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PROCEDINGS

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: This meeting of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission will now come to order. Today is Wednesday, August 17th, 2011, and the time is 1:05 p.m.

Will you please all rise and join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Welcome, everyone. It's great to see so many members of the public here in attendance today at this meeting. I have a feeling I know why you're here, a special day.

But let me introduce a few folks around the room first that are helping us.

I will go through roll call first. Then we'll introduce the other guests, so let's 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.

And the other members of our team are executive director Ray Bladine is sitting here in a blue shirt and a tie. And if you need to talk to him, please feel free to ask him any questions throughout the day.

Our deputy executive director, Kristina Gomez, is also sitting with Ray, not at the moment, but you'll see her soon.

Our public information officer, Stu Robinson, is here.

Our chief technology officer, Bob Forst.

Our legal counsel, Mary O'Grady and Joe Kanefield.

Our mapping consultant is here, Ken Strasma and Andrew Drechsler.

And am I forgetting anyone else?

Then we have a team of outreach coordinators too actually. We have Christy Olsen, Shane Shields, and Lisa Schmelling also too.

So any of these folks will be happy to help you should you need anything today.

So moving to the next item on the agenda, this is
a real treat. It's a rare privilege to have the opportunity
to be in the presence of -- let alone introduce -- a true
statesman and an American hero.

Her list of accomplishments, awards, and honors is
too lengthy to detail here. But notably it includes our
nation's highest civilian honor, the Presidential Medal of
Freedom.

There's one aspect of her past that I find
especially intriguing, that she served in all three branches
of Arizona state government before being nominated by
President Reagan to be the first female member of the
Supreme Court of the United States.

The Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission
is very pleased to have with us today the
Honorable Justice Sandra Day O'Connor.

(Applause.)

HONORABLE SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR: Thank you so much.
Thank you. I'm the one that's honored to be here.

I really am delighted to have a few minutes. I'm
going to try to be brief, but I'm here for a couple of main
reasons.

I want to thank each and every one of you for
tackling this job. It's hard job.

And I'm sure about now in the process you're
saying why did I ever agree to do this.
But somebody has to, and you're the somebodies.

And I am not here today as a judge or a former legislator. I'm here because I'm a long-time citizen of Arizona. You know, my family lived over in Greenlee County near Duncan out in the middle of no place.

And Arizona's my home. I care very much about its past, we're celebrating 100 years, and about its future.

We do have a future.

And part of what we accomplished is going -- is in your hands.

And in recent times we've noticed, not just here but other places in our country as well, a lot of political gridlock.

We've seen what I think may be an increase in partisanship and polarization on a good many issues.

And what we have not seen enough of is thoughtful civil discussion on the issues that divide us and an attempt to really develop consensus as we go along on things that we're charged with deciding.

And our Democratic government is based on the concept of fair representation.

And unlike many countries still in the world today, we enjoy the right to vote at the local levels, state level, and national level.

And to make that system work, we have, we have to
have legislative and congressional districts that represent our population.

We didn't always have that, as you know.

In fact, I remember the days when Greenlee County, Arizona, had two members in the legislature and all of Maricopa County had two members in the legislature. And what kind of system was that? Greenlee County had very few people at all and Maricopa County had over half the population of the state.

And so I was present for those changes that recognized that population difference.

And now what you're doing is to try to divide up the districts so that it is fair and roughly equal in all respects, which it certainly wasn't when I grew up.

And you have a very difficult job.

I think you're going to be pressured by all sides to accommodate different agendas. And you're just going to have to listen to what many people who come before you have to say, and then you're going to have to put your thinking caps on and look at the data that you have before you, and try to be fair and impartial in drawing boundaries.

And it's hard, because inevitably due to population changes there will be some changes in boundaries from last time. And those changes never make everyone happy.
So I guess you have to come to grips with that.  You are apt to have a lot of criticism and a lot of unwanted publicity. But this is not an agency that's in there for a popularity contest. That's not why you're serving.

And you just don't have an easy job. But thank goodness there are intelligent, decent people who were willing to take it on. And that's you.

Now, redistricting is not an exact science, as you've already learned.

There are lots of things you're going to have to decide based not entirely on the numbers.

You have to weigh competing interests and follow the legal requirements.

Arizona, I think, is fortunate to have the law that it now does on redistricting. It looks like a pretty good one to me.

And so you're able to make that work and be effective.

And that's where you have to apply your intellect to reach fair and appropriate decisions.

And I think when the voters in Arizona passed Proposition 106 to take redistricting away from the legislature and put it in the hands of an Independent Redistricting Commission, the voters in Arizona, I think,
sent a special message. And that message was we want to
take partisan politics out of the redistricting process and
we want to create fair representation in our legislative and
congressional districts.

    I think the citizens of Arizona have confidence in
you as an Independent Redistricting Commission to draw
boundaries that aren't drawn to favor any elected official,
any particular elected official, or political party, or
special interest, but districts that will serve Arizona as a
whole.

    And I wish all of you very well, as you undertake
this task.

    And I want to thank you again for your willingness
to take what must seem to be about now as a pretty thankless
job.

    Don't give up. Just do it well. We'll thank you
later.

    Thank you for listening.

    Do you have anything you want to ask me?

    I can't answer any questions that will matter, but
I don't want to cut you off if there's anything you want to
ask me.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any questions from
commissioners?

    (No oral response.)
HONORABLE SANDRA DAY O'CONNOR: Well, good luck to all of you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you very much.

(Standing ovation.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you for those words of wisdom, Justice O'Connor.

And thanks to the O'Connor House, Lucia Howard for helping coordinate this today. We really appreciate that.

I'd like to also recognize another gentleman in the audience, Bud Jones, the former Arizona Supreme Court chief justice is here today, I understand.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: You know, if you would like to say a few words, you're welcome to.

HONORABLE CHARLES JONES: I always have something to say, but I'm unprepared today.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

HONORABLE CHARLES JONES: And I will just add one thing.

The thought occurs to me, listening to Justice O'Connor, that one of the main components of this process is the ability that this Commission has to step forward and set an example for the other branches and for all of the other units in state and local government in Arizona.
I love Arizona. I've lived here most of my life. My father's people came here in the 1870s and settled in Prescott. They were loyal Arizonans. And we must bring this state to a higher level and therefore avoid the polarization and the politics of this work, but step up and set an example for the rest of the state, and let the rest of the state know that there are people who are willing to do this in that way.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Well, that was a very inspirational start to this meeting, and I thank you both for being here and sharing the wisdom with us.

Our next item on the agenda is the executive director's report, summary of most recent events and activities by staff. There won't be any action required, but our executive director Raymond Bladine will brief us.

RAY BLADINE: After those comments, my executive director's report seems pretty mundane.

And it really is.

I just wanted to comment that as everyone knows we finished the first round of public hearings. We had a good attendance at all of the hearings we had.

And on today's agenda we have approval of the
second round of hearings.

And as you know, we sent out copies of that to you earlier so that we can get the locations approved and then start trying to move ahead to set up the specific places that we will be holding the second round.

Second round we're expecting to start on September 18th, thereabouts. And hopefully by that time you will have completed a draft map and adopted that, which means the next several weeks will probably require a lot of meetings, probably more than one a week.

And as all of you know, I've asked for information on availability, and we'll continue to follow up with you and see how we can all get together.

I do want to comment since one of the things that's very different this year is the streaming of our meetings and the ability for people to respond on the Internet.

Right now we have 11,146 subscribers that get e-mails from us about the meetings. We have had 11,483 unique visitors to the website. And we've also had a lot of viewers on the streaming, about 2,239 on that.

So clearly the web page and the streaming is allowing the public to keep up with what you're doing.

Finally, I will by next week have a budget report
for you as to where we are. Still most of the expenditures
that have been going on this month are -- won't be in for
another month, primarily related to legal services that
relate to some of the activity recently we've had
unanticipated.

So I will have something for you next week on
that.

And I think that pretty well covers it.

We'll see you tomorrow in Casa Grande for our
first official mapping meeting, and then again on Monday,
the 22nd, following up on what the mapping people were able
to put together at your direction.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any questions for Mr. Bladine?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I don't have a question.

What I do have is I just want to congratulate the staff for
all their hard work, the outreach that we've been doing, the
staff and Commission have been doing since the beginning.

It's amazing the number of people that are
reaching out and the number of people who are able to
provide as to the direction of the IRC, how it should go in
creating the maps. It's really amazing, so I really want to
thank the staff and thank Ray and the Commission for doing this.

RAY BLADINE: Thank you. We all appreciate that.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Bladine, when speaking about the budget being delivered next week, what -- is this going to have history through what date, and how will you be breaking up the services that have been provided so far and through what date, and will you also be forecasting our expenditures, and how long will you forecasting those going forward?

RAY BLADINE: We will basically be using, Commissioner Stertz, the same form that I submitted to you I think it was last month that shows the appropriation for last year and the current year, and then has the budget categories down, I’ll revise those budget categories, and probably the information will be based upon August 1st.

And that’s why I was kind of cautioning. There’s been a lot of expenditure in the last couple weeks than there were in the first part of August.

It will be the same format that I provided you with earlier.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: In regards to services for the two consulting legal firms as well as the mapping
consultant, will you be breaking those down by -- will they be just bulk numbers or will you be breaking them down toward what the moneys were applied to?

RAY BLADINE: They would be bulk numbers for legal services.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Are you able to break those numbers down so that we can have a split of money that would be spent towards the activities of the Commission versus the activities of any potential --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, this is not on the agenda. So I want to make sure, are we able to discuss this in detail without it being on the agenda?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, Commissioner Herrera raises a good point. This really should be deferred until that budget discussion is properly on the agenda and have some additional legal issues in terms of how much of a breakdown is appropriate in terms of the budget discussion, and we'll request with staff on that as well.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, I'm going to suggest that -- well, when we get to future agenda items, I'll make some suggestions about the level of detail and the Q and A available to us when we have executive director's report.

Because this would be the time and place that I want to have the rest of the Commission be able to drill
some of these questions down.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So thank you, Mr. Bladine.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any other questions for Mr. Bladine?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

RAY BLADINE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you, Mr. Bladine.

I don't know if we want to take a brief recess at all just to allow folks who maybe don't want to stay for the meeting.

I don't know if we have people like that, but I didn't want people to feel like they were forced to sit through our meeting if they wanted to leave at this time.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, is there a photo opportunity with Justice O'Connor? I'd love to take my picture with her.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I would too, but I didn't know if that was appropriate.

But if you're open to that, maybe take a brief recess for five minutes, and allow folks who don't want to stay to go, and we can also do a photo.

Thank you.

It's 1:23 p.m.
We'll exit out of public session just for a brief recess.

(Brief recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We'll go ahead and enter back into public session.

The time is 1:29 p.m.

And I was neglectful in recognizing our court reporter today. Marty Herder is right up here up front doing his usual great job for us.

So, we'll move on to the next item on the agenda, which is agenda item four, legal briefing concerning the procurement of online services and Commission selection of the provider.

I believe our legal counsel is leading us in this discussion.

Is that right?

MARY O'GRADY: Yes, Madam Chair.

We were -- Joe and I were going to address this. And rather than going into detail, I might kind of just lead with a recommendation.

We reviewed the issues that were raised at the last Commission hearing. We received a follow-up letter from Dave Cantelme representing Fair Trust that addressed the issue that -- concerns he had about the Azavea proposal. And so -- and we've reviewed those issues.
And overall ESRI bid was 116,000, Maptitude at 87,000, Azavea at 49,651.

And frankly when we looked at all the packages, the bottom line recommendation would be to encourage perhaps the Maptitude approach on this, in light of we have some legal issues here that have been raised and looking at the overall cost with the original proposal.

I would toss out that as a recommendation, notwithstanding any technical issues that are addressed by others.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I should mention that since our last meeting those three proposals were put on our website.

So any member of the public can view those, should you choose, at AZredistricting.org.

Go ahead.

MARY O'GRADY: One other issue.

You know, whether it's a subcontract or a contract with the Commission, we probably could work out that detail in terms of with Ray Bladine and Strategic as a matter of what is going to make the most sense from an administrative standpoint.

I believe the purchase order for the Maptitude purchase was previously listed as reimbursable expenses in the proposal. I think either one of would work, so follow
up with that.

And the procurement officer does have the authority to enter into a subcontract to go back out and certainly within your authority as the procurement officer, we obviously wanted to brief the Commission and get its authorization regarding which way to go on this.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any comments or discussion among the commissioners?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I've had the opportunity for the last week and a half to be operating with Maptitude. I was provided the Maptitude grid maps that were provided by Strategic Telemetry for me to operate in.

I find the program system to be -- to have a high level of ease of operation and a level of complexity of data management.

And I will make the motion that we provide -- that we go ahead and ask our executive director to enter into a contract either by -- if the contract is to purchase through Strategic Telemetry, I'm assuming there will be no mark up or transfer, this would be a straight through. If there's any cost deficiencies by going direct and not through Strategic Telemetry, or in the opposite direction, we would
take that -- but it makes sense, I would like to make a
motion to authorize Ray Bladine to explore, negotiate, and
enter into agreement for the acquisition of the online
Maptitude software.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Is there a second?
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN:  I'll second that.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS:  Any discussion on that
motion?

Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA:  Yeah, I'd like to have our
legal counsel go into some detail as to why you wouldn't
recommend going with Azavea.

I'm assuming that the people sending letters or
that were opposed to Azavea at the meeting on the, I think,
the 3rd had some influence, but I want to know if we decide
on Azavea what would be the issue.

MARY O'GRADY:  Madam Chair, Commissioner Herrera,
I think there is, you know, single we've got legal risk
associated and cost difference to the state of 87,000 from
49,000, from a practical risk assessment standpoint that it
seemed to make sense to, among other reasons, go with the
Maptitude approach, and then we avoid some of the legal
issues that are, that are raised with regard to Azavea.

Without making any final determination in terms
of, you know, how those would play out, but I'm -- I was not
persuaded that when I looked at the whole package of issues, including those that Commissioner Stertz raised in terms of practical use of any other maps, that it seemed to support the Maptitude recommendation as a bottom line recommendation.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Can you -- I mean, I appreciate your explanation, but that still doesn't answer the question, what issues are you referring to? I mean, other than some of the issues out there, that's their opinion, it's not necessarily -- you know.

I'd like to see what the true issues are of not going with Azavea and legal ramifications if we are not going to with them.

I don't see it, and I want to understand.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, Commissioner Herrera, I'll rely on the communication from David Cantelme in terms of what the issues were raised -- what issues --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Sure. Those are his opinions.

What are your opinions?

MARY O'GRADY: My opinions are, as I mentioned, that the better course is not to go down that path, and in light -- and, and pursue a course that might require
additional -- that raises some legal risk at least.

Maybe not be significant legal risk, but when I looked at the numbers, sufficient there that it supports going with the Maptitude.

And one of the issues that they did raise, the third -- they have issues of fairness to the other bidders, issues of whether there is a subsidy of contractual obligation, you know, of a nonprofit.

And then also raise whether there's some sort of political benefit to a certain group who may have used that nonprofit service in the past, and whether their experience with that particular software would give them an advantage over others, with others not experienced with that software in another region.

And then they raise issues regarding -- with regard to the way the voting rights analysis had worked now. Without questioning about all those details, there was at least sufficient information -- sufficient issues raised there that when I looked at the whole package, I thought -- I looked at it as I highly recommend the Maptitude approach.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, did anybody send any letters or documentation providing contrary views to Mr. Cantelme's letter?

MARY O'GRADY: Mr. Kanefield will have some
additional comments that he wanted to make.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Before you speak, Mr. Kanefield, I just wanted to see did anybody send information to the AIRC, maybe stating their case for why we shouldn't go with Azavea?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, Commissioner Herrera, I was working off the Dave Cantelme legal letter that I have, and I don't remember receiving a specific rebuttal of that information.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: So you're making your decision based on David Cantelme's letter.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, Commissioner Herrera, in light -- in view of the issues that he's raised in that letter.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Kanefield.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: I concur with Mary's analysis. My review is not just based on Mr. Cantelme's letter, although he did raise some legal questions.

It was looking at the procurement issue with respect to this -- to obtaining this software.

As I went back and looked at all this, it was clear that the proposal from Strategic Telemetry included an online mapping tool for the public to use. As part of the proposal, the Commission asked specifically for how the
consultants were going to propose the public have input in
this process.

    They came back with some suggestions on what
vendors they might choose.

    The question was raised as to whether or not that
process would raise procurement issues.

    And frankly after I looked at the law on this, if,
if Strategic Telemetry has proposed that and it works and
that was part of the analysis, because that was part of
their proposal, they've obviously come to the Commission
asking the Commission to have some input on it.

    But if it's not going to be through Strategic
Telemetry, and the Commission wants to do it a different
way, then we'll have to do a competitive bidding RFP.

    I don't think that's necessary.

    But in light of the proposal, and after we looked
at it, as Mary said, the risk analysis and the legal issues
that were raised, legally the Commission is solid if it
chooses Maptitude. That's the software that the Commission
and Strategic Telemetry are using to draw maps and to grade
them, and it was a fair proposal, and seemed to work with
us, and alleviated some of the legal issues that had been
raised.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other comments from other
commissioners or questions?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Well, we have a motion on the floor that's been seconded.

All in favor?

("Aye.")

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any opposed?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Aye -- or nay.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So we have four commissioners voting for that, that would be Stertz, Mathis, Freeman, McNulty. One nay, that's Herrera.

So we are authorizing our executive director, Ray Bladine, to explore, negotiate, and enter into a contract either through Strategic Telemetry or directly for this online mapping software, whichever is most advantageous. This would be the Maptitude version.

Okay.

Moving on to the next agenda item.

Which is agenda item five, discussion and possible action regarding contract modification for Strategic Telemetry to clarify possible clients and documentation of contracts regarding the Redistricting Commission.

This has come up in previous meetings since we negotiated the contract with Strategic Telemetry, and I'm glad to see it's an agenda item today that we can all
discuss openly.

So who was going to lead that discussion?

Is that Mr. Bladine or legal counsel?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, I was going to start, and then others may join.

As the Chair mentioned, this dates back to a prior meeting in terms of proposed amendment, and we looked at issues including screens within Strategic from some of their current contracts, in this contract, and other issues, and a screen which one of the proposals didn't make sense in terms of dealing with small business under Strategic, but made sense it seems to restrict during the life of this contract their ability to enter into contracts that involve candidate work in the state of Arizona.

And so that would be one proposed amendment.

And then the other, although the agenda says documentation of contracts, but really regarding Redistricting Commission is document contacts. And this requires they maintain a log describing contacts that they receive forward about this work.

And it doesn't apply to the contacts you receive from staff and commissioners and us or at the public meetings, but it would apply to other written or oral communications that they get in the course of their work about the project.
So that's all documented and available and adds to the transparency of the work that's being done. So those -- that was the recommendation.

Under the contract, the executive director, the procurement officer has the authority to enter into contract amendments. And so to some extent he wouldn't necessarily require Commission approval for all contract amendments that might come up, but we thought this might make sense to bring this up because it did originate with the Commission and bring it forward for your review and consideration.

And we have reviewed this with Strategic Telemetry, and so it's agreeable. We would recommend it as counsel, and they would also agree to the proposal.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Counsel, do you have proposed language for the two modification proposals you just described?

Do you have language?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, Commissioner Freeman, yes, there is language, and that language also was available to the public in the handout.

If you don't have it in front of you, I can pass it along and I can also --

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I just -- it was just
directed to me. It was in my packet for today.

MARY O'GRADY: And if it's helpful, for the public listening, the contractor shall not accept any work, contractor being Strategic Telemetry, related to candidates within the state of Arizona for the duration of this contract, which refers to the contract with the Redistricting Commission, including any extensions thereof.

And that documentation regarding contacts -- documentation of contacts regarding contractor shall maintain a log regarding all contracts oral or written with persons other than IRC staff, attorneys, and commissioners regarding the contract.

The law shall include the person -- organization or person, represents the date, and the topic addressed. This is not about contacts made while attending a public hearing or meeting of the AIRC.

And I see we need to add an A to one of my IRCs in the paperwork.

And so there's other words in the thing we may do that, but this certainly would be the concept and the language that we had discussed.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm just reading through the language. If anyone has comments or questions they want to raise, feel free.

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

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: So to read -- explain to us, if one, for clarification, if somebody was in the audience and wanted to speak to Strategic Telemetry, any question, Steve Muratore were to call and calls him up, this amendment is already in place, so he would have to log that call? I just want to make sure I understand this.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, Commissioner Herrera, yes, he comes up to the meeting and we're not going to require they log that kind of a contact.

But if they get a call at the office from any media or anyone else, those would be logged.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And the question, how does the public or anyone else have access to the log?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, my thinking is that this would be a public record. And if someone wanted to ask for it, they could get it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Other questions or comments on this proposed language?

KENNETH STRASMA: Madam Chair, may I request clarification on two points?

One, for questions directed to us via public meetings, does that include public hearings as well?
My understanding would be that it would, and I would want to clarify that.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, Commissioners, Mr. Strasma, it does include in there comments made at a public hearing or meeting of the AIRC.

I thought about adding your family, but I thought that was going out -- but, you know, maybe sort of other contacts that are not logged. This is about contacts in the course of your work on this contract.

KENNETH STRASMA: And my second point of clarification was, this would be going forward? We have not been meticulous in logging contacts to date, but we would begin at the time at which this memo is adopted.

And I would appreciate exemption from family, but happy to log those in.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

MARY O'GRADY: We can include the family exception, but I think it would be -- under comments it would be implemented and it would be going forward from the date of execution.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other comments or questions?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: So, counsel, we need to take action as a Commission right now, direct Mr. Bladine to
implement these contract modifications?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, commissioners, I think he has the authority, but if you would like to make a motion to approve it, that would certainly be fine.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other comments or questions?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair, I certainly think these modifications are helpful. We should go ahead with these. And if we need to further tweak, it sounds like what counsel is saying is Mr. Bladine has that authority going forward.

Correct?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, Commissioner Freeman, the procurement officer has the ability to do contract amendments.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Any other comments or questions?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I don't know if anybody knows the answer to this, but -- I don't disagree with the amendment. I think the amendment -- I wanted to see, if this amendment appeared in the contract with NDC ten years ago, was it the same, did they have a similar thing?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, Commission Herrera, I did not go back and review that, but -- so I don't know
specifically. But, since we kind of made this up, I doubt it was included.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other comments or questions, discussion?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I support the amendment and the direction we're taking.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Great.
And we don't need to do a motion —

MARY O'GRADY: If you would like to do a motion that might -- that would be fine.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I would move that we acknowledge Mr. Bladine's authorization to do an amendment to the contract and request that he pursue -- that he complete that with the two clarifications that we discussed here today.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I second that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: All in favor?

(Simultaneous "Aye.")

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any opposed?

(No oral response.)

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Was there going to be discussion?
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I felt we had discussed, but I'm happy to have more discussion.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Before I vote, I just wanted to say that I still reserve my prior objection that the Commission did not authorize Mr. Bladine to enter into and authorize that contract.

That being said, I vote aye.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So we have the motion carried unanimously.

So, Mr. Bladine, you'll be moving forward with that.

RAY BLADINE: We will.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great. Thank you very much.

So --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Point of clarification, I'm abstaining from voting on this.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, I didn't realize that. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I'm abstaining from voting on this.

I'm still questioning whether or not there's validity to execution of the contract.

So, I prefer to abstain until that issue is
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. For the record, we have four ayes and one abstention with Mr. Stertz.

Our next item on the agenda items is item six, discussion and possible action regarding open meeting law training for the Commission with respect to communications outside of public meetings.

I think in talking with counsel, we decided that this would probably be something we do at a later time, just because of the agenda items that we have in front of us today.

But I'm open to discussion.

If counsel has something to say too, fine.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, that's correct. That's our recommendation to not move on this, but to move on to substantive issues on the agenda.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

We'll move forward to discussion and possible action on mapping definitions.

So, I think as everyone is aware, there's a number of definitions out there for things like communities of interest and how is competitiveness measured and things like that.

If you look at what the last Commission did, on our website there's a link to the previous Commission's
work. You can see the definitions that they ended up adopting.

We heard during our public hearings when we were out across the state some folks wanted us to define that and have this Commission do that.

Others said differently. They said keep it open.

So we thought it would be a good thing to discuss with everybody and come up with the pros and cons of defining them now or do we want to keep that open for later.

And it would be helpful to know the timing of when the last Commission adopted those definitions and how they came to those, if anybody has that historical knowledge.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, I'll briefly give you my understanding.

These definitions that have been on the Commission website from the last Commission came as a result of a court order based on the legal challenge to the legislative lines. One of the arguments was that the -- by not having definitions, the Commission had violated the Equal Protection Clause of the United States Constitution.

And it was a Superior Court judge agreed with the challengers.

As a result the Commission had come up with these definitions, and they are still on the website.

Subsequently, on appeal the Court Of Appeals
reversed that ruling by the Superior Court.

I don't believe the Commission ever took any action to do anything with the definitions at that point.

But effectively they were -- they weren't necessary, I suppose, in light of the court's -- the Court of Appeals' ruling, which is still the law.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: When were those definitions adopted? Just generally, ballpark estimate.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I think it was 2004.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, Commissioner Herrera, I think that sounds right.

I can go back and find out.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm sorry, can you repeat it? Was it 2004?

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: I believe, because it came after the court -- I think the lawsuit was brought in 2002, took a while for the court to give its ruling and had to reconvene. So that sounds right. But I hesitate to give -- to confirm that without actually looking.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Any comments or questions on this topic from commissioners?

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, I thought I would take a quick second to summarize what the Court of Appeals said in its ruling so
you have context.

   It was a very lengthy opinion. This was one of many issues. It got to this issue, they essentially rejected the argument that the equal protection clause required that there be these kinds of definitions.

   The court acknowledged that the districting decisions require a judgment in particular because the Commission was charged with considering a number of variables that may often conflict with each other.

   And then the court went on to note that it's impossible to define what a perfect map is, and the Commission needs some flexibility. And the court did note the existence of standards may aid the Commission in reaching its agreement, but they do not guarantee enmity nor is enmity mandated by the Commission.

   A quorum, a majority quorum is always required to properly make decisions.

   The court didn't say, I think it's important to note, that the Commission cannot ignore any of the constitutional criteria, favor one criteria over another -- let me make -- let me read it exactly.

   This is not saying the Commission can ignore any of the constitutional criteria, favor one criteria without considering others or can apply or terminate in a way that no rational Commission would.
So it did clearly state that obviously the Commission's decision to be rationally based.

In our opinion, in my opinion, as based on deliberations and community input among the body itself coordinates those decisions.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Mr. Strasma.

KENNETH STRASMA: If I may, this item is on the agenda for tomorrow and Monday as well, in case the issues come up again. I would recommend regardless of whether the Commission chooses to adopt definitions or not that at least some of them be deferred until after a presentation tomorrow is scheduled on public input for the first round of hearings. And many of these criteria were topics that came up frequently in those meetings.

And at Monday's meeting we have scheduled a presentation on electoral data and competitiveness, which I think would speak to the Commission's decision on definition of competitiveness.

So I would recommend not taking the action on at least those two items until after the presentations.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, we also have some folks who are here bringing slips specifically for on the definitions, so I saw an ASU professor and also Dave Cantelme of Fair Trust. I don't know if there are others.
But, again, at the discretion of the chair in terms of whether we hear that kind of comment now or at the end.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Let me look and see.

I don't only see two -- I don't think my mic is on.

We'll take a five-minute recess. The time is 2:00 p.m.

(Brief recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We'll go ahead and enter back into public session.

The time is 2:13 p.m.

So, we were in the midst of agenda item seven, discussion and possible action on mapping definitions. And we've gotten some public comment actually on a couple agenda items that I thought we could go ahead and address now, since it's an appropriate time.

One actually goes back to our last agenda item, contract modification for Strategic Telemetry.

And a request to speak form from Steve Muratore, publisher of Arizona Eagletarian.

If you would like to come up for a public comment and address a few things.

STEVE MURATORE: Thank you, Madam Chair, commissioners.
I wanted to indicate that I’m very uncomfortable with the proposed modification for the purpose of requiring the mapping consultant to log contacts with media, blogger.

I understand the intent of the contract modifications being to keep track of any attempts to lobby the Commission or the mapping consultant, but inquiries from the media just seems like it's inappropriate.

So I would hope that you would revisit that.

And as a matter of fact, Commissioner Herrera noted that as a concern.

And so hopefully that is something that you will give additional thought to.

I also wanted to mention briefly that I’m very uncomfortable with the Commission yielding to threats from a clandestine lobbying group. And Fair Trust is clandestine and is a lobbying group that is addressing this Commission.

And it's my understanding that the risk that legal counsel was addressing really is a threat of litigation from a clandestine lobbying group to try to get you guys to do something that's going to cost more money.

So I think that's incredibly inappropriate for that particular consideration to be made.

That's what I got. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Jennifer Steen, assistant
professor at Arizona State University, and this is on mapping definitions.

JENNIFER STEEN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

And thanks to all the Commissioners on their -- as an Arizonian as well as a professor -- so I appreciate that you're doing this thankless, unglamorous, hard job.

I wasn't even sure I wanted to come and testify today.

So you guys show up, put yourselves on the line a lot. So thank you very much.

I wanted to speak a little bit about mapping definitions.

I think you should adopt them. I think it will provide a good benchmark and sort of give -- we all know there's going to be litigation. There's no doubt. There will be litigation of some kind after this is all said and done. And I think if you can demonstrate that you were operating in good faith off of well-defined standards, that will help in that process.

But, assuming that you do end up adopting some definitions, I wanted to offer comments on just a couple of them.

Some of the criteria will be really quite easy to define.

Equal population is not ambiguous, especially in
the congressional context where you just don't have the latitude to define that. And it's plus or minus one person. The Supreme Court is really clear on that.

There are other, there are other criteria that offer you a range of objective, numeric measures that you can employ. For example, the issue of compactness. There are a variety of things like the Polsby-Popper scores, and it's very well known. And so to be -- I don't have a dog in that race, but you can choose that fairly easily among yourselves.

The definitions of competitiveness and communities of interest will be a little bit trickier to deal with.

And with respect to competitiveness, you know, I know you've already received a lot of comments on this. I want to add my voice to those who urge you to consider election results as the primary basis of your competitiveness measure rather than voter registration.

There's a fallacy that I've heard repeated many times as I talk to people and have listened to folks that have appeared before this body; a fallacy that treats Independent voters as the swing vote.

And that's not really very accurate. In fact, it's not accurate at all.

Empirically it's been really well demonstrated that the vast majority of people who identify as Independent
actually lean towards one party or another. And, in fact, those folks, when they vote, are just as loyal as most partisans.

And this has been documented over and over again with hardcore data. The most prominent example, Keith's book called the Myth of the Independent Voter. That's a little bit old now, 20 years old, but that analysis has been replicated over and over again. And in my written comments I've actually provided to both sides to look into that, and you can read that yourselves.

So that would be my recommendation, with respect to competitiveness, is to emphasize election results over voter registration.

Defining communities of interest is really not straightforward at all. There's no numeric score that you can rely on to define community of interest. You do have a lot of models available to you from other states and from your predecessors here on the AIRC in 2001.

Most of those definitions are very inclusive, and they recognize communities of interest that are based on shared interests in a wide variety of categories, including racial, ethnic, language, religious, social, cultural, you name it, kind of all of the kitchen sink.

Although there is one notable exclusion.

California excludes communities of interest that are based
on a particular party or a candidate or office holder. And so you might with wish to consider whether you want to make such an exclusion. It would seem consistent with the spirit of Prop 106 to do so.

Most of these definitions leave implicit the requirement that the shared interest has to have some relationship to representation or to public policy and legislation. And I think that's actually a big fault in most definitions of communities of interest.

Arizona does not have that fault.

Your predecessors chose to include key language in their definition, and I urge you to replicate that this time around.

At the end of their definition of communities of interest, they state -- you all have this in front of you, but they define as a group of people in a defined geographic area with concerns about common issues, for example, that would benefit from common representation.

And I think those six words are really very key. That you want to differentiate between interests of affinity and interests that relate to the matters that the folks that will be elected from these districts will consider.

All right.

State candidates have a similar note. They recognize communities of interest where those interests are
probable subjects or relate to probable subjects of legislation.

And I think one reason you might want to do this is because you're eventually going to face very difficult choices that will require you to differentiate among the variety of communities of interest that present themselves to you.

I think that it's inevitable that you'll find conflict among the communities of interest, right, they all have preferences, or even between the preferences of some communities of interest and the other criteria that you have to consider.

And so one way that you can differentiate is by considering how central is this interest to the business of the state legislature or of the congress.

Okay.

And so, for example, I've heard -- I've seen a number of -- in a number of locations a number of different citizens have testified about their school districts constituting a community of interest. That seems quite compelling to me because it's a very well-defined geographic area, but you also know that the families who send their children to the same schools are similarly affected by state policy and state funding for education.

All right. So that's unambiguously related to
politics.

We've heard other groups who talked about feeling a strong sense of community, but in kind of vague terms. They feel a strong affinity with their neighbors but they don't ever describe how that relates to their ability to be represented in the legislature or the congressional delegations.

So I think claims like that should be considered. They present themselves as communities of interest, but where they come into conflict with other interests that are more community related to government activity or where they come into conflict with the other constitutionally mandated criteria, I don't think they should be favored. So I urge you to consider that.

One last thing I also want to speak about the definition of significant detriment in the context of communities of interest.

Of course you have to determine the degree to which you create competitive districts without causing significant detriment to the other criteria. And, again, you know, it's very difficult, but what I urge you to do when you're considering how to evaluate the detriment, the level of detriment to communities of interest, is to consider them as a whole or as a collective. Right. Not consider them serially.
Don't say, oh, there is a significant detriment to this community of interest. Oh, well, you know, yes or no, is there a significant detriment to this community of interest?

You want to look at the big picture.

Ask yourself questions like, how many communities of interest have presented themselves to us, self-identified? How many of those interests can we accommodate? How many of them have inherent conflicts with the other criteria, whether it's the geographic -- existing geographic features, or natural boundaries, the Voting Rights Act, et cetera.

Think about the degree to which communities of interest in general are affected by modifications to the map to create competitive districts, rather than going one by one through each community of interest. Because, of course, if a single community of interest has their representation diminished by competitiveness, that group is naturally going to feel like that's a significant detriment.

But if it's one group out of dozens or hundreds that present themselves, that may be tolerable.

In fact, I think it is tolerable because we all recognize that there's no way you can perfectly accommodate all six of the criteria you're charged with. Of course the framers of Prop 106 recognize that as well, so that's why
they put in to the extent practical, to the extent practical. That qualifies every single one of those criteria.

So we know that we have to tolerate some imperfections. Not everybody can get everything they want.

So when you're considering the possibility of significant detriment to the communities of interest, keep that in mind. It's not fair to have perfect, everybody who asks for it gets it, as a standard to compare the models you're asked to.

With that, I thank you.

Do you have any questions?

I'm used to taking questions. Also used to talking for 80 minutes.

So thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

Our next speaker on the same issue, definitions, is David Cantelme, Fair Trust.

DAVID CANTELME: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, thank you again for the opportunity to speak to you. I very much appreciate the way you're doing this in an open way.

I would join with Professor Steen in urging you to adopt definitions. I've been urging the Commission to do that in one way or another since 2002 or 2003.
I would also urge you, before you adopt any particular definitions, to publish them, the proposed definitions, on your website so that you can get public input.

I don't today offer any specific or particular definition, but I do urge a process and that process be open and give notice to the public and then you do indeed adopt definitions.

And the reason for adopting definitions is because it assists the Commission in performing its work in a reasoned and impartial fashion.

Now, it's likely that you're not going to please everybody. Nobody ever does. But it's important for everyone to feel the process has been fair.

And if you have definitions and they are reasoned and they're uniformly applied, or if not, applied with reasoned distinctions, then that supports your work product, it supports the public trust in which you've done, and I think it's the better way to do it, and I would recommend it to you very highly.

Thank you so much for the opportunity to speak.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

I think that's all from my request to speak forms that are relating to that topic.

Just checking.
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes. Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Are we -- may I make a comment on the definition question, or are we done with discussion of that issue until the next agenda?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We haven't, we haven't left that agenda item yet, so if people have other thoughts. It sounds like it is on our agenda for the next couple of meetings, both tomorrow and Monday. But if people have other thoughts that they would like to raise now, they're welcome to.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I think I'll reserve my specific thoughts about these two issues for our other meetings, but generally speaking I believe that it's important that we each as commissioners have clear thoughts about each of the concepts and how we're going to -- and that we articulate those in the process of making our decisions on the mapping.

Whether we can all as a Commission reach agreement on a definition of competitiveness and/or communities of interest is another question, and we may be able to do that.

However, if we are not, I think it is equally important that we each as individuals have well-reasoned thoughts about how we approach each of those criteria and can explain those as we move forward -- I think my mic just
went out.

These mics are so touchy everywhere we go.

I also think that it makes sense for us to have a session perhaps about what each of us thinks, our thoughts about what the -- what needs to be considered with respect to each of the criteria as distinct from coming up with a hard and fast definition.

Because at the end of the day I think each of these things is going to be kind of case by case, sort of tailored to each particular situation.

So I think that we as a Commission, we all differ greatly from talking with one another, and probably with our mapping consultants and each others, about the various factors that we would think about that would go into definitions. But at the end of the day we may all wind up having slightly different thoughts about what each of these things mean, and I think that would be consistent with both the constitution and with the case law on the constitution as long as we exercise those in a reasonable and rational way.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you. Other thoughts from other commissioners on this item?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I definitely need the
I agree with Commissioner McNulty to the extent I think this is the first step. Whether we adopt definitions or not, I think we pose this issue to the public during our public comment sessions. This is the first time it's really been tee'd up in our agenda. Counsel recommendation is that we not adopt definitions today. And Mr. Strasma also wants to talk with us, and I certainly agree with that.

I think it does not make sense for us to take too many steps down that road today because we don't want to define ourselves into a potential box, which is why it's important to hear from counsel and our mapping consultant and from the public as well.

And I know we'll probably want a lot more comments from the public, maybe at the end of today's hearing, maybe tomorrow, and on Monday.

And I agreement with Commissioner McNulty, the commissioners should put pen to paper and formulate some definitions, if that's the road we're going to take, and take those and discuss them publicly, put them out to the public for the public to comment upon what we come up with.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Other comments from other commissioners?

Good discussion. Thanks, everyone.
And thank you to the public for your comments on that as well.

Our next agenda item, authorization of second round public hearing general locations.

It's item eight.

We all received a draft of what that might look like from our deputy executive director, Kristina Gomez. I'm not sure --

RAY BLADINE: We're hiding right in front of you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, right in front of me. I was looking for you there.

Okay. Sorry.

So if you wouldn't mind telling us about the memo and giving us an intro into the second round, that would be great.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: So, we just finished with the first round of public hearing. And the first round of public hearings really is an educational piece for the public to learn more about redistricting in general and for the Commission to also become more aware of the different cities and towns and regions within the entire state.

So our next step is the second round. And the second round of public hearings really consists of a critiqued up draft of a draft legislative and congressional map.
So how I went about creating this schedule is I actually went through the 2010 census redistricting data, I looked at the most populated cities and towns, and then I also looked at heavy populated or a high concentration of minority groups within these cities and towns as well.

I -- we did try the remote locations during the first round of public hearings, and it actually worked out pretty well in certain cities. However, in the more rural parts of our state, the Skyping system didn't really work for us.

So when I was thinking of this schedule, I contacted a few community colleges, and they do have videoconferencing available.

However, the issue that I came across was school has just started, so a lot of these classrooms are taken. These classrooms can hold between 30 to 40 people, which is kind of small considering the second round of public hearings will probably be a higher attendance given that people will have a map to comment on.

So that was the other issue that I faced there.

So I did make a few phone calls though. And specifically with the city of Flagstaff, I did contact Coconino Community College.

They are able to host us during the week of September -- the week of September 18th. However, with
school starting, they can't accommodate a videoconferencing
connection between Tuba City and Page.

So during this second round of public hearings as well, this is the time where we will see a greater increase
in public comment. So staff will be extremely busy
receiving and recording and sending out this public --
public comments back out to you all.

And we do have a system that we are working with,
and I believe Mr. Bladine and Mrs. O'Grady will be talking
about this later on.

But second round is -- the volume is very, very
high with public comments input.

And we are also recommending that the public
hearings for the second round take place in the evening
hours as well.

Weekdays, after 6:00 o'clock, 6:00 to 9:00 p.m.,
and then weekends from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. And that would be
on a Saturday.

And you have also received a list of cities and
towns, as the public has as well.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great. And this is a draft,
but I know you're hoping to get some sort of authorization
to move forward, right, on some of this?

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.
So did commissioners have a chance to review the memo and also the attachment showing the list of second round public hearings potential?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any comments or questions?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Is the goal before we start the second round hearings to have the initial draft map for the first round?

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Yes.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Ms. Gomez, I was pleased to see that we got a few more rural on this and a few of the other locations I suggested on round one.

It was my understanding that we would not attempt the satellite in for round two; correct?

KRISTINA GOMEZ: We will try, but however I don't want to put down cities just yet and go back like the last time and give some bad news to folks that we're not able to do -- to videoconference them in.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: But I guess we're covering a lot of ground here. There's the option if somebody wants to
speak up and say there's an urgent need, we could maybe tie
into one that's currently on this list.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: That's up to you all.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: And is this the proposed
order that we would go in?

KRISTINA GOMEZ: I just put them in this order
just to make sure I was covering every major city and town
that I possibly -- that I wrote out during my draft.

So I looked at the map, I went down through my --
I went through my redistricting U.S. census data sheet, and
I just wanted to make sure that I was keeping track of
cities and towns. This is mostly for me really.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: And I know we've heard
throughout this process from certain groups and
organizations, tribes, that they're going to be meeting and
formulating responses and comments to the Commission.

Are we taking that into consideration as we put
this schedule together so that we -- so that we don't, in
September, we don't put it in too early to not give them the
opportunity to meet and bring their concerns to us?

RAY BLADINE: Madam Chair, Commissioner Freeman,
when Kristina was developing the schedule, we talked about
the best we can do is give you what we think is in order
just as you're bringing up.

As we started implementing round two, we had
requests, can I go later, can I go earlier, we have a

conflict in the city council meeting that day.

So we would look at this as a draft, hoping you

would approve us moving in this direction, with the

understanding it very well could change in order so that we
could accommodate the things you're bringing up.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Ms. Gomez, does the

community college system not have a central location where
we could stream a meeting to all their other locations?

KRISTINA GOMEZ: I could look into that.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Well, one thought that I

had was if we could -- if we began our second round of

hearings with something like that, which wasn't necessarily

attractive at every location, but provided the maps to

people and gave them an opportunity to hear what the

presentation is and hear what the public comment is at the

location where the maps are being presented, that that might

be helpful for people in deciding whether they wanted to

attend a location, a live location.

Just a thought, so I would ask that we at least

look into that and consider that.

My other comment is that I want to be careful that

we don't lock ourselves into a time frame or an order or a

schedule that we cannot ultimately meet and therefore we
disappoint people.

I think we have a lot of work to do.

It's already August 16th.

We need to do a good job on these maps. That's first and foremost.

If we get to September 18th and we aren't ready or we haven't done a good job, no one is going to say, well, that's okay, we understand, because you were trying to do a good job.

I'd rather that we make sure before we start nailing down dates that it's something that we can actually accomplish.

Having said that, I understand that you need to start looking at venues and so forth, and I think that's great, and the list looks good to me, although I'm certainly open to comments from my fellow commissioners about where we go and when. But I'd like, on the one hand, to begin the process of getting things queued up and on the other hand not commit to something that either something that's not being able to meet it or not being able to do the work we need to do and not being able to complete the work that we need to do before we start this round.

RAY BLADINE: Madam Chair, Commissioner McNulty, we, being the legal staff and the mapping staff, discussed that very issue this morning as to the starting time on the
1 18th. And we felt that that's really the drop dead date
2 that we have to have an adopted map so that we could go out.
3
4 And we felt very comfortable that we could make
5 that.
6
7 It, of course, depends on us putting a lot of
8 pressure on you for a number of meetings over the next
9 several weeks.
10
11 But we do believe that the 18th is a reasonable
12 time to start round two.
13
14 And perhaps Ken or Joe would like to comment. But
15 we were concerned just about what you're saying. We didn't
16 want to start out and find out we couldn't meet it.
17
18 COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I feel pretty strongly
19 about that. Although I really appreciate all of your
20 optimism, we're the ones that are going to be driving that
21 boat. And maybe we will accomplish it, but I think we need
22 to be prudent about it for the reasons I just brought up.
23
24 CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you, Ms. McNulty.
25
26 Comments, questions from other commissioners on
27 the schedule or the memo?
28
29 COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.
30
31 CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
32
33 COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Bladine, Ms. Gomez,
34 obviously September's are -- not being September, if we not
35 starting until the 18th, being the most obvious thing. I
concur with Commissioner McNulty that we have to set a
target date for ourselves. Deadlines are always important.
But we also have to realize that as we get closer to that
date I don't have any intention to compromise what we would
be putting out in our first draft in an effort to
distribute.

So I'd like to hear comment back from that.

Second is that obviously it's going to be running
into the month of October. There's 22 dates. There's --
that you've got listed on here, 22 different locations.

I'm also going to suggest that you cluster, for
the purposes of staff and legal counsel and commissioners,
that you try to cluster these into parts of the state. For
the last go-around I know that you needed to make
adjustments based on availability of sites.

But there were dates where you were in southern
Arizona and northern Arizona, southern Arizona, northern
Arizona four days in a row, and that put an enormous amount
of stress on staff and legal counsel, as well as on the
Commission.

So if you'd take these things into consideration.

We realize and recognize that there are deadlines
and priorities involved. We do need to set a date that
we're going to pull the trigger. And I think as
commissioners we should just -- we're going to have to sort
of self-apply it, because there's going to have to be a date
for staff to be able to begin locking down locations.

Because that's what your critical issue is right here.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other comments, questions?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: One question about a

location, Bullhead City.

I recall when we were there people were asking us
if next time we were going to meet in Lake Havasu City. Is
that a facility issue?

And I think perhaps we had commented that although
we went to Bullhead City for the first round we might go to
Lake Havasu for the second round.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: We can do that.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: We may want to consider

that.

I think it was something that had been raised.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Along those lines, I had a

comment too on location.

I notice on some of these you have two towns
listed, either/or, and then some are listed with a slash,
which I assume is also a choice between two locations.

And I was wondering on Globe, forgive my Arizona
geography, I'm not sure how far that is from Payson, but
Payson is another town that was mentioned at some of these
public hearings as one that we might want to consider for
the second round.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Madam Chair, we can put that down
as well.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Great.

And each of these locations we will be able to
stream from; right? The streaming of the meeting on the
Internet, or no? Not necessarily?

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Madam Chair, the other problem
that we had with some of these facilities was Internet
connection. So it depends on what type of connection they
have.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: And we usually don't -- well, we
didn't know until we actually arrived and started the stream
to actually know if it would work or not.

And also to your question regarding, for example,
the "or," Marana or Oro Valley.

I just left that up to you all, because I wasn't
sure which town you would like to visit there.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Yeah, Sahuarita or
Green Valley.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I thought it would depend
on the available of a facility because they're very close to
one another.

    RAY BLADINE: Madam Chair, I think what Kristina
was just saying, our goal is to try to find locations that
stream. And we found last time that what we thought would
work wouldn't necessarily, but we still try to find
streaming.

    And we also found last time cities we thought
would work didn't work, but a neighboring city would work.
And that was like Lake Havasu and Bullhead.

    So we just want you to be aware that for us to
actually implement it, we may have to have that kind of
flexibility, but our goals will still be the same to
maximize the streaming and get the cities first laid out.

    VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

    VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I attended a good chunk of
the meetings during the first round. And the --
obviously -- it was very obvious to me and the rest of the
Commission that attended these meetings that the staff was
stretched pretty thin making this 15 meetings, and we're
adding 22, I think 23 with Payson, if we decide to do that,
that seems, unless we hire more staff, I see that could be
problematic.

    It was tough. I mean, Buck attended most of them.
He's our only IT on staff. And now we're going to require him at every meeting, that's 23, including Payson.

So although I said this is my favorite part of the meetings, I want to make a comment that I want to be fair to the staff, and the Commission as well, if this is truly reasonable and doable. Because last time we ended up canceling some of the towns that we ended up promising, and I know some commissioners were not happy with that. I don't want that to happen again.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Comment.

I do look to Mr. Bladine to let us know about staffing. And I know we have three public outreach coordinators and helping. But if -- you know, we look to you to give us that recommendation as to if you think you need more staff.

RAY BLADINE: Madam Chair, Kristina and I have talked about how we think we can accomplish this.

And we don't have a definitive answer for you, but probably our biggest issue is the streaming, recording.

We have one Buck.

We have talked about the possibility -- as you recall we had a few places last time where they could do the recording for us and the streaming. We'll try to see if there's more facilities so that we cannot have all of this fall on Buck.
We've also talked about the possibility of exploring hiring a service that might do one or two of these and perhaps the ability to even do two on one day.

So we're not prepared to answer how we're going to do it, but we do understand it will be a challenge for us to get this done and look for alternative ways to bring it about.

It seems Kristina and I, when we talked about it, that the big issue will be handling the recording and the streaming.

We probably have enough staff to cover several locations if you're all willing, you know, to do perhaps on one day two different locations.

So we'll bring you back more detail once we start to see what we can do.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Fellow commissioners, I just looked at a calendar, and I would suggest that September 26th, which is the Monday after, September 18th is a Sunday, the following Monday is September 26th, to me it feels like a more realistic target date. So I throw that out there for comment.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: The week of September 26th.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So that Kristina could
begin looking at locations, seeing what availability is out there, maybe coming up with a plan for grouping cities and towns geographically, looking at what alternatives might be.

And while she's doing that preliminary work, we can be working with the mapping consultant about what our trajectory is going to be and get a little better sense of what the time is going to be before we actually start noticing some things.

RAY BLADINE: Madam Chair, obviously from the staff perspective, for setting the second round, more time is better, easier for us. But I would also raise the issue that it will put more pressure on the tail end to -- in terms of getting the maps adopted after the hearing if our goal is October 31st.

So if we do that, I think we need to make sure the mapping consultant has told us how that would affect them if we went back.

The 18th was based upon their schedule. And I'm not saying we should stay with the 18th, but I think we need to recognize if we move back it may have an effect on when we'll get the adopted plan.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I understand that, Mr. Bladine, but the maps are what this collective process is about, and we need the time to do that job properly.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Starting on the 26th, leading up to the 26th or 27th of October, that's 30 days, of which I think we can fit 23, including Saturdays, we can fit 23 meetings into. So the target would start on the 26th, but we can fit 23 days in those 30 working days.

I concur with Commissioner McNulty, and that gives us a deadline starting place.

What Commissioner McNulty is looking for is we're looking as a Commission for another week of -- another week window so that we can flush out the issues so that what we're giving out in the public is actually that's been drilled out to something other than something that we really worked through.

So, there I go.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Other thoughts?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Although I don't disagree with Commissioner McNulty, my only concern is that pushing the date to the week of September 26th, what does that mean? So we will have a whole month of public comment, and then wrapping up late October, then having a few days to compile
that, get that information, along with other criteria and other information, and put together a map. That doesn't seem like it is enough time to do that.

I think I agree with Mr. Bladine that, yes, we'll be allowing more time for us to create that initial map, but at the end we'll be running out of time to create that map that we need.

I'm a little cautious.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Strasma, would you like to comment on the timeline?

KENNETH STRASMA: Thank you, Madam Chair.

The timeline starting at the end of 18th would allow roughly two weeks at the completion of the 30-day public comment period for adjustments based on the public comment and adoption of the final plan in order to make the deadline of October 31st.

Moving it back changes that to one week.

So it is still doable, but I've told a number of commissioners that I will speak up if ever there are changes to the timeline that make it impossible to meet the deadline of the 31st.

Basically this is a question of do we want to spend more time on the first draft map that goes out to the public at the expense of having less time to make adjustments based on the public comments.
It is still doable to make the 31st, but it would mean an intense week of meetings and adjustments the final week of October.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Is there anything that would preclude adjustments being made during the 30-day process?

KENNETH STRASMA: That's direction that we would seek from the Commission.

We did discuss that this morning. I know there has been discussion of what-if scenarios, if there is public input during the 30-day period, can you try this. Commissioners come to us and say, you know, can you see what the implication of this change is.

That's certainly the sort of thing we can be working on during the 30-day comment period. And expect to be.

I am -- it's a decision for the Commission. My guess would be that the Commission would choose not to give actual direction as to the map until all the communities have been heard in the 30-day comment period. But as recurring themes come up, we can definitely be working through the what-if scenarios. So it's not like we have to be waiting to start adjustments until the end of the
30 days.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE CHAIR HERRERA: We had talked when we had hired Strategic Telemetry, and provided with the timeline, that we wanted to meet that timeline, and we want to do everything we can to help them with that timeline.

So moving the date to the 26th really is not helping the Commission, I don't think. So I would propose that we keep the 18th, as they're recommending. Give the public enough time to make their comments. It would be unfair for us to be making changes at the beginning of the public comments when we have -- maybe people feel a little left out, you know, you've already created the map without our input. So I would not be in favor of that happening.

So I would prefer that we keep a date that they recommended, we'll stick with that timeline that they proposed, and I want to make sure that we are on time.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Mr. Kanefield.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, members of the Commission, I am just looking at the constitutional language we may need to look at this a little more carefully. But as I read it, what the constitutional provision, a map finalized and then advertised or put out for public comment
for a period of at least 30 days.

    If during that period the map is changed, you
know, you have to analyze whether or not that would reset
the 30-day period. And that's kind of what the timeline
you're operating on is the time 30-day period change would
be.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Good point. Thank you.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

    CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Strasma, now that we've
given the green light to purchase the online mapping for the
public access to it, when will that be implemented?

    KENNETH STRASMA: We expect that will be available
within three weeks.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay. So three weeks will
put us at the week prior to the 18th.

    KENNETH STRASMA: Yes.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay. So that would give
essentially one week for the public to start to look at the
grid maps.

    KENNETH STRASMA: Correct.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

    What I'm driving at is I want to give as much
opportunity for the review of the grid maps and as much
opportunity for the public to get an understanding of the
maps and software so that they can as they're -- because our
goal is that during the 30-day period collection of data is
that the public is going to be reviewing the map that we're
going to be distributing and getting comments as to which
you're going to be cataloging that comment during that time
period; is that correct?

KENNETH STRASMA: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay. So my hope is that,
and with all due respect to Mr. Herrera's time frame, it
would be great to give the public the opportunity to fully
vet the software that will be online and then to fully vet
and participate during the process.

So I'm going to stick with the start date of the
26th.

I think we can make it work, and I think we're --
I think if we're able to compress on our end, on the front
end, I don't think that's changing the process of getting
the information out to the public.

And lastly, I'll close with this, that it's really
incumbent upon staff to be able to -- and I think it was
mentioned by Mr. Bladine and Ms. Gomez, that having two a
day, I don't think it's going to hurt anyone's feelings. If
we're going to do Oro Valley in the morning and south Tucson
in the afternoon, I don't think that's going to bother
anybody. The more that you can be efficient with your time
and your scheduling and the public's -- and the dynamic with
the public, I'm sure that you can be smart in finding
locations that will be able to accommodate that as well.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Other comments, questions?

Mr. Kanefield.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Could you read that
language one more time? Are we advertising the final map?
Is that what I heard you say? Or the initial?

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair,

Commissioner McNulty, reading paragraph 16 from the
Proposition 106, says the Arizona Independent Redistricting
Commission shall advertise a draft map of congressional
districts and a draft map of legislative districts to the
public for comment, which comments shall be taken for at
least 30 days, either or both bodies of the legislature may
act within this period to make recommendations to the
Commission by memorial or by minority report, which
recommendations shall be considered by the Commission, the
Commission shall then establish district boundaries.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh, sorry.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Kanefield, I don't --

does that preclude creating a working analysis during the
course of the 30-day period by the Commission?

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair,

Commissioner Stertz, I don't believe so, but I think the map that would be advertised is the map that's being out for public comments. So certainly this process envisioned that during that period you will not only receive public comment, but I'm sure the commissioners will probably have thoughts and ideas on how that map may be adjusted at the end of the period.

The question is whether, from what I understood, could a change -- maybe I misunderstood, if a change was made and the Commission adopted it in that period, then arguably will that reset the 30-day time period.

I don't believe that any of the commissioners individually working with the consultant based on public input from making proposed changes, and during that process that would ultimately consider the end of the 30-day public comment.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mr. Kanefield, I had no intention of coming up with the idea that we would be re-ratifying or ratifying new draft maps for publication. This would be just a time when the Commission would be able to analyze the information almost on a daily basis at our will.

We're all being provided with the software. We're
all being provided with the maps. And as we -- as Commissioner McNulty had inferred, we're all going to have our own personal baseline of criteria which we're going to be making some decisions on.

And we'll be able to drill down on some of those thoughts and see whether or not they're functional as we get the public comment during that 30-day period.

I had no intention of reissuing a new draft.

So, hope that clarifies it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Ms. O'Grady.

MARY O'GRADY: Just one point, Madam Chair, commissioners.

In terms of the October 31st date, we require in the contract amendment a schedule that would permit completion by October 31st.

So that's the timeline that's been valid.

We all need that and that Strategic has and is prepared to meet. But obviously, if the Commission in the process decides that they would like to go beyond the 31st in order to do the kind of job that they think -- you know, to take the time to assess, they can do that, you can do that.

We were also developing the first deadline taking into consideration comments that we received from election
officials in Maricopa County, which was they're looking at their December 1st deadlines as far as local precincts, that sort of thing.

But there is some real validity in terms of the completion date.

I just want to say that.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

So I guess is there some middle ground? Do we start midweek?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, does this require a motion?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I think it probably would be good to do a motion and to authorize Kristina to be able to move forward with the draft agenda given the things we talked about, the potential changes and edits to it, just so that she can begin to start putting something together.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair, I move to --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, before we vote today, can I make a quick comment?

I mean, just, I want to make sure that we go back to what the commitment we made to Strategic Telemetry that we would be helping them meet that timeline. Pushing the date back to the 26th is not helping them meet that timeline.

And, like I said, I think we can do it by the day
they proposed.

We would just have to sacrifice our time and meet as often as we could, and by that timeline, and then start the public comments on the 18th.

Like I said, if you want us to take that time, which I do, I think we all agree that was a reasonable timeline.

Let's respect Mr. Strasma and his comments and let's go with the timeline that they recommend.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.
VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: First of all, nobody agreed to the timeline. It was something that was a product of the contract negotiations with Mr. Bladine that Strategic Telemetry negotiated.

My question for Mr. Bladine and Ms. Gomez is how much lead time do these locations typically need from us? Probably more lead time the better.

But a couple weeks before we really need to decide?

RAY BLADINE: I guess I'll let Kristina answer in more detail.

I think to a certain extent we kind of know some things we won't go back to and some things we will, so that will probably make it a little easier.
But it seems to me it takes about a week to really firm up three or four locations, by the time it falls back and forth. So that's the kind of -- there is an awful lot of trying to work with the community, working with the facility.

So it seems to me in a week we do three or four and then it may pick up after that.

Let me just also make a comment that relates to timing.

Clearly you all need to decide where you want to put your time and whether you think it's going to be more necessary at the front end or more necessary at the back.

As Commissioner Freeman pointed out, this is what we contractually said we would do and to meet an end.

But the hard part for all of us is we really don't know how long it's going to take for all of you to come up with that first map.

And I am hearing let's caution on the side of not being forced into a hearing before we're ready.

We kind of thought we did that, but I'm not sitting up there with all of you, so you have probably a better sense of what you're going to need to go through. So I guess all I'm saying is whatever you decide, we'll work very hard to make that happen.

But getting some direction today will help us a
lot in moving forward and demonstrating that.

And finally, the chairman a minute seemed to have said is said is there a compromise. Perhaps we could start Thursday or Friday before the 26th.

Again, you may need that for mapping.

So now that I've opened my mouth, I really think it's your all decision, and we'll do our best to make it happen.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I would suggest to the Committee to get started midweek. When we get there, we may need Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday. We may be doing what the last Commission did, get the Holiday Inn in Casa Grande for a week straight or two weeks straight. I don't know.

But, it's taken us until August 17th to get where we are now. We're talking about doing our maps in four weeks. I feel very strongly that we need to approach this with prudence, and the date I would be comfortable with is kind of September 26th.

I think we're -- we are committed to the Arizona Constitution that takes precedence over what we committed to Strategic Telemetry in their contract. And I think it's great that they're willing to bust their chops to be there for us when we need them.
That doesn't mean that we have to shorten what we need to do in order to meet that deadline. We need to do our jobs.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Other comments? Discussion?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I move that we set a schedule for a second round of hearings beginning September 26th to take place in an orderly and organized fashion whereas we try to combine cities in parts of the state in -- so that in the best possible fashion, that we do so in such a way as to not embroil the staff or the consultants in an overly aggressive schedule that does not allow us to properly meet our objectives, which are to be alert and fair with all of the public, and that we -- as a part of this motion I want to make it that these dates need to get up and published to the general public in significant advance so that they can have full participation and knowledge of what's forthcoming and what the expectations are of the public at these meetings.

And that if an extension or contemplation of extension may be required to a date to Strategic Telemetry, that that can be contemplated at a later date, in regards to their end date.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Is there a second?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I have a question for counsel.

Agenda eight is authorization of second round public hearing general locations.

Can the Commission take action as proposed or what does that mean in terms of whatever we need to do?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, Commissioner Freeman, you make the point in terms of the language of this particular agenda item, so perhaps we need to defer that particular motion until a later meeting. I think staff has gotten the direction that they need to proceed.

So perhaps we don't make a formal motion in terms of today, since this is focused on general locations rather than the date at which the committee meeting begin and some of the other issues related to that.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: And I hate to scuttle such a well-stated motion.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: It's the attorney in you.

Thank you for noticing that, Mr. Freeman.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Marty's got it down.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Marty's got it down, exactly.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Well, given all that, thanks for the discussions.

Are there any other -- anything else that you wanted to bring up on the second round of public hearings?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. I'd like to thank Kristina for her hard work on putting this together and the memo, and thank you for being prepared for us today, and hopefully you have the authorization to move forward as you heard our discussion today.

KRISTINA GOMEZ: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thanks.

Okay. It's now -- the time is 3:12 p.m. I'm being asked if we could take a five-minute recess, so we'll go ahead and do that and enter back into public session very shortly. 3:12 p.m.

(Brief recess taken.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. We'll enter back into public session.

The time is 3:26 p.m.

And I think we concluded agenda item eight.

Moving on to agenda item nine, discussion and possible action regarding the approval of Catalyst contract. I don't know who is leading this discussion. Is that legal counsel?
MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, I think I can get this started.

This is really just an online discovery tool database for the lawyers that we'll have access to the searchable data that Strategic is working on coding. And so Catalyst is an e-discovery company that we're working with on target litigation solutions. We'll be entering a subcontract that will provide Joe and I access to what we need to do the electronic submission to the Department of Justice.

And the idea is that the cost savings, we only have to do this once in terms of entering the -- getting access to the database that Strategic will have access to and that we will have access to and Joe will have access to.

So, I don't have the subcontract, but -- and, again, the procurement officer, Ray Bladine, does have authority under the contract to approve subcontracts.

But we just wanted to advise -- it's been mentioned before, so we wanted to advise the Commission that we were moving forward with this work.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So is the idea that you're not looking for action from us today on this?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, I don't think specific -- no, I would not be. We will move forward and we'll get the subcontract in place under Mr. Bladine's legal
authority as procurement officer.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Does anyone have any questions or comments?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Ms. O'Grady, the name of the company is.

MARY O'GRADY: The actual software is called Catalyst. And the website, if you're interested in information, is -- it's C-A-T-A-L-Y-S-T is the name of the software, and there's information on the software at CatalystSecure.com.


COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Secure, S-E-C-U-R-E, dot-com.

MARY O'GRADY: So that's the software, and we'll be working with an e-discovery vendor who will post us.

We've been working on this quite some time with staff and looking at a number of options, and with Strategic also, to develop something that would work for anyone and hopefully save staff time while Strategic does what they need to do and give Joe Kanefield and I the access to the documents that we need to do and not have to process these documents downstream more than once.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Is this a document type of sky drive sort of approach? Is it a central locater of documents? I'm trying to determine what the --

MARY O'GRADY: I think I'll defer to some technical people. I have, kind of an electronic filing cabinet is the way I view it. And perhaps Andrew can help me.

ANDREW DRECHSLER: Madam Chair, Commissioner Stertz, this is a document -- it's a cloud server for all the documents from the Commission, anything that's been submitted, whether it's been a web submission, mail, all information that's been presented at public hearings and handed in at public hearings, all this information will be there along with the transcripts. We have the ability to put up all media articles on there. So it's really a one-stop place.

And the only thing I would add to Ms. O'Grady is that the commissioners as well will have access to this. And if there's -- they will have a log in, and we will go through a training to show you how you can do searches. So if you're thinking of a meeting back in March and remember somebody had a comment, you can do an easy search, and that should pop right up in terms of what you're looking for.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So this is a -- there are many different companies out there that provide this type of
online file cabinets type of -- there's Base Camp, there's
other types.

Catalyst Secure is one that has been typically
used by legal counsel? Is that a --

ANDREW DRECHSLER: Yes, it's a recommendation
from -- I think your law firm, Ms. O'Grady, was the original
one who had looked at a number of different databases, and
that.

RAY BLADINE: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Bladine.

RAY BLADINE: Perhaps I can just give some
background.

What we really did was early on, as we mentioned
to you, we would have a tracking system for public comments.

And the early versions you saw were spreadsheets
that Kristina prepared and documented what came in and was
sent out to you.

At the same time we were looking at a system for
staff to do that.

We realized that the law -- the legal part would
need a similar sort of system, but more designed around
retrieving documents for submission to the Department of
Justice and if there were future litigations.

We also realized in the contract with Strategic
there was certain information they would provide.
So in the series of last probably month and a half, we've had internal meetings to look at what might be the best approach to do this that would give everybody what they need. Our concern primarily being to provide information to you that you would have available that's searchable for input coming in on the mapping, the legal staff having the documentation already prepared so they wouldn't be pulling it together when they needed to make their final for the Justice Department, and then coordinating with Strategic so they would need some of the documents for maps in their activity, but other documents they ship into this, including copies of the transcripts, we'd have all in one place.

We started out by taking a look at a system that was not aimed towards legal but was more aimed towards our desires in terms of just gathering data, and realized that there was a legal system out there, and relied upon the expertise of Osborn Maledon's IT staff, in working with Buck, to come up with -- we thought the best thing to do would be to arrange for that system through Osborn Maledon, but as we really had -- we've only talked about bits and pieces, we thought we should bring it forward to make sure that everybody understands what we're proposing to do.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: This is a question for either Ms. O'Grady or Mr. Bladine.

We are buying a license? Is this an online service that we're procuring? Is it, are we purchasing it by space? How much space that we will be utilizing? And if it is Osborn Maledon, who will be the owner of the license for the use access?

RAY BLADINE: My understanding, you're getting into some detail I'm not prepared to answer in terms of the space.

I can tell you that the way it worked is basically by we get -- lease the program, and then we're responsible for the data input.

The cost of managing that streaming, we're not sure, but it could be 5,000 to perhaps 20.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Over the term of the life of the Commission.

RAY BLADINE: That's right.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

RAY BLADINE: I would believe that since we would be purchasing it as part of a legal contract, it would be available to us, it would be our license, but I don't know the answer to that, Commissioner Stertz.

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, Commissioner Stertz, I'll follow up. I don't have that precise language, but I
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other comments or questions?

Ms. McNulty.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Just so I understand correctly, the information that would be in this cloud would be Commission information and it would be available to the commissioners and legal staff and consultants, but it would not be available to third parties for any purpose unrelated to Commission business; is that correct?

RAY BLADINE: That would be my understanding of how these documents would be handled under the open meeting law, but, yes, that --

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: So these are all documents that are public documents anyway that would be in this cloud, and it's really for the purpose of allowing us more efficient access to the information so that we can get at public comments, for example, when we remember something that we want to bring up as we're doing the mapping, and so that Osborn Maledon and Ballard Spahr can use the information more efficiently to prepare the preclearance submittal.

Is that right?

It's not going to be for use by the consultants in any other venue or for any other purpose whatsoever?
And even if it were, it's all public anyway and on our website.

RAY BLADINE: Madam Chair, Commissioner McNulty, I think you did a better job of explaining what it will do than I did.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Only because I listened to you.

RAY BLADINE: Well, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other questions or comments?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Mr. Bladine, there will be a portal available to us that we can log on and we will have access to this database?

RAY BLADINE: Yes, that's correct.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: And then my question for Mr. Kanefield is: Do you have any experience with this software package basically?

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, Commissioner Freeman, I don't. I've looked at it. It's been shown to me.

If it been works as it's been demonstrated, it will be fabulous to deal with, work with. So, but I have not myself used it, and I'm not sure about the firm. I can check. But, like I said, I think it's a format that I was
shown, it will be very helpful for us to use.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Other questions or comments?

So will this become -- will be an agenda item for later, or how are we going to proceed in terms of answering everyone's questions?

MARY O'GRADY: Madam Chair, we will execute a subcontract to our contract with Ray Bladine to get that done, and I don't see this coming back as an agenda item. I can follow up with Commissioner Stertz on his technical questions, and if there are other questions, technical questions, I will do so, but I don't see it coming back to the Commission.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

Any other discussion on this?

Hearing none, we move to the agenda item ten. We have a consent agenda in front of us. There's numerous sets of meeting minutes that you all should have received from Anna Garcia. I believe July 26 she sent out all of those. And we had this on a previous agenda but unfortunately ran out of time.

So if there's no objection, the consent agenda will be adopted.

Any discussion?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I do have a few comments on these minutes that I'd like on make.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Would you like to go through each one individually?

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: I'm going to speak generally. There are a couple specific comments, but in large measure they apply to all of the minutes.

We say in a footnote that a copy of the searchable transcript can be found on our website.

I think that's not yet the case with respect to a number of these minutes. So I want to point that out. I think if we're going to post it on our website with that notation, we need to close that loop.

I would request that we -- when we recite the law, our lawyers, the people who are present in the meeting, I would ask that we have a uniform format and that we list their names and their law firms and say that they're legal counsel and we do that in a different way.

I'd like to request that given that Mr. Muratore attends every one of our hearings that we spell the name of his organization correctly. And that's in the May 12th minutes.

And also that we spell Ms. Geri Ottoboni's name correctly, and that's in the May 31st minutes.

Some other typos that I'm not going to raise.

In the June 29th minutes, we refer to Jean Clark, she will be delegating her authority some of the mapping
consultant to the Commission in accordance with A.R.D. 41-2112. That should be A.R.S. Section 41-2112.

And I think my last request would be that in the minutes of Thursday, June 30th, we refer to a number of individuals as representing self and we have initial capital letters. And I think we can remove those initial capitals and just say representing self, lower case letters.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Other comments?

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Freeman.

VICE-CHAIR FREEMAN: I would agree I think there are a number of what I would categorize as minor grammatic and typographical issues. Substantively I thought -- and Commissioner McNulty identified a number of them. Substantively I thought they were reflective of our meetings.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Yeah, I thought this was just mostly proper noun misspellings. That was my input. Which we can get corrected before they're posted.

Other comments from other commissioners?

Is there a motion to accept these minutes given the changes that Ms. McNulty suggested, so once those are
made they'll be considered approved?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: So moved.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Second.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any discussion?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: All in favor?

("Aye.")

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Any opposed?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Great. We'll request

Mr. Bladine make sure those edits get incorporated and we'll

get them posted on our website.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Because it is dealing with

minutes still, may I also make a recommendation that when --

that I noticed that it was picked up on our website

subsequently, but minutes were posted without the word or

the phrase draft on them.

And I wanted to remind staff that draft needs to

be posted. You picked it up, but it took a day to pick it

up.

RAY BLADINE: Okay. We'll watch that. I didn't

realize that we had made that error.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I appreciate the fact that
minutes are getting up in draft form and that transcripts are being put up in place of minutes. So I appreciate it.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Any other comments?

Hearing none, we'll move to agenda item 11, discussion of future meetings.

I know we have two on the books, I think right now, tomorrow in Casa Grande at 10:00 a.m. And Monday? Is that -- I should be looking at Mr. Bladine.

RAY BLADINE: Yes. Monday, Tucson. I don't know that we have the location yet in Tucson. But it will be in Tucson. I believe we have it set for 9:00 o'clock start time, to be done by 3:00, I believe.

I didn't bring it with me.

That's our -- that's the plan for Monday.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. The agenda for tomorrow is set. It's been posted.

Have the agenda items been planned for the Monday meeting?

RAY BLADINE: There would be some continuation of the items we've had today.

But the primary purpose would be to review the submissions that the mapping consultants would work on over the weekend and on Friday in our office based upon directions you give them on Friday.
So that's the main purpose of the Monday meeting will be the continuation of -- continue the mapping activity that you will begin tomorrow.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: You mean on Thursday.

RAY BLADINE: I'm sorry, on Thursday, correct, yes.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: No problem.

We won't be meeting Friday. I know we talked about a Friday and Saturday, but ultimately --

RAY BLADINE: Right. We ended up with Thursday and then no Friday, no Saturday, but Monday coming back after the mapping consultants had a chance to follow whatever it is that you would like them to bring back.

And that's as far as we've gotten on a schedule is Monday of next week in Tucson.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yes, Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Regarding Monday's meeting, from Strategic Telemetry who will be there?

KENNETH STRASMA: Madam Chair, commissioners, myself and Willie Desmond.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.
VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I don't -- maybe I just missed it. Is there -- on this agenda there's no discussion of future agenda items.

So...

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Normally, that's in other catch --

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: What I wanted to do --

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Yeah, just discussion of future meetings. I'm not sure if that can include agenda items.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: What I'd like to do Monday, I'd like to go back to the amendment that we -- that was approved or that the amendment regarding Strategic Telemetry making a log entry when they speak to members of the public outside of public hearing, public meetings.

I would like to exclude media, and that would include bloggers as well. I see them in meetings as well.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So that would be an agenda item for Monday?

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Sure. We can do it Monday.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And what else is happening on Monday?

Is Mr. Adelson also going to make a presentation?

RAY BLADINE: That's correct, Madam Chair.

Thought we put him on the agenda to give further information
on the Voting Rights Act and what we need to do to comply.

We'd also carry over an item, any item we didn't finish Thursday or didn't think we finished, and also the potential for a briefing on the activities of our legal counsel and the Attorney General's Office.

And I don't recall right now that we have any other items, but those are the ones that I think of right off the top of my head.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

RAY BLADINE: We certainly can later circulate a draft of items for all to see and add and subtract and send it back to us.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: And it would have to be posted tomorrow?

RAY BLADINE: We could actually post on Friday.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: On Friday, because Saturday counts. Okay.

RAY BLADINE: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: So we have until Friday. Good.

Okay.

Other agenda items people thought of or want to bring up now?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: With regards to Mr. Herrera's suggestion, and my question for legal counsel, would they have an opportunity between now and Monday to do a cursory legal review of the question that he's brought forward on the table?

MARY O'GRADY: Sure.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I would just like to add that I think that's an important point that Mr. Herrera has brought up. I know we have approved a motion, but I would like to have further discussion about that issue Monday also.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Thank you.

Anything else?

Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I want to make sure that the discussion of future agenda items is on the next agenda.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We will do that.

It normally says that, so we'll get that on there next time.

That takes us to agenda item 12, call for public comment.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair.
CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Oh.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: I just have one more item. This will be quick.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Mr. Bladine during his report talked about the progress we're making reaching out to members of the community through the website, through public hearings.

I want to make sure that that's part of every -- I think it's important that we educate the people that are in attendance, and also the Commission, the work that we're doing in reaching out to members of the public via the website, public hearings, all other forms, that we're allowing and encouraging members of the public to make input and reach out to the Commission. I would like an update every...

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I would agree. I think those statistics are powerful, and I think it's worth talking about them. And maybe our public information officer can help with that, Stu Robinson.

Thank you.

Okay. Moving on to agenda item 12, call for public comment. This is the time for public to comment on the agenda or redistricting maps. Members of the Commission may not discuss items that are specifically identified on
the agenda. Therefore, action taken as a result of public comment on matters not on the agenda will be limited to directing staff to study the matter, responding to any criticism, or scheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date.

And I have a number of request to speak forms. Those that we already covered on specific agenda items, and then I have a number of others here that we'll go through.

Again, for our court reporter, if everyone could be sure to speak directly into the microphone and spell your name so that we get an accurate account. And if you could also say where you're from, what city, town, or county that you reside in, that would be great.

Our first speaker is Representative Albert Hale from the Arizona House of Representatives, representing LD 2, the Navajo Nation.

REPRESENTATIVE ALBERT HALE: Ya at eeh.
I don't know how to spell that.
Ya at ehh ahehee.
It is good. That's what ya at eeh means.
Ahehee. Thank you.
I'm called Albert Hale, representative,
Legislative District No. 2, which is the northeast corner of the state of Arizona. I've been a representative for one
1 year now, but I served before then in the Arizona Senate for
2 nine years.
3
4 And I also have been the president of the Navajo
5 Nation, chairman of the Navajo Nation Water Rights
6 Commission.
7
8 So you can call me representative, president,
9 senator, chairman -- what did I leave out? Something else,
10 whatever.
11
12 Anyway, I just want to address a number of issues
13 with you.
14
15 I spoke with the Commission, at least the two who
16 were present when they had -- when you had your public
17 meetings, public meeting in St. Michaels. At the time I
18 mentioned a number of things that I think is worth repeating
19 in light of what you have done so far.
20
21 What I understand that you've done so far is to
22 produce a grid map basically coming up with, as I understand
23 it, coming up with a map that is based on population, and
24 how you would draw a map solely based on population to come
25 up with an equal number of population in the different
26 legislative districts.
27
28 So I think you've done your task there, which to
29 me it seems like that's the easy part.
30
31 But the difficult part lies ahead. The harder
32 part lies ahead.
But this gives you, as I understand it, a jumping off point, a reference point, so that you can now apply those other requirements, including community of interests, which I want to speak at. Retrogression and dilution of voting.

Those are some of the things I want to speak at.

In the grid maps that you have produced for state of Arizona in the legislative district, and I want to address the legislative district maps first, what I see has happened based on the population is that populations that have existed historically together have been split.

If you look at the legislative district that I represent, which includes five Indian nations, the Navajo Nation, Hopi Nation, San Juan Paiute Indian Nation, Hualapai and Havasupai Indian Nations down the canyon, and the city of Flag. If you look at those communities, those nations, particularly Navajo Nation, they have existed in these parts of the state long before Arizona became a state.

But in this grid map that you have, now you splitting them up, because the line that I saw goes on -- the western Navajo County line is the line that cuts them off.

But Navajo Nation goes beyond that, into Coconino County.

So that's a problem. And that has to be addressed
in order to meet those other requirements that you have to take into consideration.

So immediately what that does, if you're going to draw the lines that way, there are a number of issues, like dilution of voting by Navajo people.

Their votes are going to be diluted if you keep the map as it is.

And then you're also -- this will also result in retrogression, which is something that is prohibited, as I understand it, in the Voting Rights Act. If you pursue the grid maps and allow that to be in place, then what is happening is that the current LD 2, which is my legislative district, you now have 30 -- or 63 percent Native Americans in that district, which allows that district to send consistently, and they've done this consistently, a Native American to the state legislature in both houses.

That has never happened before. But it's happening consistently with the type of legislative lines that you have with Legislative District No. 2.

And you're going to be moving away from this. If there's no adjustments made, there will be retrogression. Like I said, the 63 percent Native Americans in this legislative district will be reduced to a real smaller amount, I dare say probably to 25 percent, 30 percent.

So that's an issue that needs to be, that needs to
Lastly, which I mentioned earlier in my presentation, is the splitting of people who have commonality and people who have lived together, communities that have been treated as a whole, as a whole for centuries. They have common issues, common interests. Splitting the Navajo Nation and other nations.

So that's the other issue that I think needs to be addressed.

The other one that applies generally, not only to legislative districts but also to the congressional district, is the community of interest.

When it comes to Native American people, community of interest from my perspective as a Native American, and I dare say from the perspective of all Native Americans, is the fulfillment of treaty obligations.

And that stems from the recognition by the United States government that Indian nations are sovereign from day one.

That means Indian nations have existed as sovereign entities long before the formation of the United States and the state of Arizona.

As a result, the constitution did not apply to Indian people for a very, very long time.
here from time immemorial. But under United States federal law, they were not declared to be citizens of these United States until 1924.

So first here, last to be citizens.

And on the voting issue, Native Americans were not given a right to vote, and they had to fight for it, until 1935 in Arizona.

And even as late as 1970, when in Apache County the Navajo people for the first time elected a Navajo to the Apache County Board of Supervisors, there was opposition.

The opposition from the county that's outside the Navajo Nation filed a lawsuit to stop the supervisor that was voted in by the Navajo people, Tom Shirley.

And the Navajo Nation had to go to court to secure his place, and by doing that, secure and affirm the rights of Native American people to vote. And that was only done in 1970.

And once that happened, now you're beginning to see a move in the direction where I think we're finally beginning to realize that Native American people are citizens of these states. And as citizens of these states, they enjoy and are entitled to all the rights that are afforded to other citizens outside Indian nations.

So I bring these to your attention because I think those are the things that need to be addressed in what you
have before you.

What I would suggest to you in terms of the LD 2, the legislative district, and the grid map that you have before you, is to work off of that legislative district as it now is composed.

I know that that legislative district has lost a tremendous amount of population. And the reason why should be very evident. The legislative district, as I mentioned before, consists of five Indian nations. And Indian nations, because they were put on reservations, all the development, economic development, everything else, bypass Indian reservations.

So now you have Indian reservations that are similar to third world countries that exist here in the United States.

And for that reason a lot of our young people, Native Americans, are moving off the reservation. And they're moving to cities like Phoenix. And I believe that in the last count, the last centennial count, Phoenix has about the third highest population of Native Americans.

The city of Flagstaff -- or the city of Albuquerque being number two, and the city of L.A. being number one.

So there has been a shift away from the reservations because of there's lack of jobs there. There's
lack of economic development there. There's lack of opportunities, educational and otherwise, on Indian reservations.

A lot of the population has moved to what we call the border towns. For example, the city of Flag has a significant Native American population, and for that reason, they are a part of Legislative District No. 2.

The city of Winslow/Holbrook has significant Native American population, but currently they're outside Legislative District No. 2.

My suggestion, my recommendation is to add those border towns to Legislative District No. 2 to pick up the population that has been lost. And you have a reason to do that, because of the significant population of Native Americans in those towns and cities.

In addition to that, because we are -- and part of the definition that you're looking at in terms of the community of interest is religion and culture.

People who have commonality in those areas, religion, culture, history, there are lands that Indian nations own outside of Indian reservations.

For example, Navajo Nation owns the northwestern part of the Peaks, even though it's off the Navajo Nation.

And they also own the Big Boquillas, right there right outside of Williams, the Big Boquillas Ranch.
And they also own some tracts from -- between Winslow and Holbrook.

And the Hopi Nation also owns land tracts around Winslow and all the way down to Eager.

So if you add those lands that are, that are owned by Native American nations, you can pick up those populations also.

And I think that will help you get to meeting or complying with the requirement of community of interest.

I offer that to you. I offer that to you as a solution.

And I know the Navajo Nation has considered a number of options and it has come up with its own options, not only with regard to legislative districts but also with regard to congressional districts.

So that deserves an examination on your part to meet these requirements.

So I won't get into the legislative district aspect of it, but I think that the -- if you're picking up in those -- excuse me, the congressional district, if you're looking at the congressional district, you'll have the same type of problem in turn -- problem in terms of community of interest, which is the Indian nations that are in those CDs, their primary interest is going to be fulfillment of treaty obligations. And those obligations are obligations of the
They are obligations of the United States.
And there are treaty promises that promised that Indian people in return for moving to Indian reservations and agreeing not to go beyond that anymore, and all their indigenous land being taken, they were promised all these things.
A right to education. Health. Social assistance. All of those things were promised.
And Indian people have paid for that already.
So those are considerations. And I urge you to take a look at that and take a look at my suggestions.
And I thank you again very much. And I'm glad to see that you're planning to go back up to Window Rock. For those of you who missed the last trip, it's a wonderful place.
And I would also add that the Navajo Nation is larger than the state of West Virginia. The Navajo Nation is larger than most of the counties here in the state of Arizona.
So, on that basis, I would highly recommend that in addition to having your next hearing in Window Rock, you add Kayenta, which is the northernmost part of the Navajo Nation, almost close to the Utah line. And then also add Tuba City, where Tuba City is the largest community on the
Navajo Nation.

So I would urge you to do that, so you can listen to my people and have them express -- have them be given the opportunity to express their desires regarding the task before you.

Thank you very much. May the holy people be with you always.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Continuing in that same vein, our next speaker is Leonard Gorman.

Let me announce, I'll ask legal counsel, I know we have a meeting noticed for 4:00 p.m.

I'm not sure, I thought you were allowed to start those meetings later as long as it was noticed by 4:00. But I don't know if there's a time limit that you need to start it by.

JOSEPH KANEFIELD: Madam Chair, I think there is a separate meeting notice for 4:00. If you let the public know this meeting is running late and that meeting will start later, that's appropriate.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

So our meeting at 4:00 p.m. will be starting later than 4:00 p.m., and we'll continue with our public comment.

Leonard Gorman, executive director of the Navajo
Nation Human Rights, from Window Rock, Navajo Nation.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Madam Chair, can I make a quick suggestion?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Mr. Herrera.

VICE-CHAIR HERRERA: Let's stick to a four- or five-minute time frame.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Is everybody -- okay, we'll go with four minutes, if everyone could try to provide their input.

But if you go over, I'm not going to pull you off, so I'm just telling you.

Thank you.

LEONARD GORMAN: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and members of the Commission.

I'm not going to take a whole lot of time on behalf of the Navajo Nation Human Rights condition. I sincerely express the appreciation for the Commission coming to visit with us in St. Michaels and looking forward to the September meeting again up there.

And whatever help we can provide to the Commission to feel comfortable in our neck of the woods, please have your staff call us in advance to help you make those arrangements.

At that meeting in St. Michaels, I mentioned to you that the Navajo Nation council was in session at that
point and had been considering the maps for the state of Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah.

We have made significant progress in those areas, and I will be submitting the written portion of the Navajo Nations' recommendation for Legislative District 2, and also the congressional district, the northeast corner of the state of Arizona.

Just to highlight some of the comments that have been made about the definitions, I think it's important that definitions be written. I notice that the definition of community of interest is important with respect to the Navajo Nation, the Navajo people, and how those languages are to be devised, and the word significant is very important to the Navajo people.

For example, while ethnicity is an integral part of the Navajo people, it's an equal group of people as a community of interest. Also not only as a group of people, as a people with land base -- a distinct unique land base. It makes it a very interesting part of the community of interest, particularly indigenous nation to the state of Arizona.

So we look forward to having you publish the languages on the specific terms, and we do have a presentation made by Representative Hale, and look forward to having make further presentations in the future.
Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Steve Titla from San Carlo Apache, Gila County.

I'll going to read the next few names. Gene Dufoe, Andrew Sanchez, and Karyn Cushing.

STEVE TITLA: Good afternoon.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Good afternoon.

STEVE TITLA: Redistricting committee, I commend you for doing a very difficult job for the state of Arizona in congressional and legislative districts.

I spoke to you in Hondah. I don't remember if you remember me, Madam Chair, and in Hondah, White Mountain Apache.

I'm from San Carlo Apache. And I looked at the maps that -- the grid map that you produced here, grid map option one and option two. I'll be referring to these two maps.

And I'll try to keep it under four minutes as the gentleman requested.

I was looking at the definitions under the Voting Rights Act. As you know, everybody's knows about compliance with the Voting Rights Act. And I was looking at the definition for community of interest here. And that fits the San Carlo Apache and White Mountain Apache, Navajo
Nation, and the tribes together, I would think. Because we as Apaches, we have common interest in religion, we have political ties, history, tradition, geography, ethnicity, culture, social economic status. So all of that fits us very well, that definition.

And with respect to communities of interest and significant detriment, I think that any split in our vote, dilution of our vote, or retrogression in our vote, really has a significant detriment to effective representation to the native tribes in Arizona.

And looking at your option one method, already -- it seems to split the San Carlo Apache reservation already.

And for sure it splits the White Mountain Apache reservation and splits the Navajo Nation, and maybe Hopi too.

But it seems -- I don't speak for those tribes, but that's what it seems to do is what your option one map does.

And I think that map is contrary to the communities of interest definitions that we're trying to work toward.

Your option two then does the same thing too.

I think it seems to split San Carlo Apache reservation.

I would like to have a bigger map to look at, but
it seems to split our reservation, and then for sure splits White Mountain Apache reservation and splits Navajo Nation. Hopi is not in there.

So a lot of the native tribes of Arizona seem to be split. That would dilute our vote, and that would give us no chance to send any sort of representation to the congressional district or the legislative district.

And we, San Carlo Apache, we are treaty tribes since 1852, and under international law, we're recognized as sovereign prior to the U.S. as the senator eloquently stated.

So as you work forward to this, we are going to provide our input. And I think that San Carlo Apache will be providing input as they go along.

But today I speak for myself here, and thank you for going forward here. And I saw that you'll be in San Carlos at one of your visits, so we welcome you when you get there to Apache land.

Thank you.

THE REPORTER: Spell your name, please.

STEVE TITLA: Steve Titla, T-I-T-L-A.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you. Our next speaker is Gene Dufoe, from Mesa.

GENE DUFOE: Hello. My name is spelled G-E-N-E, Dufoe, D-U-F-O-E.
Chair and Commission, I object to the deferral of the open meeting law for the Commission.

It's very important that you have the benefit of this training with communications outside of the public meetings. If you have not had this, it's very important that you do have it.

The public needs confidence that the Redistricting Commission is in compliance with the open meeting law. And there seems to have been a number of objections from the public that are being invested by -- being investigated by the attorney general. So, I don't want to defer this when this is such an important decision to make.

And that will complete my conclusion. And now what is your response?

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: We cannot respond to members of the public on this, on any item actually.

So our next speaker is Andrew Sanchez, council member of the town of Guadalupe, from Maricopa County.

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Set that aside.

Karyn Curbing, representing self, from Cave Creek.


I've been to a few of these redistricting meetings, and I'm just a little bit concerned about how our
state is going to look when the maps are complete.

You know, all this talk about communities of interest and competitiveness, when really what does that mean? I mean, does any of that matter when you guys have hired these companies, such as Strategic Telemetry, and now I just hear this other company by the name of Catalyst, I don't know, I guess it's a software company, who have a specific agenda to transform our state into a liberal progressive voting block.

I object to the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission and Strategic Telemetry's hiring of Catalyst, a data mining company, microtargeting organization, who promotes a progressive agenda and promotes candidates and organizations such as the ACLU, Arizona Democratic Party, La Raza, SEIU, and the AFL-CIO, just to name a few.

This sounds like gerrymandering to me.

I don't understand why the AIRC could not have just hired a company out of Arizona, and why they had to hire this out-of-state company at all?

Why couldn't you guys have done this redistricting yourself? I don't understand.

I mean, I know you can't -- you can't tell me, but I'd like to know.

Now I hear that the taxpayers here in Arizona are having to pay somewhere in the amount of $600,000 for
I just want this to be a fair and nonpartisan process. That's all.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Bryan Berkland, representing self.

And you'll tell us where you from.

And he'll be followed by Pete Bengtson, William Engler, and Mohur Sidhwa.


I'm from Mesa, Arizona.

I live here in Arizona. I take my representation in Washington, D.C., very seriously.

And I've been following this Commission. It seems to me a number of the decisions this Independent Commission has made are fishy at best.

And, you know, what I really just want to say is it seems to me that Strategic Telemetry, in conjunction with this Catalyst organization, has the ability and intention, I would say, to engineer congressional redistricting in anything but an independent and technical manner.

The level of technology in database information that's available today, unavailable to prior census data and...
redistricting, is -- well, it allowed these companies to continue the progressive agenda and profit from it right underneath your noses without even really knowing about it.

It's such a technical manner that they're incorporating into this redistricting process that I really -- it takes the fringes, the people right on the fringe, and allows these organizations to really manipulate the information without you guys even really being able to see how they're manipulating the lines, the redistricting lines.

So, I just caution you guys, and I want you to realize that this is my main concern, that these guys can really, underneath your noses, sway how my vote is counted on the national level.

And I don't agree with that.

I don't agree with a number of things that this Commission has decided.

But I'm going to leave you with a closing statement here. And that is, the commissioners should remember that a flawed process will bring flawed results and a tainted system will just add to the scepticism of the American people.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Pete Bengtson, representing
PETE BENGTSON: Good afternoon. My name is Pete Bengtson. That's B-E-N-G-T-S-O-N.

I live in Pima County, LD 26.

First I want to repeat what I normally say. I really support the Commission, especially Chairman Mathis. I think you're doing a great job, keep it up. I also support Strategic Telemetry.

Normally I go on and then talk about competitive districts. I'm going to switch topics now and talk about measuring.

I'm a retired engineer, also got a master's degree in systems analysis.

And I firmly believe in measuring what your goal is.

If you can't measure what you're trying to do, you can't tell whether you're getting there or not.

I believe you really need to have some kind of measurement for competitive and contiguous districts.

I think you ought to really add in another measurement for this geographic dispersion of the boundary lines that you're supposed to have, boundary lines that follow city, town, and county boundaries.

And that's just as an important goal as competitive districts or any of the other goals.
I can see how you can measure competitive districts. Professor Steen mentioned one way to do that, and I want to follow up on some of those definitions.

This -- communities of interest has bothered me ever since I've been hearing people support communities of interest.

I can easily see how Indian tribes are communities of interest.

I live in LD 26, and you've heard a lot of testimony, the northern part of LD 26 seeing themselves as a community of interest with Oro Valley and Marana.

In the suburbs, I just can't see community of interests. The people are very differentiated. Where you go to church or where you shop or where you play bridge or where you recreate, doesn't strike me as a valid community of interest.

I can sort of see the rural urban boundary distinction as a community of interest, but the only one that really makes sense to me is Indian tribes.

Thank you, and see you tomorrow.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is William Engler, from -- representing District 6 Democrats, from Maricopa.

WILLIAM ENGLER: Thank you, Madam Chair,
First of all, I'd like -- the name is William Engler, E-N-G-L-E-R.

I live in Anthem.

I want to thank you, all of you, for the job you've done so far. I commend you for taking the heat you've been taking up to this point.

I speak from the perspective of the chair of a district that is not competitive.

My district as well as too many others in this state, the results are handled at the primary stage.

So I believe that disenfranchises so many voters, because they don't have an incentive to come out and vote because they know their vote doesn't count.

I know you've got many criteria you've got to look at in your deliberations, but I believe that you can arrive at just conclusions and also have competitive districts to a far greater extent than we enjoy today.

Thank you very much, and continue the good work.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Mohur Sidhwa, followed by Jim March, Betty Bengtson, Ken Clark.

MOHUR SIDHWA: Hello again. A slight variation on a theme today.

Yes, I'm still for competitive districts, and I will still use the same definition.
And like the previous speaker said, when we hand over selection of candidates to a party rather than to the public, it's a selection and not an election.

Because this leaves out the Independents, the Libertarians, the Greens, and those who are genuinely Independent.

And this does dilute the application of democracy, and it is dangerous. And it has happened in the other parts of the world constantly. I've lived there. This must not be allowed to happen in Arizona, so we have to look at competitiveness.

The other issue that I spoke about last time I want to speak about a bit more is about inmates.

Inmates cannot vote.

Then they should not be counted for the purposes of redistricting. Using inmates when counting populations is important because it leads to voter disenfranchisement.

In general counting prison populations as residents of that district artificially inflates the population, because those people cannot vote, and those small towns nearby end up getting twice the bang for their voting buck.

And instead of one person, one vote, we are looking at destruction of the 14th and the 15th Amendment right there.
It violates the equal protection of the 14th Amendment, and the minority voting principle of the 15th Amendment, which taken together creates the one person, one vote.

And the moment you put a district, an LD, like somebody had once suggested that came in a brief stretching from said farms to Yuma, you're looking at a very diluted district. So just be alert to that. I don't know who has to be alert, but I suspect not all five of you are aware of it. You will make sure that you are alert to it.

Prop 106 faces its final criteria for redistricting requiring competitiveness unless there is a substantial detriment to other criteria. I would like to emphasize the word substantial.

Bypass doctor's offices, incumbency protection are not substantial.

What Representative Hale mentioned earlier, that's substantial. That's a community of interest.

So we're looking at the nations of northern Arizona as well as southern Arizona. Just kind of keep that in mind.

Most of the people who have been urging community of interest is important have given their reasons. Which to them, I'm sure, are very valid, wherever they decide to bicycle or jog or whatever.
It just concerns me that they would sell the uniquely American concept of a competitive democracy as it's trying our constitution and its amendments on such trivial grounds. Yes, they don't think it's trivial, but those are. Competitiveness is important.

Or equally horrifying is selling us a system for the sake of protecting incumbents. This must not be allowed to happen here.

A lack of competitiveness hurts the very concept of democracy by making a mockery of the democratic process. And that's un-American.

Yet I would keep certain communities of interest together. And it doesn't take a rocket scientist to know what a community of interest really is.

The Navajo Nation, or other nations together.

You need to talk to those people, be it at Window Rock or wherever, and find out from them, and take it from there.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: I'm sorry, Ms. Sidhwa, would you mind spelling your name for the record.

And I should have said representing self, from Pima.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Jim March, Second Vice Chair, Pima County LP.

JIM MARCH: Libertarian Party.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Ah, thank you.

JIM MARCH: Folks, I appreciate your being here. I'm glad I'm able to come.

First thing I'd like to say is something I've been wanting to say in previous meetings.

My understanding is -- well, I've actually seen various people make a lot of light of the fact that the AG is apparently investigating you. And they've used that to kind of harangue you in a straighten up and fly right kind of a manner.

I just want to point something out. And I'm sorry, somebody has got to say it.

Tom Horne, our attorney general, was thrown out of the stock market by the SEC for life for a number of ethical problems.

So if Tom Horne is investigating your ethics, I find that downright weird.

Okay. I find that really funky.

So if you're concerned about the fact that Mr. Horne's investigating you, keep that in mind because he may not be the best qualified person to do so.

The other thing that I've looked at is the grid
I guess they're a preliminary review, a starting point, if you will, on how you're going to do the maps going forward. And that's fine so far as it goes.

And you have set one congressional and legislative and set two congressional and legislative.

As you progress with this process, I would like to urge you to take the set one maps, both the congressional and legislative, and toss them in the nearest fireplace and use them as kindling.

The reason I say that is the classic gerrymander was Governor Gerry of Massachusetts 199 years ago came up with a squirrely looking map that looked like a salamander. That's why we call it gerrymandering ever since.

When you've got really screwy looking districts, bent and misshapen, it's a sure sign that something has gone wrong with the process, either deliberately or accidentally or somehow.

If you look at the congressional district maps for the set one, they have two huge bookends, either side of the state, going -- running top to bottom. So on the east side, one congressman is supposed to be dealing with issues on the southern border on one day and then issues with Apache Navajo counties on the next day. That just seems bizarre to me.
And when I looked at the map carefully, I realized in horror there were a pair of vertical lines that are curving inwards. And I looked at it, and said, oh, my God, they're turning Arizona into Darth Vader's spaceship. Which puts Darth himself right somewhere around Camp Verde, which is downright bizarre.

If you look at the map one legislative districts, you have this one huge district flopping left all the way over the top. Oh, my God, it's Donald Trump's comb-over.

Seriously though, seriously, funky looking maps, we can laugh at them, but they're a sign that something went wrong with the process.

The map -- obviously the district -- I'm sorry, the set two maps still need a lot of work.

We understand that.

But to me, at least using the low rez maps we have so far, they look like a much better starting point.

I'll add one last thing, and I will be real quick with this.

If you have two districts that are sitting next to each other, normally if you have a long squiggly line reaching into the other district curling around something and coming back out, that's a bad thing.

But if that's what you have to do to solve the prison issue, to -- if what you should be doing is what
Ms. Sidhwa just asked you to do was to ignore the prison population if you can. But if you can't, if the law forces you include the prison population, God forbid the detention centers, in your process, if you have to, then you should be spreading the prisons out among the various districts to minimize their imbalancing effects of putting them all in one. And if you have to do that with a long funky line, reach out one district, grab that prison, come back, that particular kind of weirdness can be accepted for the purpose of negating the harmful effects of piling all the prisons into too few districts.

With that, I'll close out.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Betty Bengtson, representing self, from LD 26.

Followed by Ken Clark, Bob Rosenberg, and Lynne St. Angelo.

BETTY BENGTSON: My name is Betty Bengtson. That's B-E-T-T-Y, B-E-N-G-T-S-O-N.

And I live in Pima County, LD 26.

I came today prepared to talk about competitive districts and communities of interest, and to urge the Commission to come to some agreement on definitions for what those are.
And I was pleased to see that you are -- that you do have that under consideration.

I'm a little disturbed that there seems to be some uncertainty as to whether you really wanted to come up with those definitions or not.

And I certainly urge you to do so.

I particularly commend to you Professor Steen's comments about competitive districts and communities of interest.

As I thought about communities of interest, I was somewhat confused as to what they are. People, again, had talked about where they shopped and where they play bridge or recreate or whatever.

And I was quite happy to hear Professor Steen articulate the importance of the interaction between community of interest or communities of interest and how they might be affected by actions at the legislature or in congress and how important that is in deciding what is actually a community of interest that is important with regard to redistricting.

So, again, I would hope you would take a really close look at those comments and give some serious consideration to coming to an agreement on definitions for the various goals and criteria that are prescribed for your work.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

All right. Ken Clark.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: He's not here.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Bob Rosenberg, representing self, from Phoenix.

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay.

Lynne St. Angelo.

And following Lynne will be Wendy Schops and Laramar Mace.


I too, since we're giving credentials, have a bachelor's of science in mathematics, so numbers are very important to me as well.

The competitive definition, I think if you can get seven percent or less, you're doing really well.

Since the numbers in Arizona with voter registrations are 36 percent Republicans and 31 percent Democrats, if you count that a certain way, that is six already spread points apart.

So to get to seven or less in every district is going to be quite a challenge.
The 33 percent of Independents do swing the vote. If you look at the voting records, you'll see that they swing it different years one way, different years another way. And they really are the vote that's determining the outcome of the elections pretty much.

To use election polls as was suggested by, I think, the professor, those are really not measurable. They depend on what polling company you use and how you even look at it. Many times polls are wrong.

So I would say that is not a hard number that could be used in any case and that you shouldn't really even consider that.

So that was -- because that was brought up earlier, I wanted to talk about that for just a minute.

The other thing I would suggest is that when you put something in the minutes, like this new company that we didn't hear about before, this Catalyst company as a subcontract, that you spell it out so that we can look it up online and find out about the company before the next public hearing.

We knew that Strategic Telemetry in the RFP said they didn't need any subcontractors, and now all of a sudden we're going to be paying for another company, another out-of-state company, using taxpayer funds.

And when we Google Catalyst, we got a very far
right -- far left ultra-progressive liberal company that may or may not be this company that you actually are considering simply because the information that was provided in the minutes weren't sufficient.

So if that isn't true, then I'm going to apologize for what I have to say, because I will tell you what we found. Okay. Why this raises real red flags to us in the public.

Laurel Quinn is founder of Catalyst, and their clients have included Strategic Telemetry, the DNC, every Democratic presidential campaign from 1966 to 2008, and a wide range of progressive organizations and nonprofits.

They said they provide data and related services to progressive advocacy and not-for-profit organizations, campaigns, consultants, and academics. Catalyst maintains and constantly updates complete national database of 265,000,000 people, more than 180 million registered voters, and 85 million unregistered adults.

The Catalyst also derives synthetic data through modeling, offering insights about persons such as relative likelihood of turning out to vote, likelihood to be married or have a college decree, to name just a few.

Some state voter data may not be available to certain customers based on applicable state voter data laws.

And then they said they have no other mission than
to serve the data needs of the progressive community. If this is not the company you're using, I apologize, but next time please put the information on your agenda, the correct information.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Madam Chair, I believe that was in on your agenda, so we can make a comment.

MARY O'GRADY: Yes, that's right.

COMMISSIONER McNULTY: It's a different company. It's spelled differently. It's not spelled the way the company on our agenda was spelled.

The two companies are completely unrelated.

The company that will be providing document management services for us will only be doing the kinds of things that we talked about during our meeting.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Wendy Schops, Sons of Liberty Riders, and she's president.

WENDY SCHOPS: W-E-N-D-Y, S-C-H-O-P-S.

I'm the president for this group here in Arizona, and one of things we talked about at the last meeting is definitions.

And I really appreciate this jump start getting this out to the public.
As you know, I attended several of these meetings. And what concerns me is these terms, competitive districts and communities of interest. What this seems to be doing is causing a lot of division within our state.

There are so many communities of interest that have been brought up throughout these meetings, culturally, religiously, language barriers, whatever it may be.

And what I want to say is that we're Americans. We're not supposed to be saying we're from this country or this country and having these divisions.

And I would like the Commission to take that into consideration.

This redistricting is about population.

And if we keep focusing on communities of interest, this is going to make this more difficult and complex. As much as I appreciate and respect all of the cultures in our state, I still want us to at one point say we're Americans.

So please don't take too much when people come up and talk about every single thing about their community, because we really are one community.

Thank you.
LARAMER MACE: My name is Laramer Mace. First name is L-A-R-A-M-E-R. Last name M-A-C-E.

Speaking first on the grid maps that were provided, it looks to me like what has been done is you've given us one map that is so terrible that the other bad choice looks halfway decent.

Neither of them is acceptable in my mind.

I am a member of the Yavapai Republican Committee, but I am speaking for myself and a number of friends who could not afford the trip down here from the Verde Valley.

I assume that none of you have served as precinct committeemen or you would recognize that the LD options are a joke.

Legislative districts hold monthly meetings. On your grid map, one option for the legislative districts, as explained before we have a district that runs from the western edge of the state all the way across the northern, all the way down the eastern almost to the southern border.

If they're holding a monthly meeting, a question is where would that meeting be held and number two is how are they going to get there.

The districts, the legislative districts particularly, must be as close to a square as you can get.

My current district, LD 4, runs from Seligman at
Highway 66 to Bell Road in Sun City.

The Yavapai County portion is very sparsely populated. Therefore the majority population is in Sun City.

Guess what, the meetings are held in Sun City. So our PC committeeman in Seligman would have to drive over 200 miles one way to make a monthly meeting.

This is ridiculous.

They don't go.

I myself have to drive over 100 miles to get to a monthly meeting.

Yavapai County is mostly rural. And except for my age, I have absolutely nothing in common with Sun City.

I could care less when they get speakers from the Sun City fire board candidates. Therefore I have nothing in common with them.

Likewise the people in the Verde Valley have nothing in common with the liberal academics of Flagstaff.

Yavapai County would prefer to be a single legislative district by itself.

Our population base is within two percent of the required population.

Therefore, likewise, it comes about as close to a square as you can get.

Likewise, Yavapai County would prefer to be
completely within whatever congressional district we're put in.

In conclusion, I would just like to say that Yavapai County does not want to be used to balance other districts, as people's -- these maps show.

We want to be a single entity. We have a common interest, common goals.

And if you split us up, we're going to scream bloody murder.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Thank you.

Are there any other requests to speak? Anyone that would like to address the Commission?

(No oral response.)

CHAIRPERSON MATHIS: Okay. Seeing none, that takes us to the adjournment of this meeting.

I don't know how -- what's the proper procedure here?

We're going to recess and moving into the next meeting? We're just adjourning?

We need a break, so is it okay to adjourn and we'll start the next one?

Great.

Okay. Given that the time is 4:50 p.m., this meeting is adjourned.
Thank you all for coming and for your input and patience.

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.)
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