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COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The time is 3:30.
Welcome to the last in the series of 31 meetings -- outreach meetings for the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission.

My name is Rick Stertz. I am one of five commissioners on the Independent Redistricting Commission.

We are not live-streaming today. We do not have that capacity, but this is being recorded. So hello to my fellow commissioners that will be watching this after the fact.

A couple of introductions I wanted to make, but before I do that, I just wanted to say that this has been an emotionally-charged week.

There has been a lot that has been written and said about what has transpired, and I just wanted you all to know that we're going to appreciate all of the comments that you make.

So we want to try to capture the information that you have got so that we can place it into the record. And whether or not you have filled out a yellow sheet like this to speak or have
filled out a blue sheet like this to get it into testimony, all of the testimony, whether or not it's given in writing or given verbally or given online or mailed in, is all being accumulated and assimilated and collated for us -- for all of the commissioners to be reviewing so that we can create a bigger understanding and story about what your feelings are about the draft maps as they were published.

I want to introduce first some of our staff.

We've got Kristina Gomez, who is our deputy executive director in the back corner of the room.

If there's anything that you need, any paper that you need, any issues that you want to take up, Kristina will be able to assist you.

Also if you have any written comments you have already prepared that you will be reading into the record or maybe that the time frame may not -- you've got a lot that you want to place in, you might not get to it all verbally, make sure that you get those documents to Kristina and she'll place those into the record.

We've got Karen Herrman and Shane
Shields, both of our community outreach representatives are also in the back of the room. Our chief technology officer behind the large black box over here is Buck Forst. Taking our minutes is Michelle Elam. And if during the course of the meeting when you come up to give testimony, make sure that you spell your name and -- clearly so that -- before you start giving your testimony so that she can get that into the record.

We also have Andrew Drechsler from Strategic Telemetry who is going to be giving a presentation and will be able after the meeting to answer any questions.

And lastly we've got Carlos Reyes who will be our Spanish interpreter if any interpretation needs to be made.

But before we get started, let's all stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

I always enjoy that part of the meeting. It's just a great way to begin.

Before we get started with Andrew, I want to thank also the city of Casa Grande for hosting us
this evening and giving us the opportunity to be in
this beautiful location.

I feel very distant from you being all
the way back here. I just did a meeting this
morning in Casa Grande (sic) and it was like
theater-in-the-round.

So before we go with Andrew, if Carlos
Reyes -- would he be able to step up and in English
and Spanish give the introduction.

CARLOS REYES: Good afternoon,
Commissioner Stertz.

Ladies and gentlemen, 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 needing interpreting services.

Please contact the interpreter present at
the meeting so that he or she can assist you.

And now I will read the script in Spanish
for the Spanish-speaking citizens.

(Speaking in Spanish.)

Thank you very much, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, Carlos.

And Carlos has been following us on the
tour as well.
This has been a very exciting last 30 days as we been traveling around the state. This is the 31st city that we have been in. We've literally collected thousands and thousands of pieces of testimony, maps, data, speeches, e-mails, letters that we're going to be going through.

Before we get started and turn it over to Andrew, we've got about 20, 25 comment cards for speeches. We'll probably use four minutes as the timing.

So if you'll look at your presentation and if you can think about whether or not you can make the presentation within that time frame, that gives us about two hours worth of presentation tonight.

I think that -- I'll try to -- when you hear the buzzer go off, try to wrap up your comments if you can, but we're here to collect testimony, not to cut you off.

So with no further adieu, I'm going to turn this over to Andrew Drechsler for a presentation on the redistricting process.

Andrew.

ANDREW DRECHSLER: Thank you very much, Commissioner Stertz.
Before we get started today, we just
wanted to give a quick presentation that goes over
-- that gives an overview of the process and what
we're doing before we get your comments tonight. I
will also share the draft maps with you today.

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

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

The state senate will remain at 30 and
the house representatives will remain at 60 with two
members of the house of representatives nested
within each of the state senate seats.

What are the requirements of the state
Constitution per Proposition 106?
And these are really the guidelines that
the commissioners are using when they are making any
of the considerations in drawing the lines and
drawing 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, county boundaries, and undivided census tract; and E -- I'm sorry, F, favor competitive districts where no significant detriment to other goals.

We 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 that the new districts do not discriminate against minority voters in purpose or effect, which means that there can be no intentional or accidental discrimination.

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

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

And we actually have a short presentation on the Voting Rights Act as well, presentation by Bruce Adelson.

And, of course, on the 31st day of hearings we have to have technology difficulties.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Do you need five minutes of stand-up here?

ANDREW DRECHSLER: So we're going to listen to Bruce give this two-minute presentation. I apologize for the delay.

((Mr. Bruce Adelson's video presentation was played.)

ANDREW DRECHSLER: Okay. Next we want to do a quick overview of the redistricting process. And there's really -- we broke it down into six steps okay.

So the first step was setting up the Commission. So earlier this year basically what was created was a new state -- whole new state agency and the commissioners were appointed following a thorough screening process.
Each of the commissioners serve in a voluntarily, unpaid role for the Commission.

The second step was the first round of hearings.

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

Third step was the map.

Per Proposition 106, we needed to start with a clean slate. That means that we couldn't take into consideration where any incumbents lived or what any of the district lines looked like from the 2010 elections. So we had to wipe everything clean.

Next, we divided the state into equal population and compact-like grids.

Again, per Proposition 106, they asked us to create a grid map. This was approved on August 18th.

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

During this time they received additional public comment and draft maps, so this was done at the end of August throughout September into October. Then we had the approval of the maps.

On October 3rd, the Commission approved the draft congressional map that incorporated the changes based on the constitutional criteria and then the legislative map was adopted on October 10th.

Next is step four, the second round of hearings, which you are part of today.

We're currently visiting 30 towns and cities around the state. Today is the very last meeting, as we mentioned, where we've received additional public input on the draft maps throughout October and into November.

The next step is the final map, step five.

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

And then the final step is preclearance. Because Arizona is subject to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, the district maps must be
approved by the federal Department of Justice or a federal court in Washington, D.C., before they be used for Arizona's elections.

So before we show you the draft map, we just wanted to go over the process.

This map was the map that is currently -- was approved by the last Commission and most recently used in the 2010 elections.

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

Again, the grid map only took into consideration two of the six criteria, equal population and compactness.

So once the grid map was considered, that's -- when approved on August 18th, this is where the commissioners met over 25 times at the end of August and September and October to make changes to the grid map, consider -- they took into consideration the six criteria and thousands of comments from the public. And here before you you see the draft map.

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

The legislative map process followed a very similar process.

Again, this is the map that was approved by the last Commission and was most recently used in the 2010 elections.

Again, we started with a clean slate. Per Proposition 106, we didn't take into consideration where any incumbent legislators lived and we didn't consider previous lines. And then we proceeded with a grid map that was approved on August 18th.

Like the congressional grid map, it only took into consideration two of the six criteria, equal population and compactness.

And from there, that's where the commissioners took in the other four criteria and came up with a draft map that you see here.

Some of the things that we wanted to point out about the draft map, in the districts that were shown that were used for the last -- for the 2010 elections -- the population of those districts
ranged from 155,000 to 378,000. So that's obviously one reason we had to shift the lines around, is to come up with the concept of one person, one vote.

The current draft map has roughly 207,000 to 215,000. Under the state Constitution, we have the -- I think the deviance of up to 10 percent deviation, and I think we're under 5 percent here.

For the congressional map, I just wanted to point out that the congressional map has to be down to one person. So all of the districts in the congressional map are equal and one of the districts I think has one additional person.

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

The draft map has three districts wholly within Pima County and three additional Southern Arizona districts, seventeen districts primarily within Maricopa County, and nine primarily rural districts.

We want your input. That's a big reason why we're here today. If you haven't already, you can fill out one of the yellow request to speak forms and come up and
address your comments.

We want to hear what you like about the maps, what you might not like about the maps, what changes you would recommend. We would want to hear them. You can also comment on any of the additional constitutional criteria or give us comments on both the congressional and draft maps.

Besides speaking at today's hearing, in the packet of information you received there is a blue sheet at the back and you can either fill this out and hand it in today to one of the representatives. Alternatively, at the bottom of the sheet is the address. So if you wanted to mail this in or call, the phone number is on there, or you can visit us at www.azredistricting.org. There's a public comment section on there that you can fill out your comments as well.

And any of the comments, no matter what format you give to us, they will be recorded as part of the permanent record.

Here is just a screenshot of our home page. We just wanted to highlight a couple of different things.

On the top left you'll see an arrow that says "maps." If you click on there, there's -- you
can find the grid maps, you can find the draft maps, and you can also find -- during the period from the grid to the draft maps, there was a number of scenarios that the commissioners asked for. What we call the what-if maps, and you can click on there and see any of the what-if maps.

There's another arrow that points to the meetings. If you want to watch and see the how the commissioners came to the draft maps, all of the meetings are online. All of the transcripts are there so you can -- if you're bored tonight, you can go home and start watching a hundred-plus hours of the meetings, the 25 meetings took place at the end of August and September and October and see the development of how the maps went from the grid maps to the draft maps.

And the public comment section, if you click on there, you'll be able to give additional public comments. You may get home tonight, you may look at the maps and have some ideas, thoughts, suggestions, by all means, give public comments it to us there.

Down at the bottom there's another arrow that says "maps." And if you click on either of the two pictures of the maps that you see there, it will
take you to a page like this.

This page has a wealth of information. First of all, it has maps in a number of different formats that you can review the map.

There's a number of different reports. There's population tables on the maps, there's competitiveness tables, which show competitive measures. There's compactness measures, there's splits reports, and there's -- some of these reports show how the draft maps compare to the maps that were used in the 2010 elections.

So if you want to go in and compare the two, you would be able to do that.

One of the things that we have circled here is the ability to go look Google maps. If you click on here -- this is a feature that the public has really liked at the other meetings.

It will bring you to a page that looks like this. And basically it's a Google map that has the districts highlighted. This one shows the congressional districts.

And what you're able to do is you're able to scroll in and really zoom in and see what the boundaries of are your district or you can go to your neighboring districts -- neighbor's districts
and see what the boundaries are of their districts.

    Here is just a quick screenshot that shows you some of the level of detail that you would be able to see when you zoom in. This is just a screenshot of Maricopa congressional districts. Four different congressional districts here and you can see down to the exact neighborhoods, you can have a map view or a satellite view if you wanted to see various geographic features as well.

    Finally, we want you to stay connected. We encourage you to visit our website at www.azredistricting.org. As we mentioned, there's a wealth of information.

    One of the features that we have on there is draw your own map. We have an online mapping program. You can follow any of the -- you can review any of the past meetings. And as we move into this stage where we're going to be finalizing the map, you can get information on meetings, you can watch -- most of our meetings are streamed online. So if you're not able to drive and be here in person, you can watch the proceedings online.

    And you can also follow us on Twitter and friend us on Facebook.

    I just want to thank you. We really look
forward to hearing what you have to say about the maps. I was as -- Commissioner Stertz mentioned, I'll be here after the meeting. So if anybody has any questions, by all means, feel free to come up and ask me and I will be happy to answer them.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, Andrew.

As is customary with our meetings, we give preference to our leadership to speak first; our mayors, our representatives, and our boards of supervisors and then I take the rest of them in the order that they were received.

So without further adieu, what I'll also be doing is to list off the first three folks so that you'll know that you will be coming up, you'll be on deck or getting ready to speak so you can start to get your thoughts in order.

So let's go ahead and get started, and we'll start off first with the mayor of Casa Grande, mayor Bob Jackson.

BOB JACKSON: Thank you.

I'm sorry I didn't mean to blind you with that light. I was trying to make it a little darker during the PowerPoint presentation.

My name is Bob Jackson. I'm the mayor of
the city of Casa Grande.

Do you want me to spell it for you or are you okay?

THE COURT REPORTER: No.

BOB JACKSON: I'm here today not only as mayor of Casa Grande but I'm also the chairman of the Casa Grande -- or the Pinal County Alliance Legislative Committee.

And we had previously provided some suggested mapping to the IRC in hopes that we could help solve some of the dilemmas that you guys have at trying to put your maps together.

While I'm sure you know who the Alliance is, I'll just briefly tell you that it's a group of all of the Pinal County cities, the county, and many of the special districts.

We've been in existence over 20 years, and we typically meet quarterly and try to make sure that Pinal County's issues, whether they be congressional, legislative, local, have a forum where we can decide what's best for Pinal County.

I know that we had submitted back at one of your earlier meetings a suggested map. We have made some slight changes to that, and later on today you'll hear from Jill Kipnes with Robert Lynch &
Associates and she'll go through the details of those maps for you.

I have provided a copy of this presentation in its entirety. I can only read a couple of highlight items in the interest of time, but I have provided a complete document to your staff.

The revised Alliance map that you will see from Jill today keeps all nine counties whole and keeps Pinal and Mohave counties mostly whole.

Certainly Maricopa and Pima County are split as is Yuma County and Coconino County, although they are only split once each.

We do think that it's important that this map be given some consideration because rural cities and counties -- rural cities and towns use the counties to communicate particularly with the federal government. The map that does not keep rural counties together, does not benefit the counties or the state as a whole.

Our proposed congressional map recognizes communities of interest. Pinal County Indian community, Gila River, Ak-Chin, Tohono O'odham should continue to be in the same congressional district.
Saddlebrooke located in southern -- Southeastern Pinal County, many of the residents there have Tucson addresses and we more closely align them with Tucson.

Marana, which is -- while it's in Pima County, most of the -- much of the growth that's going on in Marana is actually occurring in Pinal County, and they are a member of the Pinal County Alliance. And we have shown them as part of the proposed congressional district for this area.

We also think that it protects and enhances the majority-minority characteristics of the districts. And like I said, Jill will get up here later and give you specifics about that.

On the legislative side, much of the same reasoning was used. We feel that Pinal County wants to be -- remain whole, but much of the growth that has occurred in Arizona has allowed us to have this the additional congressional seat. It really occurred in Pinal County and we feel that needs to be recognized by the IRC.

Pinal County now has sufficient population to have one full district and would need approximately 52,000 people to create a second district.
I know that there have been several public hearings in the past where there's been some question about whether Casa Grande is a rural county or rural city or not, and I just want to read the comment, our response to each one of those.

Rural county districts should be completely rural and include areas like the city of Maricopa or Apache Junction because they are not rural cities.

Our answer from the Alliance is that Maricopa and Apache Junction are full partners in Pinal County's economic and political efforts, and hence they actively participate in the Alliance.

Their future rests with Pinal County.

Second comment, cities of Maricopa and Casa Grande don't care about rural issues.

I got to tell you this can't be further from the truth on behalf of Casa Grande. Even our general plan, it really stresses the rural nature of our community.

The Alliance's response to that is that Maricopa and Casa Grande have major agricultural and rural neighbors of economic partners that thrust them into rural issues constantly. That necessary intersection is a major reason that the Alliance was
And so I think speaking on behalf of the Alliance, we would really like to see, number one on the congressional level, Pinal County be kept whole as much as possible. Our membership does include many of the mountain cities as well.

And on the legislative side, like I said, we would like to have at least one district that is wholly within Pinal County as much as possible and a second one where we would be a major voice in that. So thank you, and I don't envy your day, but I'm glad it's the end of the day and the end of the road for you today.

So thank for your time.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up we've got our mayor of Queen Creek, Mayor Gail Barney.

GAIL BARNEY: Thank you, Barry.

His dad used to work for us. He was our foreman for about 40 years. He grew up on our farm there in Queen Creek.

My name is Gail Barney, G-a-i-l, B-a-r-n-e-y, and I have the fortune to be the mayor of Queen Creek.

I want to thank you for the opportunity to share Queen Creek Town Council's thoughts on the
proposed congressional and legislative districts.

As everyone knows, you've had a challenging few months, and especially a challenging week, and we appreciate the fact that you are still here working at it and haven't given up on us.

The town has focused on two primary issues, and it's the legislative district, of course, and the congressional district.

And the town, as it's shown on the maps right now, is divided into two different districts on the congressional and the legislative and we are making a request to be made whole by being in one congressional district and one legislative district.

And as Mayor Jackson has said -- he didn't say it specifically, but Queen Creek is also part of the Pinal County Government Alliance, and their maps have shown, by our request, that we have been removed from them.

There is about 500 of our residents that live in Pinal County, and we feel that it would be more appropriate for them to be aligned with the rest of Queen Creek in Maricopa County because of our governmental alliance or governmental agreement with our neighboring communities in Maricopa County that we rely on for quite a few of our services and
some of our intergovernmental agreements.

Not that Pinal County hasn't been great for Queen Creek. They've been good partners in working and doing a lot of things with us, but we're just more aligned with Maricopa County at this time than Pinal County.

We have sent letters to the Commission and maps explaining this to you. And again, we do support the Pinal County -- or Pinal -- I was president of that organization. I can't even say the right name. But we do align with their thoughts in their maps.

The town council respects -- boy, I'm tongue-tied. It's been a long day. I've been irrigating most of the night. We still farm in Queen Creek.

We would request to be aligned in Congressional District 5 and Legislative District number 12. We would prefer and don't want our town to be divided.

And I thank you for your time and your energies.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.

Next up, council member of the town of Queen Creek, Robin Benning followed by Pinal County
Government Alliance, Jill and -- Pima County -- Pinal County, Supervisor David Snider.

ROBIN BENNING: Thank you for giving me the opportunity to address you tonight, honorable members of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission.

For the record, my name is Robin Benning, R-o-b-i-n, B-e-n-n-i-n-g, and I am a council member representing the Town of Queen Creek along with our mayor, Gail Barney.

As the mayor stated, we appreciate the opportunity to present the Town's perspective on redistricting maps, and we hope that our attendance tonight and at multiple hearings emphasizes how important it is to the town of Queen Creek that the final redistricting maps keep the town of Queen Creek in one congressional and one legislative district, which reflect our desire to be within the urban Arizona and Maricopa County cohort.

As explained in multiple hearings and letters to the Commission as well as previous statements, it's extremely important for the town to be kept with the urban Maricopa County population.

The town of Queen Creek respectfully requests the Commission amend the draft maps to
place the entire town within Congressional District 5 and Legislative District 12, including the portion of the town's incorporated area which lies within Pinal County.

The portions of our population that reside in Pinal county do not wish to be separated into a rural or non-Maricopa County district.

Thank you again for the opportunity to speak on behalf of the residents of Queen Creek.

I sincerely hope you'll revise the maps to include the town in one congressional district and one legislative district.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.

Next up we have Jill -- and, Jill, have you turned in your information to --

JILL KIPNES: I have, yeah. So I have two digital -- I have two digital maps. So if you can pull them up for me, that would be great.

I also have my handouts. Can I approach and give them to you?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Sure.

JILL KIPNES: Thank you.

It's Jill Kipnes, K-i-p-n-e-s. I'm with Robert S. Lynch & Associates, and we represent Pinal
County Government Alliance.

So, Commissioner Stertz, thank you for being here this afternoon.

So Pinal County Government Alliance introduced a map to you in July when you were here and we have since made some changes to the map.

The big advantage of going last, it has allowed us to continue to revise our map up until late this week.

So the major changes to our map, and some of them have already been discussed, of course, it combines the Navajo and Hopi Nations. It also adds the other Grand Canyon reservation and the Salt River and the Fort McDowell reservations of Maricopa County.

It moves Queen Creek into Maricopa County district. That includes their Pinal County population.

It moves Saddlebrooke into the Pima County district. It moves Marana into the eastern rural district, and it combines all of Cochise into what we call Congressional District 8.

This map still is constitutionally sound, as it meets all of the six requirements. Probably most importantly putting other -- the communities of
interest that want to be together in Saddlebrooke, Marana, Queen Creek where they want, moving more Indian reservations into that eastern district as was requested and keeping Cochise County whole and, of course, keeping Pinal County as whole as possible.

And then, sir, our other map is our legislative map. If you can go to page 2 on that.

This is a change from the draft legislative map from the IRC. District 11, the one over here on I guess the western side, District 11, is the district that was drawn into the draft that changed district -- it's District 8.

It pulls the population out of Gila and Pima counties. It puts all of Queen Creek back into that green district, which I think is District 12 -- there it goes -- and it puts Apache Junction and Queen -- I'm sorry, and Gold Canyon into District 8.

So it makes two complete Pinal County districts again, along with that northern Pima population, which is, as Mayor Jackson said, is growing into Pinal County and they are becoming more aligned with Pinal County.

So what we really are asking is after all of the public testimony that we have heard as well
as everybody else -- again, we're last, so we got to hear everything else everyone has said is that we know there is going to be a lot of changes going on, especially on the legislative map.

And so what we would like is 11 to stay the same, for our changes to be made to 8 and then kind of make all of the other changes around us.

So please don't pull into Pinal County just to fill other population gaps because we have now made our two legislative districts.

Thank you very much for your time and all of your work for Pinal County, and we look forward to seeing the end result.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

Next up we've got David Snider, Pinal County Supervisor.

DAVID SNIDER: Not members of the family, but I thank them for their support.

My name is David Snider, David and S-n-i-d-e-r. I am the Pinal County Supervisor for District 3, and welcome to District 3 today.

I am here in support of the Alliance maps as presented earlier and certainly by Ms. Kipnes.

We have worked very, very hard on those
maps, and I am proud to be able to say that they
have at least as many of the five Cs as Arizona
does.

They are constitutional, they are
compact, they are competitive, they represent
communities of interest, and they are compliant with
all federal and state regulations as they pertain to
redistricting.

The congressional district in particular
is strong. It represents the will, the expressed
will of certainly the Navajo and Hopi Nations.

It takes into account discussions with
the Eastern Arizona counties. As Mayor Jackson has
said, counties are a fundamental unit of
communication and government for much of rural
Arizona. And we deserve to be together.

We think that the Alliance maps represent
the two rural districts that everybody has been
talking about from the get-go. And they have been
tweaked in a responsible manner to solve some of the
issues that you have been confronted with and that
you have heard about over the past month and a half.

With regard to the legislative districts,
there are a number of ways, obviously, to resolve
those issues, but we feel very strongly that the
Alliance map is -- represents a very strong contender and ultimately, when you look at the consequences of keeping 8 and 11 in that manner, that it will resolve some of the challenges that we have heard from in terms of our neighbors to the north, to the east, to the west, and to the south.

I would urge you to give serious consideration to the Alliance maps.

You'll notice that in terms of the populations, they are within seven people of meeting that congressional target population in each of those districts. That's the entire spread, from 710,220 all the way up to 710,227. That's pretty close. We would have split some babies, but that's prohibited.

The legislative districts are equally strong and we would urge you to give serious consideration to those as well.

As I said, when you were first here in Casa Grande many, many months ago, I'm sure it seems like -- we don't envy you. We thank you for stepping up and taking on this challenge, and challenge it is.

I respect your willingness to put yourself in harms' way as it were. And so thank you
and best of fortune. We look forward to working with you in further endeavors.

    Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.

Next up we have the chairman of Pinal County Board of Supervisors, Pete Rios.

PETE RIOS: Thank you.

Good seeing you again.

Pete Rios, R-i-o-s, Pinal County Board of Supervisors, serving in the capacity of chairman right now.

Thank you again for letting me address the group.

And as I stated last time, I think we were in Globe or San Carlos, at one of those hearings, is I'm speaking right now for myself, not for a group.

But in respect to the congressional map that you all have basically put up, of course, you haven't adopted, you still need to do some tweaking and changing, but as far as those particular boundaries go, when I look at the U.S. Constitution of one man, one vote, when I look at the Voting Rights Act of 1965 that was again approved in 2006 by a Republican president, Republican congress, and
Republican U.S. senate, I find that that map pretty much addresses those two major issues. And that is what I look at when I look at boundaries.

And like I said before, this is my third rodeo. I've done this a few times, so I appreciate the job that you all have done on CDs with, of course, some tweaking that needs to be done.

I specifically wanted to speak today to legislative districts at the particular -- in Pinal County, which is LD 8 and LD 11.

And as I had mentioned before, included right now in LD 8 are portions of Pima County, which is Oro Valley, Catalina, and you also have Saddlebrooke, which technically is Pinal County, but by all practical purposes, part of Tucson. Their mailing address is Tucson. They identify with Tucson. Everything they do is in Tucson.

How do I know? Because I represent them as Pinal County Board of Supervisors, they are part of my district and they tell me every day that I talk to them that their real identity is with Tucson.

So you have them included in LD 8. I would recommend -- and at this particular point I am speaking for myself and there's others, but we are
not a formal group that agrees with me, that we should put Saddlebrooke and Catalina and Oro Valley with what is currently District 11. And I will be submitting electronically some maps by Tuesday or Wednesday of next week that will show what it is that we're truly trying to do and we'll give you all the demographics and numbers that go with it.

We are swapping the numbers. 11 will be 8 and 8 will be 11. I know that will be confusing, but at the end of the day, what we are recommending is that you include with the new 11, which is the copper corridor area, Apache Junction and Gold Canyon.

And when I speak of the copper corridor, that includes Globe and Miami. Even though there may be some conflicting testimony, I have spoken with the mayors of both of those communities and they have both told me that they want to be part of the copper corridor.

We are suggesting that we swap San Tan Valley and put them in LD 16 to make the numbers work.

When we remove AG -- AJ, which is Apache Junction, and Gold Canyon to the new 11 and we suggest that we swap and put into the new LD 8
Saddlebrooke, Oro Valley, and Catalina, and I think that will work.

Again, I don't want to take too much time, but I think when you do that and you look at those new proposed LDs, they are closer in communities of interest and they are a little bit more compact.

And you have to remember, when we put Globe and Miami with the copper corridor, that is part of the CAAG, councils of government. We belong to the same CAAG, which is the Central Arizona Association of Governments.

Pima County does not belong to that.

And I heard the buzzer, so with that I will terminate, and I thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Rios, before you step away --

PETE RIOS: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Just as general information, we are going to continue -- how the Proposition was crafted in the 106, it said there was a minimum of 30-day review period after the draft maps were approved. That means the minimum is going to continue. It doesn't mean that there's a cutoff.
We're going to continue to receive maps, we're going to continue to receive testimony. So we're going to encourage everyone to get their information as quickly as possible, but I just wanted to let you know that as you have those in, that delivering --

By the way, everybody, this is one lucky guy. When we were up in Globe, we took a 15-minute quick break. He popped over and dropped a dollar into one of the machines and came out a winner.

PETE RIOS: That's why I laugh. I hope you don't send these tapes to the Internal Revenue Service, but I will be reporting that as extra income.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up we've got Lynne Pancrazi, who I think gets the driving award.

LYNNE PANCRAZI: I'm Lynne Pancrazi. I'm the -- L-y-n-n-e, P-a-n-c-r-a-z-i.

I am the state rep for Yuma and La Paz County, which is currently District 24.

Rural Arizona -- my part of rural Arizona would like to stay rural.

Right now the districts that you have us attached to would be parts of Maricopa County. And
if at all possible, if you could include Yuma and La
Paz County together as whole into one district --

    I understand George Reiners from my
community put together a map that met all of the
requirements and presented it at the Yuma hearing.

    And with that -- if for some reason you
cannot include Yuma and you have to split Yuma, Yuma
would like to be attached to another rural area,
which is either Buckeye or Gila Bend and then
District 4 could be attached to Santa Cruz.

    And that would help keep the map and the
representation rural.

    But again, we would like to be put
together into one district mainly because of rural
representation and the lack thereof at the state
legislature.

    With the way the maps have been drawn
District 13 would more than likely be represented
from someone from Litchfield Park or Surprise, which
has nothing in common with Yuma County, which is
rural and agricultural.

    District 4 on the other hand is a pretty
good minority-majority district. And if we allowed
the strip to come down to Mohave County and we put
La Paz County and Yuma County in District 13 and we
picked up Gila Bend and Buckeye, that district would also be rural. And with regard to who is representing who, they would be rural representatives, which the voice of rural Arizona needs to be heard for the capitol.

So with that, thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And Representative Pancrazi, I wanted to -- I'm glad that you are okay.

LYNNE PANCRAZI: Oh, yes, I am okay, yes.

Play house is torn and my car is now fixed.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Congratulations.

She was a road warrior as we were going through our tour. And doing so, there was a mishap on the highway and she's okay, which is -- we're always happy to hear that.

So thank you very much for our representatives and our leaders in coming up and giving testimony.

So now we'll go to members of the general public. And again, our comment period is -- we're looking for about four minutes, and I'll name off the first three that will be coming up to testify.

The first up will be Greg Schuller followed by Barry McCain and Penny Phelan.

And again, as a reminder to spell your
name for the reporter.

GREGORY SCHULLER: Thank you.

My name is Gregory Schuller, G-r-e-g-o-r-y, S-c-h-u-l-l-e-r.

First off, I would like to say that I know the people in Saddlebrooke, and the people in Saddlebrooke would want to remain with us here in the central part of the state. Having spoken to a number of them quite often, that is their desire.

So I can understand our board of supervisors, Pete Rios, wanting to get them out of there because they are primarily Republican.

That's one of the things that I think should be taken into consideration whenever this is done.

The maps that the Commission has adopted is political gerrymandering to allow the Democrats to take over the congressional delegations. Even the Arizona Republic, who is ultra left, says this map flunks out and it needs to be redone.

(Audience talking over Mr. Schuller.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Folks, let's be respectful of each other.

GREGORY SCHULLER: The Commission is misleading the public by claiming there are three
competitive district. In reality, these districts are all Democrat districts.

One competitive district in Tucson, which swings left and the other is in Phoenix with a narrow Republican advantage that will fade quickly due to growth patterns.

Representative Gosar's new district is not competitive. Gosar won 2010, a high-water yearly for the Republicans, by less than 6 percent. But this map gives the Democrats over a 9.50 advantage, up 5.7 percent.

The maps are currently competitive. Three of the eight congressional districts have switched parties within the last two elections.

The Democrats ignored the Arizona Constitution by abandoning the grid map in Maricopa County so they could gerrymander the districts for the Democrats.

The maps -- Maricopa district looks nothing like a grid map. This is in violation of the Constitution, which calls for the Commission to use the grid map to develop the final map.

The map that the Commission adopted is not a compromise. The two Democrats and the Democrat-oriented chair compromised with themselves,
not with the Republican members.

Even you, Commissioner Stertz, have
properly labeled the Mathis/McNulty maps.

This map result is a completely unnatural
combination of rural and urban areas and
combinations of parts of the state that have nothing
in common with each other.

Gold Canyon, Apache Junction, Florence,
and the San Tan Valley all share the district with
Yuma and Colorado City.

Large areas of Mesa are arbitrarily
included with a district that zigzags throughout
Tempe and East Central and North Phoenix.

Maricopa, Eloy, and Casa Grande are put
with the four corners area and Flagstaff's district
goes all the way to the Mexican border.

The map is an obvious gerrymander that
could have been drawn by the Democratic party.

The new CD 9 slithers around like a snake
and gerrymandered solely for the purpose of giving a
congressional seat to liberal Kyrsten Sinema and
David Schapira.

The Gosar district goes from being a
competitive one to a not competitive one. From
Democrats 3.8 to over 9.50. Considering the
district was close even in 2010, these kinds of numbers make it virtually impossible for a Republican to win in any election year.

The Democrats are protesting in Giffords's district --

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: If you've got formal comments, you can go ahead and submit them. We'll go ahead and get them into the record.

Thank you, Mr. Schuller.

GREGORY SCHULLER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Next up is Barry McCain.

BARRY MCCAIN: Good afternoon, Commissioner Stertz.

My name is Barry McCain. Spelled like the senator. I don't have to spell that.

I would like to first off -- this is my sixth time before you, and it's been nothing but pleasure and informative and I see all of the hard work that you are doing. I would like to commend you for that.

The thing is, the governor, what she's done is unconstitutional and I don't need to address it, but I'm sorry for all of the problems that
you've had to go through. It's just appalling that someone would do that. But when they were afraid and having been a patient at a V.A. hospital, I understand what fear does. So again, that's to the task.

Pinal County, we want one competitive legislative district. As has been said already, District 8 and District 11 is problematic but in the United States Navy, I believe compromise -- if the Commission would readdress District 11, I would appreciate it. If either of -- you got to pick one or the other.

But like I said, it's been a wonderful experience and I thank you so much.

You have a good day.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir. Next up is Penny Phelan followed by Irene Littleton and Art Kennedy.

PENNY PHELAN: Good afternoon. I'm Penny Phelan, and Phelan is spelled P, as in papa, h-e-l-a-n, as in Nancy.

I appreciate your time this afternoon, and I would like to start by saying I really can't believe all of your unselfish gift of time for our state, and I appreciate your efforts at transparency
and communication with the citizens of Arizona. I think it's an impossible task.

I would like to speak to competitiveness in general for legislative and congressional districts.

I am a resident of San Tan Valley. There's 81,000 of us now. I am a Democrat and I am in a very Republican area. I do not expect probably ever to be represented in my legislative district or perhaps my congressional, but I am very concerned that you are not taking into account fairness for the entire state.

One of the things I have noticed is that we evidently as a state are divided into thirds. At the moment registration seems to be a third Democrat, a third Republican, and a third Independent. I do not feel that our current legislature reflects this.

Furthermore, this March there was a PEW Gallup poll that ranked the states according to leanings, liberal leanings to conservative, with a scale of zero to 50, I believe, with zero being the most liberal state, which I fail to remember, Massachusetts perhaps, and most conservative perhaps is Alabama.
We evidently rank right in the 20s, we are moderate. Again, I do not feel that our legislature as it is currently is composed reflects this.

Therefore, I feel like our legislative districts really need to pay attention to competitiveness for our state so that we do not have the extremes on either side of parties.

I feel part of the moderation that we are noted for on the PEW poll can be seen by Proposition 106. It can also be seen by the fact that we overwhelmingly passed the half-cent tax for education, even though it was not purported to be desired by the legislature.

So finally, please, when you do draw the final maps, keep our state's status in consideration and work the best to have a fair and competitive version for the entire state.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

Next up is Irene Littleton followed by Art Kennedy and Weymouth Fogelberg.

IRENE LITTLETON: Good afternoon.

My name is Irene Littleton, and I want to
thank you for giving us the opportunity to get up
and speak.

Littleton, L-i-t-t-l-e-t-o-n.

Thank you.

This is the first meeting that I have
come to, but I have noticed one thing about these
maps and how they are being drawn and that is I
don't think enough attention is being paid to
communities of interest.

Every one of the counties except one is
cut. Cities are cut in half. Even Florence is cut
in half. I don't understand why this has to happen.
And I think that this is something that the whole
committee should look into and try to get us back
together again the way we should be.

According to the Arizona Constitution,
district lines shall use visible geographic
features, city, town, and county boundaries and
undivided census tracts when possible.

It doesn't seem it's been possible in a
lot of areas. So I would like to have all of that
reviewed and keep Florence as one union, please.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very
much.
Next up is Art Kennedy followed by Weymouth Fogelberg and Tag Preskit.

ARTHUR KENNEDY: Good afternoon.

My name is Arthur Kennedy, A-r-t-h-u-r, K-e-n-n-e-d-y.

I'm not a map reader and I have difficulty trying to follow that one, but it appears to me that community of interest, which is paramount in my mind, is not being adequately addressed and that's my issue.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir. Next up is Weymouth Fogelberg followed by Tag Preskit and Henry Wade.

WEYMOUTH FOGELBERG: Hello.

I'm Mr. Weymouth Fogelberg, W-e-y-m-o-u-t-h, Fogelberg is easy.

I'm a 92-year-old veteran, and I'm going to do something I've never done before. I'm going to talk about myself as a veteran because this morning at the Veteran's parade I was reminded that those many years ago in the South Pacific in World War II, I worked with 85 men who died. I was a medic.

I would like to bequeath them to you.
would like to have their guts and their courage with you as you make your decisions.

I think there are so many things pulling at you people that it must take more than the wisdom of Solomon. I am very sympathetic to that. But in your heart want to be fair. Ignore this distortion of people who are extremely partisan. Give these guys what they died for; a fair democracy.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Does anyone want to follow that?

Thank you, sir.

My dad served in the South Pacific in Guam and lost him five and a half years ago. So thank you for your service.

Next up is I believe either Tag or Jay Preskit.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He was here a minute ago.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'll put it aside.

Henry Wade followed by Tom Cox and Mary Matthias.

HENRY WADE: Good afternoon.

My name is Henry Wade, W-a-d-e. I am a citizen of currently LD 23 to be split into either
LD 11 or 8.

I come before you in several different aspects; however, I try to concentrate on at least 12.

The main purpose for my standing before you is to thank you. To thank you for what you have done. The task that you have taken on as commissioners as volunteers -- I am a volunteer in a number of different activities and organizations, and these volunteer tasks become jobs after a while and lifestyle eventually.

So I appreciate the efforts that you have gone through, and I stand before you as one who has challenged my senator, challenged our governor and the action that they have taken to remove an Independent member of an independent committee.

I believe that we as citizens of the United States have the opportunity to serve. And when we do serve and are recognized for our volunteer efforts, that we should be allowed to do our jobs without being impeded by a political process. And that is what has taken place.

One of concerns that I have in reference to this is your 30-day period in which you have to respond to the Department of Justice and what the
actions of the governor has and how that will affect that process and how it will affect the overall process that you are undertaking and whether or not if the process cannot be completed in the time frames that you have to work with, will it then revert back to the senate, which we know is not the place for this action to take place?

That is a real concern of mine, and I'm hoping that that will not happen.

If that happens, all the work that you have done, all of the people who have come before you on either side of the issue have placed in goals to naught.

We will then be in the process of undergoing a gerrymandering because we know just by the very action that's taken place to remove your chair what happened in the senate.

I believe as the gentleman who stood before you, I stand before as a 20-year veteran of the United States Air Force who under unlimited liability stood to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.

So the constitution is important to me, whether it is the United States Constitution or whether or not it's the Arizona Constitution. And
it should not be used as a weapon against volunteer
citizens who are doing their job.

I'm hoping that this process will
continue. I hope that competitive districts will be
allowed to be presented, and that competitive
districts is what will rule the day, whether it be
the congressional map or the legislative map that
has been put before us.

I said this to you the first time I met
before you, do your job. Do your job well and we
will appreciate it. Some will not, but in the long
run, as citizens of the United States, our process
will have been protected.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.

Next up we have Tom Cox followed by Mary
Matthias and Dwight Snider.

TOM COX: Good afternoon.

My name is Tom Cox, C-o-x, and I live in
Casa Grande, and I appreciate the opportunity to
address you.

I'll keep my comments brief because most
of it has already been said. But in my opinion, no
real rural county should be joined with any part of
Metro Phoenix area or Tucson, except when necessary
to comply with the Voting Rights Act.

The new CD 1 places Pinal County in suburban communities of Marana, Oro Valley, and Saddlebrooke just north of Tucson.

And why in the world has the Pinal County seat of Florence been placed in the western rural district?

Draw at least two districts completely outside of the Phoenix and Metro Tucson areas, one in eastern Arizona and one in western Arizona.

It's the third largest county in Arizona but still very rural in nature. Pinal County should be the major population base of the new district that goes east.

Thank you for your time.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

Next up we have Mary Matthias followed by Dwight Snider and Neola Bye-Beza.

MARY MATTHIAS: Good afternoon.

My name is Mary Matthias. Mary as usual, M-a-t-t-h-i-a-s. No relation to the athlete.

Just to mention, my father also served in the South Pacific in New Guinea in World War II. So it's always hard to talk about that.
My concern with the congressional district is the carving up of Pinal County. I think it needs to be as whole as possible. And if we're missing seven people, I think they moved here last week. So I'm sure it's going to be just fine for however you do it.

I support the Alliance map, and my concern is keeping together the communities of interest. And Pinal County has a lot of interest. We have been under -- in previous years we've been under Maricopa County. It was a disaster for us. We have been under Pima County and it wasn't a whole lot better.

So we really do encourage you to think about us as a rural district, even though most of us have lived all over the world. We like it here.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, ma'am.

Next up is Dwight Snider followed by Neola Bye-Beza and Diann LeSueur.

DWIGHT SNIDER: First I would like to thank the Commission for the work they have done. I know just by reading all of the stops you have made, that it's grueling and this is -- I know you're volunteers and I'm glad I wasn't the one that had to
do all of this work, although I have some interest in it.

I live in Johnson Ranch area, and as most of you know, that's one of the fastest growing areas in the U.S. and there's a lot of changes going on there.

I used to drive to San Antonio and instead of taking the interstate highway, I would drive down through Oracle because it was a nicer drive.

And all of a sudden out of the desert I arrived in -- north of Tucson. Well, that's an area that is now going to be put, according to some of these maps, in Pinal County. I really think it's a -- Saddlebrooke is a suburb of Tucson. It's right there. Once you hit that, you're in city traffic.

One of the things I did was work the polls in the last election. And I was able to see the way the parties were distributed in the area. And there was a large proportion of Republicans on the rolls.

Now, we just had -- we just had the governor and the state senate remove one of the members of your committee, and I looked at some of the voting of the 11 elected members of the state
administration, nine are Republican, two are Democrats. The senate is -- they got 30 people in the senate. There's 21 Republicans, and this has been pretty steady for decades. And the reason is because of the way the voting districts were distributed and laid out.

This program here that you are doing I think will help correct that. But we have to make sure that the party in power does not corrupt this committee.

And I'm hoping that in the next 30 days you'll be able to align this so that it benefits someone other than the Republican party.

There are many, many Independents, as Penny Phelan said, maybe a third. And when I was in the polls as a worker, the Independents in Arizona have virtually no voice, and I think it's time they got some.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.

Next up is Neola followed by Diann LeSueur and Glenn Miller.

NEOLA BYE-BEZA: Well, thank you for the pronunciation. You did very well.

Neola, N-e-o-l-a, last name is Bye-Beza,
B-y-e, hyphen B-e-z-a.

And I'm a senior citizen who has been voting since I was first eligible. And generally what I found is I get my way about 50 percent of the time until I moved to Arizona.

And this week my heart just got broken. And so I just want the Commission to know that -- because I think you work for us, I am very angry at what happened and I want you to continue to do independently what you've been doing and I think you've been doing a great job.

And I appreciate the meetings are open and well-run and we are able to come -- this is my third one. We are able to say what we want to say. And I want to thank you every one of you on the Commission for doing this for us.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

Next up is Diann LeSueur, Glenn Miller, and Tom Miller.

DIANN LESUEUR: Thank you for allowing me to have this opportunity to speak.

It's D-i-a-n-n, L-e-s, like Sam, u-e-u-r.

I want to thank you as volunteers for
what you -- I can't even imagine what you have put into this and the hard work.

I've been a volunteer before. I've never been fired. I don't think you can collect unemployment.

I just wanted to say I do appreciate the hard work and that you do listen to rural Pinal County and are helping to try to keep us rural.

I appreciate the drafts that you have presented, your grids, and I would also like to say that I appreciate being at least one competitiveness legislative district as it's now drawn and I would like to encourage it to be two. I think it would give fairer representation to all of us.

And I would also like to say that I would appreciate it if our legislators would keep their noses out of this.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Glenn Miller followed by Tom Miller and Mary Kortsen.

GLENN MILLER: I'm Glenn Miller. That's G-l-e-n-n, last name M-i-l-l-e-r.

I am here for Yavapai County. You may have seen on the yellow sheet there. This is my second time testifying before the Commission.

I came down here also to get out of the
cold and now you all here in Casa Grande and Pinal County come up to Prescott to get out of the heat. So this is nice weather for me; it's probably cold for you.

But I am basically -- I'm not competent to speak to the specific issues with regards to the boundaries of districts in the draft map for this area.

I made criticisms when I spoke in Prescott Valley before you all with regard to the map and how it -- you know, the prospective LD 14, prospective CD 4, gave my opinion on that.

The big 2,000-pound gorilla here as it's been spoken to to some degree, and that is the highjacking of this process by an out-of-control state senate and out-of-control governor.

I second the comments of Mr. Henry Wade. Specifically this is unconstitutional, it's a complete lack of due process, and I hope the State Supreme Court will restore justice in this state.

This whole idea came out of the Progressive movement. Arizona, a hundred years ago, was created out of the Progressive movement. We fought for the recall against President Taft and we won that fight. After we got statehood, we had a
recall because that's what we wanted, and we were standing for the Progressive movement.

This -- Proposition 106 is a representation of the Progressive movement that was passed in 2000 by the people of Arizona. The idea is to give the power to the people as opposed to a majority party, a temporary majority party.

They should not dominate the process. The whole idea is fair competition in the way districts are drawn and to not be gerrymandering.

That is why I think beyond the precedence much the mandate of the Voting Rights Act and equal population in each district, the LDs and CDs, I think the other four, I think competitiveness is -- should be considered the most important.

But essentially to highlight the key points of no due process, the impeachment process -- number one, there was no chance to first alter the maps after this 30-day process that we are finishing up today. There was no chance to, you know, let you guys listen to the comments, take account of that, and alter the maps and come up with a final product that then they could address and see if there was a violation of your mandate by the state Constitution.

You didn't have a chance to do that
before Ms. Mathis was fired.

    And I honor all of you, including the Republicans and the Democrats and Ms. Mathis for your volunteer work.

    This little buzzer over here I think may have been my idea, by the way. I don't want to end my four minutes, I want it drawn on, but you didn't do that in Prescott Valley and people abused it in Prescott Valley. And I said to Ms. Mathis you need to have some kind of buzzer or something like that, and apparently you're doing it. Maybe that's because of me.

    Ms. Mathis had no chance to respond to the claims before she was canned. There was no hearing before the senate Committee of Jurisdiction, which is chaired by Steve Pierce, who is my state senator in LD 1. He's chair of that committee.

    The claims of impeachment are complex to support this gross misconduct charge. They are not self-evident. They need to be stated in specifics and the chance for Ms. Mathis to respond specifically to each charge.

    All three authors of the Proposition 106 in 2000, the Democrats, the Republicans, the Independents, all oppose this outrageous act by
Governor Brewer and the state senate.

Going back to '98, President Clinton had a chance when he was impeached -- before he was impeached by the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C., and our federal government, his attorneys had a chance to appear before a House committee and answer the charges before they issued articles of impeachment to the full floor of the House.

This process has been basically ignored.

And I think in wrapping it up, I think -- well, all we can say is we're depending on the Supreme Court to restore justice in our state.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.

Next is Tom Miller followed by Mary Kortsen and Dale Smith.

TOM MILLER: Good afternoon.

I'm Tom Miller. No relation to Glenn, although I appreciate the music that he produced.

And I was volunteer once and got fired.

I volunteered to sing is a group and pretty quickly they told me they really didn't need me.

But anyway, I've appeared before the Commission on a couple of occasions. I live here in
Casa Grande, and I do continue to support that we keep Pinal County whole.

I think this is very important. I think the fact that this draft map here has taken the town of Florence and that area away from CD 1, to me, just makes absolutely no sense, to put it bluntly. I think that was a mistake, especially between Florence and Coolidge. They were two communities that are totally tied together, and to split them apart and put Florence in a district that's going to go all of the way to the western border and all the way to the northwestern part of the state just doesn't really make any sense to me.

I totally -- looks like I totally support the Alliance map of what I saw on the screen earlier. It puts CD 1 basically back the way it was, and I think it was a good district the way we've got it and I see no reason to really change it.

And it would also take us away from the area down by Tucson and put that area back into the Tucson area where they belong.

So keep Pinal County whole and put Florence and that area back into CD 1. I think that would be a major accomplishment.
Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.

Next up is Mary Kortsen followed by Dale Smith and Tonya Norwood.

Is Mary Kortsen here?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She's gone.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She left.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: We'll go to Dale Smith.

DALE SMITH: I'll not speak.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you for your -- we'll have your comments that you wrote on your sheet. They will be included.

We'll go to Tonya Norwood followed by Emily Verdugo and Nancy Hawkins.

TONYA NORWOOD: Commissioner, hello. How are you?

Tonya Norwood, T-o-n-y-a, N-o-r-w-o-o-d.

Today I stand before you representing the Arizona Consumers Council, and we have a resolution that we would like to put into evidence.

Whereas in November 2000, Arizona voters passed Proposition 106, a citizen initiative that amended the Arizona Constitution by removing the power to draw congressional and state legislative
districts from the state legislature and reassign this task to the newly-created Independent Redistricting Commission.

Whereas under the Arizona Constitution, the sole task of the IRC is to establish congressional and legislative districts. The Constitution permits no more than two members of the IRC to be from the same political party and requires that the fifth commissioner not be registered with any parties represented on the IRC at the time of appointment.

Whereas the state of Arizona falls under the Voting Act, which is a landmark civil rights legislation that protects the rights of the minority voters to participate in the electoral process. It was enacted in 1965 and amended -- and extended in subsequent years. The two major provisions that concern the redistricting today are Sections 2 and 5.

And the Commission should be aware of Section 2 and 5, so I will not read those.

Now, therefore be it resolved, we the Arizona Consumers Council supports maps that A, honor minority-majority landscapes and maintain equal voting representation for all Arizonans.
B, that maintain respect for communities of interest.

C, that incorporates geographic features and acknowledges the undivided census tract.

D, that creates competitive districts without the violation of the before-mentioned goals.

Be it resolved that we, the Arizona Consumers Council affirm the autonomous right and responsibility of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission and condemn all actions that circumvent, distract from, or unjustly influence the independent operation of this Commission.

Be it also resolved, we the Arizona Consumers Council support the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission's transparent implementation of the will of the Arizona voters outlined in Proposition 106, established in 2000.

Be it further resolved, we the Arizona Consumers Council assert full -- assert faith and trust in the character and integrity of the chosen commissioners assigned to fulfill the charge of the redistricting process.

We additionally emphasize our unyielding support of Chairwoman Colleen C. Mathis.
Be it finally resolved, we, the Arizona Consumers Council and its members, condemn the deliberate actions of the governor and the members of the legislature that conspire to undermine the standing of this Commission and the will of the Arizona people.

Thank you, sir, for your time.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

Did you have information that you could be able to submit about who the Arizona Consumer Council is and their membership?

TONYA NORWOOD: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: That would be a great help to be able to place it in record along with the resolution.

TONYA NORWOOD: Thank you, sir.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

Next up is Emily Verdugo, Nancy Hawkins, and Tom Ramsdell.

EMILY VERDUGO: Good afternoon, Commission Stertz.

My name is Emily Verdugo, V-e-r-d-u-g-o. And I have come before you on several occasions, and I have stated my appreciation for the
proposed Congressional District 1, which includes most of Pinal County and is perfectly competitive. The proposed legislative map for Pinal district has not met the competitive criteria, and I hope the Commission will tweak this map to make it more competitive.

We deserve two competitive districts and we deserve it because we all know that Arizona Supreme Court issued a finding in 2009 that competitiveness is not subordinate to the other criteria and should be taken into consideration as well as the other five.

So please make our LDs more competitive. But I also wanted to take the time to cover some of the talking points I have heard today, because even after months of testimony and meetings, some folks just don't get it.

The congressional map, we have Exhibit nine. Four out of those nine districts are Republican -- favor Republicans and only two are safe for Democrats.

As for the legislative districts map, we have 30. 17 out those 30 favor Republicans.

A word about gerrymandering. Like Ms. Phelan had mentioned, Arizona is one-third
Democrat, one-third Republican, one-third Independents.

The proposed maps do not mirror this and definitely do not favor Democrats.

What was proposed in the congressional maps was an increase in competitive district, which is what folks have come before you asking for.

As to certain urban/rural areas, folks have come before the Commission asking for two rural districts, two rural majority districts. And in order to do this, some areas had to be placed with urban areas, and that's what came of it.

In closing, I just wanted to say thank you to the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission for all of their hard work, but most of all for listening to all of us who have said time and time again, we want competitive districts.

This message has been clear to you. Now let's make it clear to our governor and the state senate.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

Next up we have Nancy Hawkins, Tom Ramsdell, and Lynne St. Angelo.

NANCY HAWKINS: N-a-n-c-y, H-a-w-k-i-n-s,
and I will be very brief.

I have attended a few of these meetings. It is my understanding that part of the requirements -- or a good part of the requirements -- in fact, they should be a priority as well as competitive districts, and that is compact, contiguous, and maintaining communities of interest.

And I've heard a lot of talk about communities of interest, and that seems to be the focus. And I just want to make sure that these other three areas are not overlooked, ignored, or I guess taken advantage of or disallowed or manipulated in any way because those represent people, too.

People live in like areas for a reason. People live in compact areas and they have like needs and everything else.

So I would hope that you would take into consideration and give great importance to the three things, the compactness of the area, the contiguous, and maintaining communities of interest because a lot of these have been ignored and disrupted, in my opinion, just for the sake of being competitive.

Thank you.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

Next up we've got Tom Ramsdell followed by Lynne St. Angelo and Geri Ottoboni.

TOM RAMSDELL: Mr. Commissioner, my name is Tom Ramsdell, R-a-m, as in Mike, s-d-e-l-l.

I've attended a number of meetings here and in Tempe, and I've noticed, as you probably have, that everybody has an opinion.

I don't know how you -- I don't know how you can sit through all of these different opinions, but I'm going to concentrate on two things that I have always talked here.

One is having more than two districts along the border. And this final draft map shows three; that made me happy.

I think everybody in the country understands that the Arizona border is the gateway to America, and certainly we do here in the southern counties of Arizona. So what I see there, I'm happy with. I would like to have three gatekeepers on that border rather than two.

The other thing, instead of taking a microview at legislative districts, I would like to speak to Pinal County because I've always asked for
the ability to try to keep Pinal County as whole as possible.

I understand where -- I think it's District 3 comes into the southern -- southwestern corner. I understand why that is and why that has to be; however, when the county seat of Pinal County is removed from our Congressional District 1 and put in the western congressional district, that just boggles my mind.

I'd say that -- if you're talking about communities of interest, if you're talking about the Constitution, there's six criteria that have to be followed, and I'm sure you know exactly what they are.

But when you look at the current map and you look at how CD 4 encroaches from the north down into Pinal County, from where I'm sitting, that doesn't comply with C, D, or E in the Constitution, and I would like to go over those real quick.

C, districts shall be geographic, compact and contiguous to the extent practicable.

D, district boundaries shall respect communities of interest to the extent practicable.

And I don't think anybody can formulate a good argument that the county seat is not a community of
interest to Pinal County.

And E, to the extent practicable, district lines shall have visible geographic features, city, town, and county boundaries and undivided census tract.

Now, I know where Pinal County is located and I know exactly where Florence is because I drive there all the time, but to take Florence and put it in with cities in Yavapai County and Mohave County, like Cottonwood, Peoria, Sedona, Prescott, Camp Verde, Chino Valley, Clarkdale, Dewey-Humboldt -- I'm slowing down for her -- Prescott Valley, Lake Havasu, Kingman, Bullhead City, and Colorado City, plus 24 unincorporated towns and settlements in Mohave County, I don't get that.

It's here. It's in our county. It's our county seat, and it should be part of Pinal County.

It's not as bad as October 1st when I looked at that map that came out with five congressional districts in Pinal County. That's why I went to that meeting in Tempe on Monday and found out that we were back down to three.

So if you would, just look at Pinal County. We're rural in nature. We want to be in with our rural partners on the eastern of the state
because those are our communities of interest. We have common goals.

And you know, if it were me, if I was, you know, the guy, I would move that line up and put Marana and Oro Valley back down into that southern district. And by moving the boundary up, you could move the northern boundary -- we could get Florence back into our district.

So if you would please consider that and try to make Pinal County as whole as possible, I would appreciate it.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.

Next we have Lynne St. Angelo followed by Geri Ottoboni and then, unless -- I'm being handed another sheet -- followed by Barbara Davis.

LYNNE ST. ANGELO: I'm Lynne St. Angelo, L-y-n-n-e, S-t, period, A-n-g-e-l-o, and I came in a little late, but Jill was presenting a map, and I think it was called the Alliance maps, and I kind of liked what I saw, although you can't see in detail, you only see the big picture, big colors, but it looked very much like probably what I'm going to say. I would like to see.

As you're adjusting the maps now after
this public comment period, the only thing on the CD map I really liked a lot, but the LD 8 map, it looked like maybe it cut cross on the Pinal County line and I want to make sure that Oro Valley does not get separated from Saddlebrooke because Oro Valley, Catalina, and Saddlebrooke are right there together. You can't tell when you leave one and you come to another. They basically are a community that's right there together.

Arizona has 13 counties that are rural with an approximate population of 1.6 million people, according to the census. And that is enough to make at least two completely rural congressional districts.

The Commission can draw those districts without getting into Metro Phoenix and Metro Tucson. One on the eastern side and one on the western side of Arizona if -- and it may be that Jill's maps already did this. It kind of looks like it. You may have taken a lot of this into consideration.

If Coconino County must be included in a district with heavily populated area, it should be kept completely out of Maricopa County and Pima County.

The more populated northern areas with
Yavapai County, Mohave County, for example, would be much more in -- compatible with Yav-- -- Coconino.

The draft map does not comply with the Constitution in a number of ways. The districts are much less compact than those in previous maps.

The districts do not respect the rural communities of interest. All of the nine districts shown in the draft map have a connection to the Metro Phoenix or Metro Tucson areas.

It has created districts like CD 1, which is not compact, it does not respect communities of interest or geographic boundaries, and it is not competitive.

Do not split the five counties, Pinal, Cochise, Gila, Pima, and Yavapai for the one purpose of keeping Coconino County whole.

Do not put Pinal County communities of Marana and Oro Valley in with the eastern rural district CD 1 that includes Coconino County. We would rather be with CD 2, which is right there by us in Southern Arizona and keeps us in Southern Arizona.

The rural counties should be able to elect a candidate from rural Arizona, not from suburban Tucson, and the communities in Southern
Arizona should be able to elect a candidate from
Southern Arizona.

If you really want to have three border
districts and the two rural districts, I think that
possibly could be accommodated without still putting
in with Pima County -- without putting the western
counties in with Maricopa County and Pinal County.

Arizona does have enough people in the
rural parts of the state to deserve a minimum of two
completely rural counties -- I mean two completely
rural districts.

Florence, Coolidge, and the San Tan
Valley, if they want to be -- and I'm sure not sure
that this is true -- in the currently drawn CD 1 and
the nonreservation part of Coconino County wants to
be in the currently drawn CD 4, this would be an
easy swap to make those counties work -- or those
congressional districts work.

CD 8, which is where I was, was the most
competitive congressional district in the state,
switching back from Democrat and Republican. And
now that we're CD 1, which has a Democrat 10 point
majority, which in no way can possibly be considered
competitive, even though competitive really hasn't
been defined by the Commission and is certainly not
rural.

I would request in the 30-day review -- I'm almost done -- that you get the 2004 and 2006 election data and include those in the new data that everyone would be able to see that as well for the new districts.

Thank you so much.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

Lynne -- Geri Ottoboni, Barbara Davis, and finally, Cheryl Sims.

GERI OTTOBONI: Geri Ottoboni. That's O-t-t-o-b-o-n-i.

CD 1 shows no respect for the geographical features of the state. They have created the largest, most hard-to-travel district this state has ever seen.

This district includes Mohave desert, the Colorado plateau, the Central Highlands, the Sonoran desert, the grasslands, and the southeastern part of the state. It runs from Utah to Mexico and crosses the Mogollon Rim -- the state's great divide. And it includes 12 of the 14 counties.

It appears, in fact, that the geographic features criteria was totally ignored in this
process.

The Commission has two super-Hispanic districts and four super-Republican districts, both of these is packing.

There -- excuse me, then there were the weirdly shaped LDs, like LD 2 with a tail to get it packed with Hispanics. There are seven of these LDs.

Competitiveness, Indian reservations, and Hispanic districts have been the prime area of focus of the Commission from day one. Never mind communities of interest, which were barely ever discussed. And when they were, certain commissioners reminded the public -- public comment of a few people that ignored the comments of the vast majority of people as was done in splitting Yuma in half.

Making the entire state and all of the districts competitive has been the overriding focus of the Commission, making all other criteria subject to that and then refusing to define what competitive is.

So the commissioners would say, well, this is competitive like CD 1. Well, it has 10 point Democratic majority and it can be no way
considered competitive.

The McNulty-designed CD 9 was created and the voting results from 2004, 2006 have never been made available for comparison of whether this is a new district, or any other is true competitive. The data manipulation has been and continues to be deplorable.

Colleen Mathis was asked to answer questions by the AG Tom Horne and instead lawyered up so she would not respond to questions about the illegal activities, but instead the Commission has hired nine attorneys to protect the two Democrats and one Independent when the Republicans did not seem to have a problem testifying without attorneys.

We, the taxpayers, are paying for these very, very expensive personal attorneys to defend these three commissioners from the AG and the governor.

In addition, Chair Mathis appointed two vice chairman, which now throws the Commission into gridlock. This is a blatant violation of the Constitution, Article IV, part 2, which reads: The five commissioners shall then select by majority vote one of their members to serve as vice chair.

At the time of the vote to select the two
vice chairs, the IRC has made aware the unconstitutional decision, and Ms. Mathis chose to ignore advice to follow the Constitution.

Not only was this unconstitutional but Mathis's act has had the predictable impact on the IRC. With two vice chairs, will be almost impossible for the IRC to act on anything.

The governor and the senate realized evidence was overwhelming that Ms. Mathis had committed gross misconduct and substantial neglect of duty.

What they perhaps didn't realize was the impact of her unconstitutional reign that would have after she left the IRC.

The governor did not go far enough. Voters have no idea what Proposition 106 would bring, and she should have gone ahead and gotten rid of the whole -- all of the commissioners and put the Proposition 106 back on the ballot.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

Next up is Barbara Davis and Cheryl Sims.

BARBARA DAVIS: Hello. Hi.

My name is Barbara Davis, B-a-r-b-a-r-a, D-a-v-i-s.
I want to say thank God for all of the men and women who have served our country, and are currently serving our country.

And I do believe in the voice of people. And I think that the -- there are several people that mentioned that there are certain communities that should be attached to this or that or whatever, but I think that the communities need to be of interest, compact or contiguous, remain communities that are most important.

And perhaps the people of Florence, Saddlebrooke, Catalina, and Oro Valley would rather have their communities not with some other community but where they are presently.

So I would appreciate if the Commission would take time to look at that.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

And before we go to our final speaker, did Jay Preskit come back?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: We'll get to our final speaker, Cheryl Sims.

CHERYL SIMS: Well, I guess they did save
the best for last.

I had to do it. Thank you, Commissioner Stertz.

My name is Cheryl Sims, C-h-e-r-y-l, S-i-m-s, and I am here to speak on behalf of my sorority, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated, which is a public service organization that was founded in Washington, D.C., in 1913.

So we, too, are soon to celebrate our centennial celebration like our great state of Arizona.

Today we are more than 250,000 members strong, and I would like to acknowledge some of my sorority sisters who have come to support me today from around the state of Arizona.

If you ladies would please stand.

Thank you so much.

To put into evidence, the 2011 Arizona Redistricting Commission resolution in the affirmative, Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated, sponsored by the Tempe Alumni chapter, presented by Tucson alumni chapter.

Whereas in November 2000, Arizona voters passed Proposition 106, a citizen initiative that amended the Arizona Constitution by removing the
power to draw congressional and state legislative
districts from the state legislature and reassigning
this task to the newly created Independent
Redistricting Commission, the IRC.

Whereas, under the Arizona Constitution,
the sole task of the IRC is to establish
congressional and legislative districts. The
Constitution permits no more than two members of the
IRC to be from the same political party and requires
that the fifth commissioner not be registered with
any party represented on the IRC at the time of
appointment.

Whereas, the state of Arizona falls under
the Voting Rights Act, which is a landmark civil
rights legislation that protects the rights of
minority voters to participate in the electoral
process. It was enacted in 1965 and amended and
extended in subsequent years.

Therefore, be it resolved that the
Arizona chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority,
Incorporated, aligns their support with maps that
honor minority-majority landscapes and maintains
equal voting representations.

Be it resolved, the Arizona chapter of
the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated, affirm
the autonomous rights and responsibility of the
Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission.

Be it also resolved, the Arizona chapter
of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated,
supports the Arizona Independent Redistricting
Commission's transparent implementations of the will
of the Arizona voters outlined in Proposition 106.

Be it further resolved, the Arizona
chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Incorporated,
assert faith and trust in the character and
integrity of the chosen commissioners assigned to
fulfill the charge of the redistricting process.

Be it finally resolved, that Delta Sigma
Theta Sorority, Incorporated, a sisterhood of
250,000-plus college educated women will vigorously
encourage each of its members to attend hearings,
voice her opinion and communicate in writing with
state senators and representatives in an effort to
urge the support and monitoring of the redistricting
process.

Thank you, Commissioner, for your time
and God bless you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very
much.

Is there anyone else in attendance this
evening that would like to speak?

With that being said, a couple of closing remarks.

Mr. Wade had asked a question about what the process is going forward.

There is sort of a parallel process. In Proposition 106, there was a remedy clause if there was a choice where a commissioner was removed, there is a remedy where the Appellate Court Appointment Board reconvenes together and selects a new member, which will be then vetted by the remaining commissioners.

That Appellate Court Appointment Board is having its meeting on Monday.

Simultaneously there is a legal response taking place where there's a legal challenge by the Commission against the removal of Chairman Mathis that was filed in Supreme Court, and those proceedings are beginning as well on Monday.

Because of the 30-day process of response time, it doesn't end. It's just that the minimum time is 30 days or longer, as the Constitution lays out, that we are to collect comments after the draft maps for at least 30 days. The end of that first minimum period is this upcoming Wednesday.
So what we'll be doing now is we have literally -- and I think Mr. Forst said earlier today that we literally have thousands and thousands of e-mails, not including the testimony that we've had in person, the writing of testimony, the maps, et cetera, that we've accumulated over the past travel time since the draft maps have been distributed.

That information is going to be gathered together, collated, and then distributed to the commissioners so that we can begin our assimilation.

And this is a -- this is a deliberate and intentional process by the commissioners to really, truly understand all of the ramifications of the testimony that we have received, the impact of the changes that they have, how we have Florence in one district slightly outside of the majority of the rest of the county.

These are the adjustments that sometimes when you are drawing draft maps you just don't really capture. And that's the reason why this -- the crafters of 106 were quite smart and said you've got to get a draft period. Go out to public, capture a bunch of information and then digest all it and then go back and make these adjustments.
So I want to tell you thank you very much. Please keep us in your thoughts and your prayers.

This has been a difficult challenge this past week and going forward. We know that we are not going to satisfy everybody's needs, wants, or desires as we move this ball down the field, but if you can keep us in your thoughts and prayers, we would surely appreciate it.

And again, thanks to the city of Casa Grande for letting us use this beautiful facility.

I will call this meeting -- the last meeting of our public comment period to a close at 5:35 -- or 5:30. We'll call this meeting adjourned.

(The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.)
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