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(Whereupon, the public session commences.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Good afternoon. This meeting of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission will now come to order.

Today is Thursday, December 15th. The time is 1:11 p.m. -- I mean, a.m. -- p.m.

Let's begin with the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We'll begin with roll call.

Vice-Chair Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Vice-Chair Herrera.

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We do have a quorum. And we do expect Vice-Chair Herrera to be joining us shortly.
Other folks at the table include our legal counsel, Mary O'Grady and Joe Kanefield.

Our mapping consultant today, Willie Desmond.

We have our staff, chief technology officer Buck Forst.


And Kristina Gomez, our deputy executive director.

Our public information officer, Stu Robinson.

And our court reporter, Marty Herder, is taking an accurate transcript of today's proceedings.

So, since our meeting Monday, the next two items on the agenda have been the same for the last few meetings at least. We'll go to item two.

Discussion, direction of mapping consultant and possible action regarding adjustments to draft congressional districts and possible action regarding adoption and certification of final congressional districts.

So, it looks like Mr. Desmond was very busy over the last couple days.

We have a stack in front of us of different change reports for both the congressional and working map and legislative working maps.

So, we'll start with congressional. And I'll let Mr. Desmond decide what he'd like to cover first.
WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. If you give us just one second. We're trying to make sure that we're able to broadcast to the TriCaster. It should be loading right now. It is. Okay.

All right. There are, I believe, ten different change reports for you to look at today.

The first one you have for the legislative and congressional are both just showing you the draft map compared to the current working map. So that you can kind of see the progress we've made as we've, as we've come along.

Continuing on with the congressional. We have change maps for a map that Commissioner Stertz had put together. Also he asked that I make a full packet of, like, the splits reports and the components reports. So that's been included as well.

There's a change report for Commissioner McNulty's second draft of her congressional map.

Basically what I did there was just take the changes she had looked at last week, but overlaid them onto the new working map, so that they fit within the context of what's already been done.

And after that we go to the legislative.

So we're going to -- if you guys want to start with congressional, we can go through the working map again,
or else you can just reference this document if you have any questions of what, what has been done to affect all the different districts.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Let's go through the working map just to refresh everyone and get us on the same page.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

And I believe these are either on the website or going to be up in a little while.

If there's anyone in the room who would like a copy, I think I have them on a thumb drive, and we can pass it around.

(Brief pause.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So the draft plan is the red line here, the darker brownish black line behind it is the working map.

The only changes that have been accepted for analysis so far are some that the Hispanic Coalition for Good Government has asked for. Those happened in District 3 and District 7 are two voting rights districts.

In District 3, a slightly larger portion of Tucson was added to the district. And to compensate, some of the unincorporated area between Tucson and Marana was taken out of the district.

This, this now runs up Alvernon, over on Aviation. It used to run, I guess, down Interstate 10 and up
at Campbell. That's the change there.

Over here there's not really streets. This runs along now it's just unincorporated area, with some population to balance.

In District 7, there's been some population swap with District 6 and 9. The district goes a little farther here, out to Priest, over on Van Buren, over on McDowell, and then over on Thomas.

I can tell you specifically what north-south roads these are here. But I believe that this is like 47, and this one is -- I don't recall, but -- I'll change this.

Okay. The other changes then have been it grabs a little more population here. Instead of coming over to 7th Avenue and Indian School, it comes up north of Camelback.

It goes up Central Avenue a little bit further.

As a result of adding this population, some of it's been removed. It's gone to both Districts 6 and 9.

The district used to run along Northern Avenue until it hit 7th Avenue. Now it goes up to Glendale Avenue, takes that over to 43rd, and then meets up with Northern.

And those have been the only changes that have been made so far in the congressional draft map -- to the congressional draft map.

Are there any questions about that?
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any questions?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Those changes are all Voting Rights Act changes; is that correct?

WILLIE DESMOND: Correct.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Just checked with Strategic Telemetry and where are we -- or with legal counsel where are we with review of the, of the majority-minority districts? What's the status of the analysis?

WILLIE DESMOND: We've been working with Dr. King and his graduate students. We have gotten some information back, but at this point we're not ready to present anything. We're still going back and forth trying to figure out some last-minute questions that I have.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Are there any -- Madam Chair, are there any red flags that are being sent up in your discussions, or does -- is the -- is the opinion right now that these two districts are going or are designed in the right direction and feel fairly confident in their work?

WILLIE DESMOND: Not right now with the congressional maps, no.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm sorry?
WILLIE DESMOND: Not with the congressional maps, no, no red flags.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other questions?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Whose map are we reviewing right now?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sorry. We're just looking at the congressional working map as it stands today. And then Mr. Desmond is going to walk us through the different change reports that he prepared.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think we're ready to do that now.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Well, the first of the, of the congressional changes to look at today, there's one by Commissioner McNulty and one by Commissioner Stertz. Up to you guys where you start, but I'll leave it to you.

If it's all right, we'll start with Commissioner Stertz then.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure. If that's what you want to do.

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

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: At our -- a week and a half ago I presented a map that was, that was -- had what was considered to be by some of the commissioners substantive changes. And there was a desire to -- and there was a lot of feedback and conversation about how substantive some of those changes are.

We also this past Monday, at our hearing, determined that we were going to fix the boundaries of two of the legislative districts, Districts 3 and 7, fix them in a temporary sense so that they could move forward upstream for analysis.

The map that I had prepared affected -- the map that I prepared and presented a week and a half ago had affected Congressional District 3.

So going down the path and trying to work under those parameters, I had to revisit.

So, what I've done -- and I also heard a lot of testimony and reflecting back and there's some issues that are, are areas that led to a higher level of discussion that there was a lot of passion about, specifically in regards to the city of Flagstaff and their placement into -- with the First Nations, the -- so -- and also into the effective -- effectively looking at what we call the CD 9 district, or the district that's in the Maricopa area.
So what I chose to do for the purposes of today, at the request of some of the other commissioners, was to take a very simple walk-through approach.

And there are six -- there's simply just six steps that took place.

And if you want to, you can pass those down.

These are very simple congressional map modifications, and I can walk you through each one of them and show you where -- effectively what I was trying to achieve.

So, again, because Santa Cruz County could not be bifurcated based on the fact that Congressional District 3 is now a placeholder district for the majority-minority district, and Congressional District 7 as well, there was a lot of commentary, in fact, there was a recommendation by Commissioner McNulty, regarding keeping Cochise County whole.

So I began first with keeping Cochise County whole. And simultaneously in one approach that was taken by Commissioner McNulty, she had added that to the urban Tucson area.

We've heard a tremendous amount of testimony regarding, and I've brought this up multiple times before, regarding Oro Valley, Saddlebrooke, and Marana, and their relationship with the urban Tucson area.
So what -- so the approach that I've taken was quite simple.

I have under the first item, which is moving the population of CD 2 -- or CD 1. It's actually going in two directions here.

I'm adding, I'm adding the 123,715 people that are in this district from CD 2 into CD 1.

Making Cochise County whole, and making that entire district Cochise County part of the eastern rural district.

I then to -- an effort to -- I did not, again, based on the place holder district of majority-minority district of CD 3, I did not make the change that I was recommending earlier that we heard testimony on and that has been historically a connection between the greater Tucson urban area and Sierra Vista, I have eliminated that and gone and collected the 123,715 population from CD 1. And which, if you can see by this green line here, this is -- thank you, Willie, for boosting that up.

That line right there identifies where the current draft map line shows.

So I am capturing this southern part of Pinal County, and Marana, Oro Valley, and the areas that had penetrated down into the Casas Adobes area, and as well as Saddlebrooke, and include those into the greater metro
area.

So I had a simple exchange of -- from CD 2 to CD 1 of 123,715, and from CD 1 to CD 2 of 123,715.

This keeps Cochise County whole. It keeps Marana, Oro Valley, Saddlebrooke together with Tucson. And also it enhances the Interstate 10 corridor, which comes through right through here.

The third move that I've made is CD 4 to CD 6. This was a request that has come up at multiple meetings, which is the attempt to keep Fountain Hills with Scottsdale.

So what I've done is I have taken that divot out and filled the divot in. I have -- by taking it out of CD 4 and adding it into CD 6. That was a population exchange of 27,605.

So this line now becomes the border of CD 6.

And we'll see when we get into the splits report, the competitiveness reports, the -- that essentially I've been -- these moves have become relatively lateral, meaning that there was a -- not a large net effect.

We've created compactness and solved other of the six criteria that we've been trying to -- we've heard testimony on and wanted to make modifications without significantly bringing detriment to, to the, to the other criteria.

Now, if we want to move over, we have a small area
that we needed in south -- there's a population set off that
needed to be moved from CD 4 to CD 5 of 6610. That is a
population center from the southeast corner of CD 5.

There's a couple things that occurred. That was
a -- it's in that corner right there, which was a population
set off just to balance the districts.

If you look at the underlying, there is some --
there are neighborhoods that were also connected as well.

Now, Willie, if we can move up to CD 8 to CD 4,
the west side of CD 8, it was -- and I think, Madam Chair,
you characterized this as the rural urban district at one
time where there's a large urban population -- or a large
rural population on the west side.

What I've done is to, is to accumulate that area
and add that to the rural district of CD 4, extracting it
out of CD 8, making eight more compact, making eight more
urban, and allowing that urban part of the west side of
CD -- of the current CD 8 to be integrated into CD 4.

And then out of CD 4 we've -- and that was a
population exchange of 32,185.

And then from CD 4, what we've been trying to do
is to try to accumulate and to keep Anthem, New River
together, along with the extension of the I-17 corridor.

So that line was the current line of the, of the
map, and now I've just scooted it over to be able to pick up
New River and Anthem, and include it into the extension of CD 8.

And now you look at -- on the splits report, we now have one less split county.

In the competitiveness analysis, you'll see that, that it has been a series of for all intents and purposes lateral changes.

CD 1 actually becomes a, a slightly, slightly more Democrat.

CD 2 has a slight, by a half percent, to Republican.

CD 3 was unchanged.

It does show in one of the areas both in CD 3 and CD 9 -- or, excuse me, in CD 3 and CD 7, as well as CD 9, that there might have been population adjustments.

I'm not sure whether or not that was a -- just a pickup that when Strategic Telemetry was making the adjustments they might have picked up a block one way or the other.

But the intent was to not touch three, seven, or nine, and to make modifications to -- that we have heard from public comment.

We've now completed fixing the Fountain Hills area.

We've completed keeping Cochise County whole.
We have completed the relationship between Saddlebrooke, Oro Valley, Marana, being contiguous with the greater Tucson area.

As you can see there is no longer two border districts or even any small part of the district touching the border.

Three has remained intact. Seven has remained intact. Nine has remained intact.

There's been no bifurcation of the First Nations mapping as it occurred.

That I was looking at earlier in an attempt to get a higher level of competition between four and one, we were able to -- one is actually slightly more competitive on the -- to -- being a little -- it's almost a 50/50 district.

Two is almost a 50/50 district.

Nine is almost a 50/50 district.

And, of course, three and seven are majority-minority districts.

So any questions?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you for that comprehensive presentation. That was very helpful.

I noticed that we're losing the third border concept idea.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Well, Madam Chair, the -- to keep Cochise County whole and to keep the Santa Cruz and
that border line whole, it becomes -- the only way to try to
do it -- and I actually tried to create this little sliver
here, and it became, again, almost the same style that we
had occurred before, which was an attempt to touch the
border for touching the border's sake rather than for
actually having an impact.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any questions for Mr. Stertz? Comments?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Mr. Desmond, could you focus
in on the urban Maricopa County area, please?

I'd like to look at the map.

One thing, I mean, there are a number of things
that jump out at me, but one thing that comes to me right
now is a concern I have is with -- I have many concerns with
the proposed CD 9, but the one in particular is that there's
a strong community of interest with Paradise Valley, the
Biltmore area, the Arcadia area, Camelback corridor, and
sort of the Madison School District area of north central
Phoenix.

Paradise Valley is not densely populated. I
believe it's only about 10,000 people.

Just thinking out loud on possible refinements is
I could see that going in -- I'm not sure if --
Commissioner Stertz, if you know offhand the population of the New River, Anthem area.

I have a feeling it exceeds the PV area.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: It does.

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe it's about 36,000.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: It's actually too much.

All right.

Well, that's one thing I would like to look at is maybe an exchange there. That would underpopulate six and we would need to get population somewhere.

I was thinking that make you could get it from eight, which would allow you to grab more Peoria.

Nine would then have to shed a little population, and five would have to pick up, and we'd have to look at it to see if it made sense in terms of whether it introduced any, any splits.

That was just one thought.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Stertz --

Commissioner Stertz, the -- this -- the deviation from ideal population, I mean, there's some -- I think most of them are a little off with the exception of three.

Any ideas how you would address the deviation for population in the eight and nine districts?
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Well, the -- Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The deviation population is plus or minus single neighborhoods potentially. For example, on District No. 2, it's a deviation of 41.

In district number -- in an adjacent district, it is a deviation of 39.

So we know that we're going to be able to make subtle adjustments from one to the other.

Because this was the map that -- and let me just share this with you.

There is, there is nothing about -- this was the map that I created looking at, looking at this in, in an entirely -- in a different light.

We've been arguing about, about competitiveness. We've been arguing about compactness. We've been arguing about certain things.

But what I've heard come through is that three and seven were fixed districts, and nine was really a district that, that, that three of these commissioners are really fixed on.

And if, if fixing the other parts of the map and fixing the other parts of the state mean compromising to be able to get those fixes, that's going to be a compromise that is going to have to take place or else we're just going
to have a map that is going to not meet with the overall objectives that we have been continually hearing across the state.

So if it means that a district like nine -- and I would -- I would continue to like to, as Commissioner Freeman had alluded to, look at some of the edges of nine. But in respect to Commissioners Herrera and McNulty, nine was a district that they felt very passionate about.

I chose to not touch the edges of that map in this analysis.

There are aspects of it that, again, of this map that can be improved.

And there are aspects of these small adjustments that we can make.

But we are meeting through this map many of the objectives that we have heard through public testimony.

We've created a -- it is more compact in our, in our urban areas. We are having -- we now have two truly urban -- or rural districts. And we, and we are meeting with the objective of urban Tucson being connected with its growth corridor up into Pinal County.

So I am open for, open for, open for continued discussion on this. Hopefully that this is a -- that I presented this in such a way as that it's comprehensive.
enough to clearly understand, and that there's aspects of
this map that could be moved forward.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, I do appreciate this.

I think this is -- the steps that you provided were easy to
follow. I can understand where you took some population out
of one and put it into another. I do appreciate that.

I, I also appreciate that you didn't mess with
three and seven. I think those are things that we, I think,
we all agreed on until we get the analysis back.

So I appreciate the changes you made. I think you
went in a different direction than I would. With further
analysis, I definitely may consider. So thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any other comments or questions?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Hearing none, so,
do -- Mr. Freeman, on your, your question earlier, did you
want to see some kind of change then explored by

Mr. Desmond?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, I don't know how
productive it would be at this point in the game to go
through it live, but certainly that was one thought that
came to mind to respect that community of interest, and it
I would require -- I mean, there might be other ways to make adjustments. Again, thinking out loud, perhaps if six gets underpopulated but takes population from New River or Anthem, perhaps then this, this chunk of Mesa gets put back in it, that's a possibility, which would clean that up.

I think that would be a good change. Perhaps more Peoria could be grabbed.

I mean, there's going to be a series of adjustments there to make that happen. It's something that I could certainly look into.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: If it would please you, I would be more than happy to work with Commissioner Freeman in trying to adjust some of these areas so that we can get those changes over to Mr. Desmond in a like format for presentation.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: If that's the direction that Mr. Freeman would like to go and explore, that's fine.

Why don't we all talk -- why don't we talk about, before we give directions to Mr. Desmond, the other congressional change reports that he's prepared, and we'll talk about those, and then maybe at the end talk about what we want to have him do next.

Do we want to go to the next change report?
WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And you'll have to refresh my memory at least on some of the directions we gave you.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mine too.

It has my name on it, but I have no idea what it is.

WILLIE DESMOND: So at the last meeting you had asked that I go ahead and take any of the changes that were still kind of undecided out there, and see how I could work them in with the new working map, so that, you know, we're not trying to go back to something that doesn't necessarily fit anymore.

So for this map, what I did was I took the McNulty map that I believe was on the 5th and laid it over the top of the working map and adjusted some population there.

There were some small shifts that had, you know, affected this map from Districts 3 and 7, and kind of applied it again, so that, so that if it was something that you wanted to explore again, we were able to look at that based off of what we have so far.

So I'd be happy to go through some of the changes that happened from the draft map, and kind of retrace our steps.

The first one was, again, to keep Cochise County
In this case, Cochise County was incorporated into District No. 2.

District 2 then had some population switches with District 3.

We'd have to look and make sure that those don't undue some of the changes from Hispanic Coalition for Good Government, but I believe that's the case, but I could be wrong.

Going back out to the rest of the state, District No. 1 needs to pick up a little population. It does that in the Verde Valley.

It -- instead of -- it basically moves the Village of Oak Creek into the rest with Sedona and Camp Verde and Lake Montezuma.

As a result, District No. 4 is a little underpopulated.

District No. 4 then picks up some population here, keeping District 8 going back to the county line.

And also in, in the New River and Anthem area, it keeps -- it, it takes a little bit more population here.

District 6 is then underpopulated, so it balances its population with number eight.

Also District 6, the Paradise Valley area -- or Fountain Hills, excuse me, is put in with Scottsdale.
So what this does is it incorporates Fountain Hills with Scottsdale, it keeps Cochise County whole, and it moves Oak Creek into District 1 with the rest of the Verde Valley.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY:  Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY:  Mr. Desmond, are the districts now all balanced on that map?

WILLIE DESMOND:  I believe so, yes.

The biggest deviation is negative 23 people in District 8. So it's not perfectly balanced. There will be a little tweaking at the end.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY:  The one thing I like about this map is that it reduces the huge size of CD 1, which I think is one comment that we heard more than anything else. And of course public comment, it was that CD 1 was so huge, it was unrepresentable.

I think that Marana, Oro Valley, and Saddlebrooke, we heard a lot of comments, at least from folks in Saddlebrooke, and to a lesser extent Oro Valley and to a much lesser extent Marana, about the relationship of those communities.

And this map does keep them together in what is by and large a rural district. I think less than 30 percent of that district is urban, although there are three sort of
centers of community denser population. One would be that Pinal County area. One would be the sort of central part of the district. And the third would be Flagstaff.

So I think each of those areas would have a strong voice in the district with the other rural communities.

I think I'd like to use this opportunity to just talk about my perspective on community of interest.

I know we don't have a definition that we've adopted as a Commission, and I think one of the reasons for that is because we felt it would be difficult to arrive at a consensus definition.

And I know we each have our own perspective on what communities of interest are. And so I'd like to expand on what mine is. I've talked about this a little earlier, but I'm going to say this again.

I've spent a lot of time thinking about it and kind of wrote out the way I view it.

I think it's a group of people residing in a specific locale who have common cultural or historic heritage which defines them that and which transcends their political party affiliation and who draw together to an advocate on behalf of their community on issues that are within the purview of representatives elected from the districts whose boundaries are being drawn.

So, I see a community of interest as a fairly
small group of people that come together to take civic action with regard to the kinds of issues that the representative of the district that we're considering would be concerned about.

I see some folks here today in the audience from Guadalupe, or -- I would think of Guadalupe as a community of interest.

I think of Saddlebrooke as a community of interest.

I don't think of Saddlebrooke, Oro Valley, and Marana together as a community of interest. Although we worked extremely hard in drawing these maps to develop districts, we know that makes sense from a community perspective.

When I think of a community of interest and not -- and respecting it, my perspective is we don't take a town like Guadalupe and draw a line down the middle of that.

I don't think a community of interest is a network.

I don't think a community of interest should be used for the purpose of promoting any political party.

And I don't think it's an exclusionary device.

I don't think it's a reason to say we're different from those people and we don't want to be with them.

And I think congressional and legislative
districts are compilations of different communities and
different communities of interest.

    Our job isn't to ensure that any community, any
community of interest has a certain type of representation.

    I think it's our job to respect to the extent
practicable the ability of communities of interest to draw
together and have their voices heard as communities with
other voices within their district.

    So, Madam Chair, I apologize for taking this time,
but I know it's important that we do have these things in
our record.

    And that's been my perspective as I've looked at
pulling these districts together throughout the state about
what a community of interest is.

    So having said that, I -- we've heard a lot of
comment, as I said, particularly from Saddlebrooke, on the
Marana, Oro Valley, Saddlebrooke area. And a lot of
conflicting comment.

    I was looking through my notes over the last
couple days, and, for example, on September 27th, 2011,
Ms. St. Angelo, who's been a political consultant, who's
attended many, many, many of our meetings, testified that
Casa Grande was much more similar to their community and
that all the growth was north along the Tangerine corridor
and into Pima County and along the Picacho Peak
transportation corridor.

So I just raise that because there are very
different ways of looking at all these communities and how
it worked together.

We've got 120,000 people in that part of the
state. And I think it makes sense for Tucson at this point,
by Tucson I mean the southern Arizona metropolitan area, to
have another congressional representative.

So I don't find that as concerning as some do.
And I do find -- I do like the idea of reducing the size of
CD 1 given all the comments that we heard about that.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Other comments or perspectives?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The, the concept of
representative government is, is really the crux of what
we're talking about in these redistricting and creating
these maps. And that's that not only were we given the, the
context of the requirements of the six criteria given to us
by the, by the people of the state of Arizona through their
voting for Proposition 106, but also that, that with that I
believe that they were trying to craft, craft it in such a
way such as to give representatives a -- that have got broad
discretion in what -- how they're representing the people in their districts in Washington, but there's some commonality in what those issues are.

For example, in, in, in Congressional District 1, we've got everything from mining to -- there's three large reservoirs in the -- aquifers, I should say, in the south, the southeast part of the state. We've got ranching. We've got forestry. We've got public enjoyment, public lands.

We've got a large quantity of First Nations that have been combined together.

So, as a representative going to -- and we've also got the Pinal County connection, which is a combination of, of a -- of rural that is emerging into, into urban.

So Cochise County has got approximately 130,000 people living in it.

There's a -- we've reduced, by the nature of this design, we've reduced the quantity of representation of Pinal County.

We've maintained the representation up in the northeast, in one, in how I've described it.

So I think that there could be a representative that could be elected from anywhere from Flagstaff to Pinal County to Cochise County to represent District 1.

I think that's a very good balance, and someone
that has got a clear understanding of all those issues would
make a great representative in, in Washington.

Likewise, in the new CD 4, the western side of
what was -- what we've got in our draft maps in draft eight,
those are, those are rural areas that are now combined with
the rest of the rural part of the ranching side, everything
from north Pima County, to La Paz County and Mohave County.

Those are -- there's a -- there's transportation
and, and history that are all wound nicely together.

I'm still not comfortable on how four hooks around
to pick up the east side of the growing metro Maricopa area,
but that's something that, again, we've been going back and
forth on this ad nauseam and trying to get to a place where
we can get to a map that we can forward on to DOJ.

And as Commissioner Herrera has put forward a
number of times, this is all about, about looking at it and
compromising.

And that's the reason why I put the map together
the way that I have today.

There are aspects of it that, that I believe in
all four corners meet with the objectives that we've been
looking to do, even though we're -- it's not the map that I
put forward a week and a half ago, which I love. This is a
map that is -- that marries a lot of those together into
one.
I find that this probably is as close as I can get to, with a few tweaks on the edges, a few adjustments as I'm sure as will be suggested, as close as we can to being something that we can move forward.

So, the concept of communities of interest, Commissioner McNulty's right. We left that to our own personal discretion. And there has been commentary about that.

But I think when we look at representative government, it is how they can represent a group of -- that has something in -- a series of things that they have in common when they go back to Washington.

And the two rural districts make a ton of sense for that reason.

The urban districts make a lot of sense for that reason.

And the areas of greatest level of expansion, which is the northwest side of Tucson and the connection up the I-10 corridor, makes a -- makes all the sense in the world that somebody going back to Washington is going to have a clear and concise understanding of what those, what those needs of his or her constituents are going to be.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Other comments?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Excuse me.

With respect to communities of interest, I am not going to be able to speak with the eloquence Commissioner McNulty just did, but I have addressed that issue before.

I think it's incumbent upon the Commission, whatever it does, to apply standards evenly, fairly, consistently across the state.

We may not be able to do that in the voting rights districts, because obviously federal law governs and trumps what we're trying to do.

But in the rest of the state we need to be even and fair.

And during my time on the Commission I've heard various rationales for including various communities with other communities.

Inconsistent rationales at times.

I've heard a thousand points of light, it doesn't matter as long as we don't split the small community, we can assemble them however we want.

But also heard, well, this community doesn't fit with the other districts, so let's not put those communities there.

I've also heard rationale supporting the large
I believe there is a rural community of interest that creates a very large district.

I don't think we've had concerns about both sets of maps we've looked at so far today whether that community of interest has been respected.

I think there's more with than one way a community of interest can be disrespected.

I think you obviously can disrespect it by splitting it. Splitting the town or the city or splitting the groups of communities with a line down the middle.

I think you can also disrespect a community of interest by placing the community, although whole, with a radically -- a completely different community that has conflicting different interests.

A community of interest is a group of people that can be defined by a contiguous geographic area that, that is looking to have a voice in the legislature.

And obviously we split the community by drawing a line down the middle of it. You inhibit that voice because you decrease the effectiveness of that voice. Because you've split the community. And now that community represents a much smaller segment of the districts or multiple districts in which it finds itself.

But you can also take a community and place it,
keeping it whole, and place it in another -- with another part of the state that has radically different interests and that overwhelms that community such that once again that community of interest, its voice has been stifled in a way. And I think we hear a lot of that with the rural community of interest.

They -- there is the concern and I've heard that if you include -- it doesn't take much of an urban area to include with a rural district before the urban interests predominate.

It doesn't have to be 50 percent plus one. I think the concern is even if you've got 20, 15, maybe even 10 percent an urban population in a district -- an otherwise rural district, that urban voice speaks much loudly, clearly. It's where people are concentrated. They're easy to reach.

Perhaps there's more money there. Perhaps that's where the candidate comes from.

And the rural community is -- their interests are not heard quite as clearly.

So -- and that's why, you know, there are certainly aspects of this particular map that I think are helpful.

I still have concerns about, in particular, that rural community of interest.
We've got parts of Tucson suburbs included in an eastern rural district.

We've also got that arm coming over from the west that's including, you know, San Tan Valley and Apache Junction, and Florence even, with that so-called river district.

And then you've got District 8, which is a mixture of rural and some urban areas in western Maricopa County.

You know, I've got concerns about that, at least hitting on the rural versus urban interest, that rural community of interest is being disrespected.

And, you know, I think there are ways -- I think Commissioner Stertz tried out a map on Monday, which in many respects comported with, with ways that I was looking at addressing the congressional map such that I didn't think it was necessary for me to roll out my map. There were differences.

I think, you know, I'm interested in what he's proposed today. It's the first time I've seen it.

So, you know, perhaps there are ways that it could be adjusted and fine tuned and better meet -- to better meet all six of the goals.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Other comments?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Desmond, could we
look at the -- what are the number splits in Pinal County on
the -- these two maps?

    (Brief pause.)

WILLIE DESMOND: So, the, the only real difference
is that Marana, Oro Valley, and Catalina go to District 2 in
Commissioner Stertz's map. That's the green line.

    There is a split of Eloy that happens there.
    But that's the only split.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: The only new split.

WILLIE DESMOND: The only new split in
Pinal County, I believe.

    Actually, no. There is a small portion of, of the
San Tan that goes into District 5.
    But that's the only new split.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So do we have the report of
how many total splits there are in each county now?

    We're not including that in these summary reports;
    is that right?

WILLIE DESMOND: That's not in the summary
reports.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Good.

WILLIE DESMOND: What I could do is run the full
set of reports for --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That's okay. That's all
right. I was just curious.
The other thing I see about this, about the movement of Cochise County back into -- the whole of Cochise County into CD 1 is that it degrades the competitiveness of Congressional District 2.

Under index two it says the difference is 1.8 percent.

Republican leaning nature of the district is increased.

Democratic nature is decreased. Democratic performance is decreased.

It looks like that's true under all of the indices.

I would, I would be concerned about that also.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments or questions?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: In regards to the proposed degradation of competitiveness in Congressional District 2, it's a, it's a half of, half of a percent swing to point -- to .6 percent of a swing in -- actually bringing -- it's very close to being a 50/50, even in registration.

There was a slight increase in the ability or in the competitiveness on the -- it's 50.9 percent to 49.1 percent in index two.
50.9 percent to 49 percent in index three.
53.1 to 46.3 in index four, and so on and so forth.

It was very close -- very, very, very, very close to what it was previously.

Unlike interest in District 1, it's gone in the district -- it has gone to the improvement of the electability of Democrats. It's gone from, index two, from a 40 -- 50.1 to 49.9, from 49.4 to 50.6.

So there's a -- there was a give and take.

Again, looking at the relationships of -- and how representatives would be working in these districts.

The cleaning up of the split of the town of Eloy, Commissioner Herrera had alluded to that there was some cleaning up that needs to be done regarding some deviance -- some very miniscule deviation of population.

There's probably also some, some community splits that were, that were unnecessarily made, or unintentionally made, I should say, that could be, that could be cleaned up by just getting down to the detail and the block level.

So, I just wanted to make sure that we had clarification of those points.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, just one additional point on Mr. Stertz's comment.

The -- it's five percent on each side. So it's a
total of one percent, and it's one percent farther from 50/50 than it was.

And we have, we have four solidly Republican legislative -- congressional districts and two solidly Democratic voting rights districts.

So my goal would be not to degrade the competitiveness on the remaining competitive congressional districts.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Again, the degradation is not five percent. It's half of a percent. So I'm not sure if --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I misspoke. I thought I said .5 percent --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: .5

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: -- each way for a total of a percent.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yeah, and in the, in the Democrats, it's .8 percent for a total of 1.6 percent swing to the improvement of Democrats in the Congressional District 1.

These are, these are -- we've actually improved the registration -- the two-way registration in, in -- from the new plan to the old plan in registration alone in
District 1 from 43.2 percent Republican and 56.8 percent Democrat, to 40 -- from 43.2 down to 42.4.

And for Republicans up from 56.8 to 57.6 in Democrats.

So, just by looking at registration, also looking at competitiveness.

One becomes a, a -- and, again, looking at minor -- at the, at the mine inspector race, we've got -- we now have got -- are looking at one, two, and nine being competitive districts.

There are four -- there are two solid Democratic districts and four districts that are, in my opinion, solid Republican districts.

At the same time we are meeting with the criteria of all of the other aspects of the -- of our constitutional criteria, or getting as very close to them as we can,

so . . .

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Are the maps, the maps that Mr. Stertz, Commissioner Stertz, presented, and as well as the change reports, are they available online for the public to review?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I would have to ask.

WILLIE DESMOND: Buck just gave me the thumbs up
that they are up. The change reports are all up.

   This whole packet from Commissioner Stertz is not up right now.

   But there is a map, the Google map, the block Google equivalency file and the change report for each one of these is now a web site.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, Mr. Desmond, have you been able to determine the number of splits in Pinal County?

WILLIE DESMOND: The number of splits to the county or the number of splits -- census splits?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: The number of splits to the county.

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe it's five.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: What is our working map?

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe it's three.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I just don't want to lose sight of some of the things that we worked so hard to accomplish as we were developing the working draft, because we spent, as I recall, a long days listening to folks from Pinal County being concerned about those splits.

So, and we worked hard to come up with a working draft that minimized those splits, so I just don't want to lose sight of that.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: One of the reasons for the added, for the added splits was actually creating a community that is growth -- that grows from south side of Pinal County into, into, into the north side of Pima County, which is, which is the creation of that split.

It's a logical split.

It -- there are some other areas that are natural because of, of First Nations. And that's where -- and then there's one other small split that I think we could actually accommodate by clipping out of that. It doesn't necessarily need to be there.

So, it's a split in one direction versus another.

In other words. Pinal was split to keep from Pima being split.

So, in my opinion it's a, it's an appropriate tradeoff of, of the splits.

We've also gone from seven unsplit counties now to eight unsplit counties.

Commissioner McNulty had that as well in her, in her map of the -- of Cochise County connecting to Maricopa County, but again -- or to, to leave urban Tucson area, but I've let the map stand on its own.

Commissioner Herrera alluded to the public has got
full view of this. I look forward to hearing any comments coming from the public on, on, on this new approach.

This is a -- trust me, this is a, this is a high level compromised map.

We want to go back to the map we presented, that I presented last Monday, which, which there's a lot of areas that make a lot more sense than this does from my perspective.

But I've looked at this as being a map of compromise.

And the resistance that I'm feeling right now immediately from Commissioner McNulty is one that I am really hoping we can overcome pretty quickly.

Because this is a map that's -- that I'm working diligently to compromise to have work.

If not, I'm going to go back to the map from a week and a half ago and start pressing that forward real hard.

This map is a map of compromise.

This is looking at some communities and some representatives and public that came out and spoke to us. And whether or not you have something on some date where Lynne St. Angelo came and gave one piece of testimony, we've got volumes and volumes and volumes of folks that say that they want to be kept connected together.
And Lynne St. Angelo came out and spoke at one time and said that they want to keep themselves together as a group.

So, we keep hanging ourselves back on that, so, enough said on that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other thoughts, comments?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I have two thoughts. One is that we also, you know, received dozens of letters from folks in that area who said they looked north and never visit Tucson, so -- or almost seldom visited Tucson. So we have received conflicting comments.

The other thing I'd point out while we're having this conversation, because I know we're going to be getting to the issue of, quote, transparency, closed quote, later in the meeting, is that all of this is happening, you know, right here in this meeting. And folks are watching online, and people are sitting in the room watching.

And, you know, Mr. Stertz has put together his proposed changes, and they're all here for everyone to see.

And it doesn't really matter who he talked to, you know, who he got ideas from. His, his ideas are here, and they're fully analyzed, and they're presented, and data that Strategic Telemetry has given us, and the consequences of the changes that he would propose to make have been set out for all of us to look at and study.
So I just want, I just want to make that point when we get to it later. Because the proof is in the pudding.

And this is the pudding. You know, what Mr. Stertz has laid out here is what he would like to do. And everybody has the ability to look and see how that would work in the state.

So it's a very transparent process, and I think this just demonstrates that.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: I agree. This has -- I think even when we get the information, I think we've gotten already, from our executive director how transparent we've been in terms of the meetings we've had in the public, how easy it is for us to access the Commission, and being able to view this information online or streaming.

So we have been extremely transparent. And I'm proud of that.

And that's why I've asked the executive director, as often as he can, preferably at every meeting, mention that and talk about the statistics and how we've been able to reach out to the public, not only in public hearings, but, again, through these meetings, online streaming, our website.
So, again, I agree with Commissioner McNulty on those comments about transparency.

But I also want to talk about, you know, compromise, you know. We're always going to be compromising. The maps aren't done yet.

I felt like I've compromised, and especially Commissioner McNulty.

And so have you, Commissioner Stertz.

And we'll continue to compromise until these maps are done.

And the way things are going now, I'm very pleased that we've taken a different approach, as opposed to what we've done in the past, especially recently.

This is definitely something that I'm -- you know, to be honest, I was dreading this meeting, because I -- of what was happened in the past, in the recent past.

But today is a completely different tone, and I am hoping that it stays that way, that we stay cordial and work on compromise and continue to work on compromise.

So I'm appreciative of Commissioner McNulty and you, and hopefully we can stay this way and work on ways that we can agree on.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you. I would echo those sentiments.

Any other thoughts?
(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I would like to talk about Congressional District 8. Just in looking at Mr. Stertz's map, and I know it's really hard to look at these things in isolation, and you really can't, because as we know any changes anywhere affect everything else.

But, nonetheless, I really do like his Congressional District 8, just in terms of the compactness and his ability to keep the rural in the rural and the urban in the urban.

And I am just wondering what other commissioners' thoughts are on that.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I agree it's an improvement. I would like to see now some efforts to see further refinement or iterations whether we could capture more of Peoria.

I don't know what the density population there is that is being excluded, but that's -- if it's slightly populated, it's probably an area that's -- it's unpopulated, so it's -- okay. I got my answer.

But, anyway, that could be an area that could be cleaned up easily if it's an unpopulated area.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I agree. I think there hasn't been that much -- it looks good. I would like to understand what the implications are as it works around the map, but I do think it's certainly an improvement in look, in concept.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: As I said before, just looking at what Commissioner Stertz has presented, this looks good.

I would love to have some time to analyze it further and see what effect it has on the other districts, especially on the competitiveness of District No. 2.

Which I agree with Commissioner McNulty that we only have three competitive districts. Let's not take away any of the competition for any of these three competitive districts.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Were there other change reports we wanted to go over, Mr. Desmond, in terms of the congressional map?

WILLIE DESMOND: No, that was it for congressional.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: Just the three. The one that
compared change to draft and then the two that, the McNulty and Stertz, to the working.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So what I'm hearing from commissioners is we would like to look at what Mr. Stertz created in terms of different districts and do some deeper analysis on this very thick change report we have in front of us to kind of see what that means vis-a-vis the working map.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I would also -- I have a chance -- I haven't had a chance to look at the changes that Commissioner McNulty had proposed, but I would also like to review them a little bit further and compare them to the -- Commissioner Stertz's changes, and compare them side by side.

So I would like to review both again, hopefully tonight.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is there anything that Mr. Desmond can do to make that analysis easier?

I'm just thinking out loud.

I'm just wondering if there's anything -- I know Ms. McNulty proposed changes last week. Mr. Stertz had presented this information.

Would it make any sense to do any side by side
analysis or comparison of anything with regard to that? Or
could it even --

WILLIE DESMOND: What we could do is we could run
the same change report, using the two maps, and you'd see
the differences between the two, I guess.

The two change reports are both run off of the
same, you know, base working map.

So comparing them is a pretty fair comparison.

But if there -- if you have ideas, I'm sure we can
put something together that might facilitate it.

Perhaps it would be good to just run the full set
of reports. Commissioner McNulty's, I can do that
opportunity and e-mail that around so you guys have it
tomorrow morning to analyze.

I'll bring copies, hard copies to tomorrow's
meeting.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That sounds good.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I did receive a text from a
couple friends who are watching the -- this just online, and
they -- I was told that they weren't able to find the, the
data for Commissioner Stertz's changes. The map they did,
but they weren't able to find the data.

BUCK FORST: Everything is up.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Again, this is a text. I'm just the messenger.

BUCK FORST: I'll look again.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Please. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Actually, if Mr. Stertz is amenable, the congressional map modification table that you prepared, is that something that can go on the Internet too? I think that would be helpful for the public to see the map improvements step by step.

WILLIE DESMOND: So --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: If you have that.

WILLIE DESMOND: I don't have that.

Commissioner Stertz, if he has that electronically, he can probably give that to Buck to update.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: The information is up. Do you mind, for people that are watching, point where they can find that information.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

So, if you -- you're at the home page, you click on the map section, you have the changes from 12-15. First of all, on the top you have the two working maps.

So if you're interested in seeing the working
maps, those are both here. But then dated by date are all the changes that the Commission has looked at.

So from today, there is changes from 12-15. CD McNulty version two. CD Stertz V2.

And then there's five legislative changes that we'll look at.

So if you click on the Google maps, that will take you to a map of the state of Arizona.

Again, the color is the districts as changed. There's a faint green outline that shows what the old border was. So you can kind of compare.

But those are available.

You also have a JPEG. And that's just kind of a statewide in most cases, but in some cases where there's very specific changes, a more zoomed in map to see what changes look like.

There's a PDF, and that is the change report that the commissioners received. It's exactly the same.

And then there's the DBF. I won't click on that, but that's the block equivalency file for those people that have mapping software and want to load the plans on their own software.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thanks for walking us through that.

And thanks for getting them posted to the website,
Buck.

Do commissioners have any other things they'd like to mention on the congressional map or any changes that you'd like to explore with -- have Mr. Desmond explore?

(No oral response.)


Do you have what you need, Mr. Desmond, and you'll create.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, I'll run the rest of the reports for this.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: And we will have those available for you guys tomorrow, tomorrow at the meeting. I'll try to e-mail those out ahead of time so you can study those if you have a chance.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I don't mean to rush you, Mr. Desmond. But if you can get it tonight, that would be great. The earlier the better so we can have a chance to review them.

I know that we'll be meeting at 4:00 tomorrow, but I would love to review the information tonight if at all possible.
WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. We'll see what we can do. I might be able to run them during the break even, if possible, so . . .

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I appreciate that. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Can we move on to the next agenda item, which is the legislative map?

And we have a number of change reports in front of us.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So, your first change report is, again, just comparing the legislative working map to the draft map, so you can see what's been done so far. The changes we have done have all affected voting rights districts.

I can go through those again if you like, or we can just jump right in. It's up to you.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Please can you go over them.

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Mr. Desmond, I want to be clear that the working draft represents the map that incorporates all of the changes to the voting rights districts that have now been sent out for further analysis but no other changes.

Correct?
WILLIE DESMOND: Correct.
And in most cases these are changes designed to strengthen the voting rights districts.
There is an instance where we were worried about harming the voting rights districts. That's why that change was then looked at so it could be analyzed fully.
Starting with that, that particular change, that was the population swap here in districts -- Legislative Districts 1 and 2.
The arm that had run into Cochise County was removed, so that the District 2 ends at the Santa Cruz County border line.
In order to make up that population, Legislative District 2 picked up the area of Green Valley to try to keep the -- that corridor together, so the changes to Districts 1 and 2.
District 4 was one of our voting rights districts.
And though it had a strong minority percentage, we were worried about its ability to elect. So that was strengthened in two ways.
First of all, population was trimmed out in Yuma that did not support the minority candidates of choice.
In order to make up some of that population, District 4 took a little population from District 3, another one of our voting rights districts.
This did dilute District 3 slightly.

Although it was a very, very strong district and it helped four quite a bit.

District 3 then to balance its population, it shed a little bit in unincorporated areas between Tucson and Picture Rocks and picked up a little bit from District 9 here in Tucson.

So District 9 was affected a little bit there.

District 11 was affected a little bit also when it grabbed a little bit of population from District 3.

Continuing to the north, District 7, the Native American voting rights district shed Greenlee County to District 1.

It also shed the non-reservation areas of Mohave County to District 5.

It further shed a little population around Doney Park for the Schultz flood area, and it lost Grand Canyon City up in the north.

It made up population though by incorporating the area of Sun Valley.

It also picked up Lakeside and Show Low, just north of the Fort Apache reservation.

I believe that's the only changes that happened outside of Maricopa County.

In Maricopa County, District 13 shed a little
population to District 14 and District 22. That's the result of District 13 taking on population in Yuma. So it gave some up here.

District 24, one of our voting rights districts, shed the Fort McDowell reservation area and also a little population in south Scottsdale.

It did not pick up population anywhere. But by removing some of the lower performing areas, it was able to be strengthened slightly.

District 26 was the other area we've changed.

It shed population here in Tempe and Mesa, in the -- also it picked up the town of Guadalupe.

As a result of all that population going to District 18, the line between 18 and 17 was adjusted to balance that population.

And I believe those are all the changes that have -- oh, one other. District 27 went and picked up the portion of the Gila River reservation that is in Maricopa County.

So we did split that reservation. That was something that they had asked for.

Are there any questions?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any comments or questions on that?

WILLIE DESMOND: If not, we can go to the change
I believe there was five changes that we had prepared for today.

The first one in the packet is the changes that Commissioner Herrera asked for.

These might overlap slightly with what Commissioner McNulty had later, because she asked that I look at what Commissioner Herrera had done, but I did want to just go ahead and do this one also, so we had it to look at.

Commissioner Herrera had presented a map earlier, I think last week Monday, that made some changes to Glendale and the west valley and kind of worked its way around in Phoenix.

He asked that I take those changes and overlay them with the working map at this point and also incorporate changes that Commissioner McNulty had asked for in Districts 8 and 11.

So...

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, were you able to put together that map -- I guess I was asking for a combination of Commissioner McNulty's changes and my changes on the legislative side.
I can't find a map that has those changes.

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe that is this one. The changes Commissioner McNulty had asked for in District 6 and 7 have kind of been incorporated in some of the changes that had happened in Districts 6 and 7.

So the other one was incorporating Districts 8 and 11.

So, so basically what this is, is the map that you had looked for, working off of the working map. So it's still like a viable thing to look at.

And it's not comparing apples to oranges when you look at the change reports and things.

I also did incorporate the changes to 8 and 11 as you had asked for.

I should note Commissioner McNulty also asked for different changes in 8 and 11. I incorporated the first set.

So it's possible that for tomorrow you might want to incorporate a different set of those changes. And we can go over that.

But the changes here, and, Commissioner Herrera, you can go through these again if you like, or I can walk through them again --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair. Mr. Desmond, do you mind going through them? Honestly I came a little bit
unprepared, so if you don't mind going through them.

    WILLIE DESMOND: No problem.

    We started with removing splits to Glendale.

    Glendale in the draft map was split six times --
    or in six pieces, so it is split five times.

    The green line is the old districts.

    So the portion from the Legislative District 21
    and 20 is combined together and given to District 22.

    What this does is it removes two of the splits so
    Glendale is now in four districts. Practically speaking
    it's pretty much in three districts, but it's in three main
    pieces here.

    As a result of District 21 losing some of its
    population, it expands out and takes in more of Peoria.
    From District 22. That helps to balance.

    District 20 also lost population by not having any
    portion of Glendale.

    So it grabs a little bit from 22 also, and also
    grabs parts of Phoenix from District 15.

    Fifteen then makes up that population from 22, so
    it's kind of like a three-way trade.

    What that does is it keeps New River -- New River
    together, it removes the split of New River, keeps Anthem
    with New River, and with Cave Creek and Carefree.

    District 28 -- District 15 also comes down and
removes Paradise Valley from District 28.

That was intended to try to make 28 a more competitive district.

District 28 makes up some of the population that it loses by taking portions from 15 and 20, and also -- actually I think that's it. Portions from 15 and 20.

So, I guess, the main points are that Glendale is split less. It goes from four -- from six pieces to four pieces.

New River and Anthem are kept whole and together.

And District 28 becomes more competitive.

The other changes that are incorporated in this map that weren't in the last ones are the changes to District 8 and 11, attempting to make a more competitive district in that area.

Those are changes that Commissioner McNulty had asked for earlier.

And that we'll be going over a little bit later, I imagine.

But that was the initial change that would make District 8 more competitive.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, do me a favor and can you go over or around the boundaries of 28?
WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

So at the north it's Union Hills. It follows 7th Street south until -- I'm not sure there's really a road there, but it kind of -- kind of where Cactus comes across. It follows Cactus to 35th Avenue south over on Peoria, south on 43rd.

It goes back east on Olive and West Dunlap.

It goes south then again on 19th, over on Northern.

South on -- I believe this is 7th Avenue.

I'm not sure what this is between Camelback and Bethany Home. Missouri.


Until it hits the Scottsdale border and follows the Scottsdale border until it hits Paradise Valley border and follows that around until it hits Tatum Boulevard.

Up here, it jogs around. This is, again, Thunderbird. Follows Tatum up. Paradise Village Parkway.

I'm not sure what road this is. This is Thunderbird to the north, and comes back south on 39th.

Over on Cactus.

And I believe back to where we started.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: You know, one of the things I wanted to do is obviously follow the four state mandated criteria, but I also wanted to see if I can create as many competitive districts as possible while respecting and balancing all of the criteria.

So that's why 28, I ended up working with 28 a little more because I thought that we could create a competitive district, especially in 28.

So, hopefully people have some ideas to be able to improve it and keep the competitiveness. But I thought -- I think we owe it to the people of Arizona who wanted competition.

And they are getting it in these maps.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Here are some concerns I had. Mr. Desmond, could you put the block layer up again?

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Let me put that on top of this census place so we can still see it.

Okay. Is there an area you want me to zoom into?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Yeah. Thanks.
Because sometimes the block layer reveals some geographic features there.

First of all, 15 has been made significantly less compact. It now has this narrow neck that goes and swallows Paradise Valley.

Paradise Valley is connected to this region only by Tatum Boulevard, I believe, which runs along this western border there.

Paradise Valley is also separated from its community of interest, which is the Biltmore area, Arcadia, and north central Phoenix area.

There's been plenty of public comment to that effect. That is not only an area where I live, but it's where I'm from. So I've got a lot of my own personal experience living right in that neck of the woods.

And also, I believe, when you were going through the boundaries earlier, I believe you've been up here in this neck. You've got Paradise Valley Mall and then some small cluster of homes just sort of cutoff just to the north of PV Mall.

You've also got this area up here that is separated by the mountain preserve.

The old 28 sort of encompassed all that area.

I think the old 28 had to make some compromises, because some of the neighborhoods that I might ordinarily
perhaps include in that district were needed to be put in this coalition district, which is, which is District 24. It even looked like from the splits report that 24 was changed.

Is that correct, Mr. Desmond? Was there a modification to 24? Because I'm seeing it show up here on the analysis.

WILLIE DESMOND: Twenty-four was changed, but there was -- it doesn't look like any population moved. Most likely what happened is an unincorporated block or something came in.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: The change report just looks at the block level, anyone that moved from one district to another.

So --

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay. So I'm seeing all zeros there, yeah.

WILLIE DESMOND: That happens sometimes when there are -- you may be some areas around the fringes that if you move like a block group, it might, might take one. If you're looking at the upper left-hand corner, you might notice in the bottom right-hand corner a small portion might get moved from one of the districts, but there was no
population moved.

That's the same case with Districts 4 and 6 on the front.

You'll notice there must have been a block or two that was affected, but no population.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay.

And, you know, since -- I view that as a significant detriment to the achievement of the other goals. And since we've never completed a true baseline map that's really -- I don't think we have a true measure of what the significant detriment really is or constitutes, but at least between the working draft and this draft, that strikes me most very clearly as a significant detriment.

When I looked at this area of the map, and perhaps it's something that can be worked on for tomorrow, I was kind of focused on this District 20 that's now been changed, what's up on the screen here. But it, it looked like a district that could have been the made much more compact and more sensible boundaries used.

And in so doing I thought that on the working draft, District 15 did not include the New River area. That, you know, that change could be accommodated. New River could be added to 15, some adjustments, populations, adjustments could go made between 15 and 28, which I believe was already overpopulated slightly. And
then some other exchanges could be made between 20 and 15 and 20 and 22, which would yield four much more compact districts, with using sensible boundaries. And what I mean by that is either follow a geographic feature or a major arterial or I-17 in some instances.

Which I know I'm getting ahead of myself. But perhaps we can talk about that later.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: This is my first crack at trying to create more competitive districts on the legislative side, so I admit, yeah, there are some things we can do to clean up.

But I would challenge anyone that's going to, you know, do their own changes that hopefully we can keep 28 competitive as it is in my version of the legislative district map that I've submitted. So it all -- not only 28, but also the other ones that I was able to make more competitive.

So I want for commissioners to keep that in mind when they make those changes that, you know, competition is important, and if you can make changes to improve the other criteria, the other state mandated criteria, hopefully competition is one that we can.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.
I don't mean to be critical at all of the effort. I have to state that I'm critical of the result, but perhaps it's something that we can all work on.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other comments?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Desmond, where is this consolidated map located currently on our website?

WILLIE DESMOND: It's -- if you go to the maps page, there's a red box on the very top that has the two working maps in there, and you can get those there.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair. Mr. Desmond, I'm talking about the inclusions of the -- of Commissioner Herrera's adjustments.

WILLIE DESMOND: Oh, that would be Commissioner Herrera, it's this one here. It says LD Herrera Maricopa.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, do those -- does that particular map include Commissioner McNulty's changes?

WILLIE DESMOND: Excuse me?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Is that a combination of my
changes with Commissioner McNulty's proposed changes?

WILLIE DESMOND: That is a combination of your changes with her changes previously to District 8 and 11, not with changes she'll have today.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: All right. Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: Does that make sense?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Makes sense.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: And the reason why, I think, you addressed, Mr. Desmond, there was some contradictory changes.

Because I was looking for a combo, because you had requested that, to look at, you know. And I didn't see it. So I guess what happened is it got difficult to analyze, so is it possible to combine those two sets of changes?

WILLIE DESMOND: To some extent, but the changes that Commissioner McNulty makes today in some areas will conflict with the changes that Commissioner Herrera made.

So we can work together to, like, combine those. But they, they don't -- it's not like one, one set of changes deals with one part of the state, another change deals with another. They do deal with the same areas.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I haven't seen those changes that are being -- the newer changes that are being proposed by Commissioner McNulty. So before we combine them, I would like to see what, what those changes are. And hopefully -- I'm assuming we'll do that next or soon.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, that was my thinking for not -- obviously not including those, because I just included the ones that you had seen and mentioned.

I also purposely have tried to break these changes out where possible so that if there are aspects of a particular map that the commissioners like, it's easier to kind of go back and evaluate just those particular aspects. So in some respects I have purposely been trying to keep the changes isolated from one another.

Also, that would allow a little bit more flexibility should, should certain changes be adopted and not others. But if there are particular things you would like to see grouped together, let me know, and I'll put those into a common map.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I have a question for Commissioner Herrera.

If -- you said this is your first crack at making these adjustments.
Of the, of the districts that you, that you worked on, which ones of the districts that you think that you really nailed, that you really analyzed down to the -- to really put a tremendous amount of thought and contemplation into that you feel very comfortable that you've, that you've -- that you like a lot?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Commissioner Stertz, I don't think I nailed any of them.

I really think that I worked along with Commissioner -- excuse me, Mr. Desmond, worked at trying to create as many competitive districts as possible while balancing the other criteria.

But I like -- I think I like the aspects of some of the changes I made.

For example, and I'm going to allude to 28, where we will -- we were able to create more competitive in 28.

So there's aspects of each of the changes that I do like that I'd like to hopefully see incorporated in Commissioner McNulty's changes.

So, again, I don't -- again, I don't mean to say that I -- that I'm not happy with the work that I did, but I think I -- there's changes that I liked and there's changes that I didn't like.

And I am looking forward to see what recommendations Commissioner McNulty recommends, because I
I think there's some overlap.

I'm assuming, based on Mr. Desmond's comments, that she made some changes to 28. So, I'm looking forward to seeing what changes she made to 28 to see where the overlap is.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And I think that the purpose of my question might be obvious, that if there's something that -- if there's an area other than just the general overview of competitiveness and the attempt to gather those together, if there's a, if there's a neighborhood or a district that you really, that you really thought was really tight the way that you wanted it to be, then, then my, my view of this is that because tonight and tomorrow morning I'm going to be taking a look at your work, Commissioner McNulty's work, the original, the working, the working map, and making adjustments to those as I'm seeing it.

And if there are some that you are really -- have really have the heart for, then I want to respect that. And say I'm not going to, you know, wholly throw that piece out.

So that's the, that's the intent of asking the question.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Commissioner Stertz, I appreciate that.

Again, there's nothing that I -- any changes that I made that are set in stone or that I'm fixed to. But, again, I think the -- and I'm focusing on 28 because I felt that we could make 28 competitive when it wasn't before.

So if I'm going to look at anything that I'm maybe that I think that I did a better job on -- and I, and I, you know, I know that Commissioner Freeman has his issues with this, with 28. But, again, I felt that we can definitely create a more competitive district in 28 so I'm looking -- I want to see what other recommendations are made to keep it competitive or make it more competitive.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: What the great thing about you and Commissioner Freeman both residing up here is that you've got the areas in your experience and your life of being up here.

I've had the great pleasure of doing business up here for the last, you know, 20 some odd years and owning real estate in almost all four corners of the -- of Maricopa County. So I've got a pretty good understanding of
the area, the community, the connectivity, and will be
looking forward to laying over some of that experience into
this as I take a look at this.

And what I'll do is I'll do a very similar
approach as I did today with the congressionals, when I come
back with this tomorrow night.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.
I think we'll take a really quick break.
It's 2:54. If commissioners could try to be back
really within six minutes or so, that would be great.

(Brief recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We'll enter back into public
session. Recess is over.
The time is 3:05 p.m.
And we're in the midst of discussing these
legislative change reports that Mr. Desmond prepared.
And we can continue doing that.
Are there a lot of legislative change reports?
And the reason I ask is I have to depart at 4:00 p.m. today.
But commissioners are welcome to continue working.

WILLIE DESMOND: Commissioner McNulty has one.
Commissioner Freeman has one.
And then there are two changes to Districts 8 and
11 that we can probably look at fairly quickly. They're
right next to each other.
So there's, there's four more.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. And then we also have some public comment that I wanted to get to.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: My -- the change that Mr. Desmond prepared is not something we need to discuss today, at least my change report. And then I've got a judicial reception at 5:00. And I -- as you can see I forgot my jacket, so I'm going to have to run home, so I may be leaving about the same time as you are.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. And I guess that when Vice-Chair Herrera comes back, if he wants -- if he and Commissioners McNulty and Stertz want to keep going, they can. Or we're going to meet again tomorrow at 4:00 p.m.

So...

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm -- I think that with the folks that are here today, that if all five commissioners can hear the testimony that they'll be bringing, it's all going to be relevant to the legislative, legislative designs.

And, again, I'm speaking only for myself now, the opportunity to go through the splits reports, to go over the
information that the -- Commissioners Herrera, McNulty, and Freeman put together.

And I'm comfortable in, in -- from my perspective in getting public testimony and adjourning when you're -- when you and Commissioner Freeman have to depart.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Well, I've got about eight request to speak forms, I think.

WILLIE DESMOND: Can we do -- just check to see if any commissioners have changes that they'd like me to prepare for tomorrow's meetings? Can we do that first?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Definitely.

I actually have ten.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I would like -- I kind of outlined some changes I'd like to look at on the LD map a few minutes ago, and perhaps I can put a little bit more meat on the bones with Mr. Desmond tonight and get something rolled out tomorrow perhaps.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: As I said earlier, I'll be preparing something very similarly for Mr. Desmond as I
prepared last night.

And the good thing about Mr. Desmond is that can turn around -- he's set up to turn these things around very quickly, so, and I truly appreciate that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

So it's 3:10, and if we limit public comment to three minutes each, we can do that in a half hour, with the numbers of request to speak forms that I have. So there's -- we have some time to talk some more about legislative maps.

And then there's a couple other items on the agenda today.

There's the transparency discussion that we've talked about in terms of executive session transcripts, as well as the logging of communications.

Is that something that we can carry over, or do we need to discuss that today?

Or what do you recommend, legal counsel?

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, we can cover that today briefly or we can carry it over. We were -- those are items that we had been asked to address the Commission on, so I'm not sure if there's any sense of urgency, unless the Commission would like to know sooner rather than later what our advice is.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. And the other item is
the executive director report.

Ray, did you have things? Or is there anything that we need to cover? Probably so.

RAY BLADINE: Everything I have we can cover tomorrow.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It's on the agenda for tomorrow.

RAY BLADINE: Right. Just I have generic, and some of it is to bring what's on your -- in your packet, so I can really tomorrow update and answer any questions or follow up on items you'd like.

Oh, I beg your pardon.

We need one start time for Tuesday. What time would you like to start on Tuesday?

It's nice to have Jiminy Cricket.

We don't have that yet. That's the one thing that we would like to know as part of the director's report is what time would you like to start.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: What time would commissioners like to start for a meeting on Tuesday?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Any time is okay with me.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: 1:00 o'clock.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: 1:00 o'clock.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: 1:00 o'clock.

RAY BLADINE: 1:00 o'clock it is.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Thank you.

Okay. So I think we have a few minutes to talk just about legislative draft maps, just maybe like five minutes.

Is there anything we can go over in that amount of time?

WILLIE DESMOND: It's up to Commissioner McNulty if she wants to go over hers right now or wait until after tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think it makes more sense to do them all together.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: What did you say?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think it makes more sense to do them all together so we have a context.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Why only five minutes?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Because we have a number of speak request to speak forms, and if we limit that to three minutes each that's going to take a half an hour.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Do we have to be here out of here by a certain time?
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I have to leave at 4:00 and Mr. Freeman has to depart too.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay. Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: We can obviously go over them after 4:00 and then again tomorrow, if that's helpful.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I just thought if there was a way to cover any of it today, it would -- it might be good to at least get our feet wet to be thinking about it for tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'd be happy to summarize what I had asked Mr. Desmond to do and then he can get started.

Then we might just want to go back and revisit it once we... But I had -- when, when I participated for a short time on the phone on Monday, I had asked him to look at four things, as I recall.

One was the west district. I don't know if that's the west valley or west of the west valley. But where Legislative District 13, which includes north Yuma and the southwest portion of Maricopa County on that arm, I had asked him to look at improving that and at the prospect of bringing La Paz County into Yuma County.

And taking in some of the western areas of Maricopa County, perhaps the more rural western areas of
Maricopa County, and see what we needed to accomplish that, to address the number of the comments that we had heard, including Ms. Pancrazi's comments.

And then I had asked him to look at the west valley, the areas around -- that Mr. Herrera had worked on in Glendale, to look at consolidating one of those districts, one or more of those districts into an emerging competitive district.

Because you'll recall that when we worked on the congressional maps I was focused on that area.

There's a -- there are some Hispanic, emerging Hispanic communities there.

I wanted to work on combining those communities into one district that would emerge into a competitive district.

So I asked him to look at that based on both the working draft and on what Mr. Herrera had done.

And in LD 28, I too very strongly support the idea of another competitive legislative district in Phoenix.

I've said several times that we've got more than four million people in the valley.

Competitiveness is one of the six criteria. We're to favor it so long as it doesn't substantially deter any of the other criteria.

And so I had asked him to look at other ways
of maintaining or enhancing the competitiveness of District 28.

So that we had a couple of alternatives to look at.

And then with regard to Legislative districts 11 and 8, I had asked him to work on keeping the copper corridor communities whole in eight, and maintaining the competitiveness of that, but at the same time looking at ways that we might divide 8 and 11, either by using the I-10 corridor and/or by splitting only one of the two communities, either Casa Grande or Eloy.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: A couple things.

Commissioner McNulty, did you change at all the majority-minority districts?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I didn't change anything actually. I just asked Mr. Desmond to look at those things.

But I don't think any of those would have implicated any changes to any of the majority-minority districts.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I appreciate that. Again, I can't stress the importance, if we want to be move forward, not to be messing with the majority-minority districts until
the analysis comes back. And hopefully once the analysis
gets back we can either decide to -- if changes are needed,
we'll make the changes.

If we feel that the changes or that the way they
stand are -- would meet the DOJ approval, then we should
approve them and then start working on the rest of the
districts.

But let me -- Commissioner McNulty, if you can
tell me the competitiveness of 28 as you have it using
index two.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: As Mr. Desmond redrew it?
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yes, ma'am.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'll have to have him tell
us that.

I'm seeing them as you're seeing them.

WILLIE DESMOND: Using index two, the district is
54.8 percent Republican, 45.2 percent Democratic.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, I'm looking at the
change report for the ones that I -- for the one I
submitted. And there's -- the Republican is 52.6,
Democratic is 47.4.

So hopefully we can work on getting 28 as
competitive as possible, probably closer to 47.
Then I think the 47 margin is something that we can achieve and get that 28 to be definitely more competitive than it is now.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Did anyone else want to talk about any proposed changes that they've asked Mr. Desmond to do in terms of what Ms. McNulty just did, kind of giving an overview?

MARY O'GRADY: And, Madam Chair, I think it's understood that even as we make things more competitive, Mr. Desmond always is mindful of the other constitutional criteria along the ways so that there's no significant detriment in that process.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: When Mr. Desmond sat down with me to make those changes that I had proposed, you know, we were, we were reminding each other every time when we made a change how does this affect this criteria.

And I am looking at the four state criteria, not the federal -- not the two federal ones.

And we were making sure that we always had them in mind any time we were making changes.

So thank you, Ms. O'Grady, for the reminder.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'll ask the same question about the legislative majority-minority districts.

In your -- this is moving through -- Dr. King is in the process of providing analysis.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And in your conversations with Dr. King, what have you heard so far? Are we on the right track? Are these -- are we needing to enhance, continue to enhance these ten districts?

Is there any concern, any concern regarding District 24 in its design as it sort of serpentines through the valley?

I'm trying to get some sort of idea about where you're sensing that this is going.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, could I interrupt you just for a minute?

That brings to mind a question that -- is Mr. Adelson going to be with us here tomorrow?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: He is. Actually Mr. Adelson is going to be in our meeting.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'm thinking about the complexity of the way he answers those questions. My thought might be it might be best to have him answer that question.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, yeah.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Instead of Mr. Desmond.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: We're asking for passing the secret right now. And if Mr. Adelson is going to be here tomorrow, terrific.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I think if somebody can answer it'll be probably Mary O'Grady or Joe Kanefield.

If any of the commissioners propose a change to any of the majority-minority districts as they stand now, would we have to submit those for analysis again? And then wait either a week, week and a half, possibly two weeks for them to get back?

So, so the reason I'm asking this I want to be able to understand what the consequences are of making changes again to the majority-minority districts without waiting for the analysis to come back.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, commissioners, obviously they need to start that -- at least that area, affected area, over in terms of the analysis.

But as in terms of whether -- how much that slows down things down or doesn't slow things down, it would depend on the scope of the change.

But they would need to resubmit those provisions -- those portions for the analysis.
But I don't know how significant it would affect the timing of things.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I think, Mary O'Grady, Ms. O'Grady, I think it would slow things down. I mean, we, we still haven't gotten the changes that we proposed or the analysis that we sent in for the proposed changes that we sent in for the analysis, we haven't received that yet.

And I don't know when we'll get them.

So I would probably venture to say that if anybody makes changes, let's just stay Friday or the next week, they'll follow the same process, and it will take as long as it's taking now, maybe longer. Or am I not -- am I reading it incorrectly?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, Commissioner Herrera, again, any change, a change made to just one district, now we're analyzing all the districts, plus we're analyzing the congressional, so I think it just depends on the scope of the change and how many districts are affected and that sort of thing.

But it would obviously take some time.

I don't know if Willie has a different view of it.

WILLIE DESMOND: No.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Anything else on legislative that we want to discuss?

Thanks, Mr. Desmond, for getting all these change reports prepared for us.

We'll go into them in more detail tomorrow when we have more time.

Do we want to do number five?

You mentioned, Mr. Kanefield, it would be short in terms of legal advice, discussion and possible action on release of executive session transcripts/minutes, Commission may vote to go into executive session.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, I can give very abbreviated advice to the Commission. Unless the Commission wants to expand upon it, I would be happy to do that.

The question had come up with respect to whether the Commission should or can release the executive session transcripts. And that question came up specifically in light of Judge Fink's ruling last week that the open meeting law does not apply to the Commission and therefore certain executive session discussions could or should be made available to the public.

Our advice, and I think I may have mentioned this when this came up before, would be to refrain from releasing those transcripts until this case is fully resolved.
Because we know the county attorney has already indicated that he plans to file his appeal. We finalize the judgment today, and stipulated to with the county attorney, the notice of appeal will be forthcoming.

And until the legal issues are settled upon appellate review, our advice would be to refrain from taking any action that could be implicated by contrary decision on appeal.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any questions for Mr. Kanefield?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Mr. Kanefield, what would be the legal basis?

We have an order from a Superior Court judge saying that the open meeting law does not apply.

I would think if we don't have a basis to keep them confidential, I suppose someone could run in and ask for a stay of the ruling, pending an appeal, but I don't -- I'm not aware of that having happened.

So what would be the basis for us to withhold those from the public?

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair,

Commissioner Freeman, the basis would be the lack of finality to the decision, that it could be overturned on
appeal.

And then if the Commission chooses to release those transcripts and then the appellate courts find that the open meeting law does, in fact, apply to the Commission, then, in fact, the Commission will, in fact, duly violate the law, and there would no way to remedy that violation having the transcripts been released.

So our advice at this point would be not to do that until there's some finality.

And Commission can overrule our advice, of course, and proceed accordingly.

But that's what our advice would be at this point in time.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Mr. Kanefield, it's within the prerogative of this Commission anyway to release them anyway. I believe the first Commission on a number of occasions came out of executive session and then turned around and voted to make the record of the hearing public. We could do that anyway, couldn't we?

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, Commissioner Freeman, the Commission can discuss in open session decisions that were reached in executive session obviously.

There shouldn't be decisions reached in executive session.
But the way the open meeting law works is that those discussions that result in a decision need to be done in open sessions, so that may be what you're speaking about.

But in terms of just simply releasing executive session transcripts, we've looked at this issue before. I know it's come up, and it's been on Commission agendas in the past.

Our best reading of the law is that executive session transcripts under the open meeting law have to be kept confidential.

So the only way to release them would be through a court order or some agreement with the attorney general or the county attorney who do, who do -- who are able under the law to review those transcripts in certain situations.

So we are wishing to proceed cautiously, especially in light of all the legal scrutiny upon the Commission with respect to these laws.

And our best reading and best advice at this time is that the Commission not release those transcripts until the law is completely settled on the question of the open meeting law's applicability to the Commission.

MARY O'GRADY: And, Madam Chair, one more thing, I agree with Joe's advice on that point.

And even if the open meeting law doesn't apply to the Commission as Judge Fink ruled, the Commission as
Judge Fink also ruled would still have the ability to go into executive session and receive legal advice. And some of these executive sessions also concerned the review of confidential documents.

And so even after the lawsuit's over, these don't automatically become public record.

There's still some element of discretion on the part of the Commission, because of the attorney-client advice and the review of confidential materials.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I appreciate the advice of our counsel.

One thing I don't want to do is to be -- to make a decision now, for the benefit of this particular Commission, that might affect negatively the future Commissions.

And I see possibly releasing the executive meeting minutes, releasing and making them public, I would love to see or love to know how it would affect future Commissions.

We don't know that.

And I would ask our commissioners to seek the advice of our counsel and see what happens with the -- if there is an appeal.

But even if there isn't an appeal or if the ruling stands, to see -- for us to think, okay, any decisions we
can make now, how will it affect future Commissions. And is it in the best interest of future Commissions for us to do X, Y, and Z.

And I implore that we all keep that in mind when we make decisions like this.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, counsel was -- and I apologize. The acoustics in here are not the best, and I am having a hard time getting every word, but was the first Commission then in error when it moved to make public records of executive sessions it conducted?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, Commissioner Freeman, I'm not aware of the specific decision that you're referring to, but we can check into that and give you a response. I'm not, I'm not aware of the facts of that specific situation.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, Commissioner Freeman, I'm not either. And I may be in error, but I seem to recall Commissioner Huntwork's testimony before the legislature where he suggested that this Commission could make those executive sessions public from the prior Commission.

So that suggested to me that that Commission had not done that.
But I don't know. I may be in error. So if that's not the case, please let us know, and we'll follow up.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: It's been a while since I've reviewed those transcripts, but it was my recollection that there might have been an instance or two, or several, where they came back the next day and deliberated and said, you know, yesterday it wasn't appropriate for us to do that under -- to go into executive session, so they just moved and made the records public.

I might be misremembering that, but that's something I vaguely recall occurring.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Kanefield, Ms. O'Grady, have we -- has this Commission released any executive meeting minutes, made them public?

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, Commissioner Herrera, no.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: My, my view of this is, is pretty -- a little bit more layman than the attorneys that are flanking me.

And that's that when the public wanted this taken
out of the basement of the legislature and put it out into the public, they wanted it to be open and transparent.

It's been clearly stated over and over and over again by all five of the people up at this table that this is an open process.

The test of the open meeting law was put forth by the attorney general, and then moved over to the Maricopa County attorney, and a ruling was made saying that the open meeting law doesn't apply.

It states in the constitution that we're to hold all of our meetings -- that all of our business meetings are to be open to the public.

And in regards to any legal attorney-client privileged documents or information that might take place in executive session, I can see clearly that that information should be redacted from, from the release.

But I still, I still contend that it's in the best interest of this Commission to release the executive session documents, redact the information that would be considered attorney-client privilege.

You, Madam Chair, has put this out there in the past that she wanted to have this done. And I think that it is -- it's in the public's best interest to hear and see what we do and that we're to be as transparent as possible. Good, bad, or otherwise.
They, they might enjoy what was done in executive session.

They -- it might be just, just more information. We've had tons of meetings in public, and we've had hours of meetings in executive session.

What's -- my recommendation is to get it out there, and redact the attorney-client privilege components of it, and, and get, and get it out in the hands of the public.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Before we move on, Mr. Herrera, I just want to remind everybody we only have 28 minutes now left of the meeting, and we have at least ten request to speak forms.

So we're either going probably have to -- if there's going to be more discussion on this matter, because I don't want to limit debate or anything, I just want to be mindful of the time.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: No, I -- I'll be as quick as possible.

You know, we have -- you know, we've been doing everything possible to, to, to avoid going into executive session.
The times that we have gone, I mean, especially initially, SPO, State Procurement Office, required us to. After that we were -- we got into litigation, and our attorneys, which are Republican and Democratic attorneys, advised us to.

So I don't remember a time where we, we decided to go into executive session just for the hell of it. Most of the time, all of the time was because we, we actually were required to.

And I trust our attorneys.

I trust the State Procurement Office that they did the right thing for us to go into executive session.

But as I've stated before, we've done a lot -- and I think Mr. Bladine will probably update us on the number of times that we've met in the open versus the number of times we've had executive session minutes -- executive session, whether it be in minutes, hours.

Or also let's -- you know, not only the public, our public, the business meetings that we've had, when we've gone out into the public, two different rounds, and compare that to what, what happened before the Prop 106 started.

I mean, I wasn't, I wasn't following the process before when the legislators had control of this, but I guaranty you, I have, I have a sense that it wasn't anything like this.
They were truly doing it in the back rooms, without public comment.

So things are completely different now.

And I think people are satisfied with the way we're handling things.

So, I am, and I think people that approach us are as well.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Because this is an action item, I'm going to go ahead and move to have the executive session meeting minutes released to the public with the attorney-client privileged information redacted.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We have a motion on the floor.

Any discussion?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I'll just add briefly my perspective.

We were in executive session for two reasons and two reasons only.

Because we, on the advice of the Attorney General's Office, chose to follow some of the aspects of the state procurement code.

We were citizen volunteers. We didn't know
anything about the procurement code.

    We did it on their advice because we thought it
would help promote confidence in the public.

    It turned out to be that that was not the case.
But 90 percent of our executive sessions I would,
I would venture to say were as a result of that.

    This whole question about the independence of this
Commission, we've talked a lot about that in the last
six months. I think that's paramount.

    As I said before, from this dais, before this is
all said and done, everything that was said or everything
that happened here I'm sure will become public.

    There's nothing that we talked about in those
executive sessions that bear on the maps that we've drawn.
That's all been done in this room or rooms like this where
everyone could see what we're doing or what the implications
of those actions are.

    And my vote will be to follow the advice of
counsel and not to disclose those transcripts at least at
the present time.

    There may come a time when it's appropriate to do
that, but what we should be doing right now is finishing
these maps. That's the job we would be doing right now.
And I don't -- I think releasing these transcripts now is
just a distraction that's unnecessary.
There may come a time when we should do it, but
that time is not right now.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other discussions?
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, I agree with
Commissioner McNulty. I really do think that we have, I
mean, just a huge amount of work of ahead of us in trying to
come up with agreements on the congressional and legislative
map.

We're not finished yet. I'm assuming we're close,
but I don't know. And I don't think any of us know how
close we are.

So, to me, I agree that this is something that is
a distraction, and we should listen to our attorneys, and
also think about the future of this Commission.

Because in a couple years we'll be out of this and
there will be new people appointed. So I want to keep the
independence of the Commission. And until our attorneys
advise us otherwise, let's stay the course and see what
happens.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other discussion?
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I don't think that this
jeopardizes -- it one -- first of all, this isn't a
distraction.

Second, this is an action item.

Third, this is a -- the next series of events that
took place after the ruling by Judge Fink.

Third(sic), this is not jeopardizing the
independence of this Commission or any future Commission by
showing and continuing to be completely transparent.

I'm all in favor of shining a bright sunlight, and
it's a great, it's a great way for the public to understand
what we're doing.

And it would clear up any, any potential last
lingering thoughts that the public might have that we are
not acting completely independently.

And upon that note --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair. I'm sorry. One
more comment.

You know, I think the public has a pretty good
either idea of what we're doing.

I mean, as I stated before, not only these
meetings, but the first round and public round of hearings,
but also the recent rulings.

I mean, the recent rulings were in the favor of
the Commission, both of them, that we -- everything we've
been accused of, not only by outside influence, but also
influences within the Commission, proven to have no merit.

And we won.

And I think the public is extremely comfortable with the work we're doing.

I don't know what else we need to do, but I'm very comfortable with what we've done, and I am comfortable following the advice of our attorneys.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other discussion?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So all in favor of releasing the executive session transcripts/minutes that Mr. Stertz has motioned and Mr. Freeman seconded.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Aye.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any opposed?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Nay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Nay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Nay.

And I'd like to just say briefly that I also believe that releasing those executive session transcripts would instill even greater confidence in our process, and I hope that there will come a time when we can actually do that, but I believe in following the advice of counsel. Both legal counsel, Joe Kanefield and Mary O'Grady, were unanimous in this regard, and that is why I voted the way I
1 did.
2 So, with that, we're going to move on. But the
3 next item is the logging of communications. And I'm going
4 to see, with legal counsel, can we carry that over to a
5 future meeting?
6 JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Yes, Madam Chair.
7 CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great. So we'll do that at
8 another time and go straight to public comment.
9 There isn't anything from legal on the open
10 meeting law, is there, in terms of the item number seven?
11 JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, real quick, today
12 we entered into a stipulation with the county attorney as to
13 the form of judgment, and that has been filed with the
14 Superior Court.
15 CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.
16 Any questions or comments from anybody on that?
17 VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I'm sorry, I missed that.
18 Can you repeat that again?
19 JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair,
20 Commissioner Herrera, I was just -- on the case, the open
21 meeting law case, today we entered into a stipulation as to
22 the form of judgment, the final judgment in the case. And
23 we -- this is the -- how the final ruling would read and be
24 signed by the judge.
25 The judge had asked us to work with the county
attorney to come to agreement how that final order should read.

We were able to reach agreement with the county attorney and file that for the judge's consideration today.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. With that, we'll move to public comment.

And if we could limit comments to two minutes now, because our comments -- our discussion went longer than intended, but that would still give everyone a chance to speak.

If you could come up to the microphone and spell your last name so that we get an accurate accounting for the transcript, that would be great.

Our first speaker is State Representative Richard Miranda from Tolleson.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: He's not here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Our next speaker is Luis Gonzales from the Pascua Yaqui Tribe. He's a councilman.


CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: You don't need to give --

COUNCILMAN LUIS GONZALES: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Please don't give your
addresses to us.

Strike that from the record.

COUNCILMAN LUIS GONZALES: Okay. Well, good afternoon.

Before you again, this is my fourth time, and the last time that I, that I presented was on behalf in reference to the constituency that I have received from the Pascua Yaqui Tribe.

In fact, right now today I'm here in reference to the town of Guadalupe, where we have our constituency of over 3,000 people there.

I do believe that moving Guadalupe to the other district that we're looking at right now is being proposed. I -- a lot of our membership did not agree with it.

I do not agree with it as well either.

I've gotten a lot a people here, but it's difficult during the weekday.

As I mentioned before, I think it's the community of interest that we have currently with the South Mountain area, Phoenix area, I think it's good.

Two things, that I just want to emphasize. One is education.

We do have a satellite office in Guadalupe that was opened back in '89.

We also -- the South Mountain Community College,
the central one, is on 24th Street. It was built in 1980.

Our members from Guadalupe, Guadalupe as a whole, the community goes there. That's one commonality we have in reference to the community interest.

The second one is religion and language.

I want to speak with reference to religion.

We have tomorrow La Fiesta de Guadalupe.

There's a big festival that's happening we live in Guadalupe, but there's a lot of people that speak Spanish but also come from the Phoenix area. There's hundreds, more or less thousands of people that come there.

But one of the commonality we have with south Phoenix is the back and forth not only with religion, language, but also reference to work.

The Baseline area, we have back then, 50 years ago, we had areas of Chinese fields who we all used to work as well too, and we have a commonality and common interest with the people of south Phoenix as well.

But those are some of the ties, and I would really like the Commission --

(Alarm sounds.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: You can finish your thought there.

COUNCILMAN LUIS GONZALES: Truly consider maintaining Guadalupe where it is right now.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is Sally Ann Gonzales, representing Guadalupe. State representative.

REPRESENTATIVE SALLY ANN GONZALES: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and members of the Commission.


I am here representing -- I would actually like to speak both on district -- my district in Tucson, District 3.

I did not know of any changes that was happening.

It was unfortunately concentrating on the changes for the town of Guadalupe.

And I saw a little bit of what, of what was up there.

I'll have to go back and look into it, and maybe write some written comments.

I certainly do not or oppose the changes that were -- that District 3 is losing on the south end that are surrounding the Tohono O'odham, San Xavier district area.

Hispanic, the Hispanic community in that area is closer related to the Tohono O'odham in that area, and we're going to lose that, and gain, and gain up in the northeast side of that, of the District 3.

And the bigger, the majority of the population is in district -- that we're losing is -- has closer ties
together than the ones that we're gaining up in the northeast, in that, but I'll have to look at those again.

Like I said, I was concentrating on the Guadalupe area.

Really quickly, going on to the -- to district, the proposed District 26 of the town of Guadalupe, I am president of the Guadalupe CDC, have been for the last eight years.

And we concentrate our efforts in building moderate to low income housing for the citizens of Guadalupe in conjunction with the Town of Guadalupe and other entities within there, so, we have built the two apartment complexes, one for senior and one for multi -- multi -- multi-family complexes at the north end of the town that include 76 of the multi-family, and 32 of for senior centers -- citizens.

And I'd like to, you know, let you know that, that Guadalupe is going to -- is a unique community, but it has closer ties to the south Phoenix area that it is now currently, and I'm asking you to leave it there.

Because for the first time in history in the 2010 elections we had one Guadalupe member running for the legislature. That was first time in history.

I believe that those kind of chances of Guadalupe members getting to be able to elect a person of their liking is going to be null and void if you move them to District 26.
in the Tempe, Mesa area.

That it -- we've been working hard to get a voice
in the community of Guadalupe, and I really stress that you
leave them in district -- in your current proposed
District 27.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Sandra Gonzales, representing
District 16, Guadalupe.

SANDRA GONZALES: Good afternoon, chairman Mathis,
and members.

For the record, my name is Sandra Gonzales,
G-O-N-Z-A-L-E-S.

What I'm going to say, how difficult the IRC made
it for us to work as a working community member to be here.

At 9:00 a.m. there was more community members, but
it was changed from 9:00 to 1:00.

The Saturday meeting is canceled.

But having a meeting during the day when working
families are working is just awful.

My connections to Guadalupe are many. I was
raised in Guadalupe. It is home to my eight member family,
along with many aunts, uncles, cousins, and many extended
family, as well as my 85-year-old grandmother whom is -- we
are blessed here to have with us today.
Growing up in Guadalupe, my parents were no
close to services, public safety, no police, no fire
protection, no ambulance service, no trash collection, no
paved streets.

Things have gotten better. I can only remember
the dirt road in old photographs. And now my children will
know Guadalupe with the sidewalks and roads that they have
now. Not great, but nonetheless roads.

I was the first community member to run for a
legislative seat.

It was an honor.

And having Guadalupe in District 17 I think would
be devastating for our people and our community.

It would not provide my children the same
opportunity, as my oldest is a year, year and a half away
from becoming a registered voter.

All I ask is that you keep it where it is right
now with 16.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Gino Turrubiartes, from
Guadalupe.

GINO TURRUBIARTES: Gino, G-I-N-O, last name T, as
in Tom, U-R-R-U-B, as in boy, I-A-R-T-E-S.

And very well pronounced you continue,
Madam Chair.

I'm reading this letter on behalf of the mayor of Guadalupe, dated December 15th, 2011.

The Town of Guadalupe has come before the Commission and has asked that Guadalupe stay in Legislative District 27. For a true community of interest exists and has commonality with other neighboring communities to the west. A true community of interest would exist for all.

The IRC in its creation was to provide a fair and equitable distribution of population, especially when it comes to the community of interest.

The town of Guadalupe is situated in the Phoenix metropolitan area where almost 5500 population is residing in an area less than one square mile.

The town of Guadalupe covers an area of approximately 0.75 square miles, and it was founded around the turn of the century by the Yaqui Indians.

Today our population remains predominantly composed of Hispanic, of American -- Mexican-American descent and Native Americans who are predominantly of the Pasqua Yaqui tribe.

The town of Guadalupe has thrived because of partnerships with our neighboring communities within legislature -- Legislative District 27.

Twenty-seven is Legislative District 16, just to
clarify.

That have existed in developing Guadalupe town hall, Guadalupe fire department, South Mountain Community College in Guadalupe, Guadalupe Boys and Girls Club, Guadalupe Library, Frank Elementary School, Guadalupe Community Development Corporation, Pascua Yaqui Education Center, Pascua Community Service Center, Guadalupe Community Action Program, Guadalupe Senior Center, Maricopa County Office subdivision -- or Sub Station, and Centro de Arnistad Behavior Health Center, just to mention a few.

We have over 30 businesses and over five active churches in our community.

Through Guadalupe Housing Department, Pascua Yaqui Housing Department, Guadalupe Community Development Corporation, and a Habitat -- Habitat of Humanity, over 200 new homes have been built through the years for families who are low to very low income.

And these programs continue to meet the needs of the community by continuing new construction of homes and rehabilitation of existing homes.

The town of Guadalupe has the lowest income population of all municipalities within the Maricopa County, and one of the highest in the state of Arizona, which compares to what exists in the remaining community in Legislative District 27.
We, the Town Council of Guadalupe, voted and requested that we stay in Legislative District 27.

It is our -- it is with great importance to us that the town of Guadalupe stays in a legislative district where a true community of interest exists.

We have very little or no community of interest with Legislative District 26.

If you removed leg -- if you remove -- if we are removed from Legislative District 27, we will file objections to the plan that does not include Guadalupe in Legislative District 27.

Respectfully, Mayor Alma Yolanda Solarez.

And just on a lighter note, I just want to thank the Commission for your continued hard work, all your members, the time that you give away from your families, from your jobs. I know this is very difficult, but I just want you to know that every one of us are grateful for everything that you do.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Cristina Campoy, from Guadalupe.

CRISTINA CAMPOY: My name is Cristina Campoy, C-A-M-P-O-Y.

And I'm here to speak on behalf of my community,
to stay in the district the way it is.

I graduated from South Mountain Community College. Where I was able to make the dean's list, meaning that I made straight A's.

First of all, the first community college I went to was Mesa Community College. I didn't feel very -- I didn't feel in touch with that, with that school.

South Mountain gave me a more familial feel. Because I had instructors that were -- that were of color and were bilingual.

I also was the first one in my family to get a degree from Arizona State University.

I in large part give thanks and credit to South Mountain Community College because they were the ones that have a satellite school in the community of Guadalupe. And they also help people in the community that have limited transportation to attend community college and better their lives.

Not only does South Mountain increase our education, but it has also provided jobs for people in the community of Guadalupe. We don't have any, any commonality with the city of Scottsdale and Tempe.

By tradition, the Guadalupe, the Yaqui people have
really migrated west to the Phoenix and Laveen area.

Laveen, with Laveen, what we have in common is they were, they were the farmers, while the town of Guadalupe residents were the crop pickers.

We don't have any of that commonality with the city of Tempe, Mesa, Scottsdale.

Also the thing that was touched upon was the poverty level.

Between the years of 2005 and 2009, per capita income for Guadalupe families was $11,436.

I think we all know that Scottsdale people make a lot more income.

But I would just like to thank you for the opportunity of hearing us. Not because it's the process that you have to take, but I hope that you really listen to the community and its needs and keep us in the district that we are in already.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Frank Lopez from Guadalupe.

FRANK LOPEZ: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, I'm a resident of Guadalupe, and I'd like to just echo what my fellow residents just said.

But I've been asked -- Gino didn't have time to read this second letter. But I've been asked by Gino to
read this letter from Catherine Miranda, our District 16 representative.

Dear Chairman -- Chairperson Mathis, I'm writing to the Independent Redistricting Commission in the strongest possible opposition to removing the town of Guadalupe from my legislative district.

Unfortunately I am currently out of state on a prior commitment and cannot be there personally to express my view.

For 30 years Guadalupe has been part of the District 16 South Mountain community. We have shared common cultural events and economic growth.

Currently as their state representative, we have begun numerous economic development projects that will be impacted if Guadalupe is removed from my legislative district.

The town of Guadalupe as a community of interest has bonded and merged with south Phoenix during the past decades into a single community of interest.

District 16 legislators have become a strong voice for a community that otherwise would have been neglected and ignored if represented by an east valley legislative district.

The future economic development is at stake in this sudden proposal to place the town of Guadalupe in the
east valley for legislative representation.

    I currently serve on two major Latino -- national Latino elected official boards, which have also been contacted and concern -- and have concerns with and have raised concerns on dividing this community of interest with significant historical and cultural ties to south Phoenix.

    I remain hopeful that the IRC will recognize legitimate redistricting factors which have been expressed in opposing to removing the town of Guadalupe from South Mountain legislative district.

    The alternative would be a potential for costly and needless litigation.

    I respectfully ask that you hear the voices of logic and not divide a community that has remained intact for 30 years.

    Sincerely, Representative Catherine Miranda, District 16.

    Thank you.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

    Our next speaker is Joshua Offenhartz, representing self, from Scottsdale.

    VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, before he -- the next person speaks, I want to encourage the people from Guadalupe to come tomorrow when Bruce Adelson will be here. He'll explain the reason why we proposed Guadalupe be in a
different district and the issue of retrogression. So I would encourage you to attend tomorrow's meeting.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Which begins at 4:00 p.m. for everyone's edification.

    JOSHUA OFFENHARTZ: Joshua Offenhartz, O-F-F-E-N-H-A-R-T-Z.

    First off, Madam Chair, fellow commissioners, I want to say thank you for letting me speak and holding this meeting. I'm glad to see that cooler heads and compromise seems to be prevailing. It was a tense meeting on Monday for those of us in the audience.

    And I think that we have made great progress towards a final map. So thank you for that.

    I'm here to speak today on proposed Legislative District 23. No surprise.

    After my testimony on Monday afternoon, I went home and looked at the redistricting software to see how best to add 5 to 6,000 people from the proposed Legislative District 24 into proposed Legislative District 23.

    And what I wanted to testify to today was my recommendation for a number of reasons.

    The legislative map titled 12-12 VRA LD 26 version three is the only map that seems to have made this change so far.

    And you take two precincts from the eastern edge
of Scottsdale, specifically a boundary created by Hayden and McDowell Road and add that to LD 23.

While this is a great idea, I would offer an alternative in which you look to add the 5 to 6,000 populations from a block in between Scottsdale Road and Hayden Road, as opposed to the proposed Hayden to Pima Roads.

And the reason that I make this recommendation is that the Coronado High School is actually in that block, and you had removed it from the Scottsdale Unified School District, which had been kept relatively intact.

With all due respect, since we're just looking to add non minority-majority voters from the 24 to the 23, I think that it makes sense to pick those voters that would add to compactness and communities of interest, which is why I bring up that regard.

Just to some notes for you, in case you haven't, you know, delved into the population dynamics, the reason I bring this up is that if you move farther west, there are minority voters, and I realize that we want to keep those in that 24 district as opposed to the 23.

I'll finish up with some last thoughts. It's my personal preference for the proposed LD 28 that a final draft map would look something -- or a final map would look something closer to the draft map. But since I've only got
two minutes, I will come back tomorrow and provide that testimony.

Thank you again for listening, and I hope that we can make these changes to 23 to make it an even better district than it already is. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Alberto Gutier. From Phoenix.

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Pete Bengtson, representing self, from Pima.

PETE BENGTSON: My name is Pete Bengtson, that's B-E-N-G-T-S-O-N.

I'm one of those people advocating competitive districts.

And I know it's the last one on the list, but I just want to remind everybody that the whole purpose of the IRC is to create fair and competitive districts.

So I think it's important.

Also happy that the only thing I'm paying attention to is competitive districts.

You all have six different goals to keep in mind.

And every time I come, I'm amazed at how complex it is.

I've been paying attention to the fact that you guys are running open meetings, since I started coming to these sessions in the end of June, and then after the state
legislature and governor got involved, I paid even more
attention. And I'm really pleased to say that I'm impressed
with how all these decisions on the maps are made in open
session.

    Listening to the long, boring discussions of
moving a line here or there, I realize it's all being done
in the open. And even when there's a little conflict on
what we're going to do, it makes it even more clear that
it's all done in open session. No back room stuff.

    So keep up the good work you're doing.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Lynne Breyer, representing
self, from Maricopa.

LYNNE BREYER: B-R-E-Y-E-R.

First, I want to thank Mr. Stertz for the map that
you presented today.

    I like the map you did on Monday.

    I like this one a little bit less, but I
appreciate that you were willing to compromise to satisfy
hopefully some of the people on this Commission who really
are not that interested in compromise.

    So thank you very much for that.

    I also wanted to thank you, Mr. Freeman, for
wanting to release the transcripts of the closed meetings.
And as a member of the public it makes me wonder why the
other three are not interested in that. And it makes me
tsuspicious of that process now.

    Mr. Herrera, I'd like to thank you for being so
civil today. I will tell you that I have friends and
neighbors who will not come here to speak because you have
intimidated them into not wanting to do that. And you have
been very civil today, and I appreciate that as well.

    I have here a letter from a woman in Tucson who
has tried countless times to submit a comment through your
website.

    I have had the same experience that she had, which
is to say that it can't be done half the time.

    Now my thing is not wanting to work.

    This is from Nancy MacDonald, and her letter
reads: As a resident of Saddlebrooke, it is important to me
to give you my input and opinion on the matter of putting
our community in CD 1.

    That opinion is don't do it.

    This makes little sense because we are actually
much closer to downtown Tucson than we are to the area
covered by CD 1. And downtown Tucson is in CD 2.

    For many years Saddlebrooke has been actively
involved and has had thousands of volunteer hours logged
with the children, schools, and families in Oracle,
San Manuel, and Mammoth.
We have very little in common with the folks in CD 1, and we should not be expected to drive so far to be involved with them.

Frankly it just won't happen.

Furthermore, how can we expect any representative to cover such a huge and oddly shaped district and represent us properly.

All of the constitutional criteria are being met by leaving us in CD 2, whereas being assigned to CD 1 would not meet constitutional criteria.

Why would you be interested in changing our district when so few people find it desirable to make this change.

Clearly this seems like a clear case of gerrymandering, and I am really unhappy about something that seems so dishonest.

It is also important for you to know that I did try to send an online form today to www.azredistricting.org/public/inputASP. Both I and my husband Neil spent considerable time filling out the forms. And when we were done, put in the security codes and hit submit. A new form came up saying our information did not go through. And after going back to try to retrieve what we had written, our filled-out forms were as blank as the new ones.
Subsequently I telephoned (855)733-7478.

A woman named Ilene Wilson told me she would note my opinion and put it into a binder.

Ilene did tell me there had been a glitch in the computers in their office yesterday.

Must be a glitch every day, because that's what I keep hearing too.

And she guessed that there was still a problem.

I then asked to speak with her supervisor and was connected with someone named Anna Garcia, who announced to me that she was the executive administrative officer, heavy on the officer, for the Commission.

As I tried to explain my dilemma to her, she continued to interrupt what I was saying.

When I told her that it seemed very peculiar that the forms on the website did not work for two days and that I wanted more than a notation of my opinion in some binder, she told me it wasn't her fault and that she didn't wish to speak to me because I was very angry. And she hung up on me.

I was angry, because she continued interrupting everything I said.

She needs some training, to say the least. She had offered to give me a fax number, but I do not have a fax machine.
Needless to say as a concerned citizen who had taken the time to try to communicate my wishes in two different ways and still didn't feel as if anyone was paying attention, I am not impressed.

The way all of this redistricting has been handled is questionable at best.

Once more I'd like to say do not put the subject communities into CD 1.

Signed, Nancy MacDonald.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Ann Heins, representing self, from Maricopa.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, before we move forward, could I --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I would recommend that probably Ms. Gomez contact this individual to see if she can clear up any issues she may be having with our, with our website.

Because I think it's probably a miscommunication. I think they work perfectly, but would have Ms. Gomez contact her directly.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

ANN HEINS: So I can speak?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah.

Well, I was asked to talk -- to present information from Flagstaff Yuma, and Tucson, but I have to respond to the comments today.

The three Democrats on the IRC talk about competitiveness. But from what I hear, all you talk about is hyperpacking the conservatives to weaken them while at the same time making sure that every incumbent Democrat is protected.

And clearly Herrera's idea yesterday of putting Republicans out 8 and into 11 is super-hyperpacking.

And then I have to respond about the -- your comments that the public is very happy and satisfied.

So, I can say from the East Valley Trib, that Maricopa County -- our Maricopa County attorney said that there is no public accountability, that it is a new Redistricting Commission.

Arizona Republic, not certainly known for conservative values, said issues raised while the Commission allegedly hired a Democrat mapping consultant following behind-the-scenes lobbying and scheming by Chairwoman Mathis.

Capital Times said that behind closed doors, the officials with the state department -- I'm sorry, I'm speaking fast -- of administration stopped working with the
Commission just before it hired a mapping consultant. We
don't know about that. The executive commission to destroy
the initial score sheets from the commissioners' behind
closed door sessions.

So I beg to differ from you, sir.

That is what your public, your left leaning 1960
newspapers are saying.

So I salute also the two lawyers on the
Commission, because they have completely ignored the state
of California, the taxpayers, and the rest of the
Commission, to protect one person.

So now, Madam Chair, will you step up and vote for
the maps or are you going in a nonpartisan independent vote,
or will you continue to be controlled by the two people
surrounding both sides of you.

If you can't vote Independent, then why not
dissolve this Commission and save the taxpayers the money
and just go ahead and make your decision for the whole state
of Arizona behind closed doors.

So, Madam Chair, are you going to be Independent,
or will you be the Empress Mathis.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Don Ascoli, representing self,
from Gila.
We have two more speakers after that.


Madam Chair, could you put the map for the legislative districts up that you're discussing? I did not have the benefit of getting here early with the snow.

This won't go against my time, will it?

(Brief pause.)

DON ASCOLI: I apologize, I asked the young lady from the back if she could do this, but she did not have the software to show me. So this is my first time seeing what is being discussed.

Can you expand a little bit on, on Gila County? Is that possible, or is that the best you can zoom?

Madam Chairman, commissioners, thank you for letting me be here.

Community of interest has been said and probably you think has been overused. And I have very much sympathy for the folks in Guadalupe. But good luck with this Commission.

That's my county. Gila County.

53,000 people, and it's been sliced into three districts.

Three districts.

It was mentioned earlier by Commissioner Jose
Herrera we won. We won.

Have you heard that before?
Sounds arrogant to me. It sounds divisive to me.

That county has no right to be split.

I wear many hats in this county. I live north of Payson. I'm the chairman of the Gila County Planning and Zoning Commission. It's one of the hats I wear.

I just came from a meeting. That's why I was late. Trying to decide on a little conditional use permit for folks up in East Verde Estates.

We have worked — I have worked my six years in that commission, there's nine of us, to help the community of interest, our county.

And you folks have decided to butcher our county. It's the only rural county out of 12 that's split into three representatives.

Do you know how hard we work to have a connection and be able to work with our representatives?

We have a nice solid team who represent the rural area of Arizona in LD 5.

You are going to slice and dice this commission — this county into the three pieces, 15,000 people or so in each section. And you're going to expect them to listen to us little people.

You've used our county as political fill.
That's how I feel. And I'm going to tell you, if I could have half the county, they'd be down here saying the same thing.

I'm very disappointed.

Yes, you win, and the people have lost because of what you have done.

I have back here, and you know, what the district maps looked like in 2000. And there was a nice, nice rural district LD 5 there. It was five counties, almost all whole.

And you chopped it up into three or four districts.

We don't have any representation.

You have hurt the rural people of Arizona.

I'm upset and mad about it, and I'm not the only one.

You don't represent the people with what you've done here.

The only way you can solve it is by making us, our community of interest, whole, be compact and contiguous. Don't use us as political fill.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Sean Englund, representing self, from Cave Creek.
SEAN ENGLUND: I have some handouts of my testimony, Madam Chair.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Madam Chair, Senator Leah Landrum Taylor has given me her yellow note. I thought she turned in another one. She wanted us to turn in what she wrote on. c

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Our next. Sorry.

SEAN ENGLUND: Sean Englund, that's spelled E-N-G-L-U-N-D.

Madam Chair, Vice Chair, members of the Commission, I appreciate everything that you guys have done. I know it's been difficult, and you've put a lot of time into this, and I really appreciate it.

What I'm here to discuss today is that I support the IRC approved maps that were approved on October 10th, 2011.

I am a former title insurance agent, and I've worked up in the Cave Creek, Carefree area for over 15 years.

I'm a resident up there, I'm also a licensed realtor in the area, and I am very familiar with it.

And I am a parent of two children that attend the CCUSD schools. And I'm the manager of a large equine breeding facility. And I believe that I truly understand
the interests of that area up north.

And here's why I approve, I approve and support those maps that you've approved.

The proposed LD 15 respects both the community of interest and the municipal boundaries while creating a compact and contiguous district.

The map also uses the Scottsdale city lines to divide the proposed LD 15 and the LD 23.

This respects municipal boundaries for both -- for all of Scottsdale, Phoenix, and Carefree boundaries. And Carefree.

None of these communities are divided on the north part of the proposed district.

The parents in this north part of the proposed LD 15 comprise a block of voters that typically support our local public schools in Cave Creek, and this map keeps those parents together, which I believe is very important.

The horse industry in this area is a very tightknit group. And are, and are located in the same county as -- are in the same county supervisor district, which is District 3, both north of Carefree Highway and east and west of Cave Creek Road.

Keeping them together in this map keeps a community of agricultural interests together.

And from a title officer perspective and from a
realtor perspective, the homes and subdivisions west of the city of Scottsdale are used as comparable properties, as are the larger non-subdivision homes.

This is an important distinction.

It's hard to find comparable properties for acreage and custom built homes, and typically realtors do not use the properties in Scottsdale as comparable to properties in the proposed District 15.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Antonia Campoy, representing self, from Guadalupe.

ANTONIA CAMPOY: Good afternoon, board. Thank you.

My name is Antonia Campoy from the community of Guadalupe.

I'm going to read our Senator Leah Landrum Taylor's comments. She had to leave, I believe.

Strong support for having town of Guadalupe to be included in the current draft map.

Also support from the 48th Street to 24th Street from McDowell to I-10, taking out and keeping South Mountain Village and Laveen whole by adding then from Baseline to Broadway from 35th Avenue to 59th Avenue back into the district.
Thank you for all your hard work and truly listening to the community.

For myself I'm born and raised, a Yaqui member of the Guadalupe Yaqui community. And I have six grandchildren.

And I've served both on tribal council and town council.

I've attended many, many town council meetings within the past three or four years, and I've had the pleasure of having collaborated and met with Leah when she has come out to our town hall on issues of housing and public safety and other issues.

And so, I encourage you to listen to Ms. Leah Taylor in her support for the community of Guadalupe.

And I also support Mr. Frank Lopez and all his comments, that he gave you a brief history of Guadalupe and everything that we've worked for all these years.

So thank you for your time and hopefully you will not -- kind of -- I teach Yaqui history for South Mountain Community College.

I have been working for TD for over 30 years.

And I -- you can say that I'm involved in the community.

So hopefully my coming up here and expressing my concerns for we want to stay with some of the south Phoenix.
Thank you for your time.
Gracias. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much.
That was our last request to speak form. Did I miss anyone?
There is somebody.
Sure.
You'll have to fill out a request to speak form and tell us your name and all of that once you're done.
HOLLY HOVER: How are you? My name is Holly Hover, H-O-V-E-R.
Madam Chair, members of the Commission, thank you for letting me speak.
And in respect of your time, I know we're getting late, I would just like to relate to you that I do wholeheartedly support the legislative map that you approved October 10, 2011.
It absolutely is the best proposed option for my legislative district. That's District 15.
I would like, if I could, just go ahead and submit these thoughts for your review and let everybody get out of here.
Thank you very much.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much.
Thank you, public, for your input today. We
appreciate it.

The time is 4:23 p.m. and this meeting is adjourned. And we'll be meeting again tomorrow at 4:00 p.m. here.

Thanks.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned.)

* * * * *
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