNulty has been working really hard on the maps, as well as Freeman and us too, but you got to understand that we're doing the best we have with all of the information we have.

So I respectfully disagree with you. I think we can come with, up at a minimum, one competitive district in Maricopa County. I would
prefer four total, but that's -- the way this map
was drawn, it's not going to be possible.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Then I'll go to --
Linda -- Commissioner McNulty, if you wanted to jump
in, fine, but I wanted to clear something up on the
three border districts.

Just so that everybody is very clear
about how the three border districts started.

We have a -- we are constitutionally
mandated to create a grid map. From the grid map
that we created, we actually chose a very complex
process. It was incredibly scientific. We flipped
a coin and then we flipped a coin again and then we
flipped a coin again to decide on looking at a grid
map of how it was going to start.

The grid map that was approved by all
five commissioners to move forward on --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Actually, I didn't
vote for it.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: -- had three border
districts.

You did not vote for it. That's correct.

You did not vote for it.
Had three-border districts. It was based solely on -- and there was no question that I have had my thoughts from the very beginning about the concept to approach three border districts.

That was prior to the flipping of the coin which got us to a grid map design that actually gave us the original criteria.

We are mandated by design of the Constitution to take that grid map and to make adjustments to those lines based on six criteria of which competitiveness has equal weight as long as it does not bear detriment -- significant detriment to the other five. That's the order that we are required to follow.

So that's where it began. Okay? And that's where we are getting to right now. So I just want to make sure that we got that cleared up.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Can I correct him real quick? I just want to correct very politely.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm not sure that there is anything there that you can correct.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: As I said, I didn't note for this map, this grid map --
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That is correct.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: -- and to say this was a fair process -- we created two grid maps. Two grid maps were looked at. Both grid maps had three border districts. And you've been lobbying pretty much everyone since the -- probably before you were nominated for this, probably since you were a baby, that you wanted three border districts.

And to say this was a fair process, to say that I was given any choices is incorrect. We had two grid maps that were drawn that had three borders. We didn't have an option.

So we already -- I think the people that are opposed to the three border districts were already at a disadvantage.

So I'm going to respectfully disagree with you and I think Commissioner McNulty would like to speak.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair, I guess it was the flip of a coin that presided. It was a flip of a coin that designed -- that created the glimmer in my father's eye.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So thank for letting me know why I have been placed on the
planet.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair, you know, the three border districts kind of makes me think about the fact that -- we've heard dueling perspectives here on multiple representation. I mean, over and over again we've heard the themes keep us whole, we only want one representative as opposed to we want three border districts, we want three representatives to increase the strength of the representatives.

One thing that I kind of liked about the river district map and the fact that Oro Valley and Saddlebrooke and Marana would have been with the I-10 corridor cities, is that it would have given Metro Tucson three congressional representatives. And I thought that would have been a good thing.

I'm just looking now at the population of the city of Tucson as compared to the population city of Mesa and they aren't all that different. Mesa has almost a half a million people.

So, you know, I'm not sure that having three congressional voices for Mesa is necessarily that horrible a thing. You know, I'm sure during the comment public period Mesa will have a lot of thoughts, as will everyone else, and there may be
perspectives on another way to do this.

But again, you know, that's another thing that we could address in the public comment period.

I mean, there is a way to move that now. I'm sure we could put -- there's a square that I can see there that includes North Mesa, the north part of East Mesa, the balance of Chandler and Sun Lakes and Queen Creek -- or much of Queen Creek.

Once we do that, we got to figure out how to balance the population in Northeast Mesa that we've taken out of the district above it and then I suspect we'd have to take San Tan Valley with Apache Junction, Gold Canyon kind of move them around to the other side and then back out some population. We could do that. I mean, that's another way to do it and I think that's more or less the way it was done on the river district map, not to damn the idea of praise.

But, I mean, that would be one way to do it, but I don't think it's unreasonable at all, you know, to think that Mesa would have three congressional districts.

The other thing about one congressional representative after another all down the line, I mean, there are three and a half million people in
Phoenix and they are fairly close together. So there are going to be a lot of congressional representatives. This isn't rural Arizona, it's the densely populated Arizona.

And the last thing I say is, again, there are three and a half million people in Phoenix. It can't be -- we are talking about how we can't -- it's not proper to build around a competitive district.

But the reality is three and a half million people deserve one competitive district and all we're doing is saying that folks are going to have a completely level playing field in this district to encourage people from both parties, all parties, to come out and have a fair chance of providing the Metro Phoenix area with a race in which all of the issues are fully, you know, vetted and argued.

I think that's a really good and important thing, and I think in a city of three and a half million people, to suggest that what we should be doing is spreading out all of the Republicans so that all of the districts are Republican leaning or safe Republican, that's just wrong. That's not what we should be doing.
So in sum, I think -- I don't think there's anything wrong with the way it is right now and it will probably get fixed in public comment, whether we take the rest of today to fix it or not, folks will come on it.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: The Constitution also doesn't say to pack Republicans into heavily Republican stacked districts either.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: But, Mr. Freeman, that --

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Excuse me.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I'm sorry, I have to interrupt you because you keep saying that.

The inverse of that is that you spread Republicans out in a way that ensures that there are no competitive districts. And that is not what we are supposed to be doing.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: We are supposed to be following constitutional requirements that require us --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Favor competitive districts.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: To the extent --
there's no significant detriment to the other five goals. And once, lost in that was respect for municipal and county boundaries.

Tucson is a big city. It's only split once. That would be a minimal split. That would be following the Constitution.

Phoenix is a very large city. It's going to have to be split for a variety of reasons, Voting Rights Act concerns, and because there's just too many people. So at least we try to minimize the splits.

But there's no reason why Mesa needs to be carved up in three ways. You may say, well, it's nice, they have three congressmen, but the Constitution doesn't talk about that. It talks about respecting municipal boundaries. So I think we need to try to minimize splits.

As to the map we're trying to develop, the Constitution calls it a draft map. But to me, that doesn't mean sort of a rough draft that we're just very amorphous and we're going to change.

To me it means is what we are putting out to the people as a proposed map and it builds into it. Otherwise, we're kind of wasting our time getting the public comment on these lines, if they
are really kind of flexible.

It builds into it sort of a presumption. This is the map. Now public come out, show us the error of our ways. It puts the burden on the public to push the Commission off the lines because now the Commission sort of has a vested interest in the way the lines have been laid out because we've spent all of this time developing it.

So I think we need to work -- to me, I think we need to work a little harder on shaping up this map, at least before I can support it as going out as the draft map. And that may mean -- to me, one thing that comes to mind is the split of Mesa. Can we eliminate that split? Can we address the carving up of other -- like Pinal County. The carving up of Pinal County.

You know, the Constitution has the to the extent practicable language in there. Maybe some things have to yield because it's just not possible, but I don't think we've really explored all of the possibilities.

And if we haven't, then how do we ever really know whether creating the competitive district has caused a significant detriment to achieving of the other goals if we don't know how
the other goals really can be achieved. We're sort of operating in a vacuum.

As for specific suggestions as to what to do about the Mesa population, maybe there's some way. Maybe San Tan Valley can go into CD 1, and I think that I want to say 84,000. I don't think that closes the gap, but it brings us pretty close to closing the gap. And maybe then CD 9 -- it would be a small adjustment to CD 9 to close the gap.

Now CD 1 is going to be overpopulated but it could shed -- we could find somewhere else to where it could shed population. Possibly up north to CD 4, and that would allow us to perhaps back CD 4 off the West Valley a little bit.

It also would allow both the rural districts on the east and the west of the state to share in what populations -- a percentage basis, what populations they need to take from the Phoenix metro area.

That's one thought.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madame Chair, I just had an idea. Could we just try something? This has to be offline because we don't want to change anything that we are doing on this map.
WILLIE DESMOND: I can always go back to where we were yesterday.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm going to undo the changes to the Gila River.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: All right. That's a good view of it there.

Okay. Step number one would be to move the line that's the north boundary of District 5 to follow the Salt River Indian Community.

How much population is in that little area?

WILLIE DESMOND: There is 151,000 people.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Then there's a little corner here I would have to go to.

152,000.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. So we're going to make that part of District 5.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So now we're going to come south and we're going include all of -- now, do we have some of Mesa in District 4?

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

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. So if we
include -- we've got all of Mesa now, we've got the
rest of Chandler, we've got Sun Lakes, we've got
Gilbert.

If we -- and then let's come into Queen
Creek as much as we need to to get our population.

WILLIE DESMOND: You mean to give it up?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Yes, exactly.

WILLIE DESMOND: So remove the San Tan
Valley and stuff?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Yes. And if we
need to, some of Queen Creek and put that with
Apache Junction and Gold Canyon.

WILLIE DESMOND: Put that with 4?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Yes.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: So this is
essentially a boundary of the river district map
you're re-creating. You're putting those people in
with Buckeye and Bullhead City and the Colorado
River area.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Yes, I think that
is -- I mean, I'm not if that's the river district
map. I know --

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: It might not be
exactly the way it looked, but pretty close.

WILLIE DESMOND: So if I -- that takes 93
-- or 94,000 people out.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: So I'll go into Queen Creek next.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: All right. And how much do we need to -- I'll let you keep going until we get pretty close to --

WILLIE DESMOND: You need to get about 57,000 more.

Okay. With Queen Creek, that's about 30,000 more.

Now, I guess District 5 still needs to give up some more population, so we can do that either in Gilbert, Mesa or -- it's giving it to 4. Maybe some of the unincorporated areas crossing East Mesa. I don't know if that's --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Let's just try that. I mean, we would have to -- I don't know the answer to this question.

WILLIE DESMOND: So something like that would take about 27,000, but you are taking portions of Mesa again.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: For the purpose of this exercise, let's just do that to equalize the population.
WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So now how overpopulated is 4?

WILLIE DESMOND: Now 4 is 152,000 overpopulated.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And what about 6?

WILLIE DESMOND: 6 is about 154,000 underpopulated.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. Can we balance those out?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes. So you have some options. 6 can either go into, like, the unincorporated areas of Maricopa County or 6 could take part of 8, which then would take some from the western boundary.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: To me -- well, either of those makes sense, but I think it makes sense for 6 to take part of 8 because we've --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right.

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, Scottsdale is currently split several times.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Yeah, so let's fix that.

WILLIE DESMOND: Or else the other -- I don't want to put words -- the other idea would be
to take it from Phoenix, basically.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think my choice would be to fix the Scottsdale split as a start.

WILLIE DESMOND: So that takes about -- now 6 still needs to make up 138,000. And you can grab that from 8 probably, still. It took a little bit from 4 just to get that top part of Scottsdale.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: So I guess you'd probably would want to go through Phoenix. Would you prefer, like, the northern part up in Carefree, Cave Creek or would you prefer to go through and extend the lower boundary?

Where would you like to start moving over?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Well, my first thought is just east to west. I mean, we've got -- it looks like we have some of Central Phoenix that is --

WILLIE DESMOND: Just one second while this thinks. I'll cancel it.

Okay. So I'll show you kind of your options.

You can start grabbing in this area.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.
WILLIE DESMOND: You could grab down here or you could grab, you know, these areas up here if they fit better.

So does the middle make more sense or the top?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Well, let's see. We've got a little -- what, have we got a little bit of -- let's go west a little bit.

So we've got a little bit of -- is that -- what's between Phoenix and Sun City there --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, that he seems good, to kind of clean up that border there.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Just kind of clean that up there.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Go up to the Sun City border.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. I'll start there. That adds about 42,000. Should I accept that change?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would say yes for purposes of discussion.

And what do we need?

WILLIE DESMOND: Now you need about 96. I would think just from the look of it, it might make sense to try take from right here to try to
improve the compactness.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: I think you'll still need to add more.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: But if there's areas that I'm not understanding, let me know.

So that would take about 42,000 right there.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: And now I guess the question is, do you want to grow down here and go up or would you rather take Cave Creek, Carefree and put those with Scottsdale and the other areas over there?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: This is just instinct, but to me, it makes sense to keep the kind of new growth areas together and to gather into 6 more of the central part of Phoenix.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So --

WILLIE DESMOND: I'll just start -- we need to make up 54,000. That's about 51,000. That's 55. There is some areas that are unassigned that we can go fix.
But if I accepted something like that, now District 6 is a little overpopulated.

Let me just make sure I clean these areas up. That's an noncontiguous area and then that's another one right over her. It will probably go with 4.

Okay. So now District 8 is about 153,000 underpopulated and District 4 is about 150 overpopulated.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So we need to exchange population between 4 and 8; is that right?

WILLIE DESMOND: Correct.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. Well, let's start in the northwest and -- I'm sorry, which is which?

WILLIE DESMOND: So 4 is the western river district.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: But which is underpopulated and which is over?

WILLIE DESMOND: 8 is underpopulated. So 8 needs to throw out a little bit. Give some up.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. And we -- right now we have San Tan Valley, Queen Creek, Gold Canyon and --

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, San Tan and Queen
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Creek are all in 4.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. And Queen Creek is in two counties, right?

WILLIE DESMOND: Queen Creek is in two counties. It's kept whole here. In District 4 it goes into that little corner of Maricopa down there.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So they are in District 4 and what we have to do is balance out -- take equal population for what we've added there from 4 on the west side and put it in 8; is that right?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. Would you do that?

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And, you know, I would say start with what appeared to be growth areas in the more populated portions of 4 outside the city boundaries.

Where is Luke Air Force Base?

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe that's right here.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Yeah, I think that we want to --

WILLIE DESMOND: I think that's currently
with -- currently with District Number 8.


WILLIE DESMOND: So just taking some kind of rough cuts at it.

So pulling in Citrus Park, that takes about 15,000.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Do we want to take a break while Mr. -- I know Mr. Freeman wanted a break while Mr. Desmond does this?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: How about we take a ten-minute break.

It's 10:30.

WILLIE DESMOND: The one thing is I will want some direction on where to make up the rest. So if you want to take a break, we can come back to this in a couple minutes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I think --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: That sounds good.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: -- we'll take a break. It's 10:30 and we'll go into recess.

(A recess was taken from 10:30 a.m. to 10:49 a.m.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We'll enter back
into public session. Recess is over. The time is 10:49 a.m., and we were in the midst of making changes. We're on agenda item 3, making changes to the congressional draft map.

And I think Mr. Desmond was working through some things in the East Valley area.

Now we've moved on from that and are balancing population elsewhere to adjust for those changes.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So, Mr. Desmond, what I was asking was that you incorporate those communities west of Phoenix and west of North Phoenix and go as far to the county line as you need to go to consolidate those areas around Luke Air Force Base with Maricopa County.

WILLIE DESMOND: So we need to make up 138,000 people.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And we're staying within the donut; is that correct?

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm not -- I don't think we're within -- it's dealing with District 4, which is the western district.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. Which is --

WILLIE DESMOND: It's the areas yesterday
where we were kind of --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: It's that open area that we were trying to bring 4 into.

WILLIE DESMOND: So if you take everything in Western Maricopa and add it to 8, you come at out just about what you need, 137,367 and you need 138,239.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: So I'll accept that and show you what it looks like.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And we're not changing 3 at all?

WILLIE DESMOND: 3 is not affected by this, no.

So now District 4 is slightly underpopulated by about 2,000 people. And the districts that are overpopulated are 6 and 7. So 4 would probably have to grab about that 2,000 from 6 somewhere up here and then 6 would have to take a thousand of that and grab it from 7 or something is probably how that would work.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Does it have to be -- I mean, it could be anywhere long that north -- it could be -- oh, I see, yeah.

WILLIE DESMOND: But they are close.
Those are relatively small tweaks.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Like that last move didn't move any people. That just cleaned up the line.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: That's too bad. What's the little blue area north of the Fort McDowell?

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: How many people in Rio Verde?

WILLIE DESMOND: So if we -- so in this case if 4 took about 2,000 --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: What's that unincorporated census tract there?

WILLIE DESMOND: I'll grab some of those. That's 200. That's 344. That's about 1100, which gets you a little over halfway there. I don't -- just wanted to make sure I didn't split that little chunk off.

I mean, you could take this area right here and see what that is.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Doesn't add -- it's only four people, so it doesn't add many.
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Let's not do it, then.

What about Rio Verde?

WILLIE DESMOND: If did we that, that's about 1700 people.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So that's too much.

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, no, we need to take about 2,000.

That's too much. Let me go back.

I hope those four people are watching and know we're --

So we could take a portion of Rio Verde.

If we do accept this change, I'll show you what it does to it.

So now District 4 needs to make up about 900 people.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: When you say "make up" -- I'm sorry.

WILLIE DESMOND: It needs to get 900 more people.

I'm just looking at it -- Districts 1 and 3 need to -- if we didn't want to touch stuff in Maricopa, other districts that 4 touches would be --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: We're not going to
touch anything outside of the donut.

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, I'm saying 3 needs to go up, like, 470 people. So there is some small --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: We don't need to do that right now.

WILLIE DESMOND: So I think for the purposes of this, 4 being about 940 short --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: -- is probably a safe margin.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. So we're --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And 7 is a little over a thousand over?

WILLIE DESMOND: 7 is a little over a thousand over, yes.

So 8 would need to get a little from 7 or 2 -- 2 is -- so there are going to be some small line changes but nothing you would do at, like, the tract level or probably even the block group level. It would be individual census blocks at this point.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So for draft purposes --

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, if it was going to be the official draft map, I would recommend we go
down to a zero population deviation.

    COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: But these are things that you could look and kind of make recommendations to us? Because, for example, 7, we have to be -- that's the Voting Rights Act district, so we have to be very careful about how we do anything there.

    WILLIE DESMOND: I'm sure there's some areas around the edges where we could clip blocks and make it even stronger Voting Rights Act.

    COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: It might be good if you could spend some time looking at that time, if this is something that we pursued. I wouldn't suggest we spend the next four hours doing it.

    WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

    VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

    VICE CHAIR HERRERA: So this is just a procedure. So if Willie -- Mr. Desmond makes some changes, what's going to -- is he going to bring those changes back to the Commission for approval and then maybe Freeman is going to have his own ideas? How is that going to work?

    What I want to do is move forward either way. I mean, I want to be able to finish this map
and start with the legislative map since we -- I think we agreed to start the second round of hearings on the 10th or 11th. That's coming up in a little over a week, which is -- I suspect we will need at a minimum a full week to just concentrate on the legislative map. So what I want to do is finish this.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I agree with you.

Mr. Freeman.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Madame Chair, not to rain on anyone's parade and not to cause offense, but that's one ugly looking map. And if you notice, the only trade-off that seems to be contemplated here to sort of salvage -- this is all at the expense of this District 9, to salvage that district, is to put these Pinal County and Southeast Valley communities into CD 4.

It's now looking more and more like the river district map. If I was as nice as Commissioner Herrera was yesterday in calling it the Republican map, I would be calling it the Democratic map right now and I would be able to with this laser pointer, actually point to similarities in this map and the river district map, unlike Commissioner
Herrera, when I gave him the opportunity, would not point out the similarities between this map and the map I developed.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: What would you like to do?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, sure. What I had gone through on Tuesday was to suggest in making the trade-offs to sort of balance this out, I went through a process where we put the nonreservation portions of Gila County into CD 4. That underpopulated CD 1, which allows us to come in a little bit down here.

Then yesterday I proposed another way to make the trade-off, which was to take the communities up around Flagstaff and put them into CD 4 and that underpopulates CD 1, allows us to come in and make Pinal County more whole and to come up here in the Southeast Valley.

And either one of those approaches could yield the result that gets the population down without having to have this tendril, this sort of arching tendril to come over the Valley to pick up more of these suburban voters down here and put them with Bullhead City and Lake Havasu City.

So I've tried. I put forward proposals.
And right now -- I mean, we've got -- we've still got -- I guess we've eliminated the three-way split of Mesa, I think. I can't remember -- I think maybe it's still split down in this area, but we've still got the situation where San Tan Valley and Apache Junction, and Gold Canyon are with Buckeye and Goodyear.

Actually they are not now. Now we have this sweeping vast Western Maricopa County district over here.

So that's a problem. We've still got -- I don't know where -- other than to balance population, I have no idea why a lot of these lines are drawn. And we're even in a situation in Central Phoenix where I can leave my house and in a short drive, sort of tour the halls of Congress, I wouldn't really expect that living in a densely -- or relatively densely packed urban area. I would expect to maybe cross one boundary, but to be able to cross four, I mean, that strikes me as improbable.

So, you know, those are my thoughts on how we might -- it's hard to conceptualize because we've already moved the lines on what's on the screen here, but we could go back to what we went
through on Tuesday or yesterday to talk through those steps again to attempt to sort of balance what CD 4 has to take from the edge of the Valley with what CD 1 has to take from the edge of the Valley.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: The changes that Commissioner Freeman are proposing are to -- appear to me that they are ignoring competition again. You know, there's six criteria. Competition is just equally as important.

When you start making the changes that he's proposing, not only does it affect competition but it also affects the communities of interest.

Flagstaff was pretty clear that they don't want to be in the western rural district, they want to be in the east. This is the whole city of Flag.

We've had the board of supervisors here, the mayor here. Who else -- everyone from Flagstaff, except my professor, has been here talking about where Flagstaff should be.

I don't think Mr. Freeman wants to -- I think he's listening to them, I would hope, and they've all been pretty clear that they do not want
to be in the western rural district.

So that's a community of interest. We need to respect that. He's always saying, and I do as well. I do agree with him. So they need to be in the eastern rural district.

So that's one point.

And again, the changes that he's making, I think it's Apache Junction, including all of that in the eastern rural district, again, will lessen the competition of an already -- what I would consider a competitive district now.

I'm not happy with this map. I've said it before. I called it the "everybody Republican map" for a reason. We are not getting -- I'm not getting -- the people that care about competition and Prop 106 aren't getting what they want.

We weren't asking for a three-border district. We were asking for four competitive districts. This particular map may give us three.

So if you think that I'm happy with this map, no, you're wrong. And all we're asking for is to create that one competitive district in Maricopa County. We're actually wanting two, but the way this map was drawn out limits to us one.

So in the spirit of compromise, if a
competitive district is not drawn in Maricopa, I will not support this map.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I would like Commissioner Herrera to decide which sort of decision-making process he's going to engage in in terms of recognizing communities of interest. Because it seems like arbitrarily we're either to respect the wishes of communities to not be with other communities, the testimony -- or the public comment about Flagstaff not going to the -- some public comment about Flagstaff not going to the west versus the thousand points of light approach where as long as we don't split the Flagstaff area -- and what I did yesterday didn't split it. It took all of these communities and kept them together, you know, they work together -- they can work together with other parts of the state.

I mean, which is it? It needs to be applied consistently, I think.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I agree.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I think the changes that I proposed actually makes CD 4 more competitive. It makes CD 1 more competitive. So it
does work in the favor of competitiveness in making that shift like that.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: And, Madame Chair, just two things, and I'll be quick.

I am -- not only am I looking at communities of interest -- and I agree that we should look at it consistently throughout the state. But I'm also -- for that particular change, I'm looking at competitiveness.

So your proposed changes, by putting the entire city of Flagstaff into the western congressional district, not only does it hurt communities of interest but it also hurts competition.

I think the data shows that that particular district on the west is not competitive. Not competitive at all. And you put Flagstaff in there, their interests are not going to be heard.

So there's two criteria that you're messing with, not just one. Two of them, and I pointed them out. And the reason I favor this particular approach in putting Flagstaff in the eastern rural district is because it's both communities of interest and competition. So it's two criteria.
VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: It makes CD 4 more competitive.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: No, it doesn't.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: It makes CD 1 more competitive. It does. You can look at the registration numbers. It helps both of those districts.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Your idea of competition is very different than mine.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: That is being taken into account. You even said yesterday that CD 1 was not competitive. A few hours later you changed your mind.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Do you want me to remind you of some of the things you've changed your mind on? Do you want me to remind you?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay, guys. Stop.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: You don't want me to say that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera, please, let's stop.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Go ahead.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Let's stop, both of you.

Ms. McNulty.
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Gosh, I forgot what I was going say.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Never mind.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I'm sure I can come up with a couple of thoughts.

One is that in terms of San Tan Valley being with Bullhead City, part of this is the nature of the state. And we have a huge -- we've got this huge rural district on the east side where we have and we now have Naco with Window Rock and Sierra Vista with Winslow and things like that.

I mean, that is apparently just a function of the way Arizona works, but it's also consistent with another, you know, compromise that's been made in this draft.

And I just want to make a comment on the competitiveness notion.

What we've got here -- when you look at the registration of the state, we've talked about that before. It doesn't make sense to be creating all of these districts so that they all essentially will be Republican districts. I think we just can't do that.

We need to have -- you know, I would like to have three Democratic districts, three
competitive districts, and three Republican
districts. Partly because of the way the Voting
Rights Act works, we simply can't do that.

So we need to have very strong, compliant
Voting Rights Act districts. We need to have three
truly competitive districts, at least, and clearly
we're going to have four, the way this map works,
districts that are -- that, you know, people know
pretty much will be won by Republicans.

I spent a lot of time looking at the
Central Phoenix area and the possibilities there for
building districts around communities that also
create competitiveness. And I've said this before.
Given the way that we've created this map, some of
those possibilities don't work.

And the best -- the best approach I think
in terms of putting, you know, population that
shares common interests together is this -- is this
District 9.

The final thing I'll say is I'm looking
at the congressional district map that was drawn ten
years ago, and I don't think it's any prettier than
this map. So I don't want to get too hung up on
that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So I'm curious
about, though, the alternative, Mr. Freeman, you
mentioned for the nonreservation portions and what
that does to competitiveness in 1 and what we might
do there to go into Pinal County, I guess, area
where you were saying so that it doesn't come around
the way it currently does.

I'm just curious to see what the
alternative is.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Yeah, it's -- the
Gila County option, I think that if you take the
nonreservation portions of Gila, I want to say it's,
like, 46,000. So it's probably not -- you still
probably have to do some other things on other parts
of the map to sort of -- well, it might away you to
put -- I don't know, we would have to walk through
it. But it might allow you to clean some of this
up.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, I would be
open to just seeing what it does.

WILLIE DESMOND: Should I just show you
some numbers?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, is there a way
to -- if you don't come around and grab those
communities, what do we need to do?

WILLIE DESMOND: So if you were to grab
Gila County from 1 and put it into 4, the nonreservation areas, that adds 46,000 people. Should I accept that change?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I would like to just -- I would like to work through it and see what happens.

WILLIE DESMOND: Now 4 is overpopulated by about 45,000 people and 1 is underpopulated. So I would need to take some population from 4 and then probably I guess the best place to do that would be down here in Gold Canyon or San Tan or some of the unincorporated areas.

So if we just start working with tracts. So that's about 47,000. So it takes a portion of San Tan Valley. If I zoom out a little bit, you can see what that would do.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think he liked it. Just kidding. Okay. So now where are we now, Mr. Desmond?

WILLIE DESMOND: So now you're roughly back to equal population. 4 four still comes down and gets Apache Junction and Gold Canyon and gets part of San Tan Valley and Queen Creek.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Where is Globe and
Miami?

WILLIE DESMOND: I think that's -- do you see it?

So Globe now is in District 4.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So that's now been separated from the rest of the copper corridor?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So what if you don't take the Gila -- the nonreservation portions of Gila and instead go -- I don't know if there's anything there.

How many people are in that nonreservation portion?

WILLIE DESMOND: About 46,000.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Does anyone have any thoughts on what we might do there?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Remind me what population we're trying to move from where to where.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We were trying to avoid going all the way down into grabbing San Tan, Apache Junction.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Right, I understand that, but what's the -- I'm trying to find a way to get an equal population there to combine that with -- okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: You have the equal
population. One thing you could do is going back into splitting Mesa three times, but maybe instead of, like, a chunk going north/south and another one coming down, you could do more of an east/west split. I don't know if that makes more sense. It would make it look a little -- it would make it look better.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: You could try to grab more population from Coconino County up north or you could put this in -- I was back in the Southeast Valley.

You could sort of shift everything this way. That means putting population here into 1, overpopulating it. It's got to give the population back somewhere.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Does splitting Mesa horizontally north of 60 make any sense or no, what Mr. Desmond just suggested?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Not to me.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Would that address the population issue?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, there isn't a population issue at this point. All of the districts are roughly where they need to be.

I guess the issue is this arm of 4 that
comes down.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: But, I mean, would that preclude us from needing to do that?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, potentially what would happen then is 5 would be able to take these areas of the San Tan Valley and Queen Creek and then 5 would have to give 4 some population up here in North Mesa.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would like to look at that as a possibility. It makes sense.

WILLIE DESMOND: So 5 -- I'll just take the part from San Tan and Queen Creek.

If 5 were to take that population, that would take about 76,000 people out of District Number 1 -- or District Number 4. And so 4 would have to get some portion of Northeast Mesa.

So if we're coming down -- instead of grabbing straight down, I guess it would be grabbing this one. So it would be something like that.

Now you're back to roughly equal population, but it does split Mesa and puts that with District 4, which probably doesn't make the most sense.

So and I can undo any of those changes and go back as far as you want to any point.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, can you tell me what all the areas that are included again in District 4 are?

WILLIE DESMOND: District 4 is parts of Yuma County.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Not just District 4 the one where we split Mesa into three. It was --

WILLIE DESMOND: So it's in 5, 9, and 4.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Okay. Go into 5.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So 5 is Mesa, Gilbert, Chandler, Sun Lakes, Queen Creek and parts of the San Tan Valley, in this particular iteration.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: And what part of Mesa is in that -- what part of Mesa is in that District 5?

WILLIE DESMOND: I guess it would probably be central. I can tell you kind of the rough borders of it.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Sure.

WILLIE DESMOND: So on the east it's bordered by Bush, on the west side it's kind of bordered by Stapley Drive.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Okay.
WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah. So that is Stapley right there.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: So 9, 5 and what other district was it?

WILLIE DESMOND: 9, 5, and 4.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Can you look at part of Mesa that's in 4?

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

So that's everything east of Bush.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Can you go over?

WILLIE DESMOND: Just -- it goes all the way and includes Apache Junction and Gold Canyon.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, the rest of Mesa and what else?

WILLIE DESMOND: And the whole western side of the state.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: I mean, the other thing is if you want to keep 4 out of this area, then you have to go look at taking some again from the western side. That's the real trade-off. The question is, is Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, San Tan Valley belong with District 4 or is it Buckeye and Goodyear and some of those other areas of the West Valley?
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So we could move those areas back into 4?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And then move San Tan Valley, Gold Canyon, and --

WILLIE DESMOND: You would probably start with Mesa first.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Oh, Mesa.

WILLIE DESMOND: You would lose Mesa. It is a process, though, because then 6 needs to take some from 8 and then that's how it ripples its way through. But it can do that ripple without having to affect 7 or 9.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And if you did that ripple, could we wind up with -- I'm a little unclear on where San Tan Valley, Apache Junction, and Gold Canyon wind up.

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, what happens is that you end up splitting Mesa that third time because parts of Mesa need to go with District Number 6.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. All right. Well, I guess my sense is that it makes -- just looking at the map, it makes more sense not to split Mesa and to have San Tan Valley, Gold
Canyon, and Apache Junction in 4.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other thoughts on that?

WILLIE DESMOND: And the thing is, as it was before, all of San Tan Valley was with 4. Right now you're not getting all of it because Gila County is with 4 instead. So when we moved Gila County, it allowed us to take about 46,000 people. And maybe it makes sense to keep San Tan Valley whole and then see -- I think Gold Canyon might be closer to that number.

So that if you wanted to -- that's still not enough.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I would like the opportunity after lunch, because I would like to take some time with Mr. Desmond over the lunch period, to explore the work product that I created last night, again, staying within the general parameters of your criteria, other than the maintaining of the one district. Because one of the things -- he ran a quick splits report for me and it actually got us closer to having more parody of not
only registration closer to competitiveness in more districts, and I would like to have the opportunity to explore that after the lunch period.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We can do that.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair, if we're going to do that, I would like to see what it is that Mr. Stertz is going to propose now so that we can work with it over lunch, also. I would like the opportunity to understand what it is -- if we're going to be working with that this afternoon.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can you talk about any of it now?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Sure.

Mr. Desmond has it.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would ask that you make copies of it and give it to all of the commissioners so we can be looking at it also.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: If Mr. Desmond has it electronically, I would prefer getting it electronically as opposed to a copy.

WILLIE DESMOND: I don't know the plan loaded. All I have is the block equivalency file.
And I ran just the competitiveness report. I could print more copies of that or quickly run the other splits report. Whatever you guys prefer.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Do you have a copy of the map?

WILLIE DESMOND: I have the block equivalency file. I could load the map and then give you a copy. I haven't loaded it yet.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Can we get it -- I would prefer that we have a chance to look at that map or the changes that Commissioner Stertz is proposing and review them over lunch. So when we get back, at least we'll have an idea of what he's talking about.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure. Is that possible?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah. It will probably take me -- to get the splits reports and the map, it will probably take me about ten minutes.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: In the meantime, can we do something else?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other thoughts?

Mr. Freeman.
VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I just had a question.

How much is left of San Tan Valley that -- or explain the split there in terms of population.

WILLIE DESMOND: So the part of San Tan Valley that is in District Number 5 is 40,864. The part that is in District Number 1 is 40,457.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So if District 1 were to pick up all San Tan, it's got to shed 40,000 somewhere else?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Just looking at that, can San Tan, the census place, be kept whole and just shift the Northern Mesa line east a little bit in 5? Or is that not possible.

WILLIE DESMOND: That's a two-step process. We can do that quickly.

So if 1 grabs all of San Tan and moves roughly 41,000 people over, so now 5 needs to get more population and that needs to probably come from 4.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I don't know if it's better to go that way or east way.

WILLIE DESMOND: You want to go this way?
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I don't know. So we can just try it and see what happens.

WILLIE DESMOND: I can start this way. That's about the difference, close.

So if you were to do that, so now then District 4 now is underpopulated. And so that would need to grab from 1. I mean, it could take some of this area potentially. I don't know how many people are there. But I can look it up.

So 4 goes from 1. It's going to have to come from somewhere else. So probably --

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, you could take it from rural Western Maricopa County area. Then those changes would have to ripple through and you would end up -- the deficit would end up somewhere else.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes. 4 could take it here. Yeah, that makes sense.

4 could take it here and then that would shift it over. But ultimately, 1 needs to give up some population. So that would probably have to come from -- if it doesn't want -- don't want it to be San Tan, it would need to be Coolidge or Casa Grande or Maricopa or something like that. If you wanted to -- were hoping to remove some urban or
suburban areas.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: It is.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And we've talked about adding 11,000 to 1 also, right? Isn't that what the --

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah. So 1 would also -- if we take the Gila River, that would add about 11,000 people.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can you make that change? Can you put that reservation into 1?

WILLIE DESMOND: Uh-huh.

So at this point, 1 is about 54,000 people overpopulated.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Do we still have Globe and Miami split off from the other --

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes. All of Pima County is with 4 now.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Doesn't make sense to me. It makes more sense to me to be splitting these high-growth urban areas than to be splitting a very, you know, older, established -- those communities in Gila County.

How much population is that?
WILLIE DESMOND: Well, if I were to take all of Gila County from 4, I believe that would add about another 46,000 to 1. So then you're right around a hundred thousand that 1 is overpopulated.

So now 1 is about a hundred thousand overpopulated, primarily. 4 has -- needs to make up that difference. And that's kind of why 4 had San Tan Valley before.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I'm just a little confused. 1 is outside the donut hole, how did it get a hundred thousand people overpopulated?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, it grabbed all of San Tan Valley and that used to be in 4 and I believe that's primarily where that imbalance came from.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: It's 84,000.

WILLIE DESMOND: And then there's some pretty healthy population in the unincorporated areas making up the rest of that. And then also I got the 11,000 from the Gila River Reservation also.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: And I think we're still left with a little bit of Mesa being split and Apache Junction going over there.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.
VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: And all of these pressures are coming about because of this District 9. That is generating this exercise, basically, because of the refusal to touch any line.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: That's actually not the case. I understand that's your perspective, but the pressures are coming from the fact that we have six criteria and we have to satisfy all of them.

One of them is competitiveness. We've arrived at a way to do that. There are a lot of different ways to do all of these things. And we can characterize it that way or we can characterize it that we are trying to achieve all of the criteria, and that's what I'm trying to do.

I think there are a lot of different ways we can deal with these urban areas, and the urban/rural interface. It's not an easy task, but to lay it all at the foot of making sure that the 30 percent of the Arizonans who are Democrats and the 30 percent that are Independents have three competitive districts is not valid.

Having said all of that, I really would like to keep Gila County together. It doesn't feel right to me to be splitting that in half, at least
those communities that share the economic interests
in that copper corridor there.

    It's going to be much harder for them to
have two representatives than in the big cities
where, you know, we all have multiple
representatives.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So I'm still
wondering about District 5. We can move the Copper
Canyon back, but I would like to look at 5 again and
the whole Mesa thing.

    WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It just -- it's
east/west oriented, and I'm just wondering why we
can't -- starting at that edge of 9, just go across
at whatever -- so that an entire contiguous area
is --

    WILLIE DESMOND: You can, but then you
leave a non -- like the area that's left the in the
donut is not 710,000 and there's no way of linking
it with other areas.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So 60 is right here
or so?

    WILLIE DESMOND: Yes. Somewhere.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So I'm just curious,
what is that population at 60 going all the way
across taking out Apache Junction even or Gold Canyon? I don't have a sense of how many people that is.

WILLIE DESMOND: All right. If we just do this, it might help.

That's about 350,000 people.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: And if you go south to get the rest of Mesa, that's about 403,000 people. You take the rest of Apache Junction, now you're up to 405.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. And then can you start moving south into Gilbert?

WILLIE DESMOND: If you effectively take all of Gilbert, about 618.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Then moving into Chandler.

WILLIE DESMOND: Chandler or --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, I was thinking along that -- whatever -- what is this area?

WILLIE DESMOND: Can you use the laser pointer?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm trying. What's this?

WILLIE DESMOND: That's Chandler.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It's kind of like Tetris.

Is that northern --

WILLIE DESMOND: There's your 710,000.

Now, the problem with that is that it leaves this area as like a little island floating and this area. That's no good way really of linking those with the rest of the areas in Maricopa.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I like the way that looks a lot better, though.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Yeah, it would be even better if you could get Queen Creek and following the county line more. But then that's going to -- you're going to end up with more of a gap here between District 9 -- or this Southeast Valley district.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Anybody have thoughts on this?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: So, I'm sorry, that's 710 right there?

WILLIE DESMOND: That's 710, yeah.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And then San Tan and Queen Creek would be in District 4? I mean, District 4?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, San Tan is in
District 1. Queen Creek would be in District 4 but it would be a noncontiguous area of District 4.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Oh, okay. And if San Tan is in District 1, that's outside of the donut hole, right?

WILLIE DESMOND: At this point I'm having a hard time -- the donut hole originally included all of this area. All of this.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: It did not include any changes to District 1. So have we contemplated some counterbalancing change in District 1?

WILLIE DESMOND: What happened is 1 grabbed the San Tan Valley, which it originally did not have, and also took the Gila River Reservation, which it originally did not have.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So 1 is overpopulated?

WILLIE DESMOND: 1 is overpopulated by a hundred thousand.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. So I would -- I don't think that works.

MARY O'GRADY: Would it help to know how much is in San Tan Valley specifically and how much is in Queen Creek specifically?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Isn't it about
WILLIE DESMOND: I think it's 86,000.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: 86,000 people in Queen Creek.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm not sure how many are in Queen Creek. I can --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The -- could you -- Commissioner McNulty, could you explain that "doesn't work"?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would be happy to.

The exercise that we engaged in to try to reach consensuses would be that we would work within the donut hole and we would not adjust the districts outside the donut hole.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So it's only in regard to the exercise that it doesn't work.

If the exercise wasn't -- if that wasn't a criteria in the exercise and that was a configured district, what would your opinion be of that configured district?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think that it makes -- it made a little more sense to me to have
all of Chandler, the balance of Mesa -- or all of the balance of Chandler, all of Gilbert, and the balance of Mesa in one district and then to have Queen Creek, which is in two counties, be, to the extent anything is split, have that high-growth area with San Tan Valley be together and then have those in District 4, which I understand is tied to the west side, but I also think that makes more sense because you've got all of those high-growth areas both there and north of Phoenix.

So that -- that doesn't feel -- I mean, if we had a perfect solution and we could move those high-growth areas over to Buckeye, you know, I think that would be really cool, but we can't. But I do think they share a lot in common with the areas over in the west side of the state. And so my sense would be it makes more sense to keep those metropolitan areas together. I think there's, you know, a very sensible configuration there, as I said, includes the balance of Chandler, all of Gilbert, the balance of Mesa, and some of Queen Creek, which is already split by a county line.

And that doesn't require that we need to, you know, back into District 1 and then try to change the population, which is -- could be a day's
exercise.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: As a follow up to that, what they have in common, is it that they are high-growth areas that they have in common?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Well, I'm not suggesting I know all of the answers here, Commissioner Stertz. I'm just suggesting that they aren't any more dissimilar than, you know, many of the areas that we have included in the eastern district from border to border.

We can't have districts that are all the same. Just doesn't work. You know, your districts are going to have to include different kinds of areas. And I recognize that this is geographically separated from the west side, but to me, that makes more sense than anything else we've looked at this morning or so far.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So, Mr. Desmond, can you just pick up that balance of Chandler? Let's get it in there.

WILLIE DESMOND: Sun Lakes also?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I don't know what Sun Lakes is. If that --
Does that make sense to everyone?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Yes. We've had testimony from Chandler that they really want Sun Lakes to be part of their district.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Fine. Then let's grab it. That makes it nice and tidy, too.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: One thing you end up doing in linking areas of the state where there's the potential for high growth in the future is you create a congressional district that very quickly will be overpopulated.

Once grow turns on in the state, those people's franchise gets diminished a little bit right away because there's going to be a lot more than 710,000 people in that district compared to other parts of the state. I mean --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Well, those are all things I think we could look at. I agree that's an issue and that's one of the things I thought about in north Phoenix because those areas are growing quickly. But we still have to balance the population now for purposes of the Constitution and we have to come up with a draft for people to comment on. That seems to me like a reasonable place to --
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So 5 right now is short 261 people as currently --

WILLIE DESMOND: As it's currently configured, yes.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Willie, do we -- have we got Gila County whole?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes. Well, let me check. I believe so.

Yes, Gila County is whole in District 1 right now.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I like 5 the way it is. You guys figure out where to get a hundred thousand people for the other -- from 1.

It's a hundred thousand short; is that right?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, so -- are you talking about the pink area now?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I can't tell.

No. District 1 right now.

WILLIE DESMOND: District 1 is a hundred thousand overpopulated. District 5, which is this area of Queen Creek also and not this area of Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, and Mesa, is about correctly populated.
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I don't think it will be an easy exercise to move a seventh of District 1. I mean, we spent a lot of time on District 1 to arrive at something that worked -- potentially worked for all of us.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Well, we did it yesterday. Yesterday morning we went through that exercise. If you put the Flagstaff communities over there into District 4, that's roughly 74, 75,000.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: That's not a consensus builder, though.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, we've heard so much testimony on that from the Navajo Nation, from the Flagstaff Forty, from the City of Flagstaff, from the mayor.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Board of Supervisors.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Board of Supervisors.

I really do think that's a tough one to swallow. I think it should stay with the east.

And is there anything in the Pinal County area that can be dealt with in terms of helping 1 out?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, 1 needs to give up
population.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right.

WILLIE DESMOND: I mean, if it gives up
San Tan Valley, that takes it back to close and then
it would probably have to give up some other area,
perhaps in like the city of Maricopa to rectify the
Gila River.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Now, Mr. Desmond,
are you proposing San Tan Valley be removed from
western -- the eastern rural district?

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm not proposing --
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: That's what -- it
was just a suggestion for us to consider?

WILLIE DESMOND: That's just one place it
could lose population.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: And if that were the
case, if we were to do that, where would you --

WILLIE DESMOND: It would just become
part of the donut hole again, I guess, essentially.
So --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, I would prefer
to do that. I think that particular move, I think
keeps that particular eastern rural district more
competitive. Makes it more competitive and then we can keep San Tan in another area. Let's work on that. Because it's roughly about that population, correct?

WILLIE DESMOND: That's I think -- when we looked at it it was, like, 86,000. San Tan has got 81,000 people. So if you move that back in with 5 or something, that would --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I think the area of San Tan Valley, Queen Creek, it would make sense for them to be together.

WILLIE DESMOND: So that's something I should do?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure. We'll have to figure out what to do with 5. 5 is right on right now.

WILLIE DESMOND: All right. So now District 1 is about 18,000 people overpopulated and could give up -- as it was before, it gave up some of this unincorporated area and that's what balanced it. But it would also -- the other option would be to give -- yeah, it needs to lose about 18,000 people somewhere.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Where are the -- I'm sorry.
Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No, go ahead.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: What are the unincorporated areas you're recommending?

WILLIE DESMOND: Again, I'm not recommending them. It's just an option.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Just suggesting.

WILLIE DESMOND: If you took this area and this area, that's 2,000.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: That's roughly --

WILLIE DESMOND: That's roughly 2600 people. If you took parts of Florence or something, that would do it.

The other option is to play around with the second majority-minority district, District 3, that would need to take about 18,000 people from Maricopa and then give that up somewhere else.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

WILLIE DESMOND: Or somewhere else along the border. It could also do it on the border with Casa Grande or Eloy or something.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: What I would like to do, Madame Chair, if it's okay with you, I would like to during lunch take that on during lunch and
see if we can come up with something that will work.
I won't even eat lunch, if I have to concentrate on
that. That's how much I'm willing to sacrifice.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: And when you're
doing that, maybe -- we've heard a lot of people
from Pinal County show up again and again and give
lots of testimony about how they don't want to see
their county carved up in multiple ways.

So maybe we should be taking that into
consideration just as we're hearing the people in
Flagstaff. Maybe we should be hearing the people in
Scottsdale who show up and say don't slice us up or
the mayor of Tempe who showed up and said we have
radically different interests than the city of
Phoenix.

This is not an easy problem, so I don't
accept that proposition that just because the
Flagstaff people showed up -- I mean, I hear them.
I want to listen to them. I want to do what they
are asking, but not everything is possible.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I don't necessarily
agree with some of the comments from the people that
I don't agree with everyone that comes before us. Like I said, I live in Phoenix, and I think that parts of Phoenix have a lot in common with Tempe. So I don't necessarily agree with everyone that makes those kind of comments, but I am listening to them and we are taking those comments into account.

But as I said, during the lunch break, I'll do everything I can to make sure we take what you just mentioned and everything else into account. But I would love to do that during the lunch hour.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. And it sounds like others -- Mr. Stertz has some plans for the lunch hour, too, and Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I'm concerned that if we reopen this whole map, we're not going to get a draft map. I liked your proposal that we work within the blank area and come up with the best approach that we could and get that out for public comment and then address these issues.

I don't think that if we take on adjusting all of the districts outside over lunch that we're going to wind up with something we can agree on.

I'm concerned. I mean, we've spent weeks...
and months on this and everything leads to everything else. So, you know, I'm certainly willing to listen, but my perspective is that we work within the framework that you set up and come up with a draft and let people comment on it and work on the legislative maps.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: What I'll do is I won't change anything outside. I'll work within your parameters of working within the donut hole and see what we can do.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. That's fine.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Even the Gila River Community -- I mean, I appreciate that comment and I certainly think that it's something we could and should look at, but right now the Community is in a district with the Ak-Chin and the Tohono O'odham. And to the extent that that change requires us to revisit all of the map, I think it's better to reserve that for the public comment period. That would be my preference.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Lunch?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah. Let's see
what time it is. Yeah, it is time for lunch.  
  It's 11:54. So is an hour a good --
sorry, we have another question.
WILLIE DESMOND: I just need to know what
everyone needs from me for lunch?
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: We need the
material --
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: There will be no
lunch for you.
WILLIE DESMOND: So we'll load up
Commissioner Stertz's and provide the splits report
and all of that right away and then, Commissioner
Herrera, you're going to be working off of the 3a
map, correct?
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah.
WILLIE DESMOND: So we're going to go
back to 3a.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And, Madame Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And, Mr. Desmond,
also print out five copies of the project --
WILLIE DESMOND: Planet Z map?
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And I think you
wanted to give us the block equivalency file for
that. Is that what you said?
WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, I can do all of that.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: And competitiveness report?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yep.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is an hour good for lunch?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Probably not.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Do we need an hour and a half?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Because we've also -- Commissioner Freeman and Stertz have been invited to meet with some representatives from the City of Flagstaff as well for a meeting that they have requested.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So let's plan to be back at 1:30.

And we'll go into recess now. It's 11:55.

(A recess was taken from 11:55 a.m. to 1:51 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We'll enter back into public session. The recess is over. The time is 1:51 p.m.

And we are in the midst of discussing
agenda item 3, making adjustments to the EB version of the map and seeing what we might be able to do, I think, in the East Valley, and I think some commissioners were going to do some thinking about this over lunch and I would open it up to anyone who would like to start.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I just wanted to confirm the -- any changes that are being proposed are only going to be made to the donut hole and nothing else. Doing that -- if anybody is proposing changes outside of the donut hole, which to me, again, I think almost it's starting from scratch.

So what I don't want to do today is make sure that any changes are being proposed do not focus on anything outside of the donut hole. If they are, I really don't think we should mess with that and listen to that considering your directions were to focus on the donut hole. So that's -- I want to make sure that that's clear.

I don't know, again, what Commissioner Stertz will be proposing or Freeman or anyone else. But if that's the case, then somebody wasn't listening. If that's the case. And hopefully
that's not going to be the case.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I can assure you I was listening. I would like to hear what Commission Stertz has to propose.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So, Mr. Stertz, are you ready -- was there something that Mr. Desmond has?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm sorry, what?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: See, he wasn't listening.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Trying to have a little levity after lunch.

Madame Chair, pursuant to the direction that you gave of taking and looking at the donut hole, I focused on the Metro Phoenix area in trying to take another look to find out whether or not we could create a different style of competitiveness and actually create more -- getting a closer average of competitiveness throughout the state at the same time.

One of the things that came out of yesterday's workshop was when working around the District 9, that we ended up having a fairly large
concentration of Republican registered voters in several districts, which really decreases the level of competition in those -- the availability for competition.

So I started looking at the donut hole again, as best as I could, and started working my way around the area.

And by no means -- keep in mind that this is an 8:30 to 2:30 sort of work process during the course of the evening until my computer died because I had left my power cord here last night inside the room.

I had Mr. Desmond create a competitiveness report. And even though the numbering of the districts is wrong, I wanted to really look at the averages as they compared to the donut hole averages that we're currently working on.

And when we're looking at what they call the distance from state average because it's difficult in the Index 2 to really use those percentages because they currently do not include either 2004 or 2006. They are good thumbnail sketches to look at but I really can't use those really closely as they are plus or minus, I'm sure a percentage.
But I wanted to look at the distance from the state average, which currently on the everything -- on the donut hole map was averaging 8.8 percent above distance from the -- average distance from the state average and 9.6 from the state average of registration.

So looking at that and looking at three competitive districts and no districts within 3 percent of that Index Number 2, which is the analysis of the 2008, 2010, I started -- as a result and not being able to have any of this information when designing, I was really working from the design criteria, which was, one, given to us by the chair which was looking at the donut hole and then looking through some areas, as Commissioner McNulty and Freeman and the chair said, that we all have different views of what communities of interest and connectivity are.

And then what fell out of that was, quite frankly, fairly a pleasant analysis, which was that in the distance from the state average, we became more competitive, going from 8.8 to 7.5. Closer to zero is better. And going from 9.6 to 8.3 distance for state average. Again, getting closer to zero is better.
And we went from zero districts within 3 percent of the average 2008, 2010 to actually two districts.

So without having the data pools that are really assimilated by our mapping consultant, the design that I created is purely based on some public input, communities of interest, traffic corridors, and what was positive was what the -- what fell out of that as a test against whether or not the other criteria were met.

So Willie, do you want to bring up what I'm affectionately calling plant Z?

Again, in the central core.

WILLIE DESMOND: There you go.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Could you turn the layers on for the traffic corridors, the main highways, the 101, 202, 202, 17 and 10?

Again, some of the areas that I have -- am not happy with my work product, and there are areas that I'm not happy with my work product, exist where I've got some certain city splits.

But as a pass on it, I wanted to see whether or not we could actually create a competitive district and then generally more competition throughout the -- throughout all nine
districts or throughout the state.

And one of the things that folks need to sort of realize, that because of the Voters Rights Act -- I hate to -- I know that we've talked about this before, but I sort of want to repeat it just to let you know that from a math point of view, there's some real challenges.

We've been talking about a third, a third, and a third of the population being Republicans, Democrats, and Independents.

Well, that's when you round up and round down. We really have -- are closer to almost 35 percent Republicans, close to 31 percent Independents and other, close to 30 percent in Democrats.

And the Voters Rights Act, about 75 percent, using very round numbers, of the Hispanic population are registered Democrats. And because we have to create a majority-minority district -- two majority-minority districts on the congressional side, we are taking a large quantity out of that -- out of that overall number.

So, for example, if there's 1 million Democrats in the state and we are -- and of those,
we're going to be pulling about 400 -- about 400,000
out to put into two districts. So that leaves
600,000 to be spread out among the other seven
districts.

So creating -- creating competitive
districting by its own nature because of the mandate
of the Voters Rights Act becomes very challenging
based on the other ideas about creating crazily
put-together districts to grab pockets of Democrats
out of one area or pockets of Republicans or
Independents out of another to try to create a
district, to sort of give the impression that it's
competition and then you sort of create that
results-oriented process that I think has been a
challenge.

So I looked at this -- at a map last
night that said where are our growth areas, where
are we expanding, and what communities really seem
to tie together with one another.

And I've got some busts in here, and I
know that, and I know that I would like to have more
opportunity to explore some of these, but what I
created was a district that included going from the
southeast north. I tried to create a community
where Queen Creek, Gilbert -- because we've heard
lots of testimony that Queen Creek, Gilbert, Apache
Junction and East Mesa seem to fit well together.

I also know that in the greater
metropolitan area, it started with a core and it
grows up to the north and grows down to the south
and southeast and southwest. Those have been the
two -- the three sort of natural growth corridors
where it spurs up through Peoria, down to the
southeast, down to the San Tan.

I mean, the population in San Tan Valley
alone is close to 80,000. I think that there's --
what do we have, close to 60,000 in Gold Canyon and
Apache Junction.

So we know that we've got a lot of
population in these sort of areas. And there's a
lot of expandability and a lot of growth potential.
Johnson Ranch, for example, a large growing
community in Pinal County.

And knowing that it grows in that
direction, I sort of designed my districts to grow
in that direction. I tried to accumulate areas that
have some commonality.

Paradise Valley, Scottsdale, Cave Creek,
Anthem, Carefree. The area of Tempe, south of
Guadalupe, going up and connecting up through
Fountain Hills into the larger mass in the upper right corner. Keeping District 7, which is the minority-majority district intact, as designed. And the West Valley, Sun City, Glendale, Peoria -- unfortunately, I've got that split but there was -- trying to get population mix up there, and then connecting down to Litchfield -- around Litchfield Park, Citrus Park, and the edges of Buckeye.

There is -- Madame Chair, there's imperfections to this, but there's some natural corridor expansion. The 17 expands, the I-10 is a growth corridor, and, of course, the I-10 going into the south going into Pinal County is a growth corridor.

So what I discovered out of all of this was that we have a higher level of competition. We've got a competitive district within Maricopa County that is not the district that we were presented. It's a different district that could probably have some adjustments made to it to even be more competitive and more evenly balanced than it was before.

And I just found some -- by taking a very different approach to the similar problem, came up with a different map.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I did not have a chance to look at the map. The file that was provided to me was in a different format which I wasn't able to open.

So I guess my question to Commissioner Stertz is did you move anything outside of the donut hole?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Not to the best of my knowledge. I'm saying that because it was late and I did the best -- I don't want to have you find something somewhere that I might have made a little subtle adjustment somewhere down the road, so I won't give a definitive answer. I don't believe that I did, but I worked it very diligently not to.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Okay.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other questions on this presentation or comments?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: So is that the split there -- it goes over the I-17?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That's correct.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Freeman, are you
done?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: That's okay. Go ahead.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Can you -- Mr. Desmond, can you compare the splits -- the county splits between planet Z and the current -- what the current splits are for the donut hole map or the everything bagel map? Can you bring them up?

WILLIE DESMOND: Which -- the one that we started with this morning, the 3a?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I just want to see what the -- if you can put them side by side, that would be great.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'll try to.

The splits or the -- which report?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: The county splits. I just want to see them side by side.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: If it's all right, while we're talking about competition -- because I know the splits have got -- there's some differences, but I would like to talk about the competition. That's been the big press in discussion among the commissioners about whether or not we're getting a more or less competitive.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: So are the splits. So I would like just a quick glance at what the splits are.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Sure.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: This shouldn't take long.

WILLIE DESMOND: And today at lunch Mary pointed something out to me about the splits report in that there are splits in there that are counted as a split but it's a zero population split. That's been the case in every single one we've run to this point.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: But they are all apples to apples?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah. But I think going forward we are going to try to remove that as a split if it's just a zero population split instead of a geographic split. They have to be both.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: But as a point of cleanup in that. I know that there's going to be a comparison saying that there are six splits in this analysis and eight splits or eight holes in this analysis and six holes in whole counties and this.

The areas of being able being -- that I haven't had the opportunity to clean up any of the
edges where I've had zero population that might have
encroached over that might have been able to pick up
a split or a nonsplit.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Sure. But the
reason I bring this up is, you know, this is a major
cconcern of Commissioner Freeman. He created a whole
counties map for that purpose, to try keep as many
of the counties whole.

So if this is the case, you know, only
six are unsplit -- excuse me, only six are unsplit.
You got seven in two districts, which is to -- I
mean, to me, I'm going to compare it to the river
district map. This is a substantial deviation from
even that. So that definitely concerns me. So just
looking -- this is just my first -- when I got this,
this is the first thing I saw.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Sure.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: That definitely is a
concern. And I'm sure other commissioners have
their concerns. So I wanted to point that out.

So we're looking at side-by-side
comparison, and, yeah, there's a difference,
definitely.

So whatever happens if we decide to go
forward with the planet Z version of map, I would
like to see if we could fix that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: One of the things you'll note in the planet Z is that Maricopa is broken up into -- you can see how the counties are broken up. Pinal County, instead of being broken up into six, is broken up into four. Yuma continuing to break up into two. Maricopa being seven instead of eight.

So the large growth counties are split less, mostly Pinal. Pinal had close to double -- if my numbers are right, almost a hundred percent growth over the last ten years. And instead of splitting that up into so many different districts where there's so little representation for -- so many people touching so little people, having that split into less districts was quite appealing.

And the reason I find that interesting is because that was an untouched -- it was only touched by what was part of the -- part of the donut, so just by not splitting that in so many different ways.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Sure.

Just another quick question, Madame Chair --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Go ahead.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: For Commissioner Stertz.

I think you have them labeled here differently?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I do.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: What is -- in your version of planet Z, which one is District 9 here? I'm assuming it's District 8; is that correct?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: For the sake of comparison -- and as I said, as I was going through that, I was creating areas of traffic and communities and neighborhoods and not backing into -- not trying to back into the competitiveness.

But in an effort as knowing that as long as the competitive districts create no significant detriment to any of the other areas, I can easily see that I could take that district, by making adjustments to it, to be able to have it become more competitive without significantly jeopardizing any of the other design criteria.

So I think that from purposes of getting quality, instead of looking at it and saying, okay, here is a competitive district by virtue of picking the areas to make it competitive, I designed the districts and said here is how -- here is how the
competition -- here is what the competitiveness falls out of it.

So I was trying to take a natural approach and a systematic approach to this based on constitutional criteria.

So my pleasant analysis out of all of this is that I was able to create a relatively competitive district. We're at 52.9 instead of 50 -- let's see.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: It's 1.3 percent higher.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: 1.3 percent higher, easily along those edges by -- without really having any significant detriment to any of the other goals, we would be able to increase competition in a wholly -- in a differently designed district and still keeping communities of interest and geography and compactness and having areas sort of making sense to other parts of -- that don't have -- that really don't relate to other parts of the state making sense to these.

Now, is this perfect? By no means. But again, when I got the competitiveness analysis, this was the first time that I actually saw how the numbers turned out. So it was -- interesting result
from taking your direction and looking at it in a different way.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I appreciate that. And it goes to show that there are so many different ways to craft this. And we could really spend, you know, a year doing it, but we're going to have to come to decisions on how we want to proceed on this congressional very soon.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Since -- as you bring that up, I do agree with you that we will have to come up with a decision soon, very soon in order for us to start working on the legislative map, which should be very soon as well.

I would like to just -- if we're -- not that we're done, if we could focus now -- I want to focus on some of the changes that Commissioner McNulty had made this morning, because I had a chance to look at the map that we started this morning with, Commissioner McNulty's changes in District 5, I think. So I would like to just quickly talk about that unless, Commissioner McNulty wants to do something else.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Well, I did have a
couple comments about this.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: First, I guess I misunderstood you before lunch when you said that you had found two competitive districts in Phoenix that you were going to show us this afternoon, and I'm not seeing that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I don't think I said that.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I don't think that we should be discounting the indices that we are using because we don't have the 2004, 2006 data yet. That data is going to refine them and -- but it certainly doesn't give us any justification for discounting them.

The distance from state average is just based on the indices. So it's invalid to use the distance from state average for any purpose if the index is discounted.

But what I'm looking for is not an overall blend of competitiveness because the result of that is that you don't have districts where either party can win the election.

What I'm looking for is, and what I think is -- the voters are looking for is three districts,
at least, and I was hoping four, in which a Democrat or a Republican in an average year running a sound race and giving the people what they deserve each have a chance of winning.

What you have done, Mr. Stertz, is -- I know you said hadn't changed District 1, but it's 1.3 percent more Republican than it was before lunch.

District 2 hasn't changed in terms of competitiveness. But District 9, which is District 8 on your map, is 4 percent more Republican on your map.

And what we had talked about was a district in Maricopa County that was 50/50, that was a perfectly level playing field, that did not give an advantage to either party, that either party, Democrat or Republican, could win.

And this isn't that. So I can't support this. It doesn't, from my perspective, move us ahead.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: In just going through that same analysis, in -- we've -- in one district where it was -- in the three Maricopa
County districts, where were more heavily filled with -- or accumulated with Republican registrants, I've reduced those, increased the number of Republican or registered Democrats.

And, again, keep in mind that I didn't design this around registration. I didn't design this around competitiveness. I designed this map around how communities and transportation corridors and how communities of interest and on how geography and how growth patterns and all of the other criteria fit into place.

And I did not design a district that was -- that I picked from to try to create a competitive district and then designed everything else around it.

So that's the difference between what you're suggesting. This is a map that followed the -- linearly followed the criteria as constitutionally given, based on the criterias given by the chair.

So I'm trying not to -- if we are going to use the 2008, 2010 indices, then using them as a comparison of plus or minus the 3 percent is relevant if it's -- if we are not using the 2008, 2010 indices, then, of course, the plus or minus
3 percent is not relevant. But we can't have one without the other.

So I'm okay with eliminating that index in its entirety until the 2004, 2006 numbers come in and then not use that analysis at all and to drop out the issue or the analysis component of the plus or minus 3 percent.

So we have been told that from the design of competition, is that anyone from either of the two major parties would have the opportunity to win.

One of the ways to do that is to get a closer amount of registrants in that area. And until we get 2004, 2006 data about what election results are, we're using a very, very, very small data set to be able to use as a comparison to create these indices.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Let's let Mr. Stertz finish.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm used to him interrupting. Go ahead. Please, feel free.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I didn't know you weren't done. It was a long speech.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Please.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I just want Mr.
Desmond to clarify, when we finally get that data for 2004, 2006 and we average it out, like we -- how much of difference is that going to make in terms of competition? Because everything I've read and everything I've been told, if we balance it out with the 2010, 2008 election, include 2004 and 2006, the difference is not going to be that great.

Am I --

WILLIE DESMOND: I don't know. I would have to wait until we get the data.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: And when will that be?

WILLIE DESMOND: We are working on it as fast as we can. It's just a complicated process. I hope we'll have a progress report for on Monday, though.

I'm going to devote a lot of my weekend, assuming nothing goes crazy this afternoon, to doing that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Commissioner Herrera, could you cite -- you just said that everything that you had read?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Yes, everything that
I have read, yes.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Could you cite some of those sources?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I don't have them with me, but I can definitely try to find them.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So do you have an idea of what they might be that I could maybe do a Google search on it?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: How about I send them to you.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair, could we move on, please?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah.

Go ahead. Do you have something, Ms. McNulty?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Only that I'll say one more time for the judge who -- the poor judge that has to read this record, that I built all of my districts that I proposed based on all of the constitutional criteria over a period of many months in the map that was called river district 7a and 8a.

All of those districts were put together based on six constitutional criteria. There was a huge amount of effort that went into looking at voting rights, equal population, compactness,
contiguousness, not -- respecting counties lines, municipal lines, geographic features, looking at communities of interest, looking in addition at ways of putting communities together that aren't necessarily communities of interest but that have common interests and competitiveness.

We're trying to reach consensus on a map here. And as a result of that, we followed a procedure in which we took the best parts of a couple maps and then we worked on the middle trying to retain at least one district in Metropolitan Phoenix where the 3.5 million people there would have a 50/50 chance in one district of electing a representative in a truly competitive race.

So there has been no ignoring of the other criteria. And I'm not really saying to you, Mr. Stertz, because I know you have your perspective. I'm just putting it in the record.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair, just as a point of clarification, I have to ask Commissioner McNulty a question about the District 9 and the design of District 9.

When you designed District 9, did you design it as I've just described as a combination following the criteria and then got a result of that
after the fact to where you got your competitiveness analysis?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Pretty much. I mean, I designed it based on putting together communities that are inherently -- that inherently -- that fit together in different ways, and I've explained those at some length, and communities where electoral competition is inherent.

I didn't separate them in any way because I don't think you really can. I think it's a lot like looking at the Voting Rights Act districts. I mean, there were certain characteristics of communities and ways in which communities interact in which some of these criteria rise to the surface kind of inherently.

So it certainly was not -- I mean, it was not -- no, it was not an exercise of saying this is a competitive area, now how can I explain it. It was merely quite the opposite.

It was an exercise of saying, you know, the university is here, Mesa is here, downtown South Scottsdale is here, Arcadia is here, looking at a bunch of different attributes. And to use your words, which I don't think is what the Constitution says, but to use your words, competitiveness falls
out.

I think I just thought of a new bumper sticker. "Competitiveness happens."

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And it did. It just happened there and it's not happening here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think Mr. Freeman is wanting to talk.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Thank you, Madame Chair.

Also, for the record, for the esteemed judge who will pour through it at one point, I just wanted to say that the Constitution doesn't say that there has to be a 50/50 district. And, in fact, I have yet to see a district constructed that's 50/50. I don't even think your CD 9 is 50/50.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think it's about as close as we're going to get right now.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, the district Commissioner Stertz has constructed is pretty darned close as well. And I think it's really --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Four points less close.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I think it's really unrealistic to put everything else aside in the
pursuit of 50/50. This is based on some incomplete data. It's a snapshot in time. Things are going to change the moment we put these lines down.

And I think we're sort of -- set the Commission up for failure if we draw such a strict definition of it. And we sort of fuel the flames of ongoing grievances that we'll hear about for the next ten years if people are only saying, well, there was only one competitive district. There was only one under a certain set of criteria that was truly 50/50. I don't think that's what the Constitution requires.

The Constitution requires us to favor competitive districts, to the extent practicable, as long as it doesn't cause a significant detriment to the other goals.

I think in order to make a finding on significant detriment to the other goals, we have to see how these other goals can be met.

And this is the first time I've seen Commissioner Stertz's map. I don't have it on my machine. You know, there may be ways that can be tinkered with it to further improve it and maybe even enhance competitiveness in all of the districts and reduce splits that increase compactness and
follow all of the constitutional goals.

I would certainly like to take the opportunity to do that.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Can we start looking at the changes that Commissioner McNulty had proposed which we went over this morning based on the map -- the EB version 3a, I guess?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Are we -- Mr. Herrera, are we talking about when I had made the --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Correct.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would actually like to just look at that to refresh my memory about how that worked.

WILLIE DESMOND: The one --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: The one from this morning before we broke for lunch. I think that's the one we were making --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I was asking you to pull up because we did that early this morning. I know you saved it. I would just like to see it again.

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

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Before we so summarily dismiss my work product here, I just want to make sure that we do place on the record I do have a follow-up question for Commissioner McNulty.

You must have a very good inherent knowledge of -- on a block-by-block basis about voter registration throughout this district that you created because to be able to create this district as it picks its way through this community to be able to create this district that is so evenly balanced.

I guess I have to commend you of your expertise in having that level of inherent knowledge that would allow you to create a district without having any prior knowledge about registration.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: She's a smart lady.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Mr. Stertz, it's called Maptitude. That's what we have. That's what we've been learning to do for three months here. That's what we've been spending all of our time on. That's why we have this data. That's why we hired this consultant. That's why they are spending all of their time loading this stuff in. There's nothing inherent about it. It's what we're trying
to accomplish and I used the tools before us.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Can we go to --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: You're being silly and you're just trying to take up the whole day, and that's okay if that's what we all want to go is sit here and listen to Mr. Stertz ask me these kinds of questions.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I think that what --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: -- I would like to do is focus on Commissioner McNulty's map.

We didn't dismiss your map, we actually have been discussing it. But what I had mentioned before, if you had made any changes, did anything outside the donut hole, and it appears based on Commissioner McNulty's comments, that you did.

And again, to me, that is not what we were wanting. That wasn't the direction we were headed. The direction we were given was to just fill in -- work with the donut hole and go forward. I don't want to go back any more.

So let's focus on the map that Commissioner McNulty had talked about this morning and let's go forward.

Did you bring it up?
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So in -- I appreciate -- for being called "silly" for my work product. I appreciate the --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: That's not what she said.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: -- thoughts. So I'm hoping --

(Multiple speakers.)

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Willie, did you bring it up?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: -- that we can have a little bit more of a civil conversation moving forward.

And if you would please not interrupt me again, just for a moment.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I am actually talking to Willie, I'm not talking to you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And I understand that, but you're trying to get him to change the map. And I want --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, we need to move forward. I mean, if you want to keep wasting our time --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Let Mr. Stertz finish, please.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Would you hand the gavel over to him, please, because he's going to chair the meeting, then have him take the meeting.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: You are being silly.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz and Mr. Freeman, please.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm wrapping up right now. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Am I Mr. Freeman?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I mean Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Behave.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I'm sitting over here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sorry, Mr. Freeman. I would -- I am not -- I don't think anyone is summarily dismissing your work product. I appreciate it. I think it shows a lot of effort to try to come up with another way of looking at this. And there are many ways to look at it and there's no doubt.

And this is one, and we have one from this morning and that stemmed from our work yesterday to try to work within the parameters I had set. And I appreciated everyone trying very hard
And I think we actually came up with something pretty workable. There are some things that need to be cleaned up, no doubt, and I still think there's probably some things that can be done in that East Valley area that we started to do this morning.

And I would like to go back to that, if we could, and talk about it a little more and see if there might be something to do.

And going back to that competitiveness measurement, too, we don't have the '04, '06 data yet but we will soon. And we're not going to have it, though, I don't think in time to publish the draft map to then go out on the road for second hearings.

So it's going to -- our draft map is going to require analysis on racially polarized voting and competitiveness and all of it. And that's what I anticipate occurring during that monthly of public comment that we are going to have these maps out for.

And no doubt there's going to be adjustments to be made based on that and based on public comment that people will come forward and
tell us what's wrong with the map.

But I think we really do need to just get it out there for folks and then let them tell us.

I remember Mr. Strasma saying in his interview, I believe in the wisdom of crowds, and it's true. So the sooner we can get something in front of people so that -- and we've worked hard on this. It's not like we've just thrown something together in the last minute to do this.

It's based on a lot of input we've that we've received in trying to keep communities of interest whole and all of the other criteria.

So if we could, I would like to go back to that version from this morning and just see what still could be done to tweak that to make it overall a little cleaner and nicer in the donut hole area -- bagel hole.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: What I would like to do is just focus on some of the changes that were made this morning and the ones -- well, mainly the ones this morning that were made and also the changes that were done -- or proposed to District 9, once the map is up.
WILLIE DESMOND: This is the map that we worked on this morning to the point where we started playing around with moving Gila County and then some of the population changes in District 1.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is this where -- yeah, because I can't -- we did a number of things in the morning to number 5.

WILLIE DESMOND: Is this where you want to start from?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair, if this is the one that has the changes that Commissioner McNulty had proposed, then, yes, this is the map that I want to look at.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: That looks like the one that -- I'm sorry, Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I was just going to say it's not one that incorporates any changes I proposed. That's what Commissioner Herrera, I think, is getting at.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: No, that's not what I'm getting at.

What I'm getting at is the one that Commissioner McNulty proposed. I don't think you proposed any changes today, I don't think.
VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I proposed a lot of changes both --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Today.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: -- today, yesterday, and on Tuesday.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So why don't we go back to where we started at the beginning of the day because I would like to see that map, I guess and then we'll --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Can we focus -- the changes -- you even mentioned it, Chair Mathis, that you liked the changes that were made to District 5.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I did. I liked the compactness and contiguousness of that better than what we started with where Mesa was split in a serpentine way.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Sure.

And, Madame Chair, that's the reason why I'm focusing on this map. You made some comments about liking it, and I'm going back to that.

So I would like to focus real quickly because there's not that big of a difference from the one we looked at this morning and the one we're looking at right now, other than those changes that you wanted in District 5.
So what I would like to do is just focus on some of the positive things -- just really quickly on some of the positive things that this map does for all of us.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Go ahead. You can talk about it.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: So, Mr. Desmond, if you can focus on -- I think Commissioner McNulty talked about removing that extra split in Mesa. And so if keeping Mesa in two districts. Can you just focus on that area where she made that change?

WILLIE DESMOND: Right here.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: And I think that all five commissioners, this is something we all wanted. I know that I wanted to do this to keep Mesa into two districts instead of three.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: It is in three.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Which is achieved.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I'm sorry, it's still in three.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: No, I thought --

WILLIE DESMOND: There is the corner of, like, of East Mesa that we left in.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Okay. Is that something that we can clean up, then?
WILLIE DESMOND: We can, we haven't done it yet, though.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: So that's something we will clean up.

So what we'll do is move the rest of -- so from 2 to 3. So that is a goal that we can all, I think, agree on.

This particular map -- if you can go to District 9 real quickly, Mr. Desmond.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yep.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: This particular map keeps this only one competitive district in Maricopa intact. A 50/50/50 (sic) split. So I don't think it gets any more competitive than this.

Again, we are -- going back to the river district map, I created for four competitive districts. So this particular version is -- we're having to compromise only two or three. So that's the second area.

This particular map, also it doesn't degrade the two competitive districts outside of the donut hole. So this particular map did not mess at all with the areas outside the donut hole. So it keeps two more competitive districts for a total of possibly three.
I think it took away a county split from Pinal that went from District 5 to 4. So the splits now are -- I think a total -- can you go to that area?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yep.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I think the total splits now are four. I think it went from five splits to four splits. So this is something that I know Commissioner Stertz and Freeman were talking about, and I agree with that, trying to reduce the splits.

Can you show where the --

WILLIE DESMOND: So there is it looks like four splits. District 1, District 2 in Saddlebrooke, District 3, the reservation.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: And what I would like to do is focus on the reasons for those splits. I think these splits have a legitimate reason.

Now, let's focus on District 1 in the split with Pinal. This is a primary -- a rural traditional population areas in Pinal which includes Florence, Coolidge, Casa Grande, and Superior. I think we heard a lot about the public testimony about these communities wanting to stay together as a rural community and they wanted to be kept rural.
So this -- that particular split for Pinal District 1 can easily be traced to a -- one of the six criteria.

So let's look at District 2, now.

Again, District 2 has a split for Pinal. So that's the second split. It is -- the reason for this particular split was solely to satisfy the community of interest connecting Saddlebrooke with Oro Valley and Catalina. They are more of a retirement community and they wanted to stay together.

Again, you can tie this particular to one of the six criteria, which I think Commissioner Stertz had asked, to start tying them when we make these changes.

Let's go to the third district, which is the third split. This particular split that grabs Eloy, Ak-Chin, and the Gila River Indian Communities --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

I apologize, Mr. Herrera, for interrupting, but why are we talking about the entire map?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: No, I'm talking about the --
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Are we not talking about specifically filling in the donut hole this afternoon?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We are, but I'm just -- Mr. Herrera, what is that you want to get --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Because I'm also addressing the issue -- it has come up already where they've been talking about the many splits to Pinal. So I want to make sure that we address that, and that's what I'm trying to do. Because I know it's a concern of Stertz and Freeman, and I want to make sure those issues are addressed.

And what I'm trying to do, since Commissioner Stertz asked to tie in any of the changes we make to the six criteria, I'm honoring that request, as I did before and he had no issue when I presented those changes, which was to the river district 8a.

Again, I went through the trouble of going through all of the changes I made and tying in with one of the six criteria, which is, again, what he wanted.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. And I think that's a worthwhile exercise to do, but I would like to do it once we get to a draft map that we are all
happy with.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Okay. Then I'll go back to the changes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, what I would like to do, really, is go back to where we were at the beginning of the day because that is -- although I like the way 5 is, I don't know if that needs -- you know, if everyone is happy with that, if we should just start where we were because at least we had a starting point today where everybody was at and then from there, what changes, if any, need to be made to the donut hole.

And it sounds like the East Valley was probably the most concern and let's try to just clean that up and see if -- see where we are then. That's what I would like to do.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would just say it was helpful to see that, see what we had done there because it may be helpful in making suggestions with what we've got now, what we have in front us now also.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I just had a
question.
Commissioner Herrera, you mentioned that the river district map created four competitive districts.

What's your criteria for saying that? What criteria did you employ?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: The criteria that I used was the information that had been given to us, which is the 2008, 2010 election results. So that's all we've been given so far when I created that. So that's what I based the competitiveness model on that information.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: So then under that, using those criteria, then, Commissioner Stertz Would have created a competitive district in Phoenix as well.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: You're asking me --

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: You said there were four, so I figured you new --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: As I mentioned numerous times, the river district 8a and 7a created, I think close to four -- probably four competitive districts, which is -- which was one of my goals from the beginning to start with that I wanted to create as many competitive districts as
possible. Not two or three, four.

And, again, this particular map only
creates maybe three. And that's if we have you and
Commissioner Stertz on board on creating at least
three. But that particular map created four.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: It's not a matter of
me being on board. I'm on board with the
Constitution and that's what I'm --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: That's part of the
Constitution.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Mr. Freeman, in
response to your question, I have a little different
perspective on that.

In the river district map, I hate to
raise the name 101 again, but I will, there was a
fourth district in South Central Phoenix around the
majority-minority district that created a -- that
had, the way it was originally configured, some
increasing Hispanic communities that offered an
opportunity for an emerging Hispanic/competitive
district.

And I don't think it was even based on
the snapshot numbers that we had on the river
district map, which I think was probably before we
have this more in depth index, but now I'm not sure.
I don't think it was fully competitive in the way that this District 9 is.

But as I said at the time, as I was, you know, working on trying to put that together, the hope was that the way the growth in those communities was occurring and we thought would continue to occur, that their -- it may grow go truly a competitive district in the next few years.

So just your point of, well, if that is a competitive district, why isn't this. That's the explanation and it's also the explanation of at least what I had in my mind when I was focusing on trying to pull that other district together.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Sure. And there were three others that claim to -- there were at least, possibly a fourth, is what you're saying. So there was some criteria that was used to assess those other three.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Well, we had that 2008, 2010 snapshot number that Strategic Telemetry prepared for us that they were giving us with those maps.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I understand.

I think what my point is, if those districts are competitive, then you can't look at
this district that Commissioner Stertz constructed
last night and say that it's not.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Well, I can and I
did. I mean, it's four points less competitive than
the one that was there.

And what I was going for was a truly
50/50 district, which isn't to say that the
Constitution says that or anything like that, but
that was my objective. And I think a city of
3.5 million people deserve that.

And I do think over the next ten years --
I take a different perspective on, you know, whether
we're going to have -- I forgot quite how you put
it, whether we're going to get a lot of negative
comment.

I think quite to the contrary. I think
over the next ten years that will have proven to be
a great asset for the state of Arizona, and I really
hope we can do it.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So, Madame Chair,
am I correct that we are talking at the baseline
drawing as we started this morning --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: -- and making some
adjustments to it based on some comment that we
received in public testimony yesterday as well as our personal reviews?

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

    VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

    VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Now, the changes that you agreed to or that you liked, why are we discounting those? It just seems like -- because we put a lot of -- there was a lot of time and conversation that centered around that particular change.

    I didn't track the time, but we spent a good chunk of time in the morning going over those changes and we shouldn't discount them. I think they should be included and see how we can maybe tweak it. But to forget the changes we made and start over from scratch in the morning. That doesn't seem like a logical way to go.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, I'm curious to know, like, for District 6 if the compactness, you know, the three measures we use for compactness, how that compares to what happens if we did do the changes that we talked about for Mesa and getting it into one area. Just some things like that.
I think that would help us decide -- how do we clean up that Mesa area. Or I mean, maybe you guys like the way that looks right now. But it sure seems to me to be something we should probably address because Mesa is such a long horizontal community and it just seems like that could be oriented better to make it a more compact and contiguous district.

And it would also fix 6 so that 6 doesn't have the leg coming down. It already has an elephant trunk on it instead of having two elephant trunks.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Is this the map we focused on before lunch?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It's the one that we started with this morning, right?

WILLIE DESMOND: It's the one we left with last night.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Again, in order to get to where we're at before lunch, I would like to go back to that map that you had agreed to that you liked the changes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: That would make more sense.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I got it. I understand where you stand.

Do the others -- how do you all feel? Do you like what you saw after our work this morning or do you like this?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair, I thought you wanted to bring up this to sort of reorient yourself. I appreciate that. It helps me reorient myself on where we began today.

There's, to my knowledge, no agreement on what we did throughout the morning. It was simply to see different ways of putting a puzzle together. We were exploring that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's right.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The District 9, the McNulty-designer district that created the -- by the way, it's not 50/50/50, it's 33/33, 33 and third, 33 and a third as far as splits.

The goal about an equal balance of voters, is that -- obviously, you can see that there's other ways of skinning the same cat.
I just want to hear from the chair that this designer district is the district that we are crafting and working around and this is the only design or competitive district that we are working with.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I think it is for now. I mean, I know there are other designer districts we could draw if we wanted to, but I think that Ms. McNulty made a case for why she drew what she drew.

My charge to all of you was to come up with a competitive district that was straight up 50/50 where no major party had an inherent advantage or built-in advantage.

I didn't factor in Independents or anything. I was just really thinking straight up Republican versus Democrats.

And those numbers, you know, could change, depending on what we learn from the '04, '06 data. It will just be interesting to see once we have more data in this to see what it does to these indices that we already have generated.

But I think that, you know, this map works generally. You know, it really does bring in so much of what we all talked about and heard about
the past however many weeks.

And so I'd like to -- if possible, I would like to -- for us to try to work with this, what we have, and see if, you know, there's any minute changes in the area of cleaning things up in the donut.

But otherwise, I think it makes sense the way it is. And we have all -- we've looked at all of the criteria around the other districts to balance everything out and make sure we're meeting the other criteria.

And again, there will be -- this is a draft map that we're trying to approve to get comment on. So I don't anticipate that this is the final map at all. But I think it's a great start.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: With all due respect, the fact of the matter is is that the direction that we were given was that when you presented the donut hole concept, Commissioner McNulty had -- almost immediately had this designer district crafted on which you then asked us then to design around.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, it was in a
night -- overnight that she created it the next day.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: She did it during
the night and brought it in the next day.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And I greatly
appreciate the fact that she had the opportunity and
the skill to be able to craft it.

So the question is, that is the one -- as
you can see, that with subtle adjustments I would be
able to create another district, at least another
competitive district, in a different fashion than
this one.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And I have no doubt
that each of you could come up with a different way
to craft the center with a competitive district in
it.

And -- but, you know, it's just kind
of -- I think we have something here that's very
workable and I don't see why we can't just move
forward and try to clean up things as we would like
to and use this as a bases and then hear from folks.

And, you know, if people disagree with
various lines, they can tell us about it.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Let me -- just a quick reminder that I didn't agree -- I didn't really care for this particular map as there were three border districts. It limited the number of competitive districts we could create. So there's quite a few things that I know I'm giving up on this map.

And so I would -- respect Commissioner Stertz's comments, but I think we need to move forward. As you didn't change your mind with the three border districts or the way the map is designed because -- at my request, I hope that you also don't change your mind because Commissioner Freeman is asking you to change your mind about District 9.

So let's move forward. You've already made up your mind on District 9. Let's move forward on the rest of the map.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I have no idea what you just said.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I'll explain it to you later.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can we focus on number 5 a little bit, all of the commissioners, and see if there's things to do there with Mesa that --
or do people like it the way it is?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I don't, and I don't like the fact that you're going through cutting through all of these congressional districts. We know already, I forget, 150,000 thereabouts in this chunk of Mesa.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: And one thing we were doing late in the day is cutting this out to trim it down, but we are putting it in CD 4, which I disagree with.

The one solution is to shed it to CD 1 and then shift the population around the map either to the north or to the south. That's a possibility.

You could -- I think with shedding San Tan Valley, you get it pretty close. It's 84, 86,000, something like that. So there's still going to be some leftover population in there in Mesa that we are going to have to deal with in order to eliminate the third split of Mesa.

That's -- the rest of these lines, I think -- now I'm wondering if that was intentionally
drawn to look like an elephant because it's a -- the
rest is pretty heavily packed Republican districts.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Mr. Freeman, you
were given, you know, the opportunity to do this.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: And I did. I
presented two proposals and I guess to use
Commissioner Herrera's words, nobody listened to me.
But that was Tuesday when I tried to switch Gila
County around and I had a way to shift the
population from west to east so that both the rural
districts sort of share in taking little bits of the
urban area.

I did it again on Thursday when we took
the Flagstaff communities and put them in the
western district and used that vehicle to shift the
population around.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Say that again.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: What we did
yesterday morning.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: The option you
just described.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Which was -- when
you shed population to 1, it overpopulates it. So
it needs to shed population somewhere else, and I
shed it to CD 4 up in -- and this is what we went
through yesterday morning, which were all the
Flagstaff communities and made it come into rough
balance there.

That way that trims up -- trims away this
part of the population from here and maybe gets us
closer to having leftover one congressional district
there. It may not be perfect, which might require
further adjustments, but it moves that population
around the state, in essence.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: You know, I just
can't see fixing this problem by splitting Flagstaff
given --

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: It doesn't split
Flagstaff.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Or splitting
Coconino County.

And the other thing is -- well, we worked
on this exercise and the reason I participated --
or, you know, thought it made sense was because we
were going to stay within -- we were going to be
working on Maricopa County and we weren't going to
be adjusting all of the other districts.

If we take San Tan Valley and we put it
into 1, that changes the character of 1. And I also
don't think it makes sense. I think it makes more
sense to have Queen Creek and San Tan Valley and
Gold Canyon and Apache Junction together in a
district than carving those areas up and that
creates kind of a population hub.

If you look at the congressional map that
we're operating under right now, the eastern
district completely envelopes that metropolitan area.
It comes way down under, it goes around, and it
comes over.

And what we are looking at here is kind
of the inverse, to a certain extent. We would have
the western rural district coming over Maricopa
County and picking up some of those areas.

The western district would still be
predominantly rural but there would be a hub of
population there.

And to me, that makes more sense than a
vestige of population because the representative is
going to -- you know, there's an area there that
that representative is going to be responsible for.

So just from a community perspective and
a representation perspective, it makes more sense to
me to make -- to deal with the split in Mesa, make
that a consolidated district and then keep Queen
Creek -- or the balance of Queen Creek and San Tan
and Gold Canyon and Apache Junction together in that District 4.

Now, the other -- I guess the other possibility would be to merge those in and have everything shift, you know, over. Bring those into 6, bring -- take western 6 out, move it into 8 and then bring population -- I may be going the wrong way here, but then bring population out into 8 so that instead of these growth areas being in a district that is predominantly on the other side of the metropolitan area, they are in a district with the metropolitan area and then the district on the west side, the metropolitan area on the west side shares more with the western district.

You know, we could do -- and the chimneys and -- the chimney district the -- what did you call it? The elephant district?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Part of it looks like an elephant. It's looks like something with two tubes coming out of it.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I see.

Well, we've got a chimney, we've got an elephant.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: We've got a drain pipe. Oh, that's what you'd call the chimney over
there.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: No the chimney is at the top. It's got like a house with three chimneys.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: This looks like Asia. I guess that's Europe right there.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Well, those are -- Mr. Freeman, I don't want to go into 1 because that wasn't the way we approached this.

So I guess what I'm asking you is, you know, if you have another way to do this within Maricopa County, whether it's bringing San Tan and all of those in without changing 9 and then shifting everything over so that the western area --

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: That's what I'm not quite following, and I know it's hard to explain, what actually you're meaning there.

Right now, how does it differ from how it's drawn right now, I guess?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: What are you trying to do?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: You know, I don't know. I guess I'd have to have Willie help me.

WILLIE DESMOND: If I understood what would happen is the areas of Apache Junction, Queen
Creek would probably come join the Maricopa area.
As a result, 4 would then be underpopulated or would have come in further on the west side.

So the question is, is it better to have Queen Creek and Apache Junction the river district, District 4, or is it better to have some of the western parts?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Thank you, Willie.

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

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I understand Commissioner McNulty's desire to not go into any of the southern districts, but would that include not going into the other districts if the -- if competition could be increased?

If you could have a more competitive district or create more competitive districts, would it be your desire to want to go into those districts?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Depends on how you define "competition," Mr. Stertz. If we define it the way you did after lunch, then that wouldn't work.

My perspective right now is to get a draft map --
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I understand.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: -- and not to spend another week doing that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I apologize for interrupting you. I didn't mean to step on your words.

In District 9, the way that you define competition was registration being a third, a third, and a third as being one of --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: No. No. No. Have I stepped on your words? I'm sorry, but that's not it.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And you followed up by saying where anyone, based on whichever party had the opportunity to become elected. Is that a good paraphrase?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: The second part is close. The first part wasn't.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: But, Madame Chair, if I could explore that just for a second.

One of the ways that you were able to achieve that in your district that you created was to have parody between the Republican, Democrat -- or one of the components, again, based on small data set 2008, 2010 being another, but one of the
components you used was registration.

Is that a fair statement?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: That really isn't -- I'm not sure what you're getting at because the registration --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm asking a question.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: -- numbers are here. The registration numbers aren't the measure. The measure is the election results.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So, again, exploring that, the election results are based on a small data set.

The one thing that we do know is registration, and if the goal would be to get more parody to get a higher -- more districts throughout the state and parody or closer to having quality between registered Republicans, Democrats, and Independents, one would ascertain by virtue of this data set, this limited data set, that we might be able to have a higher level of competition once we add in 2004, 2006.

Again, it's an unknown because we don't have any information.

Wouldn't that be something that you might
want to explore in the effort of competition?

    COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I don't think it's
workable because the numbers are so far -- if you
change a district that has a 62.4 percent Republican
advantage to a district that has a 61.5 percent
Republican advantage.

    Let's see, what do we get here. For
example -- in your example, we've got District 4 in
the everything bagel map has 63.7 percent Republican
average and statewide races. And then I'm not sure
if I'm looking at what you gave us after lunch, but
that goes down to 61.5 percent. Well, that's a
difference without a distinction.

    So making the whole state more
competitive is not the same as having more
competitive districts. Or making the whole state
less Republican is not the same as having more
competitive districts because until you get down to
the point where the electoral results indicate that
either party can win an election, given all other
things being equal, that is an average year with
equal candidates, then you don't have truly
competitive races.

    So the closer you get to that point, the
more competitive they are. And it doesn't help to,
you know, make things 60 percent one party rather than 65 percent one party. So I think we're just viewing it differently.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So two and a half points one way or the other doesn't matter if it's a heavily populated Republican district? I can't -- I'm just trying to keep up with the rationale.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I mean, once again, the focus is on these 2008, 2010 election results. If you're talking about no built-in advantage, like it or not, after you apply the Voting Rights Act, the Republicans have a built-in advantage statewide.

I mean, there's a big gap between the number of registered Republicans and the number of registered Democrats. And I forget what the numbers are in the Maricopa County area, but it's on the order of, like, 40 to 25 percent.

So you either have to try to cobble together and assemble some sort of district, as has been done, or you just look at the registration numbers.

And I'm looking at the registration numbers reflected in what Commissioner Stertz did
last night. I mean, you get a number of districts
that sort of follow what -- how the state is.

There are some that are very close that
are -- there's 34 to -- 34 in District 2. So that's
even tilting to the Democrats there.

You have one that -- District 1, it's
30 percent Republican, 38.2 percent Democratic.
That's, I don't know, in the range of competitive on
the outer edge, I guess.

But then you have districts like in the
Maricopa County area, there's District 6, 40 percent
Republican, 26.6 percent Democratic. That's pretty
much the way -- what's left over, you know, after
you take out the voting rights districts.

So that's kind of the way Arizona is.
District 8 is 35.7 percent Republican versus 28.2
Democratic. That's even probably closer than the
way -- the numbers shape out.

So I think -- I resist sort of the
Commission getting locked in to a particular
district that's been a designer, competitive
district at this point when I think there are other
ways to do it that I think Commissioner Stertz has
explored, filling in the donut hole and sort of
laying out the Valley the way it is actually laid
out. And also it looks like he's determined there's a way to get a district that is pretty darned competitive.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Does it make any sense to think about the elephant nose, take the -- instead of doing it that way, do a north/south district? Split Phoenix kind of -- you know, split that population north/south in Phoenix?

Could you just look at that? Would that make it more compact?

WILLIE DESMOND: It would. It would also probably -- currently Scottsdale is in four different districts.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. Could you work on that?

Madame Chair, would you mind?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, didn't we kind of do that in the version when we cleaned up Mesa?

WILLIE DESMOND: We did that -- we did, but then --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Could we just look at that again quickly just to refresh --

WILLIE DESMOND: A couple of people had asked me to change the color that Glendale is shaded. It was a blue. The way Maptitude defaults,
sometimes it puts a very, very similar shade. I noticed that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Hey, Willie, before you make all of those changes, can we pull up the version that we -- where we had Mesa kind of more compact and cleaned up? Because I want to see what we did up in the north part where you're working now because I thought we sort of looked at that and I just want to see that.

WILLIE DESMOND: I think that's the one that we looked at a little while ago. That's what it was.

So what happened is, in essence, District 8 went all the way to the western border and then District 4 came down further and took all of this area, including the San Tan Valley, Queen Creek and that allowed us -- knowing -- then shifted a little of that population to remove some of the splits in Scottsdale. It went farther up here, to take that out of 4 and then we just kind of shifted everything over right here.

Is that -- and I know that's probably not the easiest thing to follow, but does that make sense?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair,
Willie, so even if we started from there, we would still perhaps have an opportunity to go a little more north/south than that?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, absolutely.

Do you want to look at that on this version for a minute and see how it --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I'll leave that to the chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Go ahead.

WILLIE DESMOND: So I'll do this. It's going to move 14,000 people into 6.

I would guess -- I would next suggest moving this line up and out of Glendale to remove that one split there, just to minimize the split census places, although I would be happy to --

What you could do is you could take this whole clump right here and shift it up here to make it more of an up/down district. I think that's kind what you're looking for. So that would be something like this.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I am hoping that as we are going through this process that these grabbing of census blocks and tracts, they appear to
be arbitrary and capricious in way that they are being just pickled together.

And I would want to just go on the record clearly that grabbing census blocks to fill up populations certainly does not meet what our mandate is. And that's the last time that I will mention that today.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. -- Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would say that one of the reasons I thought this made sense is that we have had testimony about Phoenix going north/south, particularly in the high -- you know, the higher-growth areas in the north.

So -- and we'll get more testimony on all of this, whatever we do. I don't think we're grabbing anything arbitrarily. We're just trying to do a draft map.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And, Madame Chair, I would let you know that's exactly the way that the map that I just presented was designed. So it would be very easy for you to be able to pick up where I left off.

WILLIE DESMOND: So a change like this would add another 81,000 people to 6. Maybe we
could just see how many are here to remove that initially and then regrow it out.

I mean, if there's a border that makes sense or a road or something that would be a good east/west divider.

I do think that improving the number of splits census places would be good and also maybe the compactness here. But I'm happy to do it in any sort of way that makes sense to the Commission.

MARY O'GRADY: Madame Chair, for what it's worth, I would agree in terms of eliminating some of the census-place splits.

The ones that showed up on the report were Glendale having a lot of splits. I think some -- Willie had identified an area where that could be -- eliminate one split.

Scottsdale was split and Mesa was split. I think we've dealt with most of the Mesa split. I think we've dealt with some of the Scottsdale split but -- and then the other was the Glendale split that, again, he's identified a way to address.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's fine with me.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. I'll add this population to 6 and then we'll have to give about 95,000 from 8 -- or to 8 from 6 to rebalance it.
That's too many. So again, if there's like -- I can turn on the streets or something if that makes sense.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I-17 would make sense.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. I'll move that.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: That will leave us a little --

WILLIE DESMOND: So just removing the split from Glendale takes about 36,000.

And you can either do this two ways. You could just keep trimming away or you could start from the bottom also. So kind of remove the -- you could do something -- we have to get 58,000 more. That's 24. That's about 35. That's about 56.

So if you did something like that -- I can show you the whole district. I think what you fairly easily have done would be remove the split from Scottsdale, remove the split from Glendale, and also kind of remove the funkiness of the elephant trunk, something along those lines.

And obviously, you could play with this any way you wanted. If you want to make it go up a little bit more, more north/south, that's something you could do.
You could grab, you know, these areas, Cave Creek and Anthem and include those with that district and then remove this chunk, or at least a portion of it. There's a lot of different ways to finesse this.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Could we eliminate that split of Scottsdale and maybe with or without including -- and make up for it in Phoenix?

WILLIE DESMOND: So remove this one right here?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: That's not going to be able to make up for it in Phoenix because District 4 doesn't touch Phoenix. You might be able to make up for it with --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Put it in 6?

WILLIE DESMOND: Some areas over here. Possibly.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: You can't put it in 6 and then take out 6 into 8?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, it's coming from 4.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Oh, it's coming from 4.

WILLIE DESMOND: So 4 would need to give
up -- or 4 would need to get a little bit more population.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: What is that population of that part of north Scottsdale?

WILLIE DESMOND: So to add that to 6, it's about 3,000 people. And there's going to be just a few more. There's a little part that's split here in Carefree. So to add that would be a couple hundred people.

And then I guess 4 would have to make up that population and it could do that pretty much anywhere.

But if you're interested in improving compactness, you could take this little arm off of Surprise. If you don't want to split anything, you could potentially take some more unincorporated somewhere. But probably not now from 3.

You might be able to have it come down and grab some of the area between Fort McDowell and Scottsdale, something like that. That's different places we could do it if you wanted to make that change.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Can I just look at one more thing, please?

South of the Surprise.
WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: There's that little area that goes -- the little area of 4 that goes into the metropolitan area.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: What have we got there?

WILLIE DESMOND: It's got a little portion of Glendale and Citrus Park and then some unincorporated areas around there.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It seems like Scottsdale should definitely be together.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Yeah, I agree.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It's obviously that should just go in to 6.

WILLIE DESMOND: So I'll make that change.

And then 4 needs to get some population. Is there any place else from 4 you want to grab before we try to balance the population, is probably the best way to think about it?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: 4 needs how much?

WILLIE DESMOND: 4 needs now to get about 3,000 people.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Where is Luke Air
Force Base right now?

WILLIE DESMOND: It's in District 8, I believe.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So it's in the metropolitan --

WILLIE DESMOND: I think most of it. This might be part of it. This is the Luke air field right here.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Should we consolidate that? That would be --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.


WILLIE DESMOND: So that would add to District 8, I guess.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: That makes sense.

WILLIE DESMOND: Something like that adds, you know, just 900 people. But you again, remove a split from Glendale.

Is that something that I should do?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I say, yes.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I do, too.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: What's next to it?

Citrus Park?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Should we just bring that line out and include Citrus Park?

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. That adds about 9,000 people, though.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Wow.

WILLIE DESMOND: 9500 people.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And then how -- then that would make us --

WILLIE DESMOND: So that makes 4 roughly 13,000 people short. So then 4 is going to need to encroach somewhere else.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So we have to go out to Surprise and do something there, perhaps.

WILLIE DESMOND: Something like that, yeah.

Is that something you wanted to do or -- Here is a good question also.

Two splits. One -- this part of Peoria is kept together. It splits the Yavapai and Maricopa County line but it doesn't split the census place. So those two --

Is it more important to not split census
place or is it more important to not split a county,
I guess would be the question. I don't think many
people live up there.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think it's more
important not to split a census place because people
live there.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Is this Citrus
Park one we want to do now or should we wait on that
or no?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would vote to
wait on it and look at Surprise. Because if we're
going to have to split Surprise to compensate for
it, I think it makes more sense to keep Surprise
more or less whole.

WILLIE DESMOND: Is that all right with
everyone, then?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz has an
idea.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Great.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, he's telling
me, and I want him to tell you.

But we've talked about this. I think we
talked about it yesterday, it's that whole idea that
along I-10 there's some population on the west side
that -- 40-some hundred people.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: You've got population on the south side of I-10 as it expands out. Right where the Maricopa is.

WILLIE DESMOND: I thought we already grabbed that yesterday.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So that's in there?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

Good suggestion.

Well, I'll cancel the Citrus Park, but then we do need to make up 47 -- District Number 4 needs 3900 people. So you can see it runs all in here. I think we've avoided touching 3 when possible, so that kind of makes it harder to touch this border. So it's somewhere along here.

You could also potentially take some of the unincorporated lands down here. You know, we're reaching farther Maricopa than that.

Is there any suggestions where to look for it?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Do we still have Mesa?

WILLIE DESMOND: Mesa is still in three districts at this point.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I thought we fixed that.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We did on that other --

WILLIE DESMOND: We did, but that was the one where we took 8 all the way to the county line and we came back to go back to where we started from this morning, I guess. It's the last --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: What are our thoughts?

My thoughts are to -- that we can fix that and that it would be a good idea to put Mesa into three.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, I completely agree with that and improve 6, too.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm not sure how we do that without shifting everything around.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Well, we would have to put San Tan Valley with Gold Canyon and Apache Junction.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Then we would have to back out some on the other side.

WILLIE DESMOND: I guess that's the question. Should this arm of 4 come down in order to keep Mesa whole or not?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I would say yes,
just because it's more similar to that than Apache
Junction, Gold Canyon, and San Tan Valley are
probably more similar than trying to do something
with them having -- putting those northern ones in
with Mesa. And I would rather keep Mesa more who le.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So if -- I'll
just tell you what the numbers will be to make sure
this works.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And doing that also
improves the compactness of 6. It hurts the
compactness of 4.

WILLIE DESMOND: So that would move about
93,000 people to District 4 and District 4 would
need to shed population on the west side. That's
what we --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Willie, what's the
total population of Gold Canyon and Apache Junction?

WILLIE DESMOND: This whole area would
be, including the unincorporated area, would be
54,800.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: How big is Queen
Valley?

That's Queen Creek.
WILLIE DESMOND: I'm sorry. That's 800 people.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I would like to get Gold Canyon and Apache Junction into 5, I think. I'm not sure if that makes the most sense or not.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, but that's -- I know, we were looking at that.

Is that what we did earlier when we cleaned -- when we made 5 all compact and clean?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, we did when we made 5 all compact and clean, we gave -- District 4 went down and grabbed Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, San Tan Valley, some unincorporated area, and then Queen Creek.

Then because it gained all of that population, it then had to shed population and it did that by moving all of this area out of District 4 into District 8 and we shifted the population over.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Can we not split San Tan back into Pinal County?

WILLIE DESMOND: Do you mean with District 1?
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: No in -- well --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, that gets into
the whole moving the donut around. The other areas.

WILLIE DESMOND: I guess what I would
like to -- is this -- the steps that we have just
taken to move Scottsdale and kind of redo the
elephant's head, is that something that everybody
kind of agrees on that we should save this as, like,
a place we can come back to or is this all just kind
of work?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm comfortable with
those changes just because it keeps a community
whole and also improves some of the compactness,
contiguosness of 6.

Do others have thoughts on this and then
we can probably take just like a ten-minute break.
It's 3:30. But I'm comfortable with those changes
that were just made.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I am, too.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: You cannot save
that to a new file and not -- a file where it
currently is?

WILLIE DESMOND: What it would do is I
would create a new plan that would be based on this starting point and this would kind of be where we went forward from, I guess.

Does that make sense?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yes.

But that does not diminish the fact that we have a previous plan that grew -- that this grew out of that still exists in your memory?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah. Everything -- we can always go back to, like, the 3a where we started.

Anytime that we make something red and then click and accept those changes, I save a version of it. So I have thousands and thousands and thousands of dates that we can go back to anyplace that you wanted to.

But it's kind of easier to make big benchmarks with a new name almost instead of doing that.

If this is something that everyone is okay with, that's what I would recommend doing now.

All right.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. The time is 3:31. We'll take a ten-minute break and come back shortly.
(A recess was taken from 3:31 p.m. to 3:50 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We'll enter back into public session. Recess is over. The time is 3:50 p.m., and we are making some good progress, I thought, on trying to clean some of these areas up and into something that looked a little more compact and contiguous and still looking at that Mesa area to see if there's something we can do down there in the southeast corner in the growing areas.

Where were we?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, the last thing we did was we just changed, I guess, a little bit of 6 to make it slightly less oblong and more kind of round, being a little more compact.

We still haven't addressed the split in Mesa yet, but maybe it would be helpful if we just one time went through what has to be done in order to not split it and what -- just so we understand --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: What the options are?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: So let me turn on the county boundary.
Sorry, I have to redo this every time I make a new plan kind of from scratch. So it's a -- and it's not a new plan, it's just a break in our old plan.

So in order to not split Mesa, and this is kind of as I see it right now and there could be a work around that I don't see, but in order to only split once -- the District 9 split, this area down here needs to shed some population. And if it sheds that population to 1, because the ripple effect that we've kind of went through and it seems like that moving Flagstaff is something that the Commission is not entirely eager to do.

The other thing it could do is shed this population to District 4, but again, that's taking the river district and reaching further around Maricopa County, which also seems like something that it's not eager to do.

I guess, the last option you might have would be to split it in more of a north/south split instead of like a -- more of a -- so there's a top and a bottom part as opposed to a left and right part.

If that makes more sense -- other than that, there's I guess -- maybe -- the only other way
that just looking at it that it might work would be
to do something a little different, and that would
be to try to extend 6 over here to try to grab this
area but then 4 becomes underpopulated so then 4
needs get some from somewhere else.

So 4 could then try to go around and grab
here, but, you know, there's no good way essentially
of doing this. There's going -- one of these things
is going to have to happen.

Flagstaff or some other area is going to
have to be moved. District 1 is going to have to
grab more or Mesa is going to have to be split, as I
see it.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Or San Tan Valley
has to be in 4.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Or we move the
boundary of 9 over here so it takes that
population -- the ripple effect goes through the
rest of the map to the urban areas. I mean, I
presume what you were saying was that this is the
intentional designer district there?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes. Assuming we don't
touch 9 at all.

MARY O'GRADY: Madame Chair, or you go
over to the west side again and make your population
adjustments on the west side.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Right.

Willie can I ask a question?

If could you zoom out a little bit, please.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Just northwest of Scottsdale, the green --

WILLIE DESMOND: Cave Creek?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: What's the population of that Cave Creek/Carefree area?

WILLIE DESMOND: About 8400 people.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. Could we pursue Ms. O'Grady's suggestion? So if we consolidated Mesa into District 5 and had San Tan Valley, Gold Canyon, and Apache Junction in 4 --

Ms. O'Grady, your thought was to put them in 5 or --

MARY O'GRADY: I wasn't making a specific recommendation as to which --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I understand.

MARY O'GRADY: Just noting that if you reach down, and I think Willie had mentioned putting those areas into 6 and then 4 is short because you've removed population from 4. If you don't make up for it -- one of the options for making up that
population is 4 is to reach around to the west side and pull out more of the urban population on the west side and put it into 4.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So the areas that we would put into 6 would be -- if we kept Mesa and Chandler, then we would have to move Apache Junction and Gold Canyon and San Tan Valley into 6. So we would bring the border of 6 down there?

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm not following.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: You mean border 4?

WILLIE DESMOND: So what would be the first step?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think -- should we try this just quickly to see?

MARY O'GRADY: Madame Chair, don't you want to -- one of the goals is to eliminate -- get Mesa into two districts?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Right. So the first thing would be to consolidate Mesa. To move the north line of 5 to the south line of the Salt River Indian Community.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So if 5 does that, it picks up 151,000 people.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. So the next step would be to remove portions of Queen Creek.
WILLIE DESMOND: Give those to 4?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Give those to 4 for the moment.

WILLIE DESMOND: So 4 from 5. It's all this, right? Until you get up 151,000?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Well, what is the -- yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: I think we looked at this earlier.

So if we take Queen Creek, I think that gets you close but not all the way there. What ended up happening before was more of that dipped into here and took parts of Mesa and made another split.

So that gets you 124,000.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: How many do we need?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, if we did this, we could get 124,000. And then -- so 4 needs to give up 120,000 people and 5 needs to give up 26,000 people and 6 needs to get 147,000 people.

Now, you could do something where you don't do the Queen Creek part and then 4 just has to take even more from over here.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. Let's try
WILLIE DESMOND: Or you could also leave the Queen Creek split. So I guess the first step need would be to have 4 make up -- or give away 120,000 people that it needs to give up. Does that make sense?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: To Mr. Stertz, apparently. He's finding it hilarious.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm trying to think about somebody from right there. In Pinal County, the population right now -- we have 150,000 people right in there.

WILLIE DESMOND: No, I think that's about 125 --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: 125,000 people. And what I know, and I've spent a lot of time here, Queen Creek and San Tan and Gilbert, they are all part of internally connected communities. And as you go down the 60 and you go out through Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, that's a community. So going on this path to try to figure out how I'm going -- how that and way up there
somewhere makes sense to me.

I'm sorry, I've known this -- known the area enough that I can't figure it out. Sorry. I didn't mean to be disrespectful. I was laughing, I was trying to keep it to myself, and I just couldn't keep my arms around it.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Mr. Desmond, I actually have a map of a current congressional district in front of me and it essentially does the same thing. It wraps right around Phoenix and includes portions of both north and south Phoenix in the rural area.

So, you know, it's the way it is now. It's not exactly this way, but the issue exists in the current congressional map.

What I would propose to do to get a draft map done is to -- is to keep San Tan Valley, Apache Junction, Gold Canyon with District 4. Equalize out the population.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Is that something that --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: But Queen Creek stays --

WILLIE DESMOND: Should Queen Creek stay in 5 or no?
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Where is the --

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I just wanted some
clarification of when somebody proposes a change and
Mr. Desmond says that it's okay, I guess I don't
understand who he's asking that to.

Is that individual requesting the change
or is that to all of us? Can somebody clarify that?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think he wants
to say he understands.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: In order for him to
move forward with a change, I'm assuming he's
asking. I want to see if it's a consensus and at a
minimum, three have to agree? Maybe I'm confused.
I just want some clarification.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We are just trying
things out right now. So if -- you know, to me, I
don't feel like anything is hard and fast. We
haven't decided on a certain line, that this is the
way it is for a draft map. We're just seeing --
right now we're still trying to see if we can make
it work with the right numbers. Just getting equal
population into these nine districts.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you for
explaining, but when he says "is that okay," that's the part that's throwing me off. Is he asking for approval from all of us?

WILLIE DESMOND: I guess what I'm trying to do is tell if it's a hypothetical like we could do this or this is something I should actually push green on.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Are you asking the person that's requesting those changes or all of us?

WILLIE DESMOND: I guess I'm waiting for someone to answer yes or no.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: You just need one person to say yes?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: No.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think he's asking -- can I ask another question?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Sorry. I don't know what he's asking.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I happen to agree with you, Commissioner Herrera, that if you're looking for one person to give you the green light on that, I don't think that's what your intent is.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: What's the population west of Scottsdale in 6?

WILLIE DESMOND: The Fort McDowell.
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: West of Scottsdale --

WILLIE DESMOND: West of Scottsdale.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: -- in 6.

WILLIE DESMOND: So in the Phoenix part it's 350,000. I can check Paradise Valley also. That's 363,000 people.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And what's the population of -- what's the population of Chandler, Gilbert, Queen Creek, San Tan Valley, Gold Canyon, and Apache Junction?

WILLIE DESMOND: Queen Creek, Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, San Tan Valley?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: That whole area. Everything south of the county line that's in 4.

WILLIE DESMOND: That's 179,000.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: If you add Gilbert and Chandler and Sun Lakes?

WILLIE DESMOND: That is 559 -- 560,000.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So that doesn't work.

What I was thinking of doing was putting Mesa in District 6 with Paradise -- with Scottsdale and then kind of trading that western part of Phoenix for this population. But this is more
WILLIE DESMOND: So this area that's in red needs to make up about 150,000 people somewhere for it to be a full district. That would have to come from Mesa.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Well, I don't think that works.

If we -- just one more time so I'm clear on this, if we take -- can we balance the population in 5 with doing -- what do we need to do there?

WILLIE DESMOND: 5 needs to right now give up 26,000 people.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. I think we were going to try and do that in the unincorporated areas of northwest -- northeast Mesa. That's what we had done earlier.

WILLIE DESMOND: That's what we did earlier, but we did have to go into Mesa.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. Well, let's try that, please.

Where is the county line?

WILLIE DESMOND: County line?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: -- in Queen Creek.

WILLIE DESMOND: It's right here. This orange line is the county line.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: This is just a quick -- this shape can be redone.

That's 23,000. It's 26 roughly. So something like that would bring it down.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Don't commit to it, but just -- can we try it?

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure. Again, we can always go back.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So what is the population hub now that's east of Phoenix that would be in 4, approximately?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, 4 is now overpopulated. So 4 --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: What is the population in 4 that's in -- that's east of metro?

WILLIE DESMOND: That's over here?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That's east.

Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, San Tan, Queen Creek.

WILLIE DESMOND: Roughly 185,000, I think.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So what's the population of Buckeye west of -- in 4? Can we take 180,000 people from there and bring them into --

WILLIE DESMOND: Let me just see.
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Once we do that, what do we have to do?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I thought we had balanced this out before.

WILLIE DESMOND: We did earlier today. So this -- that right there is about 150,000 people.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Which 4 would need to -- 4 is right now 146 over.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. But once we take that out, where does it go?

WILLIE DESMOND: That would go probably to 8.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Then what does that do to 8?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, the 8 is overpopulated, so it could give up some to 6, probably.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And does 6 need population?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, right now 6 is about 145 underpopulated. So it needs to transfer to 6.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: All right. Well,
can we try that, you know, without doing anything that commits us for ten years or ten hours?

WILLIE DESMOND: We can do that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It's worth exploring.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Now, 4 needs to get back just a little population, which you probably could do from the large unincorporated part.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: In the course of doing that, did we include the Luke area?

WILLIE DESMOND: In which area?


WILLIE DESMOND: No, that's still District -- well, a part of that is in District 3.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Oh, okay.

District 3.

WILLIE DESMOND: So if it's okay with everyone, I'll balance 4 first and then we'll work on the 6 and 8 split.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: So 4 needs to get 5700 people from District Number 8. It's 5800 people, but it looks weird.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It seems like some sort of performance art. Some sort of weird --

WILLIE DESMOND: So that's about right.

So now 4 is just off by 20 people.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Excellent. It also looks a lot better.

WILLIE DESMOND: And now 6 needs to get population from 8.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: I guess I could start with the rest of Phoenix.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yeah, that cleans -- that consolidates that community and makes that more --

WILLIE DESMOND: Let's see. I don't know if there's going to be too much population.

I'm taking a little chunk of Glendale there but we can clean that up.

So that's 135. Accept that and we can figure out the next 12,000.

I guess it should grow down to -- so this is too much population. I'll accept it, and I'll have to rebalance 8 again.

We can start with Peoria and Glendale and then you're going to have to decide either to take
some from the more urban part of Phoenix or take
some from the northern part.

Which makes more sense?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Take some from 6
into 8?

WILLIE DESMOND: 8 needs to -- when we
took all of Phoenix, it made 8 -- or made 6 too big.
So now 6 needs to give up --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Like how much?

WILLIE DESMOND: So 6 needs to shed
45,000 people?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And how much is
that area of Peoria there?

WILLIE DESMOND: I don't think there's
many because it went in one click.
So if you take those two areas to not
split the census place, that's about 6600. That
would make 8 about 4100 -- or 41,000 shy and 6 about
39,000 over and the rest of that 2000 in between is
distributed among the rest of the districts.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So if you started
in Northwest Phoenix --

WILLIE DESMOND: Would you rather I cross
or cut straight, like, up and down?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Does anyone have
any thoughts? My thought is we're going to hear a
lot of public comment if we do this.

WILLIE DESMOND: I can put the roads on,
if that would be helpful to see.

So I guess you could start by going north
of 74 or you could start by going west of 17.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Is 74 the
east/west?

WILLIE DESMOND: 74 runs east/west, yeah.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: What's the
population northwest there.

WILLIE DESMOND: That's about 41,000.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Can you keep that
New River whole there?

WILLIE DESMOND: I can't.

Now 6 needs to grab just 5200 people
somewhere.

I guess it probably makes sense to do it
in Phoenix so as to avoid another census place
split, but whatever makes --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would say just
south of New River and Anthem there in that -- even
that out a little bit, if we can. And then those
areas --

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, 6 needs to get
more population.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I'm sorry, we need more from 8?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: It could take part of New River here or parts of Peoria or Glendale or part of Phoenix.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Why not go -- see the little -- south of Anthem where we put that little bump, can we just bring the east/west line of Phoenix --

WILLIE DESMOND: Like right here?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Yeah. What is that?

WILLIE DESMOND: I think that's north of 74. I don't know how much -- I don't think there's a large amount of population there.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So that's not going to help?

WILLIE DESMOND: I mean, we can look. If I just did something like that, that's about 2600 people. You can't go up too high because then you cut this area off and it's no longer contiguous.
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Does that make sense?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Uh-huh.

WILLIE DESMOND: That right there gives you about 39. You still need to make up 2300 people.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So if you go all the way up that's going to be too many.

WILLIE DESMOND: If you go all the way up, it makes New River and Anthem not touch the rest of their district.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Oh, I see. We're going into 5, not out of 6.

What's the dark green? Is that Glendale?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Because we changed the color.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I assume that's too many people?

WILLIE DESMOND: I can try.

Yeah. It's, like, 130,000.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Remind me again what you're trying --

WILLIE DESMOND: About 6,000.
MARY O'GRADY: Would it help to have the streets back on so you can see, get oriented there?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes. That was --

WILLIE DESMOND: That covers it up. I can zoom in some more.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Covers up the lines?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah. And then I can --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Lost the streets again.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'll turn off the local streets. So you'll just have like the highways as a reference point. We can zoom and those will still be labeled if you want to zoom into a certain area.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Maybe move that area north of 101 in Glendale.

WILLIE DESMOND: So we need to get 5100 people. That's 3,000. That's about 8,000, so that's too many. Something like that. That gets you to 6,000. It's kind of roughly there.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay. Let's try that.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So now 8 needs to make up 3200 people. 7 has about a thousand extra, 5 has about a thousand extra, 6 has about a thousand
extra.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Let's put them all in 8.

WILLIE DESMOND: Put them all in 8.

That's going to make 8 very large.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Didn't you say they needed 3,000 people?

WILLIE DESMOND: 8 needs to get about a thousand. Do you want to -- I can tweak this line right there to take make up the first part of it.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Yeah, that's perfect.

WILLIE DESMOND: There's no clean-looking blocks.

So that's about 740 people. That's about 845.

So now 6 is pretty much very close to 26 people off.

8 needs to get some from 5 and 7. So I'll do that. I guess we could start with -- well, 5 is going to need to give some to 9 or 4, probably.

So if we take a little bit from -- back from this part of Mesa, you can give that over to the other side.

I hope the people watching at home are
enjoying this as much as everyone in the room.

Okay. That's about 1600 people. I'm just going to see what this is. That might be a better -- I'll take in --

Now 5 is off by 3 people. 4 and 7 both need to give some to 8.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Isn't 7 our voting rights' district?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I don't think we changed that.

WILLIE DESMOND: It's about 1100 people. We can do that later.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Yeah, I think we --

WILLIE DESMOND: I think this map is reasonably close, that the changes you do here would be in the unincorporated areas of West Maricopa would be where 4 would give up some population. This line would just be extended out a little bit.

And then what I would do is in 7, I would -- you know, we would look at the HVAP of all of the blocks on the edge and find places where removing a block from 7 would increase the HVAP, so it would take out low blocks.
Do you know to do that right now or is that something --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think that's -- what do you think?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We can do that.

Was 7 over right now?

WILLIE DESMOND: 7 is over 1190. If that works, I'll start with this line right here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I like what happened on 4. That seems to actually make some sense, the way it come into the metro area.

What are we doing now?

WILLIE DESMOND: We are extending the line. 8 is getting some population from District 4 out on the western part. It needs to give up 330. Most of these are zero population blocks.

That got it close. We're still about 90 off. So 4 is now underpopulated by about 92 people. 8 is now underpopulated by 747 people and 9 is overpopulated by 1100.

So on the border between 8 and 7, what I would do here is -- we'll do it by census block. Shade that based off of HVAP. So the darker the green, the higher the Hispanic voting-age population.
So 8 needs to come down here and grab some. Looks like just on this corner it seems to -- that would affect the overall HVAP of this too much. So if I just took 8 from 7 -- we'll try the block group and see what that does.

That's about 1300 people. Of that, there's an HVAP of 57. So it wouldn't lower -- it wouldn't necessarily lower the overall because it's right at where the overall is, but we could probably do better if we just did it with blocks and picked up some of these areas.

And this is the process we'll have to go through when we clean up all of the lines to get a zero-population deviation before the plan can be finished.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Due to the lateness of the hour and that we are reconvening again at 9 o'clock. You've got an audience that has been patient and wanting to make public testimony, is it -- and there's going to need to be time to review the myriad of changes that have taken place over the last three hours, both in design and in data, is it possible that we can move through to the next
process while Mr. Desmond is cleaning up and creating data tables for all of us to be able to review over the weekend so we can be responsive to this on Monday morning as well as hear the testimony from all of these folks that have been so patient to give their testimony?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: The time is 4:35. I take it we won't be covering much legislative mapping today, given how late it is. No one is up for that.

And do we have anything on the Attorney General inquiry?

MARY O'GRADY: No, there's no new updates.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So it is just public comment and -- Mr. Bladine is not here. I don't know if Kristina is planning on giving us anything new. We were to look at our -- the second round hearings schedule she gave us yesterday, so that won't take a lot of time. So, yeah, we just have the public comment pieces left.

What are people's thoughts on the changes we made today and the current state of the congressional map?

I heard what Mr. Stertz said. Is there
any other thoughts, too?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I agree with Commissioner Stertz. I would want to look at it. I mean, it's -- I have some serious concerns about it. I think at this point in the day -- I don't want to get home too late and neither do the folks who are out here who have been waiting. I prefer to do as he suggests and let's get the data files from Mr. Desmond and come back Monday morning and have some ideas, close the loop on this one.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Other --

Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think I would like to finish a draft map so on Monday we can work on legislative.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera, do you have any thoughts?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I do, but I would like to hear what you have to say first.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. I would prefer to finish a draft map, if we could, today. It's September 30th. Kind of a nice close to the month if we could just finish this and then be able to focus fully on legislative next week.
That's my preference. I would rather -- you know, we've all been sitting here working and looking at these lines and the changes that have been made. And we saw the splits report from last night as to how it was before today's changes and we could at least have Mr. Desmond run another splits report based on what just happened and take a look at that. I don't know how much will have changed, but we can at least look and see.

Again, this is a draft map. We're not formalizing anything for ten years with this. We're going to take it on the road for almost three weeks of public comments and we'll have ample opportunity afterwards to make adjustments based on that comment.

And I think we'll have a lot of really good input that will be warranted to cause us to make changes.

So -- and I would rather, you know, do that with the public involved and that way the five of us not aren't continuing up here to just decide what we think based on our own individual knowledge as well as what we think we've heard from the public.

So I would rather get something put
together and then out to the public and then make the changes. That's my take.

Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair, the -- I would agree Mr. -- Commissioner Freeman that there's a lot of things about this map that concern me. And I've already expressed some of my concerns about this map, but I ended up agreeing to the original version of this map as a working draft even though, again, I didn't agree to this map and it wasn't complete.

The reason I agreed to that because I wanted to move forward with a draft. That's why I agreed to it in the first place. And I, again, am not happy with this map, but I would agree to move forward so we can start working on the legislative map. So I would agree with you and Commissioner McNulty.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I would just also add that I think the changes that were just made to 8 -- well, to really all of those donut area districts make sense.

I mean, 5 looks just a lot better not having that leg coming down from 6 into it. Makes it much more whole and makes sense with this
surrounding communities. And the west side also makes sense the way it comes in to the metro area.

So I think the changes were actually really good, and it looks like Mr. Desmond completed 7, the minority-majority district so that it's now just short 156 people instead of over a thousand.

And the HVAP of that for 7 is what?

WILLIE DESMOND: 57.53.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So it's still at the benchmark. Okay.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair, could I suggest one additional cleanup item?

The Luke Air Force Base, could we go to that and to the airfield and just east of it?

WILLIE DESMOND: So this -- the area just east is right here.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. There's a part of the airfield that's in 3, I think.

WILLIE DESMOND: This portion?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Could we just -- I think that would clean up a split there and it would resolve a concern. And I wondered if we could -- could you do the same thing that you just did for District 7?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah. 3 needs give up
some population anyway. 3 is about 470 people over.
I'll turn this on.

Well, if we just start by taking this area from 3, we'll see what that does to -- the HVAP in 3 is currently 55.32.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I want to be really sensitive to that.

WILLIE DESMOND: 55.32.

I would say there is a portion of Glendale that runs right along this line right here. If we include all of that, you're going to -- do you see this?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: That's going to -- there is a lot of population right here, so that might have a major of effect.

If you wanted to just take this part, there's not many people that live there.

Does that make sense?

I'll show you one step by step.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think what we really want is the airfield, to consolidate it with the Luke Air Force Base. And if it creates --

WILLIE DESMOND: So that's 526 people.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.
WILLIE DESMOND: 3 was currently 400 -- so now it's 55.35. It actually went up by three-hundredths of a percentage.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: All right. That's excellent.

WILLIE DESMOND: And now 3 is 58 people underpopulated.

The big population that needs to be shifted around in 8 is now 1100 people over. So that needs to give some to both 2, which is going to have to go through another district because that's down in Pima. It needs to give some to 2 and also to 6.

So it can easily give that population to 6 but we're going to have to work out a way to bring some population equality down to that District 2 in Tucson.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think we can do that. That's within our margin of error that we are going to work on. Because once we get public comments, we'll be making more changes and I'm not sure it makes sense to --

WILLIE DESMOND: We did just remove another split from Glendale. There will be that portion that runs -- there's zero population. There
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: -- or a town boundary, I believe.

Are there any other tweaks that any of the commissioners are interested in seeing?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: I think you've cut out New River and Anthem from North Central Phoenix where there's strong ties and communities of interest.

I think Phoenix has been put together with Scottsdale. We've already heard a lot of comments about the distinctiveness from Scottsdale from Phoenix, how really it's inappropriate to put them together.

It does kind of put the west side together, but it also puts it together with these far-off rural places. And if I lived out there, I would wonder whether I would really be heard by my representative who is probably going to be paying more attention to the urban part of Phoenix.

It also -- not to mention the fact we've got San Tan Valley and Apache Junction and Gold Canyon being put with Babkai (sic) and these other far western cities. I mean, those are all problems.
I mean, there are other ways to approach it. I wouldn't mind having Mr. Desmond throw up whole counties version 6f. That's the one that never saw the screen because I wanted to try to work with the chair's map, but if you could do that real fast.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah. Absolutely.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Is everybody else okay with that?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, we can do that.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: That's kind of hard to see overlaid like that.

WILLIE DESMOND: Let me change the color.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Can you hide the current working draft? Maybe back out.

There's a map that was constructed simply by applying broad constitutional criteria. Trying to minimize splits to counties. Pima County is split because of the Voting Rights Act concern and because Tucson is too big.

Yuma County gets split because of the Voting Rights Act district.

Pinal County gets split but only to keep tribal areas whole and there is this small cutout
that puts Apache Junction in with the urban metro area.

Gila County is split but only because of the Indian tribe.

Coconino County is split only because of the Indian tribe.

That left us with this core area around urban Maricopa County and it was very easy -- I mean, we constructed the different -- districts in different ways, trying to construct compact districts that respected municipal boundaries. We worked from east -- southeast to west and then another version west to east. I think that sort of -- there was a starting point that we saw in there, but we were looking for the configuration that yielded more the competitive results.

It was only in a very late version, I think it was 6e, that I called out the first street, at least to my knowledge, was just to orient the map more north/south and start from the middle and work out, which was Scottsdale Road. And you ended up with Scottsdale, Fountain Hills, in this north part of the Valley together with a piece of West Mesa, Tempe, and Chandler, and Ahwatukee. Kind of like the portion of the map we have now.
We've got a nice area here in the Southeast Valley that all fits together. Mesa only gets split once. Gilbert is together. Chandler is only split once, as it is in the current working draft.

Queen Creek is kept together. The North Central Phoenix communities are all put together.

And by the way, the tops of these -- lightly populated tops of these cities I think were ultimately going to be put into this. So they would not be split. They probably reflect splits now. But there's really -- it's lightly populated.

And the West Valley is all put together. And that line there I think was roughly the I-17. It just happened to work out that way, but it makes a very nice place to split the west side from Central and North Central Phoenix.

I mean, that wasn't -- that was some very few steps. It really didn't call out -- the only street called out was Scottsdale Road and we ended up with it nicely packaged like that.

And now we've spent Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday, all day of this week trying to massage and -- you can go ahead and put the overlay or current working draft -- massage our way around this
designer district. And we're seeing how difficult it was.

Basically my instructions to Mr. Desmond in building that whole counties map were about as simple as what I laid out.

There were further tweaks to that map that could have been made, which was, like I said was putting the tops of the cities on and perhaps way up north to go over and allow -- connect the Navajo Nation lands with the Pai tribes and the Big Boquillas Ranch area, but that was adding very little population and really wouldn't cause too much stress on the rest of the map.

Yes, in whole counties, San Tan Valley is not included in the urban metro area, but you could also say, hey, it's in Pinal County, so that's where it belongs. You could try to put it there, and I think that would be possible as well.

But that was a very simple -- simply developed map that I thought yielded some good results and we hadn't finished it. And yet what we're working on now -- I just -- and it also respected communities of interest. It kept Scottsdale distinct from North Central Phoenix. It kept the North Valley together with North Central
Phoenix. It kept the West Valley together. It kept the Southeast Valley together.

It kind of fit together the way that the Valley does and Arizona does.

Was it perfect? No, but no map is. This is -- what we are working on now it just seems a little contrived and there seems to be lots of stress points and we just seem to be moving lines around simply to balance population and that's it.

And so all of those things concern me about where we're going. I mean, I would prefer to study what we are doing now over the weekend, but that's going to be, I think, up to the chair what you would like to do with it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No doubt, I think what you created there -- I mean, it's a lovely package for the whole Phoenix metro area. I'm sure it makes sense and that you were building that based upon the constitutional criteria.

I'm the one who threw the constraints into this by trying to create a map that brought in as many elements as I could from the different versions, and especially the two tracks that we were going down to get us onto one map. That was my goal.
And in doing so, we created a competitive rural, a competitive Tucson, and I felt, again, that having a goal of -- an overall goal of creating a competitive district in Metro Phoenix was something that we should strive for and I still believe that.

And that's when this District 9 got created by Ms. McNulty and then we all worked around that to see if we could create the rest of the donut around that that could make sense.

And we did come up with something today -- actually yesterday and it's certainly something that could go out for public comment as a draft map.

You know, there is cleanup needed, but I -- the Mesa area, I really thought needed help on that map, which is why we went through what we did today and we ended up having to make a lot of changes to try to accomplish that, as Mr. Desmond tried to warn us. He knew it would take a lot.

So given how many changes there were just in this exercise that we went through, maybe what he could do is run the splits report on what we ended up -- where we just ended up on and have us study this over the weekend and on Monday, at least then -- you know, my goal is on Monday, October 3rd,
we adopt a draft map.

I just -- we have to get beyond congressional, and I would hope that over the weekend you can also spend time looking at legislative, because time -- we're almost out of time and we're going on the road on the 11th.

So maybe the thing to do now would be just do public comment and then -- it's 4:53. I've got a stack here. We'll go through public comment and then adjourn, since we don't have anything to talk about on legislative today anyway, and we'll come back Monday morning.

And I believe we are meeting here. I don't know if Kristina is in the room, but I think we're meeting here again at 9 a.m. on Monday. So hopefully we can come back Monday and talk about finalizing the congressional and also have time for legislative discussion on Monday.

Does that sound okay with people?

COMMISSIONER FREEMAN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So on the agenda, it's item 8, call for public comment, and as I think many of the public -- people in the public are aware, they need to come up to the microphone, speak directly into the microphone so we can all
hear you and that we get an accurate accounting.
And please be sure to spell your last name for our
recorder so she can get an accurate record.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I think Ms. Gomez
has some comments for the executive director's
report.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, okay. I don't
see her, but -- okay, she is coming. So maybe we'll
go ahead and do executive director's report, then, I
guess next before public comment.
KRISTINA GOMEZ: Good afternoon.
I just want to give you a short update of
the upcoming round two meetings.
We have confirmed seven meetings. So
we've confirmed Tuba City, Chandler, Bullhead City,
Casa Grande, Flagstaff, Window Rock, Scottsdale, and
Yuma.
We haven't -- and I also want to let
people know that this document is a working
document. It's a draft document. So I do apologize
for not writing "draft" on this document.
So this is our beginning point and we are
working hard to make phone calls and send out
e-mails and seek out assistance as far as helping us plan these -- or help us find facilities around the entire state. So that's the update with the second round.

And also we do not have -- there are very few meetings scheduled for Friday, and that's because there's a lot of activities going on in the state. We have a lot of high school football games going on and fall festivals and religious events as well.

So we are trying to arrange these meetings around the different community events.

So that is the status for the second round.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Any questions for Ms. Gomez on the second hearing -- second round of hearings draft schedule that she gave us yesterday?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Ms. Gomez, have any of the locations been cut from the list that we looked at earlier this morning?

KRISTINA GOMEZ: No, sir.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Thanks.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other questions?

Okay. Thank you.

And so 9 o'clock here Monday, right, is our next meeting?

Okay.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So we will go to the next agenda item, which is public comment, number 8, and our first speaker is Beth Hullgren, representing self from Pinal County.

Nancy LaPlaca, maybe. I'm sorry, representing self from Tempe.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't think she's here, but she might be back.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We'll hold that.

Clark Smithson, city council member from City of Apache Junction.

CLARK SMITHSON: Thank you, Madame Chair, members of the Commission.

The City of Apache Junction stands with the other Pinal County stakeholders in supporting the keeping of Pinal County together in one congressional district.

The current versions of the maps -- the
donut hole maps -- effectively split Pinal County into four or more congressional districts. And we've seen over the past ten years that our congressional delegation is often focused on the population centers of the state. As a result of specific issues of Arizona's fast growing county, Pinal County, have a difficult time making their way to the forefront.

We respectfully request that the Commission keep Pinal County whole so that our fast-growing county receive the representation it deserves.

Additionally, I would point out that the -- putting Apache Junction and any other parts of Pinal County with District 4, in my opinion, violates three -- certainly, I think you would have to agree it violates at least two of the principles.

Certainly it is not compact. It is -- the community of interest is not met. Apache Junction and Pinal County does not have a common community of interest with Bullhead City, Kingman, Lake Havasu and the other river cities.

And I propose that it also does not meet the standard of contiguous. Yes, the lines show it does, and if you just say that lines make something
contiguous, then I guess you could say it's contiguous. But those mountains are in the way. There is no way to get in the county -- or in the proposed district from anyplace in Pinal County to anyplace else in District 4 unless we could somehow come up with some magic that would give us enough faith to level a mountain and put a road there and make it possible.

Otherwise, it is not contiguous. Yes, the lines show it, but those mountains are very much in the way.

I respectfully request that you seriously reconsider the entire concept of putting any part of Pinal County, and especially Apache Junction, in District 4.

Thank you very much for your consideration, and I'm glad I'm not on that side of the table.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you for sticking with us today, too. And I appreciate your input.

Let's see. We have supervisor Bryan Martyn from Pinal County.

BRYAN MARTYN: Thank you, Madame Chairman. I'm Bryan Martyn, Pinal County
Supervisor. B-r-y-a-n, M-a-r-t-y-n.

If I could approach briefly and just give
a map, if that's all right, Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes.

I have that.

BRYAN MARTYN: I will be brief.

As we know, it's been a very long day. I appreciate, as always, your efforts as a body and your challenges as working together to serve our entire state.

One of the problems we have with Pinal County, as you heard me say before, is that we are a rapidly growing community. Our growth pattern over the past ten years has exceeded 3,141 other counties. We are the number two growing county in the country.

Our population has gone up over almost a hundred percent, 99.9 percent. And our population in the next ten years, if you cut that number in half and say we'll grow at a 50 percent rate, which is very possible given our available lands, puts us at growing to almost 200,000 more. Taking us over 500,000.

Why do I bring that up?

We have a lot of needs in Pinal County
for federal services. We have infrastructure that we have to address, we have water issues we have to address, we have rail issues that we need to address more so than pretty much any other county in Arizona.

The drawing you have before you -- the pie chart you have before you currently represents what you have presented in the map, breaking the county into five distinct congressional districts.

Although it's not such a big deal up in Maricopa County, if you split a place, the congressman is right there and attentive to you.

These districts show -- the chart was set up to represent the portion of Pinal County in that congressional district. And the congressional districts were generic 710,000.

CD 1 right now is has approximately 18 percent of Pinal County in it. Almost a quarter. And that would be something that we could work with. That congressman or woman would surely be attentive to the needs -- the wants, needs, and desires of that congressional district if they wanted to be reelected.

Our other congressional districts are not as robust. CD 2, we represent 1.4 percent of the
congressional district. Now, there's a logistics
problem here where congressmen and women generally
don't have the time to give attention to 1.4 percent
of the population.

CD 3, 3.8 percent; CD 4, 6.5 percent; and
CD 5, 11.1 percent.

Nobody is watching out for Pinal County.
And we know that Arizona is going to grow in Pinal
County.

There have been a number of things
represented today relative to district. And I
appreciate all the work you have done, especially
that inside the donut. But outside the donut I
don't think we have the best solution for
representation of our citizens in Arizona.

Let me say that again. I don't think the
outside of the donut -- I think there are other ways
to do this where we can assure that we have
representation for the wants, needs, and desires of
not only today's personnel, citizens, but over the
next ten years.

We're going to grow like crazy. It's
going to come. And Pinal County is where it's going
to grow. And I don't have anybody that I can pick
up the phone and call and say Congresswoman
Kirkpatrick, Congressman Gosar, I need some help.

It's not a partisan issue. We worked with Ann when she was there, and she did a great job. We've worked with Paul and he's there. So it's not a partisan issue. Doesn't have anything to do with your race. It's about having ears and eyes in Washington that speak our issues that are accountable to us.

The whole district map addresses a lot of those issues. Keeping our rural counties where they are.

Finally, I'll bring up -- you have the option to move -- help out with Coconino County. Coconino County -- I don't want to single them out for any negative reason, but there are options there. You heard from them. They want to stay on the east side. Only a body -- a certain body has represented that.

There is an option to move them to the west side and pull Pinal County nearly whole and make CD 1 work.

Quick thing on Coconino County. Over the last ten years, they grew at a rate 15.6 percent. We grew at 99.9 percent. Their population right now is 134,000. We're at 375,000.
If they have growth pattern of half of what they did in the last ten years, it takes them all the way up to a robust 144,000. It will be at 565,000.

I need help. I need help to manage Pinal County. I have citizens that deserve representation in Washington. And the current plan does not afford them the ability to reach out and touch those individuals who are responsible for their livelihood.

Do you have any questions at all?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any question?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Mr. Martyn, I do have one question.

These numbers don't add up to a hundred. Can you just explain to me how this works?

BRYAN MARTYN: And they wouldn't add up to a hundred. Each congressional district is different and these are the major populations. I didn't put anything under 5,000.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: This is the percentage of the congressional district that is Pinal County, not the percentage of Pinal County that is in a congressional district?

BRYAN MARTYN: Correct.
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. Thank you. That's what I needed to understand.

All right. And which one of these is the -- one of these is Saddlebrooke?

BRYAN MARTYN: Saddlebrooke is CD 2.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And one of these would be the Gila River Indian Community?

BRYAN MARTYN: CD 3 includes Arizona City and Eloy, populations of about 16,000 and 10,000 respectively.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. Thank you.

BRYAN MARTYN: And have a good weekend.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you. You, too.

Our next speaker is Sandie Smith. She's been patiently waiting too, all day. Former county supervisor, Pinal County.

SANDIE SMITH: Madame Chair, members of the committee, may name is Sandie Smith, S-m-i-t-h.

And who am I?

I am a 41-year resident of Pinal County. I was 20 years in the retail business, 9 years on the school border 16 years as a Democrat candidate and successful candidate for the board of supervisors from '93 to 2008.
And I came to Pinal County for the quality of life it afforded myself and my family. And who are we as Pinal County?

We're communities of interest. We're 5,386 square miles. We are rural with urban pockets. We're team players with rich heritage and values.

As a county, we have an economic development team and we are focusing on economic development.

This year the Pinal County town hall is being held on economic development. It's our 25th town hall.

We have a park, open space, and trails effort county-wide. We have worked to save the state parks of Picacho, McFarland, Lost Dutchman, and then the park at the San Tan regional park.

We are working to implement the cities' and the counties' plans to connect their approved plans for open space and trails. Each one of our cities have approved plans and our county and we are working to connect all of those throughout our county.

We have transportation efforts, north/south freeway from 60 to 10, 11 that comes out...
of Nevada all the way down to 8. The gateway that
goes over to 60 in the Mesa area and the widening of
10.

We have the governmental alliance, which
represents every city and town and county as the
governing body in Pinal County. And they have
produced a map that they hope that you would
consider.

Our COG, our Council of Governments is
Pinal/Gila. It's our planning group for
transportation and other state and federal funding.

We are rural. We have an entity called
the Pinal Partnership that is bringing the private
and public entities together to address our
infrastructure needs.

We know that high growth does not create
communities of interest. Communities of interest
are like interests and like values. That's what
creates it.

So we would like not to just be lumped in
with people that are growing fast. We know that we
are growing fast. We do think that we have some
plans that will help us so that we can retain our
rural while accommodating our urban.

So I would hope that you would look at
the plans and please do not set us up into the four
to five areas that we have been proposed today that
we hear -- keep coming back and forth.

And we would like for you to look at the plans that we had presented at the very beginning
and also at the whole communities.

I stand ready for questions.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any questions?

SANDIE SMITH: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is Gina Turrubiartes, from Guadalupe.

And you can pronounce it correctly for us?

GINO TURRUBIARTES: Sure.

It's actually Gino, G-i-n-o --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sorry.

GINO TURRUBIARTES: And the last name is Turrubiartes, T-u-r-r-u-b-i-a-r-t-e-s.

Good afternoon, members of the IRC committee and everyone here this afternoon. It's been a long day for everyone.

As I stated, my name is Gino Turrubiartes, community development director for the Town of Guadalupe.
Guadalupe was incorporated in 1975 and has a current population of roughly 6,000 residents in about one square mile, predominately Hispanic and Native American.

There are over 1800 households in the town of Guadalupe. Besides the town hall, we have a senior center, a CAP office, a sheriff substation, a library, South Mountain Community College, Boys & Girls Club, civic center, which is our Mercado, Pascua Yaqui tribe center, Pascua Yaqui tribe education center, Western Sonora apartments for low-income families, Edomi senior living apartments, roughly six churches and about 34 businesses in the community.

The town council in Guadalupe voted and requested that we stay in Legislative District 16 as presented by Senator Leah Landrum Taylor and Representative Richard Miranda to the IRC in previous meetings.

The town of Guadalupe finds commonality with the neighbor to the west, south Phoenix, and Laveen.

The town council of Guadalupe would also like -- in support of congressional maps proposed by the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government.
To that end, I would also like to note that the town of Guadalupe has successfully worked together with the city of Tolleson on economic development for both our communities, as we share a lot of commonality with our -- within our well-established communities.

I ask that the IRC include the town of Guadalupe with its neighboring community to the west and on both legislative and congressional districts.

Thank you, and thank you for your hard work.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Jill Kipnes from Pima County Government Alliance.

JILL KIPNES: Good afternoon.

It's Jill Kipnes, K-i-p-n-e-s. I'm with Robert S. Lynch & Associates and we represent Pinal County Government Alliance.

First, I was asked today to come in front of you on behalf of the Coolidge City Council to read a resolution into the record that they passed at their meeting on Monday.

It reads: Resolution number 11-40. A resolution of the mayor and city council for the city of Coolidge, Arizona, urging support for the
Pinal County Government Alliance congressional and legislative maps and any other map that treat Pinal County and the city of Coolidge in a similar manner as do the Pinal County Government Alliance maps and asking the Independent Redistricting Commission to reject any maps, including river district map 7a, that divides Pinal County excessively. Whereas the city of Coolidge and its residents have a strong interest in seeing Pinal County kept as whole as possible through the redistricting process for congress and the Arizona legislature.

And whereas the city of Coolidge city council wants Independent Redistricting Commission to respect all six of the criteria for redistricting identified in the Arizona Constitution are called IV part 2 section 114. It then goes on to list the six criteria. I'm going to not do that.

Whereas Pinal County Government Alliance produced a map that kept Pinal County as whole as possible while adhering faithfully to the six redistricting criteria of the Arizona Constitution whereas the citizens of the city of Coolidge and Pinal County will be best served if their voting power is concentrated as opposed to being diluted by cutting Pinal County into excessive amount of
congressional and legislative districts.

Now, therefore be it resolved by the mayor and the city council of the City of Coolidge as follows: Section 1, the city council supports the Pinal County Government Alliance congressional and legislative map and ask that the Independent Redistricting Commission adhere as closely as possible to those maps or any other maps that treat Pinal County and the city of Coolidge in a similar manner as do the Pinal County Government Alliance map.

Section 2, the city council requests that the Independent Redistricting Commission reject any map, including river district map 7a as currently constituted that divides Pinal County excessively.

Passes and adopted by the mayor and city council of the City of Coolidge on the 26th day of September, 2011. And it is signed by their mayor, Thomas Shope.

I will also -- I do have copies and I will turn those in for the record.

Just a quick other -- two other quick things.

Our timeline, I kind of got the impression today that people don't think that Pinal
County has let their voice be known. We introduced our map to you at the public hearing on July 27th. There were people at public hearings following ours that supported our map.

We presented our map 30 days ago, I think in this room, on September 2nd, again, to discuss what our map is and how it was -- how constitutionally strong it was. And again supervisor David Snyder addressed you just on Monday over at the Holiday Inn in Casa Grande to, again, go over the six criteria of our map.

So I think that Pinal County has let it be known what their wishes are. You heard so far from some elected officials. You still have a couple more to hear from tonight, that they do want to stay together.

Lastly, really for the Alliance, that the map that we saw today, that we went over today, just sacrifices Pinal County into four or five districts just the to benefit the needs and the wants of others.

Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Belinda Akes, city councilman from Eloy.
BELINDA AKES: Good evening. I had a good morning, then I had good afternoon, now I have good evening.

My name is Belinda Akes, A-k-e-s, and I am from Eloy. In case you don't know where Eloy is, we're on Interstate 10 between Phoenix and Tucson. We're where all of the truck stops are.

On the map you have us going to the south with Tucson. We would like to stay with Pinal County. Coolidge, Florence, Eloy, and Casa Grande share a long history.

We support each other's businesses, we live in each other's towns, and our children compete with each other in sports.

If you take Eloy out of Pinal County, we would lose our identity. We will also lose our chance to be represented.

It is important to me and our community that Eloy be represented. Please keep Eloy in Pinal County where we should be.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Denise Rapata, representing Democratic party from Gilbert.

DENISE RAPATA: Yes.
Good afternoon, Madame Chair and the rest of the committee.

Thank you for letting me speak. My name is Denise Rapata. Rapata is R-a-p-a-t-a, and I am a precinct captain for Congressional District 6 and I'm also representing the Democrats in Legislative District 21.

My main concern is competitiveness.

We need fair districts and fair politics this decade. We need districts that will represent all Arizonans, not just the ones in gerrymandered Republican districts. Competitiveness will ensure that districts are fair.

Today voter registration figures show that party affiliation is approximately one-third for each, Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. And yet there is a one-party super majority in both of the Arizona House and Senate.

And is this really fair? Does it really represent all of our electorates? We need balanced and fair districts that actually reflect our state's electorates.

When a district is not competitive, it causes extremeness for both parties. Rather than compete for the general vote, they must compete for
who can be more liberal in the Democratic party or
who can be more conservative in the Republican
party.

In noncompetitive districts, elections
are won in the primary election, not the general,
leaving out a large number of voters who ultimately
feel that their vote didn't matter.

In 2010, with only 55.6 percent of the
electorate turning out to vote, a one-party super
majority was elected in both of Arizona House and
Senate. Competition, competitive districts is good
for our state and good for democracy.

When opposite party candidates actually
have to compete for the vote, they must talk to all
constituents to gain their vote. This encourages
higher civic involvement and higher voter
participation as a result. Voters must feel that
their voice counts in an election.

This is an extraordinary time for
Arizona and the Redistricting Commission has an
extraordinary job to select a fair, balanced, and
competitive map for congressional districts for the
next ten years.

I want to persuade Commission Chairman,
Colleen Mathis, and the Redistricting Committee that
no less than four competitive congressional
districts will be acceptable. Anything less than
this is clear disservice to Arizona and will give
the IRC a black eye in history.

We need districts that represent all of
Arizonans and not just the ones on the gerrymandered
districts.

Thank you very much for listening to me.
Have a good afternoon.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.
Our next speaker is Bill Engler,
representing self from Anthem.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't think he's
here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Jim March, second
vice chair, Pima Libertarian Party.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He left.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Lynn Hurley?

No.

Mohur Sidhwa.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She left.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Matt Lucky.

Heather Murphy from Pinal County.

HEATHER MURPHY: Good evening, members.
Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

My name is Heather Murphy. Normal spelling, M-u-r-p-h-y.

I am here today addressing you as a representative of Pinal County's management staff led by county manager, Fritz Behring. That's B-e-h-r-i-n-g, from the perspective of the day-to-day management of the county's affairs.

It has been difficult to command the attention of our federal delegates. While each of Pinal County's congressional representatives have met with our elected officials both in Washington and in Pinal County, the sheer size of the diversity of the issues in geography greatly limits their ability to attend to the needs of the nation's second fastest-growing county.

Pinal County's opportunities and challenges are unique. They are not shared by adjacent counties.

You won't find many counties in America with two federal interstate highways bisecting it plus a state border to state border double-track railroad. Sharply declining revenues and demands for accountability for every dollar spent has resulted in our decision to cancel representation by
a federal lobbyist. We truly rely on the face-to-face interactions with our federal representatives.

Arizona -- Pinal County is Arizona's fastest-growing county and the nation's second fastest-growing county. I know I'm echoing remarks from others, but in 2005, Pinal County was the seventh fastest-growing county in the U.S. Today it is the second.

Pinal County population has grown tremendously and leading demographers place Pinal County at the center of the sun corridor, one of just ten megalopolitan regions that will see the bulk of the U.S. growth in the coming decades. It's not a question of if, but when.

In addition we are still seeing net new residents moving into the county despite the slump. If you're not in Pinal County, you're not seeing what we see.

While the growth has slowed tremendously, houses, businesses, churches, and other enterprises are still coming to Pinal County.

For these reasons we urge you to consolidate Pinal County and its cities into as few congressional districts as possible and support the
Our next speaker is Joy Staveley, representing Small Business and Grand Canyon River Outfitters in Flagstaff.

JOY STAVELEY: Good evening.

When I took off work today and left Flagstaff at 7:30 in the morning to get down here, I believed that my comments would be considered. And so I was extremely frustrated earlier when I heard Commissioner Herrera say that he had already heard from everyone from Flagstaff.

I hope that that's not the case, and I hope that you will please continue to keep an open mind.

It is only the opinion of some that Flagstaff wants to be in the east district. I personally and the group of small business people that I represent, most definitely want to be in the west side of Flagstaff -- or in the west side of the district because we believe that that's where our true community of interest lies.

I had the pleasure of addressing the Commission in Prescott months ago. And if I may, I
would just like to briefly reintroduce myself.

My name Joy Staveley, and that is spelled S-t-a-v-e-l-e-y. I am co-owner and president of Canyoneers, Incorporated, a white water rafting company in Flagstaff operating in Grand Canyon.

There are half a dozen licensed river outfitters operating in the Grand Canyon who are based in Flagstaff.

My husband and I also own an RV park and campground by the north rim of the Grand Canyon and have owned other businesses in that area in the past. Trying to cut down a little now.

In addition to being a business owner in Flagstaff for the past 33 years, I am also past chairwoman of the Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce and advisory board member of the small business development center, Northern Arizona vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, and a past delegate to the White House on -- small White House Conference on Small Business, and I'm also a member of Flagstaff Forty.

I stand before you this evening as a small business owner who really cares about this redistricting process. I believe that Northern Arizona is heavily tied to tourism in and around
Grand Canyon, and as such, we are different from Maricopa County.

While Flagstaff is the largest city in Northern Arizona, it and the other cities and towns in Northern Arizona are still rural and really do have much in common with -- don't have much in common, excuse me, with urban areas.

We here in Coconino County do have much in common with Yavapai County, Mohave County and other northern and western communities of Arizona. And therefore should be placed together in a common congressional district there. So I'm asking if you would please consider that.

As an example, Northern Arizona communities such as Flagstaff, Prescott, and the Verde Valley share economic development interests, transportation, education, forest restoration, water management, medical and health care interests, and, of course, tourism interests.

We currently work together on common legislative issues such as the Greater Arizona Mayor's Association, Northern Arizona Council of Governments, and the Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization.

Forestled lands lie within Northern
Arizona, and this is a great concern for both Coconino and Yavapai Counties.

Additionally Grand Canyon National Park is located within the counties of Mohave and Coconino and we will be well-served by being in the same congressional district.

I am aware that some in Flagstaff's Forty and in the city and county have testified in favor of Flagstaff being in the eastern district, but I am and many of my business associates in the business community in the Flagstaff and surrounding areas believe that whole counties and whole cities should be placed in a single district to the extent possible while following the criteria spelled out in the Arizona Constitution, the Voting Rights Act, and the U.S. Constitution along with the laws that govern the Commission's rules.

Arizona's rural population is substantial enough to support two congressional districts. However, not all rural interests are the same. And in this instance, Flagstaff and the other non-Indian portions of Coconino County, including the Arizona strip, have more in common with communities of interest like Yavapai and Mohave Counties than with Native American community interests of Navajo and
Apache proposed in the eastern district.

   It is important to understand that not all of Flagstaff Forty is in agreement and not all of Flagstaff, whether it be city or county, is in agreement.

   Flagstaff should be in the western district because that will allow the western district to be become truly rural.

   Now, about one-third of the western district is Maricopa, which is urban. Without Flagstaff in the western district, in time, that district will become urbanized because of the rapid growth in Maricopa. This is not desirable. We want to be sure we have representatives in congress from two real and complete rural districts. The most current map does not seem to provide for that.

   Coconino, Yavapai, Mohave, La Paz, and Northern Yuma County have strong communities of interest. I had mentioned them a little earlier in my presentation.

   With regards to education, NAU has a Prescott campus. There is also Embry Riddle in Prescott, there is an NAU satellite branch in Northern Yuma.

   The I-17 corridor west is very important
to transportation and commerce. The Colorado River is a great water resource as well as recreation opportunity.

The entire Grand Canyon region is a huge and important tourism community of interest and, of course, there is a strong timber interest with Coconino and Yavapai Counties.

I and many others believe that respecting communities of interest and supporting two real and complete rural districts in Arizona is very important to ensure proper representation in Congress for business.

Earlier today when you were trying to make all of the numbers work, and it seemed like a great big puzzle to me, I was wanting to jump out of my seat to say, wait, the answer is leaving Flagstaff into the west. You know, it just seemed like such an easy answer to make everything work and to have all of the criteria be met.

So the group of small business folks that I represent respectfully request that you please consider placing Flagstaff in the western district of Yavapai, Mohave, La Paz, and Northern Yuma counted for all of the issues that I have just mentioned.
And we will try to do a little better job in having more of our folks communicate to you. I must tell you that the process has been a little bit overwhelming. The time period is a little short.

I'm able to take time off because I own my own business, but a lot of our members are not able to do that. And so sometimes the shorter notice or not knowing when the meeting would take place has been a little bit of a problem for them to appear.

We will try to see if we can make sure that more of them do appear. And if they cannot, at least they are able to contact you in writing.

I thank you again for your kind attention, and I ask that you please consider our request.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is James Hallgren.

Don't think he's here.

Jim Forbes, representing self from Chandler.

Martha Jo Billy, representing self from Maricopa.

MARTHA JO BILLY: Actually, I'm from
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Maricopa County.

MARTHA JO BILLY: Maricopa County.

And I've been here before you before.

Martha Jo Billy, B, as in boy, i-l-l-y.

Today I'm speaking to you briefly, I hope, on a different subject than in the past.

If I might make reference real quickly to the past speaker from Flagstaff wanting to be on the west side, I noticed that she neglected a whole group of people, essentially. And essentially what I heard her say was we don't want to have anything to do with the Indians on the eastern side.

Mr. Freeman, in addressing -- I have as that -- I feel that you are attempting to spread the Republicans out so they will have more votes.

And as far as I can tell from living in Gilbert where I've lived since September of nineteen -- no, I'm sorry. I've lived in Arizona since September of 1957. I've lived in Gilbert since June of '77.

The Republicans have done everything possible to prevent any competitiveness in Gilbert. And as far as I can say -- tell from the state legislature at the capitol that they have there,
And I know why so many people have said -- referred to Maricopa at this meeting as the "state of Maricopa."

And I do remember hearing a man last spring speak from Cochise County on TV where that was the first time I heard Maricopa referred to as the "state of Maricopa." And we all know they are referring to the capitol down in Phoenix and the surrounding area.

When I first came to Gilbert, I've heard people say it's a small town. One woman yesterday referred to it still going by the name of the town of Gilbert with pride.

Well, a city that has over 200–some thousand people is not a town and it's not a community that's all in harmony.

When I moved there, it was a two-way street. There was a lot of ranch, farmland, and it was a town then. And I remember the Dobson family's last drive of the sheep from the summer mountain range down Guadalupe Road east -- west of Chandler.

Then our council was, quite frankly, taken over by the Mormon church. It has been ruled -- the city has been ruled by the Mormon
church virtually since I've lived there. They control the council, school boards, and have all of these years.

The town of Gilbert was not settled by Mormons, it was settled by people who moved here from the dust bowls of Oklahoma and Texas.

The Morrisons, the Neelys, the Petersons, the Sawyers, the Sossomans, and there are others. I've seen a lot of the them over the years pass away, but some are still living. Descendents of those people, thank goodness.

Our city has been controlled by the religious radical rabid right for years. And this past election this spring for the city council saw the Tea Party Republicans come out in force in Gilbert. Go back and look and read if you don't believe me in the news.

The housing bubble in Gilbert is a result of the deliberate plan by the town of Gilbert to make it a bedroom community for the Mormon church. They have to give a little piece of their land for a stake it will be built on. And they've done that in their subdivisions. When I moved there, there was one stake.

And the reason I bring that up is because
the foreclosures and the bubble burst here has been blamed on the Democrats and Obama. It's the fault of the builders that turned it into a bedroom community. And most of those -- a lot of those houses were bought by people that came in from California planning to use them as extra money and to rent out. And the problem is the bubble burst and hit all of us.

Now my house is worth practically nothing in Gilbert and I've lived in it since April 1989. There's not much I can do.

I was born in the depression. I did not hope to die in one. But from the way I see things going now, it looks like I will.

So I am in favor of splitting Gilbert. I don't care how you split it, quite frankly. I think we need some diversity in Gilbert. You can cut it up into four pieces, as far as I'm concerned. Leave the downtown and get rid of the rest and put them wherever you need population. I do not -- Mr. Freeman mentioned a while ago, people are worried about being heard. And you're right, Mr. Freeman, they are, and I certainly have been worried about being heard.

I do not feel like I am being heard in
this state down at the capitol or in Washington.

When I write Mr. Flake, I get a form back that says, 
"Thanks for contacting my office." He'll get Kyl's 
Senate seat, I have no doubt.

I hope that you do get the maps 
straightened out and settled soon and that it will 
be better than the past agony of the ten years that 
I personally feel I've gone through from the state. 

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Just -- I should have at the very 
beginning -- thank you very much.

I should have at the beginning asked 
people to try to contain their comments to three 
minutes, just to respect everyone who is here on a 
Friday night. And I didn't do that and it's -- my 
apologies to everyone for that.

MARTHA JO BILLY: Your little beeper 
didn't go off.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No, I know. Thank 
you. We'll start timing people. And to the extent 
you can keep within those parameters, we would 
greatly appreciate it.

Our next speaker is Penelope Phelan, from 
San Tan Valley.
BUCK FORST: Colleen, how long?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Three minutes.

Eleanor Caster, representing self from Pinal.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She left.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

David Cantelme, from FAIR Trust.

DAVID CANTELME: David Cantelme, spelled C-a-n-t-e-l-m-e, representing the FAIR Trust. I'm from the town of Cave Creek.

Just a few points that I would like to make, Madame Chair and members of the Commission.

I want to reiterate a few points that I made yesterday, but I think they bear repeating, and that is, number one, in reaching your decision making, I would highly recommend to you that simpler is better. That's an old principle of logic I learned in Catholic high school.

Second, do the greatest good for the greatest number of people.

If you have two options, one of which benefits a narrower group of people, the other benefits a greater number, to me it's a simple decision. You go with the greatest good for the greatest number of people.
Third point, the eastern district is not competitive. There is no way anybody can say using a definition that has been mentioned in this room today that it's competitive.

I heard it said twice, a competitive district is one in which neither party has any advantage over the other party.

The eastern district has a registration edge of 9.2 percent to the Democrat party. That is an advantage. It is not one where both parties are similarly situated, similarly able to make their case to the voters.

It doesn't have to be that way.

If you sent Coconino west instead of east, you wouldn't have to bring the river district all the way over to Pinal County. You would please Mohave, Yuma, Yavapai, Phoenix, Pinal.

You would displease Coconino, and I have to comply, they've done a wonderful job, and I sympathize with them. I understand everything they've said. They've made a great case, but it's not a case with ballots on the scale of fairness tilts their way. It tilts the other way to the greatest good for the greatest number of people.

District 9. There is no light rail
community of interest. It doesn't exist. It's a myth. The light rail was built in 2005 starting in 2005. I know because my office was on the other side of Central. I had to cross it every day to get to the other side of Central.

The light rail is -- was completed in 2008. The areas in which it runs have been built out for generations. It is an overlay. It is not a community of interest.

District 9. It is said that District 9 needs to remain 50/50. If that is the case, I question does the eastern district go up to 9.2 percent Democrat advantage?

I've said from the very inception, you can't have one definition of competitiveness for one part of Arizona and a different competitiveness -- definition of competitiveness in another part of Arizona. That's not even-handed and it doesn't make sense.

Two technical points.

The Constitution. I don't think it supports publication of draft maps before the voting rights and competitiveness analyses are complete. The maps must be completed themselves before they are published.
Second, it's not the number of splits of counties and cities, it's the effect of the splits. As Mr. Desmond wisely said, if you have a split where nobody lives there, it doesn't matter. But if you have a split that takes them 25 percent one way, 25 percent another, 25 a third, 25 a fourth, as is happening to Pinal roughly, that does matter.

I wish you all a great weekend and go Diamondbacks.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Richard Elias, representing Hispanic Coalition for Good Government.

RICHARD ELIAS: Thank you, Madame Chairman.

I am Richard Elias, one of the co-chairs for the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government and Pima County Supervisor representing District 5.

I have a letter here that I'm going to read into the record.

Dear Commissioners. The Hispanic Coalition for Good Government acknowledges your hard work in drafting a map that will meet all criteria.

A number of our members were involved in the redistricting process last time and have been contributing comments during this process.
We thank you for listening to our concerns. We know that the work is difficult, time consuming and underappreciated.

But despite our involvement and the public in written input, we are concerned with the direction the IRC has taken with the current draft.

This draft map presents numerous and significant issues for Hispanics in Arizona that needs serious and immediate consideration by the IRC.

It is the HCGG's position that this map will not meet the requirements of the Voting Rights Act, would fail review by the Department of Justice, and will ultimately and permissively frustrate the ability of Hispanics to elect a candidate of their choice.

A VRA inquiry by DOJ will involve more than simply numbers. The VRA addresses the impact on Hispanic communities, especially historic communities such as the ones found in Tucson and Tolleson that have demonstrated their ability to elect candidates of their choice.

For example, Tucson has long been a credible Hispanic leadership and has been deeply active in all levels of government. Moving Tucson
out of the majority-minority district causes harm on multiple levels.

It deprives those who have always had a voice, ignores the historical and current contribution, and silences the largest concentration of Hispanics in Southern Arizona.

In fact, in 2002, DOJ, in addressing then proposed District 23, had some of the same concerns that the HCGG has. Now, quote, over the past decade, this district's Hispanic community elected the candidates of their choice, creating the proposed districts. The AIRC made several adjustments.

The circumstances surrounding the removal of these two towns and the resulting drop in the Hispanic voting-age population percentage has raised concerns regarding the ability of the AIRC to establish that this action, which had a retrogressive effect, may also have been taken, at least in part, with a retrogressive intent.

The HCGG again implores the IRC to take into consideration the HCGG's previous written submissions, meaning testimony and this letter as it moves forward. A failure to do so will irreparably harm those and the IRC it is charged to protect.
There are many examples of the problems with the map currently under review.

Number one, this map removes areas from Pima County that collectively create population centers in Tucson and Pima County. It effectively shifts the population centers significantly to Maricopa County and outlining counties.

This reduces Pima County's ability to elect a candidate of its constituent's choice. Currently that is not the case.

This map -- I'll try and go quicker here because I have another paper here that I do need to get through.

In essence -- well, let me go quickly.

The map also selects --

(Interruption by the court reporter.)

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Too fast.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: You're too quick.

The court report can't transcribe.

RICHARD ELIAS: Oh, okay.

This map splits Hispanic and other minority districts north and south of Tucson just east of I-10 from other neighborhoods directly to the east.

Historic Hispanic neighborhoods and
downtown areas of the city of Tolleson and West Phoenix should be restored back to the lines drawn in the HCGG map.

I'm not going to go on reading the rest of it. I did want to read those in particular, but I wanted to make a couple more comments.

What we are really asking in this letter and imploring you is to have another meeting in Tucson. This is the second largest population center in the state and there are drastic changes to both our congressional districts that are being made.

Before you do that draft map, we're imploring you to come back to Tucson and let the voices be heard of people who live there and also to take into account the fact that we would like to make a presentation to your committee so that you understand completely from ourselves and from our legal team the importance of what we see as real problems in achieving preclearance. And I know that's one of your main goals, Madame Chair.

I certainly appreciate all of the work you've done.

The other thing I would ask is that -- you know, typically in government when we allow
folks to make comments, we typically do that before we make motions that are clear by committee.

I think that would be a really good practice for us to employ here so that people don't feel like they have sat here all day and then don't have that opportunity to comment on those.

I'll leave you here with a copy of this, and I thank you for allowing me to go over. I apologize to the rest of the audience for being so rude.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Geri Farr, representing self from Phoenix.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She's gone.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Our next speaker is Bill Cheatham, representing self from Phoenix.

BILLCHEATHAM: Madame Chairman, it's Bill Cheatham, C-h-e-a-t-h-a-m. This is my second appearance before the committee.

I live in North Phoenix with a Paradise Valley address. Paradise Valley is surrounded on three sides by Phoenix, the other side by Scottsdale Road.
I actually moved here -- I lived in Scottsdale for ten years. I've been in PV for seven. As I testified before, much to my surprise, when I moved two miles, kind of the center of the communities that I visited, shopped in, worked in changed dramatically. Scottsdale Road became not my main thoroughfare, but Tatum Road did.

In looking at the maps that I was looking at today -- I've been here both days -- I can't -- I can't understand, frankly, how Arcadia, Biltmore and those types of areas are communities of interest with Tempe, down into Chandler, and some of Mesa.

And I'll only say this: Before I retired, I had offices around the city. And the best form of communities of interest, is what you call it, is where do you locate your office in the city to serve the communities.

I would never locate an office in Ahwatukee to try to get business from the Biltmore area. Frankly, I wouldn't locate an office on Camelback and 24th to try to get Scottsdale business. Those things to me identify communities of interest.

I'm living proof that you can move just a short distance away, as I did, and find that you are
in a different community. And I think that should you consider the map that I saw today -- I didn't really understand how those -- the area in the new District 9 had anything to do with communities of interest.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Jeff Winkler, from Maricopa.

JEFF WINKLER: Madame Chair, commissioners, Jeff Winkler, W-i-n-k-l-e-r, and I'm from Maricopa County. I'm actually from East Phoenix.

I'm here today to speak to you about presenting probably the largest community of interest in Arizona, the -- over 60 percent of the voters who represent themselves as moderate, whether they are Republican, Democrat, or Independent.

First the bad news. I think what we can all agree on is that congress is broken. We have major problems in our state and in our country and we have a congress that is gridlocked, refuses to work across the aisle to solve all of America's problems. Big problem for all of us, whatever your party identification is.
The good news, in Arizona, we actually have a lot of emphasis on the way forward and on productive civic dialog.

I would point you to two specific initiatives. One, the O'Connor House project. Great website. You can go there and you can hear all about civil dialog, civic discourse, and how it is -- it's really the foundation stone of our democracy.

And secondly, the Arizona We Want Report that was commissioned by the Center for the Future of Arizona.

I know you've got a lot of homework and I appreciate all of the hard work you all are putting into this, but you may want to click on the Center for Future of Arizona's web site and download the report and read it. What you will find is that what Arizonans want, is they want their elected officials to work together in the best interest of all the citizens.

How do we achieve this?

I think where you've gotten so far in the congressional maps is unfortunate. We could -- we can have an opportunity -- we do have an opportunity to see that we have four competitive congressional
districts.

That is going to lead to civic dialog in those districts, whether you're a Democrat or a Republican, those parties -- neither party should fear a good contest of ideas.

That's what Arizonans want. That's why I hope that you keep in mind -- and again, I encourage you to read the Arizona report. It's a wonderful report, completely bipartisan, and it talks about the Arizona really we all want, and probably including everybody on this panel.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Brent Stoddard, from the city of Glendale.

BRENT STODDARD: Thank you, Madame Chair, members of the Commission.

Brent Stoddard, S-t-o-d-d-a-r-d. I'm the intergovernmental programs director of the City of Glendale.

First let me thank the Commission for coming to visit the city of Glendale during the first round of public hearings and giving our community an opportunity to provide the Commission some important public feedback.
Secondly, I appreciate the attention paid to the city of Glendale boundaries today, particularly around Luke Air Force Base and the airfields, the municipal airfields around there. Important economic drivers for the region, for the state.

And we started the day in Glendale with I believe five congressional districts and I think we got down to three, so I think that's some significant progress.

Monday when you do come back, I would recommend the Commission taking a look at that northeast portion of Glendale, that part that got carved out and put into District 6, I believe.

There may be no choice but to carve out something somewhere. I might recommend looking at some of those unincorporated areas that aren't necessarily incorporated municipal boundaries. Maybe the New River area.

The city of Glendale is an incorporated municipality. So in the sense that we can respect those municipal boundaries in the congressional boundary drawing, the City of Glendale would certainly appreciate it.

Lastly, next week when you start work on
the state legislative district boundaries,
particularly in the city of Glendale, we would have
that you continue to pay attention to the city of
Glendale.

Ten years ago, Glendale was used to kind
of carve up to balance the populations in other
districts throughout the state and we ended up with
six congressional districts, which means dealing
with 18 legislators.

And so our citizens and the community of
interests had a difficult time over the last ten
years. And our council itself, most of who have
been on the council that full ten years, came
together and in consensus, took a position that they
would recommend to the Commission look to reduce
that number of districts.

And they didn't provide a number. They
know you have a difficult job. We know that
Glendale is kind of an odd-shaped city with the air
Force base stretching out that way, but if we could
find a way to potentially reduce the number of
legislative districts serving Glendale, we think it
would be a benefit to our citizens.

And lastly, just thank you for your
service on this Commission. We know it takes time
away from your work and your families. And on behalf of the City of Glendale and the citizens, we appreciate your service.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

I have about 12 more. Let me check with our court reporting.

That's what Marty said.

Let's see. Toby Stahl, representing Democracy for America from Maricopa County.

TOBY STAHL: Thank you. I want to thank you the Commission for all of the work you do. And I am appalled that our Attorney General thinks it's important to intimidate you. So I just want to get that out. That's from me.

What I have here with me is over 200 names of people who have signed a little petition that Democracy for America, Maricopa County, so we're a local group, that what we want is competitive districts. Districts in which our people can feel that they have a voice in the general election; that the person elected in the primary is not automatically going to represent us because that does not give us a voice. That both sides don't have to listen.
Even today, our congressional leaders are charging us to go for them to hear us. That doesn't work. That's not democracy. And we want more citizens voting, and they will not do so if they feel it's unimportant to this state. And our state needs lots of help right now.

So I ask you please to consider four competitive districts at a minimum and get us back to a democratic system. Democratic with a small "d."

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Oh, great. Thank you for the petition. We'll get that into the record.

Thank you.

Our next speaker is Harold Stahl, representing self from Maricopa.

HOWARD STAHL: Thank you. And that's Maricopa County.

My name is Harold Stahl, S-t-a-h-l. I'm representing myself. I'm a resident of Phoenix for 30 years. It's currently Congressional District 3 and Legislative District 11, and I'm not being paid for this appearance.

I am being -- I am concerned about the
pressure being applied to the chair of this Commission by the powerful to maintain the power elite.

The most important goal for the Commission to achieve is competitive districts. Competitive districts that's been pointed out several times today are good for democracy resulting in elected representatives of either party who best represent the electorate.

Another result is greater voter interest participation and knowledge of public affairs. In other words, a well-informed electorate as envisioned by our founding fathers.

The legacy of this Commission should not be more districts dominated by single political parties.

Madame Chair, your legacy, in particular, should be a strong stand against the forces of the status quo. We look to you to be a profile encourage. Lead us to better democracy through more competitive districts.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is James Kelly, I believe he left -- oh, no, I'm sorry, Mr. Kelley,
representing LD 29, Pima GOP.

I couldn't see you.

JAMES KELLEY: That's quite all right. Thank you all -- Kelley, K-e-l-l-e-y.

Thank you again for letting me address the Commissioner after the legislative district map presentation that you allowed me to present this morning.

I want to speak to competitiveness and I want to tell you a story.

Everybody else seems to need to tell about who they are and where they come from.

I'm a fourth generation Tucsonan. My great-grandfather moved to Tucson in 1925 and began a tuberculosis clinic at the old Fort Lowell.

My grandfather originally went into transportation with trucking and then expanded to steel manufacturing. His business was the entire Southern Arizona area from Yuma to San Simon. He serviced farmers, he serviced copper mines, he serviced everybody who needed water.

He not only brought water to those who didn't have it, he created storage tanks for the wells that were on the properties so that they could have gravity-fed water to their homes.
My grandfather also was able to count as a friend and confidante both of Senator Mo Udall and Senator Barry Goldwater, as well as Congressman DeConcini.

My grandmother was a conservationist who believed in the exploitation of natural resources for the greater good.

My grandfather also was very much a part of the decisions that were made with the Glen Canyon Dam and later on the Central Arizona Project.

Nobody went to a commission. The politicians didn't go to commissions. They went to men like my grandfather. Not just my grandfather, but men like him. They asked the experts, the people on the ground, the people whose businesses were affected by the decisions they were going to make. He asked them what they thought of their decisions.

And my grandmother gave them both sides. And sometimes he supported Senator Udall and sometimes he supported Senator Goldwater, and sometimes he was the one bringing Senator Udall and Senator Goldwater together on a subject that affected Southern Arizona. That's just the way it is.
He was often asked to run for public office, including the governor of Arizona by both parties. That tells you something about my grandfather, and that should say something about competitiveness as well.

Competitiveness changes. It changes with who happens to be in power at the time. There are people who are always going to be against whoever is in power.

If it's the Democrats that are in a super majority, there's going to be Independents and Republicans that vote against the Democrats. And if the Republicans are in a super majority, it's going to be Independents and Democrats that vote against the Republicans.

And everybody is going to think it's not fair. The fairest thing that this Commission can do is look at the mathematics. Begin with the math. Equal populations, the Voting Rights Act districts, the two Voting Rights Act which automatically reduces that population size for Democrats for competitiveness. And you got to spread them out and you got to spread out the Republicans.

You have good logical reasons to keep Flagstaff and Coconino County on the western side.
Good logical reasons to keep Yuma County, Mohave County whole. Good logical reasons for Tucson to have its own central competitive coalition district.

If you go by Benny White's map for congressional districts, you naturally have two competitive districts; one in Tucson and one in Maricopa as well as the protection of the two HVAPs.

Look at the them. I highly recommend that you incorporate them into any final draft that you come to. The math is right. The competitiveness is right. It's good for Arizona.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Richard Tracy, Sr., representing taxpayers and self.

RICHARD TRACY, SR.: Thank you, Madame Chair. That's T-r-a-c-y, Sr.

I want to thank the committee for the time and patience that you've shown. Also for picking this particular location, near the freeway. I don't have to pay to park. I don't have to walk a mile. Unfortunately, Arizona has very few public servants.

The city and the county are a good example in Maricopa County. You got to pay 10, $15
to park and you got to walk a mile in the heat. You
can't park near the courthouse but the employees at
the courthouse park there. The jury is a mile away.

There is no feeling of obligation to the
public because there's no fair elections. I
mentioned when I was here last time that I have
never voted for a county supervisor. I was in North
Phoenix most of the time I've been in Arizona. I've
been here 40 years. And then 11 years ago I moved
to Mesa. And I not only don't have a county
supervisor to vote for, only twice have legislative
candidates been of another party.

Elections can save a lot of money. If
you get to certain areas, check the history. If
it's not a reelection, let's not spend the money.

When I first came here, we had an
independent newspaper and I got an article in there
which pointed out that we had some representation.
There were elections all the time. I never knew
what the candidates were or what the issues were but
the lines were always short. That is an effort that
they make.

The citizens of Phoenix will go to the
election of a mayor and then walk over to another
building to vote on county issues. Any number of
times the city of Phoenix has changed their election
so there's a time when there's a very poor
attendance. Competitiveness on paper means nothing
if we don't have fair elections.

Arizona has a bad representation as well
as this country throughout our history of trying to
prevent people from voting. And this is a very
serious thing.

I came from New York and Ohio, where I
was an attorney. I was involved in affairs in the
state and the cities. I knew what was going on.

We have agencies here that don't care.

Pick up the paper. That's four murders that nobody
bothered to investigate. There's a fifth one now
and they are going to investigate.

Any number of things that you may come
across that you go to a public agency, as I have --
I was defrauded in a mortgage situation. So I got a
hold of the Attorney General, whose purpose right
now is to use the 10th amendment to repeal the 14th
amendment.

But he's never had his office answer my
request that they prosecute the situation involving
mortgage fraud. And I have sent them about 15
documents. They don't care. They don't care.

When you leave this and make your recommendations, I would like you to present a fair election system that the legislature puts through.

We're all aware of the fact that every effort is made to prevent people from voting by certain groups. We have legislation that requires identifications. There's no sense worrying about competitiveness if you don't have somebody to vote for.

The clean elections issue. We have an organization supported by Alex Goldwater Institute since back in the '70s, even Goldwater did not like that particular organization because they were radicals.

But they make every effort to prevent us from having an opportunity to vote. And they are financed by many, many foreign organizations as well as local people who are confused because we don't have a media system that's a fair one that you would have in the state where there are four or five major cities.

I thank you for your time. I hope you have a good weekend.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you. You,
Our next speaker is Maureen Bayardi, representing self from Phoenix.

RICHARD TRACY, SR.: Put those in the record and there's one for each -- your husband would enjoy reading that pamphlet. As a lawyer, he will not believe our history.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

MAUREEN BAYARDI: Thank you, Madame Chair and members of the Commission.

My name is Maureen Bayardi, B-a-y-a-r-d-i.

I stand before you this evening now as a concerned citizen with some of the -- with some questions for some of the committee members who rally under the banner of competitiveness.

Competitiveness is good but is competitiveness the only criteria that we have in this process? And it's appearing to me to be that way.

I would like them to take into account the other criteria that should be involved. Only once this afternoon did I hear mention of the other criteria.
I ask the members to please review their duties with regards to all criteria. I believe there needs to be a fair process and a fair representation for all citizens of the state of Arizona.

Thank you so much. I know it's been a long day for you. I hope you're able to get some rest over the weekend.

Thank you again.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Regina Cobb, representing Kingman area Chamber of Commerce.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She left.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Sorry.

Deb Sparrow, representing self from Tempe.

DEB SPARROW: Hello. Madame Chair, members, thank you for this opportunity. I'm new to this. I'm very happy that Arizona has this kind of system. This is something we're out on the edge of, although other states should do. If there's some difficulties in the process, that seems like that's what happens when you do something new and wonderful. And thank you very much for going through it.
I have some concerns. One is that as someone new to this -- I know it's complex, but I think there's something that could be done to help a little bit.

I've looked online a number of times. I've called and talked to an information officer here about the maps. And my question is how can I find a map with city lines on it so that I can more easily understand the import of what you guys are doing, think about it, discuss it with other people and make some sort of comments?

And when I called, the answer was that they couldn't help me with that and the information officer here couldn't. Which if they can't, then it's not just because I haven't tried hard enough.

This is one thing that shouldn't be that hard to do to make it a more inclusive process.

But my concerns beyond that are these: I've lived in Tempe for a very long time. It is my home, and I can't tell from the maps where the boundaries are. For the entire period of time I've been here this afternoon, I don't remember hearing Tempe mentioned. And I'm concerned about where the -- if you could show me where it is on the maps you're looking at now.
But my concern is that Tempe not be split up. It is small geographically. It has a lot of population. It's a university town. And as a university town, it is a lot more than that. It's a -- the people who come to Tempe and who are -- there's -- there are people who come to library -- when I'm there, I've met people from all over -- all over the Phoenix area who love our library.

There is some things that a university town has to offer that are very special. And to support that and the -- and what it takes to deal with having a university.

You know, it will give you benefits and also, you know, kind of -- I mean, they don't represent the towns. They -- a lot of benefits of having a university, but we need to make sure we have representation beyond the university. And we can't really do that if the town is split up.

So I ask you to please do not split Tempe up. And then I am -- among your concerns is competitiveness, and that is mine, too.

Two competitive districts would not be nearly enough. I have four new voters in my extended Arizona family. I want them all to feel that it's worth it for them to go and vote. That
it's a great thing to do. And I want them to feel this is -- you know, this is real, it's not just a performance thing going forward.

And for this next generation to be a part of this, it's imperative that we have as many competitive districts as possible. If it's possible to go beyond four, go beyond four. This isn't just for us.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Matthew Capalby, Coconino County.

MATTHEW CAPALBY: Good evening, Commissioners. It's a pleasure to be here this evening.

Matthew Capalby, C-a-p-a-l-b-y.

First of all, I would like to always commend you for having the patience of Job. I think you five and the two sheriffs deputies in the back have contended with quite a bit today. We'll be contacting the Vatican for -- nominating you for beatification because you've definitely met the threshold of suffering. Anyways, I just had to get that out there.

But first of all I would like to speak to
two points that were made today regarding the
eastern congressional district.

I would like to speak to Supervisor
Martyn from -- he just left actually -- from Pinal
County.

In the Greater Arizona Success map, we
were also concerned with the fact that Pinal County
was going to be significantly split. We tried to
include as much of it as possible while also, of
course, abiding by the wishes of the Flagstaff and
Coconino County community to keep it in the eastern
district.

And subsequently with that -- and
Chairwoman Mathis, we do appreciate and understand
the request for the three border districts.
However, the Cochise portion of the eastern district
does draw a lot of population out of Pinal in order
to make that happen.

So we actually looked at that back in
April to make -- to include Cochise, but we thought
it would best to include more population in Pinal
County to make that work.

And then also -- so we would like to see
more, of course, Pinal County included in that
eastern competitive district.
And as to Mr. Cantelme's points earlier on competitiveness, the registration edge in that district, yes, is 9.2 leading to Democratic, but there's some reasons for that, especially, if you look at the issues in Navajo and Apache Counties.

I've been involved in property development and economic development in Northern Arizona for most of my career. And subsequently people in Yavapai and Mohave Counties can go to the clubhouse in their subdivision to vote. It's very convenient and easy and they have a significantly high turnout also due to the high retirement areas and subdivisions, communities in those two counties.

This is not the case in Navajo and Apache and in parts of Graham and Greenlee Counties as well where you citizens, predominantly Democratic registration namely in the tribal areas that have to drive 40 miles down a muddy road in order to go vote.

Also you can -- this is going to be attested by the Secretary of State's Office, that the registration numbers in Navajo and Apache Counties are significantly skewed because of the cultural aspects. There are people who are still on rolls that died more than ten years ago. That's a
common factor. They are constantly trying to address that issue. And that actually was an issue in the Secretary of State's race two years ago.

But in closing, performance wise, it's within two percent. That's the important thing, is look at the analysis on voting performance in the proposed eastern congressional district versus registration.

The registration numbers are significantly skewed and not necessarily accurate. The performance data is much more accurate as to the competitiveness of that district.

So thank you very much and I appreciate you being here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Juan Mendez, from Tempe.

JUAN MENDEZ: Hello, everyone. Thanks for the chance to speak today.

My overall point that I want to make today is that what you guys do here today is going to the affect the kind of citizen that we make for our communities. Okay?

And I am proof of that. So the two things that are really important to me are that if
we retain communities of interest, we make places where people can consider themselves citizens of an area.

And then competitive districts, because they are going to keep me involved, give me hope, and they are going to make my efforts look like they are doing something.

I've lived in Tempe the last five years. It doesn't sound like a lot, but I've done all of my growing up in Tempe. I went to school here. I went to ASU University.

My image of Tempe has grown every year. And from, you know, the years I spent working in my Boys & Girls Club down the street to -- I've built community gardens in Tempe, I've painted graffiti on walls in South Tempe. I feel like I'm connected to the city of Tempe.

And it is that way because politics were able to be presented to me in a way that related to my experience, because Tempe was kept in its own district now, it was easy for me to understand politics and my effect on politics.

And then with competitive districts, I was able to see my efforts matter. My voice was taken seriously, even at a young age, and I'm able
to engage more people in politics because of
competitive district, because of communities of
interest like Tempe.

So I want you to keep that in mind. You
guys are going to be influencing the kinds of
citizens that we produce in our communities. We
wonder whether they are going to be engaged or
whether they are not going to see a point to being
engaged.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

My final request to speak form is Nancy
LaPlaca. Did she come back? No.

Okay. So I believe that concludes the
public comment. You all should give yourselves a
hand for making it through today. And we have
Kristina Gomez at the mic.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Madame Chair, we need to
talk about the scheduling for next weeks' meetings.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure. That's fine.

So we're set for Monday here; is that
correct?

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Yes, we are.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And everyone -- it
looks like we have a handout of commissioner's
schedules for next week.

So we're set for Tempe, Fiesta Inn, 9 a.m. on Monday.

Tuesday, due to my regular meeting, if we need that day it would have to be in Tucson.

The rest of the week I think is pretty open for people.

We can -- tentatively, should we all hold each of those days open, kind of the way we did this week?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Yeah, I think we should try to keep them all open, but I would please ask that we not have a hearing every day next week. I cannot keep all of the balls in the air if we do that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Understood.

And I thought it worked well actually this week with having that break in the middle of the week. But we can see how things are going you know, whether we want to -- we'll meet Monday and I guess we need to decide by tomorrow. So essentially tonight, right, if we're meeting on Tuesday?

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So how do folks feel about setting a meeting for Tuesday in Tucson?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair, I'll be unavailable on Tuesday after 10 o'clock.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, after 10:00?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, yeah, I can read now.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I have no idea why it reads that way.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So not available until after 10:00?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So Tuesday really -- maybe we should not plan to meet Tuesday since that's pretty much all of Tuesday.

So that would mean Wednesday -- it looks like Thursday needs to be in Tucson or Casa Grande. Right? And Jose is not available until after 2:00 or 3:00.

Well, it looks like -- I'm not sure on that Wednesday, October 5th, what's happening there, but we don't need to set that until Monday, right?

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Right.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And we're not going
to meet Tuesday. So --

    KRISTINA GOMEZ: Madame Chair, on
Wednesday, would you like to meet in Tucson or Casa
Grande?

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm not sure what
that conflict is, whether the meeting needs to be in
Tucson after 1:00. I can't remember what's
happening now. So I'll just have to let you guys
know.

    But, yeah, I mean, according to this, I'm
happy to meet after 1:00. It must be a work thing
but I just don't know what it is at the moment.

    KRISTINA GOMEZ: So we would need to post
then on Monday by -- after 1:00.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Unless it
turns out there isn't a conflict -- so we could go
earlier that day?

    KRISTINA GOMEZ: Could you send us an
e-mail this weekend?

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I will do that.
And then we'll have to -- everybody can
hold open to the extent practicable, Thursday and
Friday next week.

    I'll remind everyone the 10th, that
Monday is a state holiday and then we're supposed to
start the hearings on the 11th. So we're definitely winding down on the time.

I would just make one comment.

Do you have more on the schedule?

KRISTINA GOMEZ: No.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. So just a comment from public comment, that essentially the map that -- the everything bagel map isn't really liked by anyone, which I think is a positive in its favor. Because from my standpoint, nobody is getting everything they want.

And so I'm going to encourage commissioners to the extent possible this weekend, that they continue to work with that center area and even what we did today.

I think Mr. Desmond has printed out splits reports based on what we did do; is that right?

WILLIE DESMOND: We ran out of paper. So I will e-mail those around tonight. You'll have to print them on your own. I apologize for that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No problem.

So is the map itself on the website, too, the changes that we did today?

WILLIE DESMOND: No, there's nothing up
on the website yet. So I guess I'll work on that tonight and send it to Buck and possibly get it up tomorrow morning or something, even though it's a Saturday.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That would be great.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. I'll e-mail that around and then you guys will have a chance to look at that.

I also do have handouts for the legislative map. We were thinking about talking about today. So I will give you those so you have some time to study them before Monday.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Good.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'll also e-mail that around to -- Commissioner Herrera is not here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Any other comments from commissioners or questions?

WILLIE DESMOND: Am I to clean up the rest of this map or should we leave the population deviation as it is until Monday?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I would like to see it cleaned up. So I would say yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

MARY O'GRADY: And in terms of the scope of the cleanup, would that include -- so equalizing
the population, then, as close as they are supposed
to be and also if there are census-place splits that
can be avoided without doing any sort of policy --
that don't have any policy implications, cleanup
those little things?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes.

MARY O'GRADY: I don't know if you want
him to make an effort to clean up the split that the
Glendale fellow testified to if it doesn't cause
other splits.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I would be
fine with that change.

He had suggested the New River area or
somewhere.

WILLIE DESMOND: That is like 6,000
people, so I probably wouldn't touch that. I would
be afraid to move more than a handful of people.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Maybe I can
talk to you this weekend and we'll send any changes,
as our standard policy, of anybody -- any of the
commissioners who have ideas they want to suggest,
they can send those to Ray Bladine. Ray can -- and
to Mr. Desmond and then Ray can get those out to the
rest of the commissioners.

Anything else from anyone?
Questions or comments?

Okay. That leaves just adjournment on the agenda, and the time is now 6:36 p.m., and this meeting is adjourned.

Thank you everyone for coming and your patience.

(The meeting concluded at 6:36 p.m.)
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