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PROCEEDINGS

(Whereupon, the public session commences.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Good afternoon.

This meeting of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission will now come to order.

Today is Tuesday, December 20th, and the time is 1:09 p.m.

Let's begin with the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We'll start with roll call.

Vice-Chair Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Vice-Chair Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We have a quorum.
Other folks at the table include our legal counsel Mary O'Grady, our mapping consultant Willie Desmond.

Staff around the room include our executive director Ray Bladine, our deputy executive director Kristina Gomez, our public information officer Stu Robinson, our chief technology officer Buck Forst.

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

So with that, we can get right on into the agenda.

Which over the past few weeks now we've been kind of discussing adjustments to these both legislative and congressional draft maps. And since we didn't get to the congressional yesterday, I thought it would be good to start there, if that's okay with everybody else and our mapping consultant.

I'm not sure that he had anything he was supposed to do for us for today on that. We just need to pick up from where we were on Friday.

WILLIE DESMOND: There are no congressional change reports for you to look at today.

And the congressional map remains relatively close to the draft map. There's been some small charges in Districts 3 and 7 to improve their voting rights performance a little bit.

I'm happy to proceed however you like.
We could go back and look at the proposed changes that Commissioner Stertz and Commissioner McNulty have proposed. I believe those are the two main changes still out there.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And then there was my combo map.

WILLIE DESMOND: And your combo.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And that's something we didn't really talk about with Mr. Stertz present. And so it would be good, I think, to do that, and then also have him --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, thank you, I'd like to see if we can address the -- I guess it's called the Mathis combo map. I have had a chance to review it and I would like to give my thoughts.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Great.

And essentially just to bring everybody up to the same page, what this was, this combo map, was taking a few of the districts from McNulty's proposed changes to the draft map, keeping the same lines and boundaries for the two voting rights districts, three and seven, and then taking the map -- essentially the Maricopa County area that Mr. Stertz had proposed for Districts 5, 6, 8, and 4 too, I
1 think.

2 Yeah.

3 And I know, Mr. Stertz, you were on the phone for part of that meeting Friday, and I'm not sure how much you heard or saw of this particular map, so . . .

4 COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, if you can just give me a moment, I'm going to be loading the legislation -- legislative map. I thought we were going to go there first, so it will take me a second to pull up the congressional.

5 Maybe you could go through the overview of the, of the, of the changes.

6 Most specifically the thing that we really want to focus on is the, is the substantive difference that I saw was the exclusion of the Oro Valley, Marana, Saddlebrooke, and the Pinal County connection in lieu, in lieu of the connection of Cochise County into the greater Tucson metro area on the southern side.

7 CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, and --

8 COMMISSIONER STERTZ: In the northern map, what southern -- what salient changes were made there that maybe you could point me too so that we could expeditiously go through it.

9 CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure.

10 So just to recap.

11 Districts 1 and 2 came from the McNulty proposed
changes map. And I believe her efforts were centered around trying to address the number one piece of public comment, at least in my opinion, that we received from the public comment during that 30-day period, and that was that CD 1 was just way too big for one person to represent.

It's still a big district, as we know. It's a big district currently.

But at least in this version we do cut off the bottom of the state so it doesn't go all the way to the border.

So Cochise County is kept whole.

And so that section is at least removed.

We did sacrifice the third border district by doing that, which is something that a few of the commissioners at least, I know, were interested in, including me.

But there just wasn't a good way to do it unfortunately that worked with the rest of the map.

So, as I mentioned, two, three, and seven are identical. They're the same voting rights district maps.

And then four, five, six, eight, nine are from what Mr. Stertz proposed last week.

And we really didn't talk about the area, you know, the intricacies of these particular districts on Friday. Friday was really just an opportunity to see if
this could even be done and put these two concepts onto the same map.

So I offer the floor to anybody else who wants to talk about anything they --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: A couple of things I like about the combo map, the Mathis combo map, first of all, the majority-minority districts weren't touched. They were left as is.

Again, respecting that we are -- have sent this information for both three and seven for analysis. I like that that wasn't touched.

But also that this map that you put together incorporates both Commissioner McNulty and Stertz's maps, their individual maps.

So in particular I think there was, excuse me, District 6, 8, and 4 from Commissioner Stertz's map, and I think one and two from Commissioner McNulty's map.

I like a couple things that I think they were able to figure out.

In Commissioner Stertz's version, he was able to remove Fountain Hills from four, add it to six, while not moving Anthem and New River to District 4.

So basically keeping Anthem and New River in
District 8.

Commissioner Stertz was also able to make six and eight more compact.

There's a couple of things that I like to see in this combo map, based on Commissioner Stertz's recommendations. And what I like to see is the Pinal County area of -- there's a small portion in CD 5 that has Pinal County. And I'd like to see if we can take it out.

I think there's -- it is not that much, but it's -- again, kind of remove some of the splits of Pinal County. I'd like taking it out of five.

And also, let's see, taking Mesa out of CD 6, so it would be Mesa would be have one less split, keeping it into only in CD 5 and 9.

And then also part of Peoria is in District 4. And I think that small piece that is in District 4, that Peoria piece, should be in eight.

So those are the changes that I would recommend in the area as that we've -- that you've adopted from Commissioner Stertz's map. Again, the six, eight, and four which I do like.

And there's a couple of things I do like also about the changes that Commissioner McNulty has proposed. These are one and two.

You're looking at -- in I think both of the maps
that they -- both Commissioner Stertz and McNulty, both of them keep Cochise County whole.

But what I like about Commissioner McNulty's is she keeps Cochise County whole in CD 2.

Now, with this change that she proposed, it keeps CD 1 and CD 2 competitive and remains their competitiveness about 50/50 in performance.

So that there's hardly any change to the competitiveness level using index two in Commissioner McNulty.

Also what it does it keeps Marana and Oro Valley together, keeps them together in CD 1, and always gives southern Arizona three congressional districts. So a stronger voice in the -- in congress because of those three districts that are touching southern Arizona.

Also she adds the Village of Oak Creek with CD 1, put together with Sedona. Again, this is based on public testimony.

So those are kind of the things that I like about these -- the map, this combo map.

I'm excited to hear what other people have to say.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Do other commissioners?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yesterday we received and -- we received a letter from the town of Oro Valley from the Oro Valley Town Council.

I just wanted to read a couple of excerpts out of it. The entire document is put into the record, but it says: On behalf of Oro Valley Town Council, I wish to express our concern with the draft congressional district map adopted by the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission.

Specifically we're concerned about that our -- that our urban incorporated community of more than 41,000 people would not receive adequate congressional representation if included in the proposed rural -- rural, excuse me -- proposed rural District 1.

Clearly the Tucson metropolitan area comprises a significant community of interest.

They go on to say that they're -- the community as they see it is a community of interest that ties together with their residents with the nearly one million residents of, of the greater Tucson area, in regards to orientation, economics, politics, and culture, all as being more substantively connected to the greater Tucson urban area.

It goes on to conclude by saying that we fully understand that the difficulty of the task that you -- that we as a Commission have undertaken and that we as the, as
the council and the mayor of Oro Valley also understand that
respecting communities of interest is but one of the many
important considerations that we must make in developing our
revised congressional districts for the state.

That is one piece of, of a large amount of
testimony.

And I would, I would -- in doing, in doing our
online searches for size of the CD 1 versus keeping Marana,
Oro Valley, and Saddlebrooke with the city of Tucson,
keeping those areas whole, they were, they were fighting
neck and neck in how much information that we were receiving
from the public.

You live in the northwest part of Tucson. These
are, these are connected communities to Tucson. They are
certainly less connected to and less a part of CD 1.

Is there a way that you can see, Madam Chair, in
the way that you've modified this and included the -- sort
of a marrying of these maps a way to be able to, to meet
both of our -- both the objectives of keeping Cochise County
whole, as Commissioner McNulty in both -- she and I have
both agreed that it makes most sense.

We've heard a lot of testimony from Cochise County
regarding keeping it whole.

We also know that Cochise County is, other than
the Sierra -- the urban Sierra Vista area and Fort Huachuca,
is essentially a rural county.

In my -- the iteration of the map that I provided a week ago Monday, I actually went into Congressional District 3 to try to pick up population by virtue of this knowing that we were going to try to keep both three and seven outside of our redesign, sort of parameters in this next go around, because both of those are majority-minority districts.

I chose to include the area of Saddlebrooke, Marana, Oro Valley, northwest Tucson, going up into Pinal County as that -- those are truly communities that are tied together with the urban Tucson area, and certainly are -- is a population that has been -- in my opinion will be disenfranchised by putting them as part of the rural Congressional District 1.

In looking at this, the only way to achieve that goal would be to have modifications to Congressional District 3.

And that would be to do some -- or to move Cochise County into Congressional District 1.

Those are the only two, those are the only two options that are available to us.

And I'm looking at a large, a large group of people that gave a large volume of testimony. And I'm trying to -- again, this goes back to my conversation
yesterday. I -- we've heard from these folks over and over
and over again about why they want to be connected, not only
together, but to urban Tucson.

And it appears as though we are pulling them out
for, for a particular reason. I cannot get my arms around
what that reason is.

So if we can -- that's, that's where I am.

I'm still very comfortable with the, with the
Cochise County is -- for the majority of Cochise County is a
rural district -- is a rural county. And it fits with the
rural district.

It is clear that Marana, Saddlebrooke, and
Oro Valley, they've all given us resolutions from your
councils that say that they want to stay with urban Tucson.
They've given us a tremendous amount of testimony. They're
connected to us on a variety of different ways.

The only way to be able to solve that problem is
to put Cochise County in CD 1, which does make it a little
bit larger land mass. But according to your own analysis,
the land mass itself would now be about the same as the
current district that that resides.

Currently under the draft map, it's slightly
smaller than the current draft map. But by adding all of
Cochise County, it would become about the same as the size
of the district that it currently is now.
So, my feeling is that Cochise County is a predominantly rural district, can move into CD 1. Saddlebrooke, Oro Valley, Marana are all urban communities and are truly connected to urban Tucson area, and should be connected into, into the urban Tucson district.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Comments from other commissioners?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: The concerns Commissioner Stertz outlined are one of, I guess, three principal concerns I have on the congressional map.

The -- when I hear that Tucson will have another voice in congress through this map, what -- the concern that comes to mind is how would that resonate with rural eastern Arizona and even with Flagstaff, knowing that Tucson now has a voice.

I don't think -- I think there's a strong desire that the rural communities remain rural, and this is, this is breaking with that.

There was a huge turnout from this area of the state. Really I think it was the first group that came, came before the Commission to raise their concerns sort of en masse at our first hearing down in Oro Valley back in
June.

You know, commissioners have invoked the volume of testimony and that the people have spoken loudly and clearly.

And I've, you know, done some surveying of not even the complete written record of what the Commission has. And it's, it's easily scores and scores of comments, I believe, even hundreds of comments, with very few redundancies, talking about the nature of these communities, how they're tied, how they're a community of interest with Tucson.

They even have Tucson mailing addresses there. And now they're being placed with the northern parts of the state.

So that -- I don't think it needs to be that way. That's, that's one concern I have.

And then, Mr. Desmond, maybe if you could pan out. Maybe just center on Phoenix.

Another major concern, and it's -- you know, Commissioner Stertz talked about this a little yesterday. You know, how do we explain it to the public.

And CD 4 wraps almost entirely around Phoenix metro area, crosses the Superstitions, and then adds parts of suburbia, Pinal County to that river district.

Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, San Tan Valley, and
even Florence going into the river district.

    I don't think that, that arm on that district
needs to be there. It certainly destroys the compactness of
that district.

    And then my third major concern is something that
I talked about a lot yesterday is with CD 9 in that it
destroyes a community of interest on the legislative side.

    Since those are smaller districts, my concern was
that Paradise Valley, the Biltmore area, Arcadia area, the
greater Arcadia area, and perhaps the greater Biltmore area.
In the past I've talked about that part of the Madison
School District in north central Phoenix is a community of
interest.

    And there's will a lot of testimony as I look
through the record on that as well. Some of which I talked
about yesterday.

    I talked about the churches that line Lincoln and
the congregants who come from that area of the Valley.

    There's also a person who spoke a couple times,
Ken Miller, who came before the Commission, who talked about
their family has chosen to live in that community. And
whether it's fallen in the Biltmore, Arcadia, or Paradise
Valley area, it's one community. They've lived in homes in
each of those areas maps.

    And certainly that was another comment that really
resonated with me because that's been my own personal experience of 46 years living -- my family essentially living in that part of the state.

Paradise Valley has strong ties, and that area has strong ties to the north valley. We've had lots of comment on that.

Paradise Valley is joined with Phoenix in many respects in that fire services, used to be Rural Metro in Paradise Valley, but now it's Phoenix Fire. It's Phoenix water.

They're connected.

And the connection, having lived probably the majority of my life in Paradise Valley, is with parts to the north, directly to the north, along Tatum and the 51, and in the Arcadia-Biltmore area. That's where -- that's the community.

And, you know, again, talking, speaking of the volume of comment and people talking about their communities, the Commission has heard of lot of that, and I want to make sure those people are heard.

And, I mean, there are ways -- and obviously that district has -- I know it was designed with competitiveness in mind, but it destroys -- it does not respect communities of interest.

And in that part of Phoenix, that's a part of that
district, I think should go to the north. That's where it
belongs.

And the rest of nine could take most or all of
Scottsdale in to compensate for that.

If that wasn't palatable, perhaps there are other
ways to at least keep the Biltmore, Arcadia, and
Paradise Valley area, is my home, together and with its
north valley neighbors.

But that would be, I guess, my third major concern
with the congressional map that we're working on.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Ms. McNulty, did you have something?

I thought all the commissioners could at least
give initial thoughts on this combo map.

And then we actually have Mayor Jay Schlum from
the town of Fountain Hills, who wants to talk about
congressional districts. So I thought it would be good to
have him come up.

And if there is anybody else who wants to address
the Commission on congressional, they're welcome to do so at
this time too.

But we'll first hear from Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Thank you.

The combination map keeps the voting rights
districts intact, which I think is important.
I think Congressional District 7, the voting rights district, east of CD 9 is compact. And we worked very hard to make that an effective district.

The district to the east of CD 9, Congressional District 5 on Mr. Stertz's proposal that you've incorporated, I think makes a lot of sense.

We spent a lot of time looking at that east valley area. And, again, this is a compact district that makes a lot of sense in terms of those communities. I think it does a good job of keeping communities whole.

There are -- there is that split in San Tan Valley that I see on the southeast portion there, and another split on the north side of Mesa.

And I agree we should clean those up.

Congressional District 6, which is on the north side of Congressional District 9, I also think is an improvement over the draft map in the sense that it addresses what I had tried to address in my map, the concern that Fountain Hills had been separated from Scottsdale, and the kind of irregular shape that folks made fun of.

And this combines the Fort McDowell and Salt River reservations with Scottsdale and with Fountain Hills, and that's comment that we received.

Congressional District 8 on this map is more compact than on the map that I had proposed, and includes
Anthem and New River in an urban district, which I think is a good thing.

Again, the split of Peoria, I think was probably inadvertent. And I would suggest that we bring that up to the county line there, include that area of Peoria.

CD 9, which is in the middle of all of those districts, in my view, the districts around it are well constructed and they make a lot of sense. And CD 9 is a district that's comprised of much of the urban core, and has a lot in common for all the reasons I talked about last week and that I won't, I won't reiterate here.

On the issues of Marana and Oro Valley and Saddlebrooke, and so on, versus Cochise County, I think that -- we've heard a lot of comment from both. There, there -- this is a balance, again, as we've said so many times.

I think we have worked hard to keep Marana and Oro Valley and Saddlebrooke together.

And that was -- we've heard a tremendous amount of comment that that was what they wanted, or at least what the people in Saddlebrooke and Oro Valley wanted.

I think we've heard less comment from individuals in Marana than we have from Saddlebrooke and Oro Valley.

As I've said before, I don't think the definition of communities of interest is making sure that congressional
districts are homogenous. I think it's quite the opposite. I think we want them to be diverse, actually, and well balanced.

And I think that CD 1 as it's drawn on this map is well balanced.

There is a population hub in southern Arizona. There is kind of a population hub in eastern Arizona. There is a population hub in north Arizona.

But they're all, you know, modest in size, although they, they would each represent anchors in a largely rural district.

You know, I don't hear Flagstaff complain about Tucson being in a district with them, or how they don't have anything in common with Tucson.

And I just don't think that's the analysis that we need to do.

I do have some concerns about having a rural district that is half the size of the state.

I think it makes sense to have Cochise County with Pima County. It is now. It's worked well.

Davis-Monthan and Fort Huachuca have been represented together, and that's worked well, and I think makes sense.

As I said when you presented this map last week, I think we made a very substantial compromise in the
congressional map, or I feel that I did, when I
relinquished the possibility of pursuing a second
competitive district in the west central part of the
Maricopa County metro area.

And what we have now is a congressional map that
has four solidly Republican districts, two Democratic voting
rights districts, and three districts that are very, very
competitive, based on the definition that I've used, which
is that in an average year, given average candidates, either
of the major political parties would have opportunity to win
the seat.

And I think all the metrics that we've done, and
we've done a huge number of them, indicate that these
three districts, one, two, and nine, are very well balanced.

And for that reason I do not want to degrade the
competitiveness of Congressional District 2.

So I feel that the draft map created a good
balance.

I don't think we want to draw congressional
districts or make decisions based on political orientation.

I think a lot of what we heard from Saddlebrooke
and Oro Valley was based at least in part on a feeling of
community of interest based on political orientation.

And that's fine.

I mean, everyone has -- we all express our own
opinions, and I understand that.

But I don't think inclusion in a competitive
district of this nature will result in them not being
represented.

I think quite to the contrary. It will result in
everyone's voice in that district being heard, because
whoever, you know, has the fortune or misfortune to
represent that district is, is going to be all over it and
is going to have to pay attention to everybody in it,
including the folks in that area.

So those are my, those are my main reasons for
supporting what you put together.

I also do like the idea of the third, the third
congressional representative in or around Tucson. I think
from a southern Arizona perspective that's, that's a good
thing.

The other things I described are the main reasons
that I would like to retain the configuration we've got here
of CD 1, CD 2, and certainly CD 9.

Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

I'd like to ask Mayor Jay Schlum to come up. He's
from the town of Fountain Hills and wanted to address the
Commission on congressional districts.

MAYOR JAY SCHLUM: Thank you for coming here
today. I've been watching online.

Thanks for having here me today. Mayor Schlum,
town of Fountain Hills.

Thank you.
Chair and commissioners, thanks for your service.
I think I have an easier job, at least today.
I come understanding some of your constraints, but
also come quite grounded in my community, and that I think
as mayors we try to also use a great deal of common sense,
so I know the -- some of the things I'll be sharing will
come from that perspective.

The constraints you have I'll address as well, and
talk about obviously the original draft map, I'll be
alluding to. And then perhaps if there's a chance we could
pull up what you guys are considering today so I could be
more aware of what you're looking at today.

But, previously was here before you, and brought a
resolution from our town council, from our town of
Fountain Hills. And those items are still relevant today in
relation to the draft map.

We certainly appreciate the western cities along
the Colorado River and enjoy them tremendously, but we
are -- certainly have little in common with those
communities.

And would like to be at least included with some
of our neighbors in our congressional district.

Currently we are not with any of our neighbors and
are with very few communities within even our own county.

So we'd love to remain with our communities of
interest in Scottsdale, Fort McDowell, Salt River, and of
course the unincorporated areas, Rio Verde, and perhaps even
Goldfield Ranch. All neighbors of ours today. They will be
neighbors tomorrow. It would be great to have the same
congressional representation there.

We also share resources, memorandums of
understanding, cooperation with resources used. And also
our kids from different areas all come to Fountain Hills
from Fort McDowell, from Goldfield Ranch.

Rio Verde shops in our towns.

Fountain Hills is, in essence, their home town as
well. They just reside in Rio Verde, just to the north of
the park from us.

And then of course there's Scottsdale, who we
share a great deal in common with. Not just our borders,
but also a lot of resources and cooperative efforts related
to transportation.

I mentioned Fort McDowell. We do visitor's bureau
with them. We cooperate on them with tourism. And on a
bunch of different other areas we cooperate with one
another.
Their school children go to our schools as well.

So related to your constraints, the geographic
territory I think speaks for itself from the draft map.

It certainly is a great distance from the western
cities along the river.

So I'm not certain that that constraint has been
adhered to.

I've spoken about our communities of common
interest and our strong ties to one another in many
respects. The Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation just to note is
a very near neighbor of ours, right across the fence. There
are homes on each side.

And as I mention, our councils are very close and
also we share resources to promote our communities in a
joint effort.

The children of Fort McDowell also largely come to
the school district in Fountain Hills.

And our communities surrounding us also share
in great deal a major infrastructure as well in projects
that will require regional and federal efforts to work with
our representation -- representatives for common causes
there.

The current boundaries in the draft map from a
month ago don't put us in with our neighbors, and we would
like to respectfully request that that be changed.
The shape and the extreme diverse and remote geographic locations of major metropolitan centers of the proposed district originally number four create substantial difficulties for a representative elected from one portion to be familiar with or even physically reach our area as well.

We have great relationship with our surrounding communities, particularly with respect to their interconnected open and recreational spaces, and we respectfully ask that the Commission continue to consider the appropriate changes that would allow us to be with our neighboring communities, Fountain Hills with Scottsdale, Fort McDowell, Rio Verde, and Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian community as well.

So, thank you for your hard work, and hopefully we can get somewhere that makes sense for Fountain Hills as well.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you, mayor.

MAYOR JAY SCHLUM: Is there any chance to look at the map, or do you want to --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes. If you don't mind staying there.

And, Mr. Desmond, if you could just zoom in on where Fountain Hills is currently.

This isn't -- these are just adjustments we're
considering making to the draft map that was approved and try to address that concern here with Fountain Hills.

WILLIE DESMOND: So Fountain Hills is this area right here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So it's currently in six as we've got it.

WILLIE DESMOND: In the combo map it's in six. In the McNulty map it would also be in six. In the Stertz map it's also in six.

MAYOR JAY SCHLUM: I'm trying to see the differences in those. I don't see a great deal of difference in those.

How far south does that travel down to south Scottsdale?

WILLIE DESMOND: It's on Thomas Road.

MAYOR JAY SCHLUM: So most of Scottsdale. And it looks like it captures Rio Verde.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes.

MAYOR JAY SCHLUM: And both of Fort McDowell and the Pima Maricopa Indian communities.

That's the first time I've seen it.

So, it looks -- it's certainly improved from the draft map, which of course didn't include anyone except for perhaps Rio Verde to our north.

WILLIE DESMOND: The draft map was this green
Okay. There we go.

Certainly an improvement from that, from my perspective, given the number of items we've talked about.

And how far west does that travel? Is it towards the 51 or Interstate 17?

Just west of. . .

WILLIE DESMOND: 43rd Avenue.

And a portion of 35th and then a portion of 17.

MAYOR JAY SCHLUM: You do have some difficult constraints obviously going that far west brings up probably some different communities of interest, rather than continuing further south, but -- perhaps further.

And to the north that's further tip of Scottsdale I'm assuming there.

Well, any feedback from myself specifically you're looking for other than what I shared with you? And I appreciate the efforts here to improve it.

I'm just not sure, given the short amount of time to review this, how much further to the south we might consider the most appropriate map, and less towards the west, but had you have discussions related to that previously? I suspect you've had discussions related to any boundary that may be possible in the past.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We try to follow geographic
boundaries and city and municipal lines when possible, county lines. Those are part of our constitutional criteria.

We're not always able to do that.

We also follow major transportation corridors. The I-17 is used as a divider, I know, in the legislative map.

And you can see we kind of tried to follow the Salt River boundary down there, but ended up having to dip in Mesa. And I can't recall the reason for that, if it's strictly population or what.

If anybody has any thoughts on that, or better memory.

WILLIE DESMOND: The dip into Mesa comes from Commissioner Stertz's District 6.

So, that's not in the draft map obviously.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz might have...

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, Mr. Desmond, it might be, it might be helpful if you turned on the streets layer, at least the major streets layer, so you can see highways.

Commissioner Herrera suggested pull that corner of Mesa out and take it from six to go to five.

As a population offset, it would be practical to go to below Thomas Road and pick up -- and make Scottsdale
whole, into that district.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So you're saying to swap this for making Scottsdale whole?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yeah, there's a small --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Right.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: -- just a small piece of Scottsdale that's remaining.

My recollection is that the -- they were fairly close on -- that gets our school districts back in -- back contained. Mesa stays whole.

Scottsdale would become whole.

MAYOR JAY SCHLUM: Chair, the current district continues quite a ways to the south, as I recall; correct? Into Tempe and through Tempe perhaps.

And I know it's not a constraint for you to consider going forward, but as far as communities of interest, I'm just not sure how far west -- I know you're grabbing population as you go and some other constraints you have, I just hadn't known if there had been considerations to continue the district further to the south.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes, we talked about that at excruciating length with regard to that district. And we heard a lot of input that the area of south Scottsdale
that's south of Thomas Road was different from the area
north of Thomas Road and was a good fit with the District 9
that we put together.

    So we did spend a lot of time on that, that
endeavor.

    MAYOR JAY SCHLUM: My alma mater is south of
Thomas Road. We were bused there from Fountain Hills.

    I can understand. It's certainly a bit older
area, where Scottsdale began further to the south.

    Just you're also going quite a bit to the west.

    So there's obviously an offset there.

    I appreciate this effort. I'll review this
further, and if this is where you end up today, and look for
some more dialogue.

    Any questions for me?

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any questions for the mayor?

    COMMISSIONER McNULTY: No.

    MAYOR JAY SCHLUM: Again, thank you. Thank you
very much.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

    Was there anyone else who wanted to talk to us
about congressional district maps?

    Oh, I do have somebody.

    Linda Kavanagh, representing self --

    VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm sorry, Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I mean, I think if we take public testimony, it's probably a good idea -- I don't know if we have any elected officials in the audience -- at least one elected official -- but it's a good reminder for everyone speaking in front of the Commission not to release any addresses, whether you're an elected official or not. It's just in our best interest if you avoid doing that.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: If you can just tell us the city or county in which you reside, that would be great.

LINDA KAVANAGH: I remember that from last time.

Hi. I'm Linda Kavanagh. Fountain Hills.

The current placement of Fountain Hills in the river district was criticized by many, including the Arizona Republic.

It violated the criteria of compactness and respect for communities of interest.

As you know, I have spoken here before about undoing this.

I'm -- just wanted to say that I'm glad that the new proposal you're considering now restores Fountain Hills to the congressional district with our neighbor Scottsdale.

I hope that whatever final version that you choose keeps Fountain Hills in a Maricopa congressional district.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Gary Bohnee, representing Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian community.

GARY BOHNEE: Good morning -- or good afternoon, Madam Chair and members of the Commission. It's a pleasure to be here today.

And I really just wanted to reiterate the comments of Mayor Schlum with regard to the inclusion of the town of Fountain Hills into proposed District No. 6 and --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm sorry to interrupt you. Do you just mind spelling your name for the record.

GARY BOHNEE: Oh, Gary, G-A-R-Y, Bohnee, B, as in boy, O-H-N-E-E.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

GARY BOHNEE: Again, just wanted to reiterate the comments from Mayor Schlum of the inclusion of the town of Fountain Hills into District 6 and then also just to point of reference a letter that was provided to the Commission on November 7th from the three metro tribe -- tribal leaders from the Salt River Indian community, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, and the Gila River Indian community, enunciating a number of different items, but in particular on the congressional action to support that effort.

And I would just say I would hope that the
Commission would in their final mapping leave the district I guess as it is proposed today.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Was there anyone else in the public who wanted to talk to the Commission about congressional districts?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Mr. Freeman, did you have something?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, there was discussion of the split of Scottsdale.

And as I recall, the original discussion along those lines concerned a split a little bit north of that. It was either Camelback or Chaparral was the suggested split.

And if the time and thought had been put into arriving at that boundary would hold today, I mean, it would easily accommodate at least keeping the Paradise Valley, Arcadia, Biltmore community of interest together with the north valley, and that would be, I think, an easy population swap.

And although it would not completely satisfy me, because I think that all of that Phoenix area belongs with Phoenix and not with Scottsdale and Tempe, they have diametrically different interests. We've heard from
the mayor of Tempe even who has illustrated those very
distinct differences and interests that those two
communities have.

So, I mean, that would be my first choice, which
would be to swap Tempe for the Phoenix component of CD 9.

But short of that, at least moving that line north
so that the community of interest where I hail from can be
kept together would be my preference.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Comments from other
commissioners?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I think we've
discussed CD 9 at great length. I believe we've drawn the
line in Scottsdale in a place that makes sense.

The mayor of Tempe talked about a discrete issue
concerning airports, and suggested that the two towns would
have different perspectives on that, but that happens with
congressional representatives multiple times every day.

As I've talked about previously, three of the
mayors in that congressional district work together to
publish a piece about the light rail and the future of urban
development and how they're cooperating together on that in
the urban core.

So I -- we can point to a number of areas in which
they're collaborating also.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I think it was on -- today is -- I think it was -- was it Friday? Where Commissioner McNulty went to great lengths to describe or to put together a nice composition of why she had created District 9 the way it was.

And I think I asked our IT person, Buck Forst, to be able to enter that information on the record, put it online.

I think that was well written, gave it a nice description of why she ended up doing it that way. And I think it was compelling. I think it was an extremely compelling reason why nine looks the way it does.

And I would encourage any members of the public that weren't there to listen to Commissioner McNulty explain the reasons behind the look of CD 9 to be able to read that information, because I think it's -- if anybody is not convinced, I think that information probably would sway them, that CD 9 is good the way she put it together.

I think it's -- again, she gave compelling reasons, and, again, I would encourage people to read that information.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I would also ask them to look at the map.

I mean, we have compact, cohesive districts that
surround it also.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I -- just for the record, I disagree with the characterization of the mayor of Tempe's statements.

It was a little bit broader than simply -- it was a lot broader than simply the airport issue.

And with respect to the justification for CD 9, I think it should -- I don't think that is a compact district.

I do believe it rends asunder communities of interest. And I think there should be no need for elaborate circumlocutions as to the justification, after-the-fact justification for the construction of this pre-designed district. It should be self-evident to the people of the valley, and I just don't agree with the construction of that district.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman, was that a question for Ms. O'Grady?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: No, that was me -- my disagreement with, first of all, the mayor, Hugh Hallman, did not just focus simply on the airport issue.

I know the acoustics in here are horrible.

But, and with respect to CD 9, I don't think -- I think the district should stand on their own. They should
not require some sort of post-talk elaborate justification
for your construction.

They should make sense and make sense to the
people of this state.

And that district does not make sense to me. And
it destroys that community of interest I've talked a lot
about.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: You know, the -- I think the
only reason Commissioner McNulty came up with the -- that
length explanation for CD 9 was because of the criticism of
Commissioner Freeman.

It wasn't -- she didn't create it before that.

She created it after the fact to make sure that he -- I
mean, she, Commissioner McNulty, is able to address any of
Commissioner Freeman's concerns.

And I think she did a, a job that was, again,
 thorough, using all of the state-mandated criteria. She
explained how she did it.

And, again, I would really remind the
commissioners that it is a balancing act, and it's not going
to be easy.

Sometimes I think that these -- the four
state-mandated criteria, they -- they end up conflicting with each other.

You're not going to get a perfect looking district, but you're going to get one that Commissioner McNulty created that balances all four. And she balanced them all.

And, again, it was a great explanation of how she came up with it.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: When I put together my map and presented last Thursday, as you recall, I chose to not touch obviously because we as a Commission sort of loosely have said let's not touch the edges of majority-minority districts, which are three and seven.

I also chose not to touch District 9, because that has been sort of the -- it's, it's been debated so long, and it's known that I've got a disagreement with the way it was crafted, and I don't need to repeat that any longer.

It's -- Commissioner McNulty has laid her case on. We've disagreed. These are opinions that we have a difference of.

But what I want to -- what I'm looking at right now is that at the same time while I was doing that, I'm going back and saying, listen, folks, I've got, I've got
Oro Valley and Marana and Saddlebrooke that are part of the city of Tucson, and they deserve to be part of the city of Tucson.

And I presented a map it was a -- it was creating a mechanism to be able to do that.

So I'm taking this in a way of -- frankly it's like, it's like we've heard so much testimony saying let's keep this with the city of Tucson. I can't -- I've not heard one thing from the Commission at all that can say, yeah, it really makes sense to be able to pull these communities out.

I haven't heard anybody of -- any of the residents saying that they wanted to be pulled out, except for one tiny piece of testimony that took place from one person that has been offset by resolutions from both -- from Oro Valley, from Marana, from Saddlebrooke, from people within the community, from community groups wanting to connect with the city of Tucson.

They want representation that is within urban Tucson.

Okay?

They are part of the urban fabric of Tucson.

And when I put that proposal together, I left nine untouched.

And I did that because -- out of purely out of
respect for what has been worked hard and has really been
argued, you know, by the Commissioners McNulty and Herrera
when they placed and designed that designer district,
District 9.

I said I'll leave that.

But I can't go back to the folks back in
Oro Valley and Marana and say that this makes any sense that
they're in a community that is connected that wraps around
the other side of the state.

I can't comprehensively get my arms around that.

I can get my arms around that Cochise County is a
predominantly rural district and it fits in a predominantly rural district. I can get my arms around that.

But the rest of it, but the rest it, I can't.

So I am -- if, if the path that we're going down
is that, that Oro Valley and Marana are extracted out of
Tucson by creating this divot in Pima County, and those communities are fractured, which they are by having representation that will not be from their -- the general area -- I love the idea that you've got an urban Tucson area that connects 710,224 people of like mind, of like energy, that go all the way down to pick up -- pick up the base, pick up urban Tucson, go all the way out up through the suburbs of Tucson. And that makes a very nice, practical, organized district for representation.
That I can support.

Like I said, I was, I was willing to instead of continuing to go down the argument of whether or not CD 9 was designed in a particular way, that horse is beaten and buried right now as far as I'm concerned.

You guys have -- the three of you have felt comfortable with that as being an untouchable district.

It's been put on the record by the chair that once CD 9 is put into place in the draft map that we weren't going to touch anything around it.

I've come up with a very -- series of practical solutions, which I appreciate Commissioners McNulty and Herrera applauding those, where I have -- through District 6 have now put Fountain Hills back with Scottsdale where it should be, and District 8, made the -- made it into a more compact district, and took -- and removed out the rural aspect of, of, of that district, and placed that rural side back in the rest of District 4.

Do I still disagree that four shouldn't be wrapping around the entire Maricopa County and picking up the San Tan Valley?

Yeah.

That -- logically that's something that is very -- is much more difficult to get my arms around.

But, of all of these that I can't get my arms
around at all, that's bifurcating these three cities from urban Tucson.

And I am going to suggest, and I will wrap this right here and say, if we're going down that path I can't support it.

We've got, we've got balanced districts right now. I would like to see us move forward on the congressional map with the Congressional District 2 as I had designed, which includes Oro Valley and Marana, and puts Cochise County, a predominantly rural county, in the rural district.

Yes, it does make it a large district, but it is about the same size as it currently exists, and it has operated that way for the last ten years.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: You know, I did -- as I stated, the areas in the Mathis combo map that I liked, there was three areas, Commissioner Stertz, that you have implemented, again, six, eight, and four, that I did like. And, and one and two that I -- that I really admired from Commissioner McNulty's map.

And that, to me, I think you saw that as a compromise. And I don't disagree.

What I want to remind the Commission, when we had created the -- when we had adopted the draft map -- and if,
Mr. Desmond, can you bring up the working draft map for the congressional map?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Is that the one?

In particular can you focus on CD 1?

The -- I'm certain that I've heard, I think, all the commissioners, including Stertz and Freeman, talk about how just a large mass of area that District 1 was covering, including touching the Mexican border.

And I -- actually I didn't disagree with them. I thought it was a large district. And I, you know, I'm -- I was okay with keeping it the way the -- this, this version looks like. But I'm, I'm looking at a compromise, which the compromise is making CD 1 more compact.

And it's something that I know Commissioner Stertz and Freeman wanted to do.

And what Commissioner McNulty ended up doing, she ended up listening to that -- to those -- to that explanation of keeping CD 1 a little more compact, definitely more compact than it is now. And that's what she ended up doing.

And, as I said, Commissioner Stertz and Freeman did want to make it more compact.

So I would be opposed to the -- changing the way that CD 2 -- the way CD 1 -- the way Commissioner McNulty
has drafted it.

And also that would mean, I think Commissioner Stertz had mentioned, if, if, if we adopted the -- Commissioner Stertz's map, we would have to mess with three, and keep CD 1 the way he has it in his map. And I would be opposed to doing either one.

So I, again, I would support Commissioner McNulty's one and two in the Mathis combo map, and I would support six, eight, four from Stertz's map.

Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Just to correct one thing, you did not hear me talk about the compactness.

If you want to go ahead and run a search on the record, you won't find it.

Indeed, the whole counties map that I had prepared back in August and September, which was based on very simple instructions given to the mapping consultant during public hearing, to adjust the grid map based on constitutional criteria that I called out, and the first one I called out was adjust the grid lines so that they sort of maximize respect for county lines.

I didn't know how that map would end up looking. And in some respects it was how the map ended up perhaps
would be dependent upon the grid map that the Commission
developed.

        And the grid map, just so everyone knows, the old
CDs goes away and this Commission starts with a grid map,
which is nine districts constructed simply based on
compactness and equal population.

        And then the Constitution says we're to take
those lines, the lines of the grid map, and adjust them,
adjust the grid lines based on the application of
six constitutional criteria.

        So that was the first one I called out, which was,
you know, respect county lines. Then that map ended up
being called the whole counties map.

        But I didn't know how it would turn out looking.

        But, indeed, as the map developed, and it was
developed, again, based on objective, neutral criteria found
in the constitution.

        Cochise County was kept whole, but it was kept
with eastern Arizona -- rural eastern Arizona.

        So that district, that included the, the -- at
least where that map, the whole counties map, where it
ended -- it was never completed -- ended with the
reservation, the Navajo reservation portion of
Coconino County, all of Navajo County, all of Apache County,
I believe it included all of Gila County, Graham, Greenlee,
all of Cochise County, and the non-reservation portions of Pinal County, were all kept whole and together.

So that is, that's a district that looks -- well, there are significant differences to how Commissioner Stertz's compromises map looked. But, the one similarity is it included Cochise County with our eastern district.

So, I agree, compactness is a constitutional criteria. It needs to be considered. But that's not something that I was talking about with respect to this eastern Arizona district.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

It doesn't sound like there's going to be a lot of agreement down in the southeast corner of the map.

I'm wondering if we can go back, Mr. Desmond, to the combo map, and just look at that for the whole Maricopa area and four just to -- Mr. Stertz, do you have something?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Before you say we've exhausted talking about the southeast corner of the state --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, I'm not saying we're done talking about it. I just, I just thought maybe we could work on some areas where there's a little bit more --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm trying to get my arms around what -- again, I'm trying to get my arms around what the, what the, what the predominant disagreement is.
The -- when we look at registration, when we look at -- there is a very minor adjustment between the McNulty southeast corner and the Stertz southeast corner for Congressional District 2.

It is, it is favored every so slightly depending upon the indices to a Republican, but it would stay, for all, for all purposes, it would stay an incredibly competitive district.

Other than the -- other than Cochise County, which is, again, a predominantly rural county, being pulled in, why would we pull away these cities that are tightly aligned with the city of Tucson, urban Tucson, away from urban Tucson for their congressional representation?

There's -- I can't -- if it was -- if my design took Congressional District 2 and it turned into a hard R district where it was only going to be a Republican that was going to be elected there, I could see an argument.

I cannot, I cannot get my head around why this is such a, a -- there's such a high level of disagreement about, and there continues to be, to pull out these cities away from urban Tucson.

What in the world could possibly be the reason why to pull these cities out.

And I can't find one, so I'd like somebody to try to explain that to me, about why these cities want to be
pulled away from where, from where the core of their
community, where they grew from.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: The -- first I begin by
saying that the semantics aren't exactly correct.

We aren't pulling anyone from anywhere. Everyone
will stay in the same place. All we're doing is providing a
district which is balanced in which a representative will
need to pay very close attention to the concerns of the
constituents because it's truly a competitive district.

The Tucson metropolitan area is too big to be in
one district.

It is already in two districts. And as Mr. Stertz
knows, he and I live three blocks from the boundary of a
district.

And we aren't pulled anywhere.

We have two representatives in Tucson who do, you
know, depending on who you talk to, a pretty good job of
representing the interest of Tucson.

All we're talking about is having three
representatives who share the job of representing over a
million people. And that number is going to grow in the
next ten years, I'm sure.

There are three main, I guess, population hubs in
District 1. One is this Pinal County, northern Arizona -- I mean, northern metropolitan Tucson area.

    Another is eastern Arizona.

    And the third is northern Arizona.

    I think that's -- I think it's well balanced, and I think it makes sense.

    It needs to be either because of the population balancing Cochise County or northwestern Arizona.

    Cochise County is currently in CD 2.

    It's worked well there. The military reservations are both there. They share common interests. They've taken advantage of that, I think, in their representation.

    As I said earlier, we're not talking -- our job is not to create homogenous districts. It's to create districts that have balance and diversity.

    And I don't think we are pulling them away from anywhere.

    I think what we are doing is giving them a voice.

    As I said earlier, no one in northern Arizona is complaining about being with, being with us or being pulled away to us.

    I just don't think that's the correct analysis.

    I also think it makes a lot of sense not to add another 6600 square miles to Congressional District 1.

    There are a lot of ties between Tucson and
Cochise County.

So you could look at this either way. You could -- you can look at it from two perspectives, and that's my perspective.

In terms of the competitiveness issue in CD 2, I'll say once again that I feel that a significant compromise was made when we relinquished the possibility of a fourth competitive district in Maricopa County.

We have three very balanced districts right now, and I do not support the notion of degrading the competition in Congressional District 1, even if it's one point.

I don't, I don't support that.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Both Commissioner McNulty and myself have been talking about the importance of competitive districts and what it means to those people living there.

I think nobody would disagree when you have competitive districts, you are -- your voice is more likely to be heard.

Whether they elect someone that is from the opposite party, that individual that represents that particular district that is competitive needs to listen to all voices in order to get reelected.
Because, as you know, that's what competition means. Competition means that you as a Democrat, as a Republican can lose your seat at the next election. Because it allows anyone from whatever party to be able to compete in an election.

So that individual that is elected from two, District 2, the way it is right now, as we have it in the Mathis combo map, District 9 -- District 1 is as close to 50/50 as we can get it.

And it's -- that means that those people in those districts will have their voices heard.

I don't think anyone in those districts will not have somebody representing them. Because, again, I think competition, that's what competition means. And I think that that was a point of when we created those districts.

And, again, I think Commissioner McNulty has stated we as Democrats and those that care about competition did compromise.

From the beginning we were talking about the fourth competitive districts in Maricopa County, and we didn't get that.

And we ended up getting, even though based on the Mathis combo map, four strongly Republican districts. Two districts that are majority minority, that lean Democratic because, you know, they're minority districts, and then
three districts that are competitive.

And that's -- to me it's a huge compromise. It's a huge compromise from what people wanted in the beginning.

I think we were hearing from the beginning that we could easily get four competitive districts, and we tried to do that. But, again, we ended up compromising, which is -- I don't think there was anybody in this Commission that compromised more than we did by giving up that fourth competitive district.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, one more point.

As important I think is that when we were in Sierra Vista, we heard folks from Cochise County making the same comment, that they were concerned that they weren't going to be represented because CD 2 was so huge, and they didn't want to be with Flagstaff, and when would the representative make it all the way down to the border, and how would a representative of Flagstaff care about border issues.

So, you know, we have this, I think, the same concerns being expressed from both groups of people.

And in the, in the end, I come down where I come down, that it makes more sense to make CD 1 a little smaller, keep Cochise County with a southern Arizona district to give Tucson the benefit of having the third
You know, we did hear a lot of comment from Saddlebrooke particularly and also Oro Valley. And we got two form letters from those folks. Two different forms of form letters. And we got dozens of them, maybe, maybe a couple hundred of them.

And one said -- I left them in my file. I should go get them.

That it was extremely rare that they came to Tucson.

And the other one said, you know, something more or less along those lines.

Which isn't to say that they don't have a connection with Tucson, but which is to say that of the two issues that they expressed, one being that the three communities stay together and the other being that the district -- that they were concerned about the district they were in, there was far more concern on the part of the folks that wrote from Saddlebrooke and Oro Valley that they be together, and be together with Marana, than there was that they be in a particular congressional district.

And so for that reason too I feel that this is a good compromise, and that Congressional District 1 makes sense.

So you asked, you know, how anyone could view it
that way.

And so that's the way I have set this all out again, because that is how I view it.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And, Commissioner McNulty, I think that your -- we're both making -- I think we're both making compelling arguments.

But there's one argument that we, that we haven't really made, and one of the things you just brought up, that nobody up in Flagstaff is, is complaining.

One of the things they might want to really think about is that in that little area right there, there are, there are 300,000 people living now in that little corner of that extraordinarily large district.

So one of the things they might want to consider is that -- that that district right now, which right now has been -- for a long time has been predominantly the political hub of that rural district, is probably going to move, whereas the potential to move all the way down into that little part of Tucson right there, which is at McGee and Oracle.

There is quite a -- with 300 population in that little zone right there, that is going to become quite a political force.
So, hasten to say that this area up here might be a little surprised as time goes on about where the -- where their representation is going to be.

So, by having this large compression of population now in a very small geographic area, which is one of the -- one of the other reasons why I tried to break this up, not only to be able to keep this community intact, but also to try to give some representation up into this area where the possibility to elect may come from the Navajo Nation, might come from the city of Flagstaff, might come from, from a part of Pinal.

Now it really has got a greater opportunity about coming from 100,000 population there and the 200,000 population there.

So, we've talked this, we've talked this thing around.

It's, Madam Chair, it's going to be your decision to make about where these are going to end up.

And from my perspective is that we have, we have -- unless we, unless we start looking at breaking up the CD 9 and start relooking at that, looking at other areas within the greater Maricopa County area, which is going to end up just being a -- an ongoing and perpetual dispute between, between, between the sides -- because we are looking at this philosophically the way that CD 9 was
crafted.

I read -- I went through and I listened to Commissioner McNulty's testimony. I understood it clearly. That was something that was crafted around the design of CD 9.

You can't disagree with her opinion on that. It's her opinion. So I'm -- that's her opinion. It is what it is.

So, those are, those are my salient points. My salient points are that I believe from a representation point of view we might end up with a large representative here and we might end up -- all the folks up here might end up getting much less travel in their, in their -- from their representative than they currently have. And, and that would be a shame.

So if you're going to move forward on the map as it currently is done, let's, let's go.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: You know, I -- that's what I like about competition, that you -- no one knows where that representative will be -- in that district, District 1, the way it is, where that representative will come from.

And I think Mr. Stertz -- Commissioner Stertz made my point that, you know, when you have a competitive
district, that forces the individual running for office, whether they're a Democrat, Republican, Green Party, that they're going to have to campaign. They're going have to campaign, and that's what they should do. They're going to campaign in that area of Pinal. They're going to have to campaign in the middle of that district and also north of that district.

And that's what we wanted when we created that district.

I didn't want to create a district that will allow Flagstaff to have -- guarantee them a representative. We never said that.

And I think the city of Flagstaff people and throughout that district in District 1 understand that, that they're not assured a representative from their particular area. But what they are assured is a -- hopefully a, a representative that will represent the entire district.

Because it is a competitive district.

And it might switch from, from the Flagstaff area to south of that every two years. And that's exactly what we wanted. We didn't want a safe district from someone to -- for a particular party. We wanted a district that will force people to campaign.

And I'm happy for that. And that's exactly what
we wanted.

And another point. You know, when we were in Marana and I would hear people talk about them not having anything in common with Tucson, that they don't shop there, I even jokingly -- I forgot who I told. I go, you know what, I don't believe that they don't go to Tucson.

I even said I'm going to follow one of these people one of these weekends, and I'm going to guarantee that I'm going to see them in Tucson, and I'm going to surprise them, do you remember me, you said you don't go to Tucson, and here you are.

So I remember those comments, and I remember saying that.

I mean, I didn't say that to them, but I'm like, really, they don't shop in Tucson.

So that's, I mean, and I heard that testimony, and I thought it was overwhelming.

So, again, I just wanted to state that I think we've made a lot of progress in the congressional map compromising, compromising a lot in my opinion.

So I'm looking forward to hopefully reaching consensus or at least reaching a conclusion that I like certain areas of Stertz's map, as I mentioned, six, eight, and four, as he created them, and I like the way Commissioner McNulty created one and two.
And, again, I'm hoping that we can reach consensus and it's a 5-0 vote. But if not, then I think all of us made a compelling argument of why we like certain areas or why we don't.

But, again, if we don't agree, that's -- we have our own different opinions. And it would be nice to be able to reach consensus. But if we don't, I'm willing to vote for what I think is the right thing for the state of Arizona.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: A couple things.

The Arizona Supreme Court in analyzing Prop 106 says that it means -- the proposition means what it says, and there are six mandatory criteria we are to apply in adjusting the grid map.

The six criteria being the competitiveness criteria, which it referred to as mandatory and conditional, the only criteria being conditional. The six criteria don't talk about balanced districts or diverse districts.

It means what it says.

And in supplying the six criteria, you might end up with a district that someone might regard as diverse, someone might regard as balanced, and in some sense however
that's defined.

But you might not.

I don't think it's our prerogative to sort of create new criteria out of thin air.

As for CD 1, it is not a competitive district.

And just to illustrate what's going on here, is that the congressman that currently represents the majority of that area that is contained within the new CD 1 is in a competitive district that it changed political hands a couple times in the last decade.

I believe he won the last election with less than 50 percent of the vote.

That tells you how razor thin it is in that district.

Well, now in constructing the new district over and around that area, a lot more Democrats have been piled in.

In fact, the registration advantage is close to 10 percent in favor of the Democrats in that district, and that's deemed competitive.

However, if anything is done to touch CD 9 in urban Maricopa County where the registration is closer than 10 percent, that is forbidden.

I know the Democrats will say, well, a lot of our voters, registered voters don't turn out and vote in that
part of state.

    Well, I think another aspect of competition is
rewarding success, not punishing success.

    That's what is going on here.

    The scales are being manipulated to get a desired
political result.

    I think this Commission's job isn't to decide how
many Republican districts there are, how many Democratic
districts there are.

    It's just to apply the six constitutional
criteria.

    But I have serious concerns that we haven't
followed those criteria, and what the people of this state
are going to wake up is a state where there is roughly
30 percent registered Democrats, roughly 35 percent
registered Republicans, it's not one third, one third, one
third, there is a material gap there of about roughly
five percent, and in a state that is subject to Section 5 of
the Voting Rights Act, which means we have to on the
congressional side create two voting rights districts, and
in creating those districts you end up as a collateral
effect putting a lot of Democrats into those two
districts, which means in the other seven districts, the
registration difference between the two parties is much
greater, on the order of plus 10 percent, maybe even as much
as 15 percent.

You really have to manipulate the map to come up with the scenario that we have now, which I'm afraid is a map that creates five Democratic seats and four very solid Republican seats.

So the state will have been flipped by virtue of this map.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herder, how are you?
THE REPORTER: Whatever you need.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Why don't we take just a ten-minute break.

Amazingly, an hour and a half has already gone by. It's 2:34 p.m. We'll be back in ten minutes.
(Brief recess taken.)
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We'll enter back into public session.
The time is 3:01 p.m.
I've gotten a number of request to speak forms. And some of the folks need to leave early and yet they want to provide input on the legislative maps, so I thought it would be good to just cover them, get everybody while they can still be here. They've taken the time to come, so let's hear what they have to say.

And if I could remind everybody when they come up to the microphone to please spell your last name for our
court reporter.

Our next speaker is Diane Landis, representing self, from Litchfield Park.

DIANE LANDIS: Thank you. Diane Landis, L-A-N-D-I-S.

I'm a council member with the city of Litchfield Park. And I would like to see the map for Litchfield Park, please.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Are you able to pull that up, Mr. Desmond, the legislative?

DIANE LANDIS: I can tell you what the issue is, if you cannot.

There are two -- it looks like it may come up.

There are two pieces in Litchfield Park that are not in the same district, but there's no population in those two pieces, and so I'm hoping that you can put them together.

Those two pieces have no population.

Thank you.

Litchfield Park is in 13. And these two pieces are in 29, but they have no population, so I'm asking, and we sent a resolution, that you combine those into 13, please.

And, again, it should be a very simple fix, because there's no population.
And I would like to see the rest of 13, if I may. What I'm curious is do we still go to the California border?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

DIANE LANDIS: We do.

And I'd like to ask why, because our communities of interest are our surrounding cities. We have Goodyear providing our fire. We are very close to Avondale. This is Diane Landis citizen talking.

We're, we're very close to Avondale, Goodyear, all of these other cities, and we have nothing in common with the California border or even parts of Yuma that you've got us in. So I'd be curious why you've done that.

But, again, the immediate -- the one huge fix if you could would be to combine all of Litchfield Park into one district.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any questions, comments?

Okay. Our next speaker is --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sorry. Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I have a quick comment. I would -- the -- what you're experiencing is what I just went through for the last hour and a half in discussing
Saddlebrooke, Oro Valley, and Marana, that you are part of a
district legislatively that you have no affiliation with and
no tie to.

So you -- that, that is the argument you just
heard me making on the congressional point of view.

I as a commissioner cannot give you an answer
about why you're connected to the California border, as I
cannot give the same answer to the constituents and the
folks that live in Marana about why they're connected to
Window Rock.

DIANE LANDIS: I think it's the legislative map,
maybe the congressional map, I'm not sure, there's a claw
that comes around.

Is that the legislative map?

WILLIE DESMOND: It's the congressional.

DIANE LANDIS: That's the congressional. Okay.

That's another issue. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

I would just say that I think the problem is that
we have this equal population requirement in all the
districts, and that's federal law.

And in order to comply with that, we've been
challenged, as Mr. -- Mayor Schlum said earlier,
constrained, and that's a perfect word. There are only so
many things we can do.
And we've tried as a Commission to keep rural areas rural and urban areas urban.

And I remember being at one of the hearings, and I think it was Eagar, where somebody suggested why don't you just have a hub and spoke design on the map, because then it's just like a big pie, and each, each area comes into the urban area to get the population it needs to meet the equal population requirement.

And there was a lot of booing when that happened. And people don't like that.

And yet it's super hard to get enough people in those rural areas without having to also compromise the other criteria of compactness. And it's just something that we faced all along.

One of the constraints is our state borders. We're not -- we can't really go outside of those, because it would be great to go across the Colorado River and get those rural communities, but that's not really an option either, but -- so it's just kind of a matter of balance.

And you're also up against -- 13 is right next to four, which is a voting rights district, I think, and that also -- provides another big constraint in terms of what we can do with the lines.

But I appreciate your input on the Litchfield Park matter.
Our next speaker is Representative Richard Miranda, Arizona -- representing Arizona Minority Coalition, from Tolleson.

REPRESENTATIVE RICHARD MIRANDA: Thank you.


And thank you, I appreciate, because I was here before you started at 1:00, and I really need to get going.

I think the only concern that we would have is the kind of developments that have happened over the last seven days as far as 27, with the idea out there that somehow -- I'm glad that we still have Guadalupe in 27, but the idea that moving parts of that Phoenix area, I think, 48th Street and 32nd, into Tempe, and extending south Phoenix area all the way out to Scottsdale Road and Roosevelt would somehow make DOJ much more satisfied that somehow or other you would think that 26 is now a minority-majority district.

I think those are -- those assumptions are off base.

I think that DOJ would not really consider a two percent increase, if I understand, because each map is -- and the data that just went online this morning, I don't think that the two percent really makes an impact.

And I don't think that the DOJ would, would consider that as a minority-majority district, even if you
take old 14, and has a minority-majority district that's
even voting Arizona at minority population candidates on
their own.

But, anyway, getting back to 27, contacting some
of the folks that live in south Phoenix, some of them are
working so they just cannot get here.

I encourage them to e-mail, to get their, their
ideas, thoughts, on what extending out to Scottsdale Road
and Roosevelt would make them feel.

I don't know why that, why that somehow or another
DOJ is going to, again, make, make them happy with 26.

I think it's not a big impact with the -- it's a
very small minute total voting age population, rather than
the voting performance of 26.

What the reason to make those moves for the last
seven days, I don't know.

I wasn't here to hear the arguments on why we're
moving those populations now at the end of this whole
process rather than, you know, why wasn't this brought up
before.

So with that, I think we, we -- we're not really
happy, but we could live, as I stated before, I think, with
the October 30th draft map, that is basically Phoenix,
Arizona. And so I'm glad that we still are keeping
Guadalupe in south Phoenix area, because that's where it
And these last couple of tweaks as someone suggested to make DOJ happy, they're off base. So, that's all I have to say. And although we're not happy with the October 30 draft map, it is what it is. But these two tweaks someone suggested would cause us some concern.

And thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you. Any questions for Representative Miranda? (No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you. Our next speaker is Shirley Dye, representing northern Arizona.

SHIRLEY DYE: Shirley Dye, D, as in dog, Y-E. As I see it, there's been a couple of problems right from the get-go about having -- trying to get two rural congressional districts.

There is not apparently enough persons, if you need 750,000 people per a district -- isn't that right? Or 750,000 per district?

Okay.

So when you're, when you're looking at this, the second one is trying to have a whole Native American district.
And I think the reason we've got 300,000 people down there in Pinal County is because the Gila River Indian reservation tribe wanted to be with the Navajos and the Apaches.

And that's why this is gerrymandered over into that area.

It seems to me that the Gila River Native American district might have more in common with the Pima Native American district down in the Yuma district, number three.

If you switched out and put northern Gila County back in District 1, and maybe even Apache Junction, because it's not so urbanized, you could get your numbers that you needed in District 1 and make it more compact.

And then somehow looking over at La Paz County, and that area between Highway 8 and 10 in Maricopa, work something out that shifts all those 300,000 people over toward the west.

Now, I realize this is for, at this late hour, is rather a ridiculous request.

But with a 9.7 percent Democratic advantage in District 1, and with the communities of interest being the high forest lands of the traditional rural area up there, those 300,000 people in Pinal County, which is almost half of what they need for a district, is not going to have a clue about all of the rural issues.
And I think that, you know, it's just rather ridiculous to have that concentration of urban people in what is supposed to be a rural district.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Representative Saldate, representing self, from District 27.

REPRESENTATIVE MACARIO SALDATE: Thank you very much. My last name is S-A-L-D-A-T-E.

And I want to speak about an area that is in the area of District 27, as it's made up now, but primarily in an area --

THE REPORTER: Sir, could you speak up, please?

REPRESENTATIVE MACARIO SALDATE: I'm sorry. I want to speak up -- I should speak up anyway.

In terms of the area that is in District 27, as it's currently formed.

And then with a change to District 2, there's been small pieces of that district moved.

And that -- in not doing that, it has gone against in some ways traditional notions out of the barrio. In the barrio there's a whole new interpretation that is not necessarily political and possibly more cultural, but there is areas, for example, in south Tucson that are major streets, those are South 4th, South 6th, and South 12th.
Now, that has new interpretation for people that have not either been in that area for a long time or have already moved out and have not seen the various kinds of activities, both cultural, educational, and political to some extent, that have impacted.

But I would like to say that that can create confusion. And it is going to be more difficult, I think, to continue to develop the potential of our voters in that area. So that inconsistency I think is something that could be looked at and to try to honor possibly the compactness of that area.

That is basically my presentation.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Representative Saldate, is there a way you can show me in that -- using -- refer to that map and point to that area that you're referring to? That would be extremely helpful for me.

Representative Saldate, if you don't mind, if you will speak -- if you plan on speaking again, do you mind using the pointer, if we have one, and make sure you speak using the microphone.

REPRESENTATIVE MACARIO SALDATE: My eyesight is
not -- is this South Broadway?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Representative Saldate, can you speak into the mic?

REPRESENTATIVE MACARIO SALDATE: Is this South Broadway? I'm not sure.

Is this South Broadway, this area here?

I'm trying to find -- this is I-10, I think; right?

I would have go and check.

Can I approach the map to see what --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure, of course.

REPRESENTATIVE MACARIO SALDATE: I'm looking for South 12th, looking for Ajo.

WILLIE DESMOND: It's right here.

REPRESENTATIVE MACARIO SALDATE: So it would be...

This is South 12th here.

Actually need to get further, I guess, to see more or less where Ajo Way would be.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can you go up north?

There's Ajo.

REPRESENTATIVE MACARIO SALDATE: This is South 12th here.

Can we go further up?

WILLIE DESMOND: Ajo is right here, this white
REPRESENTATIVE MACARIO SALDATE: If we go down this way, this is the demarcation line right here, of west -- the west of 12th, that is in the district, east is not.

So when you get in this whole area here, there's a little chunk.

There are a number of them, but I think there's one that will be pulled out. It's a four-by-four-by-four block.

And that is very traditionally been, you know, the western part of that area.

East would be different.

So, that would be right here.

Right here.

That's an example of what I would think would be -- I think there's another one someplace in that area, where that could create some confusion.

But that that particular area I know well.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Willie, could you put the census tract map on it?

I think the way that -- the reason that jut is there is a census issue that happened when you were cleaning some stuff up that we were looking at a long time ago.

WILLIE DESMOND: So you have a census tract that
takes that four-by-four.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: So, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Moving that area would break up this -- would split a census tract?

WILLIE DESMOND: It would split a census tract, yes. But, I mean, the reason that is there is because of the census tract also. We were selecting at the tract level.

That wasn't an intentional block necessarily.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, can you do me a favor and highlight the entire census tract for that area, including that area, the four-by-four area that Mr. Saldate referred to.

Representative Saldate, you're asking for that four-by-four area to be taken away from two?

REPRESENTATIVE MACARIO SALDATE: Yes.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And put into where again?

REPRESENTATIVE MACARIO SALDATE: The new three, new Legislative District 3.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And only that piece; correct? The four-by-four piece, into -- from two to three.

REPRESENTATIVE MACARIO SALDATE: Yes.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay.

And, Mr. Desmond, how many people is that? How
many people in that area?

WILLIE DESMOND: 519.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Say again.

WILLIE DESMOND: 519.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, I wouldn't mind looking at that and cleaning it up. If it is an area that has traditionally been in the new, excuse me, new three, then I wouldn't be opposed to looking at the idea of putting it back in.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: What is the boundary, that brown line going south currently that -- you know.

Mr. Desmond, can you tell me that?

WILLIE DESMOND: It is South 12th.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It is 12th.

WILLIE DESMOND: Primarily to the north. Then it goes down South 7th.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So it would mean making -- following South 12th all the down is what he's saying.

Okay.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Pondering this, there's a, there's a series of notches and pop-outs in all of these, all of these districts.
Is there a reason why we're concentrating just on this? Because I know there's a lot of other parts of south Tucson where there are neighborhoods where we've got side streets that are causing demarcations. And 12th is a major north-south. 12th, 6th, and 4th are major north-souths. And it makes perfect sense to have that as a demarcation.

But is there a reason -- are other areas we want to concentrate on --

REPRESENTATIVE MACARIO SALDATE: Culturally it's always been. When -- if you went to junior high there, if you went to Wakefield, if you went to the -- it is tradition. By tradition.

I'm not saying that this is in any matter legal, but traditionally there's a sense of whether it's west of 12th or east of 12th, and communities define themselves traditionally that way.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: East or west of 12th?

REPRESENTATIVE MACARIO SALDATE: Right. Now only would someone that would be taking these issues at a university, studying, for example, the culture of the Mexican American would you hear this type of discussion.

It has nothing to do, again, formally. But there is within the neighborhoods after people have lived over the years, those that maintain, remain there, and continue to hold this definition, this milestones, in terms of how to
describe, you know, their geographic area.

That's why I think it would be somewhat difficult because of the confusion that it might create, particularly in this area. This is right in the center of that traditional barrio situation.

And, of course, it has nothing to do with any other aspect of it. It's strictly a traditional aspect of that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Other questions or comments?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, is there -- should we be looking at -- because there are other areas, other parts of south Tucson, the south side of Tucson, that actually adjust back and forth that we -- as you can see it jogs back to the east over 7th Avenue -- and 7th Avenue is by no means one of your major north-souths. You've got 4th, 6th, and 12th.

REPRESENTATIVE MACARIO SALDATE: My colleague is suggesting an area. . .

SENATOR OLIVIA CAJERO BEDFORD: I know what you're talking about, Commissioner Stertz. Yes, there are large areas, but there are large areas, neighborhoods.

I would suggest that instead of that little neighborhood, that you go behind Government Heights School. Continue the line in a larger block, leave South 12th
together.

Again, I live -- also grew up on the south side of Tucson, so I know the neighborhoods too.

So that would be my recommendation.

If you could put the map up, I would be glad to make that suggestion.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Sure.

And actually this is Senator Cajero Bedford, and state senator LD 27.

If -- for the record, if you could spell your last name.

SENATOR OLIVIA CAJERO BEDFORD:  I'd be glad to. My last name is Cajero Bedford. And that's C-A-J-E-R-O, and then Bedford, B-E-D-F-O-R-D.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA:  Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA:  These are -- in comments I want to make sure that they don't mention at all where they live, not even close. Not that you have --

OLIVIA CAJERO BEDFORD:  I grew up in that area.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA:  Oh, I misunderstood.

SENATOR OLIVIA CAJERO BEDFORD:  I know -- I knew the area. And I know that the area goes down South 7th because my mother's house, who was also a legislator, was right at that corner. So I know the boundary.
But I'm suggesting at Ajo you take in a few more of that neighborhood, go straight down, instead of curving back, and instead of curving across Ajo, make a bigger square -- my hand's not big enough.

Where's the thing?

What I'm suggesting -- what I'm suggesting is that this line, right there, go up. And that way you've taken the South 12th boundary.

Do you need -- if you need to put in -- take in more, here, up across. That's straight.

So this would wind up over here.

That would be my recommendation.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Desmond, would you go up a little bit on the screen, just for a second.

That might be a nice way to offset population by doing that 22nd Street continuation.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Just following 22nd across.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: 22nd.

If you can capture that and drop that into three, then we'll be able to pick up the continuation of 12th.

WILLIE DESMOND: That would probably end up being
a deviation of 2,000 more people in the District 2.

Do you want me to just go ahead and show you what
that would look like and make all three of those changes
real quick?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yes, please.

WILLIE DESMOND: So three would take that area,
but also this area.

District 2 would take that area.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: 12th is such a -- 12th and
22nd are really strong corridors. They're also main -- goes
back to the discussion we had yesterday about major
arterials and collectors being, being the dotted lines on
the edges of legislative borders, so... .

WILLIE DESMOND: East and west side of
12th Avenue, the only thing I would say is that District 3
at this point would be underpopulated by 10,603 people,
negative 4.9 percent. That's getting close to the edge of
what we feel comfortable with in terms of deviation.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Is that District 2?

WILLIE DESMOND: District 2 is underpopulated by
6,303.

Prior to this change, both of those were
underpopulated, but they were underpopulated by 7900 and
8900, respectively.
So what you've done here is you've taken, in three, which was at 8900, it has lost some additional 2,000 people net.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: We heard this testimony down in Tucson about picking this up and cleaning up some of these lines. I think it would be terrific to be able to send this change up, making the note of the change, and sending that up for -- into our -- for our analysis to make sure that -- because both of these are voting rights districts.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We'll -- is there any other input or questions for... 

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We're going to talk about legislative district map in a little bit. So we'll hold that thought and move to that later.

We're just moving through some public comment right now.

Thank you both for your input.

And once we get through that, we'll go back to the congressional district map and then we'll talk about legislative too.

So our next speaker is Scott LeMarr, mayor, from
Paradise Valley.

MAYOR SCOTT LEMARR: Thank you, Madam Chair, and members of the Commission.

I'm appearing along with Vice Mayor Mary Hamway. First to commend the Commission for its efforts in a really complicated statewide task. I can appreciate how difficult this may be.

The original draft map kept communities of like interest together in our opinion and was supported by Paradise Valley.

Our community has shared interests with both the Biltmore and the Arcadia areas of Phoenix, and I'll get into that in just a minute.

In particular, those two communities that I just mentioned have a shared fire department.

We have an intergovernmental agreement with the Arcadia portion of the city of Phoenix that covers that area, a little bit of the Phoenix Mountain Preserve, and all of the town of Paradise Valley.

We share the financial commitments.

We have city of Phoenix firefighters man the town of Paradise Valley firefighting equipment.

And this is just the first of a couple items I want to go through.

We also share a transportation corridor which goes
through our community. Tatum, Lincoln Drives. We're part
of MAG, and we're also part of the main transportation
system.

We also have two shared trailheads for Camelback Mountain, which requires a lot of parking
management, because each of the trailheads directly abut the
town of Paradise Valley. So the management of parking,
access, access for maintenance, is another shared
commonality we have.

Also 50 percent of the residents in our community
are on the city of Phoenix water system.

The town of Paradise Valley does not have its own
water company, so we have shared with the city of Phoenix to
buy the water company.

And also most of the residents of our community
attend schools either in the Arcadia area or my own children
are in Creighton School District, which is basically
Biltmore and south.

So that's just a highlight of the commonalities
that we have with our sister communities.

I really hope that we don't have a bifurcation of
this relationship.

I think it's vital to the continued providing of
cost effective services for our small community that does
not have its own water or own fire department.
And lastly, I might add, because we have no retail in the town of Paradise Valley other than a resort community, we depend on the Biltmore area quite a bit for our shopping and entertainment expenses.

So I ask you to please reconsider the original draft map fits the needs and commonality we have with the Biltmore and Arcadia area, and so we would like you to consider continuing to keep the town of Paradise Valley and its 13,000 residents in District No. 28 and not in the redistrict 15.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

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

JOSHUA OFFENHartz: Good afternoon. Last name is O-F-F-E-N-H-A-R-T-Z.

Thank you, Madam Chair, fellow commissioners.

I'll be brief.

I just want to say thank you for taking the time to listen to our presentation on south Scottsdale yesterday, allowing time for our recommendation to be analyzed, and really showing a willingness to compromise and accept that change if the lawyers come back and tell us if it was a negligible voting rights change.

Just to reiterate, we're asking that you do accept
the change we had come up with at yesterday's meeting.

We do believe that an attempt to strengthen the
voting rights district in LD 26 at the same time adding
population to Scottsdale in LD 23, that grabbing redistrict
areas, neighborhoods around Coronado High School, the health
park, is a smarter way to go to create a more whole
district, to keep that Scottsdale Unified School District as
whole as possible. And also, like I said, it kind of helps
both districts.

And so thank you for that.

We strongly encourage you to accept that change
when the analysis comes back, and we look forward to seeing
that in the final map.

Just as one note, as always I'd like to say that I
agree with the mayor of Paradise Valley that something along
closer to the lines of the draft map with tweaks or
competitiveness is what I'd like to see in LD 28. I think
it can be accomplished.

I think that it is also a close to competitive
district as it stands, if you look at the current
representation, and there are ways to make it more
competitive as some commissioners would like without really
tearing apart that community.

So I thank you for your time as always, and again
we hope that you will accept that final change in south
Scottsdale, and I appreciate your time.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Virginia Simpson, former vice mayor from Paradise Valley.

VIRGINIA SIMPSON: Thank you for hearing us.

Our mayor, you've heard, has described most of the reasons, but just to reiterate, one of the things is a big misnomer in our town is that many people hear the Paradise School District and think the Paradise Valley School District is in Paradise Valley.

In fact, it's not.

It's quite north of Phoenix.

We are in the Scottsdale School District, which is Arcadia, Scottsdale, and Paradise Valley.

Also we host a lot of religious institutions. We have two synagogues, and we have a large variety of Christian churches, which are populated by not only our residents, we are a small town, but a lot of people come from Scottsdale and from the Biltmore area.

Those institutions are not just open for their religious services. They become community active institutions.

They're community centers where our people get together virtually every night of the week. Go by one of those religious institutions and see the parking lot full.
That's where our people gather.

So saying that they are just a place where people worship, it's really a community.

We're very tightly bound to the Arcadia area, to the Biltmore area. And probably that's why we are such a tightknit area, which is why you'll notice also in our representation people are so tightknit that you'll see representatives where we tend to vote for the best candidate, which is probably why you'll see both parties represented in our district.

I would hate to see us go back, lose that kind of continuity and relationships that have been built up both as our mayor has referred to through intergovernmental agreements and through just social ties.

And so I'll hope you'll really reconsider going back to what has been more of a traditional boundaries where we are bound with the Biltmore and Arcadia district.

Thank you very much for listening.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Ann Dutton Ewbank, from Phoenix, Maricopa, representing self.


I'm a resident of the Sunnyslope community in north central Phoenix.
And I'd like to first thank you and the Commission for your hard work. This is a very difficult and complex process, and I appreciate your service to Arizona.

And like you I'm interested in making our legislative district maps better for the next ten years.

I'd like to speak particularly to the legislative district map. The -- particularly the north Phoenix area, and the area demarcated by Districts 15 and 28 on the October 10th approved map.

I reviewed both the October 10th approved map and also the map proposed by Mr. Herrera. And I've come to the conclusion that I prefer the October 10th map for the following reasons.

First of all, the October 10th map recognizes our Sunnyslope community very well and supports that, that community bond that we have, not only within Sunnyslope, but also with our neighbors to the east and to the west.

I appreciated the mayor of the town of Paradise Valley's comments and also the former vice mayor of the town of Paradise Valley's comments about our community being very tightknit. And I do see a lot of commonalities between Paradise Valley, Arcadia, the Biltmore area, and of course Sunnyslope.

Having more in common than -- together than going to, for example, up to New River, halfway to Flagstaff, so I
really think that this is a preferable map for that reason.

The Herrera map changes the districting question
to span all the way from New River down to Scottsdale. And
these are really two separate communities in my mind.

The other thing that I'd like you to take into
consideration is the school district configuration. Living
in Sunnyslope, I live in the Washington Elementary School
District and the Glendale Union High School District, and
I've reviewed both maps.

And while it's extremely difficult, I think, to
overlay the legislative district map with such large union
high school districts and elementary school districts, I
notice that both of these maps, those school districts span
between four and six legislative districts. And so I'd like
you to take that into consideration if you are looking into
making any changes.

And finally I'd like to reiterate that the
October 10th approved map is the best map that meets all of
the requirements of competitive based on Strategic
Telemetry's analysis, the Commission's definition of
competitiveness.

I've had the privilege of living in a competitive
district for the last ten years. I really appreciate the
opportunity to vote for and to elect very diverse
candidates, especially as an independent voter.
And I'd like to continue to have that opportunity by the Commission approving the October 10th draft map. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is James Hoxworth, from Paradise Valley.

JAMES HOXWORTH: Good afternoon.

How are you?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm sorry, if you could spell your last name for the record, that would be great.

JAMES HOXWORTH: H-O-X-W-O-R-T-H.

And I had the privilege of being at the Peoria meeting with Commissioner Herrera, I believe, back in the day.

So it's good to be back.

It's interesting hearing from Ms. Simpson earlier, since I do represent Camelback Bible Church located about 40th Street and Stanford, which is right at the -- kind of the break point of one of the congressional district lines.

Can I give you this? Is that all right?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure.

JAMES HOXWORTH: And, so, it's -- we found that interesting as we're looking at that as a church, it does kind of divide up our community of interest a little bit.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And this is on the congressional map? I'm sorry.

JAMES HOXWORTH: Congressional map, yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Maybe we can pull it up just so everyone can see.

JAMES HOXWORTH: I think it's between six and eight, maybe, or six and nine.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I can't really read on the map.

JAMES HOXWORTH: That was kind of right at the nook of where the line was.

That blue part towards...

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: You also have a pointer, if you want to use that.

JAMES HOXWORTH: Oh, all right.

Okay, this is, this is -- is this 40th Street right here? Or is this 40th? Okay.

And is this Stanford right here, or is this Stanford?

I think this might be Stanford.

Because Stanford runs east-west.

Okay. There we go.

We are literally at the corner of 40th Street and Stanford right here.

Maybe this is 36th?
Because 44th is where Stanford dead ends.

WILLIE DESMOND: This is Stanford.

I don't know why it says Missouri.

This is still --

JAMES HOXWORTH: So if this is 40th Street, we're right here on the corner of that in the heart of PV.

Kind of on the border as well.

But basically what we're asking for is to see if you guys would be willing to move the line down, because it does divide up the community of interest, being PV, the Biltmore, Arcadia. And to move it to include also south to Camelback Road and west to 24th Street, which is basically the border of the Biltmore.

Because, again, that's where many of our contingency of our church goes from Biltmore, Arcadia, and also the north and northeast valley.

And it seems like -- yeah, exactly, right there.

Because what it does is it literally kind of divides up our congregation where we have some parishioners who walk to church, could walk it from one congressional district to another, on their way even to church.

And so basically, yeah, if you could keep the areas around 40th Street and Stanford in the same congressional district, that would be awesome. It would keep contiguous lines and communities of interest together.
That's about all.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thanks.

Any questions?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: All right. Thank you.

JAMES HOXWORTH: All right. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I apologize, but State Senator Cajero Bedford, she did fill out a request to speak form and wanted to speak on some other matter.

SENATOR OLIVIA CAJERO BEDFORD: Well, I should apologize because I butted in.


Thank you members of the Commission -- can't hear me?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: If you could raise it.

SENATOR OLIVIA CAJERO BEDFORD: How's that?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great.

SENATOR OLIVIA CAJERO BEDFORD: I'm here because of the new 11 that the Tucson Mountain residents saw in the last couple of days.

The Tucson Mountains are on the western boundary of Tucson. Those of you that are from Tucson would know the area probably. It's a very active area. But in the latest map that just came out a few days ago, it was included with
Eloy, Casa Grande, to the south boundary of Chandler.

Now I'm here because the Tucson Mountain organizations and Tucson Mountain residents are communities of interest.

They have been a very activist group, fighting overzealous zoning. They have fought different issues on the environment. A very strong group.

The Tucson Mountains are only five miles to start -- about five miles west of downtown.

There is no commonality with what goes north.

So I would ask that you go back to the October map that you have had, which put the Tucson Mountains in District 3.

I sent out e-mails to different residents, because people are out shopping, doing their Christmas stuff, and not really -- nobody was paying attention, including me.

But, when I -- my response is, after I sent this e-mail out, and it told some of the residents what was now where the Tucson Mountains was going to be, they were very upset.

Because the last information that we had, and appears what we rely on, a lot of us, was this article that talked about the residents of Oro Valley and Saddlebrooke.

And so there was a feeling, and I've talked with members today, and they say this is not true, but this is
the feeling of the residents of the Tucson Mountains, is that Oro Valley and Saddlebrooke are getting their way, and so the people on the west side are getting -- the Tucson Mountains are getting the shaft. So, and I talked to members, and I've been told that is not true. But that's the way it seemed because of what had been in the paper and the latest map. That takes the Tucson Mountains, which is so close to downtown Tucson, and puts it in with the farmers and ranchers, farmers in Eloy, Casa Grande. So I'm asking that you go back to the map in October, which was very, very good. And let me -- glad to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any questions?

(No oral response.)

SENATOR OLIVIA CAJERO BEDFORD: Of course I was going to comment about that four block by four block also, but I got that started early. It seems like 500 people in that four block area is not accurate. That's just my impression, as I said, knowing the area. Anyway, but I would ask that you please put the Tucson Mountains back in with Tucson.

Don't put it in to -- you know, raise that
boundary, please.

Thank you very much. Appreciate it.

I admire you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wanted to address the Commission that I missed?

Please.

VICE MAYOR MARY HAMWAY: I have a form. I'm not sure exactly what happened to it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Tell us your name and --

VICE MAYOR MARY HAMWAY: Mary Hamway, and I'm the current vice mayor of the town of Paradise Valley.


See it? Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I must somehow -- I apologize. I don't know what happened there.

Vice mayor, town of Paradise Valley.

VICE MAYOR MARY HAMWAY: My comments will likely repeat a lot that's already been said, but I did want you to know that we were here and that I strongly support the comments by Mayor LeMarr and also former Vice Mayor Ginny Simpson.

But I just wanted to say that I'm here to speak out against the Herrera map number -- known as version two.

This puts Paradise Valley in a legislative
district with the growth areas of Anthem and New River.

Our community has really very little in common with these two communities.

We are -- our community just celebrated its 50th anniversary, and our issues are much different.

We're completely built out. We're surrounded by Scottsdale and Phoenix. And we -- our issues are very different from a new -- new communities that are growing and have to, to concern themselves about sprawl.

We're about redevelopment and protecting existing communities.

So I would say that a representative would have trouble -- or wouldn't really understand our issues if they came from the Anthem and New River area.

And also as has been stated previously, our students go to Scottsdale school districts. Our tax base supports those schools.

And we have nothing to do with the Paradise Valley School District. The only thing we share is a common name.

The transportation corridors align the communities of Paradise Valley, Arcadia, Biltmore, Moon Valley, and central Phoenix.

Paradise Valley is a mature, residential, resort community.

We have no retail.
We shop in Arcadia, Biltmore, and the Scottsdale areas.
And our residents enjoy an urban lifestyle.
They choose to live near businesses and churches, school, entertainment areas, health care institutions, and the airport.
And, the reason why we support staying in District 28 or -- because it really kind of keeps the current District 11 intact, and that district has yielded for the past three election cycles competitive representation.
So we question why you would take that and tear that apart and put Paradise Valley in a district that -- with communities it has little in common with.
So we hope that you respect the original map of in October, and keep the district competitive, because it already exists, and it already is competitive.
Thanks so much.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.
Did I miss anyone else?
(No oral response.)
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Let's check the time.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.
It's 3:56.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: There was one thing that the
mayor of the town of Paradise Valley mentioned that I wanted
to sort of discuss. I did talk about it back in October
when we were working on the maps, and but he mentioned
something in particular about the Camelback Mountain parking
issue.

And that really, really strikes home, close to
home. And it's something I deal with every weekend. And
it's only on weekends, because my wife has to deal with it
during the week, but I've been -- you know, there's these
recreation areas within -- that straddle Paradise Valley and
Phoenix. It's basically Camelback Mountain.

You can climb Mummy Mountain, but not really.
I've done it.

But then there's Squaw Peak and the Phoenix
Mountain Preserve and Quartz Ridge in Phoenix that abut
Paradise Valley, and it's a common recreation area. It's an
area I've frequented since the '70s.

And, you know, that parking issue, I can't believe
I didn't think of it earlier, it's gone from a dusty,
winding trail up Camelback Mountain to long lines of idling
cars and lots of huge parking burden on Paradise Valley and
on the adjoining areas in greater Arcadia where I live.

And just as a warning, if you -- if you're going
to climb Echo Canyon and park in front of my house, my wife
has been known to have you people towed. So don't do it.

I'm a little more forgiving. I'll just right you a note.

So I just wanted to mention that, because it was something that really sort of ties those areas, Biltmore, Arcadia, PV area together. And it's something I wanted to comment upon.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any comments from others?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Well, we appreciate all the public comment today and for you all taking time to come tell us.

It's about 4:00 p.m.

Does anyone need a break right now, or do we --

okay. I'm already seeing one nod. Two.

Okay. There's bipartisan agreement that we need a break.

So we will come back just in ten minutes.

Thank you.

(Brief recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We'll enter back into public session. The time is 4:15 p.m.

We just finished public comment. And if we could, I'd like to go back to where we were, which was the
congressional map.

(Brief pause.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And if we could, I would like to look at Maricopa County some more, just because those districts we haven't really talked about in a lot of detail, and I just want to zero in on some of that and see if people have changes.

I know there's some people have issues with four coming -- reaching around.

I don't know if there's a way to address that. It's, it's been a challenge from the beginning with this two rural district concept in terms of trying to keep it as rural as possible, both those districts.

I'd be interested in any commissioner's thoughts on the Maricopa County area in terms improvements to that. It sounded like people from Fountain Hills were pleased to be in six.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: In regarding the scoop around the north side of Maricopa to pick up population and include San Tan, et cetera, these are -- what you're -- what you are talking about would be fairly demonstrative changes at this point.

We've had, we've had recommendations that I put
forward in a map a week and a half, two weeks ago that
showed the cleaning up of that, of that hook around, and
that was fairly summarily dismissed. Which brought forth
the map that I brought forth last week Thursday regarding
five, six, four, and eight adjustments.

If we're going to go back -- listen, I'd love to,
I'd love to revisit all of that.

I would love to see us revisit it.

But we're, we're in a place right now that I think
that the weight of the decisions that are taking place --
because I think it's accomplishable. We've been able to
accomplish it in various iterations of the map. Something
else would have to give, and some of the areas that would
have to give would be -- are really centered around the city
of Flagstaff.

And that was from the two Democrat commissioners,
that was a non-starter.

So if that is a non-starter, the decision for
fixing the District 4 hook would lie on your shoulders.

We want to look at it. The only way to be able to
accomplish it would be to be for removing the greater
Flagstaff area from District 1 into District 4.

That allows us to be able to accomplish some of
these areas where we're hooking around communities to be
able to capture others.
But unless that's something that you'd be willing to entertain, all we're going to do is to start going down a path that we've already been down before.

So, my view now is that unless I hear something different from you saying, yes, let's go ahead and move Flagstaff into -- from four -- from one into four, which I haven't heard you say -- if you'd like to say that, I would be happy to hear it right now.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No, I'm not willing to say that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

So, so to do that, that's the, that's the way to accomplish that problem.

So, so if we're -- if we know that that's the only solution based on without changing -- keep in mind that we are fixed with District 3 and we're fixed with District 7.

So you've got a north border of three that is fixed.

You've got a -- you've got an area around seven that is fixed.

We've got a District 9 that has become as untouchable from the Democrats and I believe the chair's position as are the majority-minority districts.

We can then do what we can to fix the others.

Now, my recommendation during break to Mr. Desmond
regarding five, six, eight, and I think four, which cleaned up some splits that were recommended by Commissioner Herrera, I believe that all of those were able to be successfully executed giving balance to those districts.

And, again, unless we want to go back in and move Flagstaff from one to four, there's -- I don't see a way of fixing it.

If that's a non-starter, it's a non-starter.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thoughts from other commissioners?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Yeah, I agree with what Commissioner Stertz said.

Just in terms of suggestions on Maricopa County area, I know even in this area numerous different versions of these districts have been proposed.

You know, my suggestion would be, as I stated earlier, to move the Phoenix portion of nine into six and swap that out and create a Scottsdale, Tempe, Ahwatukee, Chandler district.

But I think it was along the lines of a version of a map Commissioner Stertz introduced or wanted to introduce back in October. It would still be a competitive district
and would keep those communities together and keep Phoenix together.

At the very least, my suggestion would be at least accommodate the people who live in Arcadia or even the traditional Arcadia area, which perhaps -- and the Biltmore area, with Paradise Valley and the north valley.

And to accommodate that change by perhaps moving the line slightly up in Scottsdale, as had been suggested earlier.

The other thing would be, I guess, the New River, Anthem area being separated from Cave Creek and Carefree area.

I thought we had -- someone had looked at that adjustment or it had been discussed. And that would be a tradeoff between six and eight.

I don't know if that divider line between six and eight follows I-17. I don't think it does exactly, but you might be able to swap population -- yeah.

In the southern area to accommodate keeping Anthem, New River, and Cave Creek and Carefree together, in that part of the map.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: These, these districts were taken from the -- Mr. Stertz's proposal?

I -- so, Mr. Freeman, what you're saying is New River, Anthem, would be ideally connected with
Cave Creek?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: One of the suggestions would be to move that line over so that those communities are kept together.

It would have to balance it by shedding population elsewhere.

And I don't know what the population is between I-17 and the boundary between six and eight further south on the map, whether that would be a fair even swap or not.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Do we want to take a look and see what that looks like, Mr. Desmond? Maybe that's what you're doing.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I would suggest if we do that that we also think about the split that was created in Peoria.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I was wondering about that too.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Bringing that up to the county line.

I'm not sure how many people are there, but I suggest that we factor that in.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Population in the greater Cave Creek and Carefree area is approximately 8865.

So it would be where we would find that population if we were going to bring that into -- into the district --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Into eight.

WILLIE DESMOND: There are two -- two things you can do, as Commissioner Stertz mentioned.

I'll show you the New River, Anthem thing in a second.

But what you could do initially to clean up some of the Peoria split would be this area down here in District 5, that is the split of San Tan, is 6600 people.

If you move that back into District 4, so that District 5 just goes to the county border, that would move 6600 people out of District 5, so that 5 would need to grow.

I could do that here, by kind of going back just to the reservation boundary.

This would move 6700 people, but we'd have to go to the reservation.

So then five would be ideally populated.

Six would now be under, and four would be over.

Six would then take a little bit more, probably somewhere in Phoenix, from eight.

So then six would be ideally populated.
Eight would be under.

Four would be over.

So then eight would then grow into Peoria and take -- there's about, I think, 9800 people in that portion of Peoria that's in four. So you couldn't necessarily get the whole thing, but you could get the vast majority of it.

That would be one set of changes that would remove some splits, both to counties and census places.

The other change that Commissioner Freeman just mentioned, I think would be to move -- you would move New River and Anthem into District 6. It's up to you if you want to take some of this area to the west I heard about yesterday also.

So roughly 37,000 people.

That would go into six.

So that six would be overpopulated by 37,000 people. And it could shed population to District 8, somewhere in Phoenix.

Perhaps in the area -- District 8 could come closer to I-17, somewhere in here.

Does that make sense?

Those are the two, two sets of changes. We could do those all at once, if you like both of those, or you could split those out separately. Whatever makes the most sense to you.
Or we could just not do anything.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: There's always that option.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: You know, it was just -- it was just a suggestion. You know, I've gone through the public comment the Commission has received, and there's quite a bit of comment from folks that live up there talking about the community of interest, which talked about as Anthem, New River, Carefree, and Cave Creek, and its ties through the I-17, Cave Creek Road, SR 51, Tatum, to the north valley. They defined it repeatedly in the record as something distinct from Scottsdale.

So that -- I guess that problem remains, unless there is a -- unless the change to nine is made that keeps Phoenix together and all of Scottsdale together. And that could be accomplished that way.

So, that's where that thought sprang from, just those public comments from those folks that live there.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think the first change that Mr. Desmond suggested makes a lot of sense. I would like to see that.

The second change, I would defer to Mr. Freeman
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: What?
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: The second change I would -- I'd like your input.

I couldn't actually hear everything that Mr. Freeman just said, when you said you liked that second change or you didn't like it, so I would defer, you know, to what do you think.

I'd like to hear whether you think his second proposed change is a good idea or not.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, the, the -- there's no question that the Cave Creek, Carefree, Anthem, New River is a block. It's divided by -- there's a mountain range that divides the communities, but there is, there is a connection going east-west on Carefree Highway that connects them, so I'm, I'm okay with them split and I'm okay with them put together.

I was thinking about the easier of the two, which was actually to move the Cave Creek, Carefree into the Anthem side. To move about 8800, I think, is an easier move than the other direction.

I like the -- I like the idea that we're flanking the city of Phoenix on one side and going up the I-17 corridor with Anthem, New River, on the other.

That is the development corridor that's taking
place. And it -- that there's a lot of growth that's taking
place up that corridor, and it makes sense to keep those,
keep those areas flying.

If we pull New River, Anthem, over into the
Cave Creek area, and Carefree area, it also makes sense, so,
from those communities being related to each other.

So I'm -- I guess if I was going to pull
something, if I would make a recommendation, it would be to
pull Carefree and Cave Creek over.

But then their main connection is going to --
Cave Creek Road, which is connected through by Tatum, I
mean, that intersection right there, Tatum and Cave Creek,
is a big connector that takes you up into Cave Creek and
Carefree.

Which is right there.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: How do commissioners feel
about the first set of changes that Ms. McNulty said she
just liked that Mr. Desmond said would -- might be one
alternative?

Do you want to walk through what those are again, Mr. Desmond?

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

So it starts down here in District 4 and 5.

So, what happened is District 4 would again come
up to the Maricopa County, Pinal County border.
This would remove a split of San Tan Valley and a split of Pinal County. And would also make District 4 overpopulated by 6,610 people -- additional people.

To compensate for that in District 5, District 5 would again go up to the Salt River reservation, which would remove by and large a split of Mesa.

There is still this small portion of Mesa that's in the reservation, so that would stay in District 6.

But that, that moves 6,700 people.

And I think when you go back to the actual reservation boundary, it might be a little bit closer.

So at this point District 5 is perfectly populated, four is too big, and six is too small, because six gave up that section of Mesa.

So six would then, in an area that you think makes sense, take an extra 6700 people or 6600 people from District 8, you know, somewhere along the border between six and eight.

So that eight would then shed a little population; six would be ideally populated.

What that would allow you to do is that eight could grow into four, which is overpopulated.

And, you know, I don't -- let me just show you, you know, ways we can do this.

That's too much.
That's about 9700. So there would have to be something a little less than that.

But in essence what you would do is, is just -- Peoria would remained split.

That split would then be -- there would only be about 3,000 people in this section of Peoria that's in Congressional District 4.

But you were able to remove another split from Mesa, another split from the San Tan Valley, and extract more from Peoria.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: How many people is that all together, the Maricopa County portion of Peoria?

WILLIE DESMOND: I think it's about 9800 -- 9,089. You'd also, as it's drawn, you'd have to pick up this area, and that would be 9,813.

There's this portion of Yavapai. I can take that out. It's only seven people.

So we can fix that seven.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: If we pulled those into six, couldn't we just adjust the boundary between six and eight a little more?

WILLIE DESMOND: But then you -- four would need to grow at some point though, because that's taking from four.

So four would then be underpopulated by about
3,200 people.

And we would have to find someplace where four could come in and take more.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: What would we be taking from four?

WILLIE DESMOND: Excuse me?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: What would -- what are we be taking from four?

WILLIE DESMOND: Oh, well, if you take all of Peoria, that would be from four.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: But what if you only take the portion that's in --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: The county line?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yeah.

WILLIE DESMOND: This portion up here is only six people.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Six.

WILLIE DESMOND: Six or seven.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Wow. Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: I can tell you. It's like, yeah, it's like seven people. So they would be split off from the rest of their city.

But they would be with the rest of their county.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, I like the idea of
removing the split, the San Tan, and the Pinal split.

I mean, that seems like a positive thing if we can correct those at a minimum.

And. . .

(Brief pause.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz, was there any particular reason on the split, on the dividing line between six and eight in terms of where that's drawn?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Which dividing line?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: The north-south dividing line.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: If you were suggesting that if you go below, the area -- the intentional area of the design was the New River, Phoenix split.

We wanted to pick up going down to Deer Valley Road, Deer Valley is the big east-west connector, and pick that up. Or go down to -- going down -- if -- there's a large -- I don't have a pointer -- there's a large part of development that takes place at the, at the confluence of the 101 and the 17.

So there's a lot of action that's taking place there. There's real estate development that's taking place there.

I like the idea that we've got one representative that's representing both sides of that -- of that, that
interchange.

So...

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: But in terms of moving that boundary between six and eight to the west, can that happen or --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Well, picked it up to the west, it would be unnatural. If you needed to continue it up --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We needed population.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: We needed population you needed to pick up. You know, to the west, yes. To the east, no.

Better than going to the west.

That's a combination of large residential and commercial right there. Union Hills.

WILLIE DESMOND: I mean, there, there is enough -- there are areas that you could take 6700 from here. And add it going, you know, further to the west.

The other option would be to take it from -- yeah, so this, so this line on 44th would just continue north a little bit.

This is a very large census block right here, so it would come a little bit further to the west.

Is this something -- do you want to make these changes? Or...
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: What does that compensate for?

WILLIE DESMOND: What that does is -- we're basically --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Is that the 6,000 people?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah, we would need to find 6,000 people to shuffle them down here from Peoria, it goes five, six, the eight pap.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Because we've put -- we're moved part of five into four; right? The San Tan Valley split.

WILLIE DESMOND: We haven't -- I haven't actually done that. I was just showing --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Right, that's what we're telling you about.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So we've got 6600 too many people in four.

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, if you do the San Tan and you do the Mesa, then you have 6600 people too many in six. Or, too few in six.

And four has too many.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Right. So you have 6600 too many in four, and 60 some odd hundred too few in six.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

I think, Mr. Desmond, if I'm correct, the path that you're taking in that area, and that -- there's, like I said, a combination of residential and commercial in that block that you're picking up right there. Then you're going to decrease -- then you're going to have a need in eight. We've got an overpopulation in four, and you're going to be able to pick that up by, by capturing some of the -- of Peoria.

WILLIE DESMOND: Correct.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: If this is a change that you want to, like, actually execute, I'll, I'll do that on a separate map so we still have this map the way it is.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: All of those successfully achieve not only population goals, but also communities of interest.

Keep in mind that there is, there is park and hillside there that you don't want to go around, pick up the -- go to the, go to the street level when you're talking about the area of Union Hills and the 101, so that you're picking up areas that are neighborhoods staying together.

Be cognizant of that is what I'm saying.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: We have a tendency to just
grab voter -- you know, chunks of blocks, and, and we need to be intentional.

(Brief pause.)

WILLIE DESMOND: Sorry. I copied the wrong file.

Okay.

So now District 5 is underpopulated.

District 4 is overpopulated.

District 5 is going to take the north part of Mesa.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Sure you wouldn't want to keep Scottsdale whole?

Just asking.

WILLIE DESMOND: All right. Hearing nothing, I'm going to -- so now District 6 needs to take population from District 8. I'll do this at the street level so we can really figure out the best place to do that from.

To start, would it make sense to go further up 43rd Avenue?

So, so just continue up 43rd right here.

Remove 2,044.

This starts on Union Hills and goes up pretty much to the 101.

So now District 6 needs to take in another
4,580 people.

I would say that this area out to Deer Valley would be a good start. That would move 3,255.

Is there any -- if I turn the block level on, we can pick these areas too.

I'd move 3,617.

Is that okay?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yeah.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Now for the final 963 people, we could continue, but 40 -- let me just pick up one additional chunk right here.

This is a good example of sometimes the long, the long blocks make for a weird border.

So it's probably good to have a little notch, not the big one.

So we need 963 people.

If we want to continue north, even selecting at the block level, it's going to take quite a bit and go pretty far, pretty far west.

That would be fine. Or else we can take from up here, to see how many.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair. Mr. Desmond, you're going in the right direction.
WILLIE DESMOND: Right here?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yeah, continue up.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. This would continue up, I believe, 35th, until Happy Valley Road.

Now, this has gone a little bit further up to Straight Arrow Lane.

This would move 1,041 people, which would make District 6 overpopulated by 78.

There is going to be some population balancing, and that happens in all these districts during technical changes.

We can try to get this a little closer right away. Or else this district can grow to the west. Whatever makes the most sense.

I'll zoom out a little bit so you can see how that works.

Does this make sense?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, the style of that growth makes sense.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

At this point, what we can do is we can take and add back into eight. This would move 33 people.

This would move 40.

73. So that District 6 would only be overpopulated by five people.
I can do that now. Or I can look later on, you know, looking at Maricopa County's proposed VPs and see if there are other places where we can develop population.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, I've actually driven that neighborhood. That's across the street from -- there are houses on both side of that street.

So I prefer not to do that.

I think you can find certain edges around the corners that aren't going to break neighborhoods.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. And for right now, I mean, District 6 is only off by 78 people, so it's pretty close.

It's also worth noting that District 5 is 233 people over. Or District 9 is 268. Those two border each other, so I'll look for a place to balance those that makes sense also.

All right. So, the last thing to do is for the -- for District 8 to make up some population from District 4. At this point District 8 is underpopulated by 6,694. District 4 is overpopulated by 6,633.

Just starting -- just to show you roughly, that right there moves 4,288.

It's obviously not contiguous. Let me turn on the streets.

So, so you have two options right away. You can, we can just start with this area right here, and see what
that leaves us with. I think that's probably the best way to do it, would be... 

That would move 1263 people.

Okay. And it looks like there's, you know, a neighborhood here. So we can leave this unincorporated area in District 4, as long as we don't cut it off from District 4.

So you can also start... 

I'll turn on the blocks again, so you can kind of see where the population is.

The shading reflects -- I'm not even sure.

Something.

But if it's white, it means nobody lives there.

So at this point, district -- this would add 2300 people.

Perhaps grab some of this area up here also.

We've have to accept that and move that right away.

Just to clean this up, and then we'll...

So now District 4 needs to make up a little population.

Straighten up the line a little bit to start.

Some of these areas, the way the neighborhood is built, it's kind of difficult to take a block. You see that one block moves 679 people. When you include the areas that
it surrounds, it's obviously probably close to 1,000.

So, something like this moves 107, 174, 201 people.

If you did this, at this point District 4 is underpopulated by 12 people.

District 8 is underpopulated by 49 people.

So we're very, very close.

I'll turn off the blocks and streets and just let you see what the map looks like for Maricopa County.

So the split in San Tan is gone.

The split of Mesa is gone.

The border between six and eight has been changed here in Phoenix.

And about 6700 people that live in Peoria have been added to District 8 with the bulk of the city.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: That's good.

Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

Any thoughts from other commissioners on this?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Looks like an improvement to me.

WILLIE DESMOND: Would you like to discuss moving New River and Anthem or moving Cave Creek and Carefree?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure, we can look at that, if that's -- Mr. Freeman, are you interested in seeing --
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I'd prefer to see my community of interest addressed where I live, which is the Paradise Valley, Biltmore, Arcadia area.

As I said earlier, it -- to me it makes more sense following the criteria to put Phoenix with Phoenix and Scottsdale with Scottsdale.

But, if that's not going to happen, at least if the community I've lived in all my life cannot be split, I think that would be an improvement.

And it's not just me. I mean, there's been lots of people, you know, thumbing through the public comment, going all the way back to hearings in July and around the -- people showed up around the Valley to talk about -- from Anthem, from New River, from the northeast valley, a lot from Paradise Valley, you know, various government officials from the town of Paradise Valley, some of whom showed up today, the Arcadia business community representative, folks in the Biltmore.

I mean, I don't want to see that community of interest disrespected by that line.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Commissioner Freeman, in the real word, streets and intersections, what do you want to see happen?
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, I guess there's a
number of different scenarios. And one -- of course the one
that I would prefer is that you follow the -- either
Scottsdale Road or the Phoenix Scottsdale border and -- I
mean, that's a significant change to this map.

Otherwise, I guess the bare minimum change that I
think would make sense would perhaps follow the Arizona
Canal from where it exits Scottsdale to -- over to where it
crosses Camelback at 40th Street, and then over to 24th and
up, which captures the Biltmore area.

That gets, I guess, the heart of the traditional
Arcadia area. It uses the canal, which is a divider of the
communities.

There aren't as many streets that cross the canal
because there's the canal there.

And it captures the Biltmore community.

I guess perhaps more logical would take it over to
the 51, because that ties it. Then you have Tatum and the
51, tying those communities in terms of transportation
corridors, which I know you love, with the north valley.

But that would, I think, involve a bigger -- the
bigger switch.

And perhaps I note 24th Street intersects Lincoln,
which becomes Glendale right there. There's a little clump
of homes on the slopes of Squaw Peak -- Piestewa Peak there
that I would think belong in with Paradise Valley, Biltmore area.

So I guess what I'm saying there is take it on Glendale over to the 51 and on up.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Desmond, could you turn the major streets off, please?

Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So, Commissioner Freeman, if I'm understanding you correctly, the Camelback corridor as it connects from, from Scottsdale going from the east to the west to 24th Street, going to the south, to Indian School, if you were to describe the Arcadia district, and I've, I've -- I know the Arcadia district well. I didn't grow up there and I don't own a home in the Arcadia district, but I, but I know the area well and I know its history well.

Your concern right now is that the, that the Camelback corridor has been -- is being, is being split into two different districts.

The Camelback corridor now is being represented in District 6 and District 9, and that the -- and that the 24th Street corridor and the -- the Emerald City of
Camelback and 24th Street and all of the development in there, including Biltmore Fashion Square, is really connected heavily into Scottsdale and to Arcadia, organizationally, collectively, and transportation-wise, but has been now bifurcated by the districts.

Is that -- I mean, other than the fact that we've got crossover of multiple communities and transportation and lifestyle, what are the other issues that you want to, that you want to make sure you see addressed here?

Because, again, this is going in to -- what you're asking right now is you're asking for a breach of the -- of Congressional District 9.

And Congressional District 9, as we've heard, I've even asked the chair if she would willing to even make Scottsdale whole. And I couldn't get even an affirmative.

And I'm assuming that by absence of an answer that meant no.

I just want to know, how many people -- how many -- what sort of area is really being affected here in your opinion of -- by the splitting of these districts, and whether or not it would make sense actually to move that line of Thomas up, and it goes into nine, rather than -- would you rather, would you rather see Arcadia in District 9 than in District 6?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, right now it is in
District 9.

And it's split from Paradise Valley --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Split.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: -- and --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: It's split in half right now in the Arcadia district.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, I mean, there's Arcadia and there's Arcadia. There's lots of neighborhoods that -- around that neighborhood that want to be called Arcadia, but there's one neighborhood that calls itself Arcadia Light.

As I tried to explain yesterday, the original Arcadia neighborhood is fairly tightly confined between Lafayette -- or Camelback on the north or Lafayette on the south. Lafayette kind of follows the canal. I mean, if you were to look for Lafayette, I wouldn't regard it as a major arterial. But, so if you were to go south a little bit and follow the Arizona Canal, it kind of tracks Lafayette.

So if you were to take -- use the Arizona Canal as the divider, which as it comes out of Scottsdale follows Indian School for a, for a, for a short jog, it starts to turn north. It crosses Camelback at roughly -- well, right at 40th Street.

And then to capture the -- just the core of the Biltmore area -- again, there's the Biltmore area, there's the Biltmore area.
There's the original Biltmore area, which would be if you took a line over to 24th Street, and just try to get the minimal change to keep those communities together, you would take it over to Camelback and 24th, and up 24th to Lincoln, and then, and then Lincoln/Glendale over to the 51, and on up, and on up.

And then you've got sort of that mountain preserve area together with Camelback and the north preserve area and Mummy Mountain.

That would be sort of the minimalistic approach to keep that community of interest together.

But, again, if, if -- I don't want to waste my time, because I've talked about it a lot.

And I know there's, there's lots of people who have shown up today and lots of prior hearings before, and perhaps they were wasting their time as well. But I feel it is incumbent upon me to speak up for my community of interest, since I live there and I am from there and lived virtually my whole life right in those three communities, which I view as one area.

Which is why when we -- when my family has moved, we've sort of selected residences in those areas.

And I've never lived in the actual historic Arcadia neighborhood, but I've lived in a lot of the adjoining areas, which, which want to be called Arcadia, and
which I am perfectly fine with them calling themselves Arcadia.

Likewise I've lived very close to the Biltmore area, but not exactly in the Biltmore area. I've lived just right near Camelback and 32nd Street.

But, again, I view that as one community.

I've lived in Paradise Valley, just up the road on Tatum a little ways.

Again, I view that all sort of one in the same community, which now is being split between two congressional districts.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman, did you have thoughts on the other area too though, in terms of Cave Creek and Anthem?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: No.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No.

Are there thoughts from other commissioners?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: It's ten after 5:00. We've got -- we've still got to go -- we've still got to hit legislative. Is it your goal right now to move this, move this map down the field? And if so, we know that, we know that there's going to be some minor adjustments to get equal population on the edges that Mr. Desmond will be cleaning
up.

We know that he's been given a direction regarding major arterials and collectors as devising lines, unless there's something -- some very specific reason not to.

And we know that we're still waiting for the, the data being collected by our consultants, which will be ready sometime early next week.

To move this ball down the field and to sort of set this map, is, is it your goal tonight to get a vote on this map and move this down the field?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think we are in week four now of adjustments to the draft map, and I think we've made significant improvement to the draft map, and that what is before us -- and actually if you put the whole thing up, Mr. Desmond, that would help, I think it just esthetically looks better, even though that's not a constitutional criteria. It just fits together much better than the -- our attempt at first draft.

And that draft map was a draft, as we said from the very beginning when we approved it.

And we knew we were going to hear a lot of public comment.

We did.

We tried to be as responsive as we could to as many people as possible.
And, as we all know, there's no way to make everyone happy in this process. But I do think this is a major improvement over our previous draft.

So I would be comfortable with this map in terms of moving it forward. Granted there's further analysis that still has to get done to confirm the voting rights districts, to do population balances, to do technical cleanup, but otherwise I think it's a good map.

Thoughts from other commissioners?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Would you entertain a motion?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I would.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Desmond, what do we call this map that we're looking at?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mathis combo.

WILLIE DESMOND: Right now the map that we're looking at, I have it titled move splits 12-20, because I've been making changes in separate things, so we can go back.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Have you incorporated the splits that we just did into the Mathis combo map?

WILLIE DESMOND: I could. Then that will become the new working map then.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: I could make the map combo map
version two.

    COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I would move that
Mr. Desmond incorporate the splits -- the changes that we
just made on the splits map into the Mathis combo map that
we looked at earlier this afternoon and that we adopt that
map as our tentative final map subject to -- final
congressional map, subject to the possibility of future
changes based on recommendations of our mapping consultant
or our legal counsel to adjust technical or legal issues and
subject to our final approval of any of those changes.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is there a second?

    VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, before I second
it, can I make just a quick comment?

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Of course.

    VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: As I mentioned before, that
I, that I felt like we made plenty of sacrifices in terms
of -- obviously, as I mentioned before, that fourth
competitive district in Maricopa County, we were able to
create one in district -- in District 9, and then one in
CD 1, and then one outside of Maricopa County that's in CD 1
and also southern Arizona. That's in CD 2.

    So, again, I'm not, not -- I'm not exactly pleased
with all the results, but I think this is truly a
compromise.

    As I mentioned before, this particular version has
four strongly Republican districts, two majority-minority
districts, and only three competitive districts.

So there's some hesitation, but I think this is a
true compromise. And I will second Commissioner McNulty's
motion.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any discussion?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I'd like to
make a point that it was mentioned earlier that the
Republican registration in the state is 35 percent, the
Democratic registration is approximately 30 percent. And on
this map 44 percent of the congressional districts are
solidly Republican, as compared to 35 percent of the
registration that Commissioner Freeman mentioned earlier.

Twenty-two percent of the districts are
Democratic, as compared to 30 percent registration mentioned
earlier.

And 33 percent of the districts are competitive,
which I think compares favorably with the independent
registration of the state.

So I do feel that this is a compromise map, and
that it fairly reflects, subject to having said that, that
it's the best map we could put together to fairly reflect
the composition of this state.

I would also say just briefly in response to the
comments about Congressional District 8, that I'll
incorporate by reference all the other things I've said about it, Congressional District 9, but also just add that, you know, again, I live three blocks from a congressional district boundary.

I could make all the same arguments that were just made about a community of interest that includes historic districts in central Tucson and where my daughter went to school and where my friends live and a whole lot of things like that, the parks I use.

But, and those things aren't being disrespected by the fact that they're going to be represented by two congressional representatives --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: -- in my view.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, Commissioner McNulty makes a good point in terms of the percentage of the Republican registration, the percentage of the current draft map that we'll be approving, many of those are strong Republican.

But, you know, the -- there's also a strong possibility with these three competitive districts that Republicans can win all three.

So meaning that there could be a seven-two split. That would be the worst-case scenario, or the best case
scenario, whichever way you're looking at it.

And you look at the -- for the Democrats, the worst-case scenario for the Republicans would be that they win the three competitive ones.

It would be, what, four-five.

So that, again, shows that, you know, Republicans are doing pretty well with this map.

You know, they can, they can complain all think want that this map isn't fair for them. But, you know, you start looking at the numbers, and you think, this is a darn good map.

I may change my Republican -- I mean, I may change my registration to be Republican so I can get representation if that happens.

Because seven-two is a strong possibility when you create three competitive districts.

So I guess I want to remind people that are in the audience and here that that could happen. And, I mean, I don't want it to, because I, I -- there's some differences between me and my Republican friends. But if it does, then so be it.

We did our best to create competitive districts.

And another point, you know, with district -- CD 9, you know, I, I, I mentioned this before, and, you know, the area that I live in, and Commissioner Freeman can
call it CD -- excuse me, Arcadia Light, Lower Arcadia. It doesn't matter to me what he wants to call it. It's still part of greater Arcadia.

And it's a community of interest that is well represented in CD 9. And I'm, and I'm extremely happy at the competitiveness of CD 9. And all the factors -- all the criteria that we, that we considered when we put that particular district in place -- actually all of them, because I think we followed all that criteria, all six of them.

And I think both of our attorneys, Republican and Democratic attorney, would agree that we followed the guidelines that we -- that were set before us.

And I am pretty happy with what we -- with the job we did. I think it was a true compromise. So I'm excited to be passing this, because, again, it's a true compromise map.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stetz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The last, the last Commission(sic), two years ago, or three years ago I guess, as you might recall our -- we had five Democrat congressmen representing and three Republican congressmen representing the state of Arizona. In 2010 it flipped to five
Republican congressmen and three Democrat congressmen representing.

I've been told and we've heard testimony that the last Commission was really focused on -- was not focused at all on competition until after the fact.

And we found that during the course of the last ten years we've had districts that were Republican, then Democrat, then Republican, then Democrat.

So it would be very interesting, and, again, my crystal ball is broken. I don't know how this is all going to flush itself out as time goes on.

So it'll be a very interesting thing to revisit in ten years from now to see how this work product actually turns out.

Because, because, again, the last Commission didn't concentrate on competition as their number one criteria. They concentrated on the voters rights districts and the other criteria first, and then tested everything with competitiveness, based on the records that I was able to review.

So, and, Mr. Herrera, it was, it was terrific, your comment about switching over to Republican.

I remember at a vote of Ronald Reagan's that said he was being asked a question of whether or not he took -- he was blaming the congress. He said the congress, the
previous congress was a problem and the previous
administration was a problem.

And Sam Donaldson asked him a question. He said,
Mr. President, do you not take any responsibility for this?

He says, of course I do.

He said, that's why I used to be a Democrat and
now I'm a Republican.

So I'm looking forward to having you come across
and join the Republican party as soon as you wish.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: You know, my community has,
my community of Paradise Valley, Arcadia, Biltmore has a
line right down the middle of it. It is being disrespected.

And, and that's where I live and that's where I'm
from.

And nobody is going to tell me otherwise.

I don't think that there has been any compromise
here.

I don't really believe that the constitution
requires some form of compromise. It just requires us to
follow the six mandatory criteria. And however the
districts shake out, they shake out. Because that's the
process, it introduces an element of randomness.

We create a grid map, and then those lines are
adjusted.

They're adjusted based on six constitutional criteria. And how they -- the districts are formed, they're formed.

I anticipated that we would be applying those criteria objectively, fairly, and that somewhere along the line the Commission would engage in deliberations, deliberations before the fact about communities of interest to identify where they are and whether they are real communities of interest such that we are required to respect them or not, and that we would formulate a map. Not create districts and then back out the rationale for them later.

I, I thought if we followed the constitution and did the things that way and adjusted the grid map that way, that the voters of Arizona, they may find themselves in a district that they may scratch their heads about, but they can look to this Commission and say, well, you know what, they just followed the constitutional criteria and let the chips fall where they, where they may, and that's, that's the map we got.

That I don't think has been the process with this Commission.

You know, it's been said that going back to the retaining of the legal counsel that that was a product of
compromise and negotiation.

There was no compromise. There was no negotiation.

It was a result-oriented process.

With respect to the retainage of the mapping consultant, again, that was said that that was a product of compromise and negotiation.

There was no compromise. There was no negotiation.

It was a result-oriented process.

And now it's being said that this map is a product of compromise and negotiation.

I don't see it.

I think it, again, is a result of results-oriented process.

And I am saddened by that.

And as I look at this map and think about how it was developed, I could not tell you how those lines are related to changes to the grid map.

I also can't tell you whether CD 9 or any other congressional district as viewed by one commissioner using one set of criteria as competitive, whether or not that causes a significant detriment to the attainment of the other constitutional goals. Because a baseline map, which I believe the last Commission did prepare, was never completed.
with respect to the congressional map.

   So for those reasons, and other reasons I've stated today, and over the last couple weeks and even back in October, I don't favor the adoption of this map.

   VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

   CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

   VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: You know, I --

   Commissioner Freeman is entitled to his opinion. And although I disagree with him that we disrespected any communities, I respect his opinion.

   And but what I want to do, we have a very capable attorney sitting on my left, that, that I would like to ask her, Ms. O'Grady, do you think in your opinion, your legal opinion, do you think we followed the six criteria that was outlined?

   And just -- I mean, I'd -- I think you've already stated where you -- your opinion, but I want you to be clear, and, and, respond, respond to Commissioner Freeman's comments.

   COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

   CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

   COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Before Ms. O'Grady makes that comment, I'm not sure whether or not the discussion that is -- has a motion on the floor that is specific and has been seconded in discussion unless there is a legal
question that the counselor would be asked to participate in
the discussion of the motion.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, assuming it's legally
okay, I would love to hear from Ms. O'Grady on Mr. Herrera's
question.

    COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, if it is
legally okay, it certainly is a legal question, whether she
feels we've complied with the constitution.

    MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, commissioners, as
stated when the draft map was approved, and the same is true
now, I believe that this map was developed following the
constitution, applying the constitutional criteria,
balancing the relevant factors. So I am comfortable that
the Commission has followed its constitutional
responsibility in developing the map.

    VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, may I ask one
more questions of Ms. O'Grady?

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Please.

    VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Again, I understand that
Mr. Kanefield isn't here today, but I know that you have a
good working relationship with him and he's been -- you and
him have disagreed rarely.

        And does he agree with your opinion?

    MARY O'GRADY: I haven't talked to him today,
obviously, pending the motion. But at the draft map phase
we both expressed our support for the -- that the maps were satisfying the legal criteria.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other discussion?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: All in favor?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Aye.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Aye.

Any opposed?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Nay.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Nay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

So we -- the motion carries.

We've approved this congressional map, which is this Mathis combo map as described currently. And I don't know that the official name that's on the website is up.

But I want to say that I really appreciate the work of all the commissioners to try to make the draft map a more -- a map that fits together better, as I said earlier.

It -- we listened to over 30 days of public comment, and took in the consideration of the legislature who provided their report, and all the other public testimony both in written and oral form.

And you helped us make a better map, and we
appreciate you doing that.

And I know it took a lot of time for a lot of you
to do that, so thank you.

I also appreciate the commissioners' help in
creating some of these districts too, in terms of being
responsive to all of the criteria and to the public comment.
It is a balancing act.

I'm proud of the balance achieved in this map. I
think it is well balanced and will serve the 6.4 million
Arizonans well in terms of representation.

So --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: The, the name of the map that
Mr. Desmond provided to us was a little complex, I think. I
think we should go back to the -- either we call it revised
Mathis combo map -- I think it's easier to remember, and it
would be -- it would make sense for us to change the name, just my opinion.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm fine with the name
change. It becomes the approved congressional map, I think
would be the -- probably the easiest. Approved
congressional map.

And this is pending these various legal and
technical questions that need to get addressed.
Ms. O'Grady, did you want to say something?

MARY O'GRADY: I want to make sure that that second concept is captured, if we call it the approved congressional map. But, again, the motion was that this is also subject to technical changes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think Ms. McNulty used the word tentative.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes, tentative final congressional map.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So that's what it will be called on the website.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

The time is 5:28 p.m.

And if we could, I'd like to talk about the legislative map.

And I know that Mr. Desmond prepared a new working map for us based on the discussion yesterday.

(Brief pause.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Mr. Desmond, do you want to talk about what you have in mind? What you did for us in this stack.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. We have three sets of reports.

The first of which is the full set that has
competitiveness, data tables, data tables for population, the splits report, and the plain components report.

You'll notice that there's been an update to the competitiveness table, and now includes the index of six, seven, eight, and nine, as well as two, three, four, and five, and the registration data that had been supplied before.

There's also two change reports that showed this map compared to the previous working map, and also this map compared to the original draft map.

And there have been a couple changes to that. Those indexes are -- six, seven, eight, nine are also included in here.

So...
The changes that we made are the ones we went through yesterday.

Districts 8 and 11, creating a voting rights district from District 8.

The ones in western Arizona, District 13, including La Paz. District 5 including parts of Yavapai County.

There's also been some small changes down in District 1, 9, and 10, in order to balance population a little bit.

Camp Verde has been added to District 6 in order
to balance population there.

   And then there's changes in Maricopa County to remove splits of Glendale and a couple other places.
   So at this point we can do a couple things.
   I can walk you through the change reports, although they are lengthy.
   We can look at other possible changes you want to have.

   I don't know if Mary had any issues she wanted to flag right away regarding population deviation in some of these districts, or if there's a better place to the start.
   I think we might be able to, I'm not sure, offer some sort of update on 26.
   So I'll let Mary.

MARY O'GRADY: In terms of population deviation, the things that I flagged when I was going through the working map for 12-20 is that there were a few that have increased that we might -- that the Commission may want to look at.

   The overall deviation is within the 10 percent, which is good.

   And -- but it seems like Districts 12 and 16 and 18 are all over four percent.
   So if there's a way of getting those decreased, that might be something worth considering.
The districts that are low in population are all the voting rights -- are the voting rights districts, by and large.

Some of the changes that the Commission considered yesterday eliminated deviation in six, which was helpful.

So those were the districts that seemed, again, on the high side.

So this could be addressed or at least justify keeping them where they are.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Desmond, did you -- were you able to get the registered voters logged anywhere onto any of these sheets?

WILLIE DESMOND: I haven't. I can give it to you as a separate report. I was not able to get it added in. I apologize for that.

It's something that I can prepare relatively quickly right now and print and distribute, if that would be helpful.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And, Madam Chair, for the purposes of the analysis and the potential vote on this map tonight, it's not relevant to that. It's more to have a better, more clear understanding of the voters as they pertain to the voting districts.
1 CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: You're wanting the registration by district?
2
3 COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm wanting the registration by district.

4 CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Isn't that in there?
5
6 WILLIE DESMOND: The percentages are.
7
8 COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The percentages are, not the numbers.

9 CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh. Okay. Got it.

10 COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And, Madam Chair.
11
12 CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
13
14 COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Desmond, that is something that I would like to have as something that after we get through this last stuff on the approval of the legislative draft map for my, for my files.

15 I mean, I can certainly create it off of, off of -- by accumulating it off of the data charts on Maptitude, but if you're able to do that in a, in an algorithm that extracts it into a working file, that would be terrific.

16 CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Do commissioners have any comments on the legislative working map?

17 COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I'd like to look at the changes that we made yesterday to District 26
and 27.

WILLIE DESMOND: This is District 26.

Changes yesterday related to removing Guadalupe, adding parts of Phoenix, and also adding Salt River reservation.

District 27 then takes parts of Tempe. It loses parts to 24 up here, and then gains a little bit from District 19 in this corner.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think when we did this yesterday we had three different versions of -- three different possibilities to substitute for the move of Guadalupe or the reinclusion of Guadalupe into 27.

And when we included this, I think it was the third version in the working draft. I don't think we realized that we have Tempe split, I think, it's six times.

So I would ask to look at what we had done earlier in the day yesterday.

I think we had done a version one or a version A that was very similar to this in terms of the metrics but didn't result in splitting the city of Tempe multiple times.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm not . . .

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It may not have been yesterday. It may have been the day before. But I know it's on the website.

One of them says version one.
There's the map, then there's version two, and then there's version three, and then there are three --

WILLIE DESMOND: I think I know what you're referring to. Let me bring that up.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: -- reports, A, B and C.

WILLIE DESMOND: You're referring to this one that just, that just removes part of the Dobson Ranch area?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: This was the very first one you received last week, is this the one you mean? Or the one that also includes Guadalupe? Or --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: No, it was one that we did as an alternative to including Guadalupe in 26.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. I think I know which one you're talking about.

So it was this one.

And basically what this does is, district -- District 26 just takes a smaller portion of Phoenix down here.

It does not -- if I turn off the draft -- the working map, you can see that District 27 does not come into Tempe anyplace but this little area surrounding Guadalupe, left over from the original draft map.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And in terms of the voting rights analysis, is that comparable to the third version? I
thought it was pretty close.

WILLIE DESMOND: It's not quite as strong.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: But it was stronger than the draft map.

WILLIE DESMOND: Still stronger than the draft map, yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

What is that little area of Tempe that's right next to Guadalupe?

WILLIE DESMOND: That's from the original draft map, the area -- that one in the draft map. If I turn on the streets, I'll tell you can exactly what that is.

It's Guadalupe Road, can we -- over on Orion, and then up on Hardy Drive. And the reason it's shaped the way it does -- it is, is because I believe that's one census block group, or two.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: What's the next street over? The next street to the east?

WILLIE DESMOND: The next street over is. . .

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Kyrene?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, Kyrene.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Could you turn on the HVAP layer?

Are we in District 18 now? Is that what that is?

WILLIE DESMOND: That is in District 18.
This is the HVAP layer.

This could go over -- District 27, District 27 could go over to Kyrene. That would be positive in terms of our deviation.

District 27 is a comfortable margin of HVAP.

The other thing we could do is District 18 could absorb this area that's red, although District 18 is already fairly large. It probably doesn't need any more population to be added in.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: But we can remove it from it, right, because it's over?

I'd just like to see what the Hispanic makeup of that area is.

WILLIE DESMOND: So I can give you the... COMMISSIONER McNULTY: What I was thinking was if it belongs in 27 with Guadalupe, then we should leave it there. But if it was just kind of inadvertent and it is -- it would be helpful to 26, then we could take it out of 18, which is overpopulated, and put it in 26, and it would resolve one of the splits also of Tempe.

MARY O'GRADY: And, Madam Chair, just in terms of the overall analysis, if it's helpful, the version that we submitted for analysis yesterday, which had the multiple splits of Tempe, looked -- ended up about the same as the version with Guadalupe, not a material difference in
performance between those two options.

We didn't run this particular option that Commissioner McNulty's looking at now.

So it seems to me we have the option of -- with -- let me see. Including Guadalupe in 26, or moving Guadalupe back to 26 and making some other adjustments like we did yesterday and, like, still considering.

And perhaps a third is putting Guadalupe back in 26 -- or, excuse me, back in 27, and as it was in the draft map, and then making the other enhancements that were made, like in the Dobson Ranch area, but then not make additional enhancements.

That obviously would be lower performing, but I don't know that we analyzed, you know, how different the performance is.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think that was -- wasn't that this version with the Dobson Ranch enhancement?

MARY O'GRADY: I think all of these versions now include the Dobson Ranch, because that's part of the working map.

WILLIE DESMOND: And that area is right here.

I'll grab the laser pointer.

This area has all been removed -- this area has all been removed in every version we've done, from 26, and added into District 18.
These labels are Hispanic actual percentage.
The shading is the same thing, but it just makes it a little easier to see, I guess.

So these two areas that are in 27, in the draft map and in this version, could go either to District 26 or, if you wanted to clean this, they could also go to 18, although 18 is large already.

If we took -- the other thing to consider is that District 27 is already underpopulated by 9,610 people. So removing this 3600 people would then put District 27 at a negative deviation of 6.2 percent.

(Brief pause.)

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Were you waiting for us?
WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'm sorry.
Okay. So, does that help anything or not? Does moving that help anyone?

Does it help 26 or is it better just to leave it in 27 because it's already underpopulated?

WILLIE DESMOND: The one district might help 26 a little, and that would be --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: The narrower version that you have in red now.

WILLIE DESMOND: It would be -- well, what you could do is take something like, like just this one block.
This would raise this 2,554 people and add those to 26.

Again, District 27 would need to grow somewhere. It's underpopulated.

But this would be -- it would be a net gain for both districts, actually, I believe, because that's higher than District 26 is on average and lower than District 27 is.

In terms of HVAP.

Let me just check the mine inspector index on this area and make sure it's not.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Twenty-seven is only at 4.5 percent underpopulated, and that's a voting rights district, isn't it?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, but with this change, just this little change, that it would be 5.7 percent.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Oh, okay. Let's not do that then. I don't want to start reorganizing everything. I just thought if it was easy.

But if we could -- I would really like to remove from the working draft that version that had all the splits in it, and substitute something that's comparable such as this map and have Dr. King look at it.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Six splits in a little town like Tempe doesn't make any -- sense to me. I should finish
my sentence.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. That would be something like -- let me see.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioners, it's 5:51 p.m. I'm just wondering if we could take a short break, a ten-minute break.

Okay.

So we'll have a break. It's 5:51 p.m.

(Brief recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We'll enter back into public session.

The time is 6:11 p.m.

Oh, we don't have our mapping consultant. We're going to need him.

(Brief pause.)

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay?

WILLIE DESMOND: There's a lot going on here. Let me take some stuff off.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: What did you say?

WILLIE DESMOND: There's a lot going on. I'm going to clean it up.

Okay.

Are there other changes that commissioners would like to see or other questions that they have?
One thing that we looked at during -- while we were looking at is District 26, how it could look, going back to we started out, just taking this one little portion, but also keeping kind of the changes to the other districts that we looked at yesterday.

The one thing this does is it underpopulates District 27 by more than an acceptable margin.

One possible solution that we identified would be for District 27 to take a little bit larger portion of Tempe since it does have a little portion.

I guess the one other thing we haven't discussed but we can look at would be since the congressional line is going to go right down here, as I mentioned yesterday, on the southern border of South Mountain, I could take just like the tip of Ahwatukee or something.

Does that, does that make sense?

So it would be something like this.

But...

So that District 27 would take more population from District 18 here.

District 27 is a voting rights district, so we would have to be careful what we're doing.

But this would be, this would be one other option.

The other thing we can do obviously was to have it take a little bit more of Tempe, right here, from
District 18.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Can we look at what we just had there?

WILLIE DESMOND: This would essentially just take this District 27. It needs to make up some population, make up 3,085 people, and go over to Kyrene, in between Guadalupe and Baseline.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So you're saying that would go into 27.

WILLIE DESMOND: That would go into 27.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And it wouldn't dilute it. It would help it.

WILLIE DESMOND: It would not be a positive addition as far as voting rights things go, although it would not be the worst area to add in.

And District 27 needs population somewhere. It has to grow.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And then does that put 18 in an acceptable range of deviation?

WILLIE DESMOND: So, as it's currently constituted, District 18 is overpopulated by 8,914 people. This would remove 3,085, bringing it to 5,829. So it's a deviation that's only 2.74 percent.

So it's still high, but better.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I like that
better than going into Ahwatukee.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

So that is how District 26 looks now. Guadalupe stays with 27.

District 27 is our most underpopulated district, I believe. Or -- no, not quite. District 7 is our most underpopulated district.

But District 27 is now underpopulated by 9,091, so a negative deviation of 4.27 percent.

Are there other things that you'd like to see right away or do?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, there are two other things I'd like to look at. One is the split in Yavapai County, where we added population to LD 5, combined it with Mohave County.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We heard a lot of public testimony about splitting Yavapai County, and I prefer not to split it there if we can avoid it.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So I was looking at the possibility of moving the portions of Yavapai County that are in LD 25 back into 14, moving La Paz County back into 5, and then removing from LD 14 into 13 Wickenburg, Wittman, Morristown, I think it's called, the little -- the towns in
that little triangle in the northeast corner of 13.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. We'll go ahead and just show you how that worked, but do it a little different.

So if I understand, District 14 is going to absorb population from District 15 in Yavapai County.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes, District 5.

WILLIE DESMOND: Or five.

That would add 18,865 people back into District 5 -- or into District 14 from District 5.

At this point District 5 is underpopulated by 14,516.

So it would take La Paz. That would put it overpopulated by 2.8 percent.

So at this point District 5 is pretty good.

District 14 is now overpopulated by 15,664. District 13 is underpopulated by 13,653.

So that District 13 is going to take from District 14 down here.

Go back to the county.

This would remove 12,262 people into District 13.

So at this point District 13 is underpopulated by 1391 people, a deviation of .65 percent.

District 14 is overpopulated by 3,384 people, a deviation of 1.59 percent.

There is a split removed from Yavapai County, and
La Paz is back with Mohave.

District 13 now takes the entire kind of western portion of Maricopa County.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Which I think is more rural portion of the county which is what we were shooting for, so...

The other area that I wanted to revisit was the change we had made in -- between 23 and 24 yesterday.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. In Scottsdale?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: In the school we had -- we were talking about three schools.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes, I believe there was -- the high school was right here.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'm concerned about that. I know we're trying to do maps that are compact and -- so I would prefer to use our original, the map of 24 that we had originally submitted for analysis.

If we were actually moving a district of some kind, then I would feel differently about it.

But just to move a couple schools within a district, I don't think it makes sense to be changing a voting rights district and putting that kind of contorted arm into it for that reason, so...

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: The changes that were proposed yesterday regarding those -- this swapping population, I wasn't in favor of.

I don't think it was insignificant.

And I don't think we took any action in terms of sending this change or proposed change to get it analyzed, did we?

If we did, I would like to see if we can reverse that and not -- if we end up sending it to get it analyzed, I would prefer that we not do that.

Does anybody remember?

WILLIE DESMOND: I don't believe this particular change of 24 was sent.

The larger changes dealing with taking some population from 27 and losing the Salt River reservation were sent.

I'm not sure if the analysis has been completed, but at least initially those seem to be a positive change to District 24.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Sure.

WILLIE DESMOND: But this area though was not included.

So the green line is the draft map. It did come down, just -- or the working map.

The draft map went straight across, took this
little portion out later, and then yesterday it was this -- kind of like little arm.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, I kind of view that as my fault a little bit, because I was trying to be responsive to them.

Once we realized, we couldn't do the quadrant the way they originally suggested, I think I said is there a way that we can partially accomplish what they're seeking.

And the only way to do that was to add that appendage, which I wasn't excited about, because it is a compactness issue.

But it looked better before for sure.

Any thoughts from other commissioners on that?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Just quickly the -- I think we had added some of the changes that Commissioner McNulty had proposed to the working draft map; is that correct?

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, yes, I mean, there are many changes that were added to the working draft map yesterday.

Among them were some changes in western Arizona. One of them being the Yavapai, that we just looked at taking out.

Other ones being District 22, District 15, 28, 20, 21, 14.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And, Madam Chair, I had agreed with Commissioner McNulty's -- well, most of her changes.

The only change I would be -- that I'm still supportive of is the District 28 where we make it more competitive by moving the entire Paradise Valley into 15.

If we were to do that change, with all of the other changes, all the other changes that have been -- that are on this map, how possible would it be without only messing with 28 and 15? Is it possible?

WILLIE DESMOND: It would affect, I believe, Districts 20, 28, and 15.

I assume since District 23, 24, 30 have not changed that it would be somewhat doable.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: It would be doable with changing only you said those three districts?

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm not positive.

Let me add the layer in there, and I can tell you definitively.

Marty's trying to eat my snacks, but if I talk he has to type.

(Brief pause.)

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe it would be possible.

District 20 would take population here and lose
population here.

District 28, the population it gains right here would shed this area and then the Paradise Valley to 15.

There might be some other additional tweaks that would come up. I can't say definitively. But I think it would be possible.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: You say it's possible. I -- again, not definitively, but you can see a scenario where only 28, 15, and 20 are affected by that change.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm going to do that as a separate one, so we can track these.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, what I'm trying to do is with -- have the -- with the changes that I'm proposing to 28, 15, and obviously 20, mirror the current working draft with the changes that have been proposed by Commissioner McNulty.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: So any changes that are made going forward, I want it to be reflected in the map that I've been proposing.

Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: So just -- should I try to draw this right now? I just want to make sure.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, how long would it take you to do that?
WILLIE DESMOND: Maybe ten minutes.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Sure.

Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: It might not take quite as long.

(Brief pause.)

WILLIE DESMOND: As it's currently constituted, District 20 is underpopulated by 28,466. District 15 is overpopulated by 45,344.

So what would need to happen is District 20 needs to pick up about 37,000 -- 37,000 people from District 15. That will leave them both overpopulated, but probably within our acceptable margin.

So let me -- do you have areas that you think make sense for District 20 to grow into?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, at this time I don't, but what I would like to do is to see what other changes are proposed to the legislative map and any -- I'm assuming probably going to be more changes. And once those changes are finalized or we start getting closer to what we feel comfortable that we've made all the changes that we want, then I'll propose the changes to those three districts to equal out or to get the population as close to balanced as possible, or at least under five percent, which I think the ones you mentioned are all -- are they all under five?

A couple of them are a little slightly over.
WILLIE DESMOND: They're all going to have to be over.

So right here, this would take 36,000 people from District 15 and add them to District 20.

I'm not saying this is the best way.

Fifteen would have to -- 15 is still fairly large, and would be overpopulated by 4.38 percent.

But I'll zoom out and let you just see what the districts look like this.

You might also want to clean up this area.

This is 34.

So if you did that.

Something like this, a little bit cleaner looking.

District 20 is overpopulated 3.35 percent.

District 15 is overpopulated by 4.58 percent.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, what I'd like to do is leave it, if you don't mind saving those changes, and let's go back to the working draft map.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And see what those changes are proposed. And then based on any changes that are proposed to the draft map, I'll incorporate them in -- into my -- my version of the legislative draft map.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Just one other quick question.
Did we -- am I to undo the change between 23 and 24 in south Scottsdale that we did yesterday?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, I think that's what Commissioner McNulty had proposed. And I would agree.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And I agreed too and asked if there were any other comments on it and didn't receive any.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: One of the reasons why I disagree with the -- with that change is it does impact the -- I think it's 24 that it impacts negatively. It does change it a bit, does retrogress.

Is that correct, Mr. Desmond?

WILLIE DESMOND: I think it was a fairly negligible difference in terms of the Voting Rights Act. We haven't seen the analysis on it.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay.

WILLIE DESMOND: It does obviously have a compactness component.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: The question came up last night, and legal counsel gave us their opinion, and the
opinion was that it made no impact at all on the district, and we were able to achieve something that benefited the Scottsdale Unified School District with having zero impact on the district.

And if you look at the districts as a whole, there is nothing that the little switchback at the bottom of Scottsdale district of 23, there are those sort of details on every single one of the districts.

So it's not as if compactness was dramatically affected or if any of the other districts -- those little details are all over the place.

So we determined last night that there was no impact on the voters rights district, and we were able to benefit a school district by bringing their high school and some other schools into their community of interest.

So I want to make sure that if we are going to extract this, that we know that we are going in opposite direction without having any real reason to go there.

Compactness is a non-issue. The voters rights district are a non-issue. And we would be doing this purely to harm a request from the school district to be able to bring schools into that district. So, just -- if that's, if that's the decision that the majority of the Commission wants to make, feel free.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any comments from other
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes, Madam Chair, for myself, I'm not doing it to harm a school district. I'm doing it because I don't think it's necessary to voting rights district. We had already submitted that for analysis.

I think the compactness is an issue.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I would agree. My decision was not to -- was not done to harm any school district, but what it was done -- because I think I've been pretty consistent that I want us to avoid making changes to the majority-minority districts, to avoid any changes if at all possible.

And I think with this case, I think, you know, we've put a lot of time and effort into designing the way it is now, so I feel comfortable with the analysis to get back.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: We spent a lot of time and effort last night trying to accommodate the request on 23 and we heard back from the counsel that there was no effect to the -- to District 24.
So, whether or not your intent is to bring harm or that your intent is to have compactness, it's clear by the rest of the map that we don't have compactness in many, many, many other places. So I don't think that this is adding to anything.

But if that's the decision, just make it go.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'd like to hear about the totality, I think, of all the different changes we're considering now tonight before we just decide on that.

So let's -- what else is out there that we want to address as a Commission? As individual commissioners, I should say.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I think that the -- at the end of the day yesterday, after a very long day, in regarding the majority of the legislative districts that are in -- that are contained in Maricopa County, I thought that the recommendations that had been given and outlined by Commissioner McNulty solved a lot of issues.

The reason why at the end of the day I had made a suggestion to bring pause to draw together a analysis report was based on really the core work that was done around in the general Maricopa County area.

We had communities of interest that were being
We cleaned up lines between districts.
We cleaned up splits.
I thought our work product in the general Maricopa County area was quite strong.
And I think that we -- from this commissioner's point of view, the general Maricopa County area that was designed by Commissioner McNulty had great merit, and I was extremely pleased where it all went. It solved a lot of problems that had been hanging out there from the previous maps.
I think the direction that we're currently going in is going in the -- a direction that in this commissioner's opinion is not moving that ball down the field in a positive way.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thoughts from other commissioners?
What else is out there that we'd like to address?
I think we heard some public testimony today about Litchfield Park and adding some -- two areas of zero population that are part of that community to it.
I would be certainly for that.
Others have thoughts on that one?
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And I think that that, just like the motion that was made in the previous -- for the congressional maps, I think that that regards to the technical issues, the cleaning up of the edges going to arterials and collectors where available, where they don't have any negative effect, they -- that could be couched together in a -- as a piece of a motion in a like way, specifically addressing areas where there is zero population but where we have community splits. Those could be added in.

I'm sure that Litchfield Park -- that area in Litchfield Park was specific just to that area, because we had somebody today giving testimony, but I'm sure that as the mapping consultants spend time looking at all the edges all the way around the -- all -- the edges of all the districts, that they're going to find not only there can be some adjustments from one district to another to clean up some of those edges, it would be -- they're going to find that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I agree.

Nonetheless, I think that change could easily be made today.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And I would suggest, I would suggest that that change be made today.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, I would agree that change is -- I think if the -- the way it was presented, it would be no impact to any of the surrounding districts.

So if that is the case, then, yes, I would support that change.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Did you want to pull that up, Mr. Desmond, the Litchfield Park?

What else is out there, commissioners, in terms of other adjustments to this map that people want to see?

WILLIE DESMOND: To the Litchfield Park changes, just these two areas, zero population, taken from District 29, into District 13.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I would support that change.

WILLIE DESMOND: There's a greater area of Litchfield Park, but moving that within the area that it encompasses, I think it moves like is a few thousand people, so it's not -- so this small area is, yeah.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I think that -- and I'm not speaking for the other commissioners, but from this commissioner's perspective, that those type of changes where they have a net zero effect other than to improve the quality of the -- keep in mind that someone came up during
break and said don't forget about the counties and the precinct maps, et cetera.

I think that's going to be another technical aspect that's going to come into play.

So when there's zero impact or, or the impact that might be helped -- or might be had, you know, there's some of this area where we're just going to have to allow for the interface between the precinct design, the county design, the community design, and the mapping consultants in the outlines that we've created to be able to make these subtle type of adjustments where it has no negative effect, or positive affect, other than to the community itself.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I, I agree with Commissioner Stertz.

But in this case I think this is a change that we can make now. We have it in front of us. I don't think anybody has any disputes that, that this should be done. I think we were told that it doesn't have any impact at all. There's no population there.

But I agree with Commissioner Stertz that going forward, I think, that information we should definitely have -- we should direct Mr. Desmond to look around edges. But for now I think this change I would approve putting it
into 13.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ:  Agreed.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN:  Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN:  You know, one of the, one of the glaring problems with the draft LD map was LD 13, which was a -- one of the last two districts to be drawn, and it was kind of a leftover district.  And it was a true barbell district with the population centers being the north part of city of Yuma and part of Surprise, with coyotes and saguaros basically and a few farmers in between.

And Commissioner McNulty then did propose a change yesterday that was trying to address that, I think, and it was, it was the right way to go, I think.

The problem with what happened yesterday that was of great concern to me is that Yavapai County got sliced up and the quad city area that we heard a lot about when we were up in Prescott and Prescott Valley got divided up as well.

I mean, what she's done today is sort of restore, not all, but most of the Yavapai County, put it back together.

I like that.

With respect to the change on LD 23, 24, I thought that that minor tweak actually very incrementally improved
LD 24, but I agree that zigzag looks funny. And compactness, particularly in an urban metropolitan area, I think is something to be really mindful of.

And then we try to use the major arterials that we looked at, and talked about before, I mean, if there's ways to make adjustments in that area to sort of keep the districts compact and follow municipal lines or major arterials, perhaps that's something to be looked at.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Do we want to look at that, on -- is this on 24 then? That area?

Can we pan down?

WILLIE DESMOND: So this switchback, this is -- that's Scottsdale Road.

I'm trying to...

This is Osborn.

Then the south is Oak.

Then this, this part right here, is 84th Street.

In the working map before yesterday, District 23 just had -- had this area going south down to Oak, and then back up.

And then this area was all 24.

So...

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. And it sounds like the Commission is split on that particular change.

Are there other changes out there that you want to
direct Mr. Desmond to address?

We can explore them and then decide if we want to do them.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I'm looking through my notes from our public testimony today. I guess the only other thing I see that I would ask Mr. Desmond to look at is the four block by four block area near South 12th Avenue in Tucson.

And I think there were two different proposals there.

One had just 519 people and one had 3,000 people. And I'd be willing to consider the 519 person change.

But, I -- if it didn't have any significant -- if it didn't have any effect, but I would be concerned about the larger change.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Could you zoom out just a touch, Mr. Desmond.

WILLIE DESMOND: Excuse me?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Could you zoom out just a touch, please?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: One of the things that was discussed was to bring that little notch that goes out and
crosses over Interstate 19, back over to 12th Avenue, extending 12th Avenue down to -- straight. Pull that notch out, put that into three, and then continue down on 12th Avenue and connect over.

12th Avenue continues. It's -- what their comments were was that they like the -- they like the idea of 12 being the devising line between two and three.

And my suggestion was that also 22nd Street to the north is a very strong north-south, and there could be an equal exchange of population by capturing what is being moved into -- from three to two would be moved from two to three.

So it made a, made a very even swap. And both the two representatives from -- that came and gave testimony both agreed with that.

So I'm comfortable with that, with that move.

I know the area well. And it makes perfect sense from a community of interest point of view, from a traffic point of view, and I believe that the communities that are there you're going to find -- I don't think are going to have a -- they're, they're, they're all of like demographic, so I believe that you're not going to see a -- any movement as far as the CVAP is concerned.

So I would be comfortable with making that move.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And that got notch got
created to begin with just because of a census tract; right?
That was the --
WILLIE DESMOND: Correct.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, so, okay.
WILLIE DESMOND: The one thing I just need to
point out is that this would be a net loss of 1700 people
for District 3.
So that District 3 would then be underpopulated by
10,700 people roughly, which is very close to our acceptable
margin.

But I'll leave it to Mary.
I can make that change and show you exactly.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That's why I would just
prefer to do the smaller change.
I don't want to start moving all our voting rights
districts really.

That was their, their principal concern.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: What was the initial block
that you highlighted, Mr. Desmond?
WILLIE DESMOND: This right here?
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: South of 86th, right.
WILLIE DESMOND: That -- the number of people
there?
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes.
WILLIE DESMOND: Is 3,912.
And that would be added to District 2.

So then District 2 would have a population --
well, then the other area north of 22nd, the notch, is 2,275.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Because one idea is to just have 12 keep going down, I guess, to Irvington. That would be another.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: If 12 goes down to Irvington, and that goes into two, and then the line, which is currently a side street, a local street, on 18th Street, which is that notch that goes above 22nd, comes down four blocks, then we've got a nice straight line connecting on 22nd Street to the north.

So 22nd, 22nd would go, from the east to the west, to 12th, straight down 12th, and to the -- then turning to the east on Irvington.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So you're suggesting making both those changes.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Well, both those changes were discussed, and both of those were, were --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: The 22nd one and the one that just goes straight down.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Correct. They, they had
suggested that 12th Street continue and 22nd Street continue.

I mean, it was -- that was their, their testimony, so I agree with it, and it makes perfect sense.

WILLIE DESMOND: I can, I can just show you real quickly what that would look like and then we can undo it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Mr. Herrera, do you have something?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I am in agreement with the smaller change that I think Representative Saldate was recommending, that community of interest, I think that piece that Mr. Desmond just highlighted, but I would not be in favor of the bigger change that Commissioner Stertz is proposing.

Not that Commissioner Stertz proposed, but I understand what you're getting at. It was, it was the public testimony from Olivia Cajero Bedford.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Well, both the senator and the representative both recommended these. This is a community change and from a community point of view and from a clean line point of view, it makes perfect sense.

WILLIE DESMOND: The one thing I should point out though, I hadn't realized this earlier, is this change brings the HVAP in District 3 to under 50 percent.

It goes from 50.2 to 49.66.
It's 50 is a nice round number.

I don't know if there's a huge legal distinction, but I just want to put that out.

And then the other thing is District 3 is underpopulated by 10,600 people, which is 4.98 percent.

So, not to say this is something we can't do, just pointing those two things out.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So if you extended -- if you, if you put back the 12th Avenue extension and left the 22nd Street horizontal line.

WILLIE DESMOND: So that switches --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: No, leave the --

WILLIE DESMOND: Do that change but undo this one. Correct?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Correct. And undo that one.

WILLIE DESMOND: So this would move 3,912 people back.

At this point District 2 is probably a little too underpopulated, 10,215.

I mean, there's --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: What does that do to the HVAP of three?

WILLIE DESMOND: Then three is back up to 50.36.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Well, it cleans up one of two lines that they were looking for, and that's -- I would
like to make that recommendation to this.

WILLIE DESMOND: I mean, the thing you could also do is -- I know Irvington is a good street to do it at. You could meet maybe somewhere in the middle here maybe. I mean, would any of these make sense to go down to?

Because District 2 is too small right now, so it should grow a little bit.

Could just go from the north, the first block group is, is District Street. That would put District 2 at a negative population of 9300, as opposed to 10,215.

The next block group it's Pennsylvania. That puts both districts about equally sized, both underpopulated. But one is negative 3.97. One is 3.96.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Go to the next block. Take it down to Michigan.

WILLIE DESMOND: I think -- no, the next one goes down to Ohio.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

The interesting thing is when 19 was built, it actually shows that all those streets are going through, but they don't. They are stopped into cul-de-sacs and dead ends on either side of 19.

So it's a -- that's why, that's why 12th Avenue is such an important connection.

So whatever you can do to balance the population.
If you need to back if back up to Pennsylvania, that would be...

WILLIE DESMOND: Let me just make sure what this does to the HVAP in three.

With the change, the HVAP is now at 50.05. So it's a, it's a slight loss from the 50.2, so, but it is above 50.

I assume its other indicators would also be strong, but I can't say for certain if you're in a change report district.

I can tell you like the mine inspector in District 3 would be 57, or 56.21. As opposed to it's currently -- oh, I'm sorry, it would be 69.06.

It's currently 69.07, so that's positive.

District 2 would go from 56.8 to 56.7.

Is that a change that you want me to make to the working map?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: From my perspective this is what we heard was the direction that they would like us to go in, and I would like this change to be made.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Ms. O'Grady, do you have any comments or concerns?

MARY O'GRADY: The effect on the voting rights
district doesn't seem significant, but we would have to get back, you know, for analysis, like we are with everything else.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Do we need to -- if we put this in the working draft, would we continue to have what's in the working draft now analyzed on a separate track, or are you comfortable that we could just substitute this?

MARY O'GRADY: I think we could substitute this, but then they'd need to look at, look at this.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thoughts from other commissioners?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: If it would be, if it would be okay, can we take a quick break? I'm drinking plenty of water. So, I don't want to miss any of this, so I'd like to see if we can take a five-minute break.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Stick to five minutes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think that we can do that. Are you okay with that? Can we have a five-minute break?

Okay.

As long as it's five minutes. We'll be timing
you. It's 7:06 p.m.

(Brief recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We'll enter back into public session.

The time is 7:11 p.m.

WILLIE DESMOND: So this change to Districts 2 and 3, is this something that you want to put into the working map?

Also outstanding is whether or not we change Districts 23 and 24, Commissioner Herrera's District 28, and also the changes to Yavapai, La Paz, and Maricopa County portion of 14 that Commissioner McNulty suggested too.

The only change I have right now is just to that small portion of Litchfield Park.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I would propose that the -- I think that four-by-four piece in, let's see, in -- where is it. Going from two to three, that small piece be approved and put into the working draft map.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I would propose that we listen to the folks that came here today looking for both of the changes that took place, not just moving the
four-by-four, but the other, the other changes of cleaning up 22nd Street and the extension of 12th Avenue.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I would be in favor of that, but the change -- if we were to adopt that change, that would be a significant change, and would affect the majority-minority districts, so I would not be in favor of that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I think we just had heard from our legal counsel it wouldn't.

But I -- if you knew about how Tucson works and how the areas work and how the streets work, I'm sure that if we had the opportunity to extend 12th Avenue without having a population deviation, it would be even better for us to extend it further south.

South of 22nd at that area as completely a community.

So, they talked about it, they recommended it, taking off the -- by having -- by saying that that little piece on one side or the other of 12 is just a piece of their recommendation.

I happen to agree with the recommendation that
they made, so I would like to, I would like to accept both
of the pieces, not just the small one.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thoughts from other
commissioners?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Could we go back to
Ms. O'Grady and just get clarification on her comment?
When you were talking about the fact that we could
substitute this, were you referring to the small change or
the larger change?

WILLIE DESMOND: The -- I believe -- I'm sorry.

MARY O'GRADY: Go ahead.

WILLIE DESMOND: I just -- there's -- I think
there's three changes that were proposed.

The first one -- so the red line is how the
district currently looks.

I'll turn on the major roads so you can understand
this.

The first set of changes would be just to remove
this little area, 590 people, and move it from District 2
into District 3.

The second set of changes was to straighten this
off here at District -- at 22nd Street and continue this
line down all the way until it hit Irvington.

That change had the effect of making the HVAP in
District 3 slightly under 50 percent.
A kind of compromise between the two, I guess, was to remove this portion on 22nd Street, move this section, and go down but just not as far as Irvington.

And what that did was it did lower the HVAP slightly in three, although the ability to elect is still very high there, but it left it above at 50, at 50.05.

I don't know if Mary has advice then.

MARY O'GRADY: Well, in response to Commissioner McNulty's question, I think we could substitute whatever the Commission approves -- chooses to do tonight and refer that for analysis and then get Commission information on whether it affects the viability of these as, as voting rights districts.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you, Ms. O'Grady, for explaining that again.

I think I would be okay with moving the compromise. I think that is was the third option that Mr. Desmond had mentioned. Moving it forward as part of the working map and getting it sent for analysis.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz, you were okay with that one, that alternative?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: As it's shown on the screen now, that would be yes. Because I think that that meets -- at least moves the ball down the field as far as what their -- what the folks look for, and it makes perfect sense to me.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So that will be added.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Hearing no objection.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Going back to our other changes, do you want to talk about the ones we've looked at or are there other things that we should explore if we're going back?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So right now on our list there's the Herrera 28, the Scottsdale School District issue, and what else?

WILLIE DESMOND: And the Yavapai County.

The one other thing I'd like to flag, no one's brought up, but there's a -- there is fairly large population deviations in Districts 16 and 12.

I don't know if Mary has anything she wants to say on that.

MARY O'GRADY: Yeah, I would say if you could take a look at those areas and see if those deviations can be minimized -- can be reduced at all, I think it's worth at least looking at.

We are within the 10 percent range, but we do --
we can make an effort to reduce those to the extent that we can.

WILLIE DESMOND: I believe that is as a result of Commissioner McNulty's changes to District 8, which made it better than benchmark District 23 yesterday.

So adding it back into eight as less than ideal, although to get those deviations slightly down that might be necessary if we can find some areas that make sense.

The other thing I'd be -- if any commissioner has a thought on how this could be done in a way that makes sense would be District 23 is currently overpopulated by 5,540 people.

If there's any way for it to absorb population from District 16 and 12, that would be great.

The one thing I know is that 12 does seem to run right along two census place boundaries.

So that it would probably introduce a split to Mesa here, or else it would have to come down, and perhaps, perhaps 12 can take some of the portion of San Tan from 16. Something like that.

And 16 can take something from 23.

Although I don't have, like, anything prepared as to how this can be done.

I just wanted to flag that as an option.

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

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Desmond, all of these adjustments that you need to make are, are a ripple effect from the changes that Mr. -- that Commissioner Herrera is recommending?

WILLIE DESMOND: No, no, these two changes are -- the fact that 12 and 16 are, are overpopulated is a result of trying to improve District 8.

And, you know, I'm not trying to say that these are things that have to happen.

Mary might want to say that.

I'm just pointing out that these are our two biggest districts, I believe.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I've spent a bunch of time looking at Commissioner McNulty's recommendations for Maricopa County. And I thought that she had made a extraordinary good representation and design for the districts that were in Maricopa County. And I would like to recommend going back to those districts and their design.

As far as the Scottsdale school notch, I'm -- my, my opinion is, is that we get these other areas cleaned up, that notch is probably going to go away.
I'm just more -- I'm really comfortable with the direction that Commissioner McNulty took in the greater Maricopa County metro Phoenix area in her district design. I'd like to go back to those districts.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is this because you want to go home?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: No.

As I said during break to someone, I said I can -- we can go ahead and continue to argue about districts and come up with all different kinds of ways that we can continue to disagree.

It's been rare in the nine months that I've been sitting in this Commission that I can specifically say, yeah, I've looked at these and I like them.

Listen, Commissioner McNulty knows that yesterday that she and I went toe to toe on Districts 8 and 11 for two hours.

Okay.

There is a representative here today that said that she's just -- she's extraordinarily disappointed by how 8 and 11 turned out.

We can start going down that path.

But what I'm suggesting is that the districts in Maricopa County as she contemplated them in this area -- I mean, I still do not agree with her at all in her 11
and 8. Okay. But in the cases of her Maricopa County splits, I believe that she made some very good and prudent decisions.

I'm not, I'm not agreeing with her in how she split up La Paz and Yavapai and Mohave. Okay. But she needed to make a decision with Yavapai that needed to come down and grab population in Yavapai.

The areas that surrounded the midtown area connected -- had good connection. There was a connection between, between PV and its adjacent cities, between Scottsdale and its adjacent cities, between -- it cleaned up more splits that were taking place in Peoria.

It created -- there was a lot of areas that made sense.

So, on this particular occasion, I'm happy to agree with her.

So...

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thoughts from other commissioners?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Is what's displayed on the screen now our working --

WILLIE DESMOND: No. Sorry.

This is still Commissioner Herrera's District 28
change.

Let me go back to --

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: It's not necessary. I just wanted clarification on that.

WILLIE DESMOND: Oh.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: This -- I mean, we already talked about this proposal yesterday. And, and as I said yesterday, to me this proposal reads significant detriment right out of the constitution.

In a district where you've got a legislator who could represent the corner of McDonald and Scottsdale Road and also, whatever it is, Happy Valley Highway, and the border of Peoria and north Phoenix.

I don't know what avenue that is, but I'm sure it's a big number.

That is -- that's quite a, that's quite a stretch. You've got Paradise Valley connected with -- by a narrow corridor to the north valley. Simply because of a need to pack Republicans together.

You've also split, once again, my community by splitting Paradise Valley off from the Arcadia, Biltmore area.

So I think that's a significant detriment to that community of interest.

It clearly sacrificed a lot in terms of
WILLIE DESMOND: Just -- I -- the red line is the current working map that Commissioner McNulty proposed yesterday.

This one is that change, but just to reflect Commissioner Herrera's District 28.

So Commissioner McNulty's map does not split, like, Paradise Valley.

I just wanted to --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And just to reiterate that I'm not splitting Paradise Valley. What I'm doing is keeping it whole in a different district.

And that's -- you know, I respect Commissioner Freeman but I disagree with him.

I don't think anything I did really leads to any detriment to any of the other three state-mandated goals, criteria. I think I did -- what I ended up doing is balancing out all six criteria to the best of my ability while creating a competitive district that created no significant detriment to the other goals.

But what I want to do and already directed Mr. Desmond is the -- any changes that are being proposed to the current working draft, I want to duplicated it in the
other -- in my draft, with the exception of the changes to
28, 15, and I think 20 were the three that were affected by
my changes.

WILLIE DESMOND: Correct.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, once again the record
has been misrepresented.

I did not say Paradise Valley had been split.

I said that Paradise Valley, Biltmore, Arcadia
community of interest, that I've spent my whole life in, has
been divided up again in that map.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioner McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Can I ask about the changes
that I proposed to make Yavapai -- to reduce that -- remove
that split between Yavapai and Mohave County? Was there a
problem with that from the perspective of any commissioner,
or is that something we can incorporate in the working
draft?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: That was one of the first
things I wanted to comment about it is that the effort to
sort of repair LD 13 originally resulted in -- I think it
required another split of Yavapai.

But I agree that we've heard a lot from people up
there about keeping Yavapai County as whole as possible. It
especially constitutes an LD. Now it's got a chunk of
about 51,000 people, I think, taken out of it to put in that
LD 6.

But, your effort -- your efforts to sort of repair
it, I think, are good efforts.

It keeps it as whole as possible.

It does have to dip into urban Maricopa County,
which I don't think folks up there would want, but I guess
if that's the price to be paid for salvaging 13, that's the
price to be paid.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I think based
on that I would suggest that we incorporate that in the
working draft. It's one less thing that we need to -- one
thing we can check off.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Commissioner McNulty, when
you, when you -- let me ask a question about how you --
you've got a -- the portion of Yavapai that you, that you
captured to bring into Mohave is identical in population to
La Paz County.
Could we give back La Paz to Mohave, and give the 21,191 out of northwest Yavapai back to Yavapai?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Yes, that's actually exactly what we did.

Mr. Desmond, could you walk through that again?

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure. So --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That was something that I proposed earlier tonight.

WILLIE DESMOND: Let me just add that other layer back in, and I'll be able to show you.

So essentially what happened is that this portion of Yavapai went back into District 14.

That meant that District 5 was too -- too small.

So then District 5 came down and took La Paz.

Five, five was the right size.

Thirteen was too small, and at this point 14 was too big.

So to compensate for that, District 13 went in and took, you know, Wickenburg and Morristown, and brought the border of 14 and 13 out to the Maricopa County line.

Now, District 14 does still come into Maricopa County now, but it does in the Cave Creek, New River area.

So -- but it does -- you know, this does clean up the western side of Maricopa County. There's one less split
of Goodyear and Buckeye. And District 13 is -- but does not have La Paz and as still fairly rural.

So the map did look like --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: You don't need to go back to it.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Well, the map looked like this, and now it looks like that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

So, 13, 5, 14, in my opinion, all the districts as were currently designed and put in place by Commissioner McNulty's maps. And they could be anchored.

I'm very satisfied.

Again, my argument is right now between 8 and 11. And that's not an argument that I'm going to win.

So I think that Commissioner McNulty has done a nice job in creating districts. And you just solved the big one with Yavapai, which is now not splintered up.

I wish Gila wasn't split into three.

We talked about that yesterday. Determined that between seven and eight, it became, it became non-negotiable.

Mohave and La Paz are kept whole.

Yavapai has now been broken.

Has less splints in it.
Keeps districts intact.

Thirteen is less of an arbitrary capturing of population by creating a little skinny throat to get to the body of it.

Four is a majority-minority district, which is left intact.

As it was two with the slight adjustments that we just made.

One, we've had no discussion or touching to.

Three is a minority-minority district -- majority district.

Nine and ten are the greater Tucson districts, and both of those are as close to being competitive as any districts have been in the greater Tucson area in the last 20 years.

Now if we could just fix 8 and 11, we've -- you could get me there.

Madam Chair, my kudos to Commissioner McNulty on the 14, 5, 13 fix.

WILLIE DESMOND: Am I clear that this change to Yavapai, Mohave, La Paz, District 13, is to be included in the working map?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, are there any other outstanding issues other than the --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Just answer Mr. Desmond
though first.

    Yes, I would agree to that.

    Hearing no objection, I think that those can go

into the working map.

    Sorry, Mr. Stertz.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: No, I'm going down the next

path right now. Is that not... .

    We are, we are, again, growing close to -- I'm not

trying to be -- I'm not trying to dismiss

Commissioner Herrera's redesigns of the greater Phoenix

metro area in those several districts, but there will be a

lot of resistance and hard discussion about those.

    And I am not sure whether or not the -- well, I'll

just close as saying that in the effort for a lot of, a lot

of compromise that's taking place here, take a real look at

Commissioner McNulty's decisions in these midtown districts,

and I'd like to just leave that up to the commissioner to my

right to tell me whether or not I'm off base and whether or

not he likes these, he likes these midtown districts the way

that Commissioner McNulty's presented them.

    VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

    VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I appreciate

Commissioner Stertz's comments.

    You know, I didn't propose that 28 as I'm
proposing it be part of the working map.

What I proposing is that we create -- I'm creating a map that's mirroring what we're doing with the working map.

The only difference would be obviously 28, 20, and 19, those three districts that are affected, would be slightly different than a working map.

And, it's -- if things -- if the working map -- if you guys end up approving the working map, then I guess District 28, the way I'm proposing it, will be, will be a moot point. But if it doesn't get approved, then I will propose that the -- my version be considered, because I think it's a, it's a good map.

We incorporated all the ideas that we're talking about to today with -- again, with the exception of those three districts.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Well, if that's what it down comes down to, why don't we just vote on the -- whether the Commissioner Herrera's changes are accepted or not in the working map?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: What else is outstanding, commissioners, besides the 28 -- is that the right number, Mr. Herrera? -- and the Scottsdale change? Are there any
other adjustments?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Do we want to look at 12 and 16 and see if there's any way to edge a little population up into 23?

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mary is nodding yes.

WILLIE DESMOND: All right.

One thing we can do from 16 would be to take a little bit more -- there is a split already between Mesa and 25, Mesa and 16.

Perhaps 25 could just take a little bit more population.

Twenty-five is overpopulated by 3,935 people. However, 16 is overpopulated by 10,128. Balancing those both out probably would be a good thing to do.

As far as District 12 goes, District 17 doesn't have much room to absorb any population. It is also overpopulated.

So that's not an ideal situation.

Looking at some of the areas as far as HVAP go, it's possible that District 8 could absorb a little bit from District 12, without having a terribly large effect on its ability to be better than District 22. Or 23.

I mean, let me just... 

Like, for instance, just taking this back to the
border would move 2,314 people. That would make District 12 still overpopulated, but only by 6,815 people.

District 8 would be closer to ideal population also.

So there's -- that's a less than ideal thing, because District 8 is a district that we're, we're going to bring to the Department of Justice right now, but it might be something worth exploring.

I leave it to Mary to see if the cost to District 8 as a voting rights district for Justice is outweighed by the fact that District 12 will be closer to ideal population size.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, and I don't -- did you give all the numbers?

WILLIE DESMOND: So this will take District 8 from an underpopulation -- or District 12, excuse me, from overpopulation of 9,129 people to an overpopulation of 6,815, which would be a deviation that would go from 4.28 percent down to 3.2 percent.

MARY O'GRADY: And the minority impact?

WILLIE DESMOND: So currently District 8 has a voting age Hispanic percentage of 31.33.

With this change, that percentage drops, 31.24.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Can we look at that as the last resort rather than as the first choice?
WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Can we go up to 23 and, you know, start there and see what we might add to that from 16?

WILLIE DESMOND: Sure.

Twenty-three does currently end at the Maricopa County line.

So it could go into Pinal County north of Apache Junction, Gold Canyon. It could also come in and take a portion of Mesa in District 16.

There's really no way for District 23 to grow through Tempe and this part of Mesa and Scottsdale, because those are all voting rights districts.

So...

Is there a preference as to where to start, in either Apache Junction or Mesa?

MARY O'GRADY: And, commissioner, just referring back to some public comment in the Las Sendas area at the Maryvale hearing, we did hear from a representative of that community that some of that was in 16 and they wanted it to be moved into 25, which is up on that north -- by moving the line over to Power Road which is up in the northwest corner of 16.

I don't know if that helps in addition to looking at some other switches into 23.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It seems like that would
help a little bit.

WILLIE DESMOND: So, if, if we're just doing a swap between 25 and 16, we could either do something like this, move 3,000 people -- never mind.

So something like this would move 2,147 people from District 16 into District 25.

District 16 would go from a positive deviation of 10,128, which is 4.75 percent, to a positive deviation of 7,981, which is 3.75 percent.

Additionally District 25 would grow from a positive deviation of 1.85 to a positive deviation of 2.85.

Just so it's clear what area we're talking about here, this would be continuing over on McKellips, until it hits, it looks like, Usery Pass Road.

So. . .

This is Usery Pass.

This is McKellips.

This doesn't address any of the issues in 12, but it does help 16 quite a bit.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And it doesn't introduce another split.

WILLIE DESMOND: It does not.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Okay.

That seems like a good idea.

Should we look down at 12 and see if there's
anything there that could be. . .

WILLIE DESMOND: Before we do, is this something we should do or not?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Commissioners, how do you feel about that change? This is all for the population balancing of 12 and -- 16?

WILLIE DESMOND: This would be a population balance of 16 and 25.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, how do we, how do we -- seven is the, is the most glaring district of population deviation.

WILLIE DESMOND: That's right.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I understand we're trying to get narrower between the ditches here, but seven is the one we've got our biggest deviation on.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. O'Grady, do you want to explain that or answer that?

MARY O'GRADY: Well, seven is one of the voting rights districts, so all of our voting rights districts are low, and we can certainly justify that deviation.

So we're looking at trying to focus on the non-voting rights districts and to see if any of those areas -- those deviations can be reduced.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So, in your opinion, seven, as it currently exists, is -- we should let that stay
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status quo?

MARY O'GRADY: Yeah. As a legal matter you don't need to adjust the District 7 deviation.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: That was also the opinion of Bruce Adelson, and also that is the map that the, that the native tribes in the district favor.

So I'm okay with keeping that deviation the way it is.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Part of, part of the reason why I was asking for the population or registration of each one of the districts was because voters rights districts trend and tend to be a lower registration by district.

And I am okay with -- the reason I was asking about seven is because seven actually has a higher percentage of voter registration in that district than the other voters rights district.

So even though we've got a lower population, we actually have a higher percentage of voter registration, which is -- by comparison to the other ten districts is actually nominal.

So, so I'm comfortable with leaving that district
underpopulated, if that's the recommendation of counsel and consultants.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Can we look at 12?

WILLIE DESMOND: Just still -- is this --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Why don't we lock that.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

Here's 12.

It is overpopulated by 9,129 people, which is a positive deviation of 4.28 percent.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Ms. O'Grady, can we justify that? You know, we've done a lot of work in that corner of the state.

We've kept Chandler in two districts. We've kept Gilbert as whole as we can. We've kept Queen Creek as whole as we can.

We have addressed splits in Mesa to try to reduce those.

All those things have been done with the result that 12 is a little more over populated than it might otherwise be, but I'm not seeing any logical way there to address that, unless we do another split someplace.

MARY O'GRADY: Okay. And that's what -- and that's the exercise we need you to do to look and see if there are alternatives that could reduce the deviation. And if there's not, based on the other constitution criteria,
then we're fine as long as we're in -- within the constitutional range. And we are.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I would also say that we're -- you know, we've got District 27, which is a voting rights district, just on the other side of 17, the Chandler district.

We've got 26, which is a voting rights district that we've done a lot of work on.

And we've worked on population sharing between 18 and 26 to bolster that voting rights district.

And all of those things, coupled with the things the things I just described -- I'm sorry. We have a voting rights district, 27, which is just west of 17 which is adjacent to 12.

And we've done population sharing between 27 and 18 to improve the voting rights district.

We've done population -- and just north of that is District 26, which is also a voting rights district.

We've done population sharing between 18 and 26 to improve that voting rights district.

And all of those things coupled with the things I just described about Chandler and Gilbert and Queen Creek and Mesa, in keeping those municipalities from being further divided, all contribute to the current population of 12.

So should we go back up to 16 and 23?
WILLIE DESMOND: So you want to look, again, at the balance between 25 and 16, or do you want to see if there's a way for 23 to come in and take some population from 16?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: What about those unincorporated areas? Does that make any more sense, or...

WILLIE DESMOND: I'll take a look.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Or does that make less sense?

WILLIE DESMOND: I don't think there's a lot of population there.

If we do some small, small, small splits of Mesa here, some of these areas that are city islands and county islands.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: And that's all interspersed, so -- I like what you did -- I like what you did earlier better because it doesn't introduce another split into Mesa, but it does help a little bit to balance the population.

WILLIE DESMOND: So, like, this area right here has about 1700, 1800 people.

I would do a split of Mesa, but it would also help.

Twenty-three certainly can grow, but...
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'd rather not split Mesa again, if we can avoid it. I'd rather pursue your first proposal.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. Just to refresh you on that one.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: That would also be a county split if we did it the other way; right?

WILLIE DESMOND: No, we would be able to stay within Maricopa County here.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: The -- District 23 as it is now is -- it's not underpopulated. It's actually almost ideal.

So what is the rationale of making those changes? Is it, is it because of 16 being a little overpopulated? I can certainly -- if that's the case, it's still under the five percent threshold that we talked about.

WILLIE DESMOND: I guess the thinking being that since it's kind of been the policy of the Commission to underpopulate voting rights districts to the extent that it helps improve their performance, the rest of the districts that are not voting rights districts might have to
share some of that burden and have kind of a pseudo-ideal population that's somewhat a little bit above the 213,067 that, that would be ideal if all districts were of equal size.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Could you bring up the street layer on that as well? Because if you just -- I want to make sure that we're not interrupting.

WILLIE DESMOND: So what this would do is District 25 will continue, continue east on McKellips -- McKellips, sorry, will continue east on McKellips until it hits Usery Pass Road, and it will continue up Usery Pass Road to, to the border with 23 and Indian reservation.

Currently District 25 runs up at 76th Street, over at Hermosa Vista, and then up at 84th Street.

So move backward.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: You can actually go all the way up to the county line to the right, pick up that unincorporated area, that last little piece.

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, the issue is that 16 does not have much -- or 25, excuse me, does not have much population to grab.
It could take a little bit more, yes, if we were to do something like... 

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Go to the block level. You can follow.

WILLIE DESMOND: Yeah.

So if we went to the block level, District 25 continued.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Grab that little notch down... That's 31.

WILLIE DESMOND: 3161. And then District 25 would be overpopulated by 7,096.

District 16 would be overpopulated by 6967. Deviations of 3.33 and 3.27. So, yes, that would, that would balance those two very well.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Great.

WILLIE DESMOND: Just so I can pull out you can see how that looks.

The area in red would be included with District 25.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: It seems like a reasonable swap to marry districts. The districts are demographically
very consistent with one another.

I've -- it's been probably a year since I've been up in those neighborhoods. They're -- those being split into two legislative districts, the legislators in that area probably all know each other and probably represent 25 and 16 fairly consistently. So, I see no problem with a split like this. And it balances population.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Does that get us where we need to be, Ms. O'Grady, do you think?

MARY O'GRADY: It does seem like this will help as well.

3.3 and 3.27. So that, that does help.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: The time is 8:00 p.m. So we'll take a five-minute break.

(Brief recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We'll enter back into public session.

The time is 8:07 p.m.

And I think we just found a central solution for population balancing.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Before we left and went to break, there was -- it was a -- left with sort of a dangling decision. And, and we could ask counsel if, just to put on
the record, that the concept of -- of the reason why we
would, even though we're overpopulated in districts, why we
would want to make this modification now for the record of
balancing these two districts as we -- as we're
contemplating.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, commissioners, this is
just part of an effort to look at all the deviation -- the
deviations and reduce them to the extent we can.

And then so this does help reduce some of the
higher -- the deviation in 16.

And to the -- in other areas where we have not
been able to, as it was explained, there are issues with
running into voting rights districts and also trying not to
create additional splits with municipalities. So we're
doing -- the Commission has been doing the best it can to
reduce, but also recognizing and respecting the other
constitutional criteria.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: If I understood that
correctly, if even though we're just pushing puppies from
one box to another box and the puppies are the same, it's
still is a better record to have saying that we made the
try to try to balance population, even though both
district are still overpopulated.
MARY O'GRADY: Right. Because they are -- we are reducing our high end districts, the deviation from the ideal.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Then based on the, on the map that was showing on the screen, I happen to agree with it in its entirety.

WILLIE DESMOND: I'm sorry about that.
I forgot that I was broadcasting.
This whole process would be so much easier.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, I'd recommend the action of the movement of population as described.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any objections or thoughts on that?
I shouldn't say other objections. There were no objections, but...

Okay. It seems like everybody's in agreement then on that.

WILLIE DESMOND: I just want to also -- any members of the public who might have just received a block equivalency file, it could be changed if I find noncontiguous areas. Just a fair word of warning.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Actually, speaking of the public, we have two request to speak forms, and I thought we'd go ahead and take those, if that's okay with everybody.

Okay. Steve Muratore, publisher, Arizona
Eagletarian.

STEVE MURATORE: Thank you, Madam Chairman, commissioners. My name is Steve Muratore, M-U-R-A-T-O-R-E. Very briefly I wanted to mention Commissioner Stertz had brought up that one of the changes that was recommended yesterday was brought up by a representative of Scottsdale schools, and I wanted to make clear that the gentleman that he was referring to, a Dr. Michael Rubinoff, is not a representative of Scottsdale schools.

He is instead a film professor at ASU and a resident of south Scottsdale, so . . .

The other thing I wanted to say is, I'm wondering, and nothing personal against anybody, but I'm just wondering why Mr. Freeman's community of interest would be more important than mine.

He mentioned that he's concerned about his community of interest being torn apart. And I, of course, have indicated my concern with the congressional map on that regard too.

Mine isn't going to be addressed, I don't think. And my point is that nobody on the panel's community of interest is sacred any more than any other citizen.

I just wanted to make that point.

Thanks.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Mike Flannery, from Yavapai County.

MIKE FLANNERY: Madam Chair, Mike Flannery, M-I-K-E, F-L-A-N-N-E-R-Y.

Madam Chair, commissioners, first of all, I want to start by saying thank you all. I know that this has been a very trying experience for each and every one of you. And the majority of you have had to endure personal issues as well, and hope you make well on those issues as well.

I came down here today because of a map change that had occurred.

And I am keenly aware that if you want to make somebody happy with something they’re not really happy with, show them how bad it could be.

And you did that. And thank you, Commissioner McNulty, for making that change to Yavapai County.

I am certainly happy with the way it looks now. So thank you very much.

I, as you know, started out with Yavapai County being whole.

I'll give up on that now, but you certainly have shown me that it could be a lot worse. So I appreciate
that. So thank you very much.

And with that, happy holidays, everyone. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We should have employed that strategy earlier in the process.

Okay.

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

JOSH OFFENHARTZ: Last name is Offenhartz, O-F-F-E-N-H-A-R-T-Z.

I'd just like to start by wishing the Commission and the audience a happy first night of Hanukkah.

Some of us are giving up our holiday time to be here, because this is a very tense and important effort.

With that said, I would like to clarify Steve's remarks on Mr. -- Dr. Rubinoff. He is an active citizen in south Scottsdale.

I don't want to put testimony in for him, but I know that he is actively working with the superintendent of the Scottsdale Unified School District as well as local leaders to present his ideas, along with myself.

And so while we don't speak for the school district, we have asked them to weigh in on the proposed change.

I would like to advocate for the change in the
final map and remind you that the proposal that we had initially submitted also had negligible effects on the voting rights district and would have addressed the compactness issues as they stand now.

So we, you know, strongly encourage you to accept that change into the working map and final draft.

With that said, I'd like to echo the sentiments of the previous gentleman that I do believe that the McNulty compromise is a compromise. I think that in terms of LD 23 it works very well. In terms of 28, especially the testimony that we heard from Paradise Valley today, that it is a very good compromise.

I would urge all of the commissioners to focus their attention in that direction as we move forward, especially those regions as opposed to something that I think we've heard is a little bit more drastic with the Herrera proposal.

With that said, Commissioner Herrera, we do appreciate competition, and so we would like to see that for the area.

But with that said, I'd like to reiterate that personally I find the McNulty compromise a great addition.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Just as, just as a clarification, Mr. Muratore was making comment on a piece of testimony that I put into the record. I had given — I was given the impression by his testimony that he was representing the Scottsdale School District. And Mr. Muratore was just clarifying that he was not, and you've just reaffirmed that, so I appreciate that.

JOSH OFFENHARTZ: Correct. I don't think he was intending to speak for the school district.

I know that the superintendent had spoken with Dr. Rubinoff, and was going to try and come out to speak on his own behalf for the school district, but obviously that's not the case.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Any one else from the public who wanted to address the Commission?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

WILLIE DESMOND: I think the only other thing we had besides the District 28 and the south Scottsdale was trying to remove a little population from District 12.

We wanted to try to do that without affecting District 8.

So, one thing we could possibly look at is
District 17, though overpopulated by 7,600 people, and
District 18, overpopulated by 5,800 people, are our high.
Maybe we could move just 1,000 or 2,000 people from
District 12 into District 17, and then 1,000 people from
District 17 into District 18.
And that would perhaps bring District 12 down
below the four percent population deviation, and might do
something.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think I had just
explained why it was that we felt we had made all the
adjustments to 12 that we needed to make, given that it's
surrounded by voting rights districts and we have respected
municipal lines and comments from the various municipalities
there.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I agree with
Commissioner McNulty's explanation of why 12 is the way it
is, and I would propose that we don't deviate from that.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I would add that more --
District 16 shares a boundary, a county, its northern
boundary is the county line, and that any additional change
we would make on the north side of that district would
involve an additional split of a county, and extending the
district over into Pinal County.

And for that reason I wouldn't want to do that either.

I think the change we made to 16 that Mr. Stertz organized is a good change. It helps balance the population. But I wouldn't want to move the district line over into Pinal County.

Madam Chair, would it make sense to leave it at this and if, you know, Strategic Telemetry or legal counsel come up with any other ideas that don't conflict with what we just talked about, they could bring those to us when they do the technical changes?

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay.

All right. Then the two outstanding issues I think are south Scottsdale and District 28, Commissioner Herrera's map.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: The -- my changes I that mentioned before to 28 are trying to parallel the working draft map, and the only difference would be in 28, 15, and possibly 20.

What I don't want to do is -- I mean, because right now what I have to do is be able to balance out the population between those three districts.
I don't want to spend the time and waste anybody's time here unless the draft map isn't approved. Then if that's the case, then I will definitely make the changes tonight.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thoughts from other commissioners?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I just reiterate my concern about 23 and 24.

I prefer not to introduce something that's that -- the opposite of compactness into that district. So my earlier comments stand.

I would prefer to -- last night we had talked about leaving the voting rights district as it was. And then I think we ultimately substituted that version. But I would really prefer to leave the voting rights district as it was for the reasons I explained earlier.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: The, the working draft map as it is now, it does not incorporate those changes we were talking about yesterday; correct?

WILLIE DESMOND: The working draft map does.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay. I would be in favor of reversing those changes.

WILLIE DESMOND: So the green line is the previous
working map, black line is the working map as of today.

Again, the high school, I think, was located right here. That's the -- for the switchback it's been called.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I would be supportive of moving back those lines as we had them before. I think we -- those are the changes that we -- the map that it was before, I guess, the -- going back to the working draft map, the original one before the -- we proposed those changes.

And also I think we -- Mr. Desmond had said that those changes were not sent for analysis.

WILLIE DESMOND: I don't think this switchback was switch for analysis, no.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Oh, okay.

But just in case if they were and we're somehow missing it, then I would propose that we not have Mr. King or Mr. Strasma look at those proposed changes.

WILLIE DESMOND: Well, we'll be sending continual working maps until the Commission adopts something.

So the issue would be do you want the switchback in a working map? Or would you like it to look like it did in the previous iteration? Or, would you like to look at something different, or new, another solution?

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

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: We're really -- however we spin this on this little corner is however we spin it.

Honestly, it's, it's -- I'm looking at Districts 15 and 28. Commissioner McNulty's looking at 23, 24.

If we're -- if we -- I'm looking at how they're currently configured in the McNulty map right now.

This little piece, this little change from all aspects is not consequential.

We make big sweeping changes to 28 by trying to carve up 15, and we start going down that path, this discussion on this little piece is really not real relevant by comparison to what happens if we start going down another path.

So I'd like to talk -- so I'd like to jump this piece just for a second and talk about whether or not we can start looking at whether or not this Commission wants to look closely at Commissioner Herrera's current recommendations for modifications of these central Phoenix districts.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: We're talking about a couple of blocks being moved around here.

And in another area we're talking about cities and
transportation corridors and large, large substantive changes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: As I said before, the -- there's some tweaking that I still need to do to that particular map to deal with balance out the population, everything else being equal or being very similar to the working draft map that we're looking at now.

And, again, if -- I don't want to waste anyone's time, if, if, if the working draft map ends up getting approved.

I think you had asked Commissioner Freeman the same thing on District 9. District 9 was a, a -- Congressional District 9, excuse me, was a area that Commissioner Freeman had concerns.

And you had asked Commissioner Freeman if he wanted to tackle some of these issues that he had with District 9.

And I think his -- and I'm not going to quote him, but I think he was -- basically said that if it's going to be approved, then I'm not going to waste my time.

But, you know, I don't want to speak for him, but I think that's why he ended up not tackling that issue.
Again, I will tackle that issue if, if the map doesn't get approved the way it is, yeah, I'll definitely -- I'll make the changes that I've been recommending and spend the time.

And I think I would be able to do it tonight.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, I'd like to, I'd like to see us move forward with the map as we -- as it's currently contemplated.

If Commissioners McNulty and Herrera feel adamant about the 23, 24 change, then go back to the, go back to the original design.

Scottsdale community -- Scottsdale School District is, is broken up in other areas, if they feel that strongly about it.

I feel very strongly about what Commissioner McNulty has done to design in, in the mid-Phoenix area, Paradise Valley area, its connection to its surrounding area.

And I will argue at great lengths to retain the work product that she's created.

And I think that I'll probably -- I'm not sure whether or not I'll be able to argue successfully, but I know that it would be -- I think that I can create enough testimony that it would -- it makes sense.

And I think that we can take this down to the
street and block level, the transportation corridor level, communities of interest level, geographic feature level.

She's also overlaid districts that, that meet as much criteria as we can possibly meet in these legislative districts. And I'd like to, like to hold to the lines that she's drawn.

And if one of those includes the little tail on 23, then back it off and go back to the way it was.

I'd like to see this map moved down the field the way that it is.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thoughts from other commissioners?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Just to correct yet another misrepresentation on the record.

With respect to CD 9, I did propose various alternative, alternative fixes to that district, even calling out canals and specific streets, and how the changes might be accommodated by moving the line up in through Scottsdale.

So it is not the case that I proposed -- I did not want to tackle it.

I did make numerous proposals trying to address that issue and respect that community of interest.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any thoughts from any other commissioners?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I would say I appreciate Commissioner Stertz's comments.

And on 23 and 24, I'm just uncomfortable about that where it's going to be there for ten years. I don't think it's a good reflection on our map making skills, and I would prefer to go back to where we started yesterday morning on that district.

I know it's not a huge thing in the scheme of things, but I do think the optics of it are problematic. I think it compromises compactness in a voting rights district. And I just prefer to keep the voting rights district previously as we had submitted it.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Can we direct Mr. Desmond to move the lines back to the original -- they were there this morning -- I mean yesterday morning?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Again, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Can we, can we move forward with the, with -- I'd like to get a, I'd like to get a feel from the rest of the Commission about how they feel about the mid-Maricopa districts.
And I am not disagreeing with you to -- this is a, this is a weird little notch here. And from a map -- from just a map drawing point of view, it's a weird little notch and you have to give a reason for it.

And you're going around a neighborhood to pick another neighborhood because of a voters rights issue. And typically you wouldn't -- you'd never see this if there was a previously submitted map, you would have made some other adjustment somewhere else to make it work.

So, and -- the one thing that I do know is that once our voters rights analysis comes back, and if the analysis does show that they'd like to make subtle adjustments, this may be one of the adjustments that we're going to go back to and say can we clean up this area to be able to meet this, this district's represent -- district's concept of pulling out their schools into that district.

But, I would like to see where we are on the map.

Again, I'm -- there's been really positive improvement.

Again, I hate 8 and 11.

I just want to state that. I wish we could fix that.

But this is something that's, that's very strong -- strongly put into place, and this is sort of like
CD 9.

I've got -- we've got three commissioners that wanted to lock CD 9.

We've got -- we also know that by the vote yesterday by a 3-2 vote that the 8, 11 is going to be that way. That was a decision that was made yesterday by, by the majority of the Commission.

I'd like to encourage this Commission to move forward on this map and send this, again, with the same, with the same contemplation as we -- as was just crafted by Commissioner McNulty on the, on the congressional map that there is -- that this takes it to the next level, which goes to analysis by voters rights. This goes to, this goes to consultant to clean up edges. Goes to looking at major arterials and collectors, if that is -- that if it is a sensible change to make off of a, off of a local street, where there's no significant change to that district, where there might be a pickup of zero population to clean up areas, as we found in LD 13 with Litchfield Park, and move this, move this map down the field.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY:  Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Would you entertain a motion?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I would.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I would move that we drag Mr. Desmond to -- let me, let me start over.

Mr. -- let me ask Mr. Desmond a question.

Have we made all the changes that we've discussed today to the working map with the exception of this 23, 24 change and the 28 change that Mr. Herrera has described?

WILLIE DESMOND: Just so I'm clear, the changes I have to the working map are Litchfield Park, the zero population area.

The changes between Legislative District 2, 3 on 22nd Street and 8th Avenue.

The Yavapai split has been removed.

Change to District 26 and 27 to improve those and balance population.

And a population balance between Districts 15 and 16 -- or 25 and 16, that we just did.

Is there any other changes I'm missing?

(No oral response.)

WILLIE DESMOND: If not, those are the only changes I have.

So I believe the only outstanding changes that we have at this point are this, this difference between 23 and 24 in Scottsdale and Commissioner Herrera's District 28.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Can you make the change in 23 and 24 to revert to --
WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: -- what we did -- can you do that right now?

WILLIE DESMOND: Yes.

So, just to show what that would look like, District 23 and 24, again, look like this.

So to the streets that affects, District 23 would run along Osborn until it hits Hayden and then it would go across, I believe, at Oak.

As had been in the previous working map.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So now it's configured as it was when we submitted it to Dr. King.

WILLIE DESMOND: It's very, very close to how it was submitted to Dr. King.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: All right.

Well, I would move that with this change and the other changes that Mr. Desmond has just described that we discussed and made today, that we adopt this map as our tentative final legislative map, subject to the possibility of future changes based on recommendations of our mapping consultant or legal counsel to address technical or legal issues and subject to approval by this Commission of any changes that they recommend.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is there a second?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear
the very end of that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Can you repeat?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I move that we adopt the working draft map that we're looking at now with the changes that we've discussed today and directed Mr. Desmond to make as he just described them as our tentative final legislative map subject to the possibility of future changes based on recommendations of our mapping consultant or legal counsel to address technical or legal changes and subject to approval by this Commission of any changes that they do recommend.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'll second the motion.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any discussion?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Desmond, if you don't mind just quickly going through using index two for this particular version, using -- letting me know the competitiveness, how many are under five, just -- I would love to know.

And then if you can quickly go over how many are under ten -- how many are ten and under.

WILLIE DESMOND: I can't do that quickly, because there's been other changes to the map. I have to put it all
together and make a report.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Okay. Then --

WILLIE DESMOND: Sorry about that.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: No, no problem with that.

Never mind. Thank you though.

WILLIE DESMOND: I could -- I could go over which

districts have changed and we could look at the -- next to

the other one, but. . .

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: No. That's fine.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other discussion?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Aye.

Any opposed?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, I'm abstaining.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Nay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Well, well, well.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, what I'd like to
do if I -- if it's not going to pass, can we go back to my

map? I'd like to -- I was serious about my map.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, we're waiting for one

other vote.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Oh, I apologize. I thought everybody voted.

Sorry about that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, I will have to vote no for the purposes of Districts 8 and 11.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: In the absence of a nay vote by my abstention, it would have -- the vote would have succeeded two to one, but by our constitutional requirements the vote needs to have three positive votes to pass through.

So... if we're going to visit Maricopa County and revisits those districts, I'd like to revisit 8 and 11 in their entirety.

And if we're going to visit that, then I'd start to -- I think I'd like to start revisiting some of the other areas of the state as well.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I -- you know, Mr. Stertz's is entitled to do that, creating a completely different map that the -- if he wants than the one I'll create.

Again, my map is mirroring the map we are doing now that Mr. Stertz was praising quite a bit. And -- so my, my changes won't be that different other than those three
districts that will be affected.

So what I would like to do, Mr. Desmond, if you can go back to my map, and let's start making the changes now. I don't -- I think it's not going to be a waste of my time. And see what we can do.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Before we do that though, Mr. Herrera, did any other commissioner want to explain anything?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I think this is all -- I think this is emblematic -- I lost my windscreen again -- of the theater that's going on here.

I mean, either the map was good, it met the constitutional criteria, or it didn't.

And instead what we got was a threat basically. Take this map or we'll make it much worse.

So now we're seeing that, at least from my perspective, I'm seeing that play out.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Yeah, I, I, I -- my proposal was never seemed -- I never thought of it as a threat.

I really -- from the beginning I've been saying that I -- that we can create more competitive districts
without any significant detriment to the other goals.

So, I, I, you know, I'm sorry that Commissioner Freeman sees it that way.

I was pretty clear, again, as I think he stated a couple of meetings ago, that I don't have a poker face.

And I don't. I don't gamble. I'm extremely honest.

I've said it all along that my intention is to create as many competitive districts as possible, especially in the Maricopa County area. And, again, without any significant detriment to the other goals.

So I don't see what -- where -- what threat.

I was serious about this. And as I am now.

I mean, I'm, I'm -- what I'd would like to do now is start looking at, at the map I've been proposing.

And, again, this -- there should be no surprise. I brought this up over a week ago, I think. And I've been continuously talking about the, the benefits of having a competitive district in 28.

So, and -- so this is no threat.

It should have been no surprise to Commissioner Freeman, to anyone on this commissioner.

I think not to McNulty, not to Mathis, not to Stertz.

Again, I'm sorry that he sees it that way.
This is -- and, and, again, this is, this is --
we're all doing our best. And, and we've made significant
progress today. But I have a right to be able to recommend
some of the changes that I want. And this is some of the
changes that I want.

So, if we can move forward, I would love to have
Mr. Desmond balance out the population between 28, 15, and
20.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Commissioner Herrera, the --
one of the things I had asked about last Thursday was what
of the districts that you are really -- that you really feel
passionate about.

You know, it's funny, the word passion in the
Greek means to suffer.

That might be sort of amusing right now as we're
getting to this.

And, again, my, my, my action on this is not --
I'm trying not to be a contrarian here.

Because the -- other than 8 and 11, I'm liking
where the map has gone.

Okay.

And I'm hoping that we can get to -- still get to
a vote tonight that can get to an affirmative.
It's pretty, it's pretty clear that from my perspective and Commissioner Freeman's perspective that 28, the way that Commissioner McNulty had crafted it, worked pretty well as a district.

You're trying to get 15 -- which district are you trying to get competitive, 15?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Twenty-eight.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, as I stated before, 28 -- again, without any significant detriment to the other goals, I think we can, we can do that with 28.

And I am fine with 8 and 11. As a matter of fact, I think there's, there's an opposite for -- the things that we have issues with, with the working draft map, is completely the opposite.

I have an issue with 28, as I stated before. Again, this should be no surprise.

I, I was serious about making 28 competitive, because I think we can. And I've proven that we can.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So, Madam Chair, because we were talking about 11, because the Tucson Mountains are now included in 11, there was, there was some great testimony that obviously wasn't put on the record, that was some very -- some folks that were real upset that the Tucson Mountains were taken -- were taken away from the city.
of Tucson and put up with Pinal County and the district which stretches all the way up into Maricopa County almost. They were very surprised by that, because that was something that occurred in the last go-round of the shift.

Eight is now a district that, that -- again, the 8 and 11 I disagree with.

So, if we've got -- if we start looking at these, which districts do you want to -- you're trying to get 28 to become a competitive district by -- if we can go back to 28 in Commissioner Herrera's map.

If you're trying to get it so that because there's a, there's a concentrated population of Republicans in Paradise Valley and you are extracting those out of 20 -- out of the current 28 in an effort to make that more competitive.

Even though that district that Maricopa -- or that Paradise Valley is connected with up is up into 15 doesn't have the natural connection, economically, geographically, or with the other criterion as designed.

This seems to be just a -- this is just -- your goal is really to get 28 to be competitive; correct?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: My goal, as I said all along, was to get as many competitive districts without creating any detriment to the other goals.

And I believe -- and I disagree with
Commissioner Freeman. I don't think this a detriment to that -- to any of goals.

   And, and, as I said, can we -- if we can, so in the interest of time, move forward with, with -- because I want to do is I want to start working on changes to my map and start seeing if we can tweak some of the -- or fix the population imbalances between those three districts that are affected, and we can start doing that now.

   Because now, as I said, I stated before, I didn't want to waste my time. Now I feel like it wouldn't be a waste of my time.

WILLIE DESMOND: Okay. So we had done some slight balancing before.

   As it was currently constituted, District 28 is positive by 4,217 people. District 20 is overpopulated by 7,129. And District 15 is overpopulated.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Can you repeat that again? I'm sorry.

MARY O'GRADY: Just to clarify where we are, do we still have a motion on the table at this point?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: The motion failed, is the way I read that, but it was --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Two to two and one abstention.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, two ayes, two nays, and
one abstention.

Before we start to go into looking at more modifications to 28, I, I have to say I'm a little puzzled by Mr. Freeman's vote, and I'm wondering if he would be willing to explain that so that I can just understand.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Explain my vote?

I mean, the districts by and large, at least in Maricopa County, I don't have a significant problem with.

I think my main problem is the threat that was carried out. That it was either take this, take this map or I'm going to shove this other map down your throat.

And that to me is unacceptable.

And Commissioner Herrera should have been able to vote yes or no on that proposed map, and he chose to play this game.

And I don't agree with it.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: How many times has Commissioner Stertz or Freeman abstained from voting?

And I've never disagreed with them, because that was their opinion.

And I never thought of it as a game. That's their choice. They have that option.

I think I'm correct in saying that abstention is a...
option. I didn't make it up.

I think Commissioner Freeman knows that, that it is option, abstaining from a vote.

And he's done that -- I think he's done that on numerous times, whether it be abstaining or saying or voting no.

And I, I -- again, this isn't a threat.

I had a strong feeling that they were going to vote no -- no against this map. That's why I was proposing the map that I'm proposing, because I didn't think it was going to pass.

And because as I said it all along, I wanted another competitive district in Maricopa County.

And I think we can, we can, we can achieve that now.

And, again, I don't know what is leading Mr. -- Commissioner Freeman to think that this is a threat. I've never mentioned this as a threat.

I'm extremely serious, but he -- like he is, on proposing CD 9. I'm very serious in creating a competitive district -- another competitive district in Maricopa County.

So, again, let's -- if I can move forward, if no one else has any comment, I'd love to move forward and start working on my changes.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Commissioner Herrera, just as part of the point of clarification, the abstentions that I have made were always the same. And they were abstentions that came when we were asked to go into executive session, as has been made clear even by the vote -- by the -- or by the decision by the -- by Judge Fink. The open meeting law doesn't apply to us.

And I have been making that statement over and over again that I couldn't vote for something to go into executive session, therefore I abstained from voting because I was in agreement that, that we should be -- open meeting -- that we should not be going into executive session.

So those are my abstentions, and I just wanted to make sure and clarify that.

Lastly, if there's -- is there any -- let's go back to this discussion of -- because we're going to have, we're going to have no movement from myself on 28 and 20 or 15.

Is there any movement on 11 or 8 from three of the commissioners?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, those are two districts that I do like.
So, I -- no. Those -- I have no movement from me in those two districts.

So, again, I have a map that I have been proposing working on, and I'd like to go back to that map.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Obviously you can't force the commissioner to have a vote, and for you to have -- it would be disingenuous for me to be able to propose or to, or to accept this with knowing that 8 and 11 are nonnegotiable and for me 20, 28 and 15 are nonnegotiable.

So, we, we may be -- it's going to come back to you, Madam Chair, as the decision maker on this.

You voted in the affirmative that you like the mid-Phoenix maps. And I'd like to hear whether or not we're going to continue to go down the road tonight in trying to make adjustments to something that both you -- you, myself, and Commissioner McNulty like, because I -- and I believe -- I can't speak for Commissioner Freeman because he -- his issue was more about sort of blockade of being able to move this forward.

I'd like -- like I said, other than, other than 8 and 11, I'm really liking how this map is working itself out.

And --
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Mr. Stertz?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Why don't you just vote for it and then we can go home.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, the -- this -- the question that Commissioner Stertz is proposing is really irrelevant now. The map didn't pass as it.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Remove it.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think it's very relevant.

I --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: So, Madam Chair, what I would like to do is to move to my map --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We're talking over each other.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I apologize.

As I said, the question that Commissioner Stertz -- and, I mean, I know why he asked. And I have no, no problem with that question.

The problem is that the map as is wasn't approved. So whether you liked the way that Commissioner McNulty created 28 is really irrelevant.

The question is that I'm proposing can I move forward to my map now.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: If Commissioner McNulty wants to remove -- wants to remake the motion, I will vote in the affirmative.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I move that we adopt the working draft map that we have in front of us which includes the changes that we've discussed tonight and have been made by Mr. Desmond as our tentative final legislative map subject to the possibility of changes recommended by our mapping consultant or legal counsel to an address technical or legal issues and subject to approval by this Commission of any changes that they might recommend.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Second.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Did I leave something out, Ms. O'Grady?

MARY O'GRADY: If I can have a moment in terms of parliamentary process.

You need to be on the -- if this is a motion to reconsider, essentially, the map that did not pass on the previous motion, the motion has to be made by someone on the prevailing side of the prior motion.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: There was no prevailing side.

MARY O'GRADY: The motion doesn't carry.

I'm checking my Roberts right now, but the motion didn't carry.
If we want to take a five-minute recess, I will check that. That's my concern, that if this is a motion to reconsider, essentially then it might need to be made by someone on the prevailing side, since the motion didn't carry. So I'm double checking that right now.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Are you saying Mr. Herrera needs to make the motion?

MARY O'GRADY: I don't think he's on the prevailing side either for this map.

And, again, I want to, I want to double check this, but the prevailing side would be the people who voted no.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Why don't we take a five-minute break then and just confirm all that.

So the time is 8:56 p.m.

(Brief recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We'll enter back into public session. The time is 9:04 p.m.

I believe our legal counsel was checking into matters with regard to possible parliamentary procedure surrounding this motion situation.

MARY O'GRADY: My recommendation would be that if it's going to be a different motion, anyone can make such a motion.

If it's going to be the precise same motion that
was made previously, it should be made by someone on the prevailing side.

The prevailing side, since the previous motion did not carry, would be those who opposed the previous motion.

But a different motion may be made by any member of the Commission.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, would you entertain a different motion?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I would.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I would move that we adopt the working draft map that we are currently looking at with the changes that we have discussed today and directed Mr. Desmond to make, and with the further direction that he include on a parallel track analysis of the change in District 24 to address the school district issue so that that can be looked at on a parallel track by Dr. King also, with the caveat that the map is our tentative final legislative map and subject to the possibility of future changes based on recommendations of our mapping consultant or our legal counsel to adjust technical or legal issues and subject to approval of any such recommendations by this Commission.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'll second that motion.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any discussion?
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you for entertaining and going through the process of the new motion.

I'm going to be voting in the affirmative reluctantly, because of Districts 8 and 11, which I still significantly disagree with the way that they were crafted and introduced.

I'm -- and, however the work product that has been put forth by the Commission as a whole includes a higher level of, of positive adjustments that have been made than the preponderance of the negative design of Districts 8 and 11.

So even though my opinion of those two districts specifically has not changed, I will -- I have seconded this motion and I will be voting in the affirmative for it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any other discussion?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: And I -- as before I will be abstaining from this motion, as I stated before.

I think we can -- we owe it to the citizens of Arizona and those who voted for Prop 106 to create an additional competitive district in Maricopa County.
And I think that I was able to do that along with the, the help obviously from Mr. Desmond. So that's the reason why I'll be abstaining from the vote.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Other discussion?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: All in favor?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Aye.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any opposed?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Nay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And Mr. Herrera is abstaining.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Actually, Madam Chair, I will be voting no as well.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

So we have three ayes and two nays, Freeman and Herrera.

Okay. That means the motion carries, and we have a tentative legislative map that will be doing further analysis on.

And to quote Bruce Springsteen, I believe in the promised land.
I'm really glad we're here.

And I realize it's been a very difficult process going through this the last nine months, but I think we've achieved really great maps.

We couldn't do everything, and we knew that from the beginning, but we did as much as we could. And I'm proud of the outcome that we've accomplished.

Do other commissioners have any comments?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Unfortunately I have a little different viewpoint.

I think over the summer I recall at one of our first public comment hearings a member of the public coming forward to this Commission raising concerns about the way it was conducting itself, and referred to the Commission as kabuki theater.

I am not exactly sure whether that analogy holds up, but I do know enough about kabuki theater to know that it's a respected historic art form, and I think calling us kabuki theater perhaps gives kabuki theater a bad name.

I think that this unfortunately has not played out certainly the way I had anticipated when I came on this Commission.

I did not see an effort to neutrally apply
adjustments to the grid map in a fair and evenhanded way and in an objective way such that the public would have confidence in how the maps were developed.

Unfortunately what I -- I just saw games like we saw tonight.

I saw, you know, an effort to predesign districts without regard to the constitutional criteria.

So I am disappointed in both the congressional draft maps.

I did make every effort on this Commission to work very hard. I spent a lot of time, my own time, trying to work with other commissioners, trying to develop maps that I thought made sense, and apply the criteria. And the end result is perhaps, perhaps on the LD map, 28 kind of looks like a district that I had some influence over, but, but that's about it.

Everything else got erased.

So I'm really disappointed in where we've ended up.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Other comments from other commissioners?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: You know, I'm also a little bit disappointed, but not for the reasons that
Commissioner Freeman is disappointed.

I felt that we -- although I didn't vote for the legislative map, I felt that both maps from the beginning were constitutionally sound maps.

We were able to, to -- the changes that we, that we made were, were outlined in an open meeting.

There's no -- I don't remember the last time we had an executive session. Which we could have, but we chose to conduct everything in the open. All the changes that were made to the draft map were, again, out in the open, following the six constitutional criteria.

These maps are sound maps as Commissioner McNulty has been saying since -- since the beginning, since we approved the congressional and legislative draft maps.

And I am, you know, proud of the work we've done.

I think why all gave in a little.

I sure did.

As I stated, I think the reason why I'm disappointed is because we should have created more competitive districts, both in the congressional and legislative map.

But, again, I'm, I'm very confident that these maps were -- are sound. They follow the six constitutional criteria.

And our attorneys are, are -- as I stated before,
they, they -- I think Mary O'Grady has said that in numerous occasions, and commissioner -- excuse me, and Joe Kanefield has done the same thing.

So, again, I'm disappointed for different reasons, but I'm glad the process is over.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: You can't believe how hard it was to do what I just did.

I've been fighting against the swimming upstream on this, on this Commission for a long time.

And frankly I needed to -- I felt that I needed to bring this issue to a close in an effort to stop the maps from getting -- in certain areas I was seeing where Commissioner Herrera was going, and that they were going to be going down a path where it was actually going to be making things even worse.

So instead of continuing down this path and adding more 8-7s to my world, I stopped the -- I wanted to stop the, stop the process.

So we've stopped it. It's stopped at this time right now.

We've got a -- we've got maps. And they, they -- at least we've got them stopped at a place where, where they're not going to become any more contrived and we're not
going to have to hear any more stories from Commissioner Herrera about how we negotiated and compromised to get to an affirmative agreement.

And for that, I just wanted to wish all of the commissioners, staff, and public, a very, very Merry Christmas.

And tonight on this special night, a Happy Hanukkah to all of our friends who are celebrating this evening.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any comments from anyone else?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I guess I'm the only one that hasn't spoken.

We've all worked very hard at this. I truly believe that we've created good work product here, both on the congressional map and on the legislative map.

I think everyone on this Commission has gone above and beyond.

I'm sure once we all get a good night's sleep and enjoy the holidays, we'll have more to say about the experience.

But I want to thank you for your leadership and your patience and your strength, Madam Chair, in the last nine months.

And I want to thank all the commissioners for the
effort they've put into this.

Commissioner Freeman and Commissioner Stertz and I have disagreed on many, many things, but we don't disagree on the fact that we've all put a great deal of effort into this.

It's been my honor to serve on the Commission with Commissioner Herrera. And I wish he had voted for the map, but I understood the point that he made.

So I too would wish everyone here and watching a Merry Christmas and Happy Hanukkah.

Take a break. Thanks for your interest and for your work for the state.

And thank you all, Marty, Willie, Mary, our staff, Kristina, Ray, Stu, and for everyone who's followed this so closely.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

I would also echo huge, huge thanks to just -- I don't want to get emotional, but I am.

Huge thanks to our staff who have been totally incredible through this.

We couldn't have hired nicer people to work on this Commission.

And you've been amazing.

And same goes for our legal counsel and our mapping consultant.
They are both -- and when I say both, there's others, of course, involved, other counsel, other mapping consultant folks from Strategic Telemetry.

They have been extremely professional in every step of this process.

And I don't think that any commissioner would have a complaint with anyone's work in that regard. They were fantastic.

And they all -- they too are very nice people. I think niceness is a really important quality.

You've got to be capable, competent, professional, smart, all those things are important. But it's also good to be nice. And I view that as a quality that all of these people have.

So, I don't want to be more emotional than I already am, but I will thank all the commissioners for their hard work and the sacrifices they've all made.

It's been very challenging, especially this past month or so, with a lot of different things that have happened to folks. And everybody pulled together and came to meetings and we had quorums, which was, you know, a requirement, and we were able to get through this.

So I'm very grateful.

With that, we've got a hardcore skeleton crew of public here still tonight, and I appreciate you all being
here. I don't know how many are watching online, but thank you too. And I thank all the public for their participation in this process. You've been extremely helpful in making these maps better.

And with that, I don't think there's anything more to say on those two items.

We have, I think, some meetings scheduled for next week. At least some dates. I shouldn't say meetings scheduled yet.

Mr. Bladine did get some information from commissioners and has at least ideas.

And whether or not we want to do all those meetings, we'll see, but tell us what availability there was.

RAY BLADINE: Again, I'm not sure given what you've just done how that affects the legal and the mapping staff as to when they would be available to answer some of your questions.

So, I guess that's the first question I'd ask, is taking a quick look, Tuesday, Thursday of next week looked like perhaps the best chance, but I'm not sure that you're going to have the information that you need.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, that's a great question.

I mean, we could wait until -- if Thursday makes
the most sense to start next week that's fine with me. We
are waiting on a lot of analysis from various folks.

WILLIE DESMOND: The way I see this, I hope that
the final adoption is not a drawn process to provide you
with technical changes. Hopefully those are very, very,
very minor impact on both population.

I'm not sure how -- I know the county folks were
working on voting precincts and things.

They'll be very eager to get these -- their hands
on these maps and start seeing if there are conflicts.

I'm not sure what time they'll need or we'll need
to work with those things.

I think Tuesday is probably too early.

Thursday may work, but I just -- I'm not sure how
available they'll be over the next week of things too.

As far as Dr. King's analysis goes and the rest of
the voting rights, I kind of defer to Mary to see what she
thinks that will take.

MARY O'GRADY: And, Madam Chair, I think we'll
have a better sense of that tomorrow.

And so I don't know if it makes sense -- I mean,
so I would think the earliest would be next Thursday, but we
won't have a real good sense of that for a little while.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Well --

RAY BLADINE: Madam Chair, I think we were going
on an agenda that would allow bipartisan participation.

   On Thursday, however, you would not have
Commissioner Stertz available.

   So it would be -- I'm not sure, you may want to
change what you're trying to do and try to move to where you
can get everybody to participate, but I should have pointed
that out to you that on Thursday he is not available.

   And the rest of the week people would not be
available.

   CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And we don't have to decide
the meeting tonight.

   RAY BLADINE: Okay.

   CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: But it sounds like the
earliest would be Thursday, if we do meet even Thursday. So
we'll see how it goes once we get more of the analysis back
and have this information later this week.

   RAY BLADINE: Okay. We can also, if you wish, ask
for availability the following week, which we have not done.

   Some people have given that to us, but not
everyone.

   CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Sure. That makes sense.
We can go out and ask. That would be great.

   Okay. Is there anything else?

   RAY BLADINE: No, other than I would like to say
on behalf of the staff it really has been a pleasure to work
with all of you.

We have been through some very tough and hard times, but all of you have been extremely nice and thoughtful with us. And I know we all appreciate it. And we certainly learned a lot too.

There are lot of things here I never had learned before, knew about, and maybe some I didn't want to, just like all of you, but it was my pleasure to serve you, and we'll continue to until we get this wrapped up. So thanks very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Yeah, will the maps be going up onto the website hopefully soon, once they're -- these tentative.

WILLIE DESMOND: It's going to take me a few hours to get all of the maps ready, both legislative and congressional.

I doubt very highly that Buck will be posting those in the middle of the night, but hopefully by tomorrow morning, early afternoon, sometime around then.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Yeah, as soon as possible, that would be great to get those up.

And I think the rest of the items, if anybody has future agenda items, please send them to Ray.

And then the rest, I don't think there's anything new on the open meeting law, with litigation. Nothing.
And we've done public comment, so with that, the time is 9:24, and this meeting is adjourned.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned.)
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