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PROCEDINGS

(Whereupon, the public session commences.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Good evening, everyone. And welcome to the Friday, November 4th, Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission meeting.

The time is 6:10.

My name is Rick Stertz, and I will be the acting commissioner for this evening's hearing at which we'll be taking testimony from all of the folks that would like to give testimony tonight about the comments that they have on the draft maps that have been given to us -- given to you for review.

I'd like to give some quick introductions.

Our executive director is Kristina Gomez. She's in the back of the room waving her hand.

Please if there's anything that you would need from her, either if you have not filled out one of the yellow sheets for speaking or one of the blue sheets for giving testimony, please see Kristina Gomez, and she will be able to provide that for you.
Our audio visual tonight, and we are live streaming, so the other commissioners are watching us on live stream this evening, that is being managed by Buck Forst, who is our audio visual technician.

We also have Lisa Schmelling, who is our outreach coordinator, and Kristi Olson, who are in the back of the room that greeted you when you came in the door.

Each one of you should have received a packet that looks like this that contains information about the draft maps that are, that are being discussed and reviewed at this time.

To my left, from Strategic Telemetry, I have Andrew Drechsler.

To my right, with -- one of our legal counsel, Joe Kanefield.

And down on the floor here is who I called the iron man last night because he continuously took testimony for three hours without a break up in Scottsdale yesterday where we had a room of 250 people and he took testimony for almost 90 people in a two-and-a-half-hour period, Marty Herder.

So we want to first stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Before we get started, we
have our translator, Carlos Reyes.

Carlos, if you would like to come join us at the podium.

CARLOS REYES: Good evening, Commissioner Stertz, ladies and gentlemen, commissioners.

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

Now I will read the same script in Spanish for the Spanish speaking citizens.

And it says.

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

CARLOS REYES: Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much, Mr. Reyes.

Just as a reminder, tomorrow we have another hearing scheduled for 9:00 o'clock tomorrow morning in Green Valley at the Desert Hills Social Center located at 2980 South Camino Del Sol, and tomorrow afternoon up the road in the city of Casa Grande, which will be at the city council chambers, 510 East Florence Boulevard, and that's
going to start at 3:30 tomorrow afternoon.

Folks, I know that it's been a week where a lot of emotions are moving around. It's been a difficult week and a challenging week.

So what we'd like to do tonight, we're going to -- we've got about 30 people that have given time to speak. We'll set the timer at three minutes. We'll be -- try to be considerate of the others that are speaking tonight.

And the goal of tonight is to capture as much information from each one of you as we possibly can to place into the record. So if you don't feel comfortable about placing -- or coming up to the microphone to speak, then please make sure that you fill out your thoughts on the blue cards, because the importance of the blue cards is equally important as the public testimony that you'll be giving at the microphone tonight.

Before we get started we have a presentation that will be provided by Andrew Drechsler on the process that we are currently going through.

Andrew.

ANDREW DRECHSLER: Thank you very much,

Commissioner Stertz.

We just wanted to -- before we show you the draft maps tonight and hear what your thoughts are on the draft maps, just wanted to go through a presentation that talks
about the process and how it started and where we are right now.

So just wanted to get started with that.

Just a quick overview of the process in general.

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 shall redraw Arizona's congressional and legislative districts to reflect the results of the most recent census.

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

The number of seats in the senate will remain at 30. And then the house of representatives, that will remain 60 as well.

What are the requirements of the state constitution per Proposition 106?

These are really the guidelines that the commissioners and the Commission is using to draw the maps.

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

Criteria A and B are federally mandated.
To the extent 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 the remaining four requirements here are ones that were included into the Proposition 106 along with the other two that were federally mandated.

Just wanted to do a quick overview of 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 the new districts do not discriminate against minority voting -- 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 voting rights.

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

And we have a quick presentation from Bruce
Adelson, who was -- worked for the Department of Justice in 2000.

(Whereupon, a video presentation of Bruce Adelson was shown.)

ANDREW DRECHSLER: Next we wanted to go over the timeline of the redistricting process.

First, it started earlier this year. Basically what was done is a whole new agency, state agency was created.

The commissioners were appointed following a thorough screening process, and each of the commissioners serve in a voluntary, unpaid role.

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.

And then the mapping started.

Per Proposition 106 we started with a clean slate. And then the next step was we divided the state into equal population and compact-like grids -- compact-like districts, which was the grid map that was approved on August 18.

Proposition 106 requires us to do that. We cannot take into consideration any of the old lines or where any of
the incumbents live.

Since adopting the grid maps, the Commission has met more than 25 times during the months of -- over the months in August, September, and October, to take into consideration and make adjustments to the grid to accommodate all the state criteria.

Also during this time they received additional public comment and draft maps.

And approval of the draft maps. On October 3rd the congressional -- the Commission approved the draft congressional map that incorporated all the changes based on the constitutional criteria. And then on October 10th the legislative draft map was also approved.

Step four was the second round of hearings, which we are presently part of today.

We've started the second round on October 11th, and we're finishing up tomorrow.

We've visited over 25 towns and cities around the state to share the draft maps and to receive additional public comment throughout the months of October and November.

The next step is the final maps.

Upon completion of public comment period, the Commission will adopt the final maps.

And then the final step in the redistricting
process is getting preclearance.

Because Arizona is subject to the 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 for upcoming Arizona elections.

Just wanted to give you, before we show you the draft maps, just wanted to give you an overview of the process that has taken place.

This map that you see in front of you is the map -- the congressional map that was approved by the last Commission and was most recently used in the 2010 elections.

Per Proposition 106, we started with a clean slate, and then we created the grid map.

The grid map only takes into consideration two criteria.

It takes into consideration compactness and equal population.

So this is the grid map that was approved on August 18th.

And here in front of you after the 25 meetings where the commissioners met and the numerous public comments, we came up with the congressional draft map that you see in front of you.

Some features of this, it has two predominantly
rural districts, three border districts, three districts
in the greater Tucson region, five districts that are
entirely in Maricopa County, it avoids splitting Arizona's
Indian reservations, and has two districts where minority
voters have the opportunity to elect a candidate of their
choice.

The legislative map followed a very similar
process.

You can see here this is the map that was approved
by the last Commission. And, again, most recently used in
the 2010 elections.

And, again, we started with a clean slate and then
we went to the grid map.

The grid map has the -- so we took in two of the
six criteria, equal population and compactness.

And finally the draft map that you see here was
approved on October 10. And some features of the draft
map -- the map that you just saw per -- the old map that was
most recently used in the 2010 elections, because of the
population changes in Arizona, some of the districts had as
little as 155,000 people living in those districts and some
had up to 378,000.

Under the draft map that you see here, the
population is approximately 207,000 to 215,000.

To comply with the Voting Rights Act, the draft
map includes ten districts whereby minority voters should have the opportunity to elect the candidates of their choice. The draft map also includes three districts wholly within Pima County and three additional southern Arizona districts, 17 districts that are primarily within Maricopa County, and nine districts that are rural.

We want to hear your input, and that's a big reason why we're here today to show you the maps. And there's a number of different ways that you can give us your input.

You can fill out a request to speak form, if you would like to speak tonight.

Examples of some of the input that you can give us, you can talk about any of the constitutional criteria, things that you might like about the congressional maps, things that you might not like about the congressional maps, and the same thing with the legislative maps.

And besides speaking here, you can also fill out one of these blue forms that are in the back of the packet. And you can either fill these out tonight and hand them in to Kristi or Lisa or Kristina in the back, or we have the address on the bottom, you can mail them in. Or the other way you can submit public comment is going to our website at www.azredistricting.org, and there's a public comment section where you can make public comment.
You can call us at, toll free, (855)733-7478, if you have any comments.

Next is just a shot of our home page, and just wanted to highlight a couple of things to everybody who would like to go there.

A couple arrows on here.

You can see in the upper left-hand corner you see an arrow for maps.

What you find here is an online mapping software that you can draw your own maps.

You can see the grid maps to, if you -- you can see what any of the what-if maps on there that were considered by the Commission as they came through the final maps.

You can see the arrow for the meetings. While tomorrow is the last day for round two, there will be additional hearings to finalize the maps. And you can watch all of those live. And you can go view any of the past meetings as well.

So if you wanted to see the over 100 hours that went into drafting the maps, the draft maps that you saw tonight, all those meetings are online, and the transcripts are online, and you can review those if you like.

There's an area where you can do public input. If you click on that, it will ask you a couple questions and
you can fill that out and submit that. And down on the bottom you'll see the two pictures of the draft maps.

If you click on either of those, it will take you to this page, which has a lot of information available for you on the draft maps.

It has a compactness report, competitiveness report, splits reports, which shows what counties and areas were split.

And then there's a number of different, there's a number of different maps and different formats that you can look at, that you can look at, and on top is the congressional and on the bottom is the legislative.

One of the features that people have really liked is the Google map. And that's circled in red. It's on the top.

If you click on that, you come to the screen that looks like this. And what it shows is the maps. And one of really nice features about the Google map is you're able to scroll in. People wanted to know where they live, where are their boundaries, where are boundaries for the neighboring districts. And this allows you to scroll in and zoom in so you're able to see that.

Here's an example. I think this is a shot from Maricopa County that sort of highlights the streets and the
boundaries and some of the geographic features there.

And finally we want you to stay connected.

As I mentioned there's a wealth of information on our website that's available for everybody. You can draw your own maps. You can get information on any of the past meetings or current meetings coming up.

And you can also follow us on Twitter and Facebook.

Just want to thank you for coming out tonight.

We really look forward to hearing your comments.

I will be around afterwards if anybody has any questions. I will be more than happy to answer them, or any of the staff. We want make sure that you understand the process. And happy to be here to answer any of your questions.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much, Andrew.

Before we get started, I just wanted to thank the town of Marana for providing these beautiful facilities for us to be able to hold this meeting in tonight.

And I want to thank all of you for coming out tonight to share your thoughts and your ideas about what are -- what is unquestionably a difficult task that we have. And we're looking forward to capturing all the comments that you have.
So leading into that, we'd like to go ahead and begin with our first speaker, which is Mayor Ed of the town of Marana.

MAYOR ED HONEA: Thank you, Commissioner Stertz, and welcome to our humble abode.

Our council has been talking about these maps, both the legislative and the congressional parts of the map. And probably the one we have the biggest problem with is District 1, which we are part of. And it's not that we have a problem necessarily being with Pinal County or part of Cochise County and part of southern Arizona, but that district is about a third of the state and covers three fourths of the Utah border, all the way to Mexico.

The current representative there is Paul Gosar. He's 200 miles from my house.

The district, I don't think, meets the criteria of compact or trying to keep it more compact.

Don't have a problem with the southern part of the district, but the fact that I would have to drive for four or five hours to talk to my congressman as an elected official in Marana is a little disturbing to me.

Legislatively we would be in the new district 11, which is mainly Marana and Maricopa, part of Casa Grande, Eloy, and part of Coolidge.

We don't really have a problem with that. But,
the general legislative districts around Tucson, I think, are atrocious.

I really think what has happened -- I understand that you don't draw districts to keep people in a safe district or to look at people, but we're having four and five legislators thrown in the same district with the redistricting.

And I don't know if that's good for the state of Arizona.

I understand we want to be fair, but by doing some of those things, I would hope that you would seriously look at some of the southern Arizona legislative districts, and maybe look at the congressional district and realize that it's thousands and thousands of square miles.

And Page and Marana will be in the same district. And that's a long ways away.

I mean, that's a four- or five-hour drive or six-hour drive for me.

And we appreciate what you're doing. We know it's a tough job. I'm not here to say anything bad about you.

But if compactness is one of the two primary criteria, District 1 is not compact by any stretch of the imagination.

And it would be very difficult for a congress member to represent that district well because of how far
Thank you very much for coming to Marana, and
thank you for the opportunity.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, Mayor Ed. Thank
you for the hospitality.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm going to do the best I
can to take these in order as they came in, at least that's
how the stack came. And what I'm going to do is I'm going
to read off the first three names so that you can start
getting your thoughts in your head about what you would like
to present.

So first up is Mr. Pete Bengtson.

After that is Betty Bengtson and Ben Love.

PETE BENGTSON: I knew there was a penalty for
coming early.

Commissioner Stertz, thank you for coming and
representing the Commission tonight.

Appreciate your time. I know it's a lot of effort
to get out here.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Bengtson, I forgot a
little housekeeping for everyone.

For our reporter, Marty Herder --

PETE BENGTSON: I forgot Marty.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: -- you need to spell your
first and your last name, please, for the reporter.

PETE BENGTSON: It's Peter, P-E-T-E-R, Bengtson,
B-E-N-G-T-S-O-N.

I guess I got to put my glasses on.

As I've mentioned a number of times or at least
once before I'm not -- I just started.

I'm just -- I'm really an environmentalist. I'm
not really a Democrat, although I hang with those guys. The
reason I do that, being an environmentalist is what gets me
off, walking neighborhoods and making phone calls, and
that's what I'm really interested in.

Environmentalism is sort of popular, but it's not
a top issue.

If I had my way, I would come up here and talk to
you to try and ask you to redraw the districts so that
environmentalists could get elected.

You can't do that. I know it's not one of the six
goals.

All I can do is encourage you to draw the
districts so that we have more competitive districts.

I've been to something like 22 of these business
meetings. I've kept the agendas. Scared me when I counted
them up.

But I wanted to say that I've been really
impressed with the commissioners, how hard they work,
discussing where they can draw the line here or there, to try and meet all of the six conflicting goals that you have to deal with.

Plus I'm impressed with Strategic Telemetry. I know they've gotten a lot of bad press, a lot of static, but they -- their people have been very careful not to -- I hate to say show any initiative, but that's what they're doing. They're following the directions of the commissioners all the way down the line. The lines are drawn right where the commissioners wanted them.

Finally I want to say that I'm very disappointed with the state legislature and Governor Brewer for removing Colleen Mathis.

I think that's just terrible.

(Applause.)

PETE BENGTSON: And I know the Commission attorneys have appealed, and Colleen Mathis' attorney is appealing, and I hope she's successful getting back on the Commission.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, Mr. Bengtson.

Next up is Betty Bengtson followed by Ben Love and John Olbert.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Mr. Chair, can we have some more volume, please?
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Absolutely.

BETTY BENGTSON: My name is Betty Bengtson, B-E-N-G-T-S-O-N.

And I am not going to repeat a lot of the things that Pete said because what -- his remarks certainly reflect how I feel about the work of the Commission.

I also have attended many of the meetings, and I've watched some of the streaming video of meetings that I was unable for attend.

I too have been impressed by the work and dedication of the Commissioners. And I think I have a real appreciation for the difficulty of your task.

I've seen you moving census districts from here to there, and then it makes -- it impacts both districts. You have to move another line.

I'm not surprised that you have people who are unhappy with some of the districts. I think that's just the nature of the work.

The other point I want to make is the outrage I feel over the action of the governor and the state senate. This is a clear power grab. They are going against the will of the people as expressed when Proposition 106 was approved.

The objective of that proposition is to create fair and competitive districts.
And I don't see how -- why the governor is so unhappy with the districts that are resulting. If you look at the data, clearly the Republicans still have -- will be able to elect who they wish in the majority of the districts, both congressional districts and the legislative districts.

I hope that, that Chairwoman Mathis is successful in her effort to be reinstated, and I hope the governor and the state senate come to their senses.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up is Ben Love, followed by John Olbert and Sharon Olbert.

By the way, how is your volume?

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Good.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Better? Thank you.

BEN LOVE: That's Ben, B-E-N, as in Benjamin, L-O-V-E, Love.

And I just have a quick comment.

And most -- the two speakers before me have mostly stolen my thunder. I think it's absolutely shameful the way our Governor Brewer and the Republican legislators have attempted to hijack our Democratic process.

I don't know what happens next. God help us all is all I can say. But, but especially thank you, the
surviving members of our Commission, for carrying on this
important work. Thanks for your service.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.

    (Applause.)

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up is John Olbert,
Sharon Olbert, followed by Barney Brenner.

    JOHN OLBERT: Yes, my name is John, J-O-H-N,
O-L-B-E-R-T.

    I wish to commend the Commission for working very
diligently.

    I've studied the data, and I see what you've done
as far as the population, the racial mix. And I think
you've worked very hard to follow the law of the federal law
and the state law as approved by the people of Arizona in
Proposition 102 -- or 106. Sorry.

    So thank you for your work, and please continue to
do as you have been doing.

    Thank you.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.

    (Applause.)

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up we have Sharon
Olbert, followed by Barney Brenner and Vince Leach.

    SHARON OLBERT: Hi, Sharon Olbert. I spell my
name the same way that other guy does, O-L-B-E-R-T.

    I just want to say that this is my first time here
at one of these meetings. And I'm a registered Independent, so I wanted to come and see what all this ruckus is about.

And I am just absolutely in awe of these commissioners, all the time you have spent, and I understand it's for no pay.

So, I thank you. I applaud you.

I also have been trying to understand what all the complaints are about.

I heard on NPR today that Arizona -- it is national public radio, about Arizona's polarized government, with the governor removing the chairman of this committee. And according to the commentators, it was totally a political, a political move.

So I hope that that will be resolved in the best interest of the Arizona voters.

As for the following, the mandates of the voting rights, it seems to me looking at the information, as I say I'm new to this, but I see for your equality of population, you did an incredible job, incredible job of having almost equal population in the legislative districts. There's just not that much variation.

And as far as competitiveness, it looks to me like if you look at the column on the far right, you have 16 more Republicans -- heavily Republican districts and only 12 that are more heavily Democrat.
If anything I think that it should be a little bit -- maybe that's not exactly equal, but I imagine that's probably going to be impossible to find, so I think so far what you've done is absolutely amazing.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up is Mr. Barney Brenner, followed by Vince Leach and Edward Treick.


And I am concerned with regard to following the law in drawing these maps.

It's clear that either political party would be happy to have an advantage from the way these maps turn out.

But that's not the intent of the drawing of the map, and that's not the guidelines that were set up for drawing the map.

There are two overarching guidelines, Voting Rights Act and equal population.

But then the other four criterion, the communities of interest and compactness take precedent clearly over what's mentioned at the end, which is competitiveness, which is stipulated only that it doesn't conflict with the other requirements.
And when you have communities of interest that are broken up not just in half or thirds, proven communities of interest in the state that are broken into quarters, clearly there's a conflict with what the law requires.

Now, we can have -- I can come up here and 100 other people can come up here and give you a stipulation that we want the maps to be drawn this way according to this requirement.

But the overarching criteria are following the laws.

And the way the communities of interest have been broken up is clearly in conflict with the mandate that this Commission has been given.

And just -- as well as compactness.

At one of the other meetings I heard one of our incumbent state representatives, Olivia Cajero Bedford, mentioned how thrilled she was at how compact her district was.

Well, it would be very nice if that favor was passed along to as many other congressmen and legislators as possible.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.

Next Vince Leach, Edward Treick, followed by Sam Almy.
VINCE LEACH: Good evening, Commissioner Stertz, counselor. Good to see you again.

Some notes on the actions by our governor and the state legislator session. I think some of those that just got involved in this game showing up need to go back to the early days and look at the application of the Independent that was sitting on this committee and the failure to report the involvement of her husband in political activity as a treasurer of a candidate running for political office.

Right during the height of that campaign is when she filled out that application. Claiming that she just simply forgot just doesn't cut it.

She may well blame the committee that vetted her, but the fact is she didn't fill it out.

I would ask if the Republican representatives on the Commission do -- did get the attorney that they wished for, a Republican attorney. And what the vote was for the legal counsel for the Republican attorney. It was three to two.

It was two Democrats and one Independent, yes, and two Democrats no.

That's a problem.

Closed meetings, shredded papers, we've all seen it. We've all heard it. We've lived through it early on. It's a fact.
Herrera. We sat in a meeting where we heard Commissioner Herrera actually say in a public meeting that Arizona created its own her Hurricane Katrina called SB 1070.

That's the type of commissioner you have representing the independent redistricting committee.

Failure to speak with the AG. Okay. Failure to speak, and failure to fill out the requests submitted by the joint legislative session.

You know, I sat in a presentation in Phoenix for hours on end and watched ST put together -- Strategic Telemetry put on a presentation on the perfect legislative and congressional district in circular.

Remember how that got into millions of numbers?

I would really ask the commissioners of how in the world did you come up with CD 1 or CD 4 in that type of situation. Or when you go over to the legislative side, the same thing.

The only thing that very much concerns me, and Mr. Adelson spoke to it, and he's very good at what he does, you can balance the Ds and the Rs.

All right.

Strategic Telemetry is very, very good. And they have a track record of flushing out and identifying Independents and where those Independents swing to.
And so you can look -- this Commission can look at all the formulas that you want to -- be done in a second -- it's not formulas. Okay. It's actually what comes down here.

You're going -- what you're going to do is you're going to increase minority vote, next time around you're going to try to decrease it, and they're going to get you on retrogression.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, Mr. Leach.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up is Edward Treick and Sam Almy and Janet Kline.

(Brief pause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And, Mr. Treick, before you begin, the court reporter has asked that it's very difficult for him to be able to get his -- be able to get all of his notes down, so if we can do the best we can to hold down the applause, it would be really helpful for Marty to be able to get this.

It's real important for the court record and the overall record of this Commission to be able to record. And he's our guy doing that.

So if we can do that, I'd appreciate it. Thank you.
EDWARD TREICK: My name is Edward Treick, T-R-E-I-C-K.
I live in Saddlebrooke.
My comments are twofold and short. CD 1 is the craziest district that I've ever seen on a map. With that kind of mileage, the only people that can even run for office would have to be extremely wealthy in order to be able to travel to cover the whole district.
It spreads from one border to another border, from north to south. It just makes no sense.
And overall, both the congressional district and the legislative district maps, you know, 13 and 2 in the legislative districts are crazy.
I'm not in those areas, but I certainly would complain if I were.
My thought on these maps is that we've seen in the past examples that everybody looks at to show what happens when redistricting is done in a gerrymandered way.
Someday people are going to look at these maps and show what happens when redistricting is done just for the sake of political correctness instead of for the people.
Thank you.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.
Next up we have Sam Almy --
(Applause.)
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: -- Janet Kline, and then Dan McHenry.

SAM ALMY: Hi, my name is Sam Almy, A-L-M-Y.

And I'm here because I'm very disappointed as to what happened this week with the Commission. The removal of the chair was strictly a political move.

And this Commission was formed to not be influenced by any sort of political action.

My high school teacher taught me that in democracy majority always rules but there is always that respect for the minority.

In Arizona we still have a democracy.

The minority party in this state, the Democratic Party, has no -- is getting no respect from the legislative map.

They can completely sweep all their districts and the two swing districts, competitive districts, and they will not gain a majority in the house.

That is disappointing.

I feel that Arizona should really lead the nation in something other than appearances on the Daily Show and major news media.

This Commission should really be out of the news cycle, out of the national scene.

There's concern about lumping incumbent members
of the legislature into districts. This shouldn't be a problem. Incumbencies work hard for their districts. They should prove to their constituents that they earned it.

And so I would like to make some suggestions to makes districts more competitive. I have three districts I read in Maricopa County, and I take some of these borders largely from my friend Tom McConnell who hopefully will be up here speaking.

I would suggest that you combine LD 17 and 12, sort of smush those together, move the eastern border to Higley Road, the western border to Price, the northern border would be Galveston Street, and the southern border is the Maricopa County line.

In Scottsdale you can also create a competitive district if you take 15, 23, and 28. The southern border would be East Lincoln Drive. That would travel west to State Route 51, that would go north to Thunderbird, and then north along 49th Street, Dynamite Boulevard.

The eastern border of that district would be Pima Road, and that would go down south back to Lincoln Drive.

They are -- can also be a competitive district in Tempe, which combines parts of LD 26 and 24.

The eastern border is Mesa Drive, southern border is Broadway, and then that's sort of the southern part,
which would continue west to Mill Avenue, and the northern
rectangle of that would -- the Winslow Avenue is the west,
follow along Winslow Avenue, to 143, then north on
42nd Street, and the northern border would be Lincoln Drive.

    I know that --

Commissioner Stertz: You need to wrap up.

Sam Almy: Thank you.

Commissioner Stertz: Thank you.

Next up we have Janet Kline, followed by Dan McHenry and Tom McConnell.

Janet Kline: My name is Janet Kline, K-L-I-N-E, K-L-I-N-E.

    I live in Continental Ranch, and I wanted to come
tonight to make three brief points.

Number one, I want to thank you all for all the
hard work you're doing. I'm sure it's a very difficult
time.

    And I really appreciate it.

    And certainly so does the audience here.

Number two, I am totally outraged at the political
grab of our Governor Jan Brewer, to prove it's not a
political grab, but she could not even specify what the
reasons were of why she removed her in a brief radio
interview so very recently.

    She could just stutter. Well, she just needs to
do what she's supposed to do.

Typical.

Third, I just implore you to please keep as many districts as possible competitive and do not let that power grab.

Win. This is a democratic society. Let the candidates win on their own merits. Do not let them cheat their way through.

That's all. Thank you.

(Appause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up we've got Dan McHenry, followed by Tom McConnell and Paul Barby, I believe.

DAN McHENRY: Good evening, commissioners. My name is Dan McHenry, D-A-N --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Put the mic up a little bit.


First of all, I'm disappointed that, that we couldn't find in Arizona a mapping company and we had to go back east to Strategic Telemetry. It seems to me that we should be able to use Arizona people to do Arizona work.

I'd like to reinforce what Mayor Ed said about Congressional District 1 going from Mexico to Utah, which is very extreme.

It's very not -- it's not compact and it's not
And also doesn't follow lines of communities of interest.

I think that I'm glad that the governor is listening to people and she's acting.

I went through the redistricting --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Please, folks.

DAN McHENRY: I went through the redistricting in Pinal County, and I've seen the way we were pushed around in southern Pinal County and almost ignored, and they remapped and didn't talk to us about the remapping, so we didn't have an opportunity then. So sometimes it's a good thing that the governor did act, I believe.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

Next up we've got Tom McConnell, followed by Paul Barby and Lynne St. Angelo.

TOM MCCONNELL: Tom McConnell, T-O-M, M-C, capital C-O-N-N-E-L-L.

Commission, thank you again for your work.

I really can't say I'm delighted with the congressional map, but I can live with it. There are larger districts in Alaska. There are states who have one representative to cover the entire state, so it's not unprecedented.
It is large.

We'll just see if it works.

I'm less happy with the LD maps. I don't quite approve of the way counties have been carved out to create the districts beyond the needs of the Voting Rights Act.

It should be possible to keep counties whole to a much greater extent and still to achieve more competitive districts.

I've done maps that do that. And I promised Mr. Drechsler I would sent him an example of one so you don't have to do all the street by street transcribing.

And I am sure there would be more.

I would encourage you to open the process so that more public maps can be submitted.

The current public input form is very limited in its ability. And the current online mapping, frankly I wouldn't pay the bill.

It really is not very effective, not very complete.

Other than that, I just want to say, despite not quite approving the current draft maps, I very much approve this process.

I think the idea of an Independent Commission is important and should be preserved, and I really hope that the courts will step in and take action. Otherwise why have
a constitution.

    Thank you.

    (Applause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up we have Paul Barby, followed by Lynne St. Angelo, and Virgil Rank.


    Thank you.

    Thank you, commissioner. I appreciate you being here and the other commissioners who are standing by, I understand.

    It's a privilege to be able to speak to you.

    I've been following the process in the drafting of the maps.

    I attended the hearing at the Doubletree here in Tucson -- not here in Tucson, but in Tucson a couple months ago.

    I listened to the carefully studied revisions that they were suggesting and all the suggestions that were coming in.

    I thought the Commission did an admirable job of putting this together.

    I want to talk about the small D, democratic process.

    The mandate to the commissioners was done to a
democratic process a vote of the people. And there were
certain criteria to be followed.

From my perspective, the Commission has done an
excellent job of drawing those boundaries and meeting the
criteria, in the big picture. Looking at the small picture,
of course there's some areas that I would like to see some
lines adjusted or maybe moving around the big picture.

But back to the democratic process.

The process for this Commission is one that the
people should participate in, not a legislator or a
legislature or a governor that's controlled by a majority.

They made that decision without public hearings to
remove Colleen Mathis as the chair.

That should not have happened in that kind of
forum.

There should have been situations that was
presented, cause that was presented to do that, so the
democratic process can work.

My opinion about objecting to what the Commission
has done is the Commission has given its product. Then
let's look at the product. And let's revise or make is
suggestions about the product and not take on people and
remove them in a political game, which is what it appears to
be.

I'm quite disappointed in the notoriety that we've
gained from this experience, and I think we need to correct it and get on with the business of coming up with fair, competitive, compact districts that will serve the voters well in Arizona.

Thank you very much for this presentation.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, Mr. Barby.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up we have Lynne St. Angelo, followed by Virgil Rank and Marianne DeFilippis.

LYNNE ST. ANGELO: Thank you, commissioners.

Lynne, L-Y-N-N-E, St. Angelo --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm sorry.

REBECCA LOPORTO: Do you have my name? Rebecca Loperto? Because I was here before Lynne and put in a paper.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: You're four more down the list.

REBECCA LOPORTO: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

I'm sorry, go ahead.

LYNNE ST. ANGELO: St. Angelo, S-T, A-N-G-E-L-O.

And tonight I'm here not representing myself, but speaking for Richard Ellis, who lives in Oro Valley as I do. He lives at 2256 East Saucalito Trail. And told me he's elderly and is unable to attend the meetings and would like
me to express his views on this matter of redistricting.

   The communities of interest criteria must be given priority in redistricting. That has not been the case in deciding what the congressional district that Oro Valley is in would be placed.

   This new congressional district is neither compact and it isn't competitive. It also does not respect the communities of interest as Oro Valley, Marana, and Saddlebrooke are metro Tucson towns.

   Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, Ms. St. Angelo.

Next up we have Virgil Rank, followed by Marianne DeFilippis -- I apologize, I'm butchering that name -- and Scott Wilson.


   My concern -- well, some of it's been already covered. The mayor did most of it. But the compactness and communities of interest.

   I feel that Congressional District 1 shown on the draft map is a perfect example of the gerrymandered district.

   It's not competitive, and it's not compact.

   It doesn't keep the communities of interest together or keep from splitting counties.
For example, Saddlebrooke, Oro Valley, and Marana could be joined into the District 2. That would probably make District 1 and 2 more competitive.

These communities are not close to the northern border, have nothing in common with them, could not be very well served by one representative.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.

Next up we have Marianne DeFilippis.

I'm sorry.

MARIANNE MILCZAREK DEFILIPPIS: You did it even worse.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm going backwards, aren't I?


And I would like to refer back to the early comments from the very first speakers, the Bengtsons, and thanks for your community, and mostly I would like to spend time on my own self-interest as a resident of Oro Valley. And also I think I did attend the meeting, one of the very earlier round one meetings, held at Kino complex where there
were many more people and many, many more representatives of Saddlebrooke. And I think you must have heard from them repeatedly about how Oro Valley is their community of interest.

That may be so, but it doesn't work the other way. I'm just very distressed and dismayed that Oro Valley has been plucked out of Pima County, out of our surrounding communities of interest, added to Saddlebrooke and Pinal County.

Oro Valley is a suburb of Tucson. I live in Oro Valley. I have children that go to the schools in Oro Valley. I work in south Tucson. I work full time. I couldn't make all these meetings.

I shop in Marana unincorporated county. I pay sales taxes, property taxes, everything in Pima County. And I just feel that by putting us out -- taking Oro Valley out of Pima County, it's like taxation without representation.

I'm not part of the voting block in Pima County anymore. That was my number one thing, now the boundary going back and that would be the Pima County line. And Legislative District 8 was shown up on our maps as one of the rural counties. Well, I don't think anyone in Oro Valley considers themselves rural, and Pinal County indeed is.

And then you put us into CD 1, and I think you've
heard -- I would restate those statements regarding the huge size of CD 1. And, again, forestry, Flagstaff, the Indian nations, that Oro Valley has no similarities. We're very small, with similar interests with those other communities. And the legislative -- my last comment was on the competitiveness, where LD 8 ends up, I see, again as 16 percent Republican advantage, and that is not competitive.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up we have Scott Wilson, followed by Lynn Wildblood and Rebecca Loporto.

SCOTT WILSON: Hello, my name is Scott Wilson, W-I-L-S-O-N.

At the last meeting at U of A campus, I spent a lot of time looking at the data that you folks handed out for the Commission's meeting.

And I'm looking at the requirements of the state as opposed to the federal mandates.

The state mandates put competitiveness last.

Last.

I'm going to limit my comments here to southern Arizona and congressional districts.

The duty to the extent possible you're supposed to
pay attention to geographic features, like city and town
boundaries and undivided census tracts.

Well, undivided census tract down here in southern
Arizona is not terribly, terribly bad in terms of the other
elements. But your paying attention to boundaries and
cities and communities of interest doesn't pass the
reasonable man test, as the law professes what a reasonable
man test is, but it doesn't pass it.

Dividing the city of Tucson into two congressional
districts does not pay attention to city and town
boundaries.

When I moved here in '81, my wife and I purchased
property in unincorporated Pima County on purpose. We
didn't want to live in the city of Tucson.

When we formed the Northwest Fire District, one of
the reasons we formed the Northwest Fire District, some
people back here that long remember that a lot of people
thought it was going to inhibit the city of Tucson from
splitting us up and taking us in piecemeal.

The city of Tucson at that point in time had just
built the convention center. And they were on an annexation
rampage to try to get the tax base to pay for the convention
center and other expenditures that they had made.

And that was -- we wanted not to be part of the
city.
We did not want government beyond core government business.

That included things like convention centers, arts districts, other stuff that the city was starting to venture in and was already well on its way in.

In short, Pima County has two very distinct communities of interest. These are overlapping other communities of interest, and I'm not saying they're exclusive, but they have two distinctions. Those that wanted to live in the big city, quasi-big city, the city of Tucson, with all its extra features, all of its extra taxes, and all its extra restrictions. And those of us who didn't.

When I moved here, the town of Marana, in 1977, was a few years old, was a little dot on the map, way up there.

Okay. It was way up there.

Well, why did Marana come down to abut Tucson? Quite honestly because most people in the unincorporated county at the time thought Marana a town was a lot better than Tucson and all encompassing heavy taxing city.

If you take Pinal County, Pima County, and Santa Cruz County, you have roughly two congressional districts' worth of population.

If you take out metro Tucson, and by metro Tucson
I mean the city of Tucson, Flowing Wells, South Tucson, Tucson Estates, Drexel Heights, Casas Adobes, and the Foothills, you end up with essentially that is compact community of interest. They are the city of Tucson and the areas that chose not to incorporate which can still be annexed into the city of Tucson.

I really think that those are communities of interest, and I thank the governor for removing a political hack from the chairmanship of this committee.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: After Mr. Wilson, we've got Lynn Wildblood, followed by Rebecca Loporto and Dianne Wilson.

And, by the way, if anyone has any things that they would like to place on the record, any documents, that they didn't get a chance to read their entire statement, please leave it with one of the folks in the back of the room, and that will be included in the public record for tonight's -- because I know that some people have written much longer speeches to give that they won't be able to.

LYNN WILDBLOOD: My name is Lynn, L-Y-N-N, Wildblood, W-I-L-D-B-L-O-O-D.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you, and I wouldn't have a job for anything.

My point of contention is, and it's already been
said, is District 1.

I have no idea what Marana and Oro Valley have in common as a community of interest with Flagstaff or Page.

That's, that's a huge, huge district.

I think a lot of the controversy that we've seen over the last couple of months, and I've been involved with this over some of the meetings here, is that it all kind of started with Strategic Telemetry.

I'm not saying that you've done a bad job. I'm just saying your background as a corporation has tainted some people.

That coupled with the fact there's an old saying in the Navy any time there's more than two to three people in a quiet discussion it can be considered a mutiny.

There's a mutiny any going on back here.

These are the people that are really concerned about what's going on.

You have to listen to them.

They might be Independents. They might be Democrats. They might be Republicans.

The question about the chairman being removed, I don't have any problem with that. She wasn't really an Independent.

Maybe she was registered, but, you know, this is all going to work out, so I don't think people have to get
really worried about it. It's all going to work out.

    If the governor was wrong, it will be proven. If
she was right, it will be proven.

    So my concern is still coming back to the
communities of interest in this first congressional
district. It's just too big. Geographically, it doesn't
make sense.

    Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, Mr. Wildblood.

Next up Rebecca Loporto, followed by Dianne Wilson
and Molly Moore.

REBECCA LOPORTO: Okay. My name is Rebecca
Loporto, R-E-B-E-C-C-A, L-O-P-O-R-T-O.

And I'm from Pima County LD 26, and I'm here
tonight because I would like to see our district stay
together.

    I brought a map with me of the state of Arizona,
which I thought might be able to go up on there so everybody
could see it and see what the geographical features are of
the state, and then you would understand why District 1 is
so out of bounds.

    Okay. I don't know if you can see this.

    This map was put out by the NAU, and it's on the
Internet.

    And, in Arizona we have the Colorado Plateau, the
Mohave Desert, the Central Highlands, the Sonoran Desert, and the Sky Islands area. The Sky Islands areas in Cochise County and the Sky Islands is a newer name for the grasslands over there.

In order to have all the other considerations of redistricting fall into place, these geographic features, these biogeographic regions have to be considered first.

The county lines have been drawn to reflect these features.

And there are enough voters in and around each of these regions to have districts with equal populations drawn from them.

The Department of Justice should be fine with a dedicated rural Hispanic district placed around where it is now in the southwest part of the state and in a specific region the Sonoran Desert.

The compactness and contiguousness requirements of redistricting will be fulfilled by following these features. Communities of interest can be found within these regions. And when starting with geographic features, competitiveness for the most part should fall into place as well.

I have attended four redistricting meetings before tonight, and in these meetings I have heard mostly about competitiveness.
This should be the last thing to be considered according to the commissioners' own regulations. This is because there are rules to be followed and in order -- and an order in which to proceed.

The huge district, District No. 1, on the Commission's approved congressional map is an unnecessarily large district going into every biogeographic region of the state and into 12 out of 15 counties.

It is so huge because the geographic features were not considered first.

At least so it appears.

The first district is where we have the first problem with the map.

Due to not following the rules, then the problems go on from there. Dedicated Republican districts, not considering rural areas as important as urban areas, this is the kind of thing I've heard in the meetings.

Special districts around the universities. Having a person vote -- having a person's vote be ineffective or less effective due to putting competitiveness first.

This is not what should be done in redistricting.

Two thirds of voters in this state are not registered Democrats, and they need to have their say.

Giving the people of this state the best governance possible is what redistricting should be about,
not favoring people with ties to a particular party.

The complaints about this Redistricting Commission would go away if consideration to the needs of the state and the voters and their representatives were respected.

By having respect for geographical features and putting them first, voters will come first.

The congressional districts in urban Maricopa County should be redrawn using the same criteria as above, starting with the geographic features.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, ma’am.

(Appause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up we’ve got Dianne Wilson, followed by Molly Moore and Cecilia Cruz.


I’m going to talk about the proposed CD 1.

I feel that it is wrong when you consider communities of interest of Oro Valley, Marana, and Saddlebrooke.

These communities are not close to northern Arizona, and they would not be appropriately served by the representative. I urge you to put the three communities into CD 2.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, ma’am.
Next up we've got Molly Moore, followed by Cecilia Cruz and Marilyn Calhoun.

Molly Moore?

Set her aside.

Next up is Cecilia Cruz, followed by Marilyn Calhoun and Sherese Steffens.

Cecilia Cruz? Not here.

Marilyn Calhoun, followed by Sherese Steffens and Dyanna Jordan.


First of all, thank you, commissioners, for all your hard work on the proposed maps.

I am here tonight to offer comments on them as an educator and a resident of Dove Mountain.

No one community can be its own district, and so we should strive to be with like communities.

Keeping Dove Mountain with Oro Valley makes sense so we can create a stronger voice for northern Pima County if we were to remain in CD 8 -- 1, excuse me.

Our communities continue to grow northward in Pinal County, and some feel it would make sense to be part of an I-10 corridor with northern -- with Pinal County and CD 1.

The Commission, in fact, has already heard
testimony establishing this length.

As a residence of Dove Mountain, we are part of the growing portion of Pinal -- oh, Pima County. Although I understand I-10 is a major corridor, Tangerine Road and Oro Valley have a closer connection to us in Dove Mountain than farther away communities.

I hope you can keep that in mind for the final map as you evaluate competitiveness and compactness.

Finally I'd like to speak on competitiveness.

At this stage you've heard from thousands of people about competitiveness in the next decade.

The Commission seems to believe that it has increased the number of competitive districts from four to eight.

By looking only at the results of the elections of 2008 and '10, the methodology is flawed.

Election results are driven by many factors, including the quality of the candidates, the competence of their campaigns, and overarching voter trends based on the immediate political and economical environment.

The current map has only three to six competitive districts based on registration, voting, and history.

Arizona voters want quality schools that are adequately funded.

Legislative districts that are not competitive are
preventing the will of the voters from being heard.

Public education in Arizona has suffered as a result. We see it every day in our classrooms.

It is no wonder that the general public does not believe the legislature represents its views on public education. Legislative policies reflect the views of primary voters in the majority party, not the average voter.

Please remember, in closing, that in 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 that voters' mandate.

Thank you for your time.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

(Appause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up we have Sherese Steffens, followed by Dyanna Jordan and Laura Hogan.

SHERESE STEFFENS: Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

My name is Sherese Steffens, S-H-E-R-E-S-E, S-T-E-F-F-E-N-S.

I live in northwest Pima County.

It appears to me that the biased three to two Commission votes have decided to manipulate both the congressional and legislative districts in southern Arizona
to attain the personal goal -- their personal goals of competitiveness despite the fact that it is to the detriment of the other required criteria and overall goal of Proposition 106, which was to create fair districts.

More importantly, the current draft maps deny fair representation and equality to all the citizens of Arizona. CD 1 has ten counties in it. CD 4 has six -- at least six counties. It is obvious that the LD districts in northwest Pima and Pinal Counties were intentionally drawn to be so large that any organized meetings of either political party will be impossible for those residents like myself who live at one end of the district or the other.

Time constraints, transportation availability, and the cost of gas will be deter many from participating in the political process that is guaranteed by our constitution.

I have to wonder if this was intentional or possibly just an oversight on the part of the commissioners. But for whatever reason this mistake has happened, I'm sure the Commission is relieved that the citizens of Arizona were diligent and found these mistakes.

The solution is easy.

Use the criteria Prop 106 instructed you to use in the way it was intended.

Geographical features, compactness, county and
city boundaries, and communities of interest. Then adjust for competitiveness, when possible. The communities of Marana, Dove Mountain, Tortolita, Picture Rocks, Avra Valley, Oro Valley, and Saddlebrooke are much closer to each other and have more in common than with the communities of Casa Grande, Arizona City, Eloy, and Maricopa. The same goes for CD 8 -- or LD 8, Oro Valley and Saddlebrooke. Why would they be in the same legislative district as Coolidge, Florence, or Gold Canyon? These communities are much closer to Apache Junction, Queen Creek, and Casa Grande. Southern Arizona should be kept together so we can be represented fairly. Draw an LD district that keeps the northwest part of southern Arizona together. This includes the communities of Avra Valley, Dove Mountain, Picture Rocks, Marana, Tortolita, Oro Valley, and Saddlebrooke. If you look at a map of Arizona, it makes a lot more sense than the current LD map that you have drafted and approved. When you consider the amount of time and thought each of you has invested in redrawing these lines, I would
I like to point out that you now have the opportunity and the duty to correct both the CD and LD maps before they are given final approval.

I ask the Commission to do your job to create fair districts for all of us in Arizona. Make decisions based on what is fair for all of the people in the state of Arizona.

I would like to add my thank you to the state legislative and Governor Brewer for taking action to remove a clearly biased chairman, Colleen Mathis.

If Ms. Mathis had filled out her application in full --

(Brief interruption.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Folks, let her complete -- I've let everybody speak.

SHERESE STEFFENS: She would have disclosed her husband's affiliation with a Democratic campaign, she would not even have been on the Commission.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay. We've got Dyanna Jordan, followed by Laura Hogan, and Bill Cozine.


Southern Arizona should be represented --
represented by representatives from southern Arizona, not
someone who lives in Flagstaff or the Indian reservation,
who have nothing in common and is far removed from southern
Arizona.

The solution is to put Marana, Oro Valley, and
Saddlebrooke back in CD 2.

These are communities of interest.

Since I'm in real estate and I live in Oro Valley,
I know this to be a fact. I live and work and purchase in
these areas.

How is it fair that Phoenix is such a tiny
district compared to the unjust CD 1?

If you want to split half the state, it should
make more sense to include Phoenix in the entire top half of
this state.

This Commission needs to go back to the old grid
maps or get a new company that is able to be fair and just.

I'd like to add that I'm proud of the state
legislature that Governor Brewer in the removal of Colleen
Mathis.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up we've got Laura
Hogan, Bill Cozine, and Manuel Zimmerman.


I'd like to express my appreciation to the Commission, all of the members of the Commission, including and especially Chair Mathis.

I believe that all of you have volunteered your services in support of the will of the voters of Arizona to remove politics from the process of redistricting as much as possible.

This week our governor and the Arizona senate subverted that constitutional process by ousting Chair Mathis without due process.

I understand that it's impossible to completely remove politics from redistricting, but the governor and the Arizona senate did not even try to abide by the will of the voters who passed Prop 106.

They held a kangaroo court with no specific charges of wrongdoing and certainly no evidence and offered Chair Mathis no opportunity to respond to the charges that were not specific to start with.

I believe the criterion of competitiveness is as important as any of the other criteria cited in the constitution.  And I credit the work of the Commission to fairly balance that criterion with that of communities of
interest, as well as the other criteria.

If anything, I would like to see more competitive
districts, not fewer.

Something more representing the actual voter
registration of our state, which is one third, one third,
and one third.

I would remind the previous speaker that
two thirds of the voters in this state are not Republican.

I fear the action taken by our legislature this
week, and the previous verbal attacks on Chair Mathis, will
severely affect the pool of possible candidate -- applicants
in the future.

The bully tactics that I have observed may mean
that the only people willing to serve as the Independent on
this Commission will be those who have already decided they
will bow to those Republican bullies.

The message is clear to anyone who's named to
replace Ms. Mathis. For the sake of Arizona's future, I
certainly hope that this message is not allowed to go
unanswered by the remaining members of the Commission.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up is Bill Cozine and
Manuel Zimmerman and Nina Zimmerman.

BILL COZINE: Among the several aims of
Proposition 106 --

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Sir, spell your name, please.

    BILL COZINE: Bill Cozine, B-I-L-L, C-O-Z-I-N-E.

    Not closely related to Corzine.

    Among several aims of Proposition 106 are, number one, to establish competitive districts, and, two, to remove politicians from the redistricting process because of their self-interest in that process.

    We've lived in Pima County since 1964, and have seen governors resign and be impeached.

    The events of the past week are a crude effort by the governor and senate to overturn the intent of the voters in 2000.

    I pray for a judicial system -- judicial decision to end their recent meddling in Proposition 106.

    I thank the Commission members for their work, and support completion of the product proposed by the original Commission.

    Thank you.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

    (Applause.)

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Zimmerman, followed by Nina Zimmerman and Raquel Cook.

    MANUEL ZIMMERMAN: Thank you for letting me speak

What the mayor said earlier this evening was what I would like to say now, but it will just be repetitious. So in opposition to the proposed map, it would surely make more sense that Oro Valley would be in Congressional District 2 with metro Tucson, which is competitive, and our obvious community of interest, as well as Saddlebrooke and Marana.

CD 1 borders with Utah, New Mexico, Mexico, and almost every reservation in the state is an absurdity. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.

Marty, how we doing?

THE REPORTER: Good. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay. The iron man continues.

Next up we've got Nina Zimmerman, followed by Raquel Cook and Joe Boogaart.

NINA ZIMMERMAN: Thank you very much.

According to Proposition 106 the new map violates 14C --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Ma'am, can you do me a favor and spell your name for the reporter, please.

NINA ZIMMERMAN: Pardon me?
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Can you please spell your name for the court reporter?

NINA ZIMMERMAN: Oh, yeah. N-I-N-A, as in Columbus' ship, the Nina. And my last name is Z, as in zebra, I-M-M-E-R-M-A-N.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, ma'am.

NINA ZIMMERMAN: Thank you.

According to Proposition 106 the new map violates 14C, that the district should be geographically compact and contiguous to the extent practicable.

The new CD 1 has a GOP -- I got this out of Explorer, but I know, it's true. The new CD 1 has a GOP congressman in Flagstaff representing the Oro Valley area.

It runs from Douglas to Utah, includes the Navajo Nation down to the Mexican border.

How can a representative cover all that territory? It is not a compact area. It is absurd.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, ma'am.

Next up is Raquel Cook, Joe Boogaart, and Brian Clymer.

RAQUEL COOK: My name is Raquel Cook, R-A-Q-U-E-L, C-O-O-K.

I wish I could be as erudite as many of the speakers have been before me.
But since I'm not, just bear with me. I'll just give you some of my thoughts.

The purpose of Prop 106, as I understand it, was to avoid the very thing that I have come to protest. Which is especially the drawing of CD 1. It's ridiculous.

If I didn't think it was so serious, it would be very funny.

All you have to do is look at it. And it is so apparent that Oro Valley and Marana, it -- we have nothing to do with the rural areas that we have been assigned. We are not a rural area. We are part of metropolitan Tucson.

And if you get on Oracle Road, you'll see that it's all connected.

And we shop there. We go there. We shop in our own communities.

We are contiguous, and we are compact.

So it's so funny, look at the map. It's this little dip down there so that you can include us. It doesn't make sense.

The whole District 1 is nonsense.

We have no commonality with Flagstaff, or the -- any Indian nations.

We have no -- we're not compact. We're not contiguous.
I would have to say the fact that we are a democratic republic allows us to disagree and allows us to disagree with those who say that we should not disagree with them. And so I must say bravo to Governor Brewer and the courageous senators who stood up. And I must also amend the fact that the commissioners were not elected, nor did we vote on them, so they are not bound to follow the will of the people. But that was the general intent, and I am afraid something has gone seriously wrong.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

Next up we have Joe Boogaart, I believe, followed by Brian Clymer and Shirley Muniz.


Okay. What I'd like to say --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Boogaart, let's pull the mic up.

Thank you.

JOE BOOGAART: What I'd like to point out is even Andrew, I'm sorry, I don't know your last name, but had left out two key words, I thought, when he read the criteria. And he went to F.

You went A through F.

And the last one you said creation of competitive
districts, period.

That isn't what it says.

It says creation of competitive districts where there is no significant determinant to other goals.

And the second thing was about creating minority districts.

In there he left out the word -- I believe that it's in there -- that says do not lessen, lessen minority districts, or rights in voting.

And I don't think the term lessen was in there. You were saying that we were looking to make sure that they -- you didn't say increase, but to me it implied that.

I'm afraid that what's going to happen is once you create a minority district with, with the Navajo Nation and so forth in it, the statute of the state which you can't go back, you can't lessen a minority district.

So it's my fear that once District 1, defined as it is now, becomes and -- I assume it will become a minority district representing a minority, a large minority, that that's the way it would have to stay in the future.

So that bothers me a little bit.

I may be wrong on that, but I'm sure somebody will correct me if I am.

But also, my main, my main concern is that -- and most of the people that have gone up here and spoken have,
have ignored that last part of that statement also which you
identified as F.

But that is secondary criteria to me. That's
secondary criteria. With the other ones contingent and all
that other.

I mean, when I first looked at the map and I saw
District No. 1, I thought somebody was under the influence
when they were drawing.

It's so out of -- it looks like, it looks to me,
and this is something else in discussions was brought up, it
looks like Tucson was thrown under the bus to keep the
Phoenix area compact.

You know, there's just in conversation.

So I think I want just to comment on 106, is there
is no Independent -- there is no definition of an
Independent.

I would hate to tell these people they were denied
because I am totally on the other side of the fence that I
was a registered Independent.

Usually Independents are people that have been
dissatisfied with their own party and have gone away from it
and became an Independent because either the party was
too -- wasn't liberal enough, too liberal, conservative, or
too conservative.

So that makes up the Independent -- Independents.
So when 106 says you're going to put an Independent on there, it's the luck of draw.

You know, if they got me, it would have been a whole different shop.

And this is not -- and it's just natural. It's just natural.

I don't blame anybody. I mean, you got your opinion. That's the way you're going to be.

So, anyway, that's all I have to say. I appreciate it.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.

Next up is Brian Clymer, followed by I believe it's Shirley Muniz and Kathleen Pastryk.

BRIAN CLYMER: Mr. Commissioner, members of the Commission, my name is Brian Clymer, B-R-I-A-N, C-L-Y-M-E-R. I live in Casas Adobes, and I'm an attorney. I want to stay that I support the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission.

My wife served on the Amphitheater School Board. I understand what volunteer public service is like, both for the commissioners and for their spouses. So I appreciate your service. I really do.

I want to respond to some of the concerns that have been spoken about the maps.
I know not -- nothing can be perfect, but I do feel the draft maps do conform with the constitutional requirements the Arizona voters requested when they passed Proposition 106.

I believe the mayor of Marana complained that legislators were thrown in the same districts.

I haven't checked the law, but my recollection is you're supposed to draw the maps without concern for where the incumbents are. I would ask that you do that, whether they be Democratic or Republican incumbents.

There's been complaints about the compactness of the draft for CD 1.

I would note that CD 1 currently is more compact by any measure than the current CD 1 as it currently stands. Draft CD 1 is under 58,000 square miles. The current CD 1 is over 58,000 square miles.

So, I think in Arizona, it's going to be hard to have congressional districts that are very close together. I think the current map is a good faith effort to comply with that.

In terms of communities of interest, many people -- some people have defined communities of interest, and I think that's been helpful.

Other people have not.

I think it's going to be hard to separate these
There's always going to be boundary lines.

People are going to feel left out if they're on one side or the other.

I know I'm sorry that our current LD 26 is going to be split in half, but I don't know that there's another way that it can be done.

I do want to comment on the recent events that have occurred.

I'm a lawyer. And I understand the Governor Brewer, October 26th, 4:00 p.m., asked all the commissioners to respond to charges by 8:00 a.m. on October 31st.

I am not aware of any other provision of law where you have less time to respond to charges. I'm not aware of any other circumstance where the deadline to respond is not 5:00 p.m., but 8:00 a.m. I feel like that was an unfair requirement that was placed on all of you.

In terms of Governor Brewer's actions, I'd like to comment on Robert Robb, the columnist of the Arizona Republic. He's a former lobbyist for the Phoenix Chamber of Commerce and the Arizona Chamber of Commerce. He described Governor Brewer's threat, this was before it occurred, to remove panel members as premature at best and an abuse of power at worst.

He noted, quote, there is nothing that is on the
public record so far that justifies removal from office.

    I agree with him.

There's been complaints or concerns about open
meeting violations.

    I'm a lawyer. My feeling would be let's let the
courts decide.

    I think most Arizona voters would agree.

Governors Brewer's actions have interfered with
that process.

    Finally, one person talked about this as if it
were a game, complain to some of us who are coming late to
the game.

    I always object when people use the term game to
describe something, because that suggests that we're just
pawns, that there's nothing really important here.

    This is really very important. I know that those
of us that care deeply about politics are intensely focused
on this.

    On the other hand, I think the Arizona voters are
really turned off when we do things as a game.

    I believe so far you and the other commissioners
have acted in good faith, to the best of your ability, to
fulfill the mandate of the voters.

    I applaud your work and hope that you will
continue with it.
And one last thing, what worries me with this interference is it will now take a long time to draw the maps.

My time is up. I end.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Appreciate it. Thank you.

Next up is Shirley Muniz.

I'm sure I mispronounced your name. M-U-N-I-Z or E-Z.

Is there a Shirley in the house?

(No oral response.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: All right.

Kathleen Pastryk, followed by Cheryl Cage and W. Janice Kalthoff will be number three.

KATHERINE PASTRYK: Good evening,

Commissioner Stertz, commissioners, public. My name is Kathleen Pastryk, P-A-S-T-R-Y-K. Like pastry with a K on the end of it.

My handwriting must have been terrible on that form.

Thank you to the Commission and for all of your time and also to the public for all of their input.

I've lived in Oro Valley for 12 years.

The new legislative map has Oro Valley divorced from Tucson, which seems very foreign to me.
You see -- you say that communities of interest should be grouped together. Well, for 12 years I have considered myself a citizen of the greater Tucson area.

My personal opinion is that Oro Valley should still be a part of Tucson. It should be a part of District 9, not District 8. And I am sure I'm not the only one. You heard many people tonight testify something to that -- who agreed with that.

Many of us who live in Oro Valley go to work and to school there. We attend theater, museums, concerts, and sporting events in Tucson.

That is our interest, and Tucson's interest coincides with the suburbs.

Our post office is Tucson. Our electric company is Tucson. Our school district is Amphitheater. That is in Tucson.

This is a true community of interest if I've ever heard of one. I don't think it would be take more than a tweak to move Oro Valley back to where it belongs.

We don't have much in common with Pinal and Gila County. I'm just going to leave it like that. We're not rural.

The voters of Arizona voted for an independent Commission, but the governor and the legislature should not be given the power to make the decision and redo the
redistricting.

    The governor has flaunted the will of the people
when she dismissed the Commission's chair, Colleen Mathis.

    I think we are lucky, and this is an historic
moment, to have a process that gives us a chance to do a
good, fair, and just job of redistricting.

    Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

    (Applause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up we've got Cheryl

  Cage, followed by Janice Kalthoff and Tracy --

TRACY SCHEINKMAN: Scheinkman.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

CHERYL CAGE: Good evening.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Good evening.

CHERYL CAGE: My remarks are going to be very
brief, but I hope that you understand the depth of my
passion behind these remarks.

    First I would like to -- oh, excuse me. My name
is Cheryl Cage, it's C-A-G-E, and first name is C-H-E-R-Y-L.

    First I'd like to thank Chairwoman Colleen Mathis.

    I want her to know how much the work she has done
for the community is appreciated.

    I support the work of the IRC, and I encourage the
citizens of Arizona to speak up against the blatantly
political actions of the governor.

    The actions of the governor and the Republicans in the state senate is not only a slap in the face to Arizona voters but indeed our entire democracy.

    I worry about not only the damage to the redistricting process, but also the negative impact the governor's actions may have on the willingness of citizens to volunteer their time for positions such as the IRC.

    So thank you to all the commissioners who have volunteered your time. I appreciate the work that you've done, and I hope that you will be able to continue to complete your task.

    Thank you.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

    (Applause.)

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up is Janice Kalthoff, followed by Tracy Scheinkman and Rachel McMenamin.

    JANICE KALTHOFF: Good evening.


    And good evening, and thank you very, very much for serving as our commissioners. I admire you very much, and thank you for all your hard work.

    I condemn the removal of Colleen Mathis from the committee, and think it's reprehensible that the attorney
general, Governor Brewer, and the legislature are bullying the committee and particularly Colleen Mathis.

    It's the will of the people to have an independent committee.

    The congressional district map I feel certainly has been a lot of work and has fulfilled the obligation. Whether I, you know, approve of all of it or not, you've done a good job.

    Legislative District 1, Cochise County, I live in Tucson, on the far east side.

    My voting precinct is Precinct 274, and it abuts the city limits of Tucson.

    When we have been assigned to District 1, which is Cochise County, this will be impossible for me, for time, cost, and distance restraints, for me to participate at the political level that I am now.

    And I would like to ask that you tweak the Precinct 274 into the Tucson District 10. That certainly would allow me to continue to participate and other people in our area.

    We're just not associated with Cochise County.

    And thank you all again very much for serving and serving under duress at this time.

    And good evening.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.
Tracy Scheinkman, followed by Rachel McMenamin and Faith Salzgeber.

FAITH SALZGEBER: Salzgeber.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Salzgeber.


I want to express my support for the Commission and its work and for its chair, Colleen Mathis.

I am outraged at the actions of the governor and the Arizona senate. And I agree with attorney Paul Charlton when he said that Mathis' removal from the Redistricting Commission had nothing to do with the law, it had nothing to do with the Constitution, it had to do with political intimidation.

And I encourage the Commission to please ignore that intimidation.

I would like to comment on the congressional map. I think that the congressional map is not perfect. My ideal map, based on the fact that the state is divided one third Republican, roughly, one third Democratic, and one third Independent or other, would have nine competitive congressional districts.

However, I do feel that this congressional map is adequate and should be left essentially as is.
Despite that, my future home will be up in Congressional District 4, which is not competitive. And my current legislative district, according to these maps, is not competitive. And in both cases, the parties likely to be elected there will not be the one that I support.

But I nonetheless feel that of the congressional district map should be left roughly as is.

On the legislative maps, what I ask is that you emphasize -- what I would like to do is, I'm sorry, emphasize that the map needs to be improved by making at least four or five of the safe districts into competitive districts. Because there are more Republican safe districts than Democratic safe districts, I think this will probably affect the Republican districts a little bit more than the Democratic districts.

It's not going to take much effort. A few tweaks will do the trick.

They can still remain Republican but not by enough to take them out of striking distance for Democrats or perhaps even Independents. That would be cool too.

This can be done without harming the integrity of the ten majority-minority legislative districts that are in place to ensure fair minority representation.

We do not have to choose between competition and minority representation or communities of interest. We can
and must have both.

Finally, I would like to mention that I did read through the AIRC's website concerning the definition of their job. And the court rulings on these.

And it seems to me that the court ruling of the Arizona Supreme Court ruled that all six criteria should be taken into account, including competition.

So, I encourage you to consider all six criteria.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

Next up we have Rachel McMenamin, followed by Faith -- pardon me, Faith Salzgeber and Rosalie Roszak.


As a concerned teacher, mother, and resident of Arizona and Marana, I'm here tonight for three reasons: To support the Commission in its trying work, to support the work the Commission has done thus far in its insurmountable task of redrawing the voting maps to satisfy everyone, and to support the voices of Arizona voters who chose 11 years ago to have Independent Redistricting Commission.

First I would like to thank everyone on the commission, including Chairman Mathis, for volunteering for this thankless job despite great personal costs to each of you.
Second, I would like to state that while these maps are far from perfect, which we knew from the start was an unachievable goal, since there are numerous ways to draw the map and just as many visions of the perfect map, the maps do their merits.

The congressional map that has been drawn is a win for the citizens of Marana and the northwest who will know have a voice of their own in congress, one that will not be overshadowed by the interests of metro Tucson.

The northwest region is a growing community, with Marana increasing in population by 150 percent. Marana is a community that had a huge number of young families, like my own, with school age children. The community is growing to meet the needs and demands of this increased population.

As such, its growing demands need to be heard in the halls of congress. This can be achieved by having a map that affords the citizens of the northwest its separate and unique voice in congress, as this map has done.

And most tonight speak about how there's a difficulty in terms of having Marana and Oro Valley and the northwest in a rural district, but in the current map that exists it is also linked with rural districts like Cochise County. So I'm not sure how this is so different.

Third, given the events of the last week, I can't help but feel a need to speak out and remind our legislature
that Arizonans voted to have the drawing of the maps taken out of the hands of the legislature.

Yet the actions of the governor and the legislature in the last few days undermines the very notion of having the maps be drawn independently of their closed door meetings and political machinations.

There are legal ways to address the grievances people have with this Commission, and those are being pursued.

But these latest moves didn't follow the rules of due process that can be met in a court of law. And more importantly they didn't follow the will of Arizonans who voted in 2000 to have this Commission in the first place.

As a concerned citizen who has followed and participated in this process, I don't want to have my voice undermined.

I've taken the time away from my family to attend and give testimony at these meetings. I have submitted comments online when my time is limited.

Essentially I've expressed myself through the appropriate channel.

It is an affront to me to have my voice discounted by politicians who are not following the appropriate channels.

Therefore I hope that in our various personal
frustrations with the maps that have been drawn, we continue to let the process that we voted for unfold and we don't throw out the baby with the bathwater.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up we've got Faith Salzgeber, Rosalie Roszak, and Bonnie Haymore.


I want to first of all thank the commissioners, all of the commissioners, for all the hard work that they've done. And the voters of Arizona are behind you.

I live in unincorporated northwest part of Pima County.

In 2000 I voted in favor of Proposition 106, along with the majority of Arizona's voters.

The purpose, as you know, of the proposition was to remove politics as much as possible from the task of redrawing congressional and legislative districts.

The proposition became law.

Because I believe in the goals of Prop 106, I felt it was my duty to attend meetings such as this to inform myself and express how I felt about the proposed draft maps.
I have done so, as I have suspect thousands of my fellow Arizonans. Thousands more have probably expressed themselves by mail, e-mail, and phone. Overall, the congressional map is acceptable, though I can certainly understand the issues that some have with CD 1.

I'm not so entirely happy with all of the legislative districts. I feel that there could have been more attempts at getting competitive districts in place. But these are draft maps and are the result of a monumental and at times thankless effort on the part of the independent Commission. I believe that all the commissioners have discharged their duties in good faith. However, this week the governor and senate decided that the Arizona electorate was to be totally disregarded and no longer be a part of the process set forth in Prop 106. Rather than following the process through and pursuing their complaints in the courts, they chose to remove the Commission's chair. By removing Ms. Mathis from the Commission for specious and unproven allegations they made through the
whole process and attempted to intimidate the remaining commissioners.

The creation of our congressional and legislative districts has become once again wholly political, and the decisions to be made are no longer up to the Commission or by extension the electorate.

All of the citizens of Arizona who have attempted in good faith to play out their part of Proposition 106 are being summarily dismissed.

In addition, registered Independents, fully a third of the electorate, no longer have a representative on the Commission.

In my view, Arizona does not have a governor or a legislature.

Those positions are usually held by people who believe in and uphold the laws, including the laws passed by the electorate.

All Arizona has are partisan politicians.

I'm enraged by the actions of the governor and the senate. And it is not Commission, this independent Commission, that is guilty of gross misconduct.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up is Rosalie Roszak, followed by Bonnie Haymore. And then Senator Paula Aboud
has also joined us, so it's up to the rest of the audience whether or not we want to take her out of order or whether or not she'll speak last.

So I'll let the audience make that decision when we get to the next.


I reside in Oro Valley where my husband and I have lived for -- since 1992.

I also want to thank all of the commissioners who volunteer their service on this Commission in what surely has been a difficult process.

I'm here this evening to speak on the proposed congressional maps, namely the much unloved Congressional District 1.

I'm here as an Independent.

More than 90,000 people constituting nearly 10 percent of Pima County's population live in the northwest Tucson communities of Oro Valley, Marana, Tortolita, and Catalina. Residents here live, work, shop, attend school within the overall Tucson community.

They volunteer in classrooms, in hospitals, on local school boards, and commissions, and local charitable organizations.

Their children attend local schools and play in
local sports leagues.

Many attend University of Arizona and Pima Community College.

We pay property taxes, sales taxes, school and community college district taxes within Pima County and Tucson.

We serve on local juries.

We attend sporting events, museums, arts, theaters.

We identify strongly with and contribute to the overall Tucson community.

Businesses in these northwest, Oro Valley, and Marana communities pay taxes and employ thousands of Tucson area residents. These include important businesses like the emerging biosciences industry in Oro Valley, which has been touted as an Oro Valley Tucson slash industry, and one of Tucson community's large hopes for future employment.

Yet the draft version of the congressional redistricting maps place the entire northwest section of the Tucson Pima County community within the same congressional district as Flagstaff, northern Arizona, and the Grand Canyon, extending all the way to the Utah border.

The map as drawn ignores our actual community of interest. This is not acceptable, and it needs to be amended.
There is a statement, coined by late Speaker of
the House Tip O'Neill, that all politics is local.

Yet the congressional map as currently drawn would
certainly remove the local for at least Oro Valley, Marana,
and northwest Tucson area residents.

For these reasons I ask that you revise the map
and restore the northwest areas to their actual community of
interest, which is the Tucson regional area.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

Next up we have Bonnie Haymore, and then I will
then take Senator Paula Aboud followed by Roger. . .

ROGER SALZGEBER: Salzgeber.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you. Thank you very
much.

So, Bonnie Haymore?

Bonnie Haymore has left.

So Senator Paula Aboud, please.

Thank you for your discretion in allowing me to
have Senator Aboud speak. She is my senator in LD 28.

SENATOR PAULA ABOUD: Thank you, Mr. Commissioner,
and thanks to all the folks that came here today to speak
for -- you know, representing yourself in this democracy.

And this has been a very sad week, this week.

This has been a very sad week no matter which side
of the aisle we sit on, because the will of the people has been disrespected. 

And no disrespect to anybody here.

It's sad when the legislature and the governor take an action that is going to require the court of law to determine what is right.

And time and again as I serve in this legislature that's what I see.

I see the will of the constitution disregarded, legislation passed, because the majority party chooses to challenge the constitution and to challenge the courts.

And so this is a determination -- Colleen Mathis is going to be -- her fate is going to be determined by the courts.

And what it's done is it's thrown every person in this state that cares about the redistricting process, it's thrown them into an emotional fury. Whether it's a positive fury or a negative fury, it's still the same side. It's still the same coin, folks.

And I think that what we've done is that we've forgotten the integrity of the process, because we're so desperate to have our districts suit our needs and get our side to win.

You know, when I was growing up, the most important thing that I learned watching my brother play at
Tucson High on championship teams was it's not whether you win or lose, it's how you play the game.

So when people have -- think they have the power to overrule the people, and do that, then what happens is they put winning over integrity.

And the integrity of this state is in jeopardy once again. And it's making it a very sad day for Arizona that our leaders are talking on national TV about this political action once again here.

So, having the sat on the dais in front of people testifying, I commend the citizen Independent Redistricting Commission, one and all.

And I ask folks to believe that the courts now will decide and to not be thinking that Colleen Mathis has left this Commission until the courts decide. Because time and again I've heard the legislature decide, and the courts have overturned it because they've been wrong, or the attorney general, or whoever.

So on behalf of the citizens of Arizona, thank you for your service, and for God's sake, let us keep the will of the people.

(Appause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up is Roger Salzgeber, Raymond Graap, and Patsy Stewart.

ROGER SALZGEBER: My name is Roger Salzgeber,
S-A-L-Z-G-E-B-E-R.

I live in the unincorporated area north of Tucson between Oro Valley and Marana.

And I want to thank you for allowing me to speak and thank you for your hard work and professionalism.

I'm one of the people who belongs to the statewide community of interest who believe in the goals of Proposition 106, who voted for a constitutional amendment that would take redistricting out of the hands of the legislature and who want fair and competitive districts.

I believe that the Independent Redistricting Commission has been highjacked by a governor and legislature which has as much regard for independence as it does for the Arizona Constitution and the rule of law.

If the governor doesn't like the maps, she can come down, give her input like the rest of us, without threats and intimidation.

I would think that the voters want to pick their legislators, not the legislators picking their constituents.

With regards to the maps, it is evident by the shape and scope of some of the districts that it is extremely difficult to have equal populations in districts and then meet the other criteria due to the concentration of population in Arizona.

Although not perfect, I do believe that more
competitive districts are warranted and possible.

   I can support the current maps.

   Thank you again for your dedication and service.

   The fact that you volunteered to do this is a constant

source of amazement to me.

   (Applause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

   Sir, my wife would agree with you.

   Raymond Graap, followed by Patsy Stewart and Sue

Tucker.

   RAYMOND GRAAP: My name is Raymond Graap. Last

name is -- first name is R-A-Y-M-O-N-D, second name is

G-R-A-A-P.

   Commissioner Stertz, any other commissions who may

be watching this, and Chairman Mathis, I recommend in terms

of the maps that you look very thoroughly at the mapping

suggestions of Sam Almy who was here and spoke earlier.

   He's one of three citizens in the state whose maps

were judged the best. And his suggestions, I think, should

greatly help increase competitiveness.

   Regarding the problem of compactness, we live in a

state that is a geographical trap.

   About the only way to solve that is to shrink

certain parts of the state.

   My old home state of Oregon, which I looked at
recently, has a district that must encompass two thirds of
that state. It's all eastern part of the state.

    I think it's really a geographical -- a great
geographical difficulty to be competitive.

Regarding the chairperson, Colleen Mathis. I have
attended previous IRC meetings, and I have observed that she
was attentive, polite, accepted all input with patience, and
functioned in an exemplary manner.

    I did not see a trace of, quote, gross misconduct
in office, unquote.

That appears to be a total distortion of reality.

What happened this week has been totally unfair to
that person and to the citizens of Arizona.

The IRC passed by the citizens in 2000 was to
preclude the elected politicians from interfering with the
process.

    The input, yes, but the destructive interference
is unconscionable.

    It reflects the old adage, power corrupts,
absolute power corrupts absolutely.

The citizens need to remain in charge, and the
chairperson should be restored to her rightful position.

You commissioners who have spent hundreds of hours
of effort with no pay should be allowed to continue your
work on behalf of the citizens without further
interferences.

And I thank you for your efforts.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up we have Patsy Stewart, followed by Sue Tucker and Lizbeth DeWitt.


I would just like to, again, thank all of the commissioners, but in particular someone who's taken a leadership role, which is always hard. It's hard to be a leader, because you get a lot of feedback.

Whether you're good, whether you're mediocre, or whether you need improvement, it's hard to be a leader.

And so I thank Colleen Mathis for her leadership role. And I thank everybody else that served on this volunteer Commission.

I'm terribly embarrassed that our governor and legislature has taken a person's good name and dragged it through the political mud.

Who will volunteer to do the work of civic responsibility when the reward is so punitive? It gives me great concern.

It also gives me great concern that our governor seems to think that she is the answer to due process and she
and the legislature have a better idea of what due process is than our courts.

    It's a sad day.

I appreciate that you have listened hour after hour and tweaked and nudged and tweaked and nudged as you've listened to hundreds of comments.

    Thank you.

We do appreciate it, and we support the Independent Redistricting Commission and its work.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

    (Applause.)

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up is Sue Tucker, followed by Lizbeth DeWitt. And our last speaker, unless there's somebody else, will be Geri Ottoboni.

    SUE TUCKER: My name is Sue, S-U-E, Tucker, T-U-C-K-E-R.

    My community of interest is Casas Adobes, an unincorporated area just north of Tucson. And I thank you for including Casas Adobes in with the Tucson districts.

    I would also like to say thank you to all the members of the Commission. I am also in support of Colleen Mathis as chair. I hope she can continue in that role.

    Thank you for all your volunteer work.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

    (Applause.)
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Our next speaker is Lizbeth DeWitt.

LIZBETH DEWITT: Good evening. My name is Lizbeth DeWitt, L-I-Z-B-E-T-H, D-E, capital W-I-T-T.

And I live in Oro Valley.

And first I'd like to thank the commissioners for their service. And it seems pretty thankless right now, but we really appreciate everything you're doing. And I came out here to support you and your chairperson tonight.

I'm here primarily to express my outrage over the governor's actions and this transparent political grab at power that is in direct opposition to what the voters of Arizona approved when they approved this Independent Redistricting Commission.

And it's totally outrageous, and I am really unhappy about it, and I hope it won't stand.

I trust that it won't.

It appears to me the only crime that the -- that your chair may have committed was to be married to a Democrat.

And if that's a crime, I'm guilty too.

And that's my primary interest here tonight. I'll keep this short.

I do live in Oro Valley. I am struck by the little blip that includes us in this very large District 1.
I do feel more of a connection to the Tucson area. It seems more important to tuck us in there.

But I applaud your work.

I know this is very difficult, and I know you're trying to keep it balanced and fair. So I'll support what you come up with.

Thanks so much for your service.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Our last speaker this morning is Geri Ottoboni.

GERI OTTOBONI: My name is Geri Ottoboni, that's O-T-T-O-B-O-N-I. I'm from Oro Valley.

And I am concerned about the CD 1 map. Oro Valley, Saddlebrooke, and Marana should be put in CD 2. The Commission has not only broke up counties, but also school districts.

In 2000, 2004, 2006, and 2008 probably no of the other counties have been more competitive than this one, because both Democrats and Republicans have held office in which is now CD 1.

CD 1 is now not competitive.

I want to applaud the governor for her actions.

I have been attending these meetings since May.

I have a copy of Colleen Mathis' application,
which she did not disclose that her husband, which she inadvertantly informed me at a meeting that he was Nancy Young Wright's treasurer.

Because of all this controversy between Colleen Mathis and the mapping companies and the breaking of rules of the open meeting rules, I really believe the maps should be scrapped and go back to the grid and start over. This would be easy to do to the fact that so many maps have been submitted to the Commission.

Perhaps the maps could follow the Proposition 106 guidelines, and not -- and the constitution, not the other way around.

The original said -- 106 said communities of interest, compactness, and I believe competitiveness was on the bottom.

Or better yet, bring them before the voters.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

Is there anyone else that would like to speak that has not had the opportunity to do so?

(No oral response.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Well, lastly I'd like to thank the -- Mr. Mayor, thank you very much for allowing us to use your facilities this evening. This is a great turnout. We've had lots of commentary and comments.
And let me last close by saying that this is a difficult and it is a challenging process.

But the constitution that was -- Proposition 106 was very specific in how it was crafted. And there's a lot of -- there's a lot of teeth to a lot of different pieces to it. And you can rest assured that we are having to deal with a lot of those pieces in a lot of challenging ways. So keep ourselves and my fellow commissioners in your prayers and thoughts as we continue down this very difficult and challenging road.

And have a very safe evening and good night.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The time that we adjourn this meeting is 8:25.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned.)

* * * * *
STATE OF ARIZONA      )
  ) ss.
COUNTY OF MARICOPA    )
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