Proceedings

(Whereupon, the public session commences.)

Chairperson Mathis: Good evening. This hearing of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission will now come to order.

Today is Wednesday, October 12th, and we're in the lovely town of Payson, Arizona, tonight.

The time is 6:06 p.m., and we'll start with the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

Chairperson Mathis: Well, good evening, folks. Thanks all for coming out tonight and providing input at this hearing.

The purpose of tonight's gathering and in all the towns that we're going to across Arizona is to obtain input on the draft legislative and congressional district maps that have been drawn.

And we look forward to hearing what you have to say and getting that into our record.

I want to go round and introduce folks after roll
call, and then we'll get started on the presentation, and then your public comment.

So, Vice-Chair Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And Vice-Chair Herrera.

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner McNulty.

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner Stertz.

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: The other three commissioners are watching this -- they'll be watching it in the recorded version. We're not streaming live tonight, but this meeting is being recorded, and it will be posted to our website as soon as possible by our chief technology officer, Buck Forst.

But just like last night -- I wasn't at last night's first hearing in Phoenix, and watched that online, and it's a -- it's pretty fabulous with technology these days.

So I'm sure that they will be watching and listening to your input as well.

Let me introduce some other folks at the table here besides Vice-Chair Freeman.

We have our legal counsel, Mary O'Grady.
Our mapping consultant, Andrew Drechsler, and Korinne Belock.

We have a court reporter taking an accurate transcript of tonight's proceedings. That's Marty Herder.

Buck Forst, our chief technology officer.

You saw Kristina Gomez, our deputy executive director, on your way in.

And I believe we have some public outreach coordinators, Kristi Olson and Lisa Schmelling.

Thank you all for being here.

And please feel free to talk to any of our staff if you have any issues that you would like addressed or anything during the course of the evening.

Federal law requires that we translate these proceedings this evening. And I believe we have a translator, Mr. Carlos Reyes.

If you would like to just come up and just say a few words.

(Whereupon, the interpreter made a statement in Spanish.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can you translate that to English? I can't. I don't know.

He was providing some welcome -- welcoming comments to the crowd to see if there are any need for translation services tonight, but he's coming back up and
can tell you exactly what he said.

    CARLOS REYES: I was told to do it in Spanish, so I do apologize.

    I do apologize, commissioners.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No problem.

    CARLOS REYES: It says: Chair Mathis, ladies and gentlemen, and commissioners, in accordance with the Voting Rights Act, a translator/interpreter will be available at the public hearings in order to provide translating interpreting services that might be needed for those citizens that need translating or interpreting services. Please contact the translator/interpreter present at the meeting so that he can assist you.

    And that is it.

    Thank you.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you, Mr. Reyes.

    So I think many of you are aware that we have these request to speak forms. They're yellow, and they're in the back of the room.

    So to provide input tonight, if you would like to come up and address the Commission formally, please fill out one of these forms. And I'll be calling your name for you to come up and give us your testimony.

    There are blue forms in the back if you prefer not to speak at the microphone tonight. You can fill out input
on a blue form and provide that, and that will be entered into the record just the same as it would if you stood up and stated it yourself.

So, two ways to provide input to us tonight.

And you can, of course, do it after this hearing. If you think of something later and want to address us, you can do that via our website. You'll be hearing more about different ways to provide input in the presentation.

Let me see if I missed any of the housekeeping items.

Right now I don't think so, so our next item on the agenda is for Mr. Drechsler to provide an introductory presentation for you all about the process.

ANDREW DRECHSLER: Thank you very much.

Good evening. We're here today to discuss the draft maps presented by the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission.

The draft maps are currently under a 30-day review period, which means this is one of the big reasons that we're here today, is to hear your opinions on the maps.

Before we display the maps, we wanted to give a quick overview of the process.

Arizona's redistricting process is governed by the state constitution as amended by the voters in 2000 with the passage of Proposition 106.
It stipulates that the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission redraw the Arizona's congressional and legislative districts to reflect the results of the most recent census.

Due to the 2010 census, Arizona gained a congressional seat and will go from eight seats to nine seats.

The legislative will have 30 districts, 30 senators and then two members in the house, so a total of 60 house members.

What are the guidelines of Prop 106?

Well, A, they must comply with the U.S. Constitution and the Voting Rights Act.

B, equal population.

Criteria A and about B are federally mandated.

The other four to the extent practical are from Proposition 106.

C is compact and contiguous.

D is respect communities of interest.

E, use visible geographic features, city, town, and county boundaries, and undivided census tracts.

F, favor competitive districts where no significant detriment to other goals.

A real quick overview of the Voting Rights Act.

Arizona's congressional and legislative districts must
receive preclearance or approval from the Department of Justice or the federal court under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act before they can take effect.

To get preclearance, Arizona must demonstrate that the new districts do not discriminate against minority voters in purpose or effect, which means there can be no intentional or accidental discrimination.

Under Section 5, Arizona's redistricting plans cannot be retrogressive. The plans cannot weaken or reduce minority voters' rights.

The presence of discrimination can be determined by analyzing population data and election results.

So there's -- setting up the Commission, there's really six steps as part of the timeline.

The first, the first thing that we did was establishing a Commission.

So this is basically creating a new state agency. Commissioners were appointed through a process -- through a screening process, and all serve in a voluntary role.

As you know, we have two -- two of the commissioners here tonight. We have the chair, Colleen Mathis, and Vice-Chair Scott Freeman.

Jose Herrera is another vice chair. Linda McNulty and Commissioner Richard Stertz are also not present.
tonight.

The second step is the first round of hearings.

Before drawing a single line, the Commission held 23 public hearings around the state in July and August to get input from members of the public about issues relevant to redistricting, such as geography, communities of interest, minority voting rights, and competitiveness.

The third step is mapping.

We started with the grid map, which was approved on August 18.

The grid map takes into consideration two things, equal population and compactness.

And that starting with the grid map is a stipulation of Proposition 106.

Since adopting the grid maps, the Commission has met more than 25 times to consider adjustments to the grid maps to accommodate all state constitution criteria.

During this time they received additional public comments and draft maps.

Approval of the draft maps were -- approval of the draft maps. On October 3rd the Commission approved the congressional maps that incorporated changes based off of all the constitutional criteria, and then on October 10th it approved the legislative maps.

The fourth step is the second round hearings,
which you're a part of tonight.

Currently we are in the process of visiting 25 towns and cities to share the draft maps and receive additional public comment during the month of October.

Step five is the final maps.

Under -- upon completion of the public comment period, the Commission will adopt final maps.

The sixth step is preclearance.

Because Arizona is subject to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, the district maps must be approved by -- approved by the federal Department of Justice or a federal court in Washington, D.C., before they can be used for Arizona elections.

We want to show the progression of the maps and show how we came to the current draft maps.

The map you see here was the congressional map that was approved by the last Redistricting Commission and most recently used in the 2010 elections.

Per Proposition 106 we were required to start with a blank slate.

Also, as we discussed earlier, the proposition requires us to start with a grid map, which again takes into consideration two things, equal population and compactness.

After more than 25 meetings, the Commission voted to approve the draft map you see here.
Besides taking into consideration the six criteria, the Commission took into consideration public comment provided via public meetings, round one in public hearings, comments that were mailed in, e-mails, hand-delivered, faxed, people who telephoned, and I'm probably forgetting a couple other methods, but we've heard a lot of different people.

Anyway, over 2,000 comments helped develop this map.

As you see, some of the highlights on the map are two predominantly rural districts, three border districts, two districts in the city of Tucson, five districts that are entirely -- that are entirely in Maricopa County, it avoids splitting Arizona Indian reservations, and two districts where minority voters have the opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice.

Much like the congressional map process, the legislative maps followed a similar process.

Here you see the legislative map that the last independent Commission approved and was last used for the election in 2010.

Again, like the congressional map, we started off with a blank slate before, before creating the maps.

And as, as like the congressional map, we created a grid map.
Again, took into consideration equal population and compactness.

And finally, just days ago, the Commission approved the draft map that you see here.

Some of the highlights of this draft map that we'll go through, the old districts that were used in the 2010 elections, the population ranged from 155,000 to 378,000.

The current draft map has 207 to roughly 215,000.

To comply with the Voting Rights Act, the draft map included ten districts in which minority voters have the opportunity to elect the candidate of their choice. One district with majority Native American voting age population, three districts in southern Arizona, four districts in Maricopa County that have a majority Hispanic age population, two districts in Maricopa County in which the coalition of minority voters should have the opportunity to elect the candidate of their choice.

The draft map also includes three districts wholly within Pima County, and three additional southern Arizona districts.

There are 17 districts primarily in Maricopa County, and nine districts that are primarily rural.

As we stated earlier, we want to hear your
opinions. And we want to hear what your thoughts are on these maps.

As the chair mentioned, if you want to speak tonight, we ask you to fill out one of the yellow sheets. Otherwise, you can -- and examples of the input that we're looking for is any -- all constitutional, any of the constitutional criteria, draft congressional map, comments on the draft legislative map.

You can also submit -- besides speaking at a hearing, you can fill out one of these blue forms that are available at the hearing or on the website. Or you can visit us at our website as www.azredistricting.org, or call us at (602)542-5221, or toll free at 855-redistrict.

Here's a screen shot of our home page. I just want to highlight a couple different things.

Where you can find the maps, there's two different areas. And recently we just added at the bottom of the page both -- you can click to see the legislative maps or the congressional maps.

Also on this page is meeting information.

If you want to go view any of the recordings of past meetings, those are available. And the schedule for all future meetings is also available.

And if you have any public comment, you can go to the web page and submit comments through there.
Once you click on one of the -- to view the draft maps, you're going to come to this screen. And one thing that we wanted to highlight, and people have found this feature really useful, is the -- what is the KMZ Google maps.

If you click on either of these to see the -- we're circled in red, if you click on either of those, you'll come to a screen that looks like this. And it allows you to see the entire state and the specific maps.

Over on the left you will see the opportunity click off of districts or off of county labels to see more detail or less detail.

And one great feature about this is you're able to zoom in and specifically see your area of your boundaries. And as you can see here, you can see the exact streets and locations that make up your -- the boundaries of your district.

Again, we want to hear from you, and we want to make sure that you stay connected with the process. You can visit us at our website, www.azredistricting.org.

On there you have the ability to draw your own maps.

We have an online mapping program that the public can access and use.

Watch current or past meetings and get updates on
future meetings.

You can follow us at Twitter as /AIRC or friend us on Facebook.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you, Mr. Drechsler.

That was a very informative presentation, and hopefully it helps people orient themselves for tonight's hearing.

So, just a reminder, we're here to get your input. And for those of you that filled out request to speak forms, please come up to the microphone, and get as close to the microphone as you can, and speak your name into the microphone as well as spell it so that our transcript will be accurate.

If you could also tell us where you're from -- don't tell us your specific address, but just the city, town, or county is fine. That would be great.

And the idea is if you could tell us specifics about what you like or don't like about the maps, that's very helpful. And you can -- to be as specific as you can in terms of what modifications you think should be made. Or, again, if you think everything's great, then tell us that too.

So we really want to hear as specific an input as we can, so that we'll be able to make good decisions later.
on any modifications or adjustments that need to be made on either of these maps.

And I think that's about it.

I'm going to ask everyone to try to limit your comments to four minutes.

Buck will have a timer, and he'll be timing you.

If the buzzer goes off while you're talking, please just feel free to wrap it up as, you know, as well as you can.

You can, you know, finish a few sentences or whatever. You don't have to stop instantly. But we're just trying to ensure that everybody has an opportunity to speak tonight.

So our first speaker is Larry Stephenson, representing Eastern Arizona Counties Organization, which is comprised of Gila, Graham, Greenlee, Apache, and Navajo Counties.

LARRY STEPHENSON: Thank you, Madam Chair, members of the Commission.

You have a big job behind you and ahead of you both, and we appreciate what you've been doing. We've been following you.

My name is Larry Stephenson, S-T-E-P-H-E-N-S-O-N, for the record. And I'm with the Eastern Arizona Counties Organization.
And as the chairperson of it, that's comprised of five rural counties, Gila, Graham, Greenlee, Apache, and Navajo Counties.

First I'd like to speak to the congressional districts. And this will be consistent with earlier comments that have been provided, for example, by Supervisor Tommie Martin or Supervisor Richard Lunt from Greenlee County, so it's not original in that regard. You've heard them from somebody before.

And I -- following the chairperson's -- she had the same idea. I laid out my comments in terms of problems, and what I see, and then solutions, ways to fix what I identify as problems.

First, with congressional district, you split Gila County into two congressional districts, one and four. And I don't know if that was just making the numbers work or what, but there seems to be no other justification for this. So we would like to have Gila County kept whole.

It's not a lot of people, but it's important.

You also made CD 1 a so-called border district.

But in looking at the map, about the only illegal border crossers there are the four legged variety of interest to Arizona Game and Fish Department.

There is no official border crossing as with the other border districts. So we think that -- it looked like,
in my opinion, a little bit of gerrymandering there to grab this being Douglas. But that's just the way the map looked perhaps to me.

On your October 1st of proposed CDs, you only had CD 1 just about right. It was rural, mainly. And we appreciate that. All you had to do then was just maybe tinker with Gila River Indian Reservation and bring that in to accommodate some interests. And we recognize that.

But, what happened was that a large portion of urban Pinal County was included instead in the proposed map.

Urban Pinal County is really bedroom suburbs of Phoenix metropolitan area. All you have to do is look at the traffic on Maricopa Road going outbound to Phoenix in the morning and inbound to Maricopa in the evening to confirm that.

The same with some of the other areas in Pinal County.

So there may be a logical reason to split that county into rural, urban, reservation, non-reservation. But the way you did it for CD 1 at present, I think you did an injustice to the good work you had already done with CD 1.

As far as CD 4, the other rural district -- and, again, I'm being consistent. We call for two rural districts. We -- EACO presented maps showing two rural districts, so this is not a new concept.
We also had rural district CD 4 being rural. And we thought, again, you were having a good start with it on your October 1st version of the map.

And you're almost there, and we would like to see that followed through.

Okay. Those are the problems.

The solutions are very simple. Consolidate Gila County and put it in CD 1.

Go back and keep CD 1 rural.

There's approximately 1.5 million Arizonans who choose to live in non-metropolitan areas.

We know ruralness is not a constitutional requirement, but it's a lifestyle choice by a large number of Arizonans, and we think they should be respected.

Similarly, keep CD 4 rural. And you're almost there.

And finally make CD 1 a real border district, not just a token border district the way it is now, in name only.

Madam Chair, I realize my time is up, but since I'm representing five counties, if I could move on to the legislative districts, I would appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Go ahead.

LARRY STEPHENSON: Thank you.

In the legislative districts, you split
Gila County into three legislative districts, 6, 7, and 8.

What is it about Gila County? Is it the sacrifice county on which to be split, the way you split with the congressional districts?

Second, you put Greenlee County in with the Navajo, Hopi, and Apache tribes.

They have little or no interaction with those communities to the north.

There's, for example, very little, if any, commerce or trade.

The only route is the tortuous mountainous route, a couple hours up through the White Mountains. So it's not a -- it's not really connected.

I know on the map it is, but it's not really connected.

So we see that as a problem.

You have also in the legislative district proposal split Graham County in two, and have not kept Graham and Greenlee Counties together. Two counties which have a lot of similarities in terms of jobs, commerce, similar economics, such as mining and agriculture.

These two counties have cooperated in the past in county services. They rely on one another, probably because Greenlee County is a much smaller county and was really a spin off of Graham County years ago.
And there's a history of cooperation there. So these two counties are probably more intertwined than any two in the state, and I would suggest keeping them together. We appreciate what you tried to do with LD 7 and make it predominantly a Native American district, but, again, do not add little Greenlee County with their less than 10,000 population just to make the numbers work. And as far as Apache County goes, I'm sure you will hear from them when you reach Springerville and Eager. The proposed solutions, Madam Chair, Commissioner Freeman, are relatively simple. Oh, man, I missed, I missed one problem. I'm sorry.

And that's that you've split Navajo County three ways. And we would suggest that that's not a logical split, and so we think maybe a two-way split, but not a three-way split. So, the solutions are to consolidate the non-reservation portions of Graham, Greenlee, and Gila County into a single LD.

They have a definite community of interest in their -- with their similar rural and natural resource based economies, mining, grazing, forestry, and agriculture, and so on.
Secondly, if you would adjust the boundary for LD 6 to drop out the Gila County portion, and then to include the remainder of the southern portion of Gila -- I mean, Navajo County. So Navajo County is then split only once.

Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to enter these comments into the record. And I'll answer any questions if there are any.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you. Any questions?

LARRY STEPHENSON: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I appreciate your suggestions. If you want to, yeah, give them to me, and we'll enter them into the record.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Shirley Dye, representing self, from northern Arizona.

SHIRLEY DYE: Hello again.

Shirley Dye, D-Y-E, from Payson, Arizona.

You've heard a lot from me over the past week. And I really don't know what else to say, except to say that I think probably the main thing that has caused problems with rural Arizona is that everybody wanted to have two rural districts.

And based on what the result is, that, that has really turned out to be a huge problem, because the land
mass of rural Arizona, the people are so sparse in so many places, it makes it really difficult, and very, very spread out.

One, one problem that you recall that I had with this is trying to put all the tribes into one congressional district, including even going so far as to go south down to pick up the Gila River tribe, which is down -- the big casino down there southwest of metro Phoenix, down near Maricopa.

You already had a district before that was about 50 percent Native American.

And yet you have packed this district now, in trying to be rural, you've packed it up to like 67 percent or something like that.

I don't have all of the -- all the things.

But the main thing is the White Mountain Apaches had respectfully requested not to be with the Navajo. And you had heard from Mr. Titla the other day that the San Carlos Apaches were not decided, because they are so split.

There are many of us in Gila County and the old LD 5 people that have talked to many of the San Carlos Apaches, and they're definitely split. A lot of them do not want to go with the Navajos.

And yet you put both of those tribes in that
district.

To me, if we would go back to one rural district and one river district, and not try to make the river districts and something else, you know, I just don't know. We're not happy with this map here in northeastern Arizona. Okay?

As far as the legislative district map goes, I suppose Payson should be happy in that for legislative -- or for congressional district they're with Flagstaff, although we have no communities of interest with them.

And for the congressional district, we're with Prescott, Yavapai, Bullhead City, Lake Havasu, and all of that, which we don't have any communities of interest with, and yet you split us so that we're going to be voting for a congressman in one totally different congressional district, and then having, and then having a different legislative district than all of our buddies that we have common interests with and whose topics of interest of the people that should be representing them are going to be totally skewed.

How is a person from Bullhead City or Lake Havasu supposed to represent the high country of Payson, when the high country of Yavapai is a totally different kind of high country?

Or how come -- how is a Native American
representative going to represent the kinds of communities of interest of rural Arizona?

And, you know, my thing about our resources, we have been working very, very, very hard to get mining back in rural Arizona, to get cattle back in rural Arizona, because there's proof positive that they help the soil, they help the forest, to work on the Four Forest Restoration Initiative, which we tried so hard for years and years, and the environmentalists have thwarted us, and that's why we had the huge, big Wallow Fire is because we couldn't -- we've been working for years and years on that.

And now, if we have, as I said before, dear old Raul Grijalva, from down in the Tucson area, who used to serve and thwart us on the congressional natural resources, and when he was finally in 2010 taken off as the head of that, we've finally been able to make progress, and now he's got somebody all lined up to be a congressman for this district to fight us on everything that we've accomplished over the years.

And to me that sucks.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is George Demack, representing self, from Gila County.

GEORGE DEMACK: Because -- good evening all.

Because of an inability of the Commission to provide proper
maps and instructions on how to use the maps, I am not prepared to make an argument this evening.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Would you like to spell your name for the record though?

GEORGE DEMACK: It's D-E-M-A-C-K.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Elizabeth Ann Silcock, from Payson.

ELIZABETH ANN SILCOCK: My name is Elizabeth Ann Silcock. I live in Payson, Arizona.

And I don't represent a group. I represent myself, as a voter. And hopefully speak for some of the other voters that aren't speaking tonight.

Madam Chairman and the Commission, we appreciate your letting us finally have a voice.

I have -- I wrote down just a small, little comment, because I knew that other people here would probably comment on what I wanted to talk about, plus.

I think that the Commission has not gotten the rural redistricting correct. We don't want to be split up. We don't want to lose our congressman. We don't want to have the Indian tribes that we love be divided, because they are, and they'll be more divided by you grouping them all together.
Another thing is that our main thing in rural Arizona, which has no connection with Flagstaff or Yavapai County, is ranching, timber, and mining, which provides us a good tax base. And as far as I'm concerned, I might be off base saying this, but it looks like we've been gerrymandered so that the Republicans are cut out.

And I do not like that.

I've lived here over 30 years now, and I think that we have more of an insight, the people that live here in this county, than you do, because, I don't know, do you all live here in this county?

Probably Tucson and Phoenix.

So, anyway, I hope that all of you have abided by the open meeting law and not done anything that is going to cause a lawsuit or the Justice Department not to accept your map.

I personally like option one, 8A, not the one you put together that cut us all apart.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Don Ascoli, representing self, from Gila.

DON ASCOLI: Good evening, Madam Chair, commissioners. Don Ascoli, A-S-C-O-L-I, from Payson, Arizona.
I've been before your group before, and I got to, again, point out on the presentation the gentleman gave at the beginning, slide number three, what are the guidelines of Prop 106.

First to, A, must comply with the U.S. Constitution, Voting Rights Act, and, B, equal population.

Those are federally mandated as you note. And to the extent practical, compact and contiguous.

D, respect communities of interest. E, use visible geographical features, city, town, county boundaries, and undivided census tracts.

And I don't know where you don't get it. It says it right here. That's what you need to do.

I wish your technical officer had the ability to take the old boundaries -- I'm sorry, take the boundaries of rural metro equity map mod three, which is drawn to achieve two minority districts, two real rural CD districts, and three real rural or border districts on the south of our state.

Instead, you moved that around -- this is one of the proposals -- to what we've got now, this map. And if we could morph the two boundaries, you could see this has gone
the wrong way.

I don't know what Payson and Gila County has to do
with Lake Havasu City, Parker, or Yuma. It just has nothing
to do with those parts.

We have been a solid rural district for ten years.
The counties up here are working more together than they
ever have.

The first speaker representing five of those
counties brought that to your attention.

And yet you seem to negate that and go twist the
boundaries to where it's meeting some other agenda than
being contiguous, community of interest, and not splitting
up the counties.

I'm not representing any organization per se, but
one of the functions I serve on is the chairman of the
Gila County Planning and Zoning Commission.

We work very hard to keep this county -- do things
together as a county.

Yeah, we have differences.

I think there's differences in Maricopa County.

And there's differences in Coconino.

And we are a county.

And we govern that way, and yet this map for CD
splits our county up.

Now, unfortunately when you go to the legislative
district side, the travesty is worse. Because you split
Gila County into three pieces.

We are a small county.

And when you split it into three pieces like you
have on this map you're presenting, we're going to have
three different groups of legislators, of which Gila County
is going to be a little bitty part of their district.

What clout, what kind of representation can we
have as a county when we got three different arms that go
after, or three different heads?

It's wrong.

You violated the very rules that you said, compact
and contiguous, respect communities of interest, and use
visible geographic features, city, town, and county
boundaries. You've violated them all, your own rules.

I took a look at the analysis, the option one
versus two that you were considering on the legislative map.

And I am going to repeat this for the benefit of
folks here, because you already heard me say this last
Thursday.

In the option you've chosen, you've taken
12 counties -- 12 rural out of 15 counties, and split up
eight of them.

Where if you had gone with option one, which has
the favor of the majority of people in the rural counties,
only five of the 12 rural districts would have been split. So what you've done is you took Cochise County and split it from one -- instead of being in one LD district, it's in two.

You took Gila County, which was in one district, and put it in three.

You took Graham County, which was in one, and took it to two.

You took La Paz, split it, put it in two.

You talk Yuma and split it in two.

So we've got now eight counties with different heads.

Just like a company, a company works when you have one CEO.

A county works better if it can direct its effort and its interface with a legislative group, a team of a senator and two state reps.

Splitting us into three, you've made our task three times more difficult by doing that.

So I respectfully request you go back and get it right.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Robert Hershberger, representing self, from Payson.
ROBERT HERSHEYBERGER: Good evening. My name is Robert Hershberger, H-E-R-S-H-B-E-R-G-E-R.

I just wanted to take a moment to thank you all as volunteers for the arduous -- arduous work that you've been doing.

We appreciate your spending time and energy that you have, and we appreciate that you're listening to people's comments.

I do think there is some community of interest in four, when you put Payson, a retirement community and a resort community, together with Prescott and with Sedona, and even with places like Bullhead City and the like.

So there isn't a total lack of community of interest there, though I respect what people have said in terms of keeping Gila County together too.

I might say that the way this map is drawn for the congressional district, it almost assures that no Democrat will be elected to take congressional office in District 4.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Paul LaBonte from Payson.

PAUL LaBONTE: This is my first -- this -- my name is Paul LaBonte, L-A, capital B-O-N-T-E, LaBonte.

This is my first time attending a meeting like this here.
And I'm very disappointed in everybody here.

First of all, you show all these pictures of these maps up on there. They all have numbers, one, two, three, four, five.

You hand me this paper, and you look at it and say, okay, we're going to -- October the 1st map.

And I am looking all over for October the 1st map. I cannot find where it says October the 1st on any of them.

I can't find where it says AA1 on any of these maps so I can follow along here.

I can't find anything. So all I'm going to do is sit there and listen, not sure what areas you're talking about on these maps.

And I think, when I finally did find the correct map that I'm supposed to be looking at, it looks like somebody took an egg, threw it up against the map, and said that's what we want.

Because it's all chopped up.

You don't split counties. Nobody splits counties unless they're belong in a nut house, if you pardon the expression.

That's all I got to say.

The map stinks --

(Applause.)

PAUL LaBONTE: -- and we're trying to figure out
what map you're talking about. This is garbage. You should have just left them alone. You know.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

That was my last request to speak form. I'm not sure if there are others that I missed, if anyone else has some public comment for us.

If anyone would like to speak to us, please come up to the mic and then it will definitely go into the record.

Otherwise, I don't know, Commissioner Freeman, do you have anything that you would like to say?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thanks to you all for coming out.

Yes, I am from Phoenix.

My folks had a cabin up in Pinetop when I was growing up. I've been through Payson a lot of times. This is the route you go, no offense to Globe, but I would never -- we would never go that way.

I remember when there was the old Tastee-Freez on the main drag there. I never knew what happened to it, but we always used to stop there --

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's Dairy Queen now.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Is it?

Okay. It's a Dairy Queen. I'll hit it on the way
UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: You don't know anything about our town or county.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Not as much as you, sir. No question. But I do like to get up in the White Mountains, and I hunt and fish -- and if you could let me talk now, sir.

I just want to say thank you for coming out.

The maps that the Commission approved are draft maps, and it was made very clear by a number of commissioners that they were drafts. And that, I agree, that there needs to be changes to these maps.

And one of the points of the public comment period is to go get comments like you've given us tonight. And it's incumbent upon the Commission and all the commissioners to consider each and every comment and to go back when we go back to the final redraft and spend some time incorporating those comments and applying the six constitutional criteria before we vote on the final maps.

So I'm going to try to make -- I'm not going to be able to make it to all the hearings. I don't think any of the commissioners are. But I'm trying to make it to as many of them as possible, because it's really good to see to be -- to meet everyone in person, in the flesh so to speak, and not just watch it on the Internet. But I know that I'm
going to have to do that for some of these hearings to really get a flavor of what the people think about the maps. So thanks again for coming out tonight.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you. It looks like -- if other people, if you'd like to speak, if you want to come up to the microphone.

I know you filled our a request to speak form earlier, but please come up and...

Then we can all hear you.

ELIZABETH ANN SILCOCK: Elizabeth Ann Silcock. I just wanted to make a statement.

I'm the one that asked the interpreter to interpret that in English, because I looked around, and I didn't see anybody Hispanic in the group. And I was shushed, and I didn't appreciate that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

Any other comments?

Sir?

If you could fill that out for us, that would be great.

NORMAN WILKES: My name is Norman Wilkes, W-I-L-K-E-S. I also live in Payson.

My grandmother's been here since 1975.

I am happy finally to see -- I'll try to speak a little bit louder.
I am happy to finally see our three towns finally getting back together, and from what I've seen on this map is trying to split us apart again.

I would like -- I do appreciate what you guys are too trying to do, but please listen to us. We're just now getting Strawberry, Payson, and Pine back together, and we need to keep that going.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

(Applause.)

GEORGE DEMACK: Okay. George Demack here.

It would be vastly appreciated if, in producing these maps, if it was maybe stipulated somewhere on the home page of the Commission's website that -- how to use the maps that are there.

I went for a whole week looking at postage stamp size maps, and finally had to be told by a member of the Tea Party that you had to click on these maps and then you could enlarge them in that manner.

There were no instructions, I mean, on the pages about this.

It's a very simple thing, isn't it?

And maybe a bunch of confusing designators for the maps, how about putting a date along with each map as a designator.
I mean, the other thing is looking at these maps on this page here, I see a gray blue and a purplish blue. I don't know what's -- what that difference -- what it's trying to describe to me, that vague difference there.

Also, it would be nice -- we got Gila County, I guess, but is it too difficult to maybe put Highway 87 through there so we can orient ourselves from that? A few more highways would help.

You know, I live in Gisela. And that's the sticks.

I mean, there's only 500 of us, and no commercial entities at all. But, and I drive 20 miles each way to come to meetings like this.

Let's use a little imagination, rather than just seeing what we can get by without telling the public about.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

(Appause.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I have a couple more request to speak forms.

Bill Roehr from Gila. Thank you.

BILL ROEHR: I think my problems are -- I just want to introduce myself again. Bill Roehr. R-O-E-H-R is the last name.
I think what I'm upset about is about what a lot of others are on the maps. I can't find anything.

Payson isn't even on the map.

We think we're on the map, but you folks don't seem to think so.

And with Highway 87 drawn, nothing in the way of rivers. Where are these natural boundaries?

There's no way from these maps that we can tell really what's going on in any detail.

Can we do that on the computer? Can we blow it up and find all the features so we can see what's there?

I don't know.

Anyway, make it a little easier.

Another thing that's hard for us to follow, I'm sure you've used the ratio of Democrats to Republicans, you've played with minority groups and so on, but where's the data?

You've got some percentage -- I don't understand these charts.

How can we figure that? Can you walk us through some of these, tell us why this is here and what does it mean?

I know you're trying to get equal population. Hopefully it's not being skewed to favor one party or the other in the district.
But I'm sure in some cases it isn't going to come out equal and positive with all the criteria you've got going on.

So I'd like a little more in-depth information on this, if you will.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Jennifer LaBonte from Payson.

JENNIFER LaBONTE: My name is Jennifer LaBonte, L-A, capital B, as in boy, O-N-T as in Tom, E as in Edward.

I would like to ask you one question.

In what ways does your draft map comply with the Arizona Constitution?

That's all.

Would you answer that? Please.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

We can't answer directly right now, but at the end once everyone's spoken, we'll say a few more words about all that.

JENNIFER LaBONTE: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Kay Cool, representing self, from Payson.

KAY COOL: I want to thank you for coming to
Payson. I think we've got a pretty good turnout tonight. But one of the things that I'm finding difficult is a number of people didn't sign up to speak, and so as a Payson resident and a resident of Gila County, I would really like to know if the group of people who are here support your draft congressional and draft legislative maps. And I would like to ask you for a show of hands, of the audience, so all of us have some idea whether the people who have made the effort to attend and communicate with you support what you have put together, which from my perspective is really very confusing in terms of being contiguous and in terms of just representing what I have always found to be the type of geographical boundaries that the public understands.

So I'd like to have a show of hands of how many people do not support the maps. First the congressional map. How many people do not support the congressional map?

I'm not -- necessarily one to count them, but I would like you to know. How many people do not support the legislative map?

Virtually everyone.

Thank you very much, because I really want to -- (Applause.)
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Our next speaker is Janet Williams, representing self, from Payson.

JANET WILLIAMS: Hello. My name is Janet Williams.

My name is Janet Williams, representing myself.
I'm not clear on what competitiveness means. Can that be clarified?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We won't be able to talk.

JANET WILLIAMS: Pardon?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We're not supposed to address comments until the very end of the public comment period.
So we'll talk about that in a minute when you're done.

JANET WILLIAMS: All right.

So I'm looking at Congressional District 4.

I was wondering how you -- by making that the new congressional district, if you considered tax base, like property tax base, income levels, as far as employment goes.

I see that it goes all the way up to the Indian reservation in the northwestern part of the state and all the way down practically to the border on the southwest part of the state.

Lifestyles in Lake Havasu City, also the Indian reservation, are not equal or -- I don't know if equal is the right word, but mesh with the lifestyle that we have here in Payson and surrounding areas.
Let's see.
Lifestyle, the same thing.
There's a huge mix of lifestyle, income, property, tax, employment in this whole congressional district that's not going to be able to be equally represented.

On the, on the number four on your Power Point, it says the presence of discrimination can be determined by analyzing population data and election results.

It appears to me that the way that this has been -- this map is redistricting is discriminatory to working people and property tax -- people that pay property taxes, because we are now going to be included in a huge base of people that are not going to be equal or the same as what would represent our district as it is, or drawn up now in our legislative district.

That's it.
And I also don't understand compactness.
So if you can explain those to me.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great. Thank you. We will.
(Applause.)
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'd ask Mr. Drechsler to pull up the presentation again, because I think it would be helpful for Commissioner Freeman and I to just talk to you a little bit about these different criteria and how this map that you see tonight came to be.
And if you could go back to the page that has the criteria listed.

Thank you.

So, as you can see we've carved up the state in a way that obviously you're not happy with in Gila County and some of the other counties.

And let me tell you a little bit about that process as to how it happened.

We have to comply with the U.S. Constitution and the Voting Rights Act. That's just a fact of life here in Arizona, that we need to comply with that. And, and we'll talk about what that means.

In fact, our legal counsel is very well versed in the Voting Rights Act and can explain that in a very cogent way better than I can do it.

The other federally mandated criteria is equal population. So that means, for the congressional side, we have nine districts, because we got a new one this year due to population growth in the state.

So we used to have eight. We have nine now.

Each of those nine districts has to have 710,000 people in it.

They just take the total population of Arizona and divide by nine, and it's 710,000.

So, one of the things we heard in our first round
of public hearings is how people in rural counties would like to keep them rural.

And you guys have different needs and need special representation that -- people who really understand your needs. And to the extent possible, we wanted to create two rural districts.

And that has been proved to be very challenging, because what it does is when you go try to find 710,000 people to fill a district in a rural area, you got to go really far and wide to be able to do that.

And so it really flies in the face of compact and contiguous, because it's such a broad area you have to cover to find 710,000 rural people.

And all the commissioners, we were challenged in a huge way because we wanted to keep districts -- a couple districts as rural as possible, and that Eastern Counties Organization map was a big inspiration for us in what we wanted to try to do.

But it really proved difficult in trying to find 710,000 people without having -- without going into places like Pinal County or Maricopa and touching some of that to pull population so that we could get enough people into the district.

Because we've got to have each of the nine districts have that number, 710,000.
So that's why one of those, two of them really, are very -- the river district, as we call it, and then the rural district in the east, is -- they're giant areas. And we realize that, and so they're not compact.

They may be contiguous, but they're not compact. That's for sure.

And so that's been a big challenge for us.

So if there are ways we can do that better where we can keep those two areas as rural as possible but still meet that population requirement, we would.

Respect communities of interest. That's something that's very important to all of us.

And let me just also say about all these criteria before I go into communities of interest.

Each of these criteria is to be weighed equally. Even though they're in an order up here, it doesn't mean that compact and contiguous is more important than competitiveness or anything else on the list.

They're all to be weighed equally by the commissioners in terms of when they're drawing these districts.

So respect communities of interest.

And we heard a lot in our public hearings in the first round about communities of interest. And ruralness, for instance, is one of them.
That's a major one here.

We know though that in creating districts of 710,000 people, we can't have homogenous districts. We're trying to the extent possible, but it's really impossible with balancing all of these other criteria.

So what we're trying not to do is split communities of interest.

That would be -- and that's what we don't want to do is split them.

We will have multiple communities of interest though in one district. There's no way to have a homogenous one. Maybe in central Phoenix you can do that, because the population is so dense and it's urban. But, otherwise, it's very difficult to do.

So what we're trying to do is not divide communities of interest to the extent practicable.

But, each congressional district, and in some cases some of the legislative districts, contain multiple communities of interest that are all part of it.

We're supposed to use visible geographic features, city, town, and county boundaries, and undivided census tracts, to the extent practicable.

That's another thing that kind of flies in the face of some of the other criteria.

Because sometimes when you're respecting
communities of interest -- and I can give you an example if
you know southern Arizona at all. There's a -- right
outside of Pima County, there's a retirement community
called Saddlebrooke. And it's a little bump on the map that
some of the -- the maps you'll see.

   It's in Pinal County. But it views itself as
being tied with other communities of interest in that
golfing community of Marana and Oro Valley. And so it -- so
those three communities would like to stay together, and
they're very similar types of population that would benefit
from common representation.

   And so -- they're -- but they're in Pinal County.
They're not in Pima County.

   So to keep those communities of interest together,
we have to cross a county line.

   And so oftentimes we are breaking county lines,
and that happens many times with the Indian reservations as
well and in other situations too.

   So that's -- it's just to kind of give you an
example of the way these criteria kind of compete with each
other.

   It's quite a puzzle and a challenge to try to
bring them all together, but we need to weigh them all
equally.

   Finally, competitive districts, and Ms. Williams I
think asked about that, and you'll see in your packet some charts that have a lot of information in them.

Competitiveness is one of them.

And I think each of the commissioners frankly have -- has different definitions of competitiveness. It's kind of in the eye of the beholder.

To me, competitiveness means that there's no inherent built-in advantage of either Republicans or Democrats in a given party.

So it's like a 50/50 split.

And on election day, a candidate from either major party has an equal shot at winning based on a number of things, prior election turnouts -- you know, prior election results, I should say. And also some people look at voter registration, how many percent R's, D's, and I's do you have in a given district.

There are numerous ways to measure it. And the Commission has at its fingertips now the results from the '08 and '10 elections, 2008 and 2010 elections. And different indices have been created to help us measure competitiveness based on those election years.

We're in the process this month of getting '04 and '06 data, 2004 and 2006 data as well, so that we can add to our database and look back even further, and see, you know, how do those numbers and how do those election results
impact the competitiveness of some of these districts that we've drawn. And that will help us determine if we think a, you know, a district is fairly divided or not.

And so we're still, you know, measuring that. And you'll see on your -- in your packet, it's called Commission approved congressional draft map compactness and competitiveness measures.

There are three compactness measures listed first, and then the rest of them are all competitiveness, and also show you voter registration data for each of the districts as they're currently drawn.

On compactness, these three different measures -- apparently there are hundreds. I think I've heard our mapping consultant, Mr. Strasmas, tell us there are numerous ways to measure compactness.

These are three different ways to measure them currently. And, and it's really just information to help us try to make good decisions.

And if anybody has anything they'd like to add to this discussion, you'd be welcome to.

Anything on the Voting Rights Act, Mary, that you'd like to tell people about so they understand Voting Rights Act a little more?

MARY O'GRADY: Well, as I said in the, in the presentation, we're covered by Section 5 in of the
Voting Rights Act, so we have special responsibilities in Arizona regarding compliance with the Voting Rights Act. And we have to make sure that these plans don't have retrogression, which means that the minority voters aren't any worse off when we're done than they were before.

And to make that analysis, we have to look at what they call our benchmark districts. So we look at our current legislative districts and see where the minority voters had an opportunity to elect candidates of their choice.

And then when we redraw the lines, we have to make sure that we maintain those benchmark districts if at all possible.

And in Arizona, the challenge in rural Arizona is traditionally Arizona has had one Native American district in northeastern Arizona on our legislative districts that includes mostly the Navajo -- Navajo Nation.

And in maintaining that Native American voting rights district, this, this draft map includes -- expands that area to include the Apache reservations as well, which I think was one of the things mentioned in terms of what impact that has on eastern Arizona.

But the reason for that was to maintain that, as our responsibility under the Voting Rights Act, as an effective voting rights district.
Right now the current Legislative District 2 that is the Native American voting rights district has about 59 percent Native American voting age population. So we needed to construct a district that maintained that level of voting strength.

And, frankly, we couldn't -- had not yet developed a way to do that without including the Apache tribes in that district.

And we did hear from the San Carlos Apache this week that they were supportive of that change, being included with the Navajo.

We haven't heard anything further specific on this draft from the White Mountain Apache, but we're hopeful in public comment we will get that information as well.

But the Commission has had to spend a lot of time studying how to make sure that we do comply with the Voting Rights Act when also factoring in all those other factors that, that the chair discussed that we have to comply with.

Also on congressional districts we have to get right on the number in terms of equal population.

And so sometimes that's difficult as well, because you have to make sure that we are precisely 710,000, within a person or so.

And so sometimes you might see some funny looking
lines, that they are to obtain that population equally that we're required to do so.

And these are draft maps.

Again, as part of our process, getting input and then coming back and considering all that, plus the additional analysis and coming up with final maps that hopefully will be approved and legal so that we have lines that comply with all legal requirements come 2012.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you, Mary.

I was just seeing if we have Internet in the room just to go to our website, but I don't think we do.

I don't think we have access.

ELIZABETH ANN SILCOCK: Hi. Elizabeth Ann Silcock again. I mentioned in my talk option one 8A.

Now, common sense tells me that when you have option two up there, that you've already made up your mind about it. And I would like to see option one 8A, and I would like to know when -- I know you said October the 3rd. Was it changed at the meeting, or was it changed before the meeting? And if it was changed before the meeting, or put together over the weekend from Friday, were any of the open meeting laws violated?

And I think all of you know that Arizona gets sued by the Justice Department every time we have to redistrict. I know you have legal counsel here.
Is our redistricting going to be written so that we don't get sued and the taxpayers have to pay to sue ourselves?

(Applause.)

ANDREW DRECHSLER: So we want to just look at the website. This is azredistricting.org.

We go down to the bottom. You'll see two different maps, the legislative and the congressional map.

If you click on either, it will bring you to this page.

And there's a number of different formats.

Individuals around the state have asked for a number of different formats.

The one that we highlighted in the presentation was the Google map.

Clicking on that, you'll bring up a Google map. And what this allows you to do is move in, and we can zoom in right here on Payson.

And you can see Payson sort of in the center here. And it shows the districts, the district lines. It will allow you to zoom out to see what is part of the district and what is not part of the district.

And you can see -- basically go into other parts of the state.

Over here you can turn off the other districts.
We're in District 6 for the draft map, so you have the ability to turn off all the other colors just to see it a little bit clearer.

Sorry.

If you go down to the bottom part, you can turn off the other -- the colors, so you can see just your district and a little bit more clear.

So you see here -- this is one of the ways is the map here.

Somebody in the front row here wanted to see the other maps and then somebody was asking where these other maps are.

Throughout the process, if you go to the maps, there were a number of what-if scenarios that were drawn. If you go into the what-if, you will see all the maps that were considered as part of the process, including option 8A, I believe.

So that's just a quick overview of how you can get to the maps and weigh in.

I just want to point out --

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Are you able to show those two next to each, that option, versus the one that's been approved by the Commission?

ANDREW DRECHSLER: I am not. But if you go on to the website and want to look at this and afterwards go to
the public input form, you're able to give your comments, and that will be part of the consideration and deliberation of what changes are going to be made for the final maps.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Excuse me, regarding the public input form, a number of us up here -- people have been talking to me, when you get down to the bottom of the captcha, and it's real clear, and you write down the captcha, and you hit submit, it keeps coming back with another captcha, and kept saying bad captcha, bad captcha, bad captcha, and finally you get up and walk away and it never sends.

How many of you tried doing that and it wouldn't work?

So there's a lot of lost public comments that you would have gotten.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: The security code we're talking about.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: It keeps coming back saying invalid captcha.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any ideas on what might cause that, Buck?

(Unidentified various comments.)

ANDREW DRECHSLER: We're sorry there was an error but it seems to be working now.

And, again, the number is here on the website. If
you do have problems, feel free to call us. Up on top you will see the toll free number as well, 855-redistrict.

855-redistrict.

And if you have any problems with the website, feel free to give us a call and alert us of that.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thanks, Andrew.

Well -- oh.

Thank you. Please come up.

PAUL LABONTE: My name is Paul LaBonte again.

Let me see if I understand this, because I really don't.

On each one of these different colors, you want 710,000 people?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: On, sorry, on the legislative one, it's 213,000.

PAUL LABONTE: I don't know what I'm showing you, because, like I said, I don't understand these maps because you don't --

ANDREW DRECHSLER: The title is right on them.

The title is on the top of the page, so it's either the congressional or the legislative.

PAUL LABONTE: Like I say, why don't you number them, then if you turn to map number five, I can turn to map number five on the paper, and I will know which map you're
talking about.

So, sure, you guys know. You work with them every day.

You know.

So I don't. I'm looking at this map because I can't figure out which map you're talking about. You know.

So, to me it's a waste of a day, and I should have stayed home and kicked my dogs around.

But if you're saying that each county or so is supposed to have that many people now, I'm going to say according to this, because I'm looking at it, Scottsdale doesn't have more than 710,000 people in it.

You've got Gila County split into three, three accordion stations.

My God, I don't think any of them -- I can't see where any of them has got the amount that you want. You know.

Like I said before, I think you threw an egg at a wall -- at an Arizona map and said that was it, because I can't see any rhyme or reason to your map on this particular one. You know.

But I don't -- I can't read these maps. Because if you would have numbered them for me, I could follow along.

You have them numbered on the screen.
You could've put them up on the screen for us to see as you were talking about each one, but nobody thought of that.

May I ask how many of you people live in the rural areas? Or are you all from Phoenix and Scottsdale?

I'm going to presume you are all from the city, so you don't know the problems we have up here, and you're trying to tell us how to live and what we should do.

You're wrong.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Do you have anything you want to add, Mary?

MARY O'GRADY: No.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Anything else from anyone?

Okay. Well, we really appreciate all of you taking time out of your evening to come and talk to us tonight, and look forward to -- I hope you'll continue to participate in the process, and follow us. And you can watch other venues too, other cities across the state too on their hearings, because those are also going to be online recorded so that anyone can watch any hearing that they want to see.

And I am sorry, Mr. Ascoli.

DON ASCOLI: Madam Chairman, I think that there
was -- I think there was another question. I think the question came up, where is the constitutionality behind the grid map, I believe was the question. Where in the Constitution you use that.

(Unidentified various comments.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, the grid map.

DON ASCOLI: I think we want an answer to that one.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's how we -- the grid map -- the question is what happened to the grid map.

And I don't know if that's in the presentation still or not, but that's how we started the whole process.

Arizona's -- through Proposition 106, the requirement is that unfortunately we can't just tweak the districts as they currently reside. We have to start from a clean slate.

And so a grid map, is what it's called, needs to be created that has equal population in each of the nine districts and created in a grid-like pattern across the state. So it's almost like putting a tic tac toe board across the state onto the map and making sure that there's equal population in each of those nine cells.

And that's how we started the process.

And did you show the grid maps as part of your presentation?
ANDREW DRECHSLER: Yes, it's in the presentation, and this is the grid map pulled up.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So the grid map got generated, and it was in the presentation that Andrew gave. And from there we adjust the boundaries according to the six constitutional criteria that we're following.

So, trying to see if the... If you could pull it up on your presentation, just to show them what the grid map looked like.

(Brief pause.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So here is what the congressional grid map looked like.

You can see it started down -- and we flipped a coin actually to determine where to start in the state, so that there would be no bias in terms of, you know, starting in a certain area that would impact the grid a certain way.

So we flipped a coin, and it came out that we would start down there in Cochise. And you can see the one, two, three, and it went in a clockwise fashion around the state to create the nine districts.

And that's all the grid map does, though, is it meets the equal population requirement. It's not adjusted at all to meet any of the other criteria that we have to follow.

So it's just the starting point for the whole
UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can you bring up option one and show us?
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure, we can.
THE WITNESS: Good. I'd like the group to see it.
ANDREW DRECHSLER: And, again, all of these options -- again, all of these options and all of these maps are on the website. And here's -- I'm sorry, you want grid map option one or --
UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Option one 8A.
ANDREW DRECHSLER: Okay.
MARY O'GRADY: And if it's helpful while he pulls that up, the legal concern about that was the benchmark issue with the Native American district. Because it didn't reach the benchmark.
And that was the legal problem there.
UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Benchmark of what?
MARY O'GRADY: Within the Native American district, getting up to 59 percent Native American population. It was at 52 percent. And so the concern was whether it would have a retrogressive effect on the Native American district and whether it would cause us not to get preclearance.
That's, that's the legal issue of concern.
(Brief pause.)
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: If you have comments, please come up to the microphone and identify yourself so that our court reporter can get an accurate transcript. Thank you.

SHIRLEY DYE: Shirley Dye, Payson.

The map that they're talking about is -- this is option one, version 8A.

This is option two, version 8A.

At the beginning of last week, at the beginning of last week they decided they were going to merge these two versions.

This one was prepared by Mr. Freeman, the Republican. And this one was prepared by Mrs. McNulty, the Democrat on the team.

And then so they decided to merge them together.

They already had on 8A -- I mean, option one, the statistic for number seven, District 7, was 52.05 percent Native American.

So they already had a minority-majority district there that they could add to all their other ones and still have the nine that they were looking for, but they decided they would steal these people down here and pack it in.

That's my thoughts anyhow.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Ms. Williams.

JANET WILLIAMS: My name is Janet Williams.
My question is if in Congressional District 4, if we now have 59 percent Native American representation -- is that correct? Is that what you just said?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Go ahead, Mary.

MARY O'GRADY: Those comments were as to the legislative district configuration, not for the congressional district configuration.

JANET WILLIAMS: What do we have for congressional?

MARY O'GRADY: Congressional, we don't currently have a majority Native American district.

Our voting rights districts on the congressional side, there's only one in urban Maricopa County and then there's one in southern and southeastern Arizona.

So there's not a voting rights district per se, majority-minority district, in northeastern Arizona or eastern Arizona.

JANET WILLIAMS: Okay. But, still the question remains in a legislative district, the percentage of people that would be filing federal income taxes, paying property taxes, employment, and how we could be fairly represented legislatively or congressionally.

Because the percentages would be, would be skewed as far as representation goes.

That's my comment.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.
Okay. Is there anyone else who would like to say anything?

Shirley, Ms. Dye.

SHIRLEY DYE: Shirley Dye, Payson.
To follow up on what Janet just said, the people in Flagstaff, the conservative people in Flagstaff are having a huge problem.

They did not want to be with the Native Americans like they were before, because the Native Americans decided they want their own health care clinic, because the ones in Flagstaff, I guess, weren't good enough for them.

And so their legislator decided without telling Flagstaff that they were just going to get their own health care clinic. And so they raised all of Flagstaff's taxes 16 percent to get that, and just did it.

And this is what everybody else in the legislative district as it is now is because -- and I want you to know, again I say, I am not a prejudiced person.

We work with the Tonto Apache tribe here and the San Carlos tribe and the White Mountain tribe. We have three tribes in our current legislative district and in our county.

And if we pick up that other thing, we'll have the Camp Verde Apaches too.
We do not mind having Native Americans in our
district.

But when you take the whole thing and you take all
of it all the way around for a congressional district, and
then those same people you put in and disenfranchise a whole
lot of the people that are taxpayers, you know, that's a
problem.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any other comments?

Okay. Well, again, we really appreciate you all
coming out tonight and taking time out of your lives to talk
to us about all this.

We will definitely be taking it all into account
as we go across the state. And we just started last night,
so we've got another 24 locations or so to hit.

But we appreciate you participating so early in
the process too, and we'll be adjusting things as we move
forward -- I'm sorry?

You do. There's a list of all of the venues.
It's in the back of the packet.

Oh, it's in the back of the room. Sorry.

There's a whole list, and on the website, so you
can see where we're headed next and follow us on the
Internet.

And with that, I appreciate everyone's help
tonight, the staff and team here.

   It's 7:45 p.m., and I declare this hearing adjourned.

   (Whereupon, the meeting adjourned.)
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