

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, SUE E. GARCIA, a Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Washington, residing at Tacoma, authorized to administer oaths and affirmations pursuant to RCW 5.28.010, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me on the 16th of December, 2011, and thereafter transcribed by me by means of computer-aided transcription, that the transcript is a full, true, and complete transcript of said proceedings;

That I am not a relative, employee, attorney, or counsel of any party to this action or relative or employee of any such attorney or counsel, and I am not financially interested in the said action or the outcome thereof;

IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this December 30, 2011.

  
SUE E. GARCIA, CCR, RPR  
WA Lic. No. 2781

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

WASHINGTON STATE REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

---

PUBLIC MEETING

December 16, 2011

Cherberg Building  
Olympia, Washington

---

Taken Before:

SUE E. GARCIA, CCR # 2781, RPR  
Registered Professional Reporter  
of  
**Capitol Pacific Reporting, Inc.**

2401 Bristol Court SW, #A-104, Olympia, WA 98502  
Tel (360) 352-2054 Fax (360) 705-6539  
Toll Free (800) 407-0148

Tacoma (253) 564-8494	Seattle (206) 622-9919	Aberdeen (360) 532-7445	Chehalis (360) 330-0262	Bremerton (360) 373-9032
-----------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------

e-mail: [admin@capitolpacificreporting.com](mailto:admin@capitolpacificreporting.com)  
[www.capitolpacificreporting.com](http://www.capitolpacificreporting.com)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

APPEARANCES

- LURA POWELL - CHAIRWOMAN
- TOM HUFF - COMMISSIONER
- TIM CEIS - COMMISSIONER
- SLADE GORTON - COMMISSIONER
- DEAN FOSTER - COMMISSIONER
- RUSTY FALLIS - ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
- GENEVIEVE O'SULLIVAN - COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR
- JOANN POYSKY - ASST. TO COMM. GORTON

NOTE: (As read) - paraphrased quote  
(Indiscernible) = words heard but not understood  
(phonetic) = phonetic spelling of name

1	<u>EXAMINATION INDEX</u>	
2		<u>PAGE</u>
3	EXCHANGE OF WESTERN WA LEG. PLAN PROPOSALS	
4	Senate team presentation	5
5	House team presentation	9
6	Further Senate team presentation	13
7	Further House team presentation	16
8		
9	Completion scenarios offered by Ms. Bunning	20
10	PUBLIC COMMENT	
11		
12	Mr. Robert Rodriguez	37
13	Mr. John Milem	38
14	Ms. Sharon woods	42
15	Mr. Richard May	44
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 BE IT REMEMBERED that on Friday, December 16, 2011, at  
2 10:30 a.m., at 304 15th Avenue, Olympia, Washington,  
3 the following proceedings were had, to wit:

4  
5 \* \* \* \* \*

6  
7 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Good morning and welcome  
8 to the special meeting of the Washington State  
9 Redistricting Commission. I'm -- my name is Lura  
10 Powell, and I'm chair of the Commission.

11 And I'd like to start out this morning by having  
12 the people on the dais introduce themselves.

13 So, Bonnie, would you like to start?

14 MS. BUNNING: Thank you. My name is Bonnie  
15 Bunning, and I'm the executive director to the  
16 Redistricting Commission.

17 COMM. FOSTER: I'm Dean Foster. I was  
18 appointed to the Commission by the Speaker of the  
19 House.

20 COMM. GORTON: Slade Gorton appointed by the  
21 Republicans in the Senate.

22 MS. O'SULLIVAN: Genevieve O'Sullivan,  
23 communications director.

24 COMM. HUFF: I'm Tom Huff. I represent the  
25 House Republicans.

1                   COMM. CEIS: Tim Ceis appointed by Senate  
2 Democrats.

3                   MR. FALLIS: Rusty Fallis, Attorney General's  
4 Office, general counsel to the Commission.

5                   CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. Thank you.

6                   Our first order of business is under Matters  
7 Pertaining to Redistricting and exchange of the partial  
8 plan proposals.

9                   And have the teams decided who wanted to go first?

10                  COMM. CEIS: No.

11                  COMM. GORTON: I guess --

12                  CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: You don't really care?

13                  COMM. GORTON: -- we'll volunteer.

14                  CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: You'll volunteer. Okay.  
15 Very good.

16                  COMM. GORTON: I'm not just sure how the  
17 staff put them up. But when we divided ourselves into  
18 two teams of one Democrat and one Republican each,  
19 Commissioner Ceis and I got the 22 legislative  
20 districts from the Pierce-King County line north to the  
21 Canadian border. And these are the results of long and  
22 detailed negotiations between the two of us.

23                  That's a rather small-scale map of the immediate  
24 Puget Sound area. And as we go through we can look at  
25 the individual districts as they are. But they all

1 meet the -- well, so to -- if you put your head  
2 sideways, you can -- you can see those a little bit  
3 better.

4 They all meet the population requirements. The  
5 greatest variance over or under is -- from the ideal  
6 population is 94. They reduce from 30 to 18 the number  
7 of divided cities, and they increase by the standards  
8 that I use -- and this is a very important part -- from  
9 eight to ten the number of those districts that are  
10 genuinely competitive between the two parties.

11 And as I say, I'm sure they don't totally satisfy  
12 Commissioner Ceis; they don't totally satisfy me. But  
13 I think they end up being fair and relatively logical  
14 in their -- in their composition. I'll have a couple  
15 of more detailed comments to make, but I think maybe  
16 I'll turn it over to Tim now for his initial comments.

17 COMM. CEIS: Thank you, Commissioner Gorton.

18 I would agree. It was a difficult discussion at  
19 times to resolve some of our differences. I think  
20 we've done so fairly reasonably. I'm not going to go  
21 into great detail at this point. I'll let Commissioner  
22 Gorton describe some of the specific issues.

23 But I do want to say that I think we are -- while  
24 this is a proposed map and it obviously has to be  
25 adopted after some more discussion with the Commission

1 and obviously it will have to be reconciled with what  
2 Commissioners Huff and Foster have done to the south of  
3 us here, that we are probably 95 percent of the way  
4 there.

5 We have created some more districts that will be  
6 competitive in the near term. We have tried to  
7 minimize jurisdictional splits. We've tried to  
8 recognize the will of the voters in past elections by  
9 not displacing a huge number of incumbents, although  
10 there are -- in our map a couple have been displaced.

11 So we will be making some adjustments. As I said,  
12 it's 95 percent of the way there. We will want to hear  
13 what the auditors have to say. We will want to hear  
14 what the public has to say. But I think the basic  
15 balance of this map should be maintained as we move  
16 through our further discussions with the rest of the  
17 Commission.

18 COMM. GORTON: Oh, one other just statistical  
19 point of view: The very large majority of people will  
20 be in the same districts that they're in --

21 COMM. CEIS: Yes.

22 COMM. GORTON: -- that -- you know, they're  
23 in now. If you look at that map, you can see that the  
24 districts in most cases look very similar. The figures  
25 that I have that 18 of those 22 districts will have



1 more than 75 percent of the -- of their people who are  
2 presently in the district in the new -- in the new  
3 district, and the average is over 80 percent.

4 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. And I think that  
5 continuity's important for voters and for candidates.

6 COMM. HUFF: I have a question.

7 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

8 COMM. HUFF: On the King County line, you're  
9 coming down to the King County line, and we're going up  
10 to the King County line. And it looks, from what I can  
11 see there, that the 30<sup>th</sup> is affected to some degree,  
12 and I suspect the 31<sup>st</sup> is, too.

13 And now is Milton kept whole, or is that -- is  
14 that the area that we're talking about?

15 COMM. GORTON: Yeah. The -- the 31<sup>st</sup>  
16 District will be very substantially in both King and  
17 Pierce Counties.

18 COMM. HUFF: Right.

19 COMM. GORTON: We have only the King County  
20 boundaries of it and population for that. We do differ  
21 from what I just saw an hour ago that you have come up  
22 with because we united the cities of Milton and Pacific  
23 in the 30<sup>th</sup> District. Both of them cross the  
24 Pierce-King County line.

25 COMM. HUFF: Uh-huh.

1           COMM. GORTON: And we united them in the  
2           30<sup>th</sup> District. One of the state representatives in  
3           the 30<sup>th</sup> District is the former mayor of Milton, and,  
4           you know, we felt it appropriate to do -- to do it in  
5           that fashion.

6           COMM. HUFF: There we go. Okay.

7           COMM. GORTON: That's as -- on my preliminary  
8           look, that's the only overlap we have.

9           COMM. HUFF: Okay. Thanks.

10          CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Other comments?  
11          Okay. Commissioners Huff and Foster?

12          COMM. HUFF: Yeah. I'll start.

13          COMM. FOSTER: Okay. Go ahead.

14          COMM. HUFF: well, today is the 16<sup>th</sup>. And  
15          we don't have a whole lot of time left, but it's moving  
16          along well.

17          As -- as the map will indicate, that was our  
18          section there. We had 16 legislative districts to work  
19          with. We went -- took the whole peninsula area and  
20          then down to the Columbia River and everything on this  
21          side of the mountains, of course. The next step will  
22          be going to eastern Washington, but that's another day.

23          So what we've taken care of is the peninsula  
24          itself, up the coast and Pierce County to the King  
25          County line and then north and then south to the

1 Columbia.

2 We certainly made an attempt to split as few  
3 cities as possible, and we've had some success there.  
4 The district boundaries, we considered definitely the  
5 communities of interest and, needless to say, hearing  
6 testimony that we've received in the past. Natural  
7 boundaries were certainly considered. And we split  
8 less cities, like, for instance, a good example would  
9 be Port Orchard, which would be whole in the 26<sup>th</sup>.  
10 Kelso-Longview are in the same district at this point.

11 We've -- as an example, in the 26<sup>th</sup>, we  
12 maintained the Peninsula School District whole, and --  
13 and also the Key Peninsula, in -- kept to that in the  
14 26<sup>th</sup>, which meant -- means that the center community  
15 of interest that's over in Key Center along with  
16 Gig Harbor is maintained there.

17 And we've -- we've had a series of changes with  
18 the legislators. It was sort of a little bit a domino  
19 effect, and you'll see that on the maps with Orcutt and  
20 Alexander and McCune affected.

21 with that, Dean, you're on.

22 COMM. FOSTER: I would just like to say first  
23 that -- how much we appreciate the input that we've  
24 received all summer from the public through a variety  
25 of ways, through the Internet, through the hearings

1 that we had, through our personal conversations,  
2 through letters that people continue to send through  
3 the Internet.

4 And the interesting thing about each one these  
5 communications is, in this puzzle that we're attempting  
6 to put together, every communication we get is --  
7 probably creates a tension with some other  
8 communication. And these things -- some people want  
9 their county or city in multiple districts; some don't.  
10 So those are the kinds of things that to a certain  
11 extent cause us to take longer to do than maybe some  
12 people would like to have happened.

13 In the plan that Commissioner Huff and I worked on  
14 we have a population deviation throughout the plan of  
15 less than 50. The -- less than 50 per district. The  
16 district that's out of line the most out of 137,236  
17 people is the 40 -- is the 22<sup>nd</sup> District here in  
18 Olympia, which is 46 people over. And the one that is  
19 down the most is the 18<sup>th</sup> District, which is in Clark  
20 County, and that's a minus 37. So we've -- we've kept  
21 pretty good districts. The 29<sup>th</sup>, which is in Pierce  
22 County, we have a population deviation of two.

23 The process that Commissioner Huff and I worked  
24 on, we -- we made a decision not to move across the  
25 present lines in the 26<sup>th</sup> District across the Narrows

1 Bridge into Tacoma. So we started with the  
2 26<sup>th</sup> District, and he said, we went into Port  
3 Orchard. And then we sort of worked up, and when we  
4 did that, the 23<sup>rd</sup> District took a little more  
5 population. And then we went around Clallam,  
6 Jefferson, and Grays Harbor and then down into Clark  
7 County and worked up toward the middle in the interior  
8 part.

9 I think that these -- there are some parts of maps  
10 that to a certain extent look more -- look funnier than  
11 they really are. For instance, you all have maps  
12 here -- and maybe you can see on the map between the  
13 19<sup>th</sup> and the 24<sup>th</sup> District there's an arm going  
14 north out of the 19<sup>th</sup>. Well, that's all of  
15 Montesano, which we put into the 19<sup>th</sup> District, and  
16 we went around the district line -- or the city line to  
17 include that. So it looks like it's there, but it --  
18 it really is all of the -- all of the city.

19 we do have a reconciliation to do between the  
20 30<sup>th</sup> District, the 25<sup>th</sup> District, which we -- we  
21 thought we were drawing a map to the Pierce County  
22 line. The other commissioners, I see, drew -- drew  
23 Milton and Pacific, including the city boundaries, and  
24 I think there's reconciliation between our two maps in  
25 the 31<sup>st</sup> District.

1 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Comments?

2 COMM. GORTON: I guess -- this is  
3 Commissioner Huff because he -- he lives there. I see  
4 you got rid of all of those objections about dividing  
5 the school district on the Key Peninsula; is that  
6 correct?

7 COMM. HUFF: You're right, Senator. Yes.  
8 That was a natural way to go, and, of course, I'm glad  
9 that we all agreed to that point. And I know the  
10 constituents out there will be pleased with it, also.

11 COMM. GORTON: Can I --

12 COMM. FOSTER: Go ahead.

13 COMM. GORTON: (Indiscernible).

14 COMM. FOSTER: I was just going to -- I was  
15 just going to say I -- I also received a communiqué  
16 from the legislator from that district, who was  
17 agreeing that, based on the map that I produced, that  
18 Representative Huff ought to continue to be in his  
19 26<sup>th</sup> District. So that's how we made that -- we made  
20 that change.

21 COMM. HUFF: I was only temporarily  
22 displaced.

23 COMM. GORTON: And I had a couple of things  
24 that Commissioner Ceis and I have discussed briefly but  
25 not -- not decided was --

1           If you'll put our map back on the screen, please.

2           MS. BOE: Oh. Slade's map.

3           COMM. GORTON: No. The full -- the full one.

4           MS. BUNNING: (Indiscernible).

5           COMM. GORTON: That long projection of  
6           District 39 in eastern Whatcom County, there are, as I  
7           remember, 79 people who -- who live in that area, and I  
8           just raised the question as to whether or not they  
9           would not be better off in the 42<sup>nd</sup> than in the  
10          39<sup>th</sup>. It really won't affect the projection of --  
11          the population projections at all.

12          And I don't remember. We started -- in our talk  
13          we started at the Canadian border and worked south. So  
14          that was the first one we'd done, and I don't remember  
15          whether we discussed that at all.

16          COMM. CEIS: Yeah. I think we -- it came up  
17          a couple of times. And we were asking ourselves --  
18          well, it's a large geography with very few people in  
19          it, and, you know, what's the best district for it to  
20          be in based on the ability to represent it from a  
21          transportation standpoint, I think, more than anything  
22          else. You know, I think 79 people we can probably  
23          figure out a way to accommodate without shifting the  
24          balance of the maps too much.

25          So I mean, that's -- that's a good example of a

1 few things we need to work our way through that are  
2 small in nature. It won't significantly shift the  
3 balance of the -- of the map. It's kind of in the same  
4 category, I think, as what the auditors might find in  
5 terms of some technical issues that we may want to  
6 address, too.

7 COMM. GORTON: The -- the other one I have is  
8 in the Seattle area. And that is the long and very  
9 thin sort of snakelike districts that are 30 -- 37 and  
10 11. Some of the maps, at least, that were originally  
11 put out had both 37<sup>th</sup> and the 11<sup>th</sup>, you know,  
12 more -- I guess I would say more -- more centered.  
13 That was primarily and is primarily in the division of  
14 work that Commissioner Ceis and I did, you know, within  
15 the point of view.

16 But I just -- I raised the question about how long  
17 the 11<sup>th</sup> is going into Seattle and whether or not the  
18 37<sup>th</sup> might be better entirely in the City of Seattle  
19 and the 11<sup>th</sup> entirely out of it.

20 COMM. CEIS: Right. And, you know, that's a  
21 historical issue, the 11<sup>th</sup> having had a part of  
22 Seattle in it and representing that basic geography  
23 since the last redistricting.

24 I think there's a similar issue in the 41<sup>st</sup> that  
25 you and I discussed, as well, where the 41<sup>st</sup> takes in



1 the new communities to the east that it hasn't had  
2 before. And what appears to be in an irregular shape  
3 may or may not make sense that perhaps we should  
4 discuss again some more at a subsequent meeting after  
5 people have had an opportunity to take a harder look at  
6 these maps.

7 COMM. GORTON: Okay.

8 COMM. FOSTER: I would like to add one thing  
9 that I forgot to say on our map.

10 In the -- in the mathematics of doing  
11 redistricting -- and we have attempted to keep  
12 populations a rather small deviation. You'll notice in  
13 the Clark County portion of our map there's a white  
14 spot down there just to the east of the 18<sup>th</sup>  
15 District. And that is an area that in, I believe, all  
16 of the maps that we've previously published, we all  
17 have left that as a placeholder to bring a -- one of  
18 the eastern Washington districts into that area to  
19 equalize the small amount of population that eastern  
20 Washington is under for the number of districts they  
21 get. So that's why that area is a blank in the --  
22 that's not a disagreement we had. That's a placeholder  
23 for an eastern Washington district.

24 COMM. HUFF: That's a good point.

25 COMM. GORTON: Can I ask the two of you?

1 I -- you know, I do notice that you admirably keep  
2 small counties together, Jefferson and Mason and the  
3 like. Did you consider whether or not all of Lewis  
4 County could be in a single district?

5 COMM. FOSTER: Yes.

6 COMM. GORTON: And that's it?

7 COMM. FOSTER: We can -- I can tell you over  
8 the last 20 days we've considered a lot of things, as  
9 I -- as I can tell by looking at the map that you two  
10 have, too. This is a matter of negotiations. And --  
11 and that area south of the highway in Lewis County and  
12 along the railroad or the river there, about 6,000  
13 people fit, it seemed like to me, nicely in the 19<sup>th</sup>  
14 District. So that -- there are lots of places that we  
15 can all probably look at and find ways we'd rather do  
16 it.

17 COMM. CEIS: I was -- Dean, I was also  
18 noticing on the -- Vancouver is now split three ways,  
19 the city.

20 COMM. FOSTER: We had various plans that we  
21 worked with that had Vancouver in two districts and  
22 others that had it in three. And this one we had a  
23 small piece of Vancouver, I think about 6,000 people,  
24 that we put in the 18<sup>th</sup> District.

25 COMM. CEIS: 18<sup>th</sup>.

1                   COMM. HUFF: If I could go back up to the  
2                   48<sup>th</sup> and the 10<sup>th</sup>, I just quickly saw Marysville. I  
3                   don't know. Was Marysville split, or is it -- is it  
4                   whole?

5                   COMM. GORTON: No. Marysville, like  
6                   Vancouver, is in three.

7                   COMM. HUFF: Yeah. Same. Okay.

8                   COMM. GORTON: I think that's down from four.

9                   COMM. CEIS: Yes, I think Marysville was  
10                  four.

11                  COMM. FOSTER: I believe I -- earlier I  
12                  reported that I had a visit from some of the Marysville  
13                  city council. I would just like to point out that some  
14                  of the cities that we have are as -- sometimes as --  
15                  not -- not as -- as perfectly shaped as that would --  
16                  you might like to have on a map. Marysville's one of  
17                  them. I'm not disagreeing with how Marysville's set up  
18                  as a city. I'm just pointing out that, when you look  
19                  at these simply on a map, it can look --

20                  And Senator Gorton pointed out an area in Aberdeen  
21                  to me that there are a number of small areas throughout  
22                  the state where cities are noncontiguous, and so in  
23                  some cases we have a city in two different districts,  
24                  but it -- it's the city that's the noncontiguous issue  
25                  here, not necessarily the district. And generally

1 those noncontiguous areas are zero population, and they  
2 are like watersheds or garbage dumps or sanitary  
3 landfills or whatever term that would be appropriate.  
4 So that's just a piece of information.

5 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any other questions or  
6 comments?

7 Okay. So we'll just -- you're going to continue  
8 your -- your move through additional districts. And  
9 our House team is going to continue to do the  
10 legislative through eastern Washington, and our Senate  
11 team is going to work on the congressional.

12 COMM. GORTON: Correct.

13 COMM. FOSTER: Commissioner Huff and I are  
14 meeting immediately after this meeting to -- to begin  
15 our general discussions about eastern Washington.

16 COMM. GORTON: Commissioner Ceis --

17 COMM. HUFF: Today --

18 COMM. GORTON: -- and I have exchanged maps,  
19 and we'll talk later in the afternoon.

20 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: And for those of you who  
21 are present here, we will have these maps up on large  
22 boards outside the hearing room following the hearing.

23 Okay. Next item is discussion of a timeline for  
24 completion, and I would like to call on Bonnie Bunning,  
25 our executive director.

1 MS. BUNNING: Thank you, Madam Chair.

2 In response to questions at our meeting on  
3 Tuesday, I've done more work in trying to pin down just  
4 exactly what needs to happen from now on out and how  
5 the time frames might work.

6 I've put together -- each of you have three  
7 different scenarios simply to illustrate the remaining  
8 steps and how they might play out. And I just want to  
9 emphasize that once you come to agreement on the draft  
10 final plan, then there is still work to be done by the  
11 Commission and you in resolving any errors or public  
12 input that's given, what to do about that, adopting the  
13 plan itself formally by signing the resolution, and  
14 then submitting that immediately to the legislature and  
15 posting it.

16 The next step is a final report to the  
17 Legislature, which includes the plan itself as well as  
18 some justifications and legal things -- requirements  
19 that are in the law, then submitting the plan to the  
20 Legislature at the beginning of the session and  
21 delivering it -- so delivering it to them by -- I  
22 believe it's January 9th.

23 The scenarios I put together, I'd like to turn  
24 your attention to those right now. The salmon colors  
25 in the left column indicate holidays and weekends, and

1 that's important because for any public review,  
2 difficult to do over a holiday. And we're finding that  
3 we can't print a report over weekends and holidays, and  
4 that affects how we're going to roll this out to the  
5 session.

6 Now, working backwards, let's go to Scenario 3  
7 first. Scenario 3 I made the assumption that nothing  
8 would be finalized until the 1<sup>st</sup> of January 2012. That  
9 would be the last day that that could be finalized.  
10 And we would resolve errors, put the final plan  
11 together, deal with the resolution, and adopt the plan  
12 on that day.

13 It meets the legal requirements that we need. We  
14 can still get our report to the Legislature and so on.  
15 It doesn't have time for more than a -- an internal  
16 error correction, no time built in for an additional  
17 public review, but it can be done.

18 And I want to also say that, although I don't  
19 recommend this option for a variety of reasons, we  
20 could do all of the adoption and submission only  
21 electronically and including technically the report  
22 that's due to the Legislature and not go through the  
23 printing steps if that was desired or need be. I think  
24 there are a variety of reasons why a printed report is  
25 important.

1           what I want to point out is if we are at the  
2           11<sup>th</sup> hour in adopting the plan, we will be able to  
3           construct a few plans internally to deliver to the  
4           leadership in the House and Senate. Members probably  
5           wouldn't get them until the second week of session,  
6           January 16<sup>th</sup> at the earliest.

7           Now, if everything wonderful happens, we go to  
8           Scenario 1. That's the pre-Christmas-holiday-break  
9           scenario, when you come together on the plan before  
10          then. Then we would provide a 24-hour option for  
11          auditors to take a look at it, and the public would  
12          have that same day plus over the holidays, if they  
13          chose, to take a look at it and provide input back to  
14          the Commission.

15          The time frame there would include drafting up the  
16          justification for the plan and then having a meeting to  
17          resolve errors, finalize things. And then I'm just  
18          pegging it on the 30<sup>th</sup> to adopt the plan, sign the  
19          resolutions, submit it to the Legislature, post it a  
20          day before or a couple days before the final deadline.  
21          Gives us a little more time depending on whether --  
22          that will give us time enough to get a report to the  
23          printer and be able to deliver -- probably deliver a  
24          bound report to members on the day -- opening day of  
25          session. So that's the best case that I've laid out.

1           Scenario 2 is kind of a hybrid of the two of them.  
2           Sometime between Christmas and New Year's break, I -- I  
3           put down here December 29<sup>th</sup> -- still allows for a  
4           24-hour review by auditors, a little bit of time for a  
5           public quick review, resolve errors and adopting it  
6           again on January 1<sup>st</sup>. That puts us then in the same  
7           report-publication time frame where we would get  
8           initial copies to the leadership and bound copies to  
9           everybody by the second week of session.

10           So the good news is that we have ways to do this,  
11           and we can size it up depending on when that date  
12           appears. And -- and just a note also that again the --  
13           the report is a step after adoption that will involve  
14           one or more brief meetings with commissioner input  
15           and -- and then submission.

16           COMM. HUFF: Obviously Scenario 1 should be  
17           the way we end up, I hope.

18           COMM. GORTON: Well, I was just going to  
19           suggest that --

20           COMM. HUFF: Or earlier.

21           COMM. GORTON: -- we ought to put more  
22           pressure on ourselves than that and that we should  
23           today hope that we could -- could finish these last two  
24           assignments and any of the -- the future discussion  
25           between us by next Wednesday rather than by next



1 Friday. For the 21<sup>st</sup>, if we're not there, we can  
2 push it back. But if we set next Wednesday as our  
3 goal, we're more likely to be on Scenario 1 or even  
4 better pattern than Scenario 1. Like to give more than  
5 24 hours to the auditors if we possibly can.

6 COMM. CEIS: To that end, you know, I would  
7 suggest sending the drafts we just put out today to the  
8 auditors. Let's not wait. I -- as I said earlier, I  
9 think that these are 95 percent of the there -- of the  
10 way there, and I'd like to have their input the next  
11 time we get together, if possible, so we can discuss  
12 some of those technical issues they may raise --

13 COMM. HUFF: Good suggestion.

14 COMM. CEIS: -- and decide which ones are  
15 technical and which ones not.

16 COMM. HUFF: Good suggestion.

17 COMM. FOSTER: Well, I'd -- I don't know why  
18 we have to wait till our next meeting to get an input  
19 from an auditor. If -- if we --

20 COMM. CEIS: Well, that's what I'm saying,  
21 the same thing; sent it to them now.

22 COMM. GORTON: (Indiscernible).

23 COMM. FOSTER: Send it to them now. And if  
24 they turn something around tomorrow, hopefully they'd  
25 send it back to the Commission. And that can be --

1                   COMM. CEIS: Sure. That's fine.

2                   COMM. FOSTER: That can be --

3                   COMM. CEIS: But when we get again --  
4 together again formally --

5                   COMM. FOSTER: That can be made public --

6                   COMM. CEIS: Yeah.

7                   COMM. FOSTER: -- and we can read it. And  
8 then -- and then we can respond to that when we meet  
9 again.

10                  COMM. CEIS: I think we're saying the same  
11 thing.

12                  COMM. FOSTER: Okay.

13                  COMM. HUFF: We're planning on meeting again  
14 next Tuesday again, are we not?

15                  COMM. CEIS: Yes.

16                  CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Well, I think we need  
17 to -- if you want to -- whether we meet Tuesday and  
18 Wednesday, as Commissioner Gorton suggested, or just --

19                  COMM. HUFF: Good point.

20                  CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: You know, either way --

21                  COMM. GORTON: You already have a meeting set  
22 for next Tuesday?

23                  CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: We do. But, you know,  
24 we -- these are special meetings and can be, you know,  
25 changed with 24 hours' notice to the public. We like

1 to do it a little bit longer than that if we can. But  
2 it just depends on where -- when you all think, you  
3 know, you'll be ready.

4 COMM. FOSTER: I wonder if we shouldn't  
5 schedule a meeting for every day next week and cancel  
6 them rather than -- than work one meeting at a time  
7 because we don't know how much -- we're going to have  
8 public meetings. We're going to be talking about the  
9 maps we've done today for the first time in public,  
10 essentially for the first time in public. Maybe we  
11 schedule a meeting for every day. And 24 hours prior  
12 to that meeting we make a decision about whether or not  
13 we want to cancel it as opposed to the opposite system  
14 we've been using.

15 COMM. CEIS: I concur on that. I think  
16 that's a good idea. We should just notice that  
17 we're -- starting Tuesday we're going to meet every day  
18 next week beginning at 10:30. And as you say, if we  
19 decide we don't need it, we can cancel it. Rather be  
20 proactive that way.

21 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Everyone in agreement?

22 COMM. GORTON: I --

23 COMM. HUFF: I would.

24 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I can hang out.

25 COMM. FOSTER: I -- I'm not hung up -- I'm

1 not hung up on the time. And so I -- people probably  
2 ought to look at their schedules.

3 COMM. HUFF: I -- I would agree. I have a  
4 problem on Monday and on Thursday with Mary Ann's knee  
5 replacement that I have.

6 COMM. FOSTER: What -- what time Thursday  
7 would you be available?

8 COMM. HUFF: Well, Thursday I could make it  
9 by probably about 11:00, 11:00 o'clock, in that area.  
10 On Monday I couldn't make it until about noon.

11 COMM. GORTON: I think Tim was talking about  
12 Tuesday on.

13 COMM. HUFF: Well, Tuesday no problem.

14 COMM. FOSTER: Tuesday we're scheduled to  
15 meet at 10:30.

16 COMM. CEIS: Start on Tuesday. We're not  
17 going to --

18 COMM. FOSTER: So what if we met Tuesday  
19 at -- if we schedule a meeting for Wednesday at 10:30,  
20 Thursday at 1:00, and Friday at 10:30.

21 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Well, what about your  
22 conference call?

23 COMM. GORTON: When is that?

24 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: That was Friday, wasn't  
25 it, 'cause it was postponed, or . . . ?

1 MS. POYSKY: It's -- it's Thursday, 8:00 to  
2 10:00.

3 COMM. GORTON: 8:00 to 10:00. So then I can  
4 do that in the car on the way down.

5 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Sure. Okay.

6 COMM. CEIS: Can we review those times again?  
7 I'm sorry. I looking at my calendar.

8 COMM. FOSTER: Okay. I think I said 10:30 on  
9 wednesday.

10 COMM. GORTON: No. 10:30 on Tuesday, that's  
11 already scheduled. Okay.

12 COMM. FOSTER: Right. That's already  
13 scheduled.

14 COMM. CEIS: Right.

15 COMM. FOSTER: These are the new schedule.  
16 We won't schedule a meeting for Monday.

17 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Right.

18 COMM. FOSTER: We have a meeting already  
19 scheduled for 10:30 Tuesday. We schedule a meeting for  
20 10:30 wednesday. We schedule a meeting for  
21 1:00 o'clock Thursday.

22 Is that okay, Tom?

23 COMM. HUFF: Yes, that's fine. Thank you  
24 very much.

25 COMM. FOSTER: And we schedule a meeting for

1 10:30 on Friday.

2 COMM. HUFF: Right.

3 COMM. CEIS: So can I ask if on Wednesday we  
4 could move our meeting to the afternoon? Or is that --

5 COMM. FOSTER: Yes. That's fine with me.

6 COMM. CEIS: Is that a problem for the other  
7 commissioners?

8 COMM. HUFF: Fine with me.

9 COMM. GORTON: Sure.

10 COMM. FOSTER: 1:00 o'clock Wednesday and  
11 Thursday and 10:30 on Friday.

12 COMM. CEIS: 1:00 o'clock would work. Thank  
13 you.

14 COMM. HUFF: Okay.

15 COMM. FOSTER: With the understanding that --

16 COMM. GORTON: If there's nothing --

17 COMM. FOSTER: -- three of us can cancel --

18 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

19 COMM. FOSTER: -- or call Lura and --

20 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Yeah.

21 COMM. FOSTER: And then I'm not prepared to  
22 propose the week -- the following week. But for those  
23 who cared, that might be -- we'd -- we'd hope that by  
24 that that we get done at this point, but the following  
25 week might look a lot like this -- this week.

1                   COMM. CEIS: Can we have Sunday off?

2                   COMM. FOSTER: Yes.

3                   COMM. GORTON: He's considering that.

4                   COMM. FOSTER: Yes. I --

5                   COMM. CEIS: Give it a little thought, will  
6 you, Dean. When you going to do my holiday shopping  
7 for me, by the way?

8                   CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: You're not done?

9                   COMM. CEIS: No.

10                  COMM. GORTON: (Indiscernible) of course he's  
11 not done.

12                  CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I'm not either.

13                  One thing that would be helpful for me because of  
14 my travel distance -- and if it looks like we're going  
15 to be here every day, you know, I'll just stick around  
16 probably.

17                  But if a member of each team, you know, would just  
18 sort of give some feedback to Bonnie, it's fine if you  
19 want to just pop down and talk to her 'cause we talk  
20 all the time, rather than maybe trying to reach me or  
21 whatever just to let us know if you are or are not  
22 going to be able to meet. So, I mean, you said three  
23 of the four could cancel. But it'd also just be nice  
24 to make sure that, you know, if you are like 24 hours  
25 ahead of time going to be available for meeting, as

1 well.

2 COMM. CEIS: Right. I mean, I think we're  
3 definitely going to meet Tuesday morning. There's no  
4 doubt about that.

5 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Right.

6 COMM. CEIS: So we should be able to gauge  
7 what the rest of the week may look like on that day, I  
8 think.

9 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. And I think the  
10 other thing just from a staff point of view, when you  
11 are ready with more maps, we just need to be prepared  
12 with a little bit of notice. And we can do things  
13 pretty much at the last minute, but the more notice we  
14 get, the better.

15 Bonnie?

16 MS. BUNNING: Just one more thing. I wanted  
17 to note that as soon as possible when we adjourn today  
18 we'll have the --

19 MS. O'SULLIVAN: Already up.

20 MS. BUNNING: We have the maps that you are  
21 revealing today on the website already. So they are  
22 available to the public. And I'll make sure the  
23 auditors know that so that they can start looking at  
24 them.

25 COMM. FOSTER: And I have a question about



1 the scenarios, and this is a question for Rusty. I  
2 assume that if we take a vote that includes both  
3 congressional and legislative maps and there's some  
4 sort of number that is on a disk that, as a result of  
5 that vote, no matter what time it is prior to midnight  
6 on the 1<sup>st</sup>, that will be -- we will have completed our  
7 constitutional responsibility, and administrative  
8 things like signing resolutions and approving reports  
9 could happen beyond our constitutional mandate.

10 MR. FALLIS: Right. I would agree with that.  
11 If you take the vote and hand the disk or similar  
12 medium by the -- before the 2<sup>nd</sup>, you've complied with  
13 your responsibility.

14 COMM. FOSTER: I don't want that to happen.

15 COMM. CEIS: So, Rusty, could you be more  
16 specific about the transmission to the Legislature? Is  
17 that to be a physical receipt? Can that be just an  
18 e-mail that has a time/date prior to the 2<sup>nd</sup>?

19 MR. FALLIS: No. I think an e-mail is  
20 sufficient.

21 COMM. CEIS: It is? Okay. So we don't have  
22 to have someone standing by to actually receive it?

23 MR. FALLIS: No, I don't think so.

24 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. That sounds great.  
25 Anything else to come up in this part of the

1 meeting?

2 MR. FALLIS: Can I --

3 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Yes.

4 MR. FALLIS: Just to follow up something that  
5 Ms. Bunning mentioned about the report, there is at  
6 least part of that report that I think is going to have  
7 to be the product of the commissioners' work. I mean,  
8 a considerable part of it is information that the staff  
9 is compiling. But just as a heads-up, that is  
10 something that is going to require at least a modest  
11 amount of time that we think you ought to keep in mind.

12 COMM. CEIS: Could you be more specific?

13 MR. FALLIS: Well, the --

14 COMM. CEIS: 'Cause I thought I was done  
15 midnight January 1<sup>st</sup>.

16 MR. FALLIS: One of your -- one of your  
17 specific duties is to prepare and publish a report with  
18 the plan.

19 COMM. CEIS: Right.

20 MR. FALLIS: And the statute describes some  
21 of the things that are in the report. But, for  
22 example, it says that the report should contain an  
23 explanation of the criteria used in developing the  
24 plan. I don't think the staff wants to put words in  
25 your mouth. So, you know, I think they can facilitate

1 the drafting of this, but on some level they're going  
2 to need an explanation, maybe just a general one, from  
3 you as to how you applied this criteria.

4 COMM. CEIS: I always thought that was the  
5 traditional relationship between the staff and the  
6 people they work with. No.

7 Perhaps we could then begin working on that before  
8 the 1st?

9 MR. FALLIS: That makes sense if you're  
10 comfortable doing that, and we can assist in greasing  
11 the skids any way that we'd like to.

12 Bonnie?

13 MS. BUNNING: Yes. I have been working on a  
14 draft of the verbiage part of the report. It's largely  
15 a brief introduction and some of the justifications and  
16 then maps that will get produced once the plan is  
17 finalized.

18 I would like to provide that very rough initial  
19 draft to you on Tuesday so you can add that to your  
20 pile of things to do. But . . .

21 COMM. CEIS: We can make it homework, though,  
22 can't we?

23 MS. BUNNING: Yes.

24 COMM. CEIS: 'Cause I think the Commission  
25 meeting is going to be involved in discussion.

1 MS. BUNNING: Exactly. It wouldn't be right  
2 to discuss it on Tuesday, but I'll get that to you by  
3 Tuesday in your packet.

4 COMM. HUFF: Fine.

5 COMM. FOSTER: I'm going to be out of the  
6 state between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup>.

7 COMM. CEIS: Of January?

8 COMM. FOSTER: But I presume anything like  
9 that can be done on the phone.

10 MR. FALLIS: Yes.

11 COMM. CEIS: But that -- that does not  
12 require any official action by the commissioners,  
13 however; it's just our input into the -- or does it?

14 MR. FALLIS: Well, I think that a report does  
15 need to be approved by the Commission. I mean, it can  
16 be, if need be, a five-minute meeting on the telephone.  
17 But it's specifically listed as one of the duties of  
18 the Commission, is the preparation of the report. So I  
19 don't think it's enough just to have the staff do it.  
20 I think you need to sign off on it.

21 COMM. FOSTER: But not prior -- it doesn't  
22 have to be done prior to the 2<sup>nd</sup> of January?

23 MR. FALLIS: That is correct, in my opinion.

24 COMM. HUFF: Okay.

25 MS. BUNNING: Or the 9<sup>th</sup> even.

1 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. Anything else for  
2 this section?

3 COMM. FOSTER: Or the 9<sup>th</sup>.

4 MR. FALLIS: I think the 9<sup>th</sup> is a good target  
5 because that's when the Legislature's clock starts  
6 running in terms of the amount of time it has. So I  
7 think it's --

8 COMM. FOSTER: That's --

9 MR. FALLIS: -- it's logical to try to get  
10 the report to them by then.

11 COMM. FOSTER: Should have 30 days.

12 COMM. CEIS: Are you back in town by then?

13 COMM. FOSTER: I think so.

14 COMM. CEIS: Call from the airport?

15 COMM. FOSTER: What's triggering here is the  
16 beginning of the legislative session.

17 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. Right. I understand.

18 COMM. FOSTER: They have 30 days to act.

19 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Actually the 9<sup>th</sup> is  
20 Monday, and our regular Commission meeting is scheduled  
21 for the day after that. So I don't know if we can sort  
22 of talk about whether it makes sense to do it as a  
23 separate conference call or if we can just do it  
24 officially during our regular Commission meeting 'cause  
25 they will have the electronic version in front of them.

1 So that they'll get immediately.

2 Okay. If there's no other -- anything else to  
3 discuss during this section, we can move on to the  
4 public-comment section of our meeting. We do have  
5 several online comments. We do have one person here  
6 present, John Milem, who is signed up to -- to speak.  
7 So I'd ask Mr. Milem to come forward, and I'll just  
8 read a couple of the comments while he's doing that  
9 from online, and then we'll continue.

10 The first online comment is from Robert. And I  
11 don't have a last name. Oh, there it is. The same  
12 one? Robert Rodriguez, R-o-d-r-i-g-u-e-z, from Mill  
13 Creek. And his comment is:

14 "I heard that there are several comments to put  
15 Mill Creek in the same district as Bothell. I see this  
16 plan keeps it in the 44<sup>th</sup>. What was the reasoning,  
17 as Mill Creek shares the same community interests as  
18 Bothell. Most of my neighbors I have spoken to want to  
19 be in the same district as Bothell rather than stay in  
20 the 44<sup>th</sup>? How is this plan, then recognizing  
21 communities of interest?"

22 I don't know if that's something you want to just  
23 sort of think about and maybe . . .

24 COMM. GORTON: Well, this is really for you.

25 COMM. FOSTER: (Indiscernible).

1 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. I think what we  
2 can do is take your comment under consideration. And  
3 we'll go with Mr. Milem.

4 MR. MILEM: Good morning. My name is John  
5 Milem, J-o-h-n M-i-l-e-m. I live in Vancouver, and I'm  
6 an advocate for redistricting in the public interest.

7 I would like to make one comment about what you've  
8 shown us today, and that is that it's a history of  
9 redistricting. Redistricting is about getting ready  
10 for the future, and the history of redistricting is  
11 that we always manage to drag the -- drag history into  
12 the future in ways that are unnecessary.

13 It's been at least 30 years, maybe 40 or 50, since  
14 it's been necessary to divide Grays Harbor County. It  
15 used to be too big to be a district. It hasn't been  
16 that for decades. But we don't seem to get to the  
17 place where we recognize that that is a community that  
18 should be entitled to -- to representation within a  
19 single district, and I just regret seeing that.

20 Today I want to comment about the draft of  
21 Attachment A that was furnished on Tuesday. I commend  
22 the draftsmen of Attachment A for providing a more  
23 sensible solution to the correction of errors and  
24 omissions in redistricting plans than the previously  
25 used Section 4. In a recent conversation with Vicky

1 Dalton, I was interested in her observation to the  
2 effect that the current proposal is a huge improvement  
3 over the prior language.

4 That being said, I have several problems with the  
5 draft.

6 First, I would like to observe that we do have a  
7 difference of opinion regarding the population standard  
8 to be satisfied in redistricting. If the Commission's  
9 apparent interpretation of the population standard is  
10 the correct one, I am puzzled that population, in the  
11 current draft of Attachment A, is relegated to a  
12 relatively limited role in resolving errors and  
13 omissions. My original proposal, furnished to the  
14 Commission on November 8<sup>th</sup>, was rather convoluted  
15 because I made an effort to protect the stringent  
16 interpretation of the population standard which I  
17 understand the Commission holds.

18 As you know, my interpretation is different from  
19 yours. The correction of errors and omissions is far  
20 less likely to violate my understanding of the  
21 population standard than it is yours. I believe there  
22 is some inconsistency between your professed population  
23 standard and limited role allowed in population in the  
24 errors-and-omissions-correction provision of  
25 Attachment A.



1           Second, as I proposed in my draft of  
2           November 8<sup>th</sup>, I believe the first resort in  
3           correcting errors and omissions should be to use  
4           precinct boundaries. I applaud the focus on county and  
5           municipal boundaries in Attachment A.

6           However, I'd like to point out that since  
7           precincts do not cross county or municipal boundaries,  
8           the use of precincts as the primary error-and-omission  
9           correction factor protects across -- protects against  
10          crossing either a county boundary or a municipal  
11          boundary. The application of the provisions of  
12          Attachment A as written may have the result of either  
13          requiring the creation of new precincts for areas  
14          assigned pursuant to the proposed Attachment A or  
15          complicating election administration, because even  
16          though the assignment determined through Attachment A  
17          will keep the assigned territory within its county and  
18          municipality, if any, it is entirely possible that the  
19          boundary eliminated by the addition of the misassigned  
20          or unassigned territory may actually be the boundary of  
21          some other kind of governmental entity, such as, for  
22          example, a school district.

23          There are several counties in the state in which  
24          no precinct crosses a school district boundary. In  
25          many other counties, school district boundaries are

1 generally, though not exclusively, used as precinct  
2 boundaries. It may be that the assignment required by  
3 Attachment A may cause the assignment of territory  
4 across the boundary of some other governmental entity.  
5 Using precinct boundaries as the first factor in  
6 correction of errors and omissions will significantly  
7 reduce the risk of this happening.

8 Third, I see dealing with uninhabited water areas  
9 differently from uninhabited land areas to represent a  
10 failure to deal completely with the contiguity problems  
11 resulting from erroneous assignment of uninhabited  
12 areas. If an uninhabited area separates areas assigned  
13 to a district, thereby rendering the district  
14 noncontiguous, I see no reason why it should be handled  
15 one way if it's water and a different way if it's land.  
16 The problem seems to me to be the same in both cases.  
17 The uninhabited territory should be reassigned to the  
18 noncontiguous district to assure it's contiguity.

19 Fourth, I am uncertain as to whether there is a  
20 difference in effect between my preferred language on  
21 boundary length and the language of Attachment A.  
22 Attachment A directs that territory not otherwise  
23 assigned under preceding provisions of Attachment A be  
24 assigned based upon the longest shared boundary of the  
25 area to be assigned with districts eligible to receive

1 it.

2 My approach is to look at the effect of the  
3 assignment on boundary length after assignment. It is  
4 possible that the two provisions may lead to identical  
5 results, but I am not certain that this is the case.

6 I have redrafted my proposal to remove population  
7 as a factor in the correction of errors and omissions.  
8 I believe that my proposal is considerably simpler than  
9 Attachment A while at the same time being a more  
10 comprehensive solution to the correction of errors and  
11 omissions.

12 And you have the text of that there, and I won't  
13 belabor the reading of it. Thank you.

14 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Thank you for your  
15 comments.

16 MR. MILEM: You're welcome.

17 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. Our next comment  
18 online is from Sharon woods of Marysville, and that's  
19 s-h-a-r-o-n last name w-o-o-d-s.

20 (As read) "Commissioners. First let me expression  
21 my thanks for your work on this very important effort.  
22 I can only image how challenging it has been to put  
23 these maps together. with that said, I do not  
24 understand why Marysville has been split up the way it  
25 was. It makes no sense. why can't the areas being

1 placed in the 39<sup>th</sup> be put in the 38<sup>th</sup> and the  
2 44<sup>th</sup>? The areas being put in the 39<sup>th</sup> are so  
3 small, to me it seems most logical to put Marysville in  
4 as few districts as possible. I read testimony from  
5 even our" -- "from even our City to that effect. I am  
6 very confused."

7 I'm not sure the time this was sent in. We did  
8 have a brief discussion about the Marysville issue.  
9 And this may have come in before that. But you can all  
10 take it under advisement.

11 And I think that's the last of our questions. Is  
12 that correct, Gen?

13 MS. O'SULLIVAN: Yes.

14 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay.

15 COMM. FOSTER: I would just like to say  
16 something about what Mr. Milem just gave us. I --

17 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Certainly.

18 COMM. FOSTER: I had asked him afterwards if  
19 he'd looked at the -- what we -- what we passed out the  
20 last meeting, and he came with this. And I certainly  
21 assume that staff will take a look at this. And I  
22 think maybe getting closer on those issues, this will  
23 be a exercise that probably happens after this plan is  
24 approved and beyond January 1<sup>st</sup>.

25 And so while it appears a lot of detail, if we do

1 find mistakes, then this is an important document. So  
2 I thank you for all the work you've done on this, and  
3 hopefully we're getting closer to having a good  
4 corrective document.

5 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Thank you, Dean.

6 COMM. HUFF: John, it's good to see you here  
7 again today.

8 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. Those are the only  
9 comments we have.

10 Did anybody want to make a comment who didn't sign  
11 up?

12 Yes, sir. Come forward. Please state your --  
13 state and spell your name for the record, please.

14 MR. MAY: My name is Richard May. I live up  
15 in the Whatcom County area here.

16 I'm -- I'm -- I'm quite surprised at the contents  
17 of some of these maps 'cause I had -- I had seen some  
18 very good things in some of the preliminary maps,  
19 although they were quite different from each other.  
20 But again with Marysville with three districts and then  
21 Mount Vernon cut down the middle and Bellingham cut  
22 down the middle, it's --

23 I had had the impression that one of the  
24 objectives was to try not to be cutting things down the  
25 middle. And I had heard some things in the early

1 Commission meetings about how there's going to be very  
2 few divided things, but they seem to be all up in the  
3 neck of the woods that I've been paying most attention  
4 to.

5 I had been very pleased with some of the maps I'd  
6 seen where the 39<sup>th</sup> had reunited some of the  
7 agricultural area of the 42<sup>nd</sup> so that those  
8 agricultural people could share a legislator who could  
9 look after their interests. And I had appreciated  
10 particularly the Ceis and Foster maps that had a little  
11 more Bellingham in there.

12 The -- the way that this is currently cut, the  
13 42<sup>nd</sup>, which has been a competitive district electing  
14 a combination of Democrats and Republicans for quite  
15 some time, has now been rendered a noncompetitive  
16 district by taking out seven precincts that are -- were  
17 predominately Democrat.

18 And so now what you've got is this -- this  
19 conundrum of the community of interest of downtown  
20 Bellingham and the -- compared with community of  
21 interest of the rest of the rural area, which had been  
22 balanced into a competitive district and now is  
23 noncompetitive, which means the remaining part of  
24 Bellingham that has lost those seven precincts now is  
25 just -- just going to be simply at odds with -- just

1 not getting the -- any form of legislators that they're  
2 going to be happy with rather than the mix, which some  
3 would say is ideal.

4 You know, there's -- there's an old standard, you  
5 know, talking about federal senators. A lot of people  
6 used to say really good if you get one of each because  
7 then you get a more comprehensive representation. So  
8 at this point the -- I'm displeased with -- with where  
9 this -- with where this puts the 42<sup>nd</sup>, which  
10 historically has -- has elected a combination. And I  
11 guess not much I can say on that.

12 Thank you very much.

13 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Thank you.

14 Anyone else?

15 Okay. Thank you all for coming.

16 Again, for those of you present, there are maps  
17 going to be put outside in the hallway right after the  
18 meeting, and the maps are available electronically up  
19 on our website. You can use -- you can use Google  
20 Earth to zero in on the details. So I encourage you to  
21 do that.

22 Thank you very much for coming.

23 (Proceedings concluded at 11:24 a.m.)  
24  
25