P R O C E E D I N G S

(Whereupon, the public session commences.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: This hearing of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission will come to order.

The time is 6:09 p.m., and we are on the record.

Today is October the 18th, and we are in Chandler, Arizona.

Please rise with me to recite the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, thank you all for coming tonight.

Can everyone hear me?

Okay.

Tonight we're here -- this is part -- a hearing as part of the round two of the Commission's public comment hearing.

We're here to get the public's input on two draft maps that the Commission has published, one for congressional map, one for legislative maps.
If you would like to speak and address the Commission tonight, you can fill out one of these yellow request to speak forms, they should be in the back, and get them to one of our staff members, and they'll bring it up here, and you can speak.

There are also packets available in the back that you all should have received.

In the back of the packet there is this blue form. If you don't want to speak but still want to get your comments to the Commission, you can fill out these forms, turn them in. They will become a part of the record, and the Commission will see it.

Or you can fill them out later and mail them in to us.

Let me, before we get any further, make some introductions. With me tonight is Commissioner Linda McNulty, who's here tonight.

The other commissioners, our chair, Colleen Mathis, and Vice-Chair Jose Herrera and Commissioner Rick Stertz are not here, but the Commission is sort of -- since we have 26 hearings to conduct over a short period of time, we're sort of dividing up the task.

Tonight's hearing is live streamed on the Internet, and I know the other commissioners are watching live the proceedings.
I know I haven't been able to make quite all of them, but I've watched them all either from my office or from my home.

So your comments will be heard by all the commissioners.

Also here tonight is counsel for the Commission, Mary O'Grady.

Our mapping consultant, Andrew Drechsler.

Our court reporter is here, taking down everything that is said, Marty Herder.

And we also have our assistant executive director, Kristina Gomez, with us tonight.

And two of our staff members I think are on the outside, Shane Shields and Karen Herman.

If you have any questions or want to get those forms in, you can find any one of our staff is here to help you out.

Also tonight federal law requires that we make translation services available to anyone that needs them, and I am going to invite our interpreter, Carlos Reyes, to come up to the microphone. And he's going to read an announcement in English and Spanish offering those services.

CARLOS REYES: Good evening, Madam Chair -- Vice-Chair Freeman and commissioners, ladies and gentlemen.

In accordance with the Voting Rights Act, a
translator and interpreter will be available at all the public hearings in order to provide translating and interpreting services that might be needed for those citizens that need translating or interpreting services. Please contact the translator and/or interpreter present at the meeting so that he or she can assist you.

Now I'll read it in Spanish.

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

CARLOS REYES: Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you, Carlos.

And then before we get too far along, I'd like to invite Mayor Tibshraeny to come to the podium and just give us some words of welcome as well.

MAYOR JAY TIBSHRAENY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As you mentioned, I am the mayor of your host city. I'm Jay Tibshraeny. Welcome to Chandler.

We're pleased to host one of your public hearings of the draft maps. This is a perfect opportunity for the city of Chandler to showcase our new city hall and our council chambers. We're happy to have this location available for the public to use to participate in their government, in this government function that's going on tonight.

I do want to enter introduce some council members
that are with me tonight.

I have Vice Chair Trinity Donovan with me, Councilmember Rick Heumann, Councilmember Kevin Hartke, Councilmember Jack Sellers, and Councilmember Jeff Weninger.

Also in the audience tonight is a couple of our justices of the peace. We have Sam Goodman, justice of the peace and Keith Frankel, justice of the peace.

I will be brief.

I want to express my appreciation for the work that the Commission has done. Redistricting is no easy task, but it's a critically important task, and it's a thankless job.

Your work will have a profound impact on the quality of elected representation of our citizens for the next decade.

The City of Chandler has been actively involved in this process, and we are pleased with the legislative map.

The two districts for Chandler, and, again, I'm speaking to Chandler's interest tonight, the two districts that you have drafted will ensure that Chandler has a fair chance of being well represented at the legislature. And that's all we can ask.

So we do like the legislative layout for the city of Chandler.

We are also looking at the competitive
1 congressional districts.

2 And while the map is okay, we think it would be better if all of Chandler was in the competitive district.
3 I've heard from citizens that would prefer to be in a competitive district, all of the competitive district.

4 But, again, we think it's okay the way it is, but it would be much better if Chandler was put into the competitive district and all of Chandler.

5 So I know from this vantage point your work on the Commission may seem to be a thankless task, probably because it is a thankless task, and because of all the criticism you're hearing. One thing about criticism, it means people on both sides of the equation aren't necessarily happy with what's going on, and that's not necessarily a bad thing when you're trying to find that happy medium.

6 So it is a critical issue. People are passionate about it. I know you guys are going to work through and try to find a happy medium as you adjust lines.

7 But, again, we like the legislative maps for Chandler. They suit our purpose, and you listened to us.

8 And the congressional could use a little tweaking if you so deem it to be necessary.

9 And with that, thank you, welcome to Chandler, enjoy your hearing.

10 And I have go to a Chamber of Commerce function
and promote Chandler tonight. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

And on behalf of the Commission we really appreciate the hospitality the city of Chandler has shown the Commission.

Next on the agenda is a presentation by Mr. Drechsler, our mapping consultant. He's going to tell everyone a little bit about the redistricting process and how we got to the point we are at now. So I'll turn the program over to Mr. Drechsler.

ANDREW DRECHSLER: Thank you very much.

Good evening.

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

The draft maps are currently under a 30-day public review period, and that's one of the main reasons we're here tonight is to hear your opinions of the maps.

Before we display the maps, the two draft maps, the legislative and congressional draft maps, we wanted to do a quick overview of the process.

Arizona's redistricting process is governed by the state constitution as amended by voters in 2000 with the passage of Proposition 106.

It stipulates that Arizona's Independent Redistricting Commission redraw Arizona's congressional and
legislative districts to reflect the result of the most recent census.

Due to the 2010 census, Arizona gained a congressional seat. So we're going from eight seats to nine seats.

The legislative will remain the same at 30 senate seats and 60 house seats.

What are the requirements, what are the requirements of the state constitution via Proposition 106?

The new district boundaries must, A, comply with the U.S. Constitution and the Voting Rights Act; B, have equal population.

Criteria A and B are federally mandated.

To the extent practical -- practicable, the districts must be, C, compact and contiguous.

D 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.

So these are sort of the six overriding guidelines that the Commission is following when drafting these maps.

We just wanted to quick highlight on the Voting Rights Act. Arizona's congressional and legislative districts must receive preclearance or approval from the
Department of Justice or a federal court under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act before they can take effect.

To get preclearance, Arizona must demonstrate that 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.

We wanted to give a quick overview of the timeline of the process for the redistricting process.

The first step was setting up the Commission.

Earlier this year, commissioners were appointed following a thorough screening process.

Each of the five commissioners serve in a voluntary role. They are -- here tonight with us is Vice-Chair Scott Freeman, Jose Herrera, vice chair, Colleen Mathis, chair, here tonight with us Commissioner Linda McNulty, and Commissioner Richard Stertz.

The second step was 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 was the mapping.

Per Proposition 106, we started with a clean slate.

Then, we divided the state into equal population and compact grid-like districts. This is called the grid map, and the grid map was approved on August 18th.

And, again, Proposition 106 requires us to start with a grid map that takes into consideration that the map is done with equal population and compactness.

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

Again, only two, two of the criteria were taken into consideration for the grid maps, so we needed to fold in the other four criteria.

During this time, they received additional public comment and draft maps.

Approval of the draft maps.

On October 3rd, the Commission approved the draft congressional map that incorporated changes based on all of the constitutional criteria.

It approved the draft legislative maps on October 10th.
The fourth step is the second round of hearings. Currently we're visiting 25 towns and cities to share the draft maps and receive additional public input during the month of October and November.

Step five will be the final maps. Upon completion of public comment period, the AIRC will adopt the final maps.

Step six is preclearance.

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

Before we show the draft map, we just wanted to quick go over the process of how far we got there.

The map you see here is the most recent -- is the map that was approved by the last independent Commission, and most recently used in the 2010 elections.

Again, per Proposition 106, we're required to start with a blank slate and then go to a grid map. This is the grid map that was approved on August 18th.

And, again, the two criteria -- the two of the six criteria that was taken into consideration was equal population and compactness.

And, finally, 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 also took into consideration public comment provided via public meetings, round one of public hearings, comments mailed, e-mailed, hand-delivered, faxed, and telephoned into, into the Commission office.

Over 5,000 comments helped developed this map.

Some highlights of the draft map include there's two predominantly rural districts, three border districts, two districts in the city of Tucson, five districts that are entirely in Maricopa County, and avoids splitting Arizona's Indian reservations, and two districts where minority voters have the opportunity to elect the candidate of their choice.

The legislative map followed a very similar process.

You see here is the map that was approved by the last Commission and most recently used in the 2010 elections.

Just like the congressional map, we were required to start with a blank slate, and then create a grid map. Just like the congressional map, the grid map only took into consideration two points, equal -- two of the criteria, equal population and compactness.

And finally that brought us to the draft map that you see here.
On October 10, the Commission approved the draft map.

Some highlights include takes into consideration the population growth and reduction.

Under the old districts -- the map that you saw a couple slides ago, the population in those districts ranged from 155,000 to 378,000.

The current draft that you see here, the districts are 207,000 to 215,000.

To comply with the Voting Rights Act, the draft map includes ten districts in which minority voters have the opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice.

The draft map also includes three districts wholly within Pima County and three additional southern Arizona districts, seventeen districts primarily within Maricopa County and nine districts primarily rural.

We want to hear your input.

You can fill out a request to speak form at tonight's public hearing and provide your -- the Commission your input.

Examples of your input may include any of the constitutional criteria, any thoughts on the draft congressional map, any thoughts on the draft legislative map.

You can submit your input by many different ways.
You can either speak at tonight's hearing, or as Vice-Chair Freeman pointed out at the back of your packets that you received you received a blue form where you can fill this out and either hand it to us tonight or you can mail it in. The address is on the bottom of the form.

Or the phone number is on there as well.

Or you can also visit us at our website at www.azredistricting.org, or call us at (602)542-5221. Or toll free at (855)733-7478.

We wanted to quick show you this. It's a screen shot of our home page. And just wanted to highlight a couple areas that you may find of interest.

In the top left you see an arrow that has the maps.

You can click on there to see all the maps that were developed during this process. There was a number of different what-if maps.

The grid maps are also there.

Below that you'll find meeting information.

As Vice-Chair Freeman mentioned, this is streamed over the web tonight, as is all of our meetings where possible. And you can go back and you can see any of the past meetings. If you wanted to see how the map went from the grid map to today's grid -- draft map, all 25 meetings are up on the website so you can watch that process.
Also on here is a place where you can do public
input.

And then down below is another section where we
have the draft maps. And if you click on either of those
sections, it will take you to this page. This, this is
where we have the draft maps displayed. On the top you'll
see the legislative maps, on the bottom the congressional
maps.

We have a variety of different ways you can view
those maps.

One, one way that the public really liked is the
Google maps, otherwise known as the KMZ file.

But if you -- circled in the red is how you get to
the -- just highlights the Google maps.

If you click on either of those, it will take you
to a page that looks like this.

One of the really nice features is you're able to
scroll down, and you'll see on this next page you can really
go in and see what the exact borders are of your district.

Or any of the districts around the state.

Finally, we want to make sure that you stay
connected in this process.

You can visit us at our website. It has a number
of different features, as I pointed out before. And one
feature that citizens have really liked are -- is the
ability to draw their own maps. We have an online mapping program available.

As I mentioned, you can watch our current meetings or past meetings and get updates on any future meetings. You can also follow us at Twitter and Facebook.

Thank you very much.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you, Mr. Drechsler.

Before we turn to public comment, there's one other person I neglected to thank before, and Patrice Kraus from the city of Chandler. She's been wonderful in coordinating this for us and come to a number of our hearings and spoken to the commission and really done a great job for the city of Chandler.

Thank you, Ms. Kraus.

All right. We'll begin public comment. I have currently 24 requests to speak, so I'd ask that you all limit your comments to about three minutes. We'll have a timer. I don't know if it will be a buzzer or a bell will go off. But when you hear that, just -- you don't have to end your comments right then and there, but just try to wrap it up so that we're fair to all the people who have come to speak tonight so we can hear from everyone.

Also, when I call your name, please come up to the podium, and I'd ask that you please state your name and spell your name so that our court reporter gets an accurate
record, and tell us the city or town where you're from, and
if you're representing someone tell us who you're
representing.

And with that...

Like I said before, if you'd like to speak, the
yellow forms are in the back. You can fill them out and
bring them up.

When you give comments, we're really interested in
hearing things -- the more specific you can be the better,
because that helps us more.

If you like some aspect of the map, please let us
know.

If you think that there needs to be a change made
to the map, please try to be as specific as possible.

And even if you can go the next step and tell
us -- because every change to a map -- to a line affects
every other district, if you can tell us perhaps how the map
could be modified to sort of accommodate your change, even
better. That will help us out a lot.

So with that, I'll begin.

First speaker will be Kevin Hartke, councilmember,
city of Chandler.

COUNCILMEMBER KEVIN HARTKE: Kevin Hartke. Last
name H-A-R-T-K-E.

I want to also welcome you, Vice-Chair Freeman and
Commissioner McNulty, to Chandler. It's good to have you here.

I'll be brief on my comments.

In representing Chandler, we're pleased with the overall map in terms of the division of our city into just a few districts, rather than spread out into the winds of the state.

My only -- I like the way that it's drawn in terms of the larger and smaller districts.

The only suggestion I would have, which is outside of Chandler, and question on the map, it seems like one area of interest on the northern end, which would be Dobson Ranch, seems to be split on the north end, and I -- it seems like that would be a community of interest.

My other comment is I'm also pleased with the way that Sun Lakes has been included into our city. It is certainly a community of interest with Chandler and relates well to us.

So those are my comments related to the legislative districts.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Next up is Jeff Weninger, city of Chandler, councilmember.

COUNCILMEMBER JEFF WENINGER: Jeff Weninger, W-E-N-I-N-G-E-R.
I'd like to thank you for coming to the city of Chandler to hold this public meeting. We're happy to be able to host you and our citizens of the east valley.

We're mainly pleased, pleased with the legislative districts that you have drawn for Chandler. They do reflect a community of interest.

I think Sun Lakes, as has been said, I think both sides of the aisle view that as a part of Chandler, or somewhat a part of Gilbert, rather than part of Casa Grande or something.

I think you might have a small revolt if it went back to the earlier map.

As the fourth largest city in the state, these districts will give us a good opportunity to be represented by somebody who lives in Chandler, who's a part of our community and understands our city.

So it is important to us that we're not divvied up into four different districts and with a lot smaller chance of somebody who lives and breathes Chandler representing us down in the legislature.

Moving to the congressional maps -- happy with the legislative.

With the congressional maps, I definitely am more concerned about it.

I know you said there was a constitutional of two,
the population that are mandated. But then beyond that, it
seems like the being compact and contiguous and respecting
communities of interest, I think there's some real holes in
the congressional maps that way.

I mean, if you take even the two in Chandler, the
District 9, which is, I guess, what is being termed as the
competitive map, it almost seems -- Mayor Tibshraeny was
saying it takes all of Chandler in, but even as an addition
to that, or instead of that, I think taking in Sun Lakes
even makes a little more sense than that being the
Congressional District 5.

And the way I would accomplish that is -- you do
kind of have a -- what gerrymandering's named after, this
kind of a salamander that goes up in and then over to
Phoenix over to the 51. That doesn't seem like a real
natural flow to me.

So I think if you took off some of that
population there and added in Sun Lakes into the competitive
district, I think you would accomplish kind of the same
thing that Mayor Tibshraeny was saying about all of
Chandler.

And I am concerned, somewhat, with District 4.
Actually quite a bit.

I know Lori Roberts reported in her column. It
just doesn't seem to make sense. Fountain Hills. If you're
talking about things that have to be -- you know, compactness in the dictionary says having a dense structure or parts closely packed.

And I don't see how with any rational thought that Fountain Hills would fit into that definition of having to go all the way up there.

I think you could say the -- I think you could say the same thing about the San Tan Valley.

A lot of those people down there in Queen Creek -- it's not quite Queen Creek, but a lot of those people travel through Chandler to go to work in Maricopa County, and now they're being lumped in a district hundreds of miles away from them.

Thank you again for coming to Chandler and listening.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Next is Gail Barney, the mayor of Queen Creek.

MAYOR GAIL BARNEY: Thank you, Vice-Chair Freeman.


And thank you for the opportunity of being able to give you some of our thoughts.

As a community, we have two primary issues with regard to the redistricting.

First and foremost, we feel the entire town should be included in one congressional and one legislative
Queen Creek is a small community of about 26 square miles, and we've got at the last census about 27,000 people.

And being of that size, we feel that it's very important to keep our identity and keep our citizens in one -- together in one congressional and one legislative district.

We've sent -- I have sent letters to the Commission explaining that interest to be within Maricopa County. Part of the problem is that we've been -- our community is in both Pinal and Maricopa County and the lines have been kind of drawn on county borders instead of the town borders.

I brought maps to show how this affects the town of Queen Creek, and I will give them to you, and you can look at them.

But we would ask that we be put in the Congressional District 5 and Legislative District 12, the whole town of Queen Creek.

Again, I wish to thank you for speaking this evening. And if you have any questions, I'd be more than happy to answer.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you. If you want to give our maps to Ms. Gomez, that would be great.
Next will be Clark Smithson, city council member, Apache Junction.

CLARK SMITHSON: Thank you, members of the Commission.


I did give testimony to the Commission earlier but as private citizen.

And tonight I speak as a member of the city council of Apache Junction and the fine residents of Apache Junction who in my opinion deserve better representation than we will get under the maps as representation of the congress of the United States and the state of Arizona.

Tonight I am missing a city council meeting right now that I should be at, but the mayor has asked me to attend this because of the great importance of this issue to our community.

With respect to the legislative districts, we are pleased that Apache Junction is kept in one district.

However, we comprise less than a third of a district that will be with Mesa, and I'm afraid that we're going to wind up being the stepchild, again without any significant representation because we get ignored by the overwhelming majority of Mesa in that district.

With respect to the congressional district, I -- I
hope that you won't be as offended by what I say as I am by
the maps. But if you would give serious consideration to
what I say and seriously reconsider the maps.

With respect to the taking of the six issues that
you're required to pay attention to in the constitution,
equal population.

Although the numbers match, the representation
does not. To put Apache Junction with Bullhead City makes
no sense.

Our congressional representative would not pay any
attention to us.

I do appreciate that after our last testimony,
several of us from Pinal County would all like to stay in
the same districts, you did add some additional portions of
Pinal County into that, which just might help us a little
bit, but the rest of Pinal County along with us would wind
up getting ignored and therefore effectively
disenfranchised.

With respect to compactness and contiguity. No
way.

This has to be the least compact district that has
been seen in a long time.

We would have to transverse through several other
districts in order to meet parts of the district that we
would be assigned to in this map.
The -- shows, again, it's anything but compact.

I remember when I was in graduate school and in my bachelor's degree for public administration, and political science, we talked about gerrymandering, and showed the strange, strange maps that caused that to be named after Commissioner Gerry.

I think back in Chicago. It's been a few years ago since I went to school.

But this is -- it's a joke. It's a gerrymandering joke to put us with the river cities.

Bullhead City also -- in the event that somebody from Pinal County would be elected as a congressman, then the whole river district would be unrepresented.

And you paid a lot of attention to the river cities, and I think that's appropriate. But I think we've been ignored.

With respect to the U.S. Constitutional Voting Rights Act, I assume that the Voting Rights Act is going to be met one way or the other, but I assume that you've been very careful. And it appears that you have been very careful to meet those requirements.

However, the U.S. Constitution, which is also one of the requirements, not just the Voting Rights Act, is that we have equal protection of the law. We would not have that under the maps that are currently being proposed.
Communities of interest. With all respect, that's a joke.

Would somebody please explain to me what community of interest the Pinal County and especially Apache Junction is with Bullhead City or some of the other cities along the river.

There is none.

Pinal County has presented to the Commission maps which would have left virtually the entire county together with our community interest, that would have been a competitive district also, which will not be under this one.

Geographic features.

Again, with all due respect, you must think that somebody in Apache Junction has the faith of a mustard seed and has the ability to move mountains, because the mountains are in the way.

We are not contiguous.

The lines show contiguity, yes, but we cannot get there from here, as the old joke says.

I can't imagine what the Commission was thinking with respect to contiguity and compactness with that particular district.

It appears to me that Apache Junction and parts of Pinal County were given consideration only to match numbers someplace else.
Competitive districts.

Well, I'm a Republican, but I -- this would not be a competitive district, over 60 percent Republicans. The map that we showed you, presented to you by the county, would have made a competitive district.

In my opinion also competition involves more than just the balance of Democrats and Republicans. It should also give different communities and communities of interest a fair chance to be represented.

These maps do not give us that opportunity.

It appears that, in my opinion, that the Commission has violated all six of those.

The one to give me the biggest argument on would be the numbers. But, again, equal representation cancels that out.

We feel that we've been merely used as plugs in to make somebody else happy, that we've been ignored as Apache Junction quite often has been.

During the next ten years it's very possible we'll have a population over 150,000. That's a lot of people to leave unrepresented.

So on behalf of the city council and the citizens of Apache Junction, I beg you, please give -- reconsider the maps with respect to Apache Junction and Pinal County, so that we can have equal protection under the law, a
one-on-one vote, one vote for one person, and be well represented.

Again, as I said before, when I gave them, I very much appreciate the difficult job that you have. What I don't appreciate is the results that it gives to Apache Junction.

Thank you very much for your time.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Next will be Denise Rapata.

DENISE RAPATA: My name is Denise Rapata. Rapata is spelled R-A-P, as in Paul, A, T, as in Tom, A.

I want to thank you for the hard work that you put in on this redistricting.

I know that you put in many hours, months. And your hard work is appreciated.

A couple of things that I want to address are our civil duty. I'm representing myself and as a citizen of Gilbert and Arizona.

I am a retired history teacher. And my whole life I have felt that my civic duty to my city, state, is so important.

Right now the number of people showing up to vote in the last major election was abysmal. And I and my husband have, from the time we moved here in 2005, we have worked at the polls as judges and clerks. And the amount of
turnout at the elections is so minimal.

As a history teacher, you know, I always stress with my students and with my own children how important it is to get out and vote.

But the feeling among many voters today is that the vote doesn't count. And one reason is that the districts for the past ten years have not been set up competitively.

Voter participation in Arizona, with only one half of registered voters voting in the last major election, shows that they feel that their vote or their voice isn't being heard.

We're counting on you to restore civic participation to our state by giving competitive -- giving competitiveness a bigger priority than you have given it in the past.

When the districts are competitive, the politicians running and hoping to gain those votes have to speak to all sides.

Competitive districts are better for democracy and better for Arizona.

And it's -- by having these districts competitive is the way for voters to feel that they do have a voice.

Another issue that I would like to address is the importance of the Commission paying attention to the Voters
The Voters Rights Act was created in 1965, and it exists today where the federal government can come in, after these congressional districts and legislative districts have been drawn, the federal government can decide if, in fact, they are competitive and if, in fact, the population is equal.

Now, there's a reason that the federal government to this day can still come in and check these congressional and legislative districts. It's because Arizona has had a history of racism and bigotry.

So I strongly encourage the Commission to pay attention to the Voters Rights Act.

The current legislative maps ignore the strong outcry for fairness in this new decade.

Please remember that in the year 2000 voters overwhelmingly pushed for a constitutional amendment that would create fair and competitive districts.

This Commission would not exist if it weren't for the voters' mandate to create fair and competitive districts.

I live in Legislative District 21, which is now going to be Legislative District 22, I understand.

I live in Congressional District 6, which is now, I guess, Congressional District 5.
In my opinion, they're still not competitive.

Thank you for allowing me to speak, and I wish you a good evening and continued success with your redistricting maps.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

By the way, I take it we don't have a buzzer, but we have flashing lights. If you notice the flashing lights on the podium, that's what's keeping time. If you see the red light flashing, please finish your thought so we can be respectful of the other people that want to make comments.

Next will be James Kerley, representing self, from San Tan Valley.

JAMES KERLEY: I also would like to thank the Commission for what you're trying to do, all of you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: And, sir, don't be afraid to move that microphone.

JAMES KERLEY: Okay. We'll warm it up.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thanks.

JAMES KERLEY: I appreciate what you all try to do, and basically there's the old saying you're darned if you do and you're darned if you don't.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: And can you please spell your name.


VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thanks.
JAMES KERLEY: I live in the unincorporated area of San Tan Valley.

Now, on your legislative draft map, it's hard to see, am I in Legislative District 8 or Legislative District 11? And I live in San Tan Valley. I can't tell you.

Okay.

Now, if I'm in eight, you have to consider the fact that when I leave my home, and I am heading towards Phoenix area, heading west, when I get to Empire, I turn left off of Gary Road onto Empire, and I come to the crossroads of Ellsworth and Hunt Highway. I turn right to go into Queen Creek.

And the -- what I consider the north or southeast corner is Maricopa County. The west side of Ellsworth is either in Maricopa County or Pinal County, because there's a bad intersection there that divides it. And that is kind of a mess, because part of the people that live on the south side of Ellsworth are in Maricopa. Some of the persons that live on the north side -- or southwest -- southeast side of Hunt Highway are in a different district also.

So it's quite confusing.

When I get a chance, I'll do a better explanation on the computer and I'll send it in.

The second question I have is on the congressional
map in reference to the same area where I live.

I would like to know if you can tell me what congressional district I am in at the present time with the map you have drawn.

Can you tell me that right now?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Sir, this is the time for public comment. If you have questions, you can ask our staff. I'll stick around after and answer any questions you have.

JAMES KERLEY: Okay. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Next will be A.J. LaFaro, chairman LD 17 Republicans, from Maricopa County.

A.J. LAFARO: Good evening, members of the Commission.

I would like to this evening read a couple written prepared statements into the public record. All right?

October, 2011, Resolution No. 0001, resolution of the Legislative District 17 Republicans, Maricopa County, state of Arizona strongly condemning the actions of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission, AIRC.

Whereas, the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission as knowingly violated its responsibilities for redistricting under federal and Arizona law including, but not limited to, the 14th and 15th Amendments to the United

And, whereas, the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission has failed to demonstrate a sincere commitment to performing its responsibilities in a honest, independent, and impartial fashion and to upholding public confidence in the integrity of the redistricting process.

And, whereas, the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission has knowingly violated its responsibilities for conducting open meetings to the public under Arizona law including, not limited to, Title 38 of the Arizona Revised Statutes.

And, finally, whereas, the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission has knowingly violated its procurement responsibilities to the public under Arizona law including, but not limited to, Title 41 of the Arizona Revised Statutes.

Now therefore be it resolved by the Legislative District 17 Republicans, Maricopa County, state of Arizona, strongly condemn the partisan actions of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission and recommends the following.

Action item one. That Governor Jan Brewer, state of Arizona, remove the five members of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission in accordance with
Article 4 of the Arizona Constitution.

Actions item two. That Arizona Attorney General Tom Horne, state of Arizona, aggressively continue his criminal investigation and civil litigation against the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission.

Action item three. That the majority leadership of the Senate and House of Representative, state of Arizona, make written redistricting recommendations to the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission in accordance with Article 4 of the Arizona Constitution that are in the best interest of the state of Arizona, not the Commission's favorite special interest groups. Recommendations that eliminate the wholesale gerrymandering of Arizona and hijacking of the voters' constitutional and Democratic Rights.

Unanimously passed and approved the 11th day of October, 2011, by the Legislative District 17 Republicans.

My last name is spelled capital L-A, capital F-A-R-O. My first name is A.J. And I'm the chairman of the Legislative District 17 Republicans.

I also have a cover letter that was sent to the governor, to the attorney general, to the senate -- state senate president, and to the speaker of the house.

Dear Governor Brewer, Attorney General Horne, Senate President Pearce, and Speaker of the House Tobin.
I'm writing you on behalf of the Republican constituents -- of my Republican constituents and precinct committeemen of Legislative District 17.

Hundreds of us, like thousands of Arizona citizens throughout the state, have been actively involved in the Arizona independent redistricting process, only to have our voices fall on the deaf ears of several of the Commission members and the executive director.

We have witnessed one egregious act after another by the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission who have failed to demonstrate sincere commitment to performing its responsibilities in an honest, independent, and impartial fashion, and to upholding public confidence in the integrity of the redistricting process.

It is for these reasons the LD 17 Republicans felt compelled to draft and unanimously pass this LD 17 Resolution 0001.

The unacceptable 2001/2002 independent redistricting process, coupled with the current 2011/2012 fiasco, clearly demonstrate that Proposition 106 has failed miserably and should be repealed immediately.

Warmest regards, A.J. LaFaro, chairman LD 17 Republicans.

Gentlemen, ladies, thank you for your time.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.
Next is Janie Hydrick from Chandler.

JANIE HYDRICK: This is not product placement. I'm recovering from bronchitis here.

Good evening. I'm Dr. Janie Hydrick, H-Y-D-R-I-C-K, a Chandler resident.

What your Commission is doing is not exactly rocket science. I know, because I am a rocket scientist.

However, you are all to be commended for the integrity and hard work you continue to put into this task that most rocket scientists would be loathe to undertake.

First, let me address the draft CD 9 map. When I moved here 35 years ago, my Chandler neighborhood was not one of the older suburbs. We're both much older now. And my neighborhood should be able to compete as a community for a stronger voice in congress.

CD 9, the new CD 9, faces uniquely different issues, such as these four.

Number one, we have a unique need for infill development.

The proposed CD 9 would be the only district whose land has reached what is called build-out.

We need ways to invigorate the neighborhoods that already exist and make them dynamic places our residents are proud to regard as their community.

Two, Phoenix remains the business and commerce
hub, so our neighborhoods have a strong need for sustainable transportation options. We're the heart of lightrail, the Tempe streetcar, and the crossroads for the freeway system, so traffic is important and a unique issue throughout our district.

Three, the neighborhoods in our district represent low density, high density, residential, office, and industrial.

And that mixture is pervasive yet uniquely balanced throughout this district.

Four, our current congressional district, CD 5, has been evolving. So making the new CD 9 more competitive will really resonate with the increasingly moderate disposition of our community.

Thank you for the increased competitiveness of the new CD 9.

Next I'll address the draft LD 18 map.

Thank you, thank you for making LD 18 a more competitive district.

Being a part of LD 18 as well as the new CD 9 will help support our community's increased tendency to support candidates from both parties, whose ultimate commitment should be to the whole community.

Baseline Road was a wise choice as a northern boundary for the proposed LD 18.
Tempe has a strong identity, yet the south end tends to be more suburban and blends more with the communities of west Chandler and Ahwatukee.

So thank you for including this community as part of the draft LD 18 map.

In closing, as a career educator, rocket scientist, and parent of four children who attended Kyrene elementary and middle schools and graduated from Corona Del Sol High School, I want to address the overlaying of the Kyrene School District and the Tempe Union High School District.

With the current draft, Kyrene essentially matches the boundary of LD 18, and Tempe Union High School District fits right inside of CD 9.

The lifelong friendships and the intense community engagement that our children garnered from their years in the Kyrene and Tempe Union High School Districts should be and could be hallmarks of every community.

Again, thank you for conducting these public hearings, and thank you again for your integrity and hard work.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Next will be CJ Briggle, from Ahwatukee.

CJ BRIGGLE: Good evening, and thank you.
I'm just an ordinary resident in a community that I love. Because of the legislation that has occurred over the past few years, I feel very under and misrepresented, as do the neighbors in my community. And this all leads me to believe that the current legislature does not represent Arizona very well.

We Arizonans are better than the laws that have been passed and the budget and tax cuts that have occurred, and I'm truly tired of being the mockery of late night talk shows.

This Commission and the mandate of the Commission by the people can help by creating competitive districts. And I am satisfied that the congressional districts are fairly drawn. Yet I fear that which has yet to be followed on the legislative levels.

And please take the competitive districts to the level it should be, allow ordinary Arizona residents such as myself a voice in the community that I love.

And I thank you for taking that to heart.

Thank you for your hard work.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Next is LeAnne Quimby, representing self.

LEANNE QUIMBY: The questions I have can be answered after the meeting.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Next is Grace Cuyler, representing self, from Sun Lakes.

GRACE CUYLER: The questions that I have can be answered after the meeting.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay. Talk to you then.

All right. Next is Sandra Fischer, representing self, from Mesa.

SANDRA FISCHER: Thank you, Commission, and again I appreciate your hard work and with all the comments that you have to take.

My name is Sandra, S-A-N-D-R-A, Fischer, F-I-S-C-H-E-R.

And as I said, I am a Mesa resident, but I happen to live in a very southwest corner of Mesa, in the neighborhood called Marlborough Mesa, which is one of the safest neighborhoods in Mesa.

And looking at -- I, again, also am appreciative of how you developed these maps. And I'm fortunate that in both the legislative and congressional I happen to be able -- you've seated me in the only competitive districts.

And to me, having only one competitive congressional district I find is not acceptable.

We need, as you're hearing the outcry just from here tonight, we really want a voice.
And the only way we can do that is when those districts are competitive.

And that those -- many things I've heard from people has been that if they know that their party is going to win, the candidates don't need to go out and campaign, they don't need to talk to anybody. That doesn't give someone a voice.

And we really need -- you know, I felt that -- I have felt that the legislature really has not represented me and the things that I hold extremely important.

And I want to have that voice in my legislature and in my congress.

And the only way that that can happen is if we really have as many competitive districts as possible.

So, you know, with only one competitive district, especially congressional, I think that takes a lot of work on a lot of the other boundaries in order to work around that.

The one comment by one of the Chandler councilmembers saying maybe to move that part of nine down into a little bit more of Chandler, as long as it keeps it competitive and allows more competitiveness elsewhere, I think that's a wise move.

But, you know, one congressional district competitive? I don't think that's success. And I think
that was your job.

It wasn't -- you know, as long as the other things are being kept, equal population, whatever, we need a voice.

People are not showing up at the polls because they think that it doesn't even matter.

Without that competitiveness, nobody is going to hear.

And with the legislative maps, I think overall they're doing fine. I'm fortunate -- unlike the other person -- Dobson Ranch is kept together. Living close to that Dobson Ranch area, I do know it very well. And at least it is in the same legislative district and the same congressional district.

But we have a small part of Mesa. And that's going to have a voice as far as legislative district.

But we do have a lot in common with the rest of that district, so it's very possible to stay with that.

But, again, without competitiveness in some of these other districts, you know, again, we won't have a voice at the legislature, and that's got to be the most important thing.

Thank you, and I appreciate it.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Lina Hatch, representing self.

And if I've mispronounced your name, please
correct me. And if you could tell us the city or town.


And thank you, members of the AIRC, for allowing our feedback.

I am representing 30 plus residents of Gilbert who live west of Cooper and south of Baseline.

The most recent redistricting draft legislative map proposed that our area is to be cut out of Gilbert and put into a Chandler area. This will not give our small area adequate representation.

Further, by eliminating our area from Gilbert district and reaching deeper into the southeast area, neither we who reside in Gilbert nor those newly drawn in in the southeast area are being fairly represented.

Even one of our town council members is being cut out, and he is also a precinct committeeman.

You are proposing that we be drawn into Chandler, a much larger community of interest. We do not identify with Chandler. Our small area is well established in the Gilbert legislative district.

Needlessly cutting out a small part of Gilbert only to grab all of Queen Creek has resulted in a district that is beyond its fair share of citizens by around 2,000 people.

Furthermore, this is the fastest growing area in
the valley, which means from the time you form the district, we will be numerically underrepresented, and it will become more skewed over the next ten years as we continue to grow faster than the rest of the state.

We feel that our voting rights will be violated in that each person will not be equally represented.

We prefer option one, version 8A, dated 10-3-2011, because it changes very little from the previous LD 22 map. This area has worked well for the citizens of Gilbert. Yes, it cuts some out on the southeastern section. However, the piece that is cut out is large and will be well represented, unlike the current map which splits us off like a tiny splinter.

Further, option one is the map that Mayor Lewis and the entire town council voted unanimously to approve.

The Gilbert School District encompasses all of Gilbert. At this time our school district is within Gilbert legislative district, but we will be removed with the new boundaries.

The Gilbert public school superintendent and the assistant superintendent, as well as dozens of administrators, teachers, and staff will also be cut out. The new boundaries proposed will not be representative of our Gilbert School District.

Splitting our small Gilbert off is a detriment to
adequate representation of the residents of our area.

   We support keeping cities as whole as possible.
   We ask you to adjust the western boundary of the legislative district to mirror the town of Gilbert boundaries.

   Further, we ask you to reevaluate and adopt option one, version 8A, dated 10-3-2011.

   Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Next is Larky Hodges, representing self, from Phoenix.

Anyone with a name that sounds close to that?

LARKY HODGES: Hi, my name is Larky, L-A-R-K-Y, Hodges, H-O-D-G-E-S.

I'm representing myself, and I live in Phoenix.

And thank you so much for being willing to take on this very challenging job that many people don't understand how much time you're giving.

A few years ago I was lucky enough to visit the small country of Bhutan. I was there just before the country's first ever democratic election.

They had a king who was giving up power to the people for them to govern themselves.

It was wonderful to see how excited everyone was.

There were posters everywhere talking about how much their
voted counted.

And it took a lot of self-control for me not to disappoint them. I didn't want to tell them what I was seeing in my own country, where people had become so jaded about voting that many didn't go to the voting booth anymore.

I came back home inspired, and inspired many of my friends by talking about how exciting it was to see a country just beginning to be a democracy.

I think the Commission has a chance to re-energize our citizens.

Competitive districts will do that.

If voters, including myself, feel that our vote counts again, we will come out and vote.

Competitive districts will make that possible. Competitive districts will also improve representation by our elected officials as they will have to represent a variety of interests rather than just one.

Noncompetitive districts have created extreme partisanship. Partisanship is destroying our country.

But polls show that most people, most of us, want bipartisanship.

Competitive districts will really help to diminish partisanship.

So I hope as you continue on our challenge -- of
this challenging task, that you will aim to create as many competitive districts as possible.

And thank you again for all of the hard work you're doing.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Next is Julie Smith, representing self, from Gilbert.

JULIE SMITH: Hi. Thank you for allowing me to speak. My name is Julie Smith, J-U-L-I-E, S-M-I-T-H.

I'm here to address my concern about Gilbert as a community of interest. I'd like to address the specific area of Gilbert that is west of Cooper and just south of Warner.

This is a small area of Gilbert that is to be sliced off from the rest of Gilbert in the proposed legislative district map in a newly formed LD 17.

If this happens, my family will not be fairly represented by the new LD 17 state senator and state representative.

I would not be fairly represented because the proposed LD 17 is comprised mostly of the city of Chandler with just a small slice of Gilbert.

According to 2006 census information available on the Town of Gilbert website, the percentage of population by age for under 18 is 34.6 percent for Gilbert and 30.4
percent for Chandler.

The percent population of children is much higher in the town of Gilbert than it is in the city of Chandler. According to the 2000 -- year 2000 census data, the percentage of married adults in Gilbert is 66.7 percent. In Chandler, 59 percent.

So, again, if my small slice of Gilbert is sliced off, I feel that these areas of concern, of married individuals and families, would not be fairly represented.

So I am requesting that the western town of Gilbert boundaries be fully enclosed in the Gilbert LD district.

Please add back the northwest boundary of Gilbert and maybe you could remove a portion of the southeast proposed boundary of LD 12, which is not a part of Gilbert.

Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Next is Zofia Rawmer, representing self, from Maricopa County.

ZOFIA RAWMER: Hi, my name is Zofia Rawmer, Z-O-F-I-A, R-A-W-M-E-R.

I'm here because I recently moved to Arizona and I have started a new family.

And I moved to Arizona because I love the people in Arizona. We had different options, but we found the
friendliest, the most open, and family inclusive were the people in Arizona.

One -- the other thing that attracted me to Arizona was the changing demographics, and what we saw was that over the last ten years you had a state that moved away from a two party system to a state where you had three different groups that were trying to get the attention of our political state.

One was Republicans, one was Democrats, and the third was that large category called Independents.

And those Independents had stated, in essence, we're not going to take sides. They want to make sure that there was something outside of the two, that you didn't -- you could decide one way in one issue and a different way on a different issue.

Now, recently we've had to cut up Arizona into -- to represent these different groups. And I know that you did consider equal population and you did look at compactness and contiguity.

However, you also have to look at the Voting Rights Act in order to make sure that minority interests were respected.

And in particular in terms of communities of interest.

So that map changed.
You also had to consider geographic features.

There were communities that stated they're part of a specific geographical area, we associate with each other, put us together.

So the map looks a little bit more messy than when you all started.

Then there was a last thing that you had to consider, and that was competitiveness.

Now, in terms of the congressional district, there has been an increase in competitiveness.

However, you still have Republicans controlling four out the nine districts.

However, we know that they only make up 30 something percent of the population.

You've already given Republicans 40 percent of that -- of the seats. In addition -- more than 40 percent actually.

In addition, we found that the majority, in terms of the congressional districts, were seven out of nine of those districts were Republican controlled. But we know that Republican only make up 30 something percent of the population.

So, there's some serious concern about making sure that the competitiveness is throughout.

And I know you've had these other factors.
And maybe that's why, in spite of their numbers, Republicans are still the majority of the most of our districts.

But we -- and those are large, big areas that you have to consider.

But now we have an opportunity with the legislative districts, because they're smaller, to ensure that that doesn't happen on a small level.

You have more of an opportunity to consider those smaller factors and make sure that everybody has an opportunity to be heard in the state.

Remember, Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, each all fall only 30 percent in this state, and we want to make sure that all of their voices are heard.

And the way you make sure, that we comply with the U.S. Constitution, that we respect communities of interest, and you incorporate geographic features as long as -- making sure there's equal population and compactness, is by making sure that every voice is heard, that we have that competitiveness.

So I ask you as a Commission to remember that, to remember the actual breakdown of how people are registering or what they're trying to tell you by registering as either Democrat, Republican, or Independent.

Thank you very much.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Next is Tom McConnell, representing self, from Marana.

TOM MCCONNELL: Last name is M-C-C-O-N-N-E-L-L. Thomas.

Three areas I want to talk to you about. I started tweaking your draft maps, and as it was available for download, and found that the tweaking soon led to hacking with a machete.

But my intent was to try to improve the number of competitive districts, improve the compactness score, reduce the number of counties that were split.

And I think this map at least moves in that direction while maintaining and actually increasing a number of minority districts.

The Voting Rights Act is a challenge.

I recognize that you had to struggle with it, but I think you may have painted yourself into a corner with the way those districts were constructed.

So I'd suggest that you look at that score card as a technique that you might want to use in evaluating additional maps that will be submitted by the mapping system.

One of the things that -- a specific point I wanted to make was I'm not sure how you're handling the
prison population issue with respect to minority districts, but I hope if you have addressed that that you have adequate
notes for the Section 5 people to look at.

I did notice that the Wilmont prison was included in one of your minority districts, even though it's exactly on the boundary. So in my revised map I simply moved it one block across and put it into a non-minority district so that it wouldn't be counted in that population.

On that score card, I've addressed each of the six criteria.

I've listed plan A and plan B.

I like the idea of having them blind when you first look at them so you don't get wed to a particular plan.

I think Mr. Freeman spoke to that at one of the other meetings.

But the idea would be if you look at those plans and score them, you will see as a column for weight, or opinions and values. And there's a column for each plan that has the facts.

Senator Moynihan said you're entitled to your own opinions but not your own facts.

This may be a way to recognize the delegation process.

The second thing I wanted to talk about was the
online system.

It's kind of late in arriving. It takes a long
time to use it. It could be strengthened fairly easily.

I should address the mapping consultant.

It's difficult to find it when you're looking at a block level. Counties are easy, and I kept ten counties intact with that map. But when you get down to the block level, it's sometimes hard to find where you are using the streets because the street names are not legible.

On a high-resolution monitor, I'm using a large monitor, I couldn't read them, even with the Microsoft Magnifier.

I suggest labeling the major streets in larger font and more contrasting type.

That would be huge improvement.

There's another problem in the system in that after finishing about 15 hours of work, to input that map into the system, I found that when I went to use one of the integrity tools which checks for non-contiguity, that it erased several of the districts. So I lost about five hours of work.

So find that little devil and fix it.

The other, the other thing that would help a great deal is that 95 percent the people doing mapping in Arizona in GIS work use a competing system.
All of the systems, however, allow you to create an equivalency file which could be uploaded and immediately incorporated or analyzed.

You're allowing us to download an equivalency file, but your public input doesn't allow .EDF, .XL and XLS files greater than one megabyte. A slight increase would allow people to submit maps much more quickly.

Enough on the technology stuff.

I do note -- I see the red light. I just wanted to -- one final thing.

I hope you will meet again, about a year from now, after the scars have healed, and we'll consider writing advice for the next Commission that will be seated in ten years.

And possibly elements of constitutional amendments that would make this process better.

You certainly are experiencing the joy of being there now, but I think when you have time to reflect on it, I would like to see the Commission seated 90 days earlier than you folks were, so you could get the set commissions and things behind you before the census data is available.

Thank you for your time.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: So we're now at about 7:30. I just want to check on the court reporter.

THE REPORTER: Sure.
UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is there any way the three-minute rule can be enforced?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I'm going to get to that because -- before we take a break. There's a number of public comments. We barely put a dent in them, and I don't know if any more will be provided to me soon.

I don't want to cut people short and prevent somebody -- I want to give everyone a fair chance, but I don't know exactly what you see when you're at the podium. I assume you can see the red light, and I am going to start reminding you. Because I know people get caught up in their own thoughts and they probably aren't paying attention.

So I don't mean to be rude, but I'm going to point out from here on going forward whenever the light comes on to please wrap it up.

And I think we'd like to take a short recess now for our court reporter.

We'll stay in recess and be back in five minutes.

(Brief recess taken.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay. Folks, we'll start the meeting again.

If everyone would please take your seats.

Okay. Thank you.

Just a reminder, when we come to the microphone, don't be afraid to grab it and wrestle it because we need
you to speak right into it so everyone can hear.

And please remember to spell your name as well.

And I'm going to start reading the name of the next speaker and then I'm going to provide the name of the person on deck so we can try to move things a little more quickly.

And, again, I think we've got an audio alert going now. When the red light goes on, you'll also hear a noise. That's the signal to try to finish that thought. So thanks for everyone's cooperation.

Next speaker will be Fred Barlam, representing self, from Maricopa County.

Followed by Paul Brierley.

FRED BARLAM: First I'd like to thank the Commission for the hard work and long hours. Your job is not an easy one, and I commend you on your dedication to your civic duty.

As a resident of Ahwatukee and proposed CD 9 and proposed LD 18, I would like to also thank you for your diligence in creating what I believe are two competitive districts. And I tip my hat to you for that.

With that being said, the competitiveness of some of the proposed LDs leaves a lot to be desired. After reviewing the maps and data, I do not believe that the proposed LD 6, 8, 11, and 28 are competitive.
Now I am not suggesting that they be totally redrawn. What I am suggesting is that they be reviewed and their boundaries be changed slightly to make them more competitive.

Let me remind the Commission that the 2009 Arizona Supreme Court decision ruled that the wording of the Arizona Constitution gives competitiveness equal standing with all other non-federal requirements.

The Supreme Court of Arizona made this very clear in their decision.

Section 35 of their opinions states, and I quote:

The direction that competitiveness should be favored unless one of two conditions occurs, does not, contrary to the Commission's assertion, mean that the competitive goal is less mandatory than the other -- other goals, can be ignored, or should be relegated to a secondary role,

unquote.

Proposed LD 6, 8, 11, and 28 as currently drawn are not competitive and do not meet the mandate imposed by the Supreme Court decision.

I thank you for giving me the opportunity to address this Commission and to state my opinion in this public forum. And thank you again for the hard work you are doing.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.
Paul Brierley, representing self, from Chandler.

He'll be followed by Victoria Martin.

PAUL BRIERLEY: Good evening. Thank you for hearing us tonight.

I want to thank you guys for your efforts. I know you're not having a lot of fun, but I appreciate what you're doing.

I also want to thank you for putting Sun Lakes back into Maricopa County. I think that would be really good, and I hope you can keep Sun Lakes with Maricopa County later on.

Real quick. You've heard a couple people comment on the town of Gilbert being split by Districts 12 and 17.

I have a solution for you.

Because I think that makes sense to carve that out and let the town of Gilbert's lines be followed and put them with their District 12, which is a Gilbert district. And you can swap for that, without causing a domino effect, by taking some of the southern part of that District 12 into District 17 to compensate for what you lose.

And one reason to do that is the community of interest that is Chandler School District. That goes all the way over past Power.

So it makes a lot of sense to me to let Gilbert stay within the Gilbert district, and make up for that with
whatever you need to from this community of interest that is
defined by the Chandler School District.

That will help you out and it would just be a swap
of one for the other and not have a domino effect.

One little aside. I'm wondering when this is done
if it would be possible if you could go through and renumber
the districts so there's some sanity to the numbering of the
districts.

And another note is I would urge you to keep urban
and rural separate as much as possible so that you don't
have large land masses that -- that is controlled by the
urban population.

And the CDs themselves I'm kind of concerned about
like everybody else. They've really been gerrymandered.

They've split a lot of communities of interest.

Chandler ends up with north Phoenix. My neighbors in
San Tan Valley who all commute to Maricopa County end up
with Yuma and Kingman. I think everybody has said what I
want to say on that.

So I kind of want to finish with my thoughts on
competitiveness versus communities of interest. The last
meeting I was at, and I testified, and at the end
Commissioner Herrera got to make some statements.

And he said, and I think this is pretty close to a
quote, all I care about is that we end up with competitive
districts.

And that surprised me.

But I got to thinking about it.

The point of the process, I think, is to get the best representation possible that we can for the public.

And competitive districts sound pretty all American. It sounds good.

But I really got to thinking about it and thought if it's competitive, perfectly competitive districts would be 50/50 Republican, Democrat.

But that almost by definition disenfranchises about 50 percent of the people.

So it seemed like we can do better than that.

Communities of interest on the other hand give people with similar beliefs representation.

And that, that sounded better.

So I think focusing on communities of interest should be our first priority.

But, wait a minute, I don't get to say that.

The constitution tells us what we will base that on.

And so I, with all due respect to Commissioner Herrera, would like to remind him, and you all, that competitiveness is not the main criteria. Please follow the constitution and consider communities of
Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Victoria Martin, from Maricopa County.

She'll be followed by Nicholas Collins.

VICTORIA MARTIN: My name is Victoria Martin, M-A-R-T-I-N.

I have lived in Arizona for more than 40 years.

So I remember how tortuously convoluted the districts used to be, and I really appreciate what you've done to make them more competitive.

I understand that these maps cannot be totally rational, that you have to do what is politically feasible, and that it is an impossible task.

And I thank you for all your efforts.

I, I live in Sun Lakes, and so the reason we came is we were concerned we had heard that you were going to split up Sun Lakes.

So I'm glad that you did not do that.

And not real clear about going forward what's going to happen.

I mean, I know what's going to happen.

The plan will get sued and it's going to go to court, and it's going to get kicked back, and blah, blah, blah. It will never meet again.
But my understanding is that this plan will be operative, in effect throughout all the court processes and stuff that's going to follow. And if it is, I got to say it's just a great improvement over what it used to be. It may not be perfect, but it's a great improvement, so thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Nicholas Collins, representing self, from Phoenix. Followed by Patrick O'Malley.

NICHOLAS COLLINS: Hi. I'm Nick Collins. And Nick, N-I-C-K, Collins, C-O-L-L-I-N-S.

I'm from Ahwatukee.

I wanted to also thank you all for doing what you do. I know it's a big job and a long job and thankless in many ways.

And this is my second one of these I've been to, and I know people can get kind of excited. I'm surprised they haven't asked you for your birth certificate yet.

But, I'm not angry.

I think what we have now is a big improvement over what we had in the past ten years. But even that said, I think that there are even things that you can improve on.

So just one point I wanted to bring up was competitiveness.

I know that the numbers in Arizona as a state, the
electorate, were made up of 33 percent Independent, 31 percent Democratic, and 36 percent Republican.

But for the congressional districts, it looks like they were divided up in some being safe for Republicans, some being safe for Democrats.

And the numbers, the ways those come out, it comes out to be a little larger in favor of Republicans, it seems, for four of the congressional districts are safe for Republicans. And that's 45 percent as opposed to 36 percent that they're made up of as a whole in the state. And only 22 percent safe for Democratic, whereas they were 31 percent of the electorate.

And a similar story, exaggerated a bit, for the LDs, where we are -- we have 17 out of 30 safe Republican seats, districts, and that's made up of -- that makes 57 percent safe for Republicans, whereas, again, they only made up 36 percent of the electorate.

And 30 percent safe for Democrat, where they were only 31 percent of the electorate.

So I think that the LDs and CDs could be looked at again, and I urge you to look at it again, and keep competitiveness in mind when you do that. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Patrick O'Malley, representing self, from Maricopa County.
Followed by Jeffrey Tucker.

PATRICK O'MALLEY: Mr. Chair.

Patrick O'Malley, O, apostrophe, M-A-L-L-E-Y.

I'd like to talk about the legislative district map, and in particularly about the Maricopa County precinct named happy, which is bound by Riggs, Ellsworth, Hunt Highway, and Power Road.

And tonight happy precinct is not quite so happy. We have the distinction of being the one precinct in Maricopa County that was split off by itself and put into LD 8, which is Pinal County and Gila County. No other Maricopa County precincts went with us. It is the one example I can see of that. This violates two rules of the Commission. First, you have split a community of interest. Chandler Heights Citrus Irrigation District has been in place since 1929, and has definitely defined the area out there because of the agricultural work and that irrigation tied it together.

It's now split about 40 percent into LD 8 and about 60 percent in LD 12.

Also, it does not respect a county line. Again, we are the one Maricopa County precinct that was put into LD 8, which is about half Pinal County and the southern part of Gila County.
I live there. Since I can't get in Chandler Heights, I go into Queen Creek and I go into Gilbert.

I don't go into Florence. I don't go into Superior.

We belong with the other Maricopa County districts in my opinion, and I would appreciate it if you could put happy into LD 12.

Also I've been a little short. I don't want to dilute the issue, but I've heard a lot of people talk about competitive. And frankly I listened to a few of things and realized my original feeling of what is a competitive district was probably naive.

And I would be very interested in seeing a detailed technical definition from the Commission of how you measure competitive, because I think a lot of people have different opinions on that.

Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Jeffrey Tucker, representing self, from Maricopa County.

Followed by Glenn Westmoreland.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Glenn Westmoreland, he left.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.
Followed by Phil Hettmansperger -- probably butchered that.

PHIL HETTMANSPERGER: Hettmansperger.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you very much. You're next.

JEFFREY TUCKER: Hi. Thank you for this opportunity to speak to the Commission.

I've got about five-minute letter here. However, I'll cut it down to three minutes in the interest of time.

Dear commissioners, you have made great strides in addressing the majority of the goals for redistricting, and I thank you for the many hours of hard work and for the countless difficult decisions that you have had to make.

However, I am concerned that the redrawn maps do not reflect the will of the Arizona people, nor do they bear a resemblance to the electoral makeup of this state. Competition appears to have been treated as a lower priority in this process rather than equal mandate.

When examining the voter registration statistics from the Arizona Secretary of State, our state is 31 percent Democratic, 36 percent Republican, and 33 percent Independent. A very even split.

Yet, per the Commission's competitive index statistics for the redrawn maps, the Commission has drawn legislative boundaries that yield Republicans strongholds in
57 percent of the legislative districts and provide only a handful of truly competitive districts.

Further, the Commission has drawn a congressional map where six of the nine, 67 percent, of the districts have Republican registration advantages, and result in twice the number of strongholds than Democrats.

I skip over a lot of the portion in my letter that describes how I'm viewing competition. It's basically an analysis that's based on a 10 percent differential which would represent a competitive district.

Looking at the congressional map in that view, two districts are safe Democratic, three and seven.

Three districts are competitive, Districts 1, 2, and 9.

Four districts are safe Republican, four, five, six, and eight.

A side-by-side comparison of the electoral statistics with the way the maps were redrawn show a very disparate view of our state, and it's not representative of Arizona.

Taking a look at the legislative map, it gets a little bit worse.

Nine legislative districts are safe Democratic, Districts 2, 3, 7, 19, 24, 26, 27, 29, and 30.

Four legislative districts are competitive, four,
nine, ten, and 18.

However, 17 districts are safe Republican, one, five, six, eight, nine, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 -- oh, I'm very sorry.

One, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, and 28.

This map does not look anything like the one third, one third, one third apportionment of which our electorate is comprised.

In fact, there is an even greater and more serious imbalance in competition and fairness within this map.

I'm very concerned that the Commission has not offered definitions for competition in this process, like the last gentleman spoke of.

When there are no guidelines or goalposts as to what a competitive state map looks like, how will we know that the process has been successful.

I ask that the Commission determine definitions, data, and criteria for competition that the Commission can use to measure and evaluate their progress during the map revision process.

I implore the Commission to revise its maps to create greater competition and to truly represent Arizona in their work.

Please further examine where the communities of
interest have been packed into districts, and in those
districts where competition has been proposed, please find
ways of making the competition even stronger.

    Thank you very much for allowing me to speak.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Okay. Phil Hettmansperger.

PHIL HETTMANSPERGER: Hettmansperger. Very good.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Followed by Paige

Murphy-Young.

PHIL HETTMANSPERGER: My name is Phil

    I'm here as, number one, to, again, compliment you
on the handling of a very difficult task in spite of all the
aspersions that come your way from various sources.

    I have really not too much of a complaint of your
decision.

    However, in the congressional district map, if you
looked at it, right this minute I live in a neighborhood
called Anderson Springs, an HOA. And this HOA has been
split before, and it's being split again. Because Ray Road
runs through it.

    And so if you would look at your map, you'll see
the yellow area that protrudes into the number 17, there by
Warner Road, Ray Road, and Elliot Roads, two square miles.
And just north of it there's this little appendage sitting
It comes out -- a couple of facts.

Number one, Chandler public schools ends at Warner Road. Going north.

Everything above that is Mesa.

In turns out that a more logical position would be to move it up to Warner, and take off that little appendage, and possibly even the extra square mile of purple above Warner Road, even though it's Chandler, and it would not be in -- the school district would be consistent in that regard.

But as it is right now, that little appendage up there doesn't make any rational sense.

The people who live up there have a great connection with their adjacent neighborhoods, especially Dobson Ranch.

And here we are down the way, and we are so close to downtown and the city of Chandler, and yet we're being attached with Ahwatukee very far from us.

I understand that the original design, I'm suggesting just a tweak of the map, to include the square mile of Warner, Ray, Alma School, Dobson, into District 17, and then adjusting the area in purple north of Warner and west of Highway 87, which is Chandler or Arizona Avenue.

Thank you very much for your time.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Paige Murphy-Young, representing self, from Maricopa County.

Followed by Richard Tracy, Sr.

PAIGE MURPHY-YOUNG: The name is Murphy-Young, M-U-R-P-H-Y, hyphen, Y-O-U-N-G.

Thank you all so much for your time, your creativity, and no small amount of courage.

I live in what will be a new draft LD 18. I, I applaud your competitiveness that you've protected there, that you really facilitated. And I ask you to please protect it, protect it, and protect it in Congressional District 9.

In LD 18, which is about the same area as Kyrene School District, we have a wonderful example of competitiveness which could also be seen as collaboration.

Kyrene School District is renowned, is successful, it does very well on its bonds, and it is supported by all parties, including Independents. And we all benefit.

And its benefits are beyond property values, which are pretty stable.

So it works for everybody.

I am committed to competitiveness. It's not a matter of arm wrestling between Republicans and Democrats to see who gets elected. It's far more important. It's good government.
A representative, an elected official, who has to respond to the voices and people from all parties is actually liberated, is actually able to do the right thing. It's good for us in Arizona, and I think it will make a happier future.

Thanks again.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Richard Tracy, representing self, from Maricopa County.

Followed by David Bushman.

RICHARD TRACY, SR.: Good evening.

I am very pleased to follow this previous speaker, because she talked of the subject I want to talk about, and that is the fact that there should not be the competitiveness between the cities, but rather election competitiveness where there's an opportunity for the proper and best candidate to win regardless of party.

We lack that in most areas, and you've heard a lot of people talk about the fact that there was no competitiveness in the previous districts that were set up.

I would note for the record that the representative from LD 17 Republicans is no longer in the house, but I'd like to address to him the fact that the party that he represents has been well represented in our legislature, and of course we have the conservative
newspapers. We have 90 percent of the radio stations.

He has not got a handicap being a Republican in Maricopa County.

The fact that he's going to contact the governor and the attorney general, the record should reflect that both of them are advocates of federalism. And we're here talking about America and American system of voting, which is supposed to be fair.

There's been an effort to intimidate this body, and I do sympathize with you. It is unfounded. It was prepared.

I sat through many, many hours with this committee, and I know you've worked hard, you did the best you could, and I certainly wish us luck, but I'm disturbed about this competitiveness between the cities because, as everybody knows, a house divided cannot succeed.

Maricopa County is like one big city. But because of competitiveness, we have all kinds of expensive mistakes being made that will be costly for years.

So I ask the people be a little lenient, and I'll go along with the committee that is trying to make competitiveness in the voting accomplish what we should accomplish, and that is having a uniform idea of where this community is going.

I'm particularly disturbed ever since we moved the
stadium from Tempe out to 110th Street.

How much is that going to cost us over the next 20 years?

Bankruptcy for a basketball stadium, or hockey stadium, when we have three million people or four million people who would be potential customers.

Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

David Bushman, representing self. And you can tell us where you're from.

Followed by Eleonore Krebs.

DAVID BUSHMAN: David Bushman, Mesa, Arizona.

B-U-S-H-M-A-N.

Members of the Commission, thank you again for allowing all of us the opportunity to address you on some of the concerns that we have with the current proposed maps.

While I address my comments specifically to the legislative maps, my comments would equally apply to the congressional maps.

On Monday, October 3rd, I made a full map presentation of all 30 legislative districts. Those districts were constitutionally balanced against all six constitutional requirements.

My point is that the maps can be made to the extent practicable and address all the constitutional
requirements, not any one given requirement over another.

In the interest of time, I wish to specifically address Dobson Ranch as a community of interest.

If you refer to your maps, the proposed LD 26 comprising of Tempe and west Mesa, and proposed LD 18, splits my community of interest, Dobson Ranch, south of baseline. Two thirds of the geography of Dobson Ranch is south of Baseline and a third is north of Baseline going up to the 60.

The boundaries are the Loop 101 on the west side, the U.S. Highway 60 on the north, extending to about a quarter mile east of Alma School, bends down to Baseline Road, where it jogs down along Alma School on eastern border, and, again, the southern border being Guadalupe.

Dobson Ranch, as a community of interest established since 1973, should not be divided. We are Mesa. We're part of the Mesa Union High School District.

We are not part of Tempe. We do not share all the same values as Tempe. It does not make sense to include us with a Tempe type of a district.

By the same token, we're not part of Ahwatukee and that urban area.

My proposal is that Dobson Ranch be included in a Mesa district where the whole entire Dobson Ranch can be included in Mesa.
That is what I wanted to address specifically to the Commission tonight, and, again, I thank you for your time.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Eleonore Krebs, representing self, from Tempe.
Followed by Dave Wells.

ELEONORE KREBS: I'm Dr. Eleanor Krebs, K-R-E-B-S.
The way that this whole metropolitan area has grown, we actually all live in multiple communities of interest.

I've, for example, live in south Tempe. We're contiguous to the rest of Tempe. We're contiguous to Ahwatukee. We're contiguous to Chandler. We share common interests with them. Kyrene School District overlaps all of them.

And while I recognize that sometimes this is confusing and frustrating when you have to vote in multiple elections and on multiple issues, it still makes the point that we are all involved in a lot of the issues together.

And that the really important thing, I think, while recognizing that common interest, contiguity, geography, they're all important.

I'm really grateful to see the increased competitiveness in the proposed Legislative District 18 and CD 9.
That competitiveness, in my opinion, not only
gives members of both parties a meaningful chance to vote,
but also allows voice to the Independent voters. And there
are many of us.

The increased competitiveness increases both the
likelihood that we will increase civic participation,
because you do have a chance to vote and make it count, but
it also increases the accountability of those we represent,
to actually act for the common good. And that, I think, is
a concern to all of us.

I wish to commend you on your efforts to make a
difficult task fair with fair results, that are more
equitable along many of the dimensions that you were
required to consider.

As the previous speakers have also underscored,
competitiveness is also crucial for equitable representation
to occur.

Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Dave Wells, representing self, from Tempe.

Followed by -- Genevieve Vega. That was a
complete guess on my part.

DAVE WELLS: Hi. My name is Dr. Dave Wells,
D-A-V-E. Last name is Wells, W-E-L-L-S.

And I'm representing myself, but I do teach at
ASU. I teach political science. And I want to talk a little bit about the relevance of competitiveness and the metrics used to measure competitiveness with it.

First of all, why competitiveness is important. You'll have to look at, like, Governor Brewer vetoed a number of laws this past session that the Republican legislature passed.

And I think that helps give you an indication that our legislature is not very well representative of the people.

Governor Brewer represents the whole state. She's responsible for the whole state.

The legislature is responsible for their district and often just the people who are going to vote in a primary.

We may not have a Republican controlled legislature, but it would be a much more conservative legislature than the public are as a whole. And you'll see that if you actually look at ballot propositions. They make arguments how the public has been more liberal or conservative on different things, but certainly not as conservative as the legislature.

Now, in terms of your metrics, in terms of measuring things, I'm a proponent of what you use as index two.
I don't know the algorithm that you used, but I -- obviously in general with competitiveness you're looking for the generic Republican versus Democratic race. And so I just sort of measured that 54.3 against other things. And I found that, for instance, that on our presidential elections -- which are a pretty good indication in general. I mean, we've had some nationalized elections recently in 2006, '08, and '10 where the election moved to one party or the other. But in 2008 so we had, we had a -- we had McCain on the ballot, which did not help to counter that, but I, for instance, that, that George Bush got 53.3 percent of the vote, in 2000, he got 55.3 of the vote in 2004, and McCain got 54.3 of the vote in 2008. And that averages out to 54.3 percent.

And I just chose -- I mean, I generally say that if, for instance, the Brewer, Goddard race was skewed toward the Republicans this last time, not only 2010 but an election that was much more skewed for Republicans, but after the race was, immigration really took over that.

But if you look at the races that Democrats performed better than Goddard did -- and generally you find that, like, Ron Lee got -- Horne got 52 percent of the vote and Huppenthal got 55.4 percent of the vote. So if you look at those kind of things and you'll generally see that the 54.3 actually ends up being pretty representative.
The last thing I want to mention was what you actually have right now in terms of competitive districts. You have three -- white went from 45 to 55 as being the range, 50/50 being ideal, you only have three congressional districts that fit within that, out of nine, which is okay. But you only have four out of 30 legislative districts, and that's pretty poor.

And I think you want to look at trying to see if you can improve that.

You do have leeway because you don't have to have exactly the same number of people in each district.

Thank you very much for your time, and thank you for your work.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Genevieve Vega, and I apologize in advance.

Representing self, from Tempe.

Followed by Mark Jo Billy(sic).

GENEVIEVE VEGA: Genevieve Vega,

G-E-N-E-V-I-E-V-E, V-E-G-A.

So I want to start by saying thank you very much. I appreciate it that you're here, because the voters asked to have a fair and equitable redistricting process, so thank you very much for your time.

I want to talk about the Congressional District 9 map, as its drawn, includes urban areas of Tempe, Phoenix,
and east Mesa. And these are three cities that work
together quite frequently.

CD 9 incorporates the main arterial highway and
the light rail, so arguably depending on what your definition
of communities of interest is, this is an urban area. Urban
areas have common interests.

I personally live in the city of Tempe. I love
Tempe.

I live there. I work there. My oldest goes to
school there.

So, I have -- that's my community of interest.

There's a, there's a couple of things about urban
areas that have different issues than other districts.

Like, we're looking more at infill development as
opposed to other districts that might be looking towards
expansion. Right?

We've had tremendous expansion here in the Phoenix
metro, Maricopa County area.

So developmental interests are different.

We're looking to enhance our established
neighborhoods as opposed to expanding out into, into areas
that are not developed.

There's a suggestion of adding Sun Lakes to CD 9.
And that's unfair to the people of Sun Lakes, because it's
not part of that urban corridor that would connect and as
long as CD 9 represents this urban center of Phoenix.

And, like I mentioned, we have many shared
interests that would be represented well in CD 9 as a
competitive district.

So I thank you for making that competitive.
That's a good segue into competitiveness.

We've heard a lot of really great points on
competitiveness.

One I would like to point out is on the --
actually the Republican platform. It says that competition
puts the focus on quality.

All right. This is America. We're competitive.
I worked for a very large company that has a very
large sales force.

And if we aren't competitive, we fail in our
industry. Right?

If we don't have competitive markets, if we don't
drive to beat the competition, then where is the success?
Right?

If we don't have competitiveness in our
districts -- I'm speaking of legislative districts here. We
had statistics, and I am not going to go into that stuff.
But if we don't have competitive districts, then we'll fail.
Arizona will never have appropriate representation across
the board, and we're going to continue to see budget crisis,
emergency meetings, and cuts to education, and things like
that, and cuts to our communities that really impact the
majority of Arizonans.

And that's why I'd like to argue for competitive
districts.

So please relook at your legislative maps.

Thank you very much for your time. I appreciate
it.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Mark Jo Billy.

Followed by Mitzi Epstein.

I have a feeling it's not Mark.

MARTHA JO BILLY: Remember me, I'm sure.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: And get that microphone, if
you would, please.

MARTHA JO BILLY: I live -- oh, Martha Jo Billy,
B-I-L-L-Y.

I live in Gilbert and have for 34 years, I think.

Gilbert would qualify for the prime example in
probably whole world, or at least the United States, for a
community that is noncompetitive. If you tell anybody that
you live in Gilbert and you're a Democrat, they laugh at
you.

There's no representation in Gilbert District 22
for Democrats.
The representatives at the state only represent the Republicans and Mormons.

There has not been a Democrat on the council since 1999.

It is totally controlled by the Mormon Republicans, who moved to Gilbert to make it a bedroom community.

And if you live in Gilbert, your vote counts for absolutely nothing.

I do appreciate the work, as I mentioned before, that the Commission has done. I think you've tried, and I give you points for that.

And especially Desmond too. I don't want to leave Desmond out. How he's kept up with you all, with your map changes, I don't know. He'll probably have flashbacks after all this.

And maybe you all will too.

I do appreciate what you've done, as I've said. But I do think that Gilbert and the state needs to be more competitive, because our right to vote is a bad lie if it does not count for anything.

And our vote in Gilbert does not count if you are not a Republican.

Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.
Mitzi Epstein, representing self, from Tempe.
Followed by Marsha Atkin.

MITZI EPSTEIN: Good evening, members of the
Commission. Thank you for your time, your service,
dedication, all these wonderful things, and your tough
skins.

Competitiveness is the most important thing.

I work with a group called APPLE, Arizona Parents
for Public Education. When I say work, I mean volunteer.

We encourage parents to talk with their
legislature. And we stick very firmly to the idea that
whoever gets elected, that's who we work with. So we don't
get involved in elections.

It's all about being able to walk in the door and
have a representative listen to this perspective.

Unfortunately in the time that I've been working
with this group, statewide group, we talk with legislators
from many, many different districts, they stopped listening.

And it's become very, very sad where they used to,
when we didn't have this horrible extremism going on, they
used to listen to some ideas and make some changes.

And now we just find they're almost saying I'll
let you know when I talk to my party.

And it's all about the parties. And so our ideas
are not getting vetted.
I know people who get elected depend on the process of committees and vetting ideas through the legislative process. But if nobody will speak anything but the party line, as we hear so often, then the ideas are not getting vetted. And they're afraid to get away from the extreme party line, because they think that's what their district wants of them.

So the districts have got to become more competitive so that our elected representatives can feel free to say that, yes, I'm representing my district but looking at some other ideas.

So competitiveness is about making our solutions stronger by letting our ideas be fully vetted by listening to both sides.

I know you have many issues to consider. I really can't speak strongly enough for how badly we need competitiveness for the future of our state.

Thank you very much for all the work you're doing.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Marsha Atkin, representing self, from Chandler.

Followed by Lauren Kuby.

(No oral response.)

LAUREN KUBY: Hello. I'm Lauren Kuby. That other person must have left.

So, my name is Lauren Kuby. I'm a 23-year
resident of the valley. I've spoken before you a few times before. I'm glad to be at this stage of the hearings.

I wanted to speak of a few things. One is about gerrymandering.

You've heard some various descriptions that I think are in error, and I know you commissioners, Freeman, McNulty, know what the meaning is. But there seems to be some misunderstanding that somehow a weird shape is a gerrymander, and that -- I want to say while compactness is one of the six criteria, we could have 30 perfectly rectangular districts in our state that would not serve Arizona very well.

Gerrymandering is, in fact, tweaking a district to make it favor one party over another electorally. The answer, the antidote to gerrymandering is competitiveness.

So for people to get up and say a competitive district's created in Congressional District 9, and that's gerrymandering, is sort of really not accurate use of the term.

In 2000 the voters voted for fair and competitive elections. That was written into of the referendum, fair and competitive.

We've heard many people out tonight and at other meetings talk about competitiveness, how it needs to be considered last because it was one of six criteria, it was
listed the last.

We know that in 2009 Arizona Supreme Court ruled that it had to be equal to the other criteria.

I want to speak about CD 9.

That seems to be the only truly competitive district created. I'm a little disappointed in the congressional map, but I want to fiercely defend that one victory. I think that we need to have at least one competitive district, and to me it was a natural corridor created between Mesa, the community college district, ASU, the university, and the light rail district downtown.

It makes a lot of sense.

And as far as LD maps go, I do want to say that it's very disappointing. I worry that when you are looked at ten years from now, they'll be seeing a map that was very -- that took a giant step backwards for Arizona.

In the case of LD 26 -- I'm from LD 17. In the case of the newly created LD 26, you've made a district that benefits Democrats slightly. I think it can be more competitive. Take away some of the Democrats, give some more competition to the other districts.

I'm sad to say that I saw Tempe sort of cut in half to help out and make more competitive LD 20 and LD 18.

I salute you for that.

As much as I -- it hurts to see my Tempe cut in
half, I understand that it's very important for competitiveness that we need to see that happen.

I do want to salute you in LD 26 in creating a minority coalition, because Tempe is a vibrant place, a vibrant, diverse community.

I serve on the Tempe Community Council board, and human services are our main focus, and we have so much interaction with west Mesa residents and Tempe residents, and human services is a natural sort of connection there and community of interest.

So I think the move into Mesa makes very good sense.

I just ask if you'd look at the other districts in the legislative map, take a look, and make it more competitive, because as it is now one truly competitive district is a major fail.

Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

John Gallagher, representing self, from Maricopa County.

Followed by Michael Kuby.


Thank you for allowing me to speak today.
And, you know, as members of this Commission, you really have a once in a lifetime opportunity to change Arizona's political landscape for the better by creating competitive districts that require politicians to represent all of the voters in their district and not just an extreme fringe of voters who participate in partisan primaries.

Now, I've looked at the legislative maps, and I'm sadly disappointed. I think that you're really not availing yourself of the chance to really make Arizona's political process responsive to the voters.

Now, there are those people that are threatening to tie things up in court.

I have no doubt that these maps regardless will be tied up in court regardless of what you do.

But you can't allow yourself to be intimidated by these people. We have to live with these maps for the next ten years.

And if you have to go to court to get lines that represent the voters of Arizona, so be it. Then you go to court.

But you can't back down and allow yourself to be intimidated by people that want to protect incumbent politicians and want to protect the status quo because they like things just the way they are.

You don't work for them. You work for the people
of Arizona.

So, this is the sixth time I've spoken before this commission.

And many people, not just myself, have told you they want more competition in Arizona elections.

And we represent a lot more people that don't have the time to come to these hearings or can't participate, but Arizonans don't have a legislature that represents them.

And the people of the state ought not to be at war with its government. But time and time again, the voters of this state have had to pass legislation by the initiative process that our state legislature never would have passed in a million years.

Then we've had to defend those laws passed by voter initiative from a hostile legislature in court. And we're had to pursue litigation to prevent funds from being swept and used for other purposes than what the voters intended.

Now, initiative recall and litigation are not an effective way to conduct the business of government. It's a messy and expensive way to conduct government.

But when a legislature is so out of touch with the citizens of its state because of noncompetitive districts and gerrymandering, as voters we're left with little choice.
So if this Commission fails in its mission to create districts that more faithfully represent the people of Arizona, you'll see more and more Arizonans lose faith in and respect for the institution of the state government. You'll see civility declining more than it already has, and you'll see people stop participating and not even bother to vote.

And I don't think any of us want that. So please don't cave into the special interests. Create legislative districts that really represent Arizona.

Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Michael Kuby, followed by Matt Lucky.

MICHAEL KUBY: Good evening. Mike Kuby, M-I-K-E, K-U-B-Y.

I'm a professor in the school of geographical sciences in urban planning at ASU. I was actually a candidate for this Commission. Very highly rated in the top five or so. And I couldn't serve because I didn't have time with my job at ASU.

So I applaud all of you for the time that you're taking to do this. I know it's an extremely important job.

I want to make two points, about the proposed Congressional District 9 and competitiveness.
I know there are a lot people out there trying to convince you that Congressional District 9 is not a community of interest. But it's one of the few competitive districts that there are. And I think it's actually, to make a very strong case, that it's a very strong community of interest.

When urban geographers look at the land use patterns of the city, we have two main models for doing so, we call it the sector model and the concentric ring model.

According to the sector model, you have a high income sector. However, it gets started, it just keeps going in that direction. And on either side of it are middle class.

So in Phoenix, that high income sector is up towards Scottsdale, and middle class on either side. And CD 9 has those two middle class sides to it, and misses the middle, the high income part, which makes it more of a community of interest.

And then there's the concentric ring model. You've got the central business district, the surrounding mixed use industrial warehouse district, and then what we call the inner city.

And then beyond that, the fourth ring, that's what you've got. You've got an overlap of those two middle class sectors and the fourth ring, which is generally middle
class, older homes, a lot of homeowners.

And so you really designed CD 9 as a strong community of interest.

It's got the two ends of the lightrail, but not the middle. That's actually the two areas that have the most in common, because they are the origin of a lot of the trips.

You've also got all the major highways, the 51, 202, the 101, the 60, the Broadway curve, passing through these areas. That's a common problem. People who are referring to infill, economic development, and even landlock, that's a common problem with that district.

Plus you've got the mountains. You have Camelback, Squaw Peak -- Piestewa, South Mountain, Papago Park, a common area.

And let me talk about competitiveness for a minute.

Because frankly I am with the others who are saying four competitive districts out of 30 for the legislative map is pathetic.

It's just -- it's really sad.

The reason we have this Independent Redistricting Commission, the reason I applied to be on it is that redistricting has commonly been a tool to empower the dominant one of the group, the dominant political party, and
let them consolidate their gains over the others.

And your job is to guard against that.

Okay?

So, there's two ways to do it. They try to pack a lot of the opponents into one district and waste a lot of votes and then they try to divide and conquer the others. And that's clearly what's going on in that legislative map, and you're just letting it happen.

Thank you very much.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Matt Lucky, representing self, from Tempe. Followed by Jana Granillo.

MATT LUCKY: Hello there. I'm Matt Lucky. I'm a student at ASU. I've lived in Arizona most of my live, so that's a fair amount of time.

But I would like to really come here and talk to you about the importance of competitiveness for these districts.

We know that the voter split into 30 but the thirds but the districts as you've drawn the legislative map really don't reflect that. Like Dave mentioned before, you only got, you know, four districts that will kind of -- that really match up with this. And this is a really bad thing, especially about the voter initiative and the way it negatively affects it. Nobody wants to play their game.
And you can see that, you know, just looking at CD 4, with the current CD 4, not the future one, because it has one of lowest turnout rates in all of the nation, and it's because no one wants to come out and vote when the outcome is predetermined.

The founding fathers, Thomas Jefferson was fearful of this that the great democracy was the dying out of revolution and political involvement of citizens joining these districts that undermine the people's involvement is (inaudible).

It goes against the spirit of our country and it's a cancer of our democracy.

I'd say that overall, I mean, having elections doesn't make a democracy. Ask the people in Iran about that.

You -- I mean, we -- just give the citizens their own choice to choose their election or their representative. Don't choose it for them. And, I mean, you owe that to them as their, you know, fellow citizens. It's -- you have a moral duty to that.

Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Jana Granillo.

Followed by Randy Keating.

JANA GRANILLO: Hi, I've spoken before, and this
is my second time.

My name is Jana, J-A-N-A. And my last name is Granillo, G-R-A-N-I-L-L-O.

I'm a native from Arizona.

I lived here most of my life, except for the few years that I served our country.

I worked in state government for 25 years and in the military seven.

I'm from a pioneer family and an indigenous population.

Needless to say, I'm very concerned about Arizona. My home, my ancestors' home, and the home of my daughter, and children that will come after her.

I currently live in District 17. It will now become District 26.

And I spoke before at a previous meeting when you were looking at the congressional district.

My points here today are basically to say that I support the work that's been done for CD 9. Thank you very much for that work.

I also support the lines and the work that's been done for Legislative District 26, especially building in Mesa.

I understand from my colleagues and previous citizens here that that's now a minority coalition group,
Legislative 26.

I also want to talk to competitiveness in support, as many of my other citizens have done so, and from -- who are from the district -- the same district I live in.

But I also want to say, as a minority, we can walk and chew gum at the same time.

And for those districts that come out under the protection of the voter protection right -- voters rights, that that is a separate parallel path.

The other path that you're also working on which you all know is to make Arizona competitive.

And I know that one should not -- if you have more Democrats in because of the voter protection right, that's because that's the way that worked out.

And that should not influence the results from the rest of Arizona in making that competitive.

And to please consider that and not to play one against the other.

Also, spending a lifetime of service, I appreciate the work that you've done.

If I've already said that, I'm sorry. I apologize.

I am semi-retired. I continue to volunteer for my community, and most particularly in public health.

I know what Arizona is, I know the people that
live here, and they deserve competitiveness, and so does the
future of Arizona.

Thank you very much.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Randy Keating, representing self, from Tempe.

Followed by Randall Holmes.


First of all, I'd like to thank this Commission for its work. You are doing a public service and a thankless job, as I'm sure you well know.

And Arizona needs you. So thanks for that.

Now, I'm here to speak about two topics. The -- one is Congressional District 9, proposed Congressional District 9.

I'm very happy to see this district as a Tempe resident. And I think that this is a model that can be placed on the rest of the congressional districts statewide.

Now, we only have a few points of voter registration advantage, I'll say, with a majority of voters being Independent in CD 9.

I think that's fantastic, and I hope that the rest of our districts look like that as well.

I would also like to speak about the legislative
map. I, being in Tempe, in central Tempe, I will be in the new LD 26 district.

And I also think this is a good example for what the rest of the districts should look like.

Very close voter registration numbers, majority Independent, right along major transportation routes. So we know that ideas and culture flow through transportation corridors. I think this is a fantastic district.

And I do hope that you will consider applying that same standard to the rest of the legislative districts on this map.

People had mentioned before that there's only four of 30 that are competitive. Speaking for myself, I would say that I think 30 of 30 could be competitive.

Our democracy suffers when my vote is taken for granted. Whether I'm Democrat, Republican, or Independent, if those running to represent me don't have to court my vote, then nobody wins.

Now, this Commission has been under attack by the forces of the status quo, both personally and professionally.

And you even had somebody up here earlier threaten I'm going to the governor, I'm going to go to the attorney general, I'm going to do all these things.

Do what you know is right.
The voters have set up this Commission because we do not want gerrymandered districts in Arizona any longer. Arizona can't afford it frankly.

And those making threats and those up here grandstanding are doing it for their own political reasons, not for the betterment of our state.

So, this Commission has done good work.

I urge you to resist the political pressure that you're under.

I urge you to do what the voters have sent you here to do. And that is give Arizona competitive districts, give me a politician who actually has to work for my vote.

Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

Randall Holmes, from Tempe, representing self.

RANDALL HOLMES: Hi, folks.

I hate to sound like a broken record, and you probably think I'm going to say the same thing I said before, but pay attention. I might say something different this time.

The Independent voter, I've heard people say that the interest of the Independent voters are being ignored or lost in the two party system. And I always have to laugh a little bit when I talk to an Independent voter, and they always say, well, I don't vote for the party, I vote for the
man.

    In which if they say man, that means they're a Republican probably.

    In the closet, deep in the closet.

    But they vote for the person. They don't vote for the party.

    The fact is, this is a team support. And whoever you're voting for, for the legislature or congress, you may be voting for a candidate, but the reality you're voting for either Nancy Pelosi or John Boehner to set the agenda for our nation, and in the legislature you're either voting for Russell Pearce or you're voting for Kyrsten Sinema.

    And the result of the election, the legislative or congressional election, is who gets to set the agenda.

    Whichever trailer park you live in, whatever school district or whatever subdivision, development, city, town, county, you live in, whatever community of interest you see yourself in has nothing -- has no felt on what's going to happen to you and to your children and grandchildren.

    What's going to have an effect is which team controls the agenda.

    And right now one team is totally -- is in a major battle between ideological, theological, and corporate forces. And hopefully they'll keep fighting and you won't
get united enough to actually gain the upper hand.

The other party is, is in a similar struggle, but
taking part in a primary election is where you really have
to have control.

And so if the elections are competitive, if all
the districts or as many districts as possible are
competitive, then it's more of a toss up as to who is going
to control the agenda.

In a safe Republican district, Republicans are
also disenfranchised. We've heard the Democrats in Gilbert
or Independents in Gilbert are disenfranchised. Doesn't
matter whether they turn out for the general election or
not, because it's over.

The fact is Republicans are also disenfranchised
because they get entrenched candidates who take their vote
for granted also.

Last thing I want to say is to echo what
Mr. Gallagher said about intimidation. We the people
established this Commission in order to take it out of the
greasy, money-clutching fingers of the legislature.

And we want a legislature and congressional
delegation that looks like Arizona.

We don't want to have those people controlling
what you do.

And like Mr. Gallagher said, I hope you will put
out the best map you can put out, let the chips fall where they may, and let's fight it out in court or wherever we have to.

But until we get a new legislature, nothing is going to change in the state.

Thanks.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you.

That was the last request to speak form I had.

Did anyone fill out a form and I not call out your name? Or is there anyone who wishes to speak?

(No oral response.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay. Then I want to thank the city of Chandler again, and I want to give Commissioner McNulty an opportunity to impart any parting thoughts.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Thank you all for coming. A special thanks to Ms. Cross and the City of Chandler for being engaged in this process from the beginning and I'm sure through to the end.

And thank you all for coming tonight and speaking your minds. We really appreciate it.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Thank you all again.

Tomorrow the Commission sits in Bullhead City, and I think I'm going to be there. And then I think on Friday we're at the San Carlos Indian reservation in the morning.
and then the city of Globe in the evening. Saturday we're in Avondale. And that's about as far out as I remember.

You can go to the website azredistricting.org and you can see the full schedule and follow us around if you like.

So with that, there's nothing left on the agenda except adjournment, so at 8:40 the meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned.)

* * * * *
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