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CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Good morning.

This meeting of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission will now come to order. The date is Monday, October 10th, and the time is 9:56 in the morning.

Let's begin with the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We'll, good morning, everyone. We're very excited to see this many turn out at our Tucson meeting today. We really appreciate your participation in the process.

Let's begin with roll call.

Vice Chair Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Vice Chair Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner McNulty?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Here.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We have a quorum.

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

Our mapping consultant, Willie Desmond.

We have a reporter recording -- creating a transcript today. That's Michelle.

Other staff in the room include our executive director, Ray Bladine. Public outreach coordinators Karen and Shane.

And we have our chief technology officer on hand, Buck Forst. And our public information officer, Stu Robinson. And I think that covers it for staff.

So that takes us though agenda item 2, which is review, discussion, and direction to mapping consultant regarding the development of a legislative districts draft map based on constitutional criteria.

And just to bring everybody up to speed, the Commission had a busy weekend, and hopefully some of you were able to tune in online and watch the process, but we ended last night at about 6:45 p.m., with the creation of a legislative draft map, at least the beginnings of one.

And what happened is Commissioner McNulty
and Commissioner Freeman both created different versions of what a legislative draft map could look like and we spent the last week basically putting in placeholder districts from each of their maps and adjusting the grid according to those into one single map.

And last night, we were able to come to completion in that exercise, and I, again, applaud both of them for their impressive display of bipartisanship. It was really something. And as an Independent, something I very much value. It was really neat to watch, and I thank them both.

So we thought today, since we just got the numbers last night from Mr. Desmond in terms of running the analysis on what those districts mean from a compactness standpoint, from a competitiveness standpoint, that it would be good to maybe talk about that.

And maybe Mr. Desmond could put the map up on the screen as it stands this morning.

WILLIE DESMOND: Commissioners, I'm terribly, terribly sorry. We just identified a major problem with that third page of your sheet and the third page of the sheet that we gave to the public.
The districts and the competitiveness analysis are out of order reflecting changes to the thing.

I can either tell you the order that they actually are so you can write them in or I can try to get new sheets printed and distributed right away.

The numbers are just -- the top district is District 1 but then it goes 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17. So they are completely out of order and it's just an oversight by me, and I am very sorry.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think probably printing new ones just would probably make the most sense at some point. I mean, I don't know how long that takes, but -- so that there's no confusion.

WILLIE DESMOND: It's at your direction. I think it would probably take about 10, 15 minutes to have that done, distributed.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: What do you all think, commissioners?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think that's a good idea.

WILLIE DESMOND: In the meantime, should I put up what the order is so people can see it on the screen?
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure.

WILLIE DESMOND: And it only affects that third sheet. Everything else is fine.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Mr. Desmond, when you say the "third sheet," are you referring to the competitive analysis so that's the last sheet on the full packet, the third sheet on the --

WILLIE DESMOND: It's the third sheet on what's been handed out and on the third sheet on what's been handed to you. The new combined competitiveness and compactness.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is there any way to enlarge that screen?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can you all read that?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We'll enter back into public session, even though we really didn't take a recess formally.

Apologize for this delay, but we wanted to ensure that the data is accurate and everyone has the right information. And Mr. Desmond has provided that to us now.

There's also additional copies of the
legislative draft map for anyone who didn't get one earlier. More copies have been made along with tables.

So we thought it might make sense to go through the legislative draft map district by district and talk about the constitutional criteria that applied to each of the districts and look at the numbers as we go along through them, just to see where we are.

So we thought we would get a little tour of Arizona today. And maybe the way to do that is to start at number 1.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. And, again, I apologize for the delay, and I hope everything is sorted out.

One more reminder. If you received one of the packets of the legislative merge map as of 10/9/10 that had a third page that was compactness and competitiveness and you did not get a supplemental sheet, the data in there is out of order. So the labeling is wrong. The districts aren't labeled correctly.

So please seek out one of the new sheets and everything will be fine.

But starting with District Number 1,
includes the majority of Cochise County, the
southern portions of Graham County and the western
portions of Pima County.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And as far as --
sorry to interrupt, Mr. Desmond, but I just would
invite Commissioners Freeman and McNulty to also
talk about anything they want to talk about related
to these districts since they helped draw them.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I'll just jump in
here. District Number 1, as Mr. Desmond said, is
the southeast corner of the state and it includes
Cochise County. It also includes the nonreservation
portions of Graham County.

There's a natural relationship, I think,
between the agricultural and other areas of Cochise
County and those areas of Graham County.

It includes also far east Tucson, Corona
de Tucson, Vail, Rincon Valley, some of the areas on
the far east side of Tucson that increasingly have
economic and other relationships with Benson, Sierra
Vista, and some of the portions of Cochise County.

As it's drawn right now, it also includes
the community of Green Valley.

The very odd-looking Nessie-like
exclusion from the bottom, we'll talk about when we
get to District 2, but those are essentially the
communities of Bisbee and Douglas.

So, Mr. Desmond, would you want to talk
about the other -- the measures of competitiveness
and compactness?

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

I think I'll just start with -- District
1 has a population of 207,902 people, which is a
deviation of 5,165 people, or 2.42 percent.

It is a voting-age Hispanic percentage of
18.1. Voting-age non-Hispanic white percentage of
73.86, and Native American percentage of .83.

I don't know how helpful or informative
it is to just list the Reock, Perimeter, and
Polsby-Popper numbers.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would like you
to talk a little bit about what they are and what
they do.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

So the Reock test is a way of determining
how compact a district is. The most compact
district formation would be a perfect circle.
That's the most compact shape there is.

So what a Reock test does is it compares
the area of a district to the area of the smallest
circle that can be drawn to wholly contain the district. So the closer you get to 1 means it's the more closely it resembles a circle, essentially. So it's a measure of the area of the district over the area of the smallest enclosing circle.

Perimeter is just what it sounds like, it's the perimeter of the district in miles. Used alone, Perimeter isn't necessarily a good measure to see if a district has gotten more or less compact, but by comparing the perimeter of all districts in a state, you can determine if a plan is more or less compact.

And lastly, Polsby-Popper, how that works is that it compares the Perimeter of the -- if you took the perimeter of the district and you stretched it out to a circle, it would be the area of that shape to the area of the district.

So it's similar to the Reock test but it is slightly different. In Polsby-Popper it will not be as effective in some districts in Arizona due to how jagged the natural boundaries are and stuff.

So a really jagged line will stretch out to a larger perimeter, stretch out to a larger circle. So it will perform slightly worse in the
Polsby-Popper.

So for this district, the Reock test, this district is .54. It has a Perimeter of 636.089 miles and a Polsby-Popper of .31.

Do you want me to go into competitiveness, then, also?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Well, I just thought it might be good if either Ms. O'Grady or Mr. Kanefield can talk a little bit about the inevitable trade-off between compactness and communities of interest when we're trying to construct districts that do follow -- incorporate communities that make sense or follow municipal or other geographic features.

MARY O'GRADY: Sure, commissioners.

The Commission has six criteria that they are -- they have to apply and they sometimes compete with one another in terms of how they might apply to a particular part of the state. Compactness, contiguity are some of the factors, but they also are required to look at communities of interest. They also are required to look at political boundaries. Of course, compliance with the Voting Rights Act and equal population. And we are also required primarily to work in at full census tract
levels.

So those are some of the criteria. And in particular circumstances, they may, you know, compete with one another.

The Commission’s job is to figure out the best way to balance all of them to create a map.

So, for example, on this map, at the -- the arm that reaches into Cochise County and the yellow district, which is Legislative -- placeholder district, Legislative District 2, it reaches some of the border communities in Cochise County, connects them with the border communities in Santa Cruz County. It follows both census tracts.

But by doing so it creates that jagged, uneven edge which would make it less compact.

So -- but again, you’re following other criteria of communities of interest with border communities and also following whole-census tracts.

It does -- there’s another criteria in terms of full counties. So it does go in a different county.

But, again, that’s why you have all of these different criteria that they have to juggle and make some decisions. And there’s also population equality issues and voting rights'
issues. And when we're dealing with this part of
the state, you do have an obligation to maintain the
opportunity to elect minority candidate of choice in
the same number of districts that we did previously
overall for the state.

So particularly when we have high
concentration of Hispanic voters, we have to pay
attention to the voting rights' concerns.

So all of these go into the kinds of
decision-making process.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Thank you.

Would you go ahead and talk about the
next --

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

Moving on to District 2, it's immediately
to the west --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Mr. Desmond, I
think you were going to talk about competitiveness
for this district.

WILLIE DESMOND: Excuse me.

District 1, so what we have done is
provided the Commission with several different
measures of competitiveness for them to use in
evaluating these districts during their development.

The first measure that they were given
was just this competitiveness score. And you can see it's the first set of columns on that hopefully corrected third sheet you have.

And what that does is it takes all of the statewide races from 2008 and 2010 and gives them equal weight amongst that group of races to form a competitiveness average, Democrat average, Republican score.

Because there was more races in 2010 than 2008, there was some concern that it is overweighting for 2010.

As a result we developed index 2. What that does is it gives each race equal weight amongst its year and then weighs the two years evenly.

So in 2008, the races that were held are averaged together to form a 2008 half. 2010 races that were held were averaged together to form the 2010 half. And those halves are put together to form an index 2 score.

Index 3 takes into account voter registration data. So not election results, but voter registration data.

It's based off of -- what it does is it takes the two halves from index 2 and it adds a third part. So it's one-third 2008, one-third 2010,
one-third registration data.

Additionally, we also included just the pure registration data. So the percent that are registered Republican, the percent that are registered Democrat, and the percent that are registered either other, Independent, third party, you know, any -- it's kind of a catchall for people that are registered but not Republican and Democrat.

In evaluating how these different measures work as predictors of competitiveness, we determined that registration works very well as a measure but only when you look at it on a two-way scale. So percentage of Republicans versus the percentage of Democrats.

So that's the next -- it's called the registration two-way. That's the percentage of Rep-- it's a two-way percentage of Republican registration or Democratic registration.

So it's how many Republicans are there out of the pool of Republicans and Democrats and vice versa for Democrats.

Finally, we've been using the 2010 mine inspector race as an indicator for voting rights' analysis.

Because 2010 mine inspector race was a
relatively low-name I.D. race and because it was conducted statewide, and finally because there was a Hispanic candidate running, we've been able to use it as a proxy for polarized voting, kind of. So that when we're trying to evaluate whether or not a district meets the criteria of giving Hispanic voters the ability to elect a candidate of their choice, using this as a proxy to see how the vote is distributed in these proposed districts in that 2010 mine inspector race has been helpful.

So those are the measures that are included on this sheet and have been utilized by the commissioners as they have developed these districts.

Again, I don't know if we just want to go through every number or if you just want to pick one of the indexes to look at or if anyone has a thought.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair, I just wanted to add another piece of the puzzle that we need -- that the Commission is going to need the 2004, 2006 election results.

We're going to need that as part of our voting rights' analysis, and I think we need it as well to make the data set on competitiveness more
robust, to give us a better flavor of what are truly
competitive districts.

As I've said before, and I know there's
disagreement on the Commission regarding this, 2008
and 2010 were pretty high watermarks for Republicans
in this state.

So I think simply looking at those
election results alone is going to skew the outlook
of a potential new district. And that, in reality,
wouldn't have a year that is not quite like 2008.

We had Republicans increasing the
majority in the state house, we had a Republican
candidate for president from this state in 2008.

In 2010 Republicans in Arizona achieved
an unheard of majority, never -- unprecedented in
the state's history in the state house and took all
of the statewide offices, which I don't know if
that's happened before. But I don't think in my
memory it has happened before.

So those are high watermarks. So I think
kind of -- my concern is it skews the results and if
we get a more robust data set on competitiveness,
including 2004 and 2006 data, which I know that is
being worked on by our mapping consultant to get
those figures together, they just haven't been
completed yet, it will give us a more fuller picture on that issue.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'll just say, we talked about that in the car on the way here this morning. Although Ken was unwilling to give an exact ETA, he thinks we're fairly close.

So once that data is ready, it's likely that we'll have indexes for 4, 5, 6 and going however -- considering different ways of weighing all of the different years and registration data. There's many different ways of combining. So it's likely that this sheet will grow.

JOE KANEFIELD: Madame Chair, for the benefit of the public, with respect to the competitiveness analysis, there are two PowerPoint presentations that go into a little bit more detail that the mapping consultant has presented and prepared for the Commission and the public that are available on the Commission's website on the map page on the very bottom.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

So just to give kind of an indication here, District 1 had an index 2 score of 60.2 -- 62.5 for the Republican and 37.5 for the Democrat.

An index 3 score of 62.3 for the
Republican and 37.7 percent for the Democrat.

And again, that slight discrepancy is because index 3 gives a third of its weight to registration, and Republicans are registered in that district at a 61.7 percent to 38.3 percent rate.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So in sum, this is a heavily Republican district, District 1, as it's constructed right now.

We're glad that makes some folks happy.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'll let you decide what level constitutes heavily Republican or not, but using our registration method, this is 42.2 percent registered Republican, 22.6 registered Democrat, and 31.6 percent registered other.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And as we go ahead, we will get -- we'll refine this data with the benefit of the 2004, 2006 data, which apparently is taking a great deal of time and effort.

And one of the things that we'll have to do is weigh the -- weigh that data, given that it's old and a lot of things have changed since that time.

So I'm sure, you know, as each of us add that data into the mix, we'll have our own perspectives on what it means, how important it is,
and how to compare it to the measures that we have now.

WILLIE DESMOND: Correct.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I might just also add, you know, when we -- in a prior version of the legislative maps known as option 1, we had a district that included all of Cochise County and all of Santa Cruz County and then a little sliver that extended up I-19.

I suspect that -- I don't have recall of the competitiveness figures off the top of my head, but it was probably at least a more competitive district.

But the problem we ran into is we were advised by legal counsel that we needed to construct these three minority-majority districts in Southern Arizona to comply with the Voting Rights Act.

So District 2 became that district that included -- I know we'll talk about it later -- but it included Santa Cruz County, this arm that extends up to South Tucson and then it grabs these minority -- predominantly minority populations along the border.

So in creating that district, it has an impact on what became District 1 and it obviously
made it less competitive by doing that.

WILLIE DESMOND: That's correct.

Should we go to District 2?

I think Commissioner Freeman just gave a good introduction of what it contains.

It is a voting rights' district and it has a voting-age Hispanic percentage of 61.42 percent. A voting-age non-Hispanic white percentage of 31.7. African-American of 3.21. Native American of 1.35.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, I'm sorry, but could you start over again? I'm a little distracted by the humming -- or whistling.

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

District Number 2 is of voting rights' district. It has voting-age Hispanic percentage of 61.42 percent. A voting-age non-Hispanic white percentage of 31.7. African-American of 3.21. Native American of 1.35. Pacific islander of 1.22 -- or, I'm sorry, Asian of 1.22. Pacific islander of .1 and other .11.

And again this table is the -- should be the second page in your packet. So you can look at these racial breakdowns.

It does -- because it is a voting rights'
district, the ability to elect is important. It has an average Democratic score of 61.9 in index 2. 64.2 in index 3.

And in the 2010 mine inspector's race, the Hispanic candidate received 62.4 percent of the vote.

As you probably guessed by looking at it, some compactness has been sacrificed in order to make it a voting rights' district.

Again, all of the criteria are weighed together and without prioritizing one over the other, it's difficult to sort of automate this process, but that's kind of the art of this process, not the science, as the commissioners have I think learned very well over the last several days trying to construct a map in public.

So the Reock score is .19. Polsby-Popper is .13 and has a Perimeter of 539.21 miles.

Are there other -- should we just keep going on?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Let me add a couple of things about the communities in this district.

This would replace the current Legislative District 29. There have been some
concerns about whether that district, as it's currently configured, actually affords an opportunity for a minority candidate -- for minorities to elect a candidate of their choice.

And as Mr. Desmond said earlier, that was one of the issues that we looked closely at in putting this district together. It includes South Tucson and the Santa Cruz River Valley and extends down to Nogales, which is similar to the way the district was constructed about 20 years ago.

Not only does it include minority populations, it also includes by and large, although not entirely, communities of interest along with the Santa Cruz River, at least communities that have, you know, cultural and historical and economic relationships to and with one another.

We've included Bisbee and Douglas -- the areas around Bisbee and Douglas, as Ms. O'Grady said, because they are border communities like Nogales.

And my perspective was I was interested during the public comment period in getting comment about this configuration not in terms of compactness but in terms of including the border communities together from the folks who live in these areas and
seeing what their perspective is.

WILLIE DESMOND: Madame Chair, I've just been informed by Buck that the TriCaster is not working again, although we are not streaming, when people watch the live stream -- or watch the video later, they won't be able to see my screen at this point.

I'll leave it up to you if you want to take a five-minute -- we can talk about some of these districts using the tables without actually seeing them for a minute, but I do need to restart if we want to get that going.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Should we take a five-minute break? I hate to do that because I'm concerned that people -- it turns into a 20-minute break.

WILLIE DESMOND: And we can also just stay in session and talk about some of these things --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Let's do that.

WILLIE DESMOND: -- while we do that, we'll lose the video for a second.

Should we -- is there anything else we wanted to say about 2 or should we take a last look
at 3 and then I'll restart?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Sounds good.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Okay. So District 3 is another voting-rights' district --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, can you talk about the -- you said -- the HVAP is a little high on District 2. So I think that when we start making changes, hopefully we'll reduce the HVAP slightly to -- because I think 61.42 is a little high.

Do you know -- anybody know what the HVAP was for the old District 29?

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe old District 29 had an HVAP of somewhere around 49.81 percent.

It does go up.

I'm going to quickly turn off the shading of the districts so that people can see when we get into some of the more urban areas, I think it will be helpful to see some of the -- what comprises them.

So as you can see -- and take a good look now because we're about to turn off the screen for a second.

District 3 includes Tucson Estates,
Valencia West, Drexel Heights, and parts of West Tucson. And I'll leave it to the -- also a small, small portion of Marana. And I'll leave it to commissioners if they want to talk about how this district was put together at all.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Mr. Desmond -- I guess you're tied up. I think because we're in Tucson, folks in Tucson might actually like to hear where -- what the boundaries in Central Tucson of this district are.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. I will also say that for anyone who is watching this in the future, obviously, not live right now, or anyone in the room, these files, the plan components, the plan splits, everything have been posted to the website. Also available is the Google maps KMZ files. I think those are very helpful to people when they want to look at how the districts are. You can zoom down to your street, your block, just like you could in using Google maps normally.

As soon as we get restarted, I'll turn on the street layer and we can go through some of the specific boundaries.

But before we get there, I guess we can talk about some of the racial composition of this
district.

It is a voting rights' district. It has a non-Hispanic white percentage of 38.79. Hispanic percentage of 51.16. An African-American percentage of 2.81.

Again, I don't need to go through all of these. It's 3.26 Native-American. 2.75 Asian. .08 percent Hawaiian and Pacific Islander, and .14 percent other.

It has a total population of 210,016. It is about 3,051 people short of the ideal district size, or roughly 1.43 percent.

It is a fairly compact district. It has a Reock score of sixty -- .62, a Perimeter of 83.06 miles and a Polsby-Popper of .33.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I believe, and Mr. Desmond can confirm this when his equipment comes back up, but the east boundary in Central Tucson is Campbell Avenue.

So this district includes the west and the university areas. I think it extends down to 22nd Street and then west and south to include Tucson Estates and Drexel Heights and Valencia West.

Oh, yeah, I think the other point I wanted to make is I believe we included the Pascua
Yaqui reservation in this district as well.

So our analysis indicates that it would be a performing majority-minority district. And we tried to include whole neighborhoods in a way that made sense.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. We should be back up in just one second.

Okay. Starting with the most southeasterly point in this District Number 3, it starts on the corner of --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Mr. Desmond?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: You might not need to read all of the boundaries, but if you could just kind of show it in a context that folks can see where it is and kind of get a sense of what the northernmost boundary is, the easternmost, southernmost, so forth.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. It starts at Los Reales, just north of the Tohono O'odham Nation and is bordered by Interstate 19 to its east.

It continues up largely following the interstate but kind of jogging to include District -- or South Tucson in District Number 2.

North of South Tucson it starts to go
west on 18th Street and continues -- or continues
east, excuse me, on 22nd Street.

   It does go north on Campbell quite a ways
until it hits Glenn Street and Black Ridge.

   It continues up here and then does follow
along I-10. Cuts over at 108th -- or Ina Road,
excuse me -- it's very small and my eyes are very
tired.

   So it's going west there. I'll zoom out
again so you can see that a little better.

   And then it follows some unincorporated
land I believe at the whole census tract layer kind
of southwest a little bit until it does go up
against the Tohono O'odham again and then it comes
back until it hits -- keeping all of Tucson Estates
together. It follows the 86 back west, west and
south until it comes back to the Tohono O'odham
reservation.

   It does include the Pascua Yaqui Tribe at
its very southern most boundary.

   Are there further things you wanted to
see in this district?

   COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think that's
very helpful.

   Thank you.
WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Continuing on to District Number 4 is our third voting rights' district in Southern Arizona.

It includes the Tohono O'odham Nation in Pima County and then it heads north into parts of Pinal that are also included in that reservation land and goes up on the Maricopa County border.

It includes portions of Goodyear and Buckeye in Maricopa County. Goes south at the -- again, at the county line with Yuma and includes the southern portion of Yuma County, parts of the city of Yuma and San Luis also.

I'll reshad so you can kind of get a good sense of what the district looks like. It's this green district.

It does have a voting-age Hispanic percentage of 53.65. Voting-age non-Hispanic white percentage of 35.64. Voting-age non-Hispanic African-American percentage of 3.06, and a voting-age Native American percentage of 5.24.

In order to link some areas, it does have a slightly -- sacrifice some compactness over some of the grid map influences and then also it does have some possible concerns, I think, on the competitiveness and voting rights' analysis. And
I'll leave it to legal counsel if they want to go into those. It is pending further review.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Mr. Desmond, I'm not sure this is an area that we had voting rights' concerns.

I think as the district is currently configured, there is a concern about whether it, in fact, affords an opportunity for minorities to elect a candidate of their choice, which, of course, is something that's federal law that we're bound by.

We have reconstructed it with that in mind, with a view towards creating a district that does, in fact, perform and provides an opportunity for minorities to elect a candidate of their choice.

One of the reasons that it's difficult to create a compact district here and, in fact, in many places in Arizona, is the huge expanses that we're dealing with.

This district contains an enormous amount of uninhabited land and some very rural areas.

As it's drawn now, it includes the communities of San Luis and Somerton and the minority communities and the city of Yuma are all together.

It includes the Tohono O'odham
reservation and it also includes the San Xavier
District portion of the Tohono O'odham reservation.

So what we tried to do was a little like
what we had done with District 2, keeping border
communities that have been there for centuries
together. We've done the same sort of thing here,
keeping the border communities that have lived in
this area for many, many, many years together in a
district and a district that would satisfy the
Voting Rights Act.

WILLIE DESMOND: So I guess moving
forward, is there -- does it make more sense to go
back into Tucson and Pima and work our way north or
would you like to spiral around?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I heard a vote for
Tucson.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Tucson. We're in
Tucson.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: We'd better keep our
audience --

WILLIE DESMOND: I don't know if
Commissioners Freeman or McNulty want to start with
Districts 9 and 10 or I'm happy to go through some
of the enclosed areas.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Why don't you show
District 9 and give your brief summary and then I'll go in more detail.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

District 9 includes all of the Catalina Foothills, Casas Adobes and parts of Northern Tucson.

It has a voting -- it's 19.27 voting-age Hispanic and 71.9 non-Hispanic white.

It has a Reock score of .38, Perimeter of 58.6 miles, and a Polsby-Popper score of .33.

It's one of our more competitive districts with an average Republican score, using index 2, of 47.1 percent.

It is 33.2 percent registered Republican, 36.9 percent registered Democrat, and 30 percent Independent and other.

I think that's about it.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: You might want to put it up there, Mr. Desmond, so folks can see it and maybe see where the south boundary is.

Essentially what we did was look at Tucson as a whole. And we've created two districts that -- rather than being one Republican and one Democratic district, we've tried to create two districts that are more competitive.
The northern-most district, which is central metropolitan area, is what we're looking at now and it includes the entire Catalina Foothills. I think it comes down to River Road and then it continues west to include much of Flowing Wells and to keep the entire Casas Adobes area intact.

There's a lot of commerce and relationship east/west between the Catalina Foothills and the Casas Adobes area.

And there's also the relationship north/south between Central Tucson and Catalina Foothills.

WILLIE DESMOND: Do you want me to go through some of the specific streets in that Tucson area?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: You know, I don't think we need to go through a lot of specifics but let's just show --

WILLIE DESMOND: So this major north/south line right here, if you can follow the little pointer, that is -- I believe it's North Campbell. This area right here is Helen and Bellevue Streets. Up here is Glenn Black something.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Black Ridge.

WILLIE DESMOND: Thank you.
And that's pretty much its southern border. So everything north of there would be included in this district.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Why don't you go northeast a little bit. The other east.

WILLIE DESMOND: Right here it's Swan Road, it goes up.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. And then right along where it runs along the south boundary of the Foothills there, the squiggly line. Right there.

WILLIE DESMOND: District 10 is immediately to its east and southeast. It includes the remaining portions of Tucson and Tanque Verde.

I think we've looked at the border of 2 and the border of 9, so I can go back into those streets if that's helpful, but I'll just start with its racial makeup.

District 10 has a Hispanic percentage of 19.66 and is 70.25 percent white.

It has a Reock score of .4, a Perimeter of 55.29 miles, and a Polsby-Popper score of .35.

It's also fairly competitive with a 48.7 percent Republican, using the first index, index 1, 51.3. Using index 2, District Number 10 is
47.5 Republican, 52.5 Democrat.

Index 3 is 47.2 Republican and 52.8 Democrat.

And in registration it's 33 percent Republican, 37.4 percent Democrat, and 29.5 percent other.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: So clearly this includes Central Tucson and the northeast area of Tanque Verde. I believe that the south boundary is more or less the north boundary of the Air Force base.

WILLIE DESMOND: All right.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Again, I might just say two things.

This would be a draft, keep that in mind, for people to comment on. And we heard comment from Tucson that folks would rather live in competitive districts than districts that -- which the outcome is certain. So we looked at that in putting this draft together.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. I guess continuing on, we could start with Pinal County Districts 8 and 11.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I think covering Oro Valley, Marana, that area would be
helpful, just to follow that up one more.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So those areas, Oro Valley, Catalina, Saddlebrooke, would all be included in District Number 8.

District Number 8 includes Oracle, San Manuel. If you go out, it includes the entire -- or almost the entire eastern portion of Pinal County.

It follows -- I believe that is 79 up until -- Florence and Coolidge are wholly contained. The majority of the San Tan Valley, Queen Creek, Top of the World, and then some of the copper mining areas of Southern Gila County.

Again, looking at racial composition, it is 22.82 percent Hispanic, 68.02 percent non-Hispanic white.

It has a population of 216,330. Roughly 3200 people overpopulated, or 1.53 percent.

Looking at its competitiveness scores, it is 58 -- or 56.8 percent Republican, using index 2. 43.2 percent Democrat, using index 2.

It is 55.6 percent Republican and 44.4 percent Democrat using index 3.

And just looking at pure registration is 36.2 percent Republican, 32 percent Democrat and 31.8 percent other.
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I might just jump in.

I want to make a couple comments and then turn it over to Mr. Freeman.

We received a great deal of comments over the last three or four months from Saddlebrooke and also from Oro Valley about -- and we received scores of letters about their interest in remaining together in one district with Marana, although I think we received less comments from Marana. And also the fact that they see themselves as a community of interest that has little to do with Central Tucson.

When I drafted this -- my version of this district, it was a little different than this. I had put those communities together more with the I-10 communities and Casa Grande, keeping in mind the economic development prospects between Marana and Casa Grande that those communities have talked about.

But we've done this a little differently in this map, and Mr. Freeman may want to talk about a little bit more about some of the northern areas, which are closer to his hometown.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Sure.
And a couple other things about this district in terms of the voter registration percentages, that's pretty close to a registration layout statewide where Republicans come in at about 35 percent, give or take, and Democrats at 31. This district is 36/32, so it's pretty close there.

As for the public comment about Marana, Oro Valley, Saddlebrooke area, Commissioner McNulty is right. We heard a lot of comments. Huge turnout from those communities.

And one thing you have to keep in mind is that the Commission sees comments from people and they don't always agree. And so there's a lot of weighing and evaluating we have to do to decide on which communities of interest -- which -- what constitutes a community of interest that the Commission needs to respect to adhere to the Constitution.

So, yes, we heard about the three together, we heard about Marana being separated and connected to Pinal County. We even heard that these communities should be connected with Tucson.

And in my draft, the legislative maps, I also had this area link -- figured a little differently.
But in terms of this proposed draft map, we have assigned them to different sides of Pinal County with Oro Valley and Saddlebrooke going to the eastern side and Marana going to the western side.

It keeps these -- all of these copper corridor communities together and keeps them with Pinal County, even though a number of them, Globe and Miami, they are in Gila County and that requires us to split Gila County, which one of the constitutional criteria is that we need to respect county lines.

But obviously, there's a balancing. Sometimes some constitutional criteria have to give to others.

It keeps Florence and Coolidge together. It would be nice to have a district that also included Casa Grande together with the three, but these two communities are right adjacent to each other and on the east side of I-10, so they are kept together.

We've also heard comments about taking into consideration prison populations. And this split of Pinal County does put the state -- the state prison in different districts than the other prison, which is down here near -- I think it's
closer to Picacho. So at least those two are separated.

I think we looked yesterday at the prison populations. It was roughly, give or take, pretty equally distributed between the two counties.

It does come up here and grab a part of San Tan Valley, which is in Pinal County, to sort of fill out the population in that district.

Mr. Desmond mentioned Queen Creek, but I believe it's only a very small sliver of Queen Creek that actually crosses the county line. It's probably an area that is going to be developed in the future, but right now we could justify that split based on the county line, which I think we followed there, although I can't see it on my computer right now.

WILLIE DESMOND: I misspoke. I meant Queen Valley.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Queen Valley. Yeah, I think Queen Valley is along US60 out there as you go to Superior.

So that's District 8.

Should we do 11 next?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, I think that makes sense.
So going back into Pima County for the base of District 11, it includes Picture Rock, Avra Valley, and a very large portion of Marana. This very southern section is, unfortunately, a little clipped off.

It keeps these areas with Red Rock and then the western portion of Pinal County, excluding the portion of the Tohono O'odham reservation that is kept in District Number 4.

As Commissioner Freeman mentioned, it includes Casa Grande, Eloy, Maricopa, the Ak-Chin, and Gila River reservation areas.

So it does go into Maricopa County a little bit but only in those lands included in the Gila River reservation.

District Number 10 has a population -- or District Number 11 has a population of 215,354 people.

It is 26.5 Hispanic, 58 percent non-Hispanic white.

Looking at its registration and competitiveness numbers, District Number -- well, first compactness, District Number 11 has a Reock score of .35, a Perimeter of 402 miles, and a Polsby-Popper score of .22.
Using the index 2, it is 55.9 percent Republican, 44.1 percent Democrat.

Index 3, 55.4 percent Republican, 45.8 percent Democrat.

And looking at the registration numbers, it is very close to even registration. 32.7 percent Republican, 31.7 percent Democrat and 35.6 percent Independent and other.

So Independent and other is the largest single registration groups in this district.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would just add that as I said earlier, keeping Marana and Casa Grande in a legislative district makes sense from the perspective that, for example, the town manager of Marana has talked about the fact that they see their economic future in the economic development zone and in economic development zone made up of a collaboration between those towns.

The other point I would make is that putting these districts together, they aren't going to be homogeneous and have similar interests throughout. They are necessarily compilations of a number of different communities that may have different interests in and of themselves.

The last thing I would say is that I had
hoped to find a more competitive district in this area, to be able to build a more competitive district. And that might be something that we look at during the public comment period.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I would just add on that one that the terms of the registration, certainly it seems like no party is really at an advantage in this district. It's pretty close to almost being on par.

One thing I also wanted to point out is you'll see as we walk through the map that this county line is broken here because there's some tribal lands there.

So you'll see throughout the map that Indian tribal lands are kept whole. We don't split the tribal lands.

And that's sort of a two-fold concern. One is the tribes that come forward said their reservation lands are a community of interest for them and we should respect that and not split it.

There's also probably a Voting Rights Act impact, too, to us splitting tribal lands. So that's why you see that split there.

And we kept the Gila River Indian Tribe
and the Ak-Chin Tribe together and whole in this district. Otherwise, this is essentially a Western Pinal County plus crossing in Pima County to grab Marana and those communities.

WILLIE DESMOND: All right.

I guess continuing on that and working our way north -- unless you want to do Maricopa first.

I was going to say continuing with the tribal lands, if we look at District Number 7, that is another one of our voting rights' districts, although this one is a Native American voting rights' district.

So I'll zoom out so you can see the district as a whole. It's probably the largest district.

It includes all of Greenlee County, portions of Graham, Pinal, Gila, all of Apache, portions of Navajo, portions of Coconino, and then portions of Mohave County.

District Number 7 has a population of 210,314 people.

It is 7.84 percent Hispanic. 28.09 percent non-Hispanic white and 61.91 percent Indian.

Additionally, it has a Reock score of
.31, a Perimeter of 1,784 miles, and a Polsby-Popper score of .17.

It has -- looking at some of the competitiveness measures, using index 2, is 34.9 percent Republican, 65.1 percent Democrat.

Looking at the registration, it's registered as 19 percent Republican, 53.6 percent Democrat, and 27.3 percent other.

Normally we use the mine inspector race here, but that is more of a proxy for Hispanic's ability to elect a candidate of their choice, so that's not quite as applicable to this district.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would like to see the Perimeter scores in Alaska and Montana. If we have problems.

So this -- we heard a great deal of comment from the Native American community. We had a public meeting at the Heard Museum in Phoenix where we heard from the Inter Tribal Council and members of the Inter Tribal Council. We've had a lot of input from the Navajo Nation.

We need to satisfy a benchmark in this district in order to satisfy the Voting Rights Act. And in order to do that, it was necessary and
consistent with the feedback that we've heard from
the tribe to include the Navajo Nation, both of the
Apache nations, the San Carlos and the White
Mountain, and then we've also included the Pai
tribes in the northwestern part of the state, the
Hualapai, the Kaibab, the Havasupai. I'm sure I'm
leaving something out.

So the split in Gila County is between
the reservation and the nonreservation portions of
Gila County.

One thing that we've done in this
district, I think -- we've also included the sacred
site for the tribes, which includes the San
Francisco Peaks. That was important to both the
White Mountain, Apache, I believe, and to the
Navajo, and we've included in the district some of
the Navajo's off-reservation lands, some of their
ranches. The Boquillas Ranch in the northwest and
some other lands that I think maybe Mr. Desmond is
showing in green.

One thing that we've done in this
district that was the subject of discussion between
the city of Flagstaff and the Navajo Nation was to
include the city of Winslow and the Navajo Nation
district. And that's something that -- my own
perspective is we might want to think about during
the public comment period because I think that the
city of Winslow does affect the competitiveness of
the Flagstaff district and that's something I would
like to take a look at going forward.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Just to sort of back
up what Commissioner McNulty said on the issue of
compactness, looking at the measure of compactness
in a more urban area or heavily populated area is
one thing. I think it's easy to conceptualize what
a compact district should look like.

And when you get into the rural areas,
you get -- you run into a challenge because you have
vast tracts of very lightly populated land and you
have to construct a district, you have to create,
you have to get the right number of people in it.
And for a legislative, it's roughly 213,000 people.

This district does include all of the
lands that the Navajo Nation requested. I believe
we put in their district.

For purposes of us walking through this
map, I'm going to focus on the positive aspects of
the district. So I'm not going to say anything more
about this one.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, what is the benchmark for that district?

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe it is 58.99 percent.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: And the way it's currently configured, what is the -- where does it stand now?

WILLIE DESMOND: This district is 61.9 percent.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Now, how quickly -- if you were to take out the Apache tribes, what would it bring down the --

WILLIE DESMOND: I don't know definitively.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: And the reason I say that -- I mean, the reason we ended up putting them on there to begin with was to increase the Native American population to the benchmark; is that correct?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, I believe when we didn't have them included it was somewhere in the neighborhood of 50 to 54, somewhere around there.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It was 52.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: 52.
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: It was 52 point something without the Apache. That's why we included them. Or one of the reasons we included them.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I just wanted to stress the reason why we ended up picking up the White Mountain Apache and San Carlos into that district.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: And, Madame Chair, just -- we did hear from the chairman of the White Mountain Apache Tribe who asked that the district he's currently in remain status quo. So that was one reason why I was a little reticent to proceed with a district like this.

And if, in fact, it is necessary to include both Apache tribes in this district, I mean, there might be other ways to do that and also because we've also heard from a lot of people in Eastern Arizona who talked about communities of interest in keeping their counties whole. And this map sort of runs counter to those wishes.

So I certainly hope to hear a lot of public comment about this district and perhaps hopefully look at exploring other ways to maybe try to -- you're never going to satisfy everyone but
maybe respecting a little bit more of the interests
of the people in Eastern Arizona.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Since this is so
timely, I just received a letter from the San Carlos
Apache Tribe. They must have known we were talking
about them.

It's from John Bush, vice chairman.

And should I read this into the record?

It essentially says: Dear

Commissioners -- this is dated October 10th, 2011.

Dear Commissioners. The San Carlos
Apache Tribe hereby gives notice that the tribe
hereby recommends to the Commission option 2 of the
legislative grid map that has tribes included within
the proposed district. The map is referred to as
the McNulty map.

The McNulty map will adhere to the Voting
Rights Act of 1965 by respecting communities of
interest and a major minority -- majority-minority
district.

The tribal vote will be respected in the
McNulty map.

Please call if you have any questions on
this matter.

Sincerely, John Bush, vice chairman.
So I guess that answers the question that they are okay with being in the proposed District 7.

MARY O'GRADY: And that's from the San Carlos Apache.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So we'll need another letter from the White Mountain.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Continuing on, into District 6, District 6 includes the remaining portions of Navajo County, Gila County, Coconino County, and then a small portion of Yavapai County in the Sedona/Verde Valley area.

I can zoom in to some of those portions in Yavapai County or just go through some of the makeup of this district.

District Number 6 is currently populated at 214,830 people, a deviation of .83 percent.

It's 12.4 percent Hispanic, 78.9 percent non-Hispanic white.

District Number 6 has a Reock score of .32, Perimeter of 1,048 miles, and a Polsby-Popper score of .11, which I believe makes it the lowest Polsby-Popper score we have. But that, again, reflects some of the natural features that have very jagged lines using mountain ridges or rivers and things like that increases -- or decreases a
Polsby-Popper score.

Looking at competitiveness, District Number 6 has an average Republican score of 55.4, an average Democratic score of 44.6, using index 2.

Using index 3, it's 56 percent Republican, 44 percent Democratic.

And then using registration, it is 38.4 percent Republican, 29 percent Democrat, and 32.7 percent other and Independent.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would add that we received a great deal of comments over the last months from the city of Flagstaff, Coconino County, the Flagstaff Forty, and business interests in the Flagstaff area and they had several messages for us.

One was that competitiveness was very important to the economic development efforts that are taking place there, many of which are in the biotech field and in fields that rely heavily on attracting an educated work force.

It's important to them that their university, Northern Arizona University continues to grow and thrive.

That they -- although they wanted to be in a congressional district with the Navajo Nation, each of those interests expressed their desire to be
in separate legislative districts. The tribal interests in part because they wanted to ensure that they reached and exceeded their benchmark and also so they had a strong voice to address their sovereign interests flagstaff so that they had a strong voice at the legislature to address their economic interests.

They wanted to include within this district areas along Interstate 40 that they have an economic connection with, increasingly, included Winslow and Holbrook. They wanted to include areas which was forest management and forest tourism, and forest recreation are important.

So that's what we've tried to do in this district.

We heard quite a bit of comments that the folks in the Verde Valley, Sedona, Cottonwood, that area wanted to be aligned in a legislative district with Flagstaff and vice versa, Flagstaff seeing cultural, historical, and economic ties there.

The last thing I would say is that because competitiveness is important to them, important to me, important to the Commission, that's something I would like to look at particularly with regard to this district during the comment period.
whether there are ways we can improve the
competitiveness of this district.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Anything else or
should we move on?

District 5, I guess we'll kind of work
our way around and in, is the portions of Mohave
County that are not included in District Number 7
and all of La Paz County.

Because it is two whole -- or one whole
county and the remainder of another, it is
underpopulated by 4,531 people, or roughly 2.13
percent.

It is 12.54 percent Hispanic and
82.15 percent non-Hispanic white.

District Number 5 as a Reock score of
.32, a Perimeter of 713 miles, and a Polsby-Popper
score of .3.

Looking at the competitiveness, District
Number 5 has an index 2 average Republican score of
65.5 and average Democratic score of 34.5.

Index 3 of 64. -- or 64.4 of Republican,
35.6 Democrat.

And using registration is 39.5 percent
Republican, 24.1 percent Democrat, and 36.4 percent
other, Independent.
Are there any other --

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: This district was constructed first -- well, one of the rationales for it is there is a common interest here among all of these communities that run along the Colorado River, the so-called river district. It also applied other constitutional criteria.

It keeps La Paz County whole, I believe and follows county lines. And Mohave County is split, but it's split along this tribal boundary and the Colorado River, which is a geographic feature.

It is a little bit light on population, but the problem we faced is there's nobody around here, the edge. So you got to reach way out to grab just a few thousand people, but that's something we can -- we'll certainly look at further.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. District 13 to its immediate south includes the remaining portions of Yuma County that were not included in the voting rights' district, District Number 4, and then a portion of Western Maricopa into I believe Goodyear and Buckeye a little bit.

Let me turn off the shading here so you can see the underlying communities a little better.

So it has a large portion of incorporated
Maricopa County kind of in the center portion of Buckeye, the northern portion of Goodyear and then also Litchfield Park, Citrus Park, the most westernmost portion of Glendale, actually, and a portion of Surprise.

Looking at its racial composition, District Number 13 has a total population of 215,577 people, a deviation of about 1.8 percent too much.

It is 22.92 percent Hispanic.

67.51 percent non-Hispanic white.

District Number 13 has a Reock score of .26, Perimeter of 453.92 miles, and a Polsby-Popper score of .28.

Using competitiveness, it has an index 2 Republican percentage of 63.3 and index 2 Democratic percentage 36.7.

Its registration is 41.1 percent Republican, 24.89 Democrat, and 35 percent Independents and other.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I'm affectionately referring to this as the Cape Cod district.

And one of the challenges with this district, as Mr. Freeman just noted with regard to District 5, is that there are, you know, high concentrations of population surrounded by very
light, unpopulated areas. And I'm sure we will look at this district more closely. We'll see.

WILLIE DESMOND: All right. Continuing on, you have District 14, which is the remaining portions of Yavapai County that were not included in District Number 6 and the northwestern portion of Maricopa County.

Again, the portions that are not included that are in District 6 are Verde Village, Cornville, Clarkdale, Oak Creek, Sedona, and Lake Montezuma. Prescott is all included in this District 14.

And then when it goes into Maricopa, it includes portions of Buckeye and just Wickenburg and that's about it in Maricopa.

District 14 has a racial population of 11.45 Hispanic, 83.75 percent non-Hispanic white.

District Number 13 -- or 14, excuse me, has a Reock score of .49, Perimeter of 628 miles, and Polsby-Popper score of .29.

It's competitiveness using index 2 is 65.8 percent Republican, 34.2 percent Democrat.

Using index 3, it's 66.6 percent Republican and 33.4 percent Democrat.

And its registration numbers are 45.8 percent Republican, 21.2 percent Democrat, and
32.9 percent Independent and other.

Any -- or should I just go right into the areas of Maricopa County?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I'll just add that essentially here the goal was to keep Yavapai County whole with the exception that the Verde Valley areas that are aligned with Phoenix have been included in District 6 and to include some similar areas of Maricopa County.

WILLIE DESMOND: All right. Going into Maricopa County, we'll start with District 22, I guess.

This district includes the northern portions of Peoria and Phoenix along with north portions of New River and Surprise. Also includes Sun City West.

This District 22 has a total population of 210,085. A 1.4 percent negative population deviation.

It's 8.2 percent Hispanic, 84.3 percent white.

Looking at its competitiveness numbers, District 22 has an average Republican score of 64.3, 35.7 percent Democrat.

Looking at the registration, it's
45.6 percent Republican, 22.9 percent Democrat, and 31.5 percent other.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: This would just be a Northeast Valley district that includes most of Peoria, the northern part of Peoria, Sun City West, Surprise.

Some portion that we -- Surprise ended up getting three -- split in three, which is not something I like, but it's perhaps something we can focus on down the road.

We have got -- we're using I-17 as a border for sort of separating east from west for a lot of the border of this district.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. I guess continuing along the north here, we have District Number 15, which includes the remaining portions of New River, Anthem, Cave Creek, Carefree, and the northern portion of Phoenix.

Again, I don't know -- we can look down at some of the southern boundaries. It's western boundary, as Commissioner Freeman just mentioned, is primarily Interstate 17.

Once it dips down into Phoenix, it uses primarily Paradise Lane as its north/south boundary with a few jogs here and there.
So again, District 15, looking at its numbers, is populated at 417,592 (sic), a deviation of 2.12 percent too much.

It is 11.75 percent Hispanic and 80.07 percent non-Hispanic white.

District Number 15 has a Reock score of .51, a Perimeter of 86.4 miles, and a Polsby-Popper score of .33.

Using competitiveness, index 2, it is 61.5 percent Republican, 38.5 percent Democrat.

Using index number 3, it's 62.5 percent Republican, 37.5 percent Democrat.

And using just the registration numbers, it's 41.8 percent Republican, 23.1 percent Democrat, and 35.2 percent Independent and other.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, this is the Northeast Valley or North Valley district that keeps Anthem together with Cave Creek and Carefree and joins them with the north part of Phoenix to the east of I-17.

The Scottsdale boundary -- municipal boundary is used as the eastern boundary -- municipal boundaries, respecting them as a constitutional criteria. So we used that line for that border.
It also -- these communities are tied not only by I-17 but by Cave Creek Road and Tatum and 51 that serve as thoroughfares connecting the North Valley to these communities.

WILLIE DESMOND: And again, it's bordered on its east by the city of Scottsdale, which is in District 23, which we'll go to next.

District 23 is the bulk of Scottsdale, everything except for the very southern portion of South Scottsdale.

Also includes Fountain Hills and Rio Verde and a lot of the uninhabited and unincorporated lands in Northwestern -- or Northeastern Maricopa County.

I guess looking right away at the area in Scottsdale where it's split, I believe it is Osborn Road. That is the split in Scottsdale. But other than that, it includes whole communities.

District 23 has a racial makeup -- or a population of 206,692 people. A deviation of negative 2.99 percent. It's 4.73 percent Hispanic and 89.43 percent non-Hispanic white.

District 23 has a Reock score of .33, perimeter of 265 miles, and a Polsby-Popper score of .23.
Looking at competitiveness, index 2 and 3, index 2 is 62.3 percent Republican and index 3 is 64.2 percent Republican.

Index 2 is 37.7 percent Democrat. Index 3 is 35.8 percent Democrat.

Then using the registration numbers again, it is 45.6 percent registered Republican, 21.4 registered Democrat, and 33 percent registered Independent and other.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: So a district that keeps Scottsdale as whole as possible, we heard a lot about -- public comment about keeping Scottsdale together.

So it's as whole as possible. It ties it with Fountain Hills. Fountain Hills is tied directly to Scottsdale via Shea. There's strong ties there.

It keeps the community of Rio Verde, which is linked to Scottsdale via Dynamite Road. There's probably going to be developed in this area between -- soon. You can see sort of the realtor signs on it already if you go out there.

This vast tract out here to the east is basically pushing the lines out to the county line. This is largely uninhabited. I think you got
Bartlett Lake in there and Saguaro Lake and maybe Canyon Lake.

So there's really nobody out there. So we just took the line out to the county line, which is constitutional criteria. We're to respect those county lines.

WILLIE DESMOND: Just to emphasize that last point, this area that's now shaded in red has a population of 850 people. And it's bigger than the rest of -- of the county, practically.

All right. So I'm open to suggestions as to where to go next. Perhaps it would make sense since we have done 22, 15, and 23 to start with 21, 20, and 28, kind of working our way?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Sure.

WILLIE DESMOND: All right.

So going back into the West Valley, looking at District 21, this area comprises -- this district comprises El Mirage, Youngtown, Sun City, and portions of Peoria in this map and it also includes a portion of -- probably considered North Glendale.

District 21 has a population of 213,086, which is a deviation of only 19 people from the ideal value, or .01 percent.
It is 18.09 percent Hispanic, 73.98
non-Hispanic white.

District 21 has a Reock score of .51, a
Perimeter of 40.9 miles, and a Polsby-Popper score
of .47.

Looking at the competitiveness index,
District 21 is 58.5 percent Republican. Using index
2, 41.5 percent Democrat.

Using index 3, it's 58.1 percent and
41.9.

Using the straight registration numbers,
it's 38.7 percent Republican and 28.7 percent
Democrat and 32.5 percent Independent and other.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: So this is a fairly
compact West Valley district that keeps Sun City in
one district. We heard a lot of public comment
about the distinction between Sun City and Sun City
West, that they view their interests differently and
they did not want to have their voices diluted by
being included in the same district.

We also heard about the ties between Sun
City and this portion of -- the immediate adjacent
area of Peoria that they thought that was a common
interest there that they have, that they would like
to have respected.
It does include a piece of Glendale here, and unfortunately, as you see, Glendale gets carved up a bit because of the -- and that's something that perhaps we need to look at further.

The geometry of how Glendale is laid out probably means that it's highly susceptible to being cut into different districts, but I think -- so that we don't dilute the voice of Glendale, we want to try as a Commission to minimize those splits. So that's perhaps something that we could address.

There's also I guess -- I believe we've got 29, which is one of our voting rights' districts.

So sometimes communities need to be split to sort of yield to the creation of a voting rights' district.

So 29 and I believe 30 also are voting rights' districts. So those districts kind of came into Glendale and then split.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. That's correct, 29 and 30 are both voting rights' districts.

Continuing to its immediate east is District 20. It includes a small portion of Glendale and the rest of it is in Phoenix.

You can see part of its northern boundary
is the 17 and we can look at some of the streets if commissioners -- if they would like to do that.

It has a population of 218,650 people. A deviation of 2.62 percent too many.

It is 17.42 percent Hispanic and 72.23 percent non-Hispanic white.

District Number 20 has a Reock score of .38, Perimeter of 41.13, and a Polsby-Popper of .39.

It's index 2 average Republican percentage is 57.8. Its average Democrat percentage is 42.2.

Using index 3, it's going to be 57.5 Republican and 42.5 percent Democrat.

Looking at the registration numbers, District Number 20 is 37.1 percent registered Republican, 28.2 registered Democrat, and 34.8 percent registered Independent and other.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay. Again, focusing on the positive, this is a North Central Phoenix neighborhood. We've got I-17 serving as part of -- one of the boundaries we've got, the municipal boundary with Glendale serving as another boundary.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Going -- moving on, we've already looked at District 15. So kind of
going to its southeast is District 28. This district, again, includes portions of Phoenix and all of Paradise Valley. Its border to the east is Scottsdale.

And looking at its different compositions, District Number 28 has a population of 213,915 people, a deviation of .4 percent.

It is 13.75 percent Hispanic, 79.18 percent non-Hispanic white.

Looking at its -- or compactness is .66 on the Reock score, Perimeter of 48.6 miles, and a Polsby-Popper score of .43.

Looking at competitiveness, it is 56 percent Republican, 44 percent Democrat, using index 2.

Using index 3, it is 57.3 percent Republican and 42.7 percent Democrat.

And again, using the registration totals, it is 42.1 percent Republican, 28.2 percent Democrat, and 29.6 percent Independent and other.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: So this district includes the Arcadia area -- and strictly speaking, Arcadia is a very small neighborhood that sits at the base of Camelback Mountain, but I think most people refer to it, they sort of refer to Greater
Arcadia, which is the area of the Scottsdale school district that sort of overlaps into Phoenix here and feeds into Arcadia High school.

That sort of is a unique community that has strong ties to Paradise Valley and the Biltmore area and sort of North Central Phoenix and the Madison -- part of Madison school district here.

The southern boundary ended up being what's called a coalition district, one of the districts we need to construct to comply with the Voting Rights Act, and I'm sure we'll be talking about this district later.

And to get more population, the natural place to go is north. These communities to the north of Paradise Valley sort of tie in. There's the 51 that ties these two communities together as well. And then east boundary is the Scottsdale municipal line.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. As Commissioner Freeman just mentioned, District 24, where we'll go next, is a voting rights' district.

Includes the Fort McDowell, Salt River reservation lands. The portion of South Scottsdale that was not included in District 23 south of Osborn Road and portions of -- is that Central Phoenix?
North Central Phoenix?

It is populated at 213,582 people with a Hispanic percentage of 31.76 percent. A non-Hispanic white percentage of 53.83 percent. African-American percentage of 5.65 percent. Native American of 4.71. Asian of 2.25 and then .14 and -- or .15 for Hawaiian Pacific Islander and other.

Looking at its status as a coalition district -- or looking -- first at its compactness, it has a Reock score of .19, a Perimeter of 107.95, miles, and a Polsby-Popper score of .18.

As a coalition district, it needs to ensure that minorities have the ability to elect a candidate of choice.

These coalition districts are probably the trickiest to analyze, to ensure that they will meet DOJ requirements and achieve preclearance. So that is an ongoing process, and I hope to have more information as the 30-day comment period goes on.

But looking solely at its election results using index 2, it has a 39.4 percent Republican score and a 60.6 percent Democrat.

It has an index 3 of 39.5 Republican and 60.5 percent, so very close.

Straight registration, it is 25.3 percent
registered Republican, 38.4 percent registered
Democrat, 36.4 Independent and other.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Yeah, as Mr. Desmond said, at least Central Phoenix, South Scottsdale
connected to the Salt River tribal area -- Fort McDowell tribal area and it is a potential coalition
district, maybe -- I don't know, it might be
appropriate for counsel to sort of give sort of a
thumbnail sketch of what the Commission needs to do
in terms of assembling a certain number of districts
and how they are constituted to comply with the
Voting Rights Act.

MARY O'GRADY: Sure.

Because we are subject -- Arizona is
subject to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, we
have a special obligation to avoid retrogression,
which means we can't -- minority voters can't be
worse off by the new plan. Under this new plan, we
cannot dilute the strength of minority voters.

So the analysis starts by determining how
many benchmark districts we have under the current
plan. So it starts with analysis of the current
plan.

And we -- and even some analysis is
necessary to determine that.
You look basically at where are there majority-minority districts now, majority voting-age districts of a single minority or a combined minority population and then you look at the electoral strength.

And we advised that we should have nine benchmark districts and possibly a tenth. They don't all have to be a majority level, but the test of the Voting Rights Act is do they have an opportunity to elect the preferred candidate of choice and the minority voters have the opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice.

So under this map, we were able to get eight minority-majority districts and then we have the two coalition districts, which are the combination of the majority -- minority population isn't at the majority level but we think based on our analysis there's enough to -- that the minority voters might have the opportunity to elect a candidate of choice in their districts.

And so on this map, we have two coalition districts, as Commissioner Freeman described, and that's District 26 -- 24 and 26 in the Maricopa County area are coalition districts.

And in the comment period, in addition to
receiving public comment on the map, all of the
analysis will continue to make sure that these are
viable minority districts.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Ms. O'Grady, can you
talk about the analysis that you'll be doing that
will be getting done to make sure that they are
viable majority-minority districts?

MARY O'GRADY: Sure.

We'll look at -- you look at racially
polarized voting, you look at electoral history, you
look at turnout, all of those factors.

And as a snapshot, as Mr. Desmond
mentioned earlier, we've used the mine inspector
race from 2010 because that's the most recent
statewide example of a direct, kind of general
election race between a Hispanic candidate and a
minority candidate. And we've been using that as
sort of a proxy for voting strength of the minority
candidate in a district. And we'll expand that by
looking at other races and get more detailed
analysis. And you look at both the primary and the
general.

WILLIE DESMOND: And in 2010, the
minority candidate received 58.8 percent of the vote in this district, in the mine inspector's race.

Should I go on?

Okay. Continuing on, from District 24 we'll go to another majority-minority, that is District 30, which includes portions of Phoenix and Glendale.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Should we take 29 or did we do 29?

WILLIE DESMOND: I'll do --

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: We're going to go west to east. I thought that's where you were going.

WILLIE DESMOND: I did and then I kind of snaked around. Sorry.

Let's go to 29. That's fine.

They are both comprised primarily of Phoenix and Glendale. District 29 has a population of 212,258 people. A deviation of 809 too few, or .38 percent.

It has a voting-age Hispanic percent of 61.74. Voting-age non-Hispanic white percentage of 27.15.

Looking at some of the other measures here, District 29 has a Reock score of .34, a
Perimeter of 34.21, and a Polsby-Popper of .5. Using the different competitiveness measures, it is 39.6 percent Republican, 60.4 percent Democrat, using index 2.

If you look at party registration, it is 21.5 percent Republican, 39.4 percent Democrat, and 39 percent Independent and other.

In the 2010 mine inspector's race, the minority candidate received 60.7 percent of the votes in this proposed district.

Anything we want to say about it or should I just go right to 30?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Just quickly.

That we started with recommendations from the Arizona Minority Coalition on each of these districts and have taken those into account a great deal as we worked to create the number of districts that would need to satisfy the Voting Rights Act in this area.

WILLIE DESMOND: So District 30 is another one of these voting rights' districts.

Again, it is portions of Glendale and Phoenix.

It has a population of 207,918. A deviation of negative 2.24 percent.
It is 50.72 voting-age Hispanic.
35.53 percent non-Hispanic white.
District 30 has a Reock score of .33, a Perimeter of only 29.82 miles, and a Polsby-Popper score of .44.

Looking at its various competitiveness measures, using index 2, it is 42.7 percent Republican, 57.3 percent Democrat.

Using the registration numbers, it is 23.9 percent registered Republican, 38.6 percent registered Democrat, and 37.4 percent Independent and other.

Using the 2010 mine inspector race as a proxy, the Democratic and minority candidate received 56.2 percent of the vote in this district.

Anything else about that?
Okay. Continuing on -- I guess just continuing on with the majority-minority districts, District 19 sits immediately south of District 29 and includes all of Avondale, which, again, is a good example of a trade-off between not splitting municipal boundaries and also keeping a district compact and contiguous.

This portion to the south I don't think is very highly populated, but in an effort not to
split that municipality, it was included, which does harm its compactness.

That being said, District 19 has a compactness of .38 on the Reock score, 66.63 mile Perimeter, and a Polsby-Popper score of .31.

District 19 is populated at 212,096 people. A deviation of negative .46 percent.

It is 59.98 percent voting-age Hispanic. 26.77 percent non-Hispanic white. 7.89 percent African-American.

Using the mine inspector's race for District 19, it is -- in 2010, the minority candidate received 63.2 percent of the vote.

Looking at registration, it is 19.7 percent registered Republican, 40.2 percent registered Democrat, and 40.2 percent registered Independent and other.

It does have index 2 scores of 36.9 percent Republican and 63.1 percent Democrat.

Going to its immediate east is District 27, another one of our majority-minority districts, the benchmark districts.

District 27 has a population of 208,413. A deviation of negative 2.18 percent.

It has a voting-age Hispanic percentage
of 53.71. A voting-age non-Hispanic white percentage of 23.46 and a voting-age African-American percentage of 15.34.

In the past, I think African-American and Hispanic have had a successful coalition here, so we paid particular attention to remaining a strong core of African-American voters in this district, as the Minority Coalition had requested.

District 27 has a Reock score of .37, a Perimeter of 58.2 miles, and a Polsby-Popper score of .30.

Looking at some of competitiveness measures, it is 27.4 percent Republican. Using index 2, 72.6 percent.

Using registration totals it's 14.8 percent Republican, 47.67 registered Democrat, and 37.7 percent Independent and other.

Finally, using the mine inspector's race, the minority received 72.7 percent of the vote in the 2010 mine inspector election.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would just like to add that this district also includes the village of Guadalupe.

WILLIE DESMOND: Correct.

Finally, we have one more coalition
district that is District Number 26.

    District 26 has a population of 213,000 people. Hispanic percentage of 30.41 and a non-Hispanic white percentage of 55.31.

    Taking a step back, it includes North Tempe and parts of West Mesa.

    Looking at this district's compactness,
    District 26 has a compactness score of .42 using the Reock test. 35.29 mile Perimeter, and .43 Polsby-Popper score.

    Because this is a coalition district, we have to pay particular attention to a minority candidate's ability to elect a candidate of their choice.

    That being said, using index 2, it was 43.6 percent Republican, 56.4 percent Democrat.

    Using index 3, it is 44.4 percent Republican, 55.6 percent Democrat.

    Using the registration total, 26. -- or 27.6 percent registered Republican, 32.4 percent registered Democrat, and 40.1 percent registered Independent and other.

    In 2010, the minority candidate received 54.1 percent of the vote in the 2010 mine inspector's race.
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: We've talked about this district a lot in the last couple of months. I won't say too much about it, but it does include areas of Tempe and West Mesa that have a lot in common.

We talked about the fact that it includes Mesa Community College and ASU and the communities around those institutions and is connected by the light rail and economic development opportunities that that fosters.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Continuing on I guess with District 25 -- and, Michelle, if I'm going too fast on these numbers, just let me know. I'll try to be careful.

District Number 25 includes portions of I guess Central -- North Central Mesa. Mesa has kind of a unique shape, so I'm not sure exactly how you would describe the various neighborhoods. It is wholly contained in Mesa and some of the unincorporated areas around there.

It has a population of 217,002 people. A deviation of 1.85 percent.

It is 15.77 percent voting-age Hispanic and 77.19 percent non-Hispanic white.

Looking at some of the compactness
measures, District 25 has a Reock score of .48, a Perimeter score of 44.51 miles, and a Polsby-Popper score of .40.

Using -- looking at the various competitiveness measures, it is 64.6 percent Republican and 35.4 percent Democrat, using index 2.

Using registration numbers, it is 45.9 percent Republican, 22.7 percent registered Democrat, and 31.4 percent registered Independent and other.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Sort of in the Southeast Valley area, maybe just zoom out just a tad, in a way you kind of got to look at it altogether to see how it fits together. And this is sort of the Central Mesa district. A piece gets taken out of it to construct this coalition district just to the west.

And I'll just sort of go through the other districts.

I think District 16 is -- connects East Mesa -- the entirety East Mesa with Apache Junction and Gold Canyon in an area that's growing out along the 60 and puts them together.

It gets the population -- you get a sliver of the San Tan Valley, which, unfortunately,
we had to be split.

Gilbert -- and we've heard, I have to emphasize again, a lot of public comment on various ways to put together the state, and this area of the state in particular.

And certainly during the second round of public comment hearings we want to hear more of that to assess whether this division is appropriate.

We did hear comments desired by people living in Gilbert, which is District 12. We heard some comments about a desire to keep Gilbert as whole as possible.

The city itself almost makes up a legislative district, but a piece of it needed to go into this District 17 next to it.

So we connected Gilbert with Queen Creek, which we heard there's a relationship between those two communities. So they seemed to go together.

17 is essentially -- well, probably back up and talk about 18.

18, the north boundary here is South Mountain, so that's a geographic feature and then we have this piece of Phoenix, which is Ahwatukee, that needs to go with the adjacent communities in Chandler.
We heard about how there are ties there between Ahwatukee and Chandler. It gets South Tempe. Tempe needed to be split to form this coalition district, so that's where that piece of Tempe goes. And we needed to make the population balance with an adjacent piece of Mesa into that district.

What was left was the rest of Chandler and a small piece of Gilbert. We heard lots of people in Chandler about how they sort of recognized that their community would be split, and they -- we got significant input on sort of the appropriate place to draw that line there to split those two communities -- or split that community.

We kept Chandler together with the community of Sun Lakes, which we also heard about a desire to keep Sun Lakes connected with the rest of Chandler.

And does that complete 30?

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe so.

I can go through and give you the populations and breakdowns of all of those.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay, yeah. I forgot about that.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'll do them all.
together kind of.

So District 16 has the areas of East Mesa, Apache Junction, and Gold Canyon.

It has a population of 217,000 people.

It is 12.6 percent Hispanic,
81.67 percent non-Hispanic white.

District 12, which is Gilbert and Queen Creek, has a population of 216,672. A deviation of 1.69 percent.

It is 13.5 percent Hispanic,
75.76 percent non-Hispanic white.

District 17 has a population of 213,449.
A deviation of just .18 percent.

It is 67.91 non-Hispanic white.
18.34 percent Hispanic.

District 18 has a population of 215,957 people. A deviation of 1.36 percent.

It is 12.79 percent voting-age Hispanic.
73.16 percent non-Hispanic white.

Looking at the compactness of these
districts, again, starting with District 16, it has
a Reock score of .59, a Perimeter of 75.39 miles,
and a Polsby-Popper score of .43.

District 12 has a Reock score of .4,
Perimeter of 54.77 miles, and a Polsby-Popper score
District 17 has a Reock score of .46, a Perimeter of 42.94 miles, and a Polsby-Popper score of .44.

District 18 has a Reock score of .3, a Perimeter of 52.77 miles, and a Polsby-Popper score of .37.

I'll do the index 2 scores for all of these.

So again, starting with District 16, there is an index 2 score of 61.4 percent Republican, 38.6 percent Democrat.

There is registration of 38.9 percent registered Republican, 23.5 percent registered Democrat, 37.5 percent registered Independent and other.

District 12 has an index 2 score of 66.1 percent Democrat, 33.9 percent -- or 66.1 percent Republican, 33.9 percent Democrat.

Using registration, it is 47 percent registered Republican, 20.67 percent registered Democrat, and 32.4 Independent and other.

District 17 has an index 2 score of 58.1 percent Republican, 41.9 percent Democrat.

A registration of 39.4 percent
Republican, 25.3 percent Democrat, and 35.3 percent Independent and other.

Finally, District 18 has an index 2 score of 51.6 percent Republican, 48.4 percent Democrat, and is registered at 36.9 percent registered Republican, 29.3 percent registered Democrat, and 33.9 percent Independent and other.

Are there any questions?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Thank you.

MARY O'GRADY: Commissioners, one point on the components report that you have that lists the splits of census places, some of those splits are -- I think they say, for example, Scottsdale split three times.

If you look at the splits, one of them is listed as District 28, which is zero population. It really is split twice in terms of the population. Peoria is listed as split five times, but if you go through, three of those are zero population.

So the only one that looks -- well, can't say the same for Glendale. They are split significantly, although a few of them are a very small piece of population, but -- so there is -- they are not all as split as that report indicates.
WILLIE DESMOND: And again, for anyone in the audience or anyone watching the video of this, Mary is referencing the plan splits report, which is available online to give the total number of splits by census place and also using the plan components report, which is also available online to go through district by district and show you what municipalities, what counties are included in each district, and it tells you how much of those areas are included.

So that research and those resources are available to the public on the IRC website.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Thank you for bringing that up.

You've been giving us those splits report and components reports with every iteration of the maps, both the congressional and the legislative that you have given to us and they are very helpful.

It is difficult with some of the large geographic areas that some of these communities comprise not to split them, but we've taken a great deal of time and effort.

We watched Mr. Freeman in Northwest Phoenix yesterday, in the Buckeye and Glendale area as he worked on that area.
I think a great deal of time and care in trying to figure out the best places to divide areas, and I'm sure we'll get more comment on that as we move ahead. And we ourselves will be looking at those splits and component reports.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you both for walking us through that and to Mr. Desmond for the statistics. We appreciate having all of this information at our fingertips.

It's 12:15 p.m. I don't know if commissioners would like to continue discussing the legislative map or would you like to take a short break or a lunch break. So I'm open to however you want to proceed.

COMMISSIONER MCVULTY: I'm hungry.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I have one short break one, long break.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Lunch.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Lunch.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Lunch it is. Should we make take an hour break, then, and be back at 1:15 p.m.?

So we'll go into recess. The time is 12:14 p.m.

(A recess was taken from 12:14 p.m. to
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Recess is over. We'll enter back into public session. The time is 1:37 p.m.

We are in the midst of agenda item 2, discussing this legislative district draft map that's got a bunch of placeholder districts in it. It's like a predraft draft map.

And we've been working on this for a little over a week now, I guess, since -- it goes farther back than that.

Just to recap, there were two versions of legislative draft maps that were done by Commissioners McNulty and Freeman.

And for the past week, though, we've been working on trying to bring those together into something that resembles a predraft draft map.

So we have one now and we are very excited about it. And I'm sure there are adjustments that need to be made in various places, but it's a great starting point for discussion.

So I open it up to other commissioners to see what their thoughts are.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair, I just would like to make a comment that it really
goes back even further than the proposals that Mr. Freeman and I prepared from the grid.

We've spent months really analyzing the congressional map and put together a couple dozen or more draft congressional maps that -- all of which were derived from the grid before we finally merged those into one congressional draft map derived from the grid, based on a number of iterations that we had done earlier.

And in the process of doing all of that analysis, I think we all developed an understanding and a lot of information about the state generally that went into preparing these legislative drafts from the grid also.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's a good point. There's a lot of things that do tie back to what we learned doing the congressional work.

So thank you.

Other comments?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I'll make another comment that we've also helped in the last few months that everything leads to something else. That every adjustment you make results in adjustments to other places and other criteria and other trade-offs.
So as we go through public comment on the draft map, when it's finally agreed upon, we will hear, I'm sure, lots of things from lots of folks. There will be places where splits on the micro-level concern people and we'll need to look at that.

There will be issues on the map donut hole that we'll want to look at and improve. And Mr. Freeman has talked about a couple of things and I've talked about a couple of those things, and all of those things will be the focus of our attention as we do our second round of public hearings, which as I understand is to start tomorrow evening.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's correct. They are to begin tomorrow evening.

Are there things -- you both mentioned things on the macro-level, things that we should talk about now that you think deserve addressing in this version that we have?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: One of my issues on the macro-level will be looking at the map from a perspective of competitiveness.

We have -- I think the way the process has worked, we have two different draft maps. With your very strong encouragement, we took those two
draft maps and tried to reach agreement upon a draft that incorporated things from both of those maps.

I think that -- and I think as Mr. Freeman said, he was focused on the good things about this map and I was, too. And I think there are a lot of good things about this map.

There's some areas of the state in which we can, I think, look at improving the competitiveness of the districts, and I would like to do that over the public comment period. It's not something that I think we can do right now.

And when I say "competitiveness," I'm talking about, as I've discussed earlier, the ability of either major party to win an election. An equal playing field so that in an average year, average candidates from either party have a good shot at winning an election.

What I don't mean is having numbers, you know, that like 58/42 as distinct from 75/25 because there's a point at which you get outside of the realm in which either candidate can field a candidate -- either party can field the candidate with an equal chance of winning.

So when I'm looking at competitiveness, it's not just that the numbers are a little closer
than they might have been. It's that they are within a range that either party can -- that the outcome is not predetermined and that either party can have an equal shot at winning.

So there's a few areas where I think we can improve on that in this map, but I wouldn't be looking to do that today.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Just focusing on the macro level for now and building upon what Commissioner McNulty said about competitiveness, I'm looking to get more complete data on competitiveness.

I've said this repeatedly. I don't look at competitiveness quite as narrowly as the way Commissioner McNulty articulated it.

I view a district being competitive is one where both candidates are going to field candidates with some reasonable chance of winning, but it doesn't necessarily mean a 50/50 coin flip at any one election, but the other party can get in there and compete and be heard and people can participate and feel like they can actively participate in the election.

I'm also concerned on the macro-level
about how the Commission is respecting communities
of interest in developing this map.

I think in flushing out a 30-district
map, which we finished yesterday late in the
afternoon, we did take a stab at that. I think
that's something we're going to want to really look
critically at identifying communities of interest,
making sure they are kept together and grouped
appropriately.

And I think -- and public comment is
obviously going to help really focus us on that
because now once the public has a draft map in front
of them, that perhaps may sharpen the testimony a
bit. So that's something else I'll be looking at on
a macro level.

And I did try to -- I didn't want to sort
of vent all of my concerns with the map. As
presently constituted, I know that I was trying to
focus on the positive, but I mentioned a few. The
treatment of Eastern Arizona. Even in Maricopa
County, which I know the Chair said was in some
respects derived from my map, but in some respects
it wasn't because we spent a couple of days really
looking hard at the Voting Rights Act districts and
those got really rearranged in that process.
And that kind of -- when that happens -- you know, a change to one district can affect every other district on the map. And a lot of districts, as I originally constructed in option 1, did change some of them quite a built.

I think also an important thing for us -- macro concern for us is on the voting rights' district and whether we have all of the data necessarily assembled to sort of prove -- the Commission bears the burden of proof with the Federal Justice Department to prove that we have complied with the Voting Rights Act and did not retrogress.

So I do have some concerns on that, that we have all of our ducks in a row. And just as to the constitution of those districts, I mean, there might be other better ways to put those districts together.

So that's sort of another macro concern that I have going forward.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would like to echo a couple of those comments.

On the issue of competitiveness, I agree, that in terms of this legislative map in particular we need to be looking at districts where parties
have a reasonable chance of achieving a victory, but I do also think that there are parameters outside of which you leave that prospect behind.

So in a district that is 58/42 percent. That sort of thing, I don't think we're accomplishing competitiveness by bringing districts that might have been 65/35 to a 58/42 range.

In terms of communities of interest, a lot of time has been spent -- a lot of my time has been spent looking at communities of interest and trying to configure districts in ways that make sense.

As Mr. Freeman said, you know, there were some districts where just by the nature of them and the ruralness and the vast expanses of urbanness that that becomes more challenging. And I think we will need to -- we will want to look at all of those issues during public comment.

And finally on the Voting Rights Act, we will be -- we are in the process of having a Voting Rights Act expert do an analysis of all of these potential districts and that input will be extremely important to how we handle those districts once we get that analysis back and go through public comment.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Question for counsel.

Will the voting rights' analysis be completed prior to the end of the 30-day comment period?

JOE KANEFIELD: Madame Chair, Commissioner Stertz, yes, I believe that will be the case.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And for Mr. Desmond, will the '04, '06 data be completed and implemented -- or voting data be completed and into the analysis prior to the end of the 30-day comment period?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, I believe so.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay. For counsel, is Dr. King currently working on the congressional? I know this is off issue, but I want to find out if he's currently working on the congressional analysis.

JOE KANEFIELD: Madame Chair,

Commissioner Stertz, yes, he is.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And when we get that data, how are we going to -- will he be coming
here to present or will you be giving us his best analysis?

JOE KANEFIELD: Madame Chair,
Commissioner Stertz, we haven't gotten that far yet, whether he will come here or we will summarize his report. But one way or the other we'll make sure that the report is accurately presented to the Commission.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madame Chair --
and the Constitution requires that we put the map up for at least 30 days public comment. So it's not necessarily truncated at 30 days if for any reason we didn't have that information. I expect we will, but there's no reason we would have to discontinue hearing public comment.

We've been hearing public comment for eight months now, and I'm sure we'll continue to until we finish the process.

MARY O'GRADY: That's right.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair, so I'm clear, counsel would anticipate, irrespective of when we technically end, but you would anticipate within the next 30 days the voting rights' analysis would be complete. And let's just assume -- let's
assume for the sake of argument that the
districts -- the voting rights' districts as
presently constituted are viable.

So within 30 days, we would have whatever
record we need -- needed compiled to serve as
foundation for going to Justice to make a pitch that
we've complied with the Voting Rights Act?

MARY O'GRADY: That's our hope. Again,
these are draft maps, so we would be analyzing the
drafts against the benchmarks.

The drafts can change as a result of
public comment and as a result of the analysis. So
additional analysis would then be done on whatever
the final map is.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay. But I was
just -- for the sake of argument, just assume that
the voting rights' districts are unchanged. We
would have all of our ducks in a row with the 30
days, you would need to submit?

MARY O'GRADY: That's our hope. We'll
have a better sense of that. You know, as it gets
into legislative -- we assigned the first priority
to congressional. But that's certainly our hope.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Do we know how the
last Commission handled it in terms of when they did
their racially polarized voting analysis? Did they do it on the draft map and was that part of the draft map presentation or not?

MARY O'GRADY: Madame Chair, I don't remember that being part of the draft map presentation. And they didn't -- they obviously didn't do competitiveness at this phase of the process either that this Commission is doing.

I would have to -- the dates of the racially polarized voting analysis that I have seen were later.

The submission was made in January and most of them were included and prepared as part of the submission process.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any other comments or questions for counsel or comments on the draft map?

I mean, it's not a draft map. Predraft draft map.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: I'll twist Willie's arm a little bit.

So on the competitiveness stand, are you willing to give me a date by which we'll have more of that data available?

WILLIE DESMOND: I don't have a hard and
fast date. There's been more e-mails today. I know there's quite a few counties that we have checked off so far, and we're proceeding on a county-by-county basis.

One thing I will say is that I think we do have every intention of having the voting rights' analysis done by the 30-day comment period and the 2004 to '06 data being an important part of that.

From both standpoints, both competitiveness and voting rights' analysis, it's the top priority and has been pretty much the sole focus of Ken, Andrew, and Brad in our office this past week especially. Soon.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can you assume, just for everyone's edification, why it is the situation that we're in in terms of getting this '04, '06 data out?

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

And let me know if this gets a little confusing.

It is a little bit complex, some of the issues here.

So there's a couple major issues that have complicated this process.

First of all, the census provides a
precinct identifier so that in theory you can match election results to the census data fairly easily.

That precinct is locked in prior to the 2008 election. Before that, in 2004 and in 2006, when these lines had been enacted, those precincts could be completely different and there may be no good way of translating them to the current -- current files.

One thing that complicates that is that precincts built in 2004 and 2006 are built off of 2000 block files, from the year 2000.

Those block files, the most granular unit at which census geography is recording and the building blocks for anything you look at have changed.

So there's blocks from 2000 that are now split, there's blocks that have been, you know, divided up, there's blocks that have gotten bigger. So they don't translate. 2010 doesn't nest perfectly within 2000, so to speak.

So as a result, precincts from 2004 and 2006 sometimes don't nest within our current blocks. That's one level of problem.

Additionally, we've had a hard time finding maps from 2004 and 2006 for some of the
precincts that no longer exist, but, you know, the
tlines at which results were -- or elections were
conducted in those years.

We were supplied some information but we
found several types of errors. You know, thousands
of blocks are in one congressional district in 2006
and in a different one in 2004.

So that would -- that's not possible.
Those lines were steady, so they should have been in
the same district both years.

Additionally, there is -- an issue we've
identified earlier and discussed I think at great
length, and there's a presentation about it, is that
the actual precincts on the census are wrong. A
bunch of them got scrambled. I think around
10 percent of the state has the wrong precinct on
the census than the --

So if somebody lives in a neighborhood
and it says that neighborhood is in District -- or
precinct 25 of the census, they actually are in
precinct 30 and 25 could be in a different area.

So when you're trying look at those
results, and if a line happens to run through,
people are being counted in the wrong district. So
that was one large issue we've had to fix.
I guess just from our perspective, the worst thing we could do, we think, and the thing we're really trying to avoid is put anything out there that would be wrong because it was hard enough today to get that third sheet taken back in and reprinted.

Putting out a block election results file early that everyone in the public and other interested parties and the Commission is using to make some real assumptions about competitiveness, about voting rights, to have to go back and say, oh, we found some errors in there -- we're just going to great lengths to make sure that the product we put out is the right one and won't have to change.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And so this entails talking with the elections directors in each of the counties or what is it --

WILLIE DESMOND: GIS people, elections directors, anyone who might have copies of electronic files.

Simply the act of compiling all of the election results from 2004 from the different counties results files. You know, every county calls the president in 2004 something different. Some abbreviate it, some have presidential elector.
It's hard to even standardize just the results, let alone matching those to a precinct file then matching that to the 2000 blocks, then translating that to the 2010 blocks and then verifying that the things aren't scrambled.

So it's a lot of balls in the air that all need to be kind of lined up. And it's just a very tedious process.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you for that explanation.

I know they are working hard on it. I've seen some of those e-mails that some of the counties are not all completed, and I'm hoping that it will happen soon.

And I understand that you can't give us a hard date, but I think that Mr. Strasma knows our great interest in having this information.

WILLIE DESMOND: And I'll send Ken a message and see if he's willing to offer one. I know things have been improving today. I'll see. I'll let you know.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

So any other thoughts or comments on how you would like to proceed?

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

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: You used the words, and they've been used a lot on the Commission, where a draft and the word placeholder.

Could you give me your best definition about what those mean?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, we don't have an approved draft map yet, so I hesitate to call this a draft map, but it's a predraft draft, as I mentioned, because what it contains are what we talked about all this weekend, which is putting in place -- and last week -- putting in placeholder districts from the two maps to the extent possible.

As Mr. Freeman noted, he had done some districts in Maricopa County, come up with some majority-minority placeholder districts in his own map that we tried to put directly into this map, but it turned out we needed to -- based on where HVAP concentrations were in the state and in that area and the need to create even more districts, since we needed to create some coalition districts as well, we had to shed some of those lines a little bit, which then, of course, the districts that Mr. Freeman had built around on his map, those had to shift, too. So they aren't exactly identical.
And we've had to do some shifting in Pinal County.

So what this map contains, and I call it a predraft draft, and it contains placeholder districts from the two versions that they created and then what we discussed over the past week and a couple days of how lines need to shift in order to try to keep census places whole and also work with all of the constitutional criteria and ensuring that we are factoring those in equally at every step of the way.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair, in terms of how I would like to proceed, I would like to turn it from a predraft draft into a draft and publish it and let the public comment on it and work on it when we -- with the benefit of the public comment on the issues that Mr. Freeman outlined and the issues that I have outlined and the issues and concerns that the other commissioners before we finalize the map in the future.

But I think it's a good sound start. I think it gives folks something to look at and work on.

I'm sure we'll get lots of enthusiastic and vigorous comments on it. I hope we'll also get
fair and methodical comment on it.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I just want to ask about a clarification.

When we issue the draft map and we start going out in public for the second round hearings, we will not be able to make any changes to the draft map while -- during that 30-day period; is that correct?

MARY O'GRADY: Commissioners, this would be the draft for that 30-day period. Now, you may continue to study issues and run, you know, sort of hypotheticals about things that you might consider shifting, but the Constitution talks about a 30-day comment period on the draft.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And the same draft gets presented at all of the different places we go across the state.

MARY O'GRADY: That's right. Now, theoretically you have a lot of options, but if you have a new draft, it would trigger a new 30-day period, perhaps. You need a complete 30-day comment period on a draft map.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I know Commissioner McNulty had proposed that we go forward with adopting this one or a version like this one to get to a draft map.

What would we need to do next?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Should we take public comment?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We can do that.

Do you want to do public comment first and then talk about whether we want to -- in order to proceed, we would have to have a motion and second and then vote on whether we wanted to use this as our draft legislative map for the 30-day comment period.

But, yeah, I have a stack of public comments.

Do I have my trusty timer over there, too?

Great. He raised his hand.

What I would like to do is when I call your name, please come up to the microphone and speak directly into the microphone and spell your name for our court reporter so that she gets an accurate spelling.
And if you could limit your comments to three minutes each, that would be great, since we have a lot of people who want to speak with us today.

And you'll hear a little timer go off, and if you could wrap up your comments when you hear that within a reasonable amount of time to finish your thought, that would be fabulous.

Okay. Our first speaker is Representative Daniel Patterson, Arizona State Rep LD 29, from Tucson, Pima.

DANIEL PATTERSON: Thank you, Madame Chair, and commissioners, everyone in the office. Always good to see you here in Tucson.

Thanks for doing a hard job with a very tough task.

And on the legislative maps, I wanted to comment, if I could briefly, on District 2, which takes a large part of the people I currently represent at the state capitol, District 29, and puts it in quite a different bit of -- very different looking map.

Immediately one thing that jumps out at my with the District 2 numbers is that it appears that currently there could be packing too many
minority voters into District 2. It's very important that --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm sorry to interrupt you, I just thought it would be helpful if you could pull up District 2, Mr. Desmond.

Please continue.

DANIEL PATTERSON: And the numbers I looked at currently that District 7, about 50/50. I know that the Commission has been looking at thresholds about 54 percent, and I think that makes sense.

Your current numbers seem to be above 61 percent. And certainly it's critical that Latino voices be powerful in Southern Arizona. They are now and they will continue to be so.

I just wondered if some of those voters could have a more positive effect on the competitiveness or balance in other districts.

And so I don't have a specific recommendation on how to do that, but over 61 percent for District 2 seems quite high.

The other question I have about District 2, obviously, it's one of the more unique-shaped districts on the map.

I want to certainly defer to your
expertise and your desire to do as fair districts as possible, considering everything you have to point in.

That district I think -- and again, there's a difference between elections and how people actually govern at the state capitol.

I worry that that type of a district with that log dog-like going all the way out to New Mexico, it could be a winnable district in an election but it may be very difficult to actually represent a district like that at the capitol effectively.

I know certainly I would try very hard, but it's a very spread community and I'm not sure what Douglas -- how much Douglas has in common with areas like the south side of Tucson. There are some very generic similarities, but geographically it's a pretty big district.

I did have a couple of specific things on the north -- and if you want to zoom in, it's the northwest corner of the District 2 and 3 boundary right in Tucson.

That little -- right where Pima lists right there, that cutout is extremely strange. It doesn't really make any sense to me.
Currently we have a boundary in there of 12th Avenue, and if you look at the neighborhoods in that area and the way people relate, that that boundary there, in my opinion, really people would be better represented if that just followed 12th Avenue.

And I noticed that District 3 needed to pick up some more voter anyway, so that might be one good place to do it.

The other place that concerns me -- and I'll wrap this up here in a second -- the other place that concerns me is in the downtown area. Now we currently -- and we have a lot of issues at the state legislature that affect downtown Tucson with Rillo Nuevo, all kinds of questions constantly coming up from downtown.

It pulls the district kind of out of downtown. And if there's a way to look at pushing that district back up to Congress Street and probably just over to the freeway and also using the Union Pacific/Nogales Line railroad tracks as an eastern boundary, that neighborhood just to the immediate north of the current boundary there is closely identified with downtown and what would be District 2.
And I think that the constituents in there and people would be much better served to keep that. The break there at 18th Street is really odd since those neighborhoods all really work together.

So those are just some specific ideas. And I look forward to a draft, but especially that weird little bump out to the west right south of the junction between I-19 and I-10, the 12th Avenue boundary there is there now. It makes a lot of sense. It makes sense where people live and work. And the neighborhood dynamics in there and that really should be made the same.

And finally, just a final plea. Competitiveness districts I think are -- always should be the goal. I say this as a representative who comes from not a competitive district. I would be happy to represent a more competitive district because competition affects not only elections, it also affects how people govern at the capitol.

And I see it repeatedly that members from less competitive districts often ignore big parts of their constituencies because all they are worried about is winning primaries.

And I applaud the Commission's effort to draw as competitive districts as possible.
Thank you very much for your service to
the people of Arizona.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thanks for your
service, too.

Our next speak is Mark Miller,
representing self from Green Valley.

MARK MILLER: I pass.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Our next
speaker is Steve Early, representing moveon.org from
Pima.

Okay. He left.

Christina Early?

They are probably together.

Our next speaker is Nancy Haak or Haak
representing self from Pima.

Alex Jacome from Sahuarita.

Jim March, Second vice chair, Pima County
Libertarian.

Geri Ottoboni, from Rancho Vistoso HOA
from Pima.

GERI OTTOBONI: Geri Ottoboni, that's
G-e-r-i, O-t-t-o-b-o-n-i.

Can you hear me okay because I can't hear
me.
Okay. One thing I wanted to mention was that -- and I agree with what Mr. Freeman said, that we need to show the 2004, 2006 data. I think that's really important, especially in Oro Valley where I live. It was predominantly Democrat. We had a Democrat for -- in the legislative, also in the senate.

But what I want to talk about is -- make a few comments about the CD1 map. To begin with, it looks like a salamander or a Puff the Magic Dragon. I'll give this to you when I'm finished.

It borders three, almost four states and there's no road that goes from Cochise County to Coconino County while getting through four different counties.

The people who live in Marana, Saddlebrooke and Oro Valley have no business relationship with the Navajo Nation and there's no community of interest between the Navajo Nation and these cities.

The Navajo Nation is rural, whereas Saddlebrooke, Oro Valley, and Marana are urban.

One thing I thought was interesting is Legislative 1 wanted to be separated from the Indian
reservation and Flagstaff wants to be separated from the Navajo Nation because there was no common interests and legislatively. So why should they remain together in the congressional?

So instead I think it would be better served if you would add it to CD 2.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: You can give it to us.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We'll give it to Ray.

Our next speaker is Joe Holt, representing self from Oro Valley.

Our next speaker is Olivia Cajero, state senator from Tucson, Pima County.

It just says Cajero, but it's Cajero-Bedford, right?

OLIVIA CAJERO-BEDFORD: Thank you.

Olivia Cajero Bedford or O-l-i-v-i-a, C-a-j-e-r-o, Bedford, B-e-d-f-o-r-d.

I'm going to just say a few words and then I'm going to call up Representative Saldate to read my comments.
I just wanted to tell you I put these together yesterday afternoon, and I've been scratching out a lot of this stuff because today it looks like you have option 2, which is LD 3. And I believe that LD 3 complies with the voting acts right (sic) for a majority-minority district with only one minor change, which I would suggest, which is the same thing Representative Patterson pointed out. It takes away that small little neighborhood on South 12th. 16 blocks. It's like -- there's no reason for it to be there.

I would ask that it be changed and moved back into to the east -- the line moved east.

So you can see all of my notes crossed out because I was going between 1 and 2 yesterday.

If I may defer to Representative Saldate.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure. Thank you.

Sorry about your voice.

OLIVIA CAJERO-BEDFORD: My boyfriend is happy.

MACARIO SALDATE: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: If you'll state your name and spell it, too, for the record.

MACARIO SALDATE: Oh, I'm sorry.
Macario Saldate, that's M-a-c-a-r-i-o, Saldate, S-a-l-d-a-t-e.

Thank you very much, Madame Chairman, distinguished commissioners.

With your permission, I'll read the senator's comments.

Members of the Redistricting Commission, thank you for allowing me to speak.

My name is Olivia Cajero-Bedford, and I am the current senator for Legislative District 27 that encompasses the central, west side, and southwest area of Tucson.

In studying the maps as best I can get on my computer, I believe that option 2 is best. LD 3 complies with the Voting Rights Act for a majority-minority district with only one minor change that I would suggest.

And that's the change that you just mentioned already.

OLIVIA CAJERO-BEDFORD: 16 blocks.

MACARIO SALDATE: Okay. It's a four-by-four block area on South 12th Avenue.

The minor change in option 2, LD 3, would be to keep, not take out, the small neighborhood to the west of South 12th Avenue.
From the 2010 census, Tucson has the largest or the highest Hispanic population of 41.6 percent ahead of Phoenix, which has 40.8 percent.

In Pima County, the Hispanic population of 338,802 makes up 34.5 percent of the population. In Tucson there are 216,308 Hispanics, which make up the 41.6 percent of the population.

The concentration of this population is in the central and west side of Tucson. Central and western Tucson is a community of interest and compactness.

I think that's it.

Most of it -- oh, yes, and Olivia, of course, wants to thank you very much for your seemingly endless job that you are doing.

I appreciate the dedication all of you have given to this very important work.

And I also want to thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

I'm sorry, we have a question.

Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Actually, this is for public comments. If you want to make that part of the record, I'll give it Mr. Bladine. Do you
I want to make that part of the record?

OLIVIA CAJERO-BEDFORD: Do you want the scratched out one or the original?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Whatever you want to give us.

OLIVIA CAJERO-BEDFORD: I'll give you the original.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Maddy Urken, representing self from Pima.

How about Garland Cox, representing self.

Oh, I'm sorry.

MADDY URKEN: My name is Maddy Urken. M-a-d-d-y, U-r-k-e-n, and I live in Sahuarita.

I thank you very much for all of your work and the opportunity to be heard.

You have discussed competitiveness in terms of the chances that candidates have of being elected in a specific district.

I hope that while you're working you're also remembering that the degree of competitiveness is mirrored to a very large extent in the political composition of the state legislature.

During the last legislative session, the
size of the Republican majority was such that legislation could not pass if it wasn't in keeping with the Republican agenda.

To a great extent, that happened because the number of competitive districts was too small and the number of districts with Republican majority was too large when compared with the actual number of Republican registered voters in the entire state of Arizona.

This Commission still has the opportunity to create a map that levels the playing field a little bit more so that our legislature comes closer to representing all of the people of Arizona, and I sincerely hope that do you that.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Garland Cox, represent self from Pima.

Mohur Sidhwa, representing self from Pima.

MOHUR SIDHWA: Oh, finally somebody shorter than me.

Sorry.

Thank you all very much. I know I may be thanking you in advance and you may wind up doing
something very bizarre later, but I appreciate the
way Commissioners Freeman and McNulty worked
doggedly yesterday.

I was hearing it online and it was
mind-numbing and nobody fell asleep. The two of
you, of course, were hyperalert to each other's
moves, but it was fascinating to hear and I hope
this is the beginning of something new for Arizona.

The one thing I am eternally grateful
for, and I wasn't sure if one person could make a
difference.

Thank you for keeping Arizona from being
yet another state indulging in prison and
inmate-based gerrymandering. And I applaud you for
keeping that in mind. I really do. And I'm very
grateful.

Certainly we don't -- by my standards
don't have quite enough competitiveness. Work it,
guys.

Commissioner Stertz had mentioned he had
a few ideas. Maybe he does. Check it out.

And once again, I would like to thank you
very seriously.

The other thing I would like to bring up,
a friend of mine was going to come and represent
herself, but she's kind of elderly and couldn't. So I'm going to read a short note that she left.

Her name is Marian Lupu, M-a-r-i-a-n, L-u-p-u, and she is the founder and executive director of Pima Council on Aging, an institution in her own right.

And this is her letter.

To the Redistricting Commission, I have lived for 50 years in the same house both when it was and was not in a competitive district.

It is imperative that as many as possible competitive districts be developed to allow the best to be elected to office. This is the real function for democracy.

I do suggest the two districts enable minority candidates.

I apologize for not being able to make my statement and intentions known in person.

Sincerely, Marian Lupu. Her address, executive director and founder Pima Council on Aging for 42 years now retired.

May I put this in?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes.

And do you mind spelling her name for the record?
MOHUR SIDHWA: Marian, M-a-r-i-a-n, last name Lupu, L-u-p-u.

And I thank you from both us.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Amy Winchester, representing self from Pima.

How about William Sobeck from Pima.

Onita Davis, representing Smart Girl Politics from Pima.

ONITA DAVIS: Good afternoon, everyone.

Onita, O-n-i-t-a, Davis, D-a-v-i-s.

Commissioners, it would appear -- and I'm speaking to CD 8 map. I don't know if that made a difference. I think I wrote it on my form CD 8.

The congressional district as opposed to the legislative district.

It would appear that the time and effort of speaking before this Commission was for naught.

The act of requesting input from the citizenry was a charade.

The currently approved CD map does nothing to address many of the issues raised on numerous occasions.

For example, despite the fact that the rural counties have very different issues and
concerns from metro counties, Coconino County has been combined with the communities north of Tucson.

What factors could have possibly justified such a move other than political gain, i.e., gerrymandering. So much for the importance of communities of interest.

What about the constitutional requirement for compactness or respect for geographical features or political boundaries?

CD1 currently extends from the Utah border to the border of Mexico and westward almost to the border of Nevada.

Help me to understand how such a vast territory can be a community of interest or meeting the compactness definition. We do not even share the local news or weather reports.

Counties have been split, communities of interest have been split, vast geographic features have been traversed and so out the window goes the congressional directive stating to the extent practicable, district lines should use visible geographic features: City, towns, and county boundaries and undivided census tracts.

CD1 creates serious issues of effective representation for our friends to the north and for
those of us who live in Oro Valley.

One representative to represent the issues and concerns of such a vast and diverse district will surely please no one.

Every-- someone's voice will not be heard. Northern Pima County and Southern Pinal do not belong in CD 1 as currently constructed and would be a better fit in CD 2.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Justin Schmidt, representing self from Pima.

Okay. Shereese Steffens, representing self from Pima.


First of all, I was wondering if you could zero in on the little map to the eastern border of LD 11 as portrayed in the map we were given today.

Okay. Right up there in the corner, the southeastern border, there's a little jog back against the pink and underneath the blue and that's where I live.

Okay, that must be the other one.
But anyway, I live right in that little yellow square that's back in there and my precinct is all in the blue. And you've got me in -- according to the congressional map that you guys have drafted, you've got me in Congressional District 1 but I'm in LD 11. So my LD isn't even in the same congressional district.

And that just doesn't make sense. It doesn't, because I would be going towards Casa Grande, all the way to Maricopa County for LD meetings whereas my congressional representative is right there on the border. I'm right on the far west border of the congressional district that you got me in.

So I would please ask you to take that little yellow square above the pink -- I don't know which one to describe it as -- and put that into the blue or the pink. I don't care either one. Just put me in a district where I'm with the people where I shop and where my precinct is and everything else because I'm a PC and I'm also precinct captain and this really, really messes up everything that I am used to.

And my community of interest is not on this side, the west side of I-10. My community of
interest is -- here is I-10 right here. Okay? And my community of interest is all over here and you've got me in an LD that goes all the way up to Eloy, Casa Grande, all the way to the town of Maricopa whereas -- it just doesn't make any sense.

So I would please ask you to change my little area back over, please. Okay? And that's in my notes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

SHERESE STEFFENS: Now, according to -- okay, I've already done that.

You've talked repeatedly about not splitting up our counties. In fact, you pointed out, Ms. McNulty, or someone did, that Yavapai County was pretty well drawn the way it was to preserve the county but then you have split Southern Arizona, Pima County, four different times on the LD map that I can find.

You've got -- it's going everywhere and you split the whole county up. And we're not that big of a county compared with other counties.

So I don't understand why you applied some of the parameters and criteria to certain areas of the state and then you find other parameters to apply to Southern Arizona.
And with that, I will come up with my next statement.

You have one congressional district, the bottom one over here, representing two-thirds of the Southern Arizona border with Mexico. And that makes no sense at all.

You've got a little tiny bit of another one, I think it's Congressional District 2, a little tiny, tiny bit with not even a -- maybe it's not -- but anyway, the one congressional district has two-thirds of the border.

And the other thing is that CD -- the CD map that you have out there now includes eight counties, which is Congressional District 1 and it goes all the way to Flagstaff. And I don't see how you can put a northwestern Pima County -- or Southern Arizona, whatever you want to call us, in the same CD as Northern Arizona, which is where you've got us, because Flagstaff is Northern Arizona.

And you also have us in with two or three large Indian -- Native Indian reservations which makes no sense because northern -- or Southern Arizona, Northwestern Pima County has nothing in common with those -- the Indians.
They have requested to have their own
district so they can elect their own
representatives, which is fair.

So to put them in with us, it's not even
competitive.

So thank you very much for the time to
talk to you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Can you leave it up
there?

SHERESE STEFFENS: Oh, sure.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is
Fred Highton, representing self.

Dale DeNunzio, from Tucson.

DALE DENUNZIO: Thank you. Dale DeNunzio
D-a-l-e, D-e, capital N-u-n-z-i-o.

I'll make it brief.

I applaud all of the efforts of the
Commission to make -- I applaud all of the efforts
the Commission to make the districts as competitive
as possible so that makes it a level playing field.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Glenn Lundell,
representing self from Pima.

How about Fay Maucci.

How about Nick Johnson.

Benny White, representing self from Pima.

BENNY WHITE: Good afternoon, Madame Chair and commissioners.

My name is Benny white. That's B-e-n-n-y, W-h-i-t-e.

I come to speak this afternoon about the Voting Rights Act.

This Commission -- apparently your attorneys have embarked on a very interesting adventure. You've created a new race of people.

This Commission is dealing with Hispanics as a race and neither the federal government, Department of Justice or the Attorney General consider them a race and neither does the Census Bureau.

The Hispanics are classified as a language minority by the Attorney General and by the Department of Justice.

And so with that, it's curious to me why you have decided that we need two congressional districts, majority-minority, for the Hispanic race and nine legislative districts for the Hispanic race.
to be majority-minority districts.

It just so happens that it's probably just a coincidence that 2 and 9 equate almost exactly to the 29.8 percent of Hispanics that the Census Bureau reports that are present in this state.

However, if the Hispanics are treated as a language minority, which they are by the Attorney General and the Civil Rights division and the Department of Justice in their analysis of compliance with the Voting Rights Act, you have to understand that not all Hispanics are members of the language minority group.

In order to be a member of a language minority group, you have to have some limitation to your proficiency in English.

In Arizona, 32.6 percent of the Hispanics report that they do not speak Spanish at all. They speak English only.

In addition to that, 26.8 percent of Hispanics report that they speak English very well. So they have no deficiency in their English proficiency.

This leaves you with 18.1 percent of the Hispanic population in this state that speaks
English less than very well.

In addition to that, the Voting Rights Act does not apply to noncitizens. In this state, 21.5 percent of the Hispanics are noncitizens. And so the Hispanic voting-age population has to be reduced by that amount.

I noticed on Friday that you went through a lot of contortions about trying to decide who the Hispanic voting-age population was and how that modified the percentages and the numbers. But you have to understand that the Hispanic voting-age population includes noncitizens in those numbers.

So at the bottom line on all of this is that the people in this state who are both Hispanic and members of a language minority who should receive special consideration under the Voting Rights Act amounts to 2.7 percent of the entire population of the state, not 29.8 percent.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Jere Fredenburgh, representing self.

How about Laurie Jurs.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sorry. I'm not waiting long enough. Sorry about that.
JERE FREDENBURGH: It's Jere Fredenburgh, J-e-r-e, F-r-e-d-e-n-b-u-r-g-h, citizen of Cochise County.

I have -- a little about me.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can't hear you.

JERE FREDENBURGH: Is that better?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

JERE FREDENBURGH: I've been listening online, and I came today -- normally I spend about 40 hours a week doing volunteer work for the Cochise County Humane Society, I do financial arrangements.

Two comments.

With regard to the congressional district, Congressional District 1, I concur with what I'm hearing with my peers, that it's huge, we will not be represented.

So I would like you to reconsider and specifically leaving Cochise County as one entity within a congressional district. So that's one.

And the legislative district, I'm also hearing the gentleman from District 29, and I've heard a couple of others comment about the Douglas/Bisbee area being moved into District 2.

Cochise County is Cochise County. We would like to remain whole. By cutting out that
section, it also cuts out Palominas, for example.

And we as a community have pulled together. We had two fires in Cochise County this year and we had support from the entire county.

So I would ask the Commission to move those communities back into Cochise County. I think it's about 5,000 voters, which I don't think is going to, you know, substantially alter the numbers. But I would ask that you consider that.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Laurie Jurs, representing self from Pima.

LAURIE JURS: Good afternoon. Laurie Jurs, L-a-u-r-i-e, J-u-r-s.

I would like to speak today to encourage to you take another look at the separation of Green Valley and Sahuarita into two different legislative districts.

I've lived in this area in unincorporated Pima County, Green Valley address for 27 years. And in terms of the contiguous criteria, contiguous area criteria, community of interest criteria, and the geographical features area and the relationships that I have with state government and that I see in
the next ten years, and believing that this all
should be rather future-oriented to stand us in good
stead for the next ten years, I think that Sahuarita
and Green Valley are a community -- a strong
community of interest and certainly strong -- I
don't know what the word would be -- nodules on the
whole I-19 corridor in terms of commercial, economic
value.

I've heard a lot of reference to economic
relationships. I've heard a lot of reference to
thoroughfares that run through the state, and I
think the I-19 corridor really qualifies as that.

And then when you add the Santa Cruz
River and you add the Santa Rita Mountains, then I
think you've got a pretty strong -- a corridor going
on right there.

So in terms of the ability to govern,
represent us in terms of our ability to deal with
our representatives and be closer to them physically
in other ways, I think that it would be good to take
another look at that.

This is my first meeting. I can see what
you're up against. I see that all of you have
probably taken years off your life to do this job,
and I thank you very, very much.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Frank Bergen, representing self from Tucson.

FRANK BERGEN: Madame Chair, commissioners, my name is Frank Bergen, F-r-a-n-k, B-e-r-g-e-n.

And I, too, seem to have a croak in the throat.

I thank you for the opportunity to be here today. On my request to speak form, I said that I represented myself and also I've got the number right here, 784,271 other 2000 November voters in the state of Arizona who voted overwhelmingly to pass Proposition 106, which remains in effect or you wouldn't be here doing the job you're doing.

If I may speak not only to you but over your heads to people who should be listening, 106 was passed because the state was tired of having election districts at the congressional and legislative levels decided by the legislature.

We still feel that way. I believe a majority of us, a solid majority still feel that way. And I would ask the people who don't quite understand that, give a little thought to the text
of Proposition 106 to its intent and to the intent of the voters of the state.

Having said that, I would draw everyone's attention to the preamble to 106, which said that there should be an independent commission of balanced appointments to oversee the mapping of fair and competitive congressional and legislative districts.

And that is the constituent language, fair and competitive legislative districts.

I think you people are doing a marvelous job under incredibly difficult circumstances. Some of the circumstances can be seen in every attempt to draw districts.

Some of the circumstances can be heard and read in the sometimes untempered comments made in the press in reference to your work.

You're doing a great job. And if I were in the legislature, I would introduce legislation which would mandate that the state pay for each of you about a three-month vacation going in five different directions when this is done and over with.

In the meantime I encourage you as best I can to keep at it, to see it through to the end, and
to realize as all in the state should realize, that
until we prove to the Department of Justice that we
are serious about giving everyone in the state a
vote which counts, we are going to be faced with,
well, what does the Department of Justice think and
how do we comply with the Voting Rights Act, which
we're still trying to comply with after 46 years
because we haven't quite convinced them yet.

Let's do it this time.

Thank you all very much. You're doing a
great job, and I would lead a round of applause, but
that's probably for later.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Debbie Stoner,
representing self from do cheese count.

DEBBIE STONER: Hello. My name is Debbie
Stoner, D-e-b-b-i-e, Stoner, S-t-o-n-e-r.

Okay. Members of the Redistricting
Commission, I live in Palominas, Arizona, which is
right on the border between Sierra Vista and Bisbee.

I've been there since 1969. My husband
and I -- or my husband's family homesteaded in
Southern Arizona.

My husband and I have ten children and
I'm very active in my community. I was a
firefighter for 16 years and now serve on our
Palominas fire district board.

   The congressional map that you have
released does not show compactness or contiguousness
or communities of interest mapping.

   Cochise County should be kept together.
We are contiguous and compact and we do have
communities of interest.

   At the beginning of this meeting, it
became clear that competitiveness was the main focus
of this Commission, which is directly against the
Constitutional amendments of Arizona.

   Even during emergencies, the Monument
fire and the Horseshoe Two fire, we had fire
companies from Mescal, Bisbee, Huachuca City,
Sonoita, and Douglas, among others, are contiguous
and community-based communities in Cochise County
and Santa Cruz pulled together and helped each other
out.

   I don't feel that we in Palominas have
anything in common with Flagstaff and the Grand
Canyon and the Indian reservations.

   You have excluded our neighbors, Bisbee
and Sierra Vista, from Palominas, where I live.
These cities are where we go to work and where we
shop. Over the years, my children have attended schools in both Bisbee and in Sierra Vista. How in the world do you expect a representative to be able to travel the length of the state to be able to represent anyone properly? You are blatantly breaking the Constitution of Arizona by tearing the communities apart.

We in Cochise and Santa Cruz are made up of small ranches and small towns. I'm asking that you put Graham and Greenlee Counties in without the Indian reservations. That would make up a contiguous district.

In both congressional and legislative mappings, you need to keep contiguous -- as contiguous as possible.

Seeing a map this morning of the legislative district, it shows that Palominas, again, is broken out from our neighbors. Please keep our communities intact.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Tim Sultan, representing self from Pima.

How about Carol Borges.
Merritt McGlothlin.

MERRITT MCGLOTHLIN: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great. Representing self from Oro Valley.

MERRITT MCGLOTHLIN: Madame Chair and commissioners, thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Since I've been sitting here all day, all I hear is the word competitive, competitive, competitive.

Competitive to some people's, their definition of competitive is maybe political, engineering to other people. And I resent -- I live in Oro Valley.

I do have a comment on the legislative -- or the CD district that most of the people that have spoken here are commenting on.

I think it's almost ludicrous when you look at it. And I don't know what kind of representation anyone feels that equates to the people of Arizona with a district like that.

I really would like to speak to the legislative district where you have Oro Valley and Saddlebrooke and I think Catalina and I think it was Commissioner -- I'm not sure which commissioner
because I couldn't see, but one of you mentioned
that the people of Oro Valley and Saddlebrooke
aren't interested in Central Tucson.

    Well, that is just unbelievable that you
could make statement like that. That's not true.

    I'm not going to change my shopping
habits and be interested in the central area of
Gilbert and Florence because I live in Oro Valley
and you put us into that district.

    So I would plead with you to reconsider
District -- Legislative District 10 -- or 8 and
reassess where you have that area of Oro Valley and
Saddlebrooke and put it where they belong, which is
in the Greater Tucson metro area.

    Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Benjamin Brookhart,
representing self from Tucson.

BENJAMIN BROOKHART: Benjamin Brookhart,
B-e-n-j-a-m-i-n, last name, B-r-o-o-k-h-a-r-t.

    Madame Chair, members of the Commission,
thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak
again in regards to how we're going to determine
representation that affects the entire state of
Arizona.
There are three points that I really want to make real quickly.

The first one that I thought really stands out is the physical size of some of the districts. They are just simply too large. The congressional district -- in regards to Congressional District Number 1 as well as the Legislative District Number 7, both of these districts represent nearly -- cover about half of the state. I mean, how is someone going to represent all of these people covering that much ground? It's not really practical.

And furthermore, looking at the second point here, looking at districts that are crossing multiple county lines where two counties are sharing the same legislative district or even congressional district, for that matter, that don't share a county line. Like Legislative District 8 and Legislative District 11, they are going through multiple county lines and that just doesn't make any sense.

I can understand maybe, you know, communities that are right across from each other on a county line maybe being communities of like interest and therefore I can understand that, but when you're crossing multiple county lines, that's
just -- it's ludicrous.

Then the third point is that the purpose for redistricting is to allow for equal number of populations within communities of like interest that make -- that are intact with a geographic area. That's what makes sense.

It seems as though we're trying to determine what the outcomes is going to be at elections looking at the percentages of Republicans versus Democrats or looking at the ethnicities and the percentages of the ethnicities in a particular district. It shouldn't be about that. It should be total number of population in an area that's localized that impacts the people that live in that area.

I would ask that you strongly look at these things, and I thank you for the time that you are putting into these issue because it is a difficult task.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Representative Saldate or have you -- I wasn't sure if you wanted to speak.

MACARIO SALDATE: Yes.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Representing District 27.

MACARIO SALDATE: Yes, thank you very much.

Should I respell my name for you? M-a-c-a-r-i-o.

Thank you very much.

I just wanted to echo my colleague's point here, from Representative Patterson and Senator Cajero-Bedford on the issue of boundaries of District 2 and 3 as proposed.

There's an area there that just seems -- that would create a lot of confusion. It's a four by-four-block. I would like to sort of, again, reaffirm that that will create a problem. And if you would look at that issue again for us.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker Randy Graf, representing self from Green Valley.

RANDY GRAF: Good afternoon. My name is Randy Graf, that's R-a-n-d-y, G-r-a-f.

Madame Chair and commissioners, I've got a concern that Pima County is being used to balance
the state's electoral map.

There are about approximately

six-and-a-half-million people that live in the
state. We have about a million that live here in
Pima County. And the way I see the map being drawn
here, we have it looks like eight districts coming
into Pima County.

One of the districts was drawn
predominantly Republican, three are drawn
predominantly Democrat, including three of them to
satisfy the number of districts you need to achieve
the voting rights' requirements. And then four
competitive districts, including a Foothills
district, and a Tanque Verde Valley district that
both even lean slightly Democrat.

Now, you can -- districts can be
justified using just about anything -- any type of
language that you want to fit the need. But to
accept competitiveness, you have one request that
suggested that -- I believe up in the Flagstaff area
that Commissioner McNulty mentioned earlier, that
they had a concern about economic development and
that competitiveness was key to their economic
development.

I don't know how you can draw that nexus
and how you can accept that type of a premise to
draw a district that really is -- doesn't fit.

Now, more locally here, I agree with
Laurie Jurs who spoke earlier talking about Green
Valley and Sahuarita being kept together.

Green Valley has been in existence since
1960s. Sahuarita incorporated in 1994 and has grown
up there. They are neighboring communities. I
served on the Continental school board, which is a
K-8 school. Our students go from there to the
Sahuarita Unified School District. And Green
Valley/Sahuarita Chamber of Commerce share a name
and share communities.

So I would suggest that the Green Valley
and Sahuarita areas be kept together like they have
for many, many years.

So I would hope that you would take that
into consideration.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Jose Rivera.

Laura Dent. Am I getting that right?

Representing Las Adelitas from Tucson.

LAURA DENT: Hi. My name is Laura Dent,
L-a-u-r-a, D-e-n-t, and I'm here on behalf of Las
Adelitas, Arizona.

First, I'll keep it really brief.

I want to thank the Commission for your time and all of the work that you have been doing and just say that Las Adelitas, Arizona, is an organization. It's a nonprofit group that advocates for Latina advocacy and engagement in the political process and we did endorse the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government's draft map.

We just want to thank the Commission for considering this draft and again, emphasize the importance of our historic neighborhood and keeping those contiguous and together and the importance of our west and south side connections with the University of Arizona.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Regina Romero, Tucson City Council member.

Good afternoon, Commission. Thank you so much for the service that you are doing for our state. Your work is extremely important for all of us.

My name is Regina Romero, R-e-g-i-n-a, R-o-m-e-r-o.
And I am here to thank you first and foremost for your service and secondly to thank you for listening to the concerns of communities of interest and moving toward the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government's recommendation for legal districts.

I would encourage you to continue on that same path. I know that your map is looking -- your draft map -- congressional draft map is looking more and more according to the recommendations of the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government.

I'm going to tell you a little bit about myself because it pertains to the communities of interest that I represent on the Tucson City Council.

I'm a native of Southern Arizona. Born in Yuma. Grew up in Somerton. And at 17 I was accepted at the University of Arizona and came to live in Tucson.

As a matter of fact, I left when I was 17 and I've been here close to 20 years. So I've been in Tucson much longer than I was in my native hometown.

And I can tell you coming to Tucson and living close to downtown and in the south side,
married and then moved to the west side, the neighborhoods that I represent and making sure that we keep historic neighborhoods in our downtown and close to the University of Arizona as a community of interest is important.

Also I think it's very important to make sure that we also advocate for competitiveness both in the legislative district map and the congressional district map yet keep the districts legal.

And so I thank you again for your extreme -- extreme amount of time that you invest into this; that we support your congressional draft map and that I look forward to coming ten years of competitive legal districts.

Thank you so much.

And we're here with you. We -- I concur with the gentleman that said we should pay you for all of your time and just advocate for legal and competitive districts to move into the next ten years of Arizona's future.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

How is our court reporter doing?

Are you sure?
We'll keep going then.

I'm not asking the Commission.

Deyanira Nevarez, representing self.

Forgive me if I'm mispronouncing your first name.

From Tucson, Pima.

DEYANAIRA NEVAREZ: Actually, you did pretty good, considering.

It's Deyanira Nevarez D-e-y-a-n-i-r-a,

Nevarez, N-e-v-a-r-z.

I just kind of wanted to echo what the previous two speakers have said.

First of all, I wanted to thank you for service and time and also wanted to thank you for the consideration that you did give to the maps submitted by the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government.

In addition, I wanted to echo the sentiment that there should be consideration to keeping our historic neighborhoods and the south and west sides close to the -- with the University of Arizona. And we need to consider the fact that there are not only historical links there but also cultural and a heritage there that we need to keep these neighborhoods together.

So thank you very much for your time.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Betty Bengtson, representing self from Pima.

BETTY BENGTSON: Thank you.

Betty Bengtson, B-e-t-t-y, B-e-n-g-t-s-o-n.

Someone remarked earlier about the -- watching the video, yesterday's meeting, and the harmony with which commissioners were working together to try to juggle and move -- and move lines and create districts.

I think it illustrated, one, it's really nice to see the civility and harmony in that work. And secondly, the difficulty that the Commission has in its work, it really brought home to me how hard your job is to create districts, either congressional or legislative, that meet the criteria and result in fair and competitive districts.

So I really thank you for your work.

As to the legislative district map that you have been discussing, I will be in what you have labeled District 9, LD9, and I'm quite happy with that district. It's competitive. So it's -- and it appears to pull together the communities of interest that I'm interested in. And so I thank you for
that, and I hope you keep LD 9 as it is right now.

I do hope that you work on the competitiveness of all of the 30 districts. I just did a quick look this morning at the competitiveness measure and it looks like there are only three districts that are truly competitive, and I hope you work to raise that number.

I know you've got a difficult job and good luck with the rest of your work.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Kevin Dahl, representing self from Tucson.

KEVIN DAHL: Madame Chairman, commissioners, I am Kevin Dahl, K-e-v-i-n, D-a-h-l, M-o-u- -- oh, wait.

I think you have to be old to understand that.

Two quick things.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Using the mic. We can't hear you.

KEVIN DAHL: Well, that's why they didn't laugh.

Can you hear me now?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.
KEVIN DAHL: I wanted to thank you with as much sincerity as Frank Bergen, but I don't think I can. But many of us recognize and applaud your sincerity and hard work and realize that you are killing yourselves for this, and we do thank you for that.

I want to address the congressional draft map, which I think has come a long ways and is something that I can really support.

I have sent in written comments, as a university resident, University of Arizona area resident, that our communities of interest is tied to the university and the downtown and to the older parts of Tucson in the west district. When we look to go to a cultural event, it's downtown or at the university.

Some people have been there for a long time, generations. I've lived in the house that I owned for 30 years having chosen to live in that area to be close to the university, to be close to the older part of downtown. I've chosen to work in that area, as many people do.

So I think you've done a great job of holding on to that area.

If you do any fine-tuning, I don't think
that's the area to do it, except maybe to move that boundary -- it could move a little bit to the east, if you had to adjust for Cochise County, for instance.

I own a second home on the far side of Cochise County near the Chiricahuas and I wouldn't mind if I lived there being in that large district because it is really rural. It would be okay with me.

It would be okay with me for Cochise County to be one unit, too. But then we would just have two border districts, which I think would be okay as well.

So it's up to you. You're doing a great job.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is John Olbert, representing LD 26 from Pima.

JOHN OLBERT: Yes. John O-l, b, as in boy, e-r-t.

Just very briefly, I want to say that it looks like the Commission has done a great job trying to meet the demands of Prop 106, also the demands for becoming a legal division as far as the
U.S. country is concerned.

So I realize that there are a lot of different interests and that, but still it looks like you have kept to the main point of the Prop 106.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Magdalena Barajas, Hispanic Coalition for Good Government, Pima.

MAGDALENA BARAJAS: Good afternoon.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

My name is Magdalena Barajas.

M-a-g-d-a-l-e-n-a, B, as in boy, a-r-a-j-a-s.

I just wanted to come back and thank the Commission for all of your hard work, all of the work that you have done and thank you for seriously considering the input that you have received, especially when it comes to legal districts and the maps that the Hispanic Coalition put forward.

I’m really happy to see the direction that you have taken.

On a personal note, I would really like to thank you for including all of Sunnyside school district into one district. That was something that
was personally very important to me as the district faces some challenges of growth in an area that was looking to be left out. So I really wanted to thank you for that and, again, for your service.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Ryan Husk, representing Coconino County.

RYAN HUSK: Madame Chair, members of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission, my name is Ryan Husk. That's H-u-s-k, representing Coconino County.

I come before you today on behalf of Chairman Lena Fowler and the County Board of Supervisors.

On behalf of the board, we'd like to thank you for your long hours of hard work and diligent drafting the congressional and legislative maps for our state.

As you continue your deliberations on the legislative districts, I would like to reiterate the county's testimony from last week.

Please keep the Coconino County areas of Timberline, Fernwood and Doney Park around Flagstaff, including the proposed -- included in the proposed Legislative District 6 in the same district
as the city of Flagstaff.

This is an important shared constituency area for us as it is the area of the Schultz fire and the subsequent flooding that has occurred after the fire.

The Schultz flood area is comprised of 3,000 residents who live in unincorporated areas a few miles outside the city of Flagstaff.

Most of the residents work in Flagstaff and their children attend schools in Flagstaff.

The flood area is part of the joint regional planning area of the city and the county and is within the Flagstaff metropolitan organization boundary.

The neighborhoods within the flood areas need to be included with the legislative districts as the city of Flagstaff -- as the city of Flagstaff because the residents identify with Flagstaff and the two communities are interdependent.

The city of Flagstaff is also in support of this position based on the communication we have had with them in the last week.

We appreciate the dedication of the IRC members and the staff and for the opportunity to provide our perspective.
Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Can I ask Mr. Desmond to show us that area real quickly?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, that's fine.

Does that help?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, is the Doney Park currently within District 6; is that correct?

WILLIE DESMOND: It's in District 6, correct.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Now, what about the other two areas? Are they -- all of those two areas next to each other, Fernwood and Timberline?

WILLIE DESMOND: I don't know if those are defined areas on the census.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Go north.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think it's north.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: There's a pointer right there. Do you know where the area --

RYAN HUSK: It would be the area the west side of Highway 89. About right up in this area.

Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Diana Rhoades, representing Las Adelitas and Santa Rita Park Neighbors.

DIANA RHODES: Hi. Thank you. My name is Diana Rhoades D-i-a-n-a, R-h-o-a-d-e-s.

I just want to thank you for listening to the concerns of people in Pima County and Southern Arizona.

We were testifying to keep communities of interest together in Congressional District 3 and then also keep Congressional District 2 competitive. And it seems like a congressional map does a great job of that. So thank you.

I am a member of Las Adelitas, an organization working to empower Latina women to get involved in the political process. And we appreciate your consideration of the Hispanic coalition maps.

I do live in downtown Tucson in the Santa Rita Park neighborhood, and I would like to agree with Representative Daniel Patterson, that it would be great to keep the LD 29 -- existing LD 29 lines in downtown together, both on the South 12th area and actually south of Congress.
Existing LD 29 does go to Congress and Daniel and I both live in an area we describe as SOCO, and connect to the communities on the south side. I do believe that is a community of interest in SOCO and the south side.

So ask you to -- both for Daniel's comment and Senator Cajero-Bedford's comment, again, on that south 12th line as well is a good boundary.

It does appear -- I just saw those maps today, the legislative district maps, and it does appear that this district could be more competitive. Seems not very competitive right now and that it could be more competitive in that legislative district while still keeping community of interest -- communities of interest together.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair,

Ms. Rhoades --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm sorry,

Ms. Rhoades.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Before you leave, while you're up there with the pointer, would you Representative Patterson show us the area that you're --

MARY O'GRADY: Excuse me, to the extent
that any of this got into where Representative Patterson resides --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Oh, okay.

MARY O'GRADY: -- that is not a consideration and should not be part of the record.

DIANA RHOADES: It's just where I reside, which happens to be where --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Could you pull that up, Mr. Desmond? The northwest corner of District 2. I'm just looking at it on the map here. I'm not understanding.

DIANA RHOADES: It's the Santa Rita Park Neighborhood. My address is --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: No, we don't need your address.

Once -- Mr. Desmond, could you zoom in on that area?

MARY O'GRADY: And an additional comment about any anything regarding incumbent residence should not be mentioned.

DIANA RHOADES: I'm sorry.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: And, Ms. Rhoades, did you say you happen to live where Representative Patterson lives?

DIANA RHOADES: I do.
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Okay. Never mind.

DIANA RHOADES: Well, I don't live in the same place but he lives near me. We both live in SOCO.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: All right. Maybe you could draw a map of the boundary that you are recommending, the existing LD 9 boundary submit that as part of public comment.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Our next speaker is Katie Miller.

JOE KANEFIELD: Madame Chair, before we go to the next speaker, just as a reminder incumbent residency should not be considered, even to the extent you may have knowledge of where an incumbent lives, it cannot be considered during the map -- district mapping process.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I wasn't asking for where he lived. I just wanted to see the intersection of Congress and 12th Avenue that they are talking about. That's all I was getting at.

JOE KANEFIELD: Madame Chair, Commissioner McNulty, I wasn't directing that comment at you. It was only to remind the Commission the constitutional requirement that incumbent residency not be considered. Even if you
may have knowledge, it cannot be considered.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: We also agreed that we're not taking any form of an address from any of the people testifying just for -- not only their safety but also just in case they happen to be married to a legislator, which could happen.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Katie -- and, Ms. Miller, would you mind saying who you are representing and city or town.

KATIE MILLER: I should have put self.

Hi. My name is Katie Miller, K-a-t-i-e, M-i-l-l-e-r.

I'm a resident of Cochise County. I reside in St. David. We're a small community. And basically my statement is the criteria for redistricting should be based on population, communities of interest, and geography explicitly. As soon as you get into Ds and Rs and Is and everything else, you then cease to be representative of everyone.

Voters decide by their votes, not by their registration, competitiveness in any district.

Cochise County and both the CD map and
the LD map deserve to be whole. Like a previous speaker has said, we come together as a community and dividing out Douglas, Bisbee, and Palominas, especially with this map because we looked at it at lunch, it divides the Palominas school district. School districts need to remain whole. You divide up everything when you start doing that.

There is nothing -- the community can't come together as a whole when you start dividing up school districts.

I also am a school district member. Mine happens to be very small, but it could end up being cut in two, and I don't want to see that.

Cochise needs to remain whole.

Basically that's all I have to say.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Pete Bengtson, representing self from Pima.

PETER BENGTSON: It's Peter Bengtson, B-e-n-g-t-s-o-n.

And if I got to ask you to put the next statement in caps, you guys are doing great.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: If you could tilt the microphone a bit.
PETER BENGTSON: You guys are doing great. I've been attending a lot of these meetings.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can you all hear?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Just tilt it towards your --

PETER BENGTSON: I've had easier times with other microphones.

You guys are doing great. I've been to a lot of these meetings.

I didn't know what I was going to get into when I started going to these meetings, but it's amazing to me how difficult the job is to create these districts using the six designated criteria which are basically incompatible and you have a tough job combining these things. And I think you've done a wonderful job.

It's not perfect. Nobody is going to be completely happy.

There have been comments about not splitting county boundaries, communities of interest, but if you've got to have equal congressional districts of whatever it is plus or minus one, you've got to do that kind of stuff.

There's been a lot of negative comment
about your CD 1. It was really interesting to me. I was -- I attended the public hearing down in Nogales. It was a strong interest in the rural districts.

I attended a number of other meetings when the Navajo Nation was speaking. They really wanted all of the tribes together.

The rural Arizona -- there's just not a lot of people out there to get a district that includes the required number of people. You're going to have to have some big rural districts.

So keep on doing what you are doing.

And I like the guy's idea about giving you a five-month vacation separate, and I'd write to my senator, but I don't think Mr. Melvin would like it and he'd probably require a low bid.

So thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Just to give people a sense of where we are, we've got about three -- seven more slips.

Is that okay, Michelle?

Okay. James Woodbrey, representing self from Green Valley.

JAMES WOODBREY: Thank you, Madame Chair and other commissioners for all of the work you're
Earlier it was pointed out -- you err'd in placing a person in an LD that was not in the CD of that person. Same here. My condolences. I'm sure there's a lot of that around the state.

In forming this -- the District 1 and 2 in your merged map -- maybe it would be good to look at that in the Green Valley area.

It appears to me that you stood out east of Wilcox somewhere and you reached across rivers and valleys and up over the top of Mt. Wrightson, you grabbed Green Valley and excised it from the Santa Cruz Valley.

You heard two comments today about respecting the community of interest of Green Valley from Mr. Graf and Ms. Jurs and you heard several testimonies in the past about that.

Yesterday you heard a detailed testimony about that. I would urge you strongly to read the testimony represented to you yesterday by Mrs. Gregory on that issue. The arguments for that community of interest are very detailed and, in fact, true. So I would urge you to pay attention to that.

In a previous discussion of that District
2 in the merged map, there was discussion about wanting to make that a majority-minority district, something that's admirable. And it was said that Green Valley would detract from that.

It was pointed out to you yesterday, and I wanted to reiterate that today, that the -- it's not just the minority composition of the registration in these districts that determines whether a minority-majority district is valid. I believe it's really the minority ability to elect. You need to drill down into the voting history of these areas. And when do you that, you will find that the voting history in these areas will show you that the minority ability to elect in Green Valley is far, far better than it is in Sahuarita. And so the inclusion of Green Valley will actually help in that respect, rather than detract from making it a minority-majority district.

I would also like to comment that salamander tail that's going out into the Cochise County is not very attractive to people who look at contiguous and compactness, and I would urge you to take a look at that and see what parts of that can be put back in Cochise where it really does belong.

Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Steven Nygren, representing self from Tucson.

STEVEN NYGREN: My name is Steve Nygren. That's N-y-g-r-e-n.

I've come to this place before, different locations.

I'm kind of disappointed that when we overlay a single minorities voting preference, that we destroy all of the community of interest, all of the geographical centers of our industrial and commercial areas and we create just these wastelands of disinterested people.

I can't believe that we have a congressional district that is two-thirds of the width of the state.

I also can't believe we have one that's the full height of the state. It is impossible to represent any sort of a mild travel trip.

It looks to me as though the Commission, in an ability to try and satisfy the single vote principle, is kind of, like, destroying the communities of the state. Would you say?

It's a difficult time for all of us. And I hope that the appeal process on this will sort of
resolve what looked like to be -- I would say almost impossible issues with the mindsets that are being used to create these shapes.

Good luck.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Tom Chabin, representing self from Flagstaff.

TOM CHABIN: My last name is spelled C-h-a-b as in boy, i-n.

Madame Chair and members of the Commission, I am Representative Tom Chabin. I am Legislative District 2, which District 2 includes the city of Flagstaff, the great Navajo Nation, Hopi, Hualapai, and the Havasupai tribes. That is my district now.

For over 25 years, I lived in Native America. Before -- I was on the board of supervisors in Coconino County. And my -- I am here as a representative. And I've served in public service -- Tuba city school board as well because of Native America.

So there is much of what had been discussed by the Commission in the past about including portions of Flagstaff in with Native America that would serve my interests. But I assure
you, that competitiveness serves everybody's
interests.

I appreciate the work that you have done.
I appreciate where you are. I appreciate the
difficulty of public service, especially in
designing by Prop 106 a political process by
nonpoliticians to do the very most political thing
you could possibly do, and that's to draw political
districts.

And it's fine and it's great and you can
have all sorts of definitions. You want to make
people unhappy? Draw a map. That's all it takes.

So I appreciate all that you've done.

I would like to ask you to consider one
aspect about one of the districts you've drawn,
Which is District 6.

You heard the concerns again from
Coconino County about the inclusion of that portion
that is I guess part of District 7, that portion of
Coconino County that is not Native American north
and east of Flagstaff to be included with the
Flagstaff area.

You have heard from them. I'm not going
to tell you why they think that is important. And I
think all of those arguments are extraordinarily
strong. I don't have to repeat them.

However, let me suggest this: It would serve one other purpose, and that would be by adjusting the lines in other areas of concentrated Republican voters and in other areas of this District 6 that you have designed, by making an adjustment there, you will make the district far more competitive.

Did I do that?

You would make that district far more competitive. As it is now, it's at 7 percent, as you have drawn it.

And let me just tell you that with competitiveness, what am I asking for? Yeah, I'm a Democrat. Sure. I want competitiveness. Sure. All right. Okay.

What do I want? I want a fair fight. I want to have an election where I put my ideas out and my opponent puts out their ideas and that a jury of fair-minded, balanced voters will render a decision.

And fortunately for you, that District 6 is the only opportunity in Northern Arizona to draw a competitive district. It is possible to make it nearly even.
So I thank you for your public service. All you had to do was splash up a map and get comments from everybody, from even a guy like me. I appreciate it, and any considerations you have on my thoughts is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you. Our next speaker is Stefanie Mach, representing self from Pima County.

STEFANIE MACH: Hello. My name is Stefanie Mach. It's S-t-e-f-a-n-i-e, M-a-c-h. I am here from Pima County, and I'm representing myself, but I'm also representing my community and the future of Arizona.

And I think that the future of Arizona really depends on all people being able to put their ideas forth and all representatives being able to have a fair shot at taking a community's values into the legislature and making sure that we all have the best ideas that we can in order to make the best decisions.

So that's why I'm here for competition. I'm not here for Republican or Democratic values. I'm here for the value of competition. We need that. We want that. And I think above all else,
that's really the job here.

So I really appreciate all of the work that you've done. I truly do. I know it's been grueling for you all. But I -- and I want you to just go that extra mile and try to make some of the legislative districts a little bit more competitive just to take us to that level.

So again, I appreciate it.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Sheldon Gutman, representing self from Tucson.

SHELDON GUTMAN: Thank you. I didn't have a chance to shave today. I ran out of time.

I hope when the court hearing -- has a date been set for the court hearing versus our Attorney General Tom Horne? If you might have an electronic feed down to Tucson so that the rest of the citizens could watch the court hearing, the Commission versus the State of Arizona and Tom Horne. Maybe we could get it in this hotel.

I was -- a few distinguished people in the audience who were -- that is elected officials, one Randy Graf. I hope he may consider a run for the U.S. congress again. Again, expressed interest
I see Dan Eckstrom, he's a former member of the board of supervisors who helped bring Tucson Electric Park here. He'll be speaking before the Commission.

And with all of the great statistics of attendance at Tucson Electric Park, he'll get spring training back here again. Over 121,001 one time the team was there.

Bruce Ash, Republican councilman to the Republican National Committee spoke passionately today on the radio about problems with the Redistricting Commission. And I can't paraphrase what he said, but he said that in the process, two seats may be taken out of Southern Arizona and brought to Maricopa County. So we won't have a legislative representation at either the state or federal level. And to those -- what he speaks of, hopefully the districts will remain intact, what he was referring to in Pima County.

And I wish all of you well in your deliberations.

And Mr. Ash again reminds us of the possible conflicts here. He said that you should have more members of the Commission. That could
only be accomplished through a state legislative bill.

Thank you for your.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Your next speaker is Mac Hudson, representing self from Tucson.

MAC HUDSON: Hello. Yes, Mac, M-a-c, Hudson, H-u-d-s-on.

And thanks to staff and the Commission for all of your hard work. I know it gets said a lot, but it should be said a lot. It's hard work and I appreciate it.

I do have some of my own perspective on geographic features, competitiveness, but in lieu of remembering what I say today, considering all of the people you probably hear across the state, I do hope you will listen to the direction provided by the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government. For the most part what I have seen them say, I have appreciated and supported.

So I also, from my perspective, really feel that fair representation of Tucson is really important. I'm a third-generation Tucsonan and, you know, we all live in one state, and the great state of Arizona, but we do have some differences of
opinion in our state and I think that Tucson really
ought to be recommended by Tucsonan, Southern
Arizonan as opposed to people from Maricopa County.

So thanks again for your service and
please continue to listen to the direction provided
by the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Jim March, second
vice chair, Pima County Libertarian.

JIM MARCH: I'm not even going to try to
bend over for this thing.

My name is Jim March. Last name is
spelled the same as the month.

My first comment is the period coming up
next, the public is going to have to comment on the
details of each of these maps.

I would like to beg the mapping
consultant in particular to print each district as a
very high-resolution PDF file to where we can see
street-level detail without going into this program
and having to learn an entirely new application.
That will open up comments to the less
technically-minded people who are unable to deal
with that program.

I'm begging that. Crank out some high --
even if they are ten megabytes per district, print it to paper, bigger than 11-by-17, virtual size. At least we'll be able to zoom on the screen at very high resolution all over the maps.

That's my first comment.

My second comment is I have to take off for the first time my Libertarian Party hat, and I need to do that because we're not living yet in a Libertarian society. Give us eight years of Ron Paul, we might change that.

But in the meantime, the first nations are under continuing assault from various large corporations and out-of-control bureaucracies at the state and federal level.

The reason they need -- want to stick together is very clear, that they want at least one congressperson and state representatives who definitely have to pay attention to their issues.

So when, for example, some ski company wants to literally piss all over the White Mountains by taking recycled waste water and using it on the ski lifts, okay, that somebody will pay attention. And right now they don't have that.

So I have to support the idea, although it's contrary to hard-core Libertarian beliefs, of
keeping as many of the first nations together as you have done here.

   It makes District 7 look ugly as hell and there may be places where it can be tweaked, but the general concept of keeping as many of them together, so that somebody is paying attention to their issues has to make sense unfortunately. It's sad that I have to say that.

   But anyways, thank you.

   And please, one of the things that somebody can do, if it's not mapping consultant, there should be one document on your website that says if you are looking for this kind of information, go to this document, this document, this document, like political breakdowns.

   If you're looking to check the racial breakdowns of the various districts, the racial implications, here is how you find that.

   You need -- I'm an old tech writer from way back. You need a frequently asked questions document that guides people through the rest of the site because it's getting real messy, folks. You've really got to help out with that.

   And that kind of -- that really affects whether or not people can effectively comment from
the public into this process. And that's a key part of what you are doing.

    So I really appreciate that.

Big pdfs of each individual district so that we can see on street level what's going on. So people can comment on on a street-level basis and a how-to guide or frequently asked question, one or the other as to how to navigate your entire website to get the kinds of details that various types of people might like.

    Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

    Our next speaker -- and I have three more. I know they got added.


    I don't understand why Oro Valley has been disconnected from who we are. We're part of Tucson. Downtown Tucson, when it's not bad traffic, which could be like, oh, 8:30 in the morning, we're 20 minutes from downtown Tucson.
You put us in Pinal County and north, which is rural. It's empty land. There's no shopping there. There's no services.

Our life is south. Our life is not north, and I don't understand how we could just be taken away from who we are.

We're on the Oro Valley -- we're on the Oracle corridor and this area has attracted and grown with like-minded people. Those that live there feel comfortable with each other. We have beautiful scenery, we have good services.

The people there have chosen to live there. We have Republicans, we have Democrats. But we're not a rural area. We can't be serviced up there. We have nothing in common.

And as I look at the criteria for what the Commission is supposed to be doing, out of the six criteria, you've taken us out. Compactness and contiguous, doesn't work. Communities of interest doesn't work. Geographic features, don't work. Competitiveness, doesn't work.

We're not rural. We're hot, we're not cold. We have lovely homes. They are close together. We're not rural.

Our businesses surround us and they
provide the services we need in our lifestyle.

We live in Oro Valley. We work in Tucson, we work in South Tucson, we work in the Foothills. I'm also a dental hygienist.

It's easy to go south, but I don't understand why you took us off and you put us in a totally, totally, totally different area that we have nothing in common with.

And there again, you divide us up. You put us in one legislative district and then you put us in another congressional district.

I am also a precinct committeeman. And for me to have to go north to go to a meeting, I don't understand where you're going with cutting Oro Valley out of who we are.

So we in Oro Valley, we wish you would reconsider what you've done to our community and where you put us.

Please don't divide us from the people that we're a part of.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Keith Bagwell, representing self from Pima County.

KEITH BAGWELL: My name is Keith Bagwell.
That's B-a-g-w-e-l-l.

I'm here to support the map of the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government. I was here a couple of weeks ago looking at a much worse map than we have now.

This one is definitely an improvement, and I like this process and I think you're all doing a good job.

I would like to see the lines on the -- what is labeled 3 here, the congressional district map, moved to the east past Campbell Avenue. And the reason for that is -- these are historic Glen Manele, Sam Hughes, and others to the south, Broadway, are older historic districts that have a lot in common where I live in Armory Park.

We've always had the same kind of cultural and social interaction. We associate with the University of Arizona and with Pima College to the west, and I would like to see us all in the same district.

I had a union density and union halls in these areas, and it is a lot of racial diversity.

So I think these neighborhoods should be included in the same district, and I would urge you to do that.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

I have three more sheets, so I'm going to ask our court reporter and then I'm going to cut it off there, and if we want to have more public comment at the end of the meeting, we'll do that if there are more people who still want to speak, but that's as many as I have right now and we'll continue on then.

Susan Thorn (sic), representing self from Pima.

SUSAN THORPE: Yeah, hi there. It's actually Susan Thorpe, T-h-o-r-p-e.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm sorry.

SUSAN THORPE: That's okay.

I wanted to thank the commissioner. I'm sure this a monumental job. It's quite incredible what you're doing here.

Thank you so much for letting us weigh in, because I think it's really important.

I've been here in Tucson since 1981. I've been a realtor since 1985. At first I did IBM relocation, so I was all over the city. So I have a pretty good feel for everything.

But in the last, I would say, 15, 20
years, I've been doing only -- you know, kind of a
community of interest, actually, university people
and that sort of thing.

So I pretty much know what they are have
in common and what neighborhoods they are all
wanting to live in. You know, and I would say if
anything, it needs to be bumped out to Alvernon
probably on the east side because that's what the
people are looking at. Those are the communities
that all talk to each other, work together, historic
houses, the neighborhoods that work together.

You know, the university, the west side,
the south side, Dunbar Springs, environmental
people, you know, they all are big, huge contiguous
bunch of people.

And the same with the Pima County -- or
the Pima College on the west side, I would say.

So it would be nice to keep all of that
together. And I understand the Hispanic Coalition's
recommendations have kind of, like, pushed for that,
and I believe that is somebody that really does know
what the area is about.

And I think that you're doing a great
job. I would just like to recommend, you know,
bumping it out to -- probably out to Alvernon. I
mean, I know who I'm talking to years and years and
years, and that's kind of what everybody looks at as
a big contiguous area.

I just think it's real important that we
don't ever want to be ruled by Maricopa County. I
mean, Tucson needs to be ruled by local Tucsonans.
Keep Tucson for Tucson. We have nothing in common
with Maricopa County.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is
Cam Juarez, representing self.

You'll have to tell us where you're from,
just a city or a town.

CAM JUAREZ: Madame Chair, members of the
Commission, it's good to see you again. Thanks
again.

Can you guys hear me okay?

All right. My name is Cam Juarez, and
I'm from Tucson, from Pima County.

Actually, I too live in a lovely
neighborhood in a lovely home in Southwest Tucson,
and I appreciate all of the work that you have done
so far and will continue to.

I continue to support the Hispanic
Coalition for Good Government map. But nonetheless,
I appreciate the work that has been done.

The map that I referred to a second ago here is map that encompasses a lot of these U of A area neighborhoods, neighborhoods that I work with in my professional time and our neighborhoods like the ones that Mr. Bagwell was referring to, historic homes, homes that have a lot of history with Tucson but specifically with the congressional district that has been working with them.

So again, I thank you for your continued efforts and it's a valiant effort, that's for sure.

So thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker, and last speaker for this segment of public comment is Lee Oler, representing self. And you can tell us where you're from.

LEE OLER: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

My name is Lee Oler, L-e-e, last name is Oler, O-l-e-r, and I've lived in Tucson since 1970.

I want to -- I'm impressed when I walked in here today and I saw all of this, I think you guys are wonderful.

I want to remind -- not remind, you know this. That we want these districts to be
competitive. That's why the main message -- I also enjoyed Mr. March's comments about a little better resolution on the maps and a little easier navigation. I would enjoy that, too, because I have looked at them several times and haven't gotten really far on that.

So better maps, if you can do it on the website, and keep -- get these districts competitive and I'll be a very happy camper.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much. Thanks all of the public for coming today and participating in the process. We appreciate your input.

The time is 3:48, and I'm sure our court reporter would love a break as would others. So we'll take 15-minute recess and be back shortly.

(A recess was taken from 3:48 p.m. to 4:15 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We'll enter back into public session. Recess is over. The time is 4:15 p.m.

And we just heard a lot of comment on both the congressional draft map that was approved for -- that's going to go out on the road for 30
days at least of public comment and also some
comments on this predraft draft legislative map that
we've put together. And we appreciate everyone's
input on that.

And no doubt there will be areas of the
state that we are going to just have to look at
closely. And also we're going to be getting a lot
more analysis over the next month, both
racialized -- racially polarized voting analysis as
well as more deeper -- more deep analysis on
competitiveness.

So no doubt we just could always use more
data and we're going to be getting a lot of that
over the course of the next month.

So what are commissioners thoughts after
public comment on the legislative predraft draft?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I think we heard a
lot of good comments. It's wonderful to get to the
point where we're actually hearing comments on a map
about specifics.

My own feeling is that I would like to
send this map out. We've heard a lot of comment
today about things that definitely need to be
addressed and that we'll want to pay attention to,
but each one of them leads us to something else and
that's just inevitable with any changes that we
would make.

And I would -- so my view is I would
rather not start that process now. I would rather
take the map out, let people have an opportunity to
comment on it and then address all of their comments
in a harmonious manner once we've received the
comments.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I think the public
comments are great. And it's always good to hear
things that we -- that the public needs -- for us to
hear in terms of what they are looking for in their
district, things that we could tweak. And that to
me is helpful.

I'm looking forward to, whether we adopt
this map today or whatever ends up happening, I'm
looking forward to hearing the 30 days of public
comment to see how we can improve the map.

And I know some of the public comments
today were telling us that -- directing us to form
more competitive districts. Whether we do it today
or after the 30-day period, but I think that's
something that we need to be doing. The map, the
way it currently stands, isn't too competitive, but I think we can do a better job.

Again, I'm okay with waiting until after the 30-day comment period is over. Again, we have some tweaking to do to make sure that people -- we're listening to the requests.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any other comments?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I'll give an example about the comments, for example, that we've heard from Green Valley and Sahuarita are something that I'll want us to look at very closely in -- during the comment period. However, we've been advised by legal counsel that we need to get our voting rights expert analysis that district to ensure that it's an effective district and to understand what we might change about it, if anything.

So rather than proceed today to begin making changes in advance of receiving those comments, that analysis, I think it makes sense to get that in and then we can look at that whole area of the Green Valley comments, the comments about the border and address those as a whole.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments?
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: One, I want to commend the hard work of Commissioners Freeman and McNulty as they were diving through the Maricopa County, northern part of the state. I really have a -- was amazed at how close the two of them were able to work together to take the -- those areas and districts and really move them forward and move the ball down the field.

However, in that spirit of cooperation, my feeling about this today is that that spirit of cooperation did not happen in Southern Arizona.

And when we wanted to take a look at making some of those adjustments in Cochise County and what you're just referring to now, Commissioner McNulty, that you want to look at down the road, I've got a concern that that is -- that that won't be looked at down the road.

So there is lot on this map that I truly like a lot. There's some parts of this map that I've got significant issues to and want to put some of that on the record and did not -- was not effective in being able to have that commentary take hold.
So I think this is one of those maps that we're going to have to vote on it and see what's in it to get some -- get the appropriate feedback. So I'm not exactly sure what's in this map yet.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: There was a lot of give and take when we were looking at composing this map. Stertz -- excuse me, Commissioner Freeman had his ideas that he brought forth and Commissioner McNulty did the same thing, and there was hardly any type of argument. It was very amicable and it was -- actually I was surprised. I think they both get along well, but it was still a bit surprising and nice to see.

And I am looking forward to the day that we are going to have to make some changes to it. Hopefully this process is going to be the same where there's not going to be any arguments. That if Commissioner Stertz or Freeman recommends a change, it will like, okay, let's make that change and hen Commissioner Freeman or yourself may make proposed change and we'll be okay with it.

I hope it stays the same way as it was.
over the weekend, because it was actually very nice.

It was actually a little boring because of that
because there was no bickering. And not that I'm
used to the bickering or want to bicker, but it was
very surprising and welcome. So I hope it stays
that way.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: It sounds like this
is going to maybe move down the road to a vote on
this map to take it from the draft draft to the
draft map.

I would still like to know what your
definition is of the placeholder that we've used for
these -- I want to make sure that I have a -- and I
think that I'm uncomfortable with understanding that
these were designs that were put in that we are
going to be looking at adjusting going forward.

I would also like to have a discussion or
at least have an understanding so that the public
understands what draft -- what that means when we
say "draft map."

How much of these lines are going to be
moving? How much of their -- because we've heard --
as Commissioner McNulty said, we've heard testimony for the last seven to eight months. We're going to hear it for the next 30 days in multiple cities. And how much of that testimony are we going to actually be not just hearing but actually responding to and implementing?

Because in a lot on the lines on here, as we've heard already today, we've heard ad nauseam testimony regarding the Oro Valley, Saddlebrooke, Marana connection that all of a sudden they've fallen out of the Tucson metro area in both congressional and legislative maps and that's -- we've got volumes of testimony saying that they did not want to have that happen.

So I want to have sort of an understanding about what -- who we're going to pay attention to. If we're going to pay attention to the people of Coconino County and Flagstaff only, which I don't think we're going to do, but it seems like we're paying special attention to certain groups and we are not paying attention to others.

So when we talk about a draft map, I just want to make sure we're not disingenuous about when that means.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair, can I
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: During this whole process -- this is my opinion. I don't think we took the testimony of one group over another.

I saw the testimony from -- I heard everyone's testimony at all of the meetings. When I wasn't able to make meetings, I listened to them on the recording on the website.

So I don't -- that I don't agree with.

And also the -- I don't know what changes we'll make. I don't think Commissioner Mathis -- or Chairwoman Mathis would know or anybody on this Commission would know what changes we're planning on making because we haven't heard public testimony.

Even though I think a lot of the comments we made were -- a lot of the map, I think, is based on public comments. So I sure don't have an idea of how much of the lines we're going to move. I'm hoping they will be moved, but I don't know if it's going to be miniscule moves or major moves.

So this is my response. I have no idea.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I don't either. It will just depend on what we hear when we're out on the road for 30 days and see what people are saying.
about this. I mean, the great thing is, as
Ms. McNulty, said now people have something they can
latch onto and actually say, no, this is wrong, you
need to do this or, no, this works great.

So that's the kind of input we need to
hear because these people know their communities
better than anyone.

We've heard conflicting testimony.
Mr. Stertz mentioned the Oro Valley, Saddlebrooke
area. And we've tried to keep them together. In
one version we had them down with -- with -- towards
the border and keeping them towards Tucson and then
we heard public comment that, no, they look to the
north and they want to be associated with the
communities growing along the Marana corridor and
I-10. So that changed again.

So it seems like there's different -- you
know, maybe it's different groups, I'm not sure, but
we'll be able to really untangle that when we're on
the road and can actually hear directly from Oro
Valley, Marana, Saddlebrooke themselves and they can
talk to us about all of that.

And the same for Coconino, for the
Flagstaff area, any community, or Cochise County,
we've heard some of that today, that some people
like Cochise whole, some think it can separated along rural lines.

We do need to preserve these majority-minority districts, as we all know, to the extent possible without packing them but maintaining that benchmark level that we need to.

So it's just it's a -- it's a big puzzle, really. There's always criteria that are -- as you heard today, they are conflicting, many of them. So we've just got to weigh and consider them equally and then figure out a way to make it work to the best of our ability and to the extent practicable.

And thankfully that language is in there because I don't know how you could do it otherwise. Because I know that this Commission has considered all of these criteria in adjusting the grid map.

And it's not perfect. We know that and we know there will likely have to be changes. But the extent of the change or where the change will occur, I don't know until -- I don't think any of us can answer until we hear from the public.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And do more analysis on the map, too.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Voting rights'
VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: And you all know my position on what constitutes a draft map.

I think that the draft map should be a proposed final map that we're sending out to the public. And I stated this with respect to the congressional districts a little bit that all of the voting rights' data should be there to back it up, that all of the constitutional criteria should be drilled down and assessed in every respect. And that's what we are putting out for the public to comment on, not a rough draft that's going to change substantially down the road.

I know that everyone is going to work on this. I appreciate everyone's cooperation, particularly Commissioner McNulty who worked with me over the weekend on parts of this map.

It's been referred to as a merged map. In some respects it is, in some respects it isn't.

I know Southern Arizona pretty much stayed exactly the same as option 2. Maricopa County and parts north were changed, and that's what we were doing Friday, Saturday, and Sunday was...
drawing those lines because we reconfigured the
casting rights' districts in that area different from
option 1.

So all of those other districts -- that
has a ripple effect and all of those other districts
changed.

So I -- while I think it should be a
proposed final map, I hope this is a draft map. I
hope that it is -- I hope there's going to be room
for change on it because, you know, we put -- you
know, we drew the 30th district last night, and I
really want -- I would really want to spend more
time thinking about all of the constitutional
criteria and how they apply to every district,
including communities of interest, including
competitiveness and all of the other criteria as
well, voting rights -- where the appropriate
locations for the voting rights' districts are, what
are viable voting rights' districts, coalition
districts, et cetera, et cetera.

So while it's perhaps inconsistent with
what I said last week, I do hope this is a draft
this go-round.

And I know staff has done an enormous
amount of work. Our first -- second round of public
hearings begin tomorrow night at Phoenix College in Phoenix and then we're on the road for about three weeks and all of those dates have been locked in and we need to have two sets of maps to take with us.

So let's proceed.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I do also hope we make changes to this map. There's still plenty of work we have to do. And currently the way the map stands, there's at least sixteen solid Republican districts, eight Democratic, and then a few competitive.

So, yeah, this map is what we call a draft, and I suspect that we will get public comments talking about competitiveness and then we will make the changes that are needed, that we need to make afterwards.

But let me just talk about the issue -- the reason why we adopted the southern part of that draft map is because according to our legal counsel, that met -- according to them, that met the muster to pass the Voting Rights Act and that's why we decided to do that.

And I think if your -- I know you did a
good job at trying to do that, but I think if yours
was similar to Ms. McNulty's, I'm sure our legal
counsel would have told us the same thing. Either
one or the other pick. We can adopt a few things
from Freeman's, a few things from McNulty, but it
was the reason that we adopted that particular area
was because our legal suggested that we do that.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Gee, I would like
to think it was because it was just great.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: It was great.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That leads me to,
again, my level of concern that there is some sort
of recommendation by legal counsel that the three
drafted -- or the three-drawn designs as they
currently exist for the majority-minority districts
are fixed.

And if that's the case, then -- this
is -- why I'm saying this is I'm hearing that
repeated, and I don't want to -- and I'm bringing it
up again because on Friday -- at Friday's hearing,
we had this exact same discussion, and I'm repeating
it again today, saying that I don't believe that
that's what counsel recommended. They had said --
they made the recommendation that they wanted to
have three minority-majority districts in the
southern part of Arizona and that Commissioner
McNulty's designs were going to be used as a
placeholder, as phrased by the Chair.

And I actually went and did a
Merriam-Webster's definition of placeholder and of
draft just so that I would have a clear
understanding of what these mean for me.

And a placeholder is -- actually it's a
mathematical phraseology. It's actually a symbol
used in mathematics in the place of a numeral not
yet known. So we're going to say that it's a symbol
used in the place of a design not yet known, would
be a placeholder.

And then a draft is a preliminary sketch,
an outline or a version.

So if that is where we are going, then --
and we are going to be listening and taking into
account these -- the volumes of testimony we
previously received and the testimony that we are
going to be receiving, because in each one of these
Southern Arizona districts, we've got
constitutional -- based on the constitutional
criteria, we've got big breaches already. We're
breaking communities of interest, we're breaking
county lines, we're breaking transportation
corridors, we're breaking geographic barriers
already in districts.

We've got -- we've got large
concentrations of registration both Democrat and
Republican, as was brought up by testimony today.
Even Representative Patterson was saying don't
overpack my district because I would rather have it
be more competitive.

I value that a lot. I think we've got to
take all of that into a high level of consideration.

We've also got rural communities that are
being broken away into -- being represented by
groups of concentrations of counties that they've
got no affiliation with.

And if there's -- and with all due
respect, Commissioner Herrera, we have really done a
lot of design around the Hispanic Minority Coalition
designs. Those have been really heavily taken into
account.

You had said earlier that we really
didn't focus on any one particular group. We really
focused a lot on those folks. We really focused a
lot on the representatives from Coconino County and
Flagstaff.

And I appreciate that. I think that they've done a great job at bringing forward their testimony and we have to be responsive to the other folks that will be bringing testimony to us as well.

But, unfortunately, at this time, because of the map as it stands right now and my earlier concerns dating back to last Friday, I won't be able to -- I don't like going forward and voting for something that we vote for it and find out what's in it later. That's troubling to me.

So that's all I have to say on that matter.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: One of the reasons why we're paying close attention to the comments made by the Hispanic Coalition the Hispanic groups is because we have to meet the Voting Rights Act.

I think that all of us would agree that that's our number one priority. That's why we're listening to them. That's why we're listening to the Native American groups, because we want to meet the Voting Rights Act.

So if it wasn't for the Voting Rights
Act, we would probably be treating everyone equal. But there's no way around it. So that's why if it appears that we're treating someone or a particular group with a little more attention than others, it's because of that.

That's all I have to say about that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Madame Chair, would you entertain a motion to approve the draft map?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I would.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I would move that we adopt this as our draft legislative map and that we instruct our staff to advertise it to the public and take comment for at least the next 30 days.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is there a second?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I guess I'll make it. I thought Commissioner Freeman would, but I'll go ahead and make the second.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any discussion?

All in favor?

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Aye.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Aye.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any opposed?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: No.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So for the record there were four ayes and one no from Commissioner Stertz.

So we have a draft legislative map and there is no question that we'll be entertaining a lot of comment over the next 30 days on this and listening to people and being as responsive as we can to balance the six competing criteria and ensuring that we are meeting all of those and addressing all of them for each of the districts.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: If I could just explain my vote a little bit.

Again, the Commission has done a lot of work to pencil out to draft map and we are going to go forward with public comment hearings beginning tomorrow night. Those have been set.

Under those circumstances, I think we need to have two maps, obviously, federal and state legislative to go forward.

And if we're going to go forward with the legislative map as the advertised draft map, then
perhaps this is the one, despite the fact I have a lot of serious concerns about it, as I stated prior to the vote, and I would just sort of incorporate those comments I made in this statement right now so I don't have to repeat myself.

But there are -- I do have those serious concerns. So I hope, you know, we do get -- a lot of the public shows up and gives us a lot of feedback on it and tells us about their communities of interest and tells us about the error of our ways, as I have said before and has been repeated, and doesn't show up with too many pitchforks and torches, although I know we'll probably see some of those.

And that way when we come back after this comment period and we have the complete competitiveness data, which I hope we get as soon as possible so the public can have that as well, and when we have the voting rights' analysis drilled down to the nth degree so that we feel very comfortable with the districts either as constituted or we at least have a good idea of how these districts need to be reconstituted so that we pass preclearance, that we then sit down and thoroughly go through this map again and incorporate public
comment and, you know, apply the constitutional criteria and sort of reiterate the map and come up with a final product that really is reflective of how Arizona is put together.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

I would just like to also say, and it's been said numerous times, but we wouldn't have this legislative draft map if it weren't for the efforts of Commissioners McNulty and Freeman.

They both rose to the occasion in a huge way to work together and they both know Arizona very well and how it's put together and they understand communities of interest and they both were very cognizant of that as they drafted their maps.

And it's just a testament to them. I think that they were able to act in such a bipartisan way and it was very encouraging to watch yesterday and over the past few days.

So I thank you both for that.

Any other comments from other commissioners?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: When we finally -- when we do our -- if we get the information on the
2004, 2006 elections, I want to see that the columns reflect different ways of measuring that information.

So I think we've talked about -- so weighing them evenly in one column, 2008, 2010, 2004, 2006, weighing them according to relevancy. So putting more relevancy 2010, 2008, 2006, 2004 maybe, you know, that type of a scale so that doing it a variety of ways as opposed to just one way where we will lump them all the same.

Does that make sense, Mr. Desmond?

WILLIE DESMOND: That does. We'll explore several different indexes.

I assume Ken would want to do some similar analysis to see if there are different measures and different combinations and how those affect -- the correlation those have on predicting different competitive elections. And we'll also be willing to put together any custom sort of accommodations that you guys would care to see.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I appreciate that.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: And, Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: There's a disagreement as to the relevancy of the different
years because I would weight the earlier -- I would
perhaps weight the earlier elections more heavily
than the more recent ones, given the circumstances
2008 and 2010.

So I would suggest just laying out the
election years and the results as they are and then
the public or any commissioners can crunch the
numbers as we see fit.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Wait, I'm having a
difficult time --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I'm sorry, you
guys will have to stop talking. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Freeman, can you
repeat yourself? I'm sorry.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: The whole thing?
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Not the whole thing.

How about halfway.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: The gist of it?
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: The gist of it.

Summarize it.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I was recommending
that we just -- we get each year's election
tabulated and then commissioners can argue about
relevancy at the different years and we can blend
them into whatever formula we want and argue that
this measure is more reflective of competitiveness.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I don't disagree with that at all. What I was wanting to do is just get as much information as possible, mix them up like we have one -- one level of competitiveness, one index 2 and we have about three of them. I think we can have more than that and we can explain what they are and then we can pick and chose which we want to use.

We may not all agree how we want to use it, but at least we have the options to say, okay, I like index number 3 because of these reasons and that's what I choose to use.

So that's where I was getting at, where we combine all of that information in as many indexes as possible.

WILLIE DESMOND: Again, we will make the block files and Maptitude files available to any members of the public who want those election results.

So, yes, we can do any sorts of things.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Two quick things.

First, I also want to give unbelievable thanks to Commissioners Freeman and McNulty for their hard work. I was unbelievably impressed by the work product that you guys have put together on the northern side of the state. We'll -- I'm looking forward to the discussions on the southern side. As we get to public input.

But really, thank you for your hard work. The Chair is correct, we wouldn't be at today and having this vote if that work product didn't take place.

A question for Mr. Desmond. Did you get any e-mails or texts regarding when this data is going to come in?

WILLIE DESMOND: Honestly, I just got one about five seconds ago. I texted him a second time. This is exactly what it says.

ETA on '04, '06 remains as soon as possible. I think this week, but don't want to commit on a date.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And is Mr. Strasma coming out soon for some of the hearings?

WILLIE DESMOND: Andrew and Korinne and have been divvying up a lot of the public hearings.
Ken is kind of on standby. I think if there's Commission meetings, he would be at those more than public hearings necessarily, particularly with the amount of work that remains to be done on the '04, '06 and the racially polarized voting analysis, we've kind of tried to keep him in front of his computer chained to his desk in Wisconsin as much as possible.

But he's available to come out if there were -- if the Commission prefers and give some of the second round hearings.

But as it stands now, it's currently scheduled to be Andrew and Korinne for the next week and a half or two weeks or so and then I'll be back here for some of them. Probably be here doing some maps as we figure out exactly how we incorporate the public comment that you guys will be receiving during the second round.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty you.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I was going to ask Mr. Kanefield and Ms. O'Grady a question.

The 2001 Commission, did they use 1994 and 1996 data?

MARY O'GRADY: I don't know that they used -- I don't know how -- the extent to which they
used that. I know for the Arizona quick and dirty analysis, which was part of their competitive analysis, it was just the first two elections. It wasn't -- it definitely wasn't -- I don't know if they used older data for their JudgeIt, but they didn't for quick and dirty. And they did all of that later. Again, they didn't do any at this phase, any of that analysis at this phase.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And they didn't do their voting rights' analysis, I think you said, until after the final map was drawn?

MARY O'GRADY: I haven't seen anything other than the description of the numbers. I haven't seen -- the racially polarized data that I have seen is from reports that were included with the submission that had a later date. I don't know if there were other reports that were prepared early. What I've seen, again, is just demographics.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: I just wanted to make the point, I think that this Commission has "information R us." That's kind of been our way of operating. We've gathered a huge amount of information that we've used as we prepared these maps and are continuing to.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I have a question,
also, for legal counsel.

Wasn't Dr. King also going to provide some kind of competitive analysis in addition to the racially polarized voting analysis?

MARY O'GRADY: He's available to do that. We've had him focusing on the racially polarized voting Section 5 issues first. But he certainly can help with some of the other if the Commission would like his assistance.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thanks.

Okay. Any other comments?

Anything Mr. Desmond needs from us with regard to moving forward for the hearings on those two draft maps?

WILLIE DESMOND: I don't think so. We'll be working hard tonight and tomorrow to make sure we have as much information available to the public at the meetings and on the website as possible.

This map will be put up in a special section. If you go to the maps tab on the IRC website, there is a special tab for draft maps. This map will join the congressional map there.

BUCK FORST: It's already posted.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: And you'll include the block equivalency file when you post it?
WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, that's been included in all of the what-if scenarios to date and will obviously be part of the draft maps.

BUCK FORST: It's already posted.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And I think also to the extent possible, if we could have blowups for the hearing that we are going to of -- you know, a specific district that we're going to be talking about, especially on the legislative where things are so tight and to just zero in as much as you can and be able to have some poster-sized versions for the wall that people can look at. That would be great.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. I'm not sure -- I think definitely want to have at least statewide wall-sized printouts for tomorrow's meeting. We'll work diligently to try to get the individual districts available for tomorrow. But just like Ken with the '04, '06, I don't want to commit to having those for tomorrow evening, but certainly in the very near future.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. And then I think just as we go to each of these venues, whatever venue we're going to, let's have it tailored to that location.
WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: The comments made by Jim March regarding the high-resolution PDF, is that -- what do you think about that? Is that possible? Is that something that's needed?

WILLIE DESMOND: You know, I think it's probably possible. It's something we have been meaning to do, kind of. With the meetings coming right up into this second round hearing, there hasn't been much time to prepare a lot of further kind of layouts and things to that nature.

It's something we haven't done yet, just because it is a great amount of time to get those available for every single what-if scenario. It wouldn't have been very feasible and also, you know, a lot of times just the time it takes to print maps like that. We're working right up until the deadline a lot of these days.

Again, we'll look at doing it. And I think it makes sense. I would just, again, want to emphasize to people there is a great deal of information available for everyone. These maps are on the website.
In addition to the plan components, plan splits, competitiveness, racial breakdown, data tables, block equivalency files, there is also the Google KMZ files, ESRI shape files, caliber and compact files and, you know, just JPEG and PDFs of the actually eight-and-a-half-by-eleven layout that we have provided the commissioners.

I think the Google KMZ files have been very helpful to some people who have gotten a little more comfortable working with them.

Basically how it works is you click on that, it takes you to Google maps in your Internet browser, and it's just like looking at anything else in Google maps. You're able to really drill down to the individual street level. You can see your house if you want to, see what district it's in.

So we'll continue to refine the information we have available to make in more user friendly as time goes on.

Just to date, it's been difficult to provide the Commission with information and also tailor that to some public who hasn't maybe been paying as close attention as you have.

We don't want to give you guys anything that we don't make available to the general public.
So a lot of what's gone up has been more, I guess, insider, to some extent. That's just a reflection of us make everything available.

RAY BLADINE: May I just comment.

Your staff will work with Willie to get as many maps and as much detail as we can because I think we're now to a point where we have more capacity, since we're dealing with two maps.

We have already posted your approved legislative map draft. It's on the web page. There's a link on the front that will take you to the detail, all of the files that Willie was talking about.

For those that are computer literate, it's available there as of now and we will do our best to get maps.

I guess while I'm up, may I slip into executive director's report for just a second or do you want me to come back?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is there anything else on the --

WILLIE DESMOND: I just wanted to say those maps that are under draft, they will change probably tonight so that the titles reflect the fact that they are Commission approved legislative draft
map and not just map as of 10/9. So we'll get that changed so that there's no confusion.

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: It should say 10/9/11, no 10/9/10.

WILLIE DESMOND: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And just a quick suggestion.

If you go under maps, the first thing that pulls up in order is IRC maps, which are I think all of the what-if scenarios.

Is there any way we could do the reverse, have the draft maps coming up first?

WILLIE DESMOND: I'll ask Buck about it. I assume that's something he could do.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: If you could put the IRC draft maps or the what-if maps at the bottom probably so they are not too close, because it could be confusing.

WILLIE DESMOND: I think there's a lot that can be done to make these maps more accessible to the public now that it is just two maps.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, and maybe even change the title from IRC map to something else. We can talk about that just because it is confusing. I agree, draft map should be the first thing that
comes up.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. anything else?

WILLIE DESMOND: No. Just continue to let us know if there's things that you think would make it easier for people to really explore these maps and understand how it will affect them and their community. And we'll work hard to make sure that that gets done.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great. Thank you.

Okay. I think that takes us to item 3 on the agenda, executive director's report.

RAY BLADINE: I'm sorry, I just wanted to let you know -- and actually, if you go to your very first page, there's a picture of the Commission, the first two items under that are the legislative and the congressional maps.

So we will make the changes you all talked about to bring those maps above the what-if, but we did make links right up front so the first think -- I think we're going to have to put in flashing numbers or something so it's more visible, but the title has been changed and it is officially posted.

I just wanted to do two things. We do,
as you mentioned, have the hearings starting
tomorrow. That schedule has been posted for a few
days now and I can't even give you a day or two to
rest to ask if you'll please let us know what
meetings you may able to attend so we can get that
populated and know that we have commissioners lined
up.

I know that's a mean thing to do after
what you've all just been through, but if do you
that, that would help.

I also want to mention that when you
called during public comment, Mr. Rivera was not
here, but he did send a letter indicating that they
were appreciative of the changes and the attention
that was paid to their concerns.

They have a few concerns with District 7
but will talk about those in future meetings on the
draft map.

So really we will do everything we can to
back up Willie. To make sure we get this as easy as
we can for the public.

Finally, as you know, we posted
tomorrow's meeting as most likely being canceled if
the map is adopted today.

So we have shown that on the web page
that the meeting is canceled and we are sending out
e-mail notices right now so that people will get as
early a notice as possible.

And I would be happy to answer any
questions.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's great.

Regarding Mr. Rivera's input, he sent a
letter, correct, and it was for Congressional
District Number 7, not the LD; is that right?

RAY BLADINE: Yes, you're right. Thank
you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So we do have that
letter that came to the Commission?

RAY BLADINE: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments
or questions for Mr. Bladine or anything on the
hearing schedule that anyone wants to say?

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: When and where
tomorrow night?

RAY BLADINE: It's at Phoenix College at
6 p.m., and that's on Thomas -- I don't remember the
exact address, but Thomas Road in Phoenix.

VICE CHAIR FREEMAN: Barring a strong
objection by my wife, I'll be there.

RAY BLADINE: I completely understand and
I hope she takes sympathy on you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

RAY BLADINE: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

RAY BLADINE: Congratulations. That is a super job for the state of Arizona.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thanks.

Anything on the inquiry we need to cover?

Okay. So the next item -- and then call for public comment. I only have one speaker slip after all of the public comment we did earlier.

So we'll go ahead and do that.

Mariana Spier, representing self from Pima.

MARIANA SPIER: Good afternoon.

My name is Mariana Spier, S-p-i-e-r.

When I filed the request, I didn't know that you were going to adopt a map as a draft. So since I missed the beginning of the discussion this morning, I have to work, I was interested in my -- my community, my neighborhood.

So I was about to ask you if you can zoom in, but I think it's already too late.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, we can still --
VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Always.

MARIANA SPIER: Okay. Thank you so much.

I live on the east side of Tucson. In the previous two options it put my neighborhood into two different districts. So I would like to know in the -- make a comment.

The area -- the general area is -- okay.

District 10.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Hold the little button.

MARIANA SPIER: Oh, this button.

Okay. Somewhere in that area I guess, if we can zoom in. Is it -- let me see the streets.

WILLIE DESMOND: This is --

MARIANA SPIER: Moving to the right a little bit.

So it will be between Houghton and Harrison in golf --

COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Mr. Desmond, maybe if you could just describe the east boundary, then she'll know if she's east or west of it.

MARIANA SPIER: I can see now. So that's Golf Lanes, Houghton. I see Harrison. And thank you very much for including my neighborhood in Tucson.
Well I've heard people talking about Oro Valley, Marana and their connection to Tucson, but we are Tucson.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Don't forget the pointer. That's government-issued.

MARIANA SPIER: Do you want to take my fingerprints off of it?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Anything else from other commissioners on anything?

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: Madame Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I think I already thanked McNulty and Freeman, but if I didn't, let me thank them again because without them, I -- we would not have been here. We would have been still been talking about it. So I'm glad they did all of the work they did. So thank them and thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

With that, that leaves adjournment on the agenda, and at 5:01 p.m., I declare meeting adjourned.

Thank you.

(The deposition concluded at 5:01 p.m.)
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