

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 30, 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
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
- NICK PHARRIS - GIS MAP & DATA SPECIALIST
- EMILY WALTERS - ANALYST FOR COMM. CEIS

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

	<u>INDEX</u>	
		<u>PAGE</u>
1		
2		
3	Leg line adjustment recommendations - Mr. Pharris	8
4	Ms. Debra Perry (answering Commission question)	19
5	Discussion of eastern WA leg maps	56
6		
7	PUBLIC COMMENT	
8	Mr. Dave Valiant	50
9	Ms. Mary Johnson-Hall	52
10	Ms. Debra Perry	67
11	Mr. Bart Taylor	68
12	Mr. Dan Palmeri	70
13	Ms. Rebecca Ableman	70
14	Mr. Miguel Blanco	71
15	Ms. Lua Pritchard	72
16	Mr. Dexter Gordon	74
17	Mr. Dan Palmeri	76
18	Mr. Shane Thorson	77
19	Mr. Jonathan Fox	77
20	Ms. Sue Lani Madsen	77
21	Ms. Linda Atkins	78
22	Ms. Amanda Taub	78
23	Mr. Elliott Fabric	80
24	Mr. Matt Watkins	80
25		

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

INDEX
(continued)

PAGE

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Mariah (first name only)	81
Ms. Mary Ann(first name only)	81
Leg line adjustment amendments - Mr. Pharris	83
Mr. Dave Valiant (answering Commission question)	95

1 BE IT REMEMBERED that on Friday, December 30, 2011, at
2 10:35 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 I'd
8 like to welcome you to this special meeting of the
9 Washington State Redistricting Commission.

10 what -- we're going to have a delay in moving
11 forward this morning. One of our members is a
12 little -- going to be late in getting here until -- so
13 we're actually going to start the business of the
14 Commission around 11:00 a.m. this morning.

15 we do -- Commissioner Ceis did have one thing he
16 wanted to comment on about some of the work he'd like
17 to do today.

18 COMM. CEIS: Yes. So at some point this
19 morning, Nick, I'd like you to be ready to present your
20 summary of all the comments we've received from
21 auditors and third parties about boundary adjustments
22 related to technical errors and other matters.

23 Can you be prepared to do that?

24 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

25 COMM. CEIS: And I think it's just a form of

1 a briefing for all the commissioners so we all get the
2 same information, get on the same page.

3 MR. PHARRIS: I have all of the comments on
4 the legislative plans. I have not had time to -- to
5 incorporate all the comments on the congressional ones
6 yet.

7 COMM. CEIS: That's fine. Legislative plan's
8 great. Thank you.

9 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. Then we are in
10 recess until 11:00 a.m. this morning. Thank you.

11 (Recess.)

12
13 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. We hope to be able
14 to get started shortly, and I'm hoping by around
15 11:15 to 11:20. So stick with us. And we appreciate
16 your patience.

17 (Recess.)

18
19 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. We are ready to
20 reconvene this special meeting of the Washington State
21 Redistricting Commission, start our business for the
22 day. So I would like to start by having those of us up
23 here introduce ourselves.

24 So, Bonnie, would you like to start?

25 Oh, probably mention my name is Lura Powell, and

1 I'm chair of the Commission.

2 MS. BUNNING: I'm Bonnie Bunning. I'm
3 executive director for the Redistricting Commission.

4 COMM. GORTON: Slade Gorton, the Republican
5 Senate appointee.

6 COMM. CEIS: Tim Ceis appointed by Senate
7 Democrats.

8 MS. O'SULLIVAN: Genevieve O'Sullivan,
9 communications director.

10 COMM. FOSTER: Dean Foster appointed by the
11 House Democrats.

12 COMM. HUFF: Tom Huff appointed by the House
13 Republicans.

14 MR. FALLIS: I'm Rusty Fallis with the
15 Attorney General's Office. I'm general counsel to the
16 Commission.

17 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. When we first
18 convened this morning at 10:30, we discuss -- we had a
19 request to have Nick Fallis run through -- Pharris --
20 sheesh. Thank you -- Nick Pharris run through some of
21 the data that we've received from the auditors and
22 others. So he's prepared to do that now if that's okay
23 with everybody.

24 COMM. GORTON: Yep.

25 MR. PHARRIS: Just a sec while the screens

1 warm up.

2 Good morning, commissioners. This is a
3 presentation of the comments that our office has
4 received from county elections offices and also from
5 certain members of the public who have made very
6 concrete suggestions about how to alter the proposed
7 legislative district lines that have been made public
8 so far.

9 Most of these are very small tweaks. I have not
10 included the ones that involve no population at all,
11 but --

12 Oh, I'm -- I do apologize. I have handouts for
13 you to put in front of you.

14 COMM. HUFF: That's a package and a half.

15 COMM. GORTON: Oh, my.

16 MR. PHARRIS: Do you have one?

17 COMM. CEIS: No, I don't. Thank you very
18 much.

19 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: He's been working late
20 every night.

21 COMM. HUFF: The paper mills must love us.

22 COMM. CEIS: That's great. This is exactly
23 what we wanted.

24 COMM. GORTON: It sure is. The value of
25 getting them out in advance.

1 MR. PHARRIS: This first slide shows a
2 comment we received from John Milem. The city limits
3 of winlock follow this line here, and he suggested,
4 instead of following the highway, you -- you follow the
5 city limits of winlock. This would involve moving four
6 people from the 20th to the 19th District in Lewis
7 County.

8 This is a similar situation, again, between the
9 city limits of winlock and this highway and -- with the
10 same population; would involve moving four people from
11 the 20th to the 19th District in Lewis County.

12 This is a small block, again in Lewis County, on
13 the east side of --

14 COMM. FOSTER: Just a minute now. Wait.

15 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

16 COMM. FOSTER: What page number is this?

17 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Start from the beginning.

18 COMM. HUFF: This one.

19 COMM. FOSTER: We're on page 3 now?

20 MR. PHARRIS: Yes. Sorry. This is the third
21 one.

22 Please -- please feel free to stop me if I go too
23 fast. I can obtain better, clearer images of these and
24 zoom in if -- if need be.

25 COMM. CEIS: No. That's fine.

1 MR. PHARRIS: This is a small block with two
2 people. John suggests moving it from the 20th --
3 arrow's going the wrong way. That should be from the
4 20th into the 19th District to maintain State
5 Route 6 as the boundary.

6 COMM. GORTON: 19th into 20th, isn't it?

7 MR. PHARRIS: It's currently assigned to
8 District 20. I apologize. The arrow's pointing the
9 wrong direction.

10 COMM. GORTON: The arrow's the wrong way?

11 MR. PHARRIS: Yeah. It's -- this purple
12 color is the 20th District. So it's currently in the
13 20th. He's suggesting moving it to the 19th.

14 This will be in south Thurston County along
15 Lawrence Lake Road. There is another road running
16 parallel to it with two people apparently living in
17 between. John suggests moving these people from the
18 2nd into the 20th District to maintain Lawrence Lake
19 Road as the boundary.

20 COMM. HUFF: Difference of 11 and 200 people.

21 MR. PHARRIS: This is the boundary of the
22 area that Commissioners Gorton and Ceis districted.
23 They put this block of two people in District 5.

24 Mr. Milem suggests using the school-district
25 boundary, which is this purple line -- excuse me -- as

1 the district line instead and moving these two people
2 into what would become the 31st District.

3 This is in Snohomish County. Mr. Milem suggests
4 that continuing the boundary along 20th Avenue West
5 would create a shorter, more easily defined boundary,
6 and only two people would move, then, from the 1st to
7 the 32nd District.

8 This is a comment we received from Skagit County
9 Elections. The -- the proposed legislative line runs
10 along a power line here. I have not actually gone in
11 to look at an aerial photo to see whether the power
12 lines is actually here. Census Bureau's power lines
13 are kind of notoriously bad in terms of accurate
14 placement on the Earth.

15 Skagit County Elections suggests moving the line
16 to Prairie Road.

17 Mr. Milem has a counterproposal which would
18 involve moving this block instead from the 40th to
19 the 39th. That would be a movement of two people and
20 would put the boundary along the Samish River. There
21 are several parcels that would be split by the Samish
22 River that would not be split by the line along Prairie
23 Road; however, the transfer of population would be
24 smaller.

25 COMM. GORTON: These two are the same place?

1 COMM. CEIS: Yeah.

2 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

3 COMM. CEIS: Can you move back to that slide,
4 please?

5 MR. PHARRIS: Yeah. So the slide I just
6 told -- showed you, Skagit County suggests moving this
7 block here from the 19th into the 40 -- or 39th
8 into the 40th.

9 John Milem countersuggests moving this block from
10 the 40th into the 39th.

11 COMM. CEIS: So this is one of those
12 situations where the auditors brought up specifically
13 where they asked us to avoid splitting parcels?

14 MR. PHARRIS: Right. And the parcels are
15 these thin white lines here.

16 COMM. CEIS: Right. So the river would split
17 the parcels?

18 MR. PHARRIS: River would split a few
19 parcels. Yes.

20 COMM. CEIS: And this river migrates, I
21 assume, as well.

22 MR. PHARRIS: It's probably not terribly well
23 defined, and I'm not sure how accurate the Census
24 Bureau's line --

25 COMM. CEIS: Yeah.

1 MR. PHARRIS: -- for it is.

2 COMM. CEIS: 'cause this is not an armored-
3 bank river. This is a --

4 COMM. GORTON: So your preference is which?

5 MR. PHARRIS: Over -- in terms of creating
6 easily defined boundaries, Prairie Road would probably
7 be the better choice.

8 COMM. CEIS: That's 19 people?

9 MR. PHARRIS: Yeah.

10 COMM. CEIS: And do you recall what the
11 deviation is between the 39th and the 40th right
12 now?

13 MR. PHARRIS: I do not.

14 COMM. CEIS: Could you just make a note of
15 that so before we come back to --

16 MR. PHARRIS: Yeah.

17 COMM. CEIS: -- agree to these, we know where
18 we stand on that?

19 'Cause I think I would prefer Prairie Road if we
20 don't have a deviation issue.

21 COMM. GORTON: Yeah, I would, too.

22 MR. PHARRIS: Right. And it may be that
23 District 40's going to be under, and then it would make
24 sense.

25 This is an issue that was brought to our attention

1 by Pierce County Elections. They came and presented it
2 themselves.

3 The problem basically is that the Census Bureau
4 thinks the boundary between Edgewood and Milton runs
5 along this line, when, in fact, the boundary runs along
6 this line. They didn't suggest a remedy to this.
7 We -- I -- I believe it's still something of an open
8 question whether we can -- whether you can split a
9 census block in creating districts.

10 The problem -- I can say the problem would go away
11 if Milton and Edgewood ended up in the same district.
12 It would be moot.

13 COMM. CEIS: Likely.

14 Rusty, you were going to try and take a look at
15 this. I don't know if you had a chance yet or not.

16 MR. FALLIS: Right. I -- you know, you're
17 required to use census data for -- for drawing your
18 districts. But I don't think your statute goes so far
19 as to require you to essentially accept boundary errors
20 that the Census Bureau has made. So I think legally
21 you have the latitude to follow the true jurisdictional
22 lines if you want to do that.

23 MR. PHARRIS: The problem is, this block
24 here -- and I'm not lying -- has 49 people in it. So
25 you would only approximately know the populations of

1 those two districts on either side of that line within
2 49 people.

3 COMM. FOSTER: I thought at one point you
4 said that there were -- the left-hand side there were
5 four people in that area.

6 There is -- isn't there a church there?

7 MR. PHARRIS: There's a church and a couple
8 of houses in here, yes.

9 COMM. FOSTER: And didn't we think there were
10 four people?

11 MR. PHARRIS: There is no census number for
12 that since it's only part of a block.

13 COMM. FOSTER: Oh, okay.

14 MR. FALLIS: Can I ask a question, Nick, in
15 that regard?

16 In practical terms, aren't there ways that we
17 could get some reasonable assurance of what the
18 population of that -- that area is? I mean, seems like
19 it shouldn't be that difficult to -- to do that.

20 MR. PHARRIS: Well, it would be possible to
21 send out a survey team and take a census of it. But
22 that actually wouldn't tell us the population of it as
23 of April 1, 2010.

24 COMM. FOSTER: Well, is it --

25 Is the population in the left-hand block

1 associated with the church?

2 MR. PHARRIS: Uh . . .

3 COMM. FOSTER: Like, could it be a parsonage
4 or something?

5 MR. PHARRIS: I -- I have no idea.

6 Again, it's this -- this polygon is what we're
7 concerned about, which is actually inside the city of
8 Milton but the Census Bureau considers part of
9 Edgewood.

10 COMM. FOSTER: My recollection of this whole
11 issue --

12 COMM. GORTON: (Indiscernible.)

13 COMM. FOSTER: -- is that Pierce County
14 brought this to us, and Pierce County knew a lot about
15 this particular area.

16 Could we query them one more time and see if they
17 know a little bit more?

18 MR. PHARRIS: We can. It would also be
19 possible to -- to look at property records for these
20 parcels here.

21 COMM. GORTON: We're talking about that one
22 square where your arrow is now?

23 MR. PHARRIS: That's correct.

24 COMM. CEIS: That's the one in question.

25 COMM. GORTON: That's the one in question.

1 And it's -- and it's basically a church.

2 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. There seems to be a few
3 other structures in there.

4 COMM. GORTON: Yeah. There --

5 MR. PHARRIS: There are a couple of
6 residences in there, as well. Yeah.

7 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Excuse me just a minute.

8 We just had a comment come in from David Valiant
9 up there. He says, "The 2 houses are not affiliated
10 with the church."

11 MR. PHARRIS: Oh. Also, I've just received
12 some notes. You asked about the -- the relative
13 deviations of the 39th and 40th Districts as -- as
14 proposed.

15 COMM. CEIS: Yes.

16 MR. PHARRIS: The 39th as proposed is -- is
17 short 48 people. The 40th as proposed is short by 15
18 people.

19 COMM. CEIS: So this proposes to move 19 more
20 from the 40 -- from the 39th into the 40th.

21 MR. PHARRIS: That is correct.

22 COMM. CEIS: which would put the 40th four
23 over and make the 39th 50-, 60-whatever-7.

24 MR. PHARRIS: Sixty-seven short.

25 COMM. CEIS: Short. Okay. Thank you.

1 MR. PHARRIS: Are there more questions about
2 this one, or shall I move on?

3 COMM. CEIS: And does Mr. Valiant, if he's
4 still watching, know how many structures there are in
5 that quadrant right there? Is it --

6 COMM. GORTON: Looks like two houses.

7 COMM. CEIS: -- two or three?

8 MR. PHARRIS: I believe they said two
9 residences plus the church.

10 COMM. CEIS: Maximum --

11 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: (Indiscernible).

12 COMM. CEIS: Maximum legal occupancy is
13 eight. So we can assume a maximum of 16.

14 MR. PHARRIS: I don't know how big those
15 house are.

16 Actually, I have just received another note. The
17 mayor of Milton is here and could possibly clarify the
18 situation.

19 COMM. CEIS: In the audience?

20 Hello, Mayor. Would you like to come forward?

21 MS. PERRY: Sure.

22 COMM. GORTON: Tell us what you know about
23 this house.

24 COMM. CEIS: These two houses.

25 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

1 COMM. CEIS: I assume you know your city very
2 well.

3 MS. PERRY: Well, first you have to assume
4 you know what you're looking at.

5 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Well, for -- for our
6 recording, could you just sort of state your name and
7 spell it for our transcriptionist?

8 MS. PERRY: Okay. I'm the mayor of Milton,
9 Debra Perry, D-e-b-r-a P-e-r-r-y.

10 And I believe that the red-and-yellow line is
11 Taylor Street. And if that is correct, that's Mission
12 woods Church. And there might be a house right where
13 all the trees are, just above the trees.

14 COMM. CEIS: Uh-huh.

15 MS. PERRY: And I think that's about it
16 'cause it's a -- it's a very large church with a day
17 care and preschool. And I think that -- that you might
18 be looking at one or two residents, and that's about
19 it. And then even in the topography of the land, I
20 can't ever see us having 8 or 60 or whatever you guys
21 are talking about there.

22 MR. PHARRIS: It's -- it's a total of 49 for
23 this entire block. Yeah.

24 COMM. CEIS: And I assume, Mayor, it would be
25 your preference to have your entire city within the

1 district boundary.

2 MS. PERRY: Yes.

3 Did you want me to give my statement now, or do
4 you want me to wait till later?

5 COMM. CEIS: I'm going to leave that to the
6 Chair to rule.

7 MS. PERRY: Okay.

8 COMM. CEIS: Okay. Thank you.

9 MS. PERRY: Uh-huh.

10 MR. PHARRIS: Moving on?

11 COMM. CEIS: I think we should do that.

12 MR. PHARRIS: There's another comment from
13 Pierce County Elections. This is an unincorporated
14 island, technically two unincorporated islands. Well,
15 all right. This one isn't quite surrounded by the City
16 of Milton. This one actually is since 12th Street is
17 part of a city limits.

18 The problem is there are only 13 people in this
19 area. It is not part of the City of Milton. If there
20 is a legislative line along here -- I believe it is an
21 existing precinct line, however. If there is a
22 legislative line along here, this -- these 13 people
23 will have to be their own precinct.

24 Pierce County did not offer a remedy for this.
25 Probably the only possible remedy would be to include

1 some of this area in the 25th District. That is part
2 of Milton's urban growth area, as well, for what it's
3 worth.

4 Another comment from Pierce County Elections, this
5 line here that is currently used as the north boundary
6 of the 2nd Legislative District, they say, is not a
7 street. There's no real street there. On the other
8 hand, as you can see, it is actually a parcel boundary.

9 It would not split any houses. It would just be,
10 you know, somewhat difficult to place those voters.
11 The north line of this block is also not a street.

12 COMM. CEIS: Yeah.

13 COMM. GORTON: (Indiscernible).

14 MR. PHARRIS: This is -- there is an
15 annexation to the City of Puyallup in -- sorry. Let me
16 get my mouse going -- this area of the block, in the
17 western part of this area. The annexation does not
18 follow existing census-block boundaries. It will be
19 effective January 1, 2012, so in two days, and it is
20 currently not in the 25th District with the rest of
21 the City of Puyallup.

22 The County actually recommends carrying the 25th
23 District out to Puyallup's urban growth boundary, which
24 is -- which would add 72 people to the 25th District.

25 COMM. CEIS: So that urban-growth boundary

1 becomes a municipal boundary as of the first of the
2 year?

3 MR. PHARRIS: Actually, the -- the annexation
4 on the first of the year only covers part of this area.
5 It's the western part of this area.

6 COMM. CEIS: Oh, I see. Just a small area.

7 MR. PHARRIS: Yeah. And I -- I don't know
8 how many people are in it, the annexation specifically,
9 because it's only a partial block.

10 COMM. FOSTER: The annexation is to the west
11 of 134th?

12 MR. PHARRIS: The annexation, I believe it's
13 two parcels, one to the west of 134th and one just to
14 the east, as I recall.

15 COMM. CEIS: So can we ask the Pierce County
16 Auditor to show us the actual annexation parcels, or do
17 we have that?

18 MR. PHARRIS: Let me see if I can find that
19 here.

20 COMM. CEIS: Seventy-two people causes a
21 deviation problem for us. That's . . .

22 MR. PHARRIS: With your permission, if you'd
23 like me to look for that, I can find the map that they
24 sent us.

25 COMM. CEIS: Sure. We can look at it

1 later --

2 MR. PHARRIS: Okay.

3 COMM. CEIS: -- as you keep going through
4 things.

5 MR. PHARRIS: Moving on, then, this is a
6 suggestion from Snohomish County elections. They
7 suggest moving these eight people from the 21st into
8 the 1st District, which -- this -- this is also a
9 school-district boundary. So they're both sort of
10 reasonable boundaries. But the -- the streets would be
11 perhaps somewhat easier for them to work with since
12 they maintain addresses in street files.

13 Another suggestion from Snohomish County, there
14 are two pieces of Mill Creek. Most of Mill Creek is in
15 the -- has been assigned to the 44th District. There
16 are two pieces that are left in the 21st District.
17 It's those parts of Mill Creek -- again, this purple
18 line is the school district line -- those parts of Mill
19 Creek that are in, I believe, Edmonds School District,
20 the rest of Mill Creek being Everett School District.
21 This is one of them, which has 15 people; this is the
22 other, which has 33.

23 COMM. CEIS: Split school district. So does
24 this --

25 MR. PHARRIS: Again, these are both parts of

1 the City of Mill Creek but not in the -- the district
2 that contains the rest of Mill Creek.

3 COMM. CEIS: Are we being given the choice of
4 splitting a school district or splitting city here? Is
5 that what that is?

6 MR. PHARRIS: Yes. Well, I believe the
7 school district -- I -- I haven't looked at -- Edmonds
8 School District would definitely be split into several.

9 COMM. CEIS: They'd already be split.

10 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

11 COMM. CEIS: Yes, we did, I thought. I
12 thought that the intent was to have all of the --

13 Is this the only part of Mill Creek that's not
14 part of the 44th?

15 MR. PHARRIS: 44th, yes.

16 COMM. FOSTER: But there's two maps, right,
17 two sections?

18 MR. PHARRIS: Two sections. There --
19 there -- the other one I just showed is just north of
20 here.

21 COMM. HUFF: Nick.

22 MR. PHARRIS: Actually, no. I apologize.
23 It's just south of here.

24 COMM. HUFF: Repeat that again, Nick. I
25 didn't hear that.

1 COMM. GORTON: One has 8.

2 MR. PHARRIS: The map that I just showed you
3 is just to the south here.

4 COMM. HUFF: Okay. Thanks. Gotcha.

5 MR. PHARRIS: Okay. This is the -- another
6 suggestion from Snohomish County. The current proposed
7 boundary runs along Jones Creek, or at least where the
8 Census Bureau thinks Jones Creek is. That line as it
9 falls on the ground splits a few parcels and, the
10 County indicates, splits a house.

11 So they recommend moving the boundary to 64th
12 Avenue and running it along roadways. That would move
13 43 people from the 38th District to the 44th within
14 Marysville.

15 COMM. FOSTER: And is the blue line 64th
16 Avenue to the left?

17 MR. PHARRIS: Yes, this one highlighted by
18 the thick blue line.

19 Yeah. I apologize. That doesn't show up very
20 well on the screen.

21 COMM. CEIS: We're going to -- you know, with
22 the cumulative effect of these, 44th is going to be
23 way over. So --

24 MR. PHARRIS: It would. Yeah. 15, 48, 91
25 people.

1 COMM. GORTON: Next one's the same.

2 COMM. CEIS: Next one's the same direction?

3 Okay.

4 MR. PHARRIS: This one is again a problem
5 with the Census Bureau's city limits. The Census
6 Bureau considers this to be the limit of Everett.
7 It's -- it's -- in fact, Everett includes the right of
8 way of Interstate 5. It's just been drawn a bit too
9 wide in the Census Bureau's maps. These parcels here
10 should not be part of the City of Everett. Presumably
11 the population that was counted must be in these
12 parcels. It's another problem like the Milton problem,
13 effectively.

14 COMM. HUFF: Excuse me, Nick.

15 MR. PHARRIS: Yeah.

16 COMM. HUFF: As we go through this and these
17 numbers have changed, have we had a chance to adjust
18 the numbers to each district to see where we're over or
19 under?

20 MR. PHARRIS: I have not done that. I could
21 do that.

22 So again, these -- these two people -- yeah.
23 Snohomish County suggests using I-5, which is the
24 effective boundary of the City of Everett. These --
25 these two people are in this census block, which again

1 is misdrawn. It -- it should run along these lines
2 here, the parcel lines.

3 Another Snohomish County suggestion, the boundary
4 between the 10th and 39th is mostly running down
5 Arlington-Darrington Road. But in this little section,
6 it breaks off and falls, looks like, the -- the
7 eastbound and westbound lanes of 294th Street here,
8 trapping ten people on the other side of Arlington-
9 Darrington Road.

10 COMM. CEIS: Uh-huh.

11 MR. PHARRIS: One or two people is the
12 estimate that Snohomish County gave me. The block, in
13 fact, has ten people.

14 COMM. CEIS: Ten? Okay.

15 MR. PHARRIS: King County suggested some
16 rather more substantive changes to the boundaries. One
17 is here at the south edge of Issaquah. This 60th
18 Street was formerly a county-council line. And so
19 this -- this rectangle here is Edgehill Precinct. It
20 was necessitated by the fact that this area was trapped
21 between the City of Issaquah and a county-council line.
22 That county-council line has now moved.

23 The elections department would like to eliminate
24 Edgehill Precinct and merge it into the precinct to the
25 south. But obviously if there a legislative district

1 line there, they can't do that. This would involve
2 moving 81 people from the 41st into the 5th District.

3 COMM. CEIS: So the green line represents
4 what they're --

5 COMM. GORTON: What we do, I guess.

6 COMM. CEIS: No. I think that's what --

7 Is that represent what the County's asking us to
8 do?

9 MR. PHARRIS: To move, yes.

10 COMM. CEIS: To take that area and move it
11 into the 5th from --

12 And where's the municipal boundary?

13 MR. PHARRIS: The municipal boundary runs
14 along the north edge of that polygon.

15 COMM. CEIS: So that green line is the
16 municipal boundary.

17 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

18 COMM. CEIS: Really?

19 MR. PHARRIS: Yes. Or as close to it as the
20 Census Bureau could get.

21 COMM. CEIS: One wonders if that's truly the
22 municipal boundary.

23 COMM. GORTON: They have some wild lines.

24 COMM. CEIS: Yeah, in that area, too.

25 COMM. GORTON: Next one looks like the same

1 thing.

2 MR. PHARRIS: Right. The next one is
3 effectively the same thing. This is an area trapped
4 between the City -- the edge of the City of Sammamish.
5 And I believe this is an existing precinct boundary,
6 but it would -- it would be -- they would be able to
7 eliminate this precinct and merge it into the
8 neighboring one if there were not a legislative
9 boundary running along here.

10 I can tell you, these blocks are not only outside
11 the City of Sammamish but also outside its urban growth
12 area. So they would not be expected to be annexed any
13 time soon.

14 Again, this would move 66 people -- and that is
15 for both -- both of these areas together -- from the
16 41st into the 5th District.

17 COMM. GORTON: That should affect that.

18 COMM. CEIS: Makes you wonder who drew these
19 municipal boundaries and urban-growth boundaries.

20 COMM. GORTON: Uh-huh.

21 COMM. CEIS: We know who drew the urban-
22 growth boundaries.

23 MR. PHARRIS: These are several areas along
24 the edge of the City of Redmond which were cut off from
25 the rest of the city by an existing legislative or

1 congressional line; it escapes me at the moment. These
2 are -- this was the Redmond city limits back in 2001,
3 when the current lines were drawn. It has since
4 annexed across that line in these several locations.

5 All of the people are, in fact, in this section
6 here; this section and this section have no people.
7 The total for the three -- I'm really meaning the
8 population up here -- is 79 people.

9 COMM. GORTON: So the red area is
10 unincorporated?

11 MR. PHARRIS: The red -- the red outside of
12 these blue polygons is unincorporated, yes.

13 COMM. GORTON: Okay.

14 MR. PHARRIS: The -- the corporate boundary
15 is this yellow line, which is somewhat difficult to see
16 against the blue.

17 COMM. GORTON: Well, two of them, easy. They
18 aren't really people.

19 MR. PHARRIS: So leaving these areas in the
20 45th District would necessitate having a precinct, or
21 potentially three, for these areas.

22 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

23 COMM. FOSTER: Does a precinct have to be
24 created if there's no population in it?

25 MR. PHARRIS: Technically, it does.

1 COMM. FOSTER: It does?

2 MR. PHARRIS: Yeah.

3 COMM. GORTON: Certainly little --

4 COMM. CEIS: Yeah.

5 COMM. GORTON: -- that one later.

6 COMM. CEIS: Need to figure out the
7 population shift.

8 MR. PHARRIS: This is a -- an area in, I
9 believe, the newly annexed portion of Kirkland, the
10 north part of the city. The proposed legislative line
11 runs along Juanita Creek up to 122nd Street. As you
12 can see, this indication of Juanita Creek is rather
13 schematic and probably not very accurate.

14 King County suggests moving the boundary down to
15 120th Place, which is more easily definable for them.
16 This would move 124 people from the 45th into the 1st
17 District.

18 THE REPORTER: Nick, could you slow down when
19 you say the names of places?

20 MR. PHARRIS: Ah.

21 THE REPORTER: Thank you.

22 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

23 COMM. CEIS: And the municipal boundary is
24 where?

25 MR. PHARRIS: There's no municipal boundary

1 at issue here. It's simply that creek splits several
2 parcels.

3 COMM. CEIS: I'm misunderstanding. I thought
4 you said this was -- had been part of an annexation.

5 MR. PHARRIS: No. I apologize. I was just
6 giving the location of the area.

7 This is within -- I believe it's within the newly
8 annexed part of Kirkland.

9 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

10 MR. PHARRIS: I believe that was June of this
11 year.

12 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. Right.

13 MR. PHARRIS: This is in the same general
14 area, the sort of Juanita-Kingsgate area. This is the
15 new north boundary of the City of Kirkland. City of
16 Kirkland will not be annexing any further up here.
17 This is in Bothell's potential annexation area, I
18 believe. And if these 142 people were moved into the
19 1st District, the County would not have to create a
20 precinct for these blocks.

21 COMM. CEIS: So again we're adding about 300
22 people to -- these two moves?

23 COMM. GORTON: The 1st. Yeah.

24 COMM. CEIS: Yeah.

25 MR. PHARRIS: This is again a poorly drawn

1 creek bed probably, or it may actually be accurate.
2 But either way, it splits a number of parcels over
3 here. This is the proposed leg line. This is actually
4 a nonvisible boundary that simply strikes through
5 several parcels.

6 The County suggests moving the boundary to over to
7 be streets 312th Avenue, 180th place, 318th way.
8 This would be out kind of east of Woodinville, I
9 believe.

10 COMM. CEIS: 45th is going to be way under.

11 MR. PHARRIS: Again, moving territory out of
12 the 45th District.

13 COMM. CEIS: Yep. Okay.

14 MR. PHARRIS: This one -- I apologize. The
15 light blue highlight is difficult to see against the
16 green.

17 The proposed line, which is an existing precinct
18 line, runs along here, 132nd Street, up Odell Road to
19 139th, up 322nd to Kelly Road. This is an existing
20 precinct boundary. And the County is proposing keeping
21 that as a precinct boundary, and -- which would
22 necessitate moving 385 people from the 5th into the
23 45th District.

24 COMM. FOSTER: This is solely based on this
25 being a precinct line? There's no cities involved in

1 this one, or . . . ?

2 MR. PHARRIS: Right, no city boundaries.

3 COMM. FOSTER: School districts, or . . . ?

4 MR. PHARRIS: Basically for convenience,
5 based on the existing precinct line and the fact that
6 this line does slice through some parcels.

7 COMM. CEIS: Yes. But you could move that
8 line over to the road, could you not?

9 MR. PHARRIS: I am not --

10 COMM. GORTON: Right where that yellow arrow
11 is --

12 COMM. CEIS: Right where your yellow arrow
13 is --

14 COMM. GORTON: -- by that road?

15 COMM. CEIS: Yes.

16 MR. PHARRIS: Probably. I suspect that --

17 COMM. CEIS: And then they -- they can deal
18 with precinct issues themselves.

19 MR. PHARRIS: Yeah.

20 COMM. GORTON: I think that's a great --

21 COMM. FOSTER: 385 people is almost a
22 precinct, anyway.

23 COMM. CEIS: It is a precinct. A lot of
24 areas it is.

25 COMM. FOSTER: Yeah.

1 MR. PHARRIS: This is a small scrap of the
2 City of Tukwila. There -- there are two. I'll show
3 the other one in a second. That it is basically
4 trapped on the wrong side of the boundary between the
5 33rd and 11th District.

6 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. I think we . . .

7 MR. PHARRIS: There are actually three.
8 There's a sizeable chunk of Tukwila that was assigned
9 to the 33rd District and then two additional small
10 scraps, this one with 34 people, this one with 31. And
11 the County is requesting that those two scraps be moved
12 into the 11th District. Again yellow line here is
13 the SeaTac-Tukwila city limits.

14 I didn't get a chance to include it. There is
15 also a pending annexation to the south end of Tukwila
16 that is currently assigned to the 33rd, and it make
17 sense to move it into the 11th. I communicated this
18 to the staff earlier and sent them the relevant
19 shapefiles.

20 COMM. FOSTER: How big is the pending
21 annexation and when?

22 MR. PHARRIS: Twenty-three people. And I
23 don't believe they've set effective date yet.

24 COMM. FOSTER: There's a lot of pending
25 annexations going on around the state.

1 MR. PHARRIS: This is again the boundary of
2 the area Commissioners Gorton and Ceis drew districts
3 for.

4 COMM. GORTON: What's -- what's the white
5 district?

6 MR. PHARRIS: That is the undistricted area
7 that would presumably end up in the 31st District.
8 It has not been assigned.

9 COMM. GORTON: It's an omission?

10 MR. PHARRIS: Pardon?

11 COMM. GORTON: It's an omission? It's not in
12 a district?

13 COMM. CEIS: We didn't draw the 31st.

14 COMM. GORTON: Oh, that's right.

15 MR. PHARRIS: Right.

16 COMM. CEIS: This is the area where we've got
17 to reconcile the maps.

18 COMM. GORTON: Oh.

19 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

20 King County's problem with this line is that this
21 is a parcel line, not a -- not a street. Streets are
22 easier for them to use. So they recommend extending
23 the 30th District out to F Street here. This appears
24 to be part of the City of Auburn. That would move 577
25 people into the 30th District.

1 Another recommendation from King County, this line
2 here, a nonvisible boundary, and this line here, both
3 slice through several parcels. The County recommends
4 moving the line up to 212th Avenue and
5 Covington-Sawyer Road.

6 Moving -- making that change would move 128 people
7 from the 47th into the 5th District. It would be
8 possible. It appears to move only this block at the
9 east end and this in the south, which would put the
10 boundary along a street here.

11 COMM. CEIS: It follows a street now, though.

12 MR. PHARRIS: Parts the boundary follow
13 streets. This is not a street.

14 COMM. CEIS: Okay. That's a parcel?

15 MR. PHARRIS: Yeah, and here. And, in fact,
16 it's cutting through parcels.

17 COMM. CEIS: I see. We could minimize it
18 by . . .

19 MR. PHARRIS: You could move the boundary up
20 to here and along this road here.

21 COMM. CEIS: And minimize the population
22 shift.

23 MR. PHARRIS: This is a nearby area. Again
24 this is a nonvisible boundary that may be difficult for
25 the County to define, and this, as well, at the west

1 end. The County recommends using -- continuing the
2 boundary along 304th Street near the city limits of
3 Black Diamond. This would move 57 people from the
4 47th to the 5th.

5 COMM. CEIS: This might offset this if we --

6 COMM. GORTON: Yeah. (Indiscernible).

7 COMM. FOSTER: The nonvisible boundary that
8 you just mentioned is something that the Census Bureau
9 uses.

10 MR. PHARRIS: Uh-huh.

11 COMM. FOSTER: And how do they describe it?
12 Do they describe an extension of Southeast 202nd
13 Place, 700 feet west, or --

14 MR. PHARRIS: They -- they don't describe it.
15 They simply categorize it as a nonvisible boundary.
16 Covers a multitude of sins. And there are a multitude
17 of nonvisible boundaries in the state.

18 And we have some concrete suggestions from Rick
19 DeWitt, who came and testified for us a couple of days
20 ago. The first is a recommendation to move the
21 boundary between the 44th and 39th Districts in
22 Snohomish County to the Snohomish River rather than
23 stranding six people on the other side. This would
24 move six people, again, from the 39th to the 44th.

25 COMM. CEIS: Tough to do.

1 COMM. FOSTER: Snohomish River?

2 MR. PHARRIS: I believe this is the Snohomish
3 River, yes.

4 COMM. FOSTER: Isn't that what we read about
5 all the time that changes its boundaries every time it
6 rains?

7 COMM. GORTON: I don't think the Snohomish
8 changes.

9 MR. PHARRIS: Mr. Dewitt indicated that it is
10 a well-recognizable landmark and would make a good
11 boundary.

12 COMM. FOSTER: Okay.

13 MR. PHARRIS: Mr. Dewitt -- oh, this is
14 another small change. This actually involves no
15 people. He recommends, rather than using this straight
16 line, running the boundary between the 1st and 44th
17 Districts along Puget Park Drive.

18 Similarly, that same straight line extends through
19 this neighborhood. And Mr. Dewitt would prefer to move
20 the line down here. Actually, in his suggestion that
21 he sent to us, he wanted to use Silver Firs Drive, and
22 I believe this is 156th Street. But, in fact, those
23 roads are so new that the Census Bureau does not have
24 them correctly in there. They should actually be
25 running through this right of way here, but the Census

1 Bureau --

2 COMM. CEIS: This --

3 MR. PHARRIS: -- does not have them in their
4 databases right.

5 COMM. CEIS: So our -- our line is just
6 cutting through parcels right there, right?

7 MR. PHARRIS: It is an existing precinct line
8 that cuts through a bunch of parcels here, yes.

9 COMM. CEIS: So what we could do is make some
10 minor adjustments, could we not, down to Puget Park
11 Drive there, 148 Street Southeast over there, and shift
12 back a couple of things --

13 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

14 COMM. CEIS: -- those roadways?

15 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

16 COMM. CEIS: Could you do that for us as an
17 alternative to this?

18 MR. PHARRIS: Sure.

19 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

20 MR. PHARRIS: The problem is -- I -- I did
21 look at that. The problem is that the west end, what
22 to do with this line. This is not a gridded
23 neighborhood. A lot of the streets do not connect up.
24 And it's difficult to find suitable boundaries. But
25 I -- certainly, if you wanted to keep this line, you

1 could at least ameliorate the problem by --

2 COMM. GORTON: I think that's what we'd ask
3 you to do.

4 MR. PHARRIS: Okay. Sure.

5 COMM. CEIS: And this is an existing precinct
6 boundary, though, the current white line that you have
7 up there, correct?

8 MR. PHARRIS: That is correct, yes.

9 COMM. FOSTER: We're really put between a
10 rock and a hard place in some of -- with creative
11 developers and cul de sacs, and . . .

12 MR. PHARRIS: It's true. And it --

13 COMM. FOSTER: Just looking at this map --

14 MR. PHARRIS: Yeah.

15 COMM. FOSTER: -- you see what the problem is
16 between --

17 COMM. CEIS: Developers should follow
18 precinct lines. What are they thinking?

19 COMM. FOSTER: Maybe counties ought to set
20 that up as a --

21 MR. PHARRIS: Yeah. And it can create some
22 very large blocks, as well, which are very unwieldy to
23 kind of move around.

24 COMM. FOSTER: Yeah.

25 MR. PHARRIS: Mr. Dewitt also suggests that

1 the boundary between the 38th and 44th Districts in
2 Marysville would be better following major roads, in
3 this case in particular, 67th Avenue Northeast and
4 52nd Street Northeast. This would move 240 people
5 from the 44th to the 38th District.

6 COMM. HUFF: Oh, yes.

7 MR. PHARRIS: Similarly Mr. Dewitt would
8 prefer to move a large chunk of Marysville into the
9 38th District following 84th Street Northeast,
10 eastward to State Highway 9, and south to 64th Street
11 Northeast. would move 474 people from the 39th to
12 the 38th District and 5,767 people from the 44th to
13 the 38th District.

14 COMM. HUFF: Nick, I forget. who is Rick
15 Dewitt related to, or is he an auditor?

16 MR. PHARRIS: He is not an auditor, no.
17 He's -- he's a member of the public, a citizen who came
18 and testified here a few days ago. He essentially --
19 this is a sort of good-government recommendation that
20 you follow major transportation routes.

21 COMM. CEIS: Good --

22 MR. PHARRIS: Mr. Dewitt also made the same
23 observation I showed you earlier that Snohomish County
24 had that these two little sections of Mill Creek that
25 are cut off by the school-district boundary ought to be

1 part of the 44th District along with the rest of Mill
2 Creek.

3 COMM. GORTON: Oh, yeah. We've already seen
4 this one.

5 MR. PHARRIS: Yes, we've seen this one
6 before.

7 Another part of Mr. DeWitt's recommendations are
8 that we -- that the Commission straighten out the
9 boundary between the 38th, 21st, and 44th
10 Districts along Interstate 5. To that -- to that end,
11 he would move the portion of the 38th District that
12 is east of Interstate 5 in this area into the 44th
13 District. That's 3,889 people from 38 to 44. If you
14 move this area northwest of Mill Creek out of the
15 44th district and into the 21st --

16 COMM. CEIS: Can you back up -- I'm sorry.

17 MR. PHARRIS: Yeah.

18 COMM. CEIS: -- to the previous one.

19 COMM. GORTON: Is that area east of I-5 --
20 that's part of the City of Everett, isn't it?

21 MR. PHARRIS: It is part of the City of
22 Everett. It would introduce a city split, yes.

23 COMM. CEIS: So that -- that is the municipal
24 boundary we followed?

25 MR. PHARRIS: It is close to the municipal

1 boundary. This yellow line here is the municipal
2 boundary. I believe the rest of it does follow the
3 Everett city limits, yes.

4 COMM. CEIS: So do you -- so can you give us
5 an alternative that fixes the municipal-boundary
6 element of it?

7 MR. PHARRIS: That moves just the area
8 outside --

9 COMM. CEIS: Yes.

10 MR. PHARRIS: -- of the city limits.

11 COMM. CEIS: Yes.

12 MR. PHARRIS: -- into the 44th?

13 COMM. CEIS: Yes.

14 COMM. FOSTER: Yeah.

15 MR. PHARRIS: I spoke to Mr. DeWitt on the
16 phone to -- to clarify his positions on these. He
17 actually was actively in favor of including a portion
18 of the City of Everett into the 44th District.

19 COMM. CEIS: I know he was.

20 MR. PHARRIS: (Indiscernible).

21 COMM. CEIS: But we're trying to respect --

22 MR. PHARRIS: Right.

23 COMM. CEIS: -- municipal boundaries.

24 MR. PHARRIS: Right.

25 COMM. CEIS: I mean, we can discuss that

1 alternatively when it comes up.

2 MR. PHARRIS: Right.

3 I've gone over this one. Again, this is another
4 arm of the City of Everett, actually part of the same
5 one. But this part has been assigned to the 21st
6 District. Mr. DeWitt recommends that it be moved into
7 the 44th District since it lies east of Interstate 5.
8 This area contains 4,785 people.

9 COMM. CEIS: Again, that's the municipal
10 boundary of Everett, correct?

11 MR. PHARRIS: That is the Everett city
12 limits, yes, the current proposal is following.

13 COMM. CEIS: Did Mr. DeWitt talk to the City
14 of Everett about fixing their boundaries?

15 MR. PHARRIS: He did not. He indicates,
16 however, that the City of Everett -- and this is true.
17 The City of Everett has been annexing piecemeal all
18 through here. So wherever you put the boundary, it's
19 not going to be the Everett city limits for very long.

20 COMM. HUFF: Moving river.

21 MR. PHARRIS: This is to indicate the final
22 effect of Mr. DeWitt's proposals. This is the area
23 that's been moved into the 38th District in
24 Marysville. The dashed black line is the proposed --
25 the line proposed by the Commission.

1 And then farther south in Everett and just north
2 of Mill Creek, this area would move from the 44th to
3 the 21st, this area from the 21st to the 44th,
4 and this area from the 38th to the 44th.

5 I did actually run these numbers through
6 autoBound, and I can give you the -- the final
7 deviations. That's just with Mr. Dewitt's proposed
8 changes, none of the others. The 1st District ends up
9 down 927 people, 927 short of the ideal population.
10 The 21st District ends up 2,732 short of the ideal
11 population. The 38th District ends up 2,641 higher
12 than ideal. 39th ends up 528 short of the ideal
13 population. And the 44th ends up 1,624 people too
14 high.

15 COMM. GORTON: That's incredible. Jeez.

16 MR. PHARRIS: And finally, I have some
17 recommendations from King County Elections to try to
18 reconcile the proposed legislative and congressional
19 lines to avoid having small areas trapped in between
20 them.

21 Again, in case the audience is not aware, no
22 precinct, no voting precinct, may cross a legislative,
23 a congressional, a county-council or commission, or a
24 city-limit line. So if there's an area trapped between
25 a congressional and legislative line, it will have to

1 be its own precinct, even if it's very small.

2 And one example is here along Madison Street in
3 Seattle. The congressional -- the proposed
4 congressional line runs straight down Madison Street,
5 and the proposed legislative line between the 43rd
6 and 37th jogs away from it for one -- sort of about a
7 third of a city block, including 21 people. And they
8 recommend that these 21 people be moved from the 43rd
9 into the 37th to reconcile those two lines.

10 COMM. FOSTER: That the existing line now?

11 MR. PHARRIS: That may be. I believe there
12 is a jog in this area in the current plan. But there
13 is no congressional line running through there now.

14 COMM. CEIS: Hmm. Is there anything else
15 besides people in that triangle?

16 MR. PHARRIS: I -- I don't know.

17 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

18 MR. PHARRIS: This again, the orange line
19 with the black kind of outline, is the proposed
20 congressional line, and the colors are showing the
21 proposed legislative lines. King County proposes to
22 move this unpopulated block from the 5th into the
23 41st District to harmonize with the proposed
24 congressional line.

25 I would actually recommend a different course.

1 This is actually the urban-growth-area boundary for the
2 City of Sammamish. This area here is a recent
3 annexation to Sammamish that does not follow census-
4 block lines. So to include the entire area, these
5 blocks that top over the line were included in the
6 41st District.

7 I would recommend that the boundary between the
8 41st and 5th District be moved out to the urban-
9 growth boundary for the City of Sammamish, which would
10 prevent the City from, you know, annexing across this
11 line in the future.

12 COMM. GORTON: Is that still a zero
13 population?

14 MR. PHARRIS: There are no people in this
15 area; that's correct.

16 Another area that King County identified some
17 areas trapped between legislative and congressional
18 lines is in the east -- the area east of Renton. They
19 recommend moving the legislative line between the
20 11th and 5th Districts in this area to match the
21 congressional line, again shown in orange here. This
22 would move 322 people from the 5th to the 11th
23 District.

24 And this is in the same area --

25 COMM. FOSTER: Were we not to do that, there

1 would then be a precinct there with a total population
2 of 322 and probably --

3 MR. PHARRIS: That is --

4 COMM. FOSTER: -- 150 registered voters.

5 MR. PHARRIS: That's correct.

6 COMM. FOSTER: Thanks.

7 MR. PHARRIS: Again, here the County
8 recommends using the congressional line, which runs
9 along here, and moving the legislative line to match,
10 which would move 85 people from the 11th into the 5th
11 District.

12 Looking at this, I would actually differ with
13 them. I think they're better off going with the
14 legislative line since this is a recently annexed
15 portion of the City of Renton, which again does not
16 follow census-block boundaries. Using the
17 congressional line would cut off this very small area
18 of the City of Renton and force creation of a precinct
19 there.

20 If this were all included in both the -- I believe
21 this is probably the 9th and 8th -- the 9th
22 Congressional District and the 11th Legislative
23 District, then this would be a small precinct, but not
24 as small as this one would be if it were cut off by
25 this line here.

1 COMM. CEIS: So not being terribly familiar
2 with the rules around precincts, can't they --
3 something that small, can't they combine it with a
4 neighboring precinct?

5 MR. PHARRIS: They can't because the precinct
6 is not supposed to cross a municipal boundary.

7 COMM. CEIS: Precinct adjacent to it, that's
8 in the City of Renton, isn't it?

9 MR. PHARRIS: No.

10 COMM. CEIS: No?

11 MR. PHARRIS: So the Redmond -- Renton city
12 limits run along here. If this line were used, the
13 orange line, this area of Renton would be completely
14 cut off from the rest of the city.

15 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

16 MR. PHARRIS: This is another difficult area
17 as -- as the City has been annexing piecemeal a lot
18 in -- in this area.

19 And that's all I had for you today.

20 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. I do have a couple
21 of comments sort of relevant to the discussion that
22 have come in. And I'm -- if there's any of the maps
23 here, I couldn't find them. So you're going to have to
24 do it for me.

25 But the first is from Dave Valiant who said, "The

1 puyallup annexation is composed of around 20 parcels.
2 It currently contains 6 residences but will be
3 redeveloped. A portion of this annexation is zoned
4 medium to high density residential."

5 COMM. CEIS: Doesn't matter.

6 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: And then there was --

7 COMM. FOSTER: When -- when is it? Did he
8 say when it's going to happen?

9 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Um . . .

10 MR. PHARRIS: January 1, 2012.

11 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Is that when it is?
12 Okay.

13 MR. PHARRIS: Two days.

14 COMM. CEIS: The annexation -- we don't care
15 about future development.

16 COMM. FOSTER: We have this one in here?

17 COMM. CEIS: We care about what the
18 population is today.

19 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I don't know. Do we have
20 anything in here that they can look at?

21 MR. PHARRIS: Yes. This is slide 13.

22 COMM. CEIS: Right. We just don't know -- we
23 don't have the exact boundary of the actual annexation,
24 though, do we?

25 MR. PHARRIS: We know where the boundary is,

1 but it doesn't follow census-block boundaries.

2 COMM. CEIS: I see. Of course not.

3 COMM. FOSTER: Yeah.

4 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: And then there was a
5 comment from Mary Johnson-Hall of Pierce County. And
6 she said, "Regarding the census error in
7 Milton/Edgewood border. Would it be possible for you
8 to add something to the redistricting plan narrative
9 that would allow to correct the census error."

10 And I don't know that that -- what --

11 COMM. GORTON: I don't think the Census
12 Bureau's going to listen to us.

13 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I don't think so. But I
14 don't -- I don't -- anyway --

15 COMM. FOSTER: Well, we --

16 COMM. CEIS: I don't know. When Gary Locke
17 was (indiscernible) --

18 COMM. GORTON: (Indiscernible).

19 COMM. FOSTER: If that means -- if that's
20 that means adding a -- an asterisk to our plan that
21 says, "we're going to take an area of 400 feet square
22 and put it in this district," I don't see why we
23 couldn't do that. We could describe it some way which
24 would be contrary to what the census people say. But I
25 don't know that that would necessarily change what they

1 do.

2 COMM. CEIS: No. It's not going to change
3 their mind. But that's their problem ten years from
4 now.

5 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Those are the only
6 comments that came in that were sort of relevant --
7 directly relevant to this discussion.

8 MR. PHARRIS: It -- it would even be possible
9 to describe that area as "the portion of block whatever
10 lying within the City of Milton."

11 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. Yeah, that makes sense.
12 Okay.

13 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. Um . . .

14 COMM. CEIS: So what --

15 COMM. GORTON: How do we deal with this?

16 COMM. CEIS: Yes. That was going to be my
17 question, too: How are we going to start dealing with
18 these? Anybody have any great ideas on that?

19 COMM. FOSTER: What we -- what we don't have
20 here is -- is sort of population reconciliations.

21 COMM. HUFF: Exactly.

22 COMM. FOSTER: And the further we got in the
23 packet -- I was pretty comfortable with the first 20
24 pages where we were dealing with three and four and two
25 and zero. And but when we get to those big ones --

1 COMM. CEIS: Yes.

2 COMM. FOSTER: -- I think we need to do some
3 balancing. The balancing that we received from
4 Mr. Dewitt that -- his entire package clearly causes
5 major problems.

6 COMM. GORTON: It's way off. Yeah.

7 COMM. FOSTER: And --

8 COMM. CEIS: So I'm wondering if we could
9 delegate some of this and then have a consent package
10 brought back to us that we could deal with as a whole.
11 And then the ones that are not consent we can deal with
12 individually as a commission. Would that makes sense?

13 COMM. HUFF: Yeah. I would agree with that.

14 COMM. FOSTER: Yeah, me, too.

15 COMM. GORTON: (Indiscernible).

16 COMM. FOSTER: We can at least knock some of
17 these off.

18 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Yeah.

19 COMM. GORTON: But can't -- I think we can do
20 that right now. We can knock -- we can probably take
21 care of a good half of them by going through these ones
22 that are very -- that are zero or very small.

23 COMM. CEIS: Right. I -- there may be some
24 other ones, though, that could actually be done, as
25 well, as part of a consent package that may seem large,

1 but combined with a couple others that were in here,
2 might --

3 COMM. GORTON: Okay.

4 COMM. CEIS: -- actually might balance
5 themselves out. If we delegated that to Nick and a
6 representative from each of us to work with Nick on,
7 perhaps that would get us --

8 COMM. GORTON: Okay. All right.

9 COMM. CEIS: -- through it quicker.

10 COMM. GORTON: Right.

11 COMM. HUFF: That's fine with me.

12 MR. PHARRIS: All right. Sounds good.

13 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: All right. So each one
14 of you are just going to delegate somebody and just --
15 they'll just work as a team and then bring that back to
16 us.

17 COMM. CEIS: I don't know how to do that.

18 Yeah.

19 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. Great.

20 Okay. So what's your pleasure for moving forward?

21 It is about ten after 12:00 right now.

22 COMM. CEIS: well, we're still stuck
23 obviously in eastern washington on the legislative map.
24 we still have those outstanding issues to deal with.

25 COMM. HUFF: Yes, I -- I agree with that.

1 And I -- you know, we've been working together. And
2 we're sort of at loggerheads now.

3 I'd like to propose looking at Dean Foster's most
4 recent map that he shared with me. We never really got
5 to discuss it for -- for whatever reason. And so,
6 therefore, I would like to present that to the group to
7 look at.

8 And it increases the hispanic number considerably.
9 It takes it up to 53.76, and -- and people of color
10 would go up to 59.37, remembering that currently we are
11 at -- I was at 50.61, and the -- the current
12 population, of course, is, like I said, 47.6, the
13 current hispanic population.

14 Now, we're dealing with a hispanic district, and
15 that would be the 15th. And I would -- the maps are
16 available for distribution, are they not, to the public
17 as well as the commissioners? Dean has seen it. I've
18 seen it. Probably the rest of you have not seen it.

19 And I would move that we accept this. This would
20 clear up eastern washington, and we could move on to
21 doing what we're -- start doing today's cleaning up
22 some of the other items. And officially move that we
23 accept his map.

24 COMM. FOSTER: Well --

25 COMM. HUFF: The reason we haven't discussed

1 it much -- I'm sorry -- is because that's sort of when
2 the wheels came off. He -- Dean didn't like my
3 proposal, which I will admit was sort of an unusual
4 proposal because we were swinging 15 and 14 opposite
5 each other. And in order to get 15's hispanic count
6 up, you had to go in other counties. And that -- that
7 was what Dean was concerned about and disliked. And
8 consequently that's why we're here today. So that's my
9 motion.

10 COMM. CEIS: Yeah.

11 COMM. FOSTER: I put a map on the table on
12 December 28th, which is not this map. We -- when
13 Commissioner Huff and I discussed eastern Washington,
14 we had a lot of maps in front of us. But the one that
15 I brought to the Commission on the 28th is the one
16 that's on the board now.

17 And if you would like to have me amend your motion
18 to have this map accepted, then I would do that. Or if
19 you want to have a vote on your -- your proposal of --
20 then I'm happy to vote "no" on that.

21 COMM. HUFF: well, ironically, you take --
22 the next map took up to 61.46 versus 47.61, and that's
23 an increase of virtually 10 percent, 12 percent,
24 13 percent, people of color up to 10.96. It doesn't
25 reflect the population there.

1 And -- and, therefore, I couldn't accept your
2 amendment. And I would prefer voting on my -- my
3 suggestion that we -- we -- yours was certainly more
4 fair and equitable. I didn't want to go that high
5 because population numbers don't indicate that.
6 Certainly trends may indicate that four years from now,
7 six years from now, eight years from now. But it
8 certainly doesn't reflect that today.

9 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I've just got a question
10 as far as -- I'm not sure whether we're ready for a
11 motion --

12 COMM. HUFF: I'm ready for a motion.

13 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: -- at this point.

14 COMM. CEIS: He's made the motion.

15 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: well, I know, but -- but,
16 you know, we're talking about accepting a partial map,
17 and I don't know -- so as a point of information for
18 Rusty, I don't know whether we can -- 'cause usually --

19 COMM. GORTON: well, we've got two full maps.

20 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Hmm?

21 COMM. GORTON: You've got two full
22 alternatives for eastern Washington, this one and
23 Dean's.

24 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: well, then Tim presented
25 one.

1 COMM. CEIS: I --

2 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I guess I'm -- I'm a
3 little bit -- I just want to clarify what we're -- what
4 we're -- what we're doing there.

5 COMM. CEIS: I'm presuming Mr. Huff is asking
6 us to approve this as the eastern Washington
7 legislative map.

8 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

9 COMM. HUFF: What Mr. Ceis is 100 percent
10 right, yes.

11 COMM. GORTON: And Dean proposed an
12 alternative to it.

13 COMM. CEIS: And Tom did not accept his
14 friendly amendment. So we have a motion on the floor.
15 Tom, is that correct?

16 COMM. HUFF: Yes.

17 COMM. CEIS: You have a motion.

18 COMM. HUFF: That's exactly right. Yes.

19 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay.

20 COMM. HUFF: Because they're entirely
21 different maps. I mean, Dean's second map changes
22 everything that we've talked about. It's a complete
23 contrary map to what we've been discussing and what we
24 basically arrived at. What we're looking at in this
25 map here is pretty much what we -- where we've been

1 with the exception of -- we didn't get 14 and 15 in
2 place. We had everything else in place.

3 COMM. FOSTER: What Commissioner Huff
4 continues to refer to as the conversations that he and
5 I had up until a couple days ago when I believe that
6 the latest offer that he gave me was unacceptable and I
7 chose to recommend to this commission that we view it
8 as -- as a commission rather than the two of us because
9 my words were that "we're at impasse." Commissioner
10 Huff disagreed with that. But at that point I believed
11 we're at impasse. It appears like we still are.

12 COMM. HUFF: Well, interesting thing about
13 this whole procedure is that we did the same procedure
14 for western Washington as we're doing in eastern
15 Washington. And we used a similar pattern that the
16 senators -- or Senate did with the areas from King
17 County north.

18 So now all of a sudden we get down to the very
19 end, and -- and we sort of changed the game rules. As
20 you can compare Dean's first map with his second map,
21 they're entirely different. If you compare -- looking
22 at my map here, this -- and maps that we used are very,
23 very similar with the exception of one that I exchanged
24 with -- with Dean the other day. And, of course, I --
25 I would agree that it turned out to be sort of an ugly

1 looking 14, 15 for the simple standpoint to arrive at
2 the correct Hispanic numbers and -- and people of
3 color.

4 So we're really talking about apples and oranges.
5 We're not talking about the same plan that we've been
6 working for for weeks.

7 You know, this commission's been working on -- on
8 redoing redistricting since January. We spent millions
9 of dollars of -- in the process, and now we're
10 crosswise the railroad track because we can't overcome
11 one particular area of the state.

12 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Well, I guess my sort of
13 confusion -- 'cause this one is a little bit different
14 than what we have had, you know, where we've had
15 consensus from the teams being just brought in as -- as
16 maps. We haven't really accepted any of the other ones
17 or voted on any of the other ones at this point. And
18 so that's why I'm sort of struggling a little bit here
19 with a motion --

20 COMM. HUFF: Chairman Lura --

21 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: -- on something where we
22 haven't had on any of the others. So that's -- that's
23 my question.

24 COMM. HUFF: That's correct.

25 COMM. FOSTER: I just think we ought to vote

1 on this motion. I think it's an appropriate motion. I
2 don't see any reason not to vote on it. That -- that's
3 what we have a commission about. There -- there will
4 be -- there may be other motions, to --

5 COMM. GORTON: Sure.

6 COMM. FOSTER: -- declare plans. And so I --
7 I think we ought to honor Commissioners Huff -- Huff's
8 motion and vote on it.

9 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: well, we can certainly do
10 what you all --

11 COMM. CEIS: That's fine.

12 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: -- would like to do.

13 COMM. CEIS: That's fine.

14 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. We have a motion
15 on the floor to accept, it looks like, its Draft
16 Legislative Plan 1228A. Is that a reasonable
17 description?

18 COMM. HUFF: well, it's 12/28 is basically
19 what it . . .

20 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Yeah, 12/28.

21 COMM. HUFF: And it's speaks for the date.

22 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: So the motion is to
23 accept this plan. Are you ready for the question?

24 All those in favor say "aye."

25 COMM. HUFF: Aye.

1 COMM. GORTON: Aye.

2 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Opposed?

3 COMM. CEIS: No.

4 COMM. FOSTER: No.

5 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I can't break a tie,
6 guys. So we're -- does not pass.

7 COMM. CEIS: well, I don't know if this will
8 bring clarity or not or will help the process or not.
9 But I am going to make another proposal to see if we
10 can help spur discussion.

11 Nick, do you have that up?

12 This one is dated today so not to be confused with
13 yesterday.

14 Okay. Here it is in its entirety. I'm not going
15 to take a lot of time on this. You're familiar with a
16 lot of it. The 15th District, which we have been
17 spending a lot of time discussing, is the same 15th
18 District that was proposed by Commissioner Foster in
19 his 12/28 proposal to this Commission. It is just over
20 60 percent latino and about 67 percent total minority,
21 I believe. It provides us with very compact and
22 contiguous boundaries. It respects communities of
23 interest economically, geographically, ethnically,
24 racially. And I think that we discussed it quite a bit
25 to this point.

1 That's for you.

2 what we haven't seen is -- if we can go up to the
3 Spokane area. Open up the Spokane area. This is a
4 revised map of Spokane County. And I drew this based
5 on feedback we received from the public that we have
6 all had a chance, I hope, to review 'cause it's been
7 quite significant feedback we've received, as well as
8 some comments I -- I've heard from Commissioner Gorton
9 about communities of interest south of Cheney,
10 particularly the agricultural interests south of
11 Cheney, wanting to be part of the 9th.

12 And then the other comments we've heard quite a
13 bit of in the testimony that was provided to us by
14 e-mail was the desire of Airway Heights, Medical Lake,
15 and Cheney to be part of a single district, the
16 6th District. I thought it was quite informative that
17 the mayor of Airway Heights informed us that those
18 three cities are actually working closely together on
19 agreements related to services and growth and see a
20 real value to being in the same legislative district so
21 their joint agenda can be pursued by their legislative
22 representatives.

23 I think the other advantage of this map is it does
24 represent -- it does recognize the urban and rural
25 differences that are very apparent in Spokane County.

1 Nick, if could you go -- there's, I believe, a
2 Google Earth file on there.

3 You can see -- you can see the urban areas of
4 Spokane County from this Google Earth file that they
5 are the grayer areas and the municipal areas. And what
6 we've done, I think, with this map -- what I tried to
7 achieve is putting those communities of interest
8 together, the urban and suburban, and trying to keep
9 the more rural areas in the 9th and the 7th. As --
10 again, as we saw from many of the comments we've
11 received online, that has been a concern, as well, that
12 the rural areas do not see themselves particularly
13 aligned with the urban areas of Spokane.

14 So I'm offering this as an alternative to what
15 we've been discussing to date up in Spokane County.
16 Again, as I said, I've incorporated the Foster proposal
17 for the 15th, and we have made the necessary
18 adjustments throughout eastern Washington to ensure
19 balance and boundaries that align with the rest of the
20 districts. I'm certainly open to ideas and suggestions
21 for improving this map. But I offer it in the hope of
22 moving our discussion forward towards an agreement.

23 COMM. GORTON: Does that mean you -- you
24 don't want a vote on it?

25 COMM. CEIS: No, I'm not suggesting a vote on

1 this. I'm offering it as an proposal, and I'm certain
2 it can be improved. But again, just offering it --

3 COMM. GORTON: Okay.

4 COMM. CEIS: -- to further some discussion
5 towards compromise.

6 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: well, thank you for
7 putting that together. And you've obvious put a lot of
8 thought into that.

9 Do you -- could you just address the issue that
10 comes up -- has come up in this -- all of our
11 comment -- a lot about keeping Pasco whole? And -- and
12 I notice that it's still split on this map. Spokane
13 County maybe -- if there aren't -- if there are reasons
14 why it can't be together, I think we just need to let
15 those folks know.

16 COMM. CEIS: well, Pasco creates a challenges
17 in terms of causing displacement of incumbents. And I
18 attempted here to ensure that that displacement didn't
19 occur, to be quite honest with you. And if we want to
20 explore options for Pasco beyond that, that's something
21 I would have to take up with other commissioners.

22 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. Thank you.

23 COMM. HUFF: well, I move that we recess --
24 it's lunchtime -- and then get back together about
25 2:00 o'clock?

1 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: That okay with everyone?

2 COMM. FOSTER: Sounds good.

3 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. we'll reconvene at
4 2:00.

5 (Recess.)

6
7 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. we're going to
8 reconvene just long enough to take some testimony from
9 the folks that have to leave.

10 So, Mayor, would you like to come forward? It's
11 almost like sort of continuing for you because you were
12 very helpful to us a little bit earlier during our
13 process. But would you do me a favor and please just
14 sort of restate and spell your name for the record.

15 MS. PERRY: First of all, thank you,
16 commissioners. I know you'd like to leave for lunch.

17 My name is Debra Perry. I'm the mayor of Milton.
18 And that's D-e-b-r-a P-e-r-r-y.

19 And short and sweet, which is, Milton is almost
20 7,000 people, and we are within two counties, which
21 poses all its own set of problems, which you guys are
22 gracious this year to help us with our EMS. we had
23 problems with EMS because we were between counties.

24 So I would like to ask that whatever district we
25 end up with, that we have one representative. And with

1 that, also, I would like to be with cities such as
2 Federal Way or Fife, who share the same problems we do,
3 which is that we are on the I-5 corridor. And because
4 we are so small, people forget that we face to those
5 same issues.

6 One of our urban growth areas that we are in the
7 process of annexing in is along 99, which is also along
8 the I-5 corridor. So light rail, transportation, I-5
9 corridors, those are the issues that we face every day.

10 Thank you very much.

11 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Thank you.

12 COMM. CEIS: Mayor, when you say "district,"
13 you're speaking both legislative districts and
14 congressional districts?

15 MS. PERRY: Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

16 where we have been -- we have been represented
17 very, very well by having two representatives. But it
18 would be easier if it was one.

19 COMM. GORTON: Thank you.

20 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Thank you for your
21 comments.

22 MR. TAYLOR: Yes. My name is Bart Taylor.
23 And I am mayor pro tem of Milton, and that's spelled
24 B-a-r-t T-a-y-l-o-r.

25 And I just have to echo Debra Perry's comments. I

1 actually live on one side of the district, and she
2 lives on the other. It's very confusing for our
3 people. The district that I live in services about 800
4 people. And her district services about 6500.

5 I come from a retirement center, quite large,
6 dealing with a lot of senior citizens. It's very
7 confusing for them. I personally get a lot of
8 questions, "well, who am I supposed to be talking to?"
9 It would be so much easier if we could just have one of
10 representative for the entire city. Thank you.

11 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Thank you.

12 MR. TAYLOR: Thank you again.

13 COMM. CEIS: Thank you for coming.

14 COMM. GORTON: Good luck in doing that.

15 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. We can, I believe,
16 go back into recess to return around 2:00.

17 (Lunch recess.)

18
19 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I'm going to reconvene
20 this meeting of the Washington State Restricting
21 Commission.

22 And what we'd like to do is, first of all, thank
23 you all for being so patient. And we wanted to start
24 with giving anyone who would like to an opportunity to
25 make any public comment. And I'm waiting for the --

1 the sheets to be brought forward, and they should be
2 here in just a minute. I'm going to take a look at
3 some of the comments that have come in earlier online
4 while we're waiting for that.

5 Okay. We have not really separated them today on
6 the congressional and legislative. So can -- yeah,
7 move down just a little bit, I guess, to reach that.

8 I'll read just two online comments, and then we'll
9 go to those who are present.

10 The first comment is from Dan Palmeri. It's --
11 D-a-n is the first name and then P-a-l-m-e-r-i. And he
12 says, (as read) "I have issues with Congressional
13 Districts 8, 1, and 2. The southern area of Pierce
14 County in Congressional District 8 has no business
15 being in there if the purpose of this is to have a
16 common community with shared interests and goals."

17 Followed by a comment from, Rebecca,
18 R-e-b-e-c-c-a, last name A-b-l-e-m-a-n. And she has a
19 congressional-district comment. Says, (as read)
20 "Please consider maintaining the City of Lake Stevens
21 in District 2 instead of placing the jurisdiction in
22 predominately rural District 1. The city has more
23 issue and interest in common with urban areas than with
24 small rural cities and rural or resource lands to the
25 east and north."

1 Scroll down here.

2 "Placing Lake Stevens into a rural district would
3 be a less practical representation of the differing
4 community interests and issues. An adjust-" -- "an
5 adjustment to the northern boundary of the proposed
6 district would be more appropriate." And she lives in
7 the City of Lake Stevens.

8 Okay. Our next person is -- let's see. Debra
9 Perry and Bart Taylor talked earlier. So that's --

10 We have Miguel A. Blanco. Mr. Blanco here? Yes.
11 Please come forward, and just state and spell your name
12 for the record, please. Yes. Thank you.

13 MR. BLANCO: Good afternoon, Commission. My
14 name is Miguel Blanco. Do I have to spell it?

15 COMM. CEIS: Yes, please.

16 MR. BLANCO: M-i-g-u-e-l first name. Last
17 name B-l-a-n-c-o.

18 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Please start whenever
19 you're ready.

20 MR. BLANCO: Great. As I said before, my
21 name is Miguel Blanco. I work in Tacoma. And I'm here
22 to represent the Pierce County argument with the 29th
23 District.

24 The 29th District is accustomed to having
25 minority representation. Ms. Rosa Franklin represented

1 the district for many, many years.

2 Pierce County has grown 88.3 percent on behalf of
3 the hispanic demographic as of the last census in 2010.
4 I know this. I am the president of the Pierce County
5 Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. To have -- to -- excuse
6 me -- to not have a minority-majority district in a
7 place that's experiencing tremendous growth on behalf
8 of individuals from the minority populations is not
9 good for representative democracy.

10 So here I am before you asking that it would --
11 that it can be considered to have the 29th District
12 become that legislative district that is majority-
13 majority [*sic*], one of the few that should be in place
14 based on the growth that we've had in population in
15 Washington state.

16 And with that, I -- I end. Thank you.

17 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Thank you.

18 And we have -- next person is Lua Pritchard.
19 Please state your name and spell it for our
20 transcriptionist, please.

21 MR. PRITCHARD: I am Lua Pritchard, L-u-a
22 P-r-i-t-c-h-a-r-d. I'm from Tacoma, Washington.

23 And I'm here to urge the Commission to make the
24 29th Legislative District in Tacoma-Pierce County a
25 majority of people of color. I am also the chair of

1 the Pierce County Asian Pacific Island Coalition. And
2 I am a member of the win/win Network.

3 30 percent, or one in three, Pierce County
4 residents is a person of color. Our elected
5 representatives should reflect a diversity of Tacoma.
6 As you complete your work, we urge you to prioritize
7 and not divide communities in Tacoma-Pierce County that
8 have historically been the home to people of color,
9 especially in the Salishan eastside Tacoma and Lincoln
10 Tacoma and others.

11 In 2010 census, just for the Asian Pacific Island
12 people -- population alone, there was a thir- --
13 40 percent increase in population, just for Asian
14 Pacific Islanders. And in the respective 29th
15 District location that is in question right now with
16 you, east Tacoma, 38th District, Lincoln High School,
17 are mostly people of color.

18 A 29th Legislative District in Tacoma-Pierce
19 County that is a majority of people of color, that will
20 increase voter turnout and civic participation because
21 communities will feel that their vote can make an
22 impact. A 29th Legislative District in Tacoma-Pierce
23 County that is a majority of people of color will
24 encourage representatives to be genuinely accountable
25 to the diverse needs and issues of the community. We

1 urge you to improve civic engagement in
2 underrepresentative communities in Tacoma-Pierce County
3 by creating a POC-majority 29th Legislative District.

4 Thank you for your time and consideration.

5 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Thank you very much for
6 coming.

7 Okay. I don't have anyone else signed up to
8 speak. Does anybody else want to?

9 Okay. Please come forward, sir. And I'll read
10 another comment from online while you do.

11 I got to figure these out. So why don't you go
12 ahead, sir, and then I'll try to look through
13 the (indiscernible).

14 MR. GORDON: I actually signed up on another
15 sheet that's sitting in the back.

16 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Oh, you did? Okay.
17 well, please state your name and spell it for us.

18 MR. GORDON: My name is Dexter Gordon,
19 D-e-x-t-e-r G-o-r-d-o-n, so a little bit different from
20 Slade Gorton.

21 I live and work in Tacoma, I am also part of the
22 win/win Network, I'm a member of the Tacoma Black
23 collective, and I'm actually a professor at the
24 University of Puget Sound. I'm here to testify on
25 behalf of our effort to have the Commission establish

1 or, we think, reestablish the 29th Legislative
2 District in Tacoma as a people-of-color-majority
3 district.

4 I have a particular interest in this because, both
5 as a professor and as someone who is very active in my
6 community in Tacoma, I am consistently engaged in the
7 effort to get people in general, young people in
8 particular, engaged in their civic duties, their civic
9 responsibilities.

10 And I should let you know that I -- as part of the
11 recent political season, I ran for school board; so I
12 was at people's doors and engaged with people at all
13 kinds of levels. And the most heartbreaking element of
14 my experience was the number of young people of color
15 who told me their votes didn't matter and they had no
16 reason to participate in the process.

17 I want to urge you to make the 29th District a
18 people-of-color-majority district because it will be a
19 boost to democracy in Tacoma. And for all the efforts
20 of these many years, especially 46 years since the
21 Voting Rights Act, and we see levels of voting going
22 down among people of color. It is a disheartening
23 prospect. And anything that we can do to enhance that
24 process will enhance this notion of representative
25 democracy and will enhance the quality of our lives and

1 the quality of participation from all sectors of our
2 community.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Thank you.

5 COMM. GORTON: Excuse me. Tell me, what do
6 you teach at UPS?

7 MR. GORDON: I'm a teacher of rhetoric.

8 COMM. GORTON: Good. Thank you.

9 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. I think what --
10 what I was trying to figure out on these online
11 comments is -- we had some -- like some splits that
12 came in from the same speaker that I started with.

13 So this is a continuation of what Mr. Palmeri --
14 Palmeri -- Palmeri was trying to say. And again it's
15 Dan, D-a-n, and then P-a-l-m-e-r-i. And his continued
16 comment was, (as read) "There should be some balance in
17 redistricting. For example, Kitsap is to itself in one
18 district, but Thurston, the same size, has been split.
19 Snohomish and Pierce should have the same number of
20 districts." I'm not sure I understand that.

21 (As read) "with the eastern part of the proposed
22 8th Congressional District, it should have more
23 connections with the rest of the district. It makes
24 more sense" -- okay. Some of these are hard to read --
25 "for it to either have both US-2 and I-90 or US-2 and

1 Washington 20. Chelan and Douglas counties are part
2 of" -- let's see. Is that "Seattle's"?

3 MS. O'SULLIVAN: (Indiscernible).

4 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: -- "Seattle's DMA."

5 "Why split Tacoma into three pieces while
6 Seattle's only split into 2?" Okay.

7 And then -- then there was a comment from Shane,
8 S-h-a-n-e T-h-o-r-s-o-n: (as read) "Pasco should stay
9 together as one voting city and placed in District 9.
10 It is a good idea to place West Richland into the
11 16th."

12 And a comment from Jonathan Fox: (as read)
13 "Renton should not be split into 3 legislative
14 districts. The 37th GOP objects to the fact that
15 37th is one of only 5 districts that would constrain
16 more than one city. This reduces public participation
17 in the process as people are concerned with things that
18 happen in their city but not in some other place."

19 Comment from Sue Lani Madsen, S-u-e L-a-n-i
20 M-a-d-s-e-n: "As you discuss these small adjustments
21 to create districts of the 'ideal' population, keep in
22 mind that this ideal will never actually exist. You
23 are creating ideal districts that might have existed at
24 the moment the census was taken, but there is no one
25 moment when the population froze in place and the

1 census was accurate. Error" -- (as read) "please err
2 on the side of maintaining logical, physical community
3 connections -- counties, cities, school districts -- as
4 best you can within the requirements of the law for
5 allowable deviations."

6 From Linda Atkins, "I would like to hear the
7 commissioners address the proposed new boundaries of
8 the 8th congressional district, and explain on the
9 record how this proposal achieves the goals of
10 compactness and community of interest."

11 And I want to just stop here and see:

12 Did anybody else in the audience want to make any
13 comments?

14 Okay. Thank you.

15 And let's see. We have a comment from Amanda
16 Taub, A-m-a-n-d-a T-a-u-b, from Douglas County. And
17 she says, "Douglas County has already commented on our
18 preference for Commissioner Huff's Legislative Plan.
19 We have reviewed Commissioner Foster's Legislative Plan
20 and here are our concerns and comments."

21 Let's see. (As read) "Previously Douglas County
22 commented on a plan that split Riverside Trailer Park
23 and in so doing split multiple trailers in half. We
24 must again ask the Commission not to split Riverside
25 Trailer Park, but move the boundary between the 12th

1 and 13th Legislative Districts to the west to
2 boundary between our voting precincts of 202 and 204.
3 We ask that you follow our newly adopted voting
4 precinct boundaries and not split our precincts in
5 creating boundaries between Legislative Districts 12
6 and 13 if you must split the county between these
7 districts.

8 (As read) "Our voting precincts were created by
9 looking" -- I think it should be -- "at population and
10 taking into account the boundaries of special election
11 and taxing districts. Splitting precincts affects
12 privacy issues when reporting election results via
13 precinct and could impact our newly adopted county
14 commissioner boundaries. The boundary between
15 Districts 12 and 13 splits 14 voting precincts in urban
16 and rural areas of Douglas County. We will send maps
17 of the areas of concern."

18 COMM. CEIS: who's that from?

19 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: That's from Amanda Taub.
20 She's was from Douglas County.

21 MS. BUNNING: She's in the auditor's office.

22 COMM. CEIS: She's in the auditor's office?

23 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: She's in the auditor's
24 office. Yeah.

25 She had a couple other brief comments to continue.

1 And then she -- she con- -- Amanda Taub continues, (as
2 read) "There's a long swath of District 13 in the
3 Columbia River just north of the City of Bridgeport.
4 This needs to be removed and put into District 12.
5 Also, the boundary between Districts 12 and 13 split
6 the City of Bridgeport in the north part of the city.
7 The western and southern boundary the Commission is
8 using for Bridgeport is incorrect. Please see our city
9 limit GIS layer for up-to-date Bridgeport boundary."

10 And then another comment from her: "There is a
11 sliver of District 12 cutting into District 13 near
12 SR 174 and Crown Vista Point Road on the border of
13 Douglas County and Grant County that should be moved
14 into the thir-" -- "District 13."

15 Comment from Elliott Fabric, E-l-l-i-o-t
16 F-a-b-r-i-c. And he says, (as read) "I am in the
17 6th Legislative District currently, and Mr. Ceis's
18 proposal makes sense in keeping urban communities
19 together and rural communities together."

20 There was -- a comment came from Mr. Matt Watkins,
21 Pasco mayor: (as read) "I want to thank the commission
22 for your hard work. We all know you're in crunch time
23 and appreciate the balancing act you have" -- "you have
24 in satisfying a difficult array of criteria. We know
25 you have to have districts with equal numbers" -- "have

1 to have districts of equal numbers and need to comply
2 with the Voting Rights Act and not favor or
3 discriminate against incumbents, candidates, or
4 parties. We just ask that you do your best not to
5 divide the city of Pasco or Franklin County and retain
6 our community of common of interest."

7 A comment from -- well, we don't know -- don't
8 have full names. Yeah.

9 For those of you listening online, it's really --
10 we really need to get your last names.

11 I have one from Mariah, and hopefully she will
12 send us her last name, M-a-r-i-a-h. She says, (as
13 read) "The 6th Legislative District as proposed
14 initially by Commissioner Ceis" -- I don't know if
15 that's different from the map you had today -- "seems
16 to be the most common sense and logical option. I like
17 this plan better than Mr. Huff's proposal."

18 And one from Mary Ann says, (as read) "I am
19 enthusiastic about Commissioner Ceis' plan for the
20 6th Legislative District. I hope you support it."

21 COMM. HUFF: Chairman, is it possible that we
22 get this in typing and that we can read it at our
23 leisure and move on to another subject?

24 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Yeah, we can. We can do
25 some of that 'cause they keep oncoming in faster than I

1 can keep up with them.

2 COMM. HUFF: I know.

3 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I try -- try to give
4 everybody a chance, but we -- but this is part of the
5 record, and we can get this to you. So --

6 COMM. HUFF: Yeah. Right.

7 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: -- I think we probably
8 need to do that at this point so we can move on.

9 COMM. HUFF: 'Cause I think we can move on to
10 this subject right here. It would be helpful.

11 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. All right. So do
12 we have --

13 I think the next thing we wanted to try to do was
14 move on to some of these -- take a look at some of
15 these areas of changes that have been suggested by the
16 auditors.

17 COMM. CEIS: Yes.

18 COMM. GORTON: And others.

19 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: And others? Oh, yes.
20 That's right. Yes. We do have others.

21 COMM. CEIS: Madam Chair, could -- the online
22 we're getting right now, could we ensure that those are
23 run off for us so -- today?

24 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Sure.

25 COMM. CEIS: I'd like to have them this

1 afternoon.

2 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I assume we get that
3 done. Jen?

4 Okay. Nick, are you ready for us to sort of walk
5 through these?

6 COMM. GORTON: That seems to be a logical
7 one, Madam Chairman.

8 COMM. FOSTER: (Indiscernible). This is
9 winlock? Okay. I think it makes sense.

10 COMM. CEIS: Yes.

11 COMM. HUFF: Looks good to me.

12 COMM. CEIS: Nick, you going to be able to
13 keep track?

14 MR. PHARRIS: I'll do my best.

15 COMM. CEIS: All right.

16 COMM. GORTON: This one the same?

17 MR. PHARRIS: It's the same situation.

18 COMM. HUFF: Okay with me.

19 COMM. FOSTER: Me, too.

20 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

21 COMM. HUFF: The twos are pretty easy.

22 COMM. CEIS: This one makes sense.

23 COMM. GORTON: Okay.

24 COMM. FOSTER: So what we're going to have
25 here is we're going to have this arrow pointing --

1 MR. PHARRIS: I apologize. Yes, the arrow
2 should be pointing the other way.

3 COMM. FOSTER: Right.

4 MR. PHARRIS: This should go into the 19th.

5 COMM. FOSTER: And then in the 20th --

6 COMM. GORTON: So the Main Street will be --

7 COMM. CEIS: Main street will be --

8 COMM. GORTON: -- surrounded all the way.

9 Yeah.

10 COMM. FOSTER: So it eliminates the -- okay.

11 COMM. GORTON: It eliminates the triangle,
12 yeah.

13 COMM. FOSTER: Good.

14 MR. PHARRIS: Right. It reverses --

15 COMM. FOSTER: Oh, sorry.

16 COMM. CEIS: This one seems to make sense, as
17 well, doesn't it?

18 COMM. FOSTER: Are you looking at Old Bam and
19 Dynamite Roads?

20 COMM. GORTON: We're looking at Dynamite
21 Road.

22 COMM. FOSTER: Well, then there's Old Bam up
23 above it. Oh, that's a "barn." I thought it was
24 "bam."

25 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: "Bam" sounds better.

1 COMM. GORTON: Okay.

2 COMM. FOSTER: This is okay?

3 COMM. CEIS: And then this was -- yeah, it's
4 the school-district boundary.

5 COMM. GORTON: School district. Yeah, that
6 sounds fine.

7 COMM. HUFF: Okay.

8 MR. PHARRIS: I believe that's a corner of
9 Auburn School District.

10 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

11 COMM. FOSTER: John, you haven't changed your
12 mind on any of these, have you?

13 MR. MILEM: No, sir.

14 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

15 COMM. HUFF: John, what are you going to do
16 when this is over with?

17 MR. MILEM: What's that?

18 COMM. HUFF: What are you going to do when
19 this is over with?

20 MR. MILEM: I always manage to keep busy.

21 COMM. CEIS: Then you'll have to prepare for
22 the next one.

23 COMM. GORTON: This looks okay.

24 COMM. CEIS: Yes.

25 MR. PHARRIS: I believe this is an existing

1 precinct boundary, but --

2 COMM. HUFF: Okay.

3 MR. PHARRIS: -- the currently proposed line.

4 COMM. CEIS: Where we currently have it, or
5 what John's proposing?

6 MR. PHARRIS: Where the current proposal is.

7 COMM. CEIS: So --

8 MR. PHARRIS: But that may not be what
9 Snohomish County intended?

10 COMM. FOSTER: May not be what Snohomish
11 County wants, or -- we're awful close to approving
12 this, so you better say what you -- what --

13 MR. PHARRIS: It's in the Census Bureau data
14 as a precinct boundary, but I'm -- I think the road
15 would make a perfectly good precinct boundary.

16 COMM. HUFF: Would what?

17 MR. PHARRIS: I suspect the road would make
18 an even better precinct boundary than what we have now.

19 COMM. CEIS: Excuse me. What -- what is that
20 line, do we know, that we're on right now? Is that a
21 parcel boundary? An arbitrary boundary?

22 MR. PHARRIS: I'm not sure.

23 COMM. CEIS: An invisible boundary?

24 MR. PHARRIS: Outside of Lynnwood. It
25 appears to be outside of any city.

1 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

2 COMM. GORTON: It looks like an invisible
3 boundary to me.

4 MR. PHARRIS: Yeah.

5 COMM. CEIS: It does look like an invisible
6 boundary.

7 COMM. GORTON: I think we should do it.

8 COMM. CEIS: Okay. I'm okay. What do you
9 guys think?

10 COMM. FOSTER: Looks good to me.

11 COMM. HUFF: Yeah.

12 COMM. GORTON: The next two are alternatives
13 for one, right?

14 MR. PHARRIS: Correct.

15 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

16 COMM. CEIS: So this is where the 39th is
17 currently under by 48 people and the 40th is under by
18 15, correct?

19 MR. PHARRIS: Right.

20 COMM. CEIS: So if we go with moving -- the
21 John Miley proposal, that would add 19 more people.

22 MR. PHARRIS: That -- this is Skagit County's
23 proposal.

24 COMM. CEIS: This is Skagit? Which -- well,
25 the first one is Skagit County, right?

1 MR. PHARRIS: Right.

2 COMM. CEIS: And that would move 19 people
3 into the 40th from the 39th, creating a bigger
4 problem for us in the 39th making it 67.

5 And John Milem's proposal would actually help us
6 equalize between the 40th and the 39th by taking
7 two people from the 40th and moving them into the
8 39th. But it's a river that meanders, and it divides
9 multiple parcels.

10 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

11 COMM. CEIS: Are you remembering all that?

12 MR. PHARRIS: Correct.

13 COMM. CEIS: I was paying attention.

14 COMM. GORTON: Sounds like the river's a
15 pretty good boundary. That's a good size river.

16 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. I'm just remembering the
17 admonition we had from the auditors about not using --
18 not dividing parcels.

19 MR. PHARRIS: I believe these are
20 agricultural parcels, if it helps.

21 COMM. CEIS: I'm sure they are up here.
22 Yeah.

23 COMM. GORTON: I think based on our
24 population basis, the Milem one is preferable.

25 MR. PHARRIS: Sammamish River?

1 COMM. CEIS: Is that the consensus?

2 COMM. FOSTER: I'm okay with that. I --

3 COMM. HUFF: I am, too.

4 COMM. CEIS: The great Milton debate.

5 COMM. GORTON: Well, we even heard from the
6 mayor of Milton on that one.

7 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Yes.

8 COMM. GORTON: I think we should go ahead and
9 do it. And --

10 COMM. CEIS: And, Rusty, you don't have any
11 problems with us doing this, right?

12 MR. FALLIS: No, no problem.

13 COMM. FOSTER: So will it take a special bit
14 of language in the final report to ensure that this
15 is --

16 MR. PHARRIS: It -- it will, yes.

17 COMM. FOSTER: Okay. Can you and Rusty work
18 on that language?

19 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

20 COMM. GORTON: I think this Pierce County one
21 is not especially a good idea.

22 COMM. CEIS: I don't know. I had -- I put
23 "no" down in my notes.

24 COMM. GORTON: So did I.

25 COMM. CEIS: And I don't recall why I said

1 no. Help me. Refresh me on this one.

2 MR. PHARRIS: The only way to really solve --
3 resolve this one would be to add part of -- at least
4 part of Milton's urban growth area over here to create
5 a larger unincorporated precinct.

6 COMM. FOSTER: So if this stays the way it
7 was written, what will happen?

8 MR. PHARRIS: It's --

9 COMM. FOSTER: There will be 13 people in a
10 precinct?

11 MR. PHARRIS: Correct.

12 COMM. FOSTER: Inside Milton?

13 MR. PHARRIS: Almost entirely surrounded by
14 the City of Milton. Oh, actually, southern boundary
15 here is Fife.

16 COMM. HUFF: You're just talking about 13
17 people, right?

18 MR. PHARRIS: Correct.

19 COMM. HUFF: Wow.

20 COMM. CEIS: And if it's added, what problem
21 does it create for us?

22 MR. PHARRIS: Well, it -- it -- well, if it
23 were added to the 27th, that would still leave this
24 bit, which really couldn't be added to the 27th since
25 the road right of way's in -- in Milton. So the

1 only -- the only way this will be remedied is if part
2 of this area were added to the 25th.

3 COMM. FOSTER: Which area?

4 MR. PHARRIS: The area to the west of Milton
5 here. This -- this is also unincorporated area.

6 COMM. CEIS: Oh, I see. So you'd have to
7 move all that into the 25th, which would create a
8 bigger problem for us. There's quite a few people that
9 live in that area, correct?

10 MR. PHARRIS: That's true. Several hundred,
11 at least.

12 COMM. CEIS: How many people live in that
13 little area down below 12th Street East?

14 MR. PHARRIS: None.

15 COMM. CEIS: So what do we care? There's
16 nobody in there.

17 MR. PHARRIS: If -- if the larger area were
18 added to the 27th, this area would have to be a
19 precinct of its own.

20 COMM. CEIS: Right. But it's nobody in
21 there. It's a precinct with nobody in it.

22 MR. PHARRIS: Right.

23 COMM. GORTON: It wouldn't be. It would just
24 be added to an adjacent precinct, wouldn't it?

25 MR. PHARRIS: No, because it's entirely

1 surrounded by incorporated area.

2 COMM. CEIS: So it couldn't be outside.

3 COMM. GORTON: Oh, I see. I see.

4 COMM. CEIS: If there's nobody that lives in
5 a precinct, does a precinct really exist?

6 MR. PHARRIS: Good question. Dave Valiant
7 would tell you yes, 'cause they had to order 50 ballots
8 every time, even -- even for the precinct in Tumwater
9 that consisted of a duck pond.

10 COMM. GORTON: I think we should leave this
11 one alone.

12 COMM. CEIS: Sounds like it.

13 COMM. HUFF: I'd agree with that.

14 COMM. FOSTER: Unintended consequences of us
15 overthinking this might be terrible.

16 COMM. CEIS: I think it already has had a
17 consequence.

18 Next one was --

19 COMM. GORTON: South.

20 COMM. CEIS: Oh, right. This one made sense.

21 COMM. GORTON: Yeah. This one looked good.

22 MR. PHARRIS: Okay.

23 COMM. HUFF: The white spaces, what district
24 is that?

25 MR. PHARRIS: That's -- that's the area left

1 open for the 35th.

2 COMM. HUFF: Oh, the thirty --

3 MR. PHARRIS: Sorry. For the 31st.

4 COMM. HUFF: 31st, yeah. That's what I
5 thought. Okay.

6 MR. PHARRIS: Pierce County didn't suggest a
7 remedy for this one, and none is immediately obvious.
8 Obviously, the -- the block to the north has 700 people
9 in it, and the block to the south has 189.

10 COMM. CEIS: So the issue is 112th is not a
11 real street?

12 MR. PHARRIS: Right, though it is a parcel
13 boundary. So it would -- it would not be splitting any
14 residences.

15 COMM. CEIS: So okay. So it is a legal
16 boundary in that it is a parcel?

17 MR. PHARRIS: Yes. I don't know what it's --
18 right, it is essentially right on top of a parcel
19 boundary, yes.

20 COMM. FOSTER: Would they rather have us
21 describe this in some other way or leave it the way it
22 is?

23 MR. PHARRIS: They didn't say.

24 COMM. HUFF: Leave it the way it is?

25 COMM. CEIS: Well, is it a platted street

1 that is just not developed?

2 MR. PHARRIS: That's possible. I don't know.

3 COMM. FOSTER: Could we describe it in any
4 way?

5 COMM. CEIS: Well, if it's a platted street,
6 it's already described in the --

7 COMM. FOSTER: Okay.

8 MR. PHARRIS: It will be -- I mean, this is a
9 census block right here. So when it's -- if the census
10 block is listed within the 31st District, this is the
11 one.

12 COMM. CEIS: We should just leave this alone.

13 COMM. GORTON: Okay.

14 COMM. CEIS: We should say no.

15 COMM. HUFF: Okay.

16 COMM. GORTON: I think we should say
17 (indiscernible.) Okay. You describe that.

18 COMM. CEIS: So I -- my view is we should say
19 no to this. We don't have a legal description for what
20 the annexation is. And if we add the entire
21 urban-growth boundary, that's 72 people.

22 what is the -- where are we in terms of the 25th
23 right now?

24 MR. PHARRIS: Well, here.

25 COMM. CEIS: Yeah, 'cause --

1 COMM. HUFF: Is this Dave's recommendation?

2 MR. PHARRIS: This is the Pierce County
3 recommendation, yes.

4 COMM. CEIS: But if you move it into the
5 25th, it does perhaps cause a problem.

6 COMM. GORTON: I don't mind it.

7 COMM. CEIS: Unless the 25th's under.

8 MR. PHARRIS: Got it?

9 MS. BOE: Eleven.

10 MR. PHARRIS: Up or down?

11 MS. BOE: Up.

12 COMM. FOSTER: I want to make sure I have
13 this right, now. These three parcels are going to be
14 annexed into Puyallup --

15 MR. PHARRIS: Correct.

16 COMM. CEIS: -- January 1st
17 (indiscernible).

18 COMM. FOSTER: And the blue line is, also --
19 which is that annexed area, is also the urban-growth
20 boundary.

21 MR. PHARRIS: No. The actual annexed area
22 runs along an east-west line here down, I believe,
23 below this road and includes this area here. It's --

24 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I did get some input from
25 Dave Valiant, and he just says, "We can work with the

1 parcels boundary."

2 COMM. GORTON: Does that mean we should leave
3 it alone?

4 COMM. CEIS: This is --

5 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Huh?

6 COMM. CEIS: (Indiscernible).

7 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I think so. Dave, does
8 that mean we should leave it alone?

9 COMM. FOSTER: And the population of -- of
10 the entire area is 72.

11 COMM. CEIS: -- of the entire area is 72.

12 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I'm waiting to see.

13 COMM. FOSTER: It's certainly not -- the area
14 is --

15 COMM. CEIS: There doesn't appear to
16 be anybody --

17 COMM. FOSTER: Here's 21.

18 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. We saw a photo -- do you
19 still have that photo?

20 MR. PHARRIS: Let me see here.

21 COMM. CEIS: We saw a photo. It doesn't
22 appear that anybody currently lives in these parcels.

23 COMM. HUFF: Section here is --

24 COMM. FOSTER: Why don't we go on the city
25 line as of January 1st? Yeah.

1 COMM. CEIS: Because we didn't have a
2 description of it, a legal description or anything
3 else.

4 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: We've got a delay on
5 this, which is a problem. He was referring to
6 incomplete roadway we were talking about. So it was --

7 COMM. GORTON: So he was talking about that
8 one.

9 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Huh? Yeah.

10 COMM. GORTON: That one?

11 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I think so.

12 MR. PHARRIS: The new annexation does not
13 follow census-block boundaries. The only way we could
14 get -- the smallest amount of population you could add
15 and get the whole annexation in 51. That would be --
16 excuse me -- this block here with 24, this block here
17 with 27.

18 COMM. HUFF: would you go back to that last
19 picture.

20 Is that a new road?

21 MR. PHARRIS: It must be.

22 COMM. CEIS: The interest --

23 COMM. HUFF: That one there.

24 MR. PHARRIS: This large one here appears to
25 be under construction.

1 COMM. CEIS: what's the deviation on District
2 25? Did we get that?

3 MR. PHARRIS: 25 is currently 11 people high.

4 COMM. FOSTER: So it would -- then it would
5 be adding --

6 COMM. CEIS: 72.

7 COMM. HUFF: -- to that.

8 MR. PHARRIS: Adding at least 51 to get the
9 whole annexation in should put it 62 high. And it
10 would have to be compensated somewhere else.

11 THE CLERK: Madam Chair, can I just remind
12 people to use the microphones?

13 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Oh, okay.

14 THE REPORTER: You're -- you're sort of
15 getting away from that, and it's hard for me to hear.
16 Thank you.

17 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Thanks for the reminder.

18 COMM. HUFF: why don't we hold on this
19 temporarily.

20 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

21 COMM. HUFF: Till we can get a little bit
22 better feel for it.

23 MR. PHARRIS: This again is a choice between
24 using streets or using a school-district boundary.

25 COMM. CEIS: And so which direction is which?

1 MR. PHARRIS: I'm sorry?

2 COMM. HUFF: The first --

3 COMM. CEIS: The existing boundary that we
4 proposed is the street, and the other is a
5 school-district boundary?

6 MR. PHARRIS: Other way around.

7 COMM. CEIS: Other way around.

8 MR. PHARRIS: The colors are as proposed. So
9 this is a proposed boundary.

10 COMM. CEIS: So ours is.

11 MR. PHARRIS: On a school-district boundary.

12 COMM. CEIS: On a school-district boundary.

13 COMM. FOSTER: Is that the only --

14 COMM. CEIS: And the County would like us to
15 use the street instead of the school-district boundary?

16 MR. PHARRIS: That was their suggestion.

17 COMM. FOSTER: So the school district now
18 is --

19 COMM. GORTON: Now they have to have a
20 precinct with eight people in it?

21 COMM. CEIS: Boundaries don't -- that doesn't
22 apply.

23 MR. PHARRIS: Yeah. Precinct boundaries are
24 not required to follow school-district boundaries. In
25 Snohomish County they typically do.

1 COMM. FOSTER: So if we use the street, as
2 they recommend, we'll be splitting a school district?

3 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

4 COMM. HUFF: That doesn't make any sense.

5 MR. PHARRIS: I don't know whether that
6 school district already has splits or not.

7 COMM. FOSTER: Don't the school districts
8 hold elections, too? And don't they have to be within
9 some kind of boundary area? And aren't we creating
10 another precinct with eight people by doing what they
11 recommend?

12 MR. PHARRIS: School district --

13 COMM. FOSTER: Or am I reading this
14 backwards?

15 MR. PHARRIS: School districts are not
16 required to be in -- a precinct is not legally required
17 to be in a single school district, no.

18 COMM. GORTON: Yeah, but nonetheless, these
19 people, when they vote, they'll vote school district
20 directors.

21 COMM. CEIS: Right.

22 MR. PHARRIS: Right.

23 COMM. CEIS: And then they could vote for
24 their -- the same legislators. The people across the
25 street from them could vote for the same school

1 directors.

2 COMM. GORTON: I guess.

3 MR. PHARRIS: Right. So there would be a
4 precinct boundary along here. And then the -- the
5 County would maintain a split for the -- for the two
6 different school districts in this precinct.

7 COMM. CEIS: Why would the County want to do
8 that to itself?

9 MR. PHARRIS: I don't know.

10 COMM. CEIS: I think we should save them from
11 themselves.

12 MR. PHARRIS: Leave it as is?

13 COMM. CEIS: Leave it alone, yeah.

14 COMM. HUFF: I agree. Yes.

15 COMM. GORTON: This one, I think we did need
16 to keep Mill Creek all in the same place. I think
17 that's both for this one and the next one.

18 MR. PHARRIS: This one and the next one are
19 kind of a pair.

20 COMM. CEIS: Keep the City of Mill Creek
21 together in the 44th was our intention. Yes.

22 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

23 COMM. FOSTER: So that's a population change
24 of --

25 Or you're recommending we not take this?

1 COMM. CEIS: well, you bring up a good point,
2 Dean, because there's a whole series of these that are
3 adding population to the 44th that follow behind
4 these. And there's another -- there's four of them in
5 total, it looks like. Maybe we should look at them
6 together. These -- the first two reunite the city.

7 MR. PHARRIS: Correct.

8 COMM. CEIS: The next two --
9 Can you describe again, Nick?

10 MR. PHARRIS: You're looking at this
11 Marysville one?

12 COMM. CEIS: Looking at Marysville, yes, and
13 then there's another one.

14 COMM. GORTON: And the one just beyond that,
15 as well.

16 MR. PHARRIS: well, the Marysville's one is
17 to avoid having this line sever a number of parcels,
18 including a residence.

19 COMM. CEIS: Oh, so that actually is Jones
20 Creek?

21 MR. PHARRIS: Uh . . .

22 COMM. CEIS: It's not Jones Creek Road.

23 MR. PHARRIS: Right. That is a creek, which
24 is probably somewhat inaccurately in the Census
25 Bureau's data.

1 COMM. CEIS: I see.

2 COMM. FOSTER: But in the terms of these,
3 we're adding 98 people to the 44th District.

4 COMM. CEIS: In total, all four of them?

5 COMM. FOSTER: Yeah.

6 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

7 COMM. FOSTER: I think it's 98.

8 COMM. CEIS: And the last one's only two
9 people. Avoids that very small City of Everett
10 precinct.

11 COMM. FOSTER: 93.

12 COMM. CEIS: I mean that last one we should
13 do just so we know they end up with a remnant precinct,
14 right?

15 MR. PHARRIS: This -- this one is another --

16 COMM. CEIS: Oh.

17 MR. PHARRIS: -- tricky Census Bureau
18 school -- Census Bureau city-limit problem. The Census
19 Bureau actually considers the Everett city limits to be
20 here; so they -- as far as the Census Bureau's
21 concerned, the district as drawn is drawn to the -- to
22 the Everett city limits.

23 COMM. CEIS: But the City of Everett disputes
24 that?

25 MR. PHARRIS: Yes, and the Snohomish County.

1 COMM. CEIS: The auditor.

2 MR. PHARRIS: Pardon?

3 COMM. CEIS: And the auditor.

4 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

5 COMM. CEIS: So shouldn't we go --

6 COMM. GORTON: We better go with them.

7 COMM. CEIS: -- with them on this?

8 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

9 MR. PHARRIS: All right.

10 COMM. CEIS: I mean, does that cause a
11 problem for us to do that 'cause we're not bound by the
12 census-block boundary. They've got it wrong. We've
13 already established that precedent, haven't we?

14 COMM. FOSTER: We may have to write it
15 differently.

16 COMM. CEIS: Does it cause a description
17 problem for us?

18 MR. PHARRIS: No.

19 Let's see. If we described along -- well, in
20 fact, it -- it will all be described in terms of the
21 census block. So this block will be described as part
22 of District 44. Most likely these two people do not,
23 in fact, live in the City of Everett; most likely they
24 live in one of these parcels here. So probably using
25 the County's suggested line would more accurately

1 reflect who's in and out of the City of Everett.

2 COMM. CEIS: So you're agreeing we should
3 accept this?

4 MR. PHARRIS: I think so.

5 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

6 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

7 COMM. FOSTER: But the other three are on
8 hold?

9 COMM. CEIS: Well . . .

10 COMM. FOSTER: Do we have any more involved
11 in this area or around the 44th District, I guess?

12 COMM. GORTON: Well, we have a whole bunch of
13 big ones --

14 COMM. CEIS: Later on.

15 COMM. GORTON: -- that (indiscernible)
16 changed our totals.

17 COMM. CEIS: I mean, we did intend to keep
18 Mill Creek from being split.

19 MS. BUNNING: That's 48 people.

20 COMM. CEIS: Where's 44 in -- in its
21 deviation?

22 MR. PHARRIS: It's high by 29 people.

23 MS. BOE: Short.

24 MR. PHARRIS: And 21 is already low by 37.

25 COMM. HUFF: You say 28?

1 MR. PHARRIS: Twenty-one.

2 COMM. CEIS: So can we perhaps defer the two
3 Mill Creek municipal boundaries, one to the staff group
4 and see if they can make some adjustments between the
5 two districts to rebalance them by getting the City of
6 Mill Creek into its entirety?

7 COMM. GORTON: Yes. That's a good idea.

8 COMM. HUFF: I agree with that. We'll hold
9 on that.

10 COMM. CEIS: We'll hold on those and ask the
11 staff to come up with a solution?

12 And then what do you want to do with this one, the
13 Marysville?

14 COMM. GORTON: We really don't want to go
15 through a house.

16 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. We're going to have to
17 find an offset, then, again somewhere else 'cause it is
18 43 people. So we're going to put that back into the
19 group and look for an offset?

20 COMM. FOSTER: They're going to be working on
21 the 44th.

22 COMM. CEIS: Yeah.

23 COMM. FOSTER: So I think they might as well
24 take a look at this while they're at it.

25 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

1 COMM. CEIS: See if they can find an offset.

2 And we said yes to the last one.

3 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

4 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

5 COMM. CEIS: 38 to 44 with two people.

6 COMM. FOSTER: Right.

7 COMM. CEIS: The next one, that one seems to
8 make sense.

9 COMM. GORTON: Yep, that sure does.

10 COMM. CEIS: Just mapping error on our part.

11 MR. PHARRIS: Agreed on that one?

12 COMM. CEIS: Yeah.

13 MR. PHARRIS: Agreed on it? Yeah.

14 COMM. GORTON: I don't think we need this.

15 COMM. CEIS: I agree. I had this down on as
16 a no.

17 COMM. GORTON: We have that down as a no.
18 There was no reason to have a precinct.

19 COMM. FOSTER: We're now talking about the
20 King County 12/21 Comment 4, total population 81?

21 COMM. GORTON: Yes.

22 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

23 COMM. CEIS: Right. They wanted to us follow
24 city boundary so they wouldn't have to create an
25 Edgehill precinct.

1 MR. PHARRIS: Right.

2 COMM. HUFF: So you're recommending a no?

3 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

4 COMM. CEIS: It's a small precinct, but it's

5 not a --

6 COMM. HUFF: Yeah.

7 COMM. CEIS: There's no issues or anything.

8 COMM. GORTON: Who voted for whom.

9 COMM. CEIS: Voting security or anything.

10 MR. PHARRIS: And it does already exist.

11 COMM. CEIS: And it does exist?

12 MR. PHARRIS: (Nods head.)

13 COMM. CEIS: Yeah.

14 Oh, this one was a challenge. So these -- these
15 were both unincorporated areas outside of the Sammamish
16 boundary?

17 MR. PHARRIS: Correct, and outside the urban
18 growth area.

19 COMM. CEIS: And outside the urban growth
20 area.

21 In total both of these are 66 people?

22 MR. PHARRIS: That's right.

23 COMM. FOSTER: So the blue line -- I think
24 that's blue. It might be green. I'm not sure.

25 MR. PHARRIS: It's blue with a yellow line

1 over it.

2 COMM. FOSTER: That is the city line?

3 MR. PHARRIS: The -- yes. The -- this is the
4 city limit.

5 COMM. FOSTER: In Issaquah or Sammamish?

6 MR. PHARRIS: Sammamish.

7 COMM. FOSTER: Well, it makes sense to do,
8 but it's got 66 people.

9 COMM. CEIS: Into 5?

10 COMM. FOSTER: What?

11 COMM. CEIS: Into 5?

12 COMM. FOSTER: Into 5? I --

13 COMM. CEIS: It's pretty easy to find 5 -- 66
14 people to move out of 5.

15 I mean, what is 41? Is it --

16 MS. BOE: Seventy-nine over.

17 COMM. CEIS: Seventy-nine over?

18 Yeah, we could --

19 COMM. GORTON: Then we should probably do it.

20 COMM. CEIS: We should probably do it. It's
21 fairly easy to make an adjustment in 5.

22 COMM. HUFF: Okay.

23 There's -- there's 179 people in that little
24 corner, huh?

25 MR. PHARRIS: Right. Only the northernmost

1 portion. The other two are unpopulated.

2 COMM. CEIS: That's the -- the entire
3 population of this problem is up in that little area?

4 MR. PHARRIS: Right.

5 COMM. HUFF: (Indiscernible)?

6 COMM. GORTON: And we're -- where is that?
7 Is that Redmond or --

8 MR. PHARRIS: Yes, northeast corner of
9 Redmond.

10 MS. BOE: The 45th.

11 COMM. GORTON: Okay. The green is Redmond.
12 Or --

13 MR. PHARRIS: The green is the 48th
14 District. The Redmond city limits are -- are here on
15 the outside of those areas.

16 COMM. CEIS: Right. So -- but that --

17 COMM. GORTON: But the area up on the left
18 is -- is what? Unincorp- -- we're talking about.

19 MR. PHARRIS: These areas are all
20 incorporated. These are all parts of Redmond.

21 COMM. GORTON: Oh, I see.

22 COMM. CEIS: The only population is the one
23 in the upper left.

24 MR. PHARRIS: Right. At the moment these are
25 separated from the rest of Redmond by a district

1 boundary.

2 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. So the -- the two don't
3 make any -- don't create any problem. But the 179
4 people moving from the 45th into the 48th will.

5 COMM. GORTON: What's the 48th population?

6 COMM. CEIS: Don't know.

7 COMM. GORTON: What's the 48th in
8 population?

9 MR. PHARRIS: 48th is 94 over. 45th is 61
10 short.

11 COMM. CEIS: So we're making our problem
12 worse.

13 COMM. GORTON: Yeah. And we're also --
14 we're -- just about everything's in the city.

15 COMM. CEIS: Yes.

16 COMM. GORTON: Another part of Bellevue.

17 why don't we give them the two that don't have any
18 people?

19 COMM. FOSTER: Two out of three?

20 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

21 COMM. CEIS: Two out of three?

22 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

23 COMM. FOSTER: Unless there's some area that
24 we can balance off that population.

25 COMM. CEIS: Well --

1 COMM. GORTON: Well, with all the city limits
2 the way they are -- the way we have, trying to keep
3 them together ought to be difficult.

4 COMM. CEIS: Very difficult.

5 COMM. FOSTER: That's true.

6 COMM. CEIS: Very challenging.

7 MR. PHARRIS: We can hunt around for a
8 convenient offset if you'd like.

9 COMM. GORTON: Pardon?

10 COMM. CEIS: Well, let's --

11 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

12 COMM. CEIS: Why don't we give it to the
13 staff --

14 COMM. GORTON: Yeah. Give it to the staff
15 and see if they can find one.

16 COMM. CEIS: -- and see if they can find a
17 solution.

18 COMM. FOSTER: But do -- but do the bottom
19 two for sure.

20 COMM. CEIS: The bottom two for sure. But
21 see if they can find a solution to that one.

22 COMM. FOSTER: Yeah.

23 MR. PHARRIS: Okay. Another creek. I
24 suspect the creek is actually following this parcel
25 line here --

1 COMM. CEIS: Yeah.

2 MR. PHARRIS: -- poorly mapped.

3 COMM. FOSTER: I'm trying to think about
4 Juanita Creek. I was -- I have that in the back of my
5 mind that that's a fairly well-established, pretty
6 well-controlled creek, nonmeandering.

7 COMM. GORTON: I think that's right.

8 COMM. CEIS: I think it floods periodically.

9 COMM. FOSTER: Well, it might flood, but
10 it's --

11 COMM. CEIS: I mean, it's an urban area. It
12 flows through --

13 COMM. FOSTER: It's urban creek, so therefore
14 it somewhat controlled better than some of the rural
15 areas. I guess I'm trying to talk myself into not
16 doing this because of the population.

17 COMM. GORTON: I think you're -- I think
18 you're right.

19 MR. PHARRIS: It kind of gets back to the
20 philosophical question:

21 If you say this block is in this district, does
22 that mean where -- is it actually delineated by where
23 Juanita Creek actually is, or is it as the Census
24 Bureau's drawn it?

25 COMM. CEIS: Well, is this the Census

1 Bureau's boundary --

2 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

3 COMM. CEIS: -- Juanita Creek in the -- this
4 is?

5 MR. PHARRIS: This is where they think
6 Juanita Creek is.

7 COMM. CEIS: Then we're sticking with the
8 census on this.

9 COMM. FOSTER: I don't have a particular
10 philosophy about that.

11 COMM. HUFF: No. That what we're saying?

12 COMM. CEIS: I think we're saying no to it.
13 Yeah. That's a lot of people that we don't have to --

14 COMM. GORTON: And I think we say no to this
15 one. It's just on a precinct line.

16 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. But it's a big enough
17 precinct, 142 people again.

18 COMM. GORTON: Yeah. I would say no to this
19 next one.

20 COMM. HUFF: So how does it affect 1 numbers?
21 Are we over or under?

22 MR. PHARRIS: 45 is short. 1 is -- 45 is 61
23 short. 1 is 85 over.

24 COMM. CEIS: we'd be making both problems
25 worse.

1 COMM. GORTON: Worse, yeah.

2 COMM. HUFF: Make it worse.

3 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

4 COMM. FOSTER: So that's a no?

5 MR. PHARRIS: That's a no.

6 COMM. GORTON: That's a no.

7 COMM. HUFF: No.

8 COMM. GORTON: But the next one might be a
9 yes.

10 COMM. CEIS: I'm sorry. You said 45
11 was . . . ?

12 MR. PHARRIS: Underpopulated by 61.

13 COMM. GORTON: Oh, under. (Indiscernible).

14 COMM. CEIS: It's already under. Yeah.

15 COMM. GORTON: Oh.

16 COMM. HUFF: Under by 61.

17 COMM. CEIS: I'm not certain that the north
18 fork of Cherry Creek is as stable as Juanita.

19 MR. PHARRIS: And I'm -- I'm not sure what
20 this portion of the boundary is supposed to be. Seems
21 to be slicing through some parcels.

22 COMM. CEIS: Is that creek -- looks like it's
23 meandering all over the place, too. Put it to staff to
24 figure this one out. What do you think?

25 COMM. GORTON: Yeah, turn it over to them.

1 COMM. FOSTER: Well, we may come back here
2 having done these and still take -- need to take a look
3 at populations.

4 COMM. CEIS: Oh, absolutely.

5 COMM. FOSTER: And they may undo -- may undo
6 something.

7 COMM. CEIS: They're just going to see if
8 they can make something work. Yeah. I agree.

9 MR. PHARRIS: Yes. Again, King County's
10 requesting that this entire precinct be kept.

11 COMM. CEIS: No.

12 COMM. GORTON: No.

13 COMM. CEIS: No. We did talk about that one
14 little area.

15 MR. PHARRIS: See whether this is --

16 COMM. CEIS: Using that road, it would be a
17 better boundary.

18 COMM. GORTON: Using that road.

19 MR. PHARRIS: See whether this is a block
20 boundary, yeah.

21 COMM. CEIS: Yeah.

22 MR. PHARRIS: Whether we can use that.

23 COMM. CEIS: Check that one out.

24 COMM. FOSTER: So it'd take that little green
25 area right by the arrow and move that.

1 COMM. CEIS: Yes.

2 COMM. GORTON: Yes.

3 COMM. CEIS: That really isn't a block
4 boundary anyway. Yeah.

5 COMM. HUFF: We're saying no to everything
6 except for that one small section, right?

7 COMM. GORTON: Yes.

8 COMM. CEIS: I think this is another case
9 where it was our intention to have the Tukwila city
10 limits.

11 COMM. GORTON: Well, we have a -- changed it,
12 so this will be incorporated (indiscernible).

13 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

14 COMM. FOSTER: Is this the little piece that
15 is on the other side of -- of I-5? Is that -- I'm not.

16 COMM. GORTON: No, that's not that part.

17 COMM. FOSTER: I don't have this in
18 perspective.

19 COMM. CEIS: No. No. This is not -- uh-uh.

20 COMM. FOSTER: Okay.

21 MR. PHARRIS: I-5 is farther --

22 COMM. HUFF: What is that right-hand border
23 there? What is that?

24 MR. PHARRIS: This is 53rd Avenue South.

25 COMM. HUFF: It's what?

1 MR. PHARRIS: 53rd South. This is the city
2 limits.

3 COMM. HUFF: 53rd South?

4 MR. PHARRIS: Oh. It's east of I-5. Yeah,
5 I'm sure it is.

6 COMM. CEIS: I mean, I think we should say
7 yes to these two. I think there was some -- there has
8 been some preliminary work on looking at this, too,
9 hasn't there, Emily?

10 MS. WALTERS: Yep.

11 COMM. CEIS: About fixing these two anyway?

12 COMM. HUFF: Okay.

13 COMM. CEIS: -- part of the reconciliation
14 anyway.

15 COMM. GORTON: Oh, it is. Yeah.

16 COMM. CEIS: This is the 31st over here in
17 white, isn't it, Nick?

18 MR. PHARRIS: The space left for the 31st.
19 Yeah.

20 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. so we have to reconcile
21 the whole -- putting together the two maps together
22 anyway. Shouldn't we hold on this for that purpose?

23 COMM. FOSTER: Especially for 577 people.

24 COMM. CEIS: Yes.

25 (Indiscernible) a good precinct boundary.

1 MR. PHARRIS: It would be 212th and
2 Covington-Sawyer Road.

3 COMM. CEIS: That's a lot of people.

4 COMM. GORTON: That's all of -- a lot of
5 people when --

6 MR. PHARRIS: There was some talk of trying
7 to follow these roads here and just avoid these
8 nonvisible boundaries that split parcels.

9 COMM. CEIS: So this is where we didn't
10 actually follow anything; it was imaginary road?

11 MR. PHARRIS: Well, I think that was the
12 Pierce County one.

13 COMM. CEIS: Okay. This one -- so what is
14 the problem here that we're solving?

15 COMM. FOSTER: So the issue is right between
16 there and go to the left?

17 MR. PHARRIS: Census Bureau has lots of
18 little -- little random lines connecting roads that
19 don't really correspond to anything.

20 COMM. CEIS: Is that a split parcel over to
21 the right?

22 MR. PHARRIS: This is a split parcel over
23 here, and there are several other here.

24 COMM. CEIS: I see. So if we divided cul de
25 sacs, we could solve the problem.

1 MR. PHARRIS: We -- we could move the line
2 just up to these streets here and see what effect that
3 has on the population.

4 COMM. CEIS: So maybe this is one we have you
5 guys take a look at, too.

6 COMM. FOSTER: Experiment again.

7 COMM. CEIS: See if you can solve it.

8 Thank goodness these weren't our mistakes and most
9 of them are the Census Bureau's mistakes.

10 MR. PHARRIS: You mouth to God's ears.

11 COMM. FOSTER: Always good to have somebody
12 to blame, isn't it?

13 MR. PHARRIS: These are nonvisible boundaries
14 here; though, they seem to be more or less following
15 parcel lines.

16 COMM. CEIS: Well, I agree that a road would
17 be a much better boundary here.

18 COMM. GORTON: What are the respective
19 populations of 47 and 5?

20 MR. PHARRIS: 5 is 40 over. 47 is 94 short.
21 So it would compound the problem.

22 COMM. GORTON: Never mind that.

23 COMM. FOSTER: Haven't -- haven't we messed
24 around with 47 and 5 in four or five other places?

25 COMM. CEIS: I think we've been messing

1 around with 5 quite a bit. Yeah.

2 COMM. HUFF: Yes, we have.

3 COMM. FOSTER: So if we approve it, it would
4 only be contingent upon somebody --

5 COMM. CEIS: Are you suggesting that we hand
6 this over to the staff and have them work on it?

7 COMM. FOSTER: It's working that way, isn't
8 it?

9 COMM. HUFF: Or (indiscernible) out numbers.

10 COMM. FOSTER: Look at the staff out there.
11 No wonder we keep losing people.

12 COMM. CEIS: We haven't lost staff yet,
13 though. I -- they're still in the room.

14 COMM. GORTON: Well, I think let's have
15 Nick -- Nick take a look at that, but this is not a
16 necessary -- an absolutely necessary --

17 COMM. CEIS: No. No. I mean, if it causes
18 other problems, we should --

19 COMM. GORTON: Yeah. yeah. Yeah.

20 MR. PHARRIS: I believe there was another
21 area where we took out of the 5th, so that would help.

22 COMM. CEIS: Oops.

23 COMM. GORTON: Next one only has a population
24 of six. I think that's one we can do.

25 COMM. CEIS: Oh, this was the people on the

1 wrong side of the river.

2 MR. PHARRIS: Right.

3 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

4 COMM. FOSTER: This -- this is the --

5 Are we in Everett now?

6 MR. PHARRIS: We are --

7 COMM. FOSTER: What river is that?

8 MR. PHARRIS: Looks like east of Snohomish.

9 This is the Snohomish River.

10 COMM. GORTON: No. It's quite a ways

11 southeast of Everett.

12 COMM. FOSTER: Snohomish River or Snoqualmie?

13 MR. PHARRIS: I believe it's the Snohomish at
14 this point.

15 COMM. CEIS: Either way, it looks like you'd
16 have to take a boat across to (indiscernible).

17 COMM. FOSTER: Which is known for changing --

18 COMM. CEIS: -- course --

19 COMM. FOSTER: -- quite a bit.

20 MR. PHARRIS: And unfortunately there is no
21 census-block boundary down the center line. The choice
22 is one shore or the other.

23 COMM. FOSTER: This looks like it makes
24 sense.

25 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. It's only six people,

1 too. Yeah.

2 Is the -- I'm sorry, Nick. The area just below
3 it?

4 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

5 COMM. CEIS: That's also in the 39th?

6 MR. PHARRIS: You still on this one?

7 COMM. CEIS: Yes.

8 MR. PHARRIS: Okay.

9 COMM. CEIS: That area right there.

10 MR. PHARRIS: This is in 39th. Yes.

11 COMM. CEIS: So that's all included, right,
12 the area down below, as well, that has the white lines
13 drawn around it? Yes?

14 MR. PHARRIS: Right, both.

15 COMM. CEIS: So both of those get sent over
16 to the 44th.

17 MR. PHARRIS: That's right.

18 COMM. CEIS: Thank you.

19 MR. PHARRIS: That's actually all one block.

20 COMM. CEIS: Yeah.

21 COMM. GORTON: This one's right. And the
22 next one's probably right, too.

23 COMM. CEIS: There's no people in this one.

24 MR. PHARRIS: This one's trivial.

25 COMM. HUFF: Sounds okay to me.

1 COMM. FOSTER: 44 and one? Ye9.

2 COMM. GORTON: This one only has two people,
3 and presumably he talks about --

4 COMM. CEIS: This one is two. Yeah.

5 MR. PHARRIS: I'm sorry.

6 COMM. FOSTER: This is 1,012.

7 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: No. It's a thousand --

8 COMM. CEIS: The next one is 1,012.

9 COMM. GORTON: Oh, excuse me. You're right.

10 COMM. CEIS: Yeah (indiscernible) comment.
11 We can't do this.

12 COMM. GORTON: No.

13 MR. PHARRIS: We did --

14 COMM. CEIS: We can't even consider this. We
15 won't even give this to staff, will we?

16 COMM. GORTON: No.

17 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

18 MR. PHARRIS: We talked about --

19 COMM. CEIS: Saved you. See?

20 COMM. GORTON: And that's probably true with
21 most of the rest of these. They're all big.

22 MR. PHARRIS: There was some mention of just
23 trying to follow these roads and seeing what that did.

24 COMM. FOSTER: Which roads?

25 MR. PHARRIS: 148th Street, Puget Park

1 Drive. I mean --

2 COMM. CEIS: We already dealt with the Jones
3 Creek issue before, didn't we? Is this a --

4 COMM. GORTON: He's -- he's talking about the
5 previous one.

6 COMM. CEIS: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm skipped
7 ahead. I'm sorry.

8 COMM. GORTON: And saying that we take --

9 COMM. HUFF: (Indiscernible). Where's 148th?
10 Oh, up there.

11 COMM. CEIS: Oh, the Puget Park Drive fix.

12 COMM. GORTON: The Puget Park Drive and
13 148th Street.

14 COMM. CEIS: Yeah, that makes sense.

15 MR. PHARRIS: Try that?

16 COMM. GORTON: That does make sense.

17 COMM. FOSTER: That?

18 COMM. CEIS: Then we don't split parcels.
19 You're right.

20 COMM. FOSTER: Okay?

21 MR. PHARRIS: Leave the western line as it
22 is?

23 COMM. FOSTER: Get a population for those?
24 Or did you have one?

25 MR. PHARRIS: I don't have one yet.

1 MR. MILEM: Twenty-six people.

2 COMM. FOSTER: How many?

3 MR. MILEM: Twenty-six.

4 COMM. FOSTER: In those two pieces?

5 MR. MILEM: There are five blocks involved.

6 MR. PHARRIS: Right. Be a block here, block
7 here.

8 MR. MILEM: The people are north of, yeah,
9 that area around Puget Park Drive, those three blocks
10 have, 5, 4, and 17, total of 26.

11 MR. PHARRIS: 26 people here.
12 Any population here?

13 MR. MILEM: Zero there.

14 MR. PHARRIS: Zero? And zero here?

15 MR. MILEM: Zero there.

16 MR. PHARRIS: This would be a movement of 26
17 from 1 into 44.

18 COMM. GORTON: And then it would go the
19 opposite way when you follow Puget Park Drive.

20 COMM. CEIS: Twenty-six people.

21 COMM. HUFF: How many people is that again?

22 MR. PHARRIS: Twenty-six.

23 COMM. HUFF: Twenty-six. Okay.

24 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

25 COMM. GORTON: Okay. Now we can go to the

1 next one.

2 COMM. CEIS: Now this one.

3 COMM. GORTON: No.

4 COMM. CEIS: I'm still on the wrong one?

5 COMM. GORTON: (Indiscernible) on the right
6 one (indiscernible).

7 COMM. FOSTER: Well, this -- this has got
8 Jones Creek and 68th as opposed to 67th? Is that
9 what we're -- I don't know anything about Jones Creek,
10 but this is quite a few people to be --

11 COMM. CEIS: Jones Creek looks familiar.
12 Didn't we just deal with Jones Creek?

13 MR. PHARRIS: It's just a recommendation to
14 use major roads.

15 COMM. FOSTER: Yeah.

16 MR. PHARRIS: I believe this is the block we
17 spoke about earlier.

18 COMM. CEIS: That's what I was going to say:
19 Jones Creek is very familiar.

20 MR. PHARRIS: We were -- we were going to
21 look at moving this one block.

22 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. We were. We asked you
23 guys to take a look at it, didn't we? So we're saying
24 no to this version.

25 MR. PHARRIS: Otherwise, no.

1 COMM. GORTON: 6,000 people on this page. I
2 think we can just say no to that.

3 COMM. CEIS: Yes. That's a good idea. And
4 we're already dealing with the Mill Creek issue in a
5 different setting.

6 COMM. GORTON: We've got -- we've already
7 discussed those two.

8 4,000 people in this. I think we better say no.

9 COMM. CEIS: Well, this is the Everett-city-
10 limits issue. This is the Everett city limits.

11 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

12 MR. PHARRIS: Right. The suggestion was to
13 use I-5 as the boundary instead of the Everett city
14 limits.

15 COMM. CEIS: Right. We're just splitting
16 Everett unnecessarily --

17 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

18 COMM. CEIS: -- when we do that, though.

19 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

20 COMM. CEIS: We don't have any other Everett
21 in the 44th.

22 MR. PHARRIS: I don't believe so.

23 COMM. HUFF: It's a no?

24 COMM. GORTON: No.

25 COMM. FOSTER: Yes, that's a no.

1 COMM. HUFF: Yes, it's a no.

2 COMM. GORTON: And I think the same thing on
3 this next one, 2,000 people. We would have to get the
4 populations right.

5 And the next one's almost 5,000 people. And the
6 next ones are just drawings of those earlier ones.

7 COMM. CEIS: Yes.

8 COMM. FOSTER: So now we're on --

9 COMM. GORTON: We're on to Seattle, East
10 Madison Street in Seattle.

11 COMM. FOSTER: We -- maybe I'm not keeping up
12 with you guys.

13 COMM. HUFF: Where we at?

14 COMM. GORTON: The last three were just
15 drawings of --

16 COMM. FOSTER: Up on the board there, we said
17 no.

18 COMM. HUFF: No, right.

19 COMM. FOSTER: The next one in the middle of
20 the lake. We said no.

21 COMM. HUFF: No. Right.

22 COMM. GORTON: And those are just what it
23 would look like if we did those.

24 COMM. FOSTER: Oh, okay. Right. This one.
25 Okay.

1 MR. PHARRIS: Next two.

2 MS. BUNNING: And so the next one --

3 COMM. CEIS: This one we can say yes to?

4 COMM. FOSTER: Yep.

5 COMM. CEIS: We checked?

6 COMM. FOSTER: Yep. It was an apartment --

7 COMM. CEIS: Yep.

8 COMM. FOSTER: -- in that area.

9 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

10 COMM. GORTON: This is a zero population.

11 COMM. CEIS: This is the one you had an
12 alternative to that made more sense.

13 MR. PHARRIS: This is the one I had a
14 countersuggestion for.

15 COMM. CEIS: Right, which is on the next
16 page.

17 MR. PHARRIS: Right.

18 COMM. GORTON: Oh, okay.

19 MR. PHARRIS: And that would be around both
20 the legislative and congressional line along the
21 Sammamish urban-growth boundary.

22 COMM. CEIS: Then it has zero --

23 COMM. HUFF: This one's no, and the next
24 one's yes?

25 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. The alternative --

1 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

2 COMM. FOSTER: And zero population?

3 MR. PHARRIS: That's right.

4 MS. BUNNING: Right.

5 COMM. CEIS: So on this one, does it create
6 one 322-person precinct, or is it two different
7 precincts?

8 MR. PHARRIS: It would be one 322-person
9 precinct.

10 COMM. CEIS: That doesn't seem like a
11 hardship.

12 MR. PHARRIS: Until Renton grabs some more of
13 the area.

14 COMM. CEIS: Pardon me?

15 MR. PHARRIS: Oh, this is an area that Renton
16 has been doing a lot of piecemeal annexations in, but
17 they're hard to predict.

18 COMM. CEIS: Yeah.

19 COMM. GORTON: Yeah. Follow the
20 congressional boundary where we can. That's fine.

21 COMM. CEIS: Right. But it 322 people if we
22 take this into advisement moving into the 11th out of
23 the 5th.

24 COMM. FOSTER: But, again, that's single
25 precinct there, not plural, right?

1 COMM. CEIS: Right. It's one.

2 MR. PHARRIS: That would be one precinct,
3 yes. Though, it looks like this one --

4 COMM. GORTON: Probably have to find
5 something to balance this one off with.

6 COMM. CEIS: We would if we take it, so we'll
7 have to assign to staff.

8 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

9 COMM. CEIS: Looks like another one. Well,
10 it involves the (indiscernible).

11 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: You guys knocked off a
12 lot of those.

13 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. We really helped them out
14 a lot.

15 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Yes, you did.

16 COMM. GORTON: Well, the next one partly
17 balances is off.

18 COMM. CEIS: So we'll just put that in the
19 mix with them and let them take a look at this one,
20 too.

21 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

22 MR. PHARRIS: This was the one where I
23 actually recommended the opposite, to move the
24 congressional line and to match the legislative line to
25 keep all of Renton together.

1 COMM. CEIS: well -- well, why don't you guys
2 take a look at that, come back with a recommendation on
3 it.

4 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

5 COMM. FOSTER: We're a lot more constrained
6 on population congressionally than we are
7 legislatively.

8 COMM. CEIS: we've got all those deviations
9 under ten, so we do not want to exceed that.

10 well, that was a good thing to do.

11 Should we take a recess for a few minutes?

12 COMM. GORTON: Yeah, 'cause we'll have
13 something for you.

14 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: A little break?

15 COMM. CEIS: Okay. what do you think? 4:30?
16 5:00?

17 COMM. GORTON: well, let's make it 4:30.

18 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. Okay. We -- you
19 guys agree?

20 COMM. FOSTER: I didn't hear.

21 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Recess till 4:30? Take a
22 little break?

23 COMM. FOSTER: That's great.

24 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay.

25 COMM. FOSTER: I'm in agreement.

1 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. We are recessed
2 now until 4:30 p.m.

3 (Recess.)

4
5 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. I'd like to
6 reconvene this meeting of the Washington State
7 Redistricting Commission.

8 And do you want to make a presentation first,
9 or . . . ?

10 COMM. CEIS: Nope.

11 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. What are we --
12 okay.

13 COMM. CEIS: Well, I think that we're
14 probably getting close to the end of the day here.
15 I -- we've been at it a long time. We need to
16 probably --

17 MS. BOE: Can you come forward?

18 COMM. CEIS: Sorry. Just thinking to myself.
19 we're probably close to the end of the day here,
20 and there might be just a couple odds and ends we might
21 want to finish up here before we go. But probably
22 should discuss some --

23 COMM. FOSTER: Well, I'd like to discuss the
24 next phase of reconciliation. We have one major piece
25 of reconciliation, considering today what we did was

1 the auditor and John Milem's and other people's
2 suggestions, and that is the reconciliation between
3 King County and Pierce County and the legislative side,
4 because we've never had an open commission discussion
5 about that. And if we're -- I would like to have that
6 conversation so that if one or more of us would like to
7 put together a plan for that area, we've got some ideas
8 on the table.

9 COMM. HUFF: Sounds -- sounds good to me. I
10 agree with that.

11 COMM. FOSTER: And I'm happy to start. I --
12 when we divide the responsibilities, Tom and I moving
13 north into Pierce County and the other two moving south
14 from the Canadian line, I thought that our assignment
15 was to go to the Pierce County line. And the 31st
16 District would be the one area that would go across the
17 county line, and -- and we would reconcile that balance
18 when we got done.

19 when we saw the maps, it didn't turn out that way.
20 We had a couple of issues where the map in the
21 30th District went down into Pierce County in a
22 couple of places. We drew -- we -- we've got
23 overlapping jurisdictions now.

24 COMM. GORTON: Yep.

25 COMM. FOSTER: We heard from people today

1 who -- who are concerned about the city being -- the
2 cities which go across county lines, which help us
3 create this problem. They voluntarily did that. And
4 now it's, do they remain a city and a legislative
5 district, or do they remain a city in two counties,
6 which is what they are now. And I think we ought to
7 move toward a discussion about that.

8 COMM. GORTON: I think so, too, of course.

9 COMM. FOSTER: I -- we -- we drew a map that
10 left the 31st District open but not the others. And
11 so I guess that's where I start from.

12 COMM. GORTON: Well, I guess we left the
13 31st District open, too, on the King County side.

14 COMM. CEIS: Yep.

15 COMM. GORTON: Except when you draw all
16 the -- all the rest, there you have it.

17 COMM. FOSTER: Well, it's the 30th district
18 that you went across the county line.

19 COMM. GORTON: The 30th District that we went
20 across the county line those two places.

21 COMM. FOSTER: But our overlap is in that
22 area, and that will make a difference in the 25th and
23 maybe all the way around to the 31st.

24 COMM. GORTON: It will.

25 COMM. HUFF: Well, I -- Dean, I would agree

1 that we've got to work out the 25th and the 30th.
2 And we tried to do that one time, and -- and we did it.
3 But that was not the final map by any stretch of the
4 imagination.

5 COMM. FOSTER: Right.

6 COMM. HUFF: And, of course, there's --
7 there's a couple of problems with a couple of precincts
8 that we've talked about already. And that -- we need
9 to resolve that. I don't know if we can resolve that
10 tonight, but we certainly probably should start with
11 that first thing in the morning and have maps out and
12 here's what we suggest and here's what you suggest and
13 move from there. That would be my suggestion.

14 COMM. GORTON: Let's do it when we're fresh
15 and maybe we solve the big problem.

16 COMM. HUFF: Yeah.

17 COMM. FOSTER: What?

18 COMM. GORTON: I said, let's do it when we're
19 fresh, and maybe then we solve the big problem.

20 COMM. FOSTER: Okay. All right. I just want
21 to make sure that -- that we somehow got into this
22 conversation and that people would know that we'd be
23 working on those things 'cause I see the eastern
24 Washington issue, and then I see this reconciliation,
25 and then I see the work that the staff is going to do

1 under Nick's leadership on what we did this afternoon
2 as sort of all leading to the end of this process.

3 COMM. HUFF: Right.

4 COMM. CEIS: Nick, have you had a chance to
5 have any discussions with folks about how to approach
6 your job?

7 MR. PHARRIS: I'm -- I actually have not had
8 a chance to speak with all four caucuses about who's
9 going to be withing with me yet.

10 COMM. CEIS: I know two.

11 MR. PHARRIS: I know three of them at this
12 point.

13 COMM. CEIS: Those two right there, one in
14 the yellow, one in the black.

15 Okay. So that's as far as we are on that? Okay.

16 Just one other housekeeping thing, I -- I don't
17 think we sufficiently thanked John Milem for his work
18 on the technical adjustments today as we went through
19 them.

20 And I just would like to express my appreciation
21 for the work you did in pointing out those adjustments
22 to us. It was very, very helpful. And, again, our
23 appreciation to your participation in the process,
24 John.

25 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Here, here.

1 COMM. HUFF: I think that's unanimous.

2 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. why don't --

3 Is there anything else that anyone wants to bring
4 forward at this time?

5 Okay. I may want to make a proposal about
6 changing the time of the meeting on Sunday morning.
7 But I think I'm going to wait till first thing tomorrow
8 to do that.

9 COMM. GORTON: Okay.

10 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I want to think about it
11 a little bit more and look for options. So --

12 COMM. HUFF: One day at a time, right?

13 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: One day at a time. Okay.

14 COMM. CEIS: We have a 24-hour problem.

15 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: well, I thought if we do
16 it at -- well, it depends on what time we want to
17 switch it to.

18 COMM. CEIS: well --

19 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I mean, we could do it at
20 10:30.

21 COMM. CEIS: You have a -- it's at noon now.
22 If we meet at 10:30 tomorrow, the earliest you could
23 call it --

24 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: At 10:00.

25 COMM. CEIS: -- would be for 11:00 o'clock on

1 Sunday.

2 MR. FALLIS: That's the issue.

3 COMM. HUFF: I make the suggestion that we
4 establish the time for Sunday for 10:00 or 10:30. And
5 if we have to delay it for a while, we can. We can do
6 that.

7 COMM. GORTON: It's easier to delay than to
8 move it forward.

9 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Yeah. Okay. Okay.

10 COMM. GORTON: 10:30, then.

11 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: 10:30 on Sunday? Can
12 we --

13 COMM. HUFF: That sounds fine.

14 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: -- staff, make that
15 change, please?

16 COMM. CEIS: So we're going to renote it for
17 10:30 Sunday? All right.

18 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Anything else anybody
19 wants to bring forward? Bonnie?

20 COMM. FOSTER: And, Nick, I know we're
21 putting a lot on you. But you think you can have
22 congressional report tomorrow morning?

23 MR. PHARRIS: It's going to be difficult to
24 do both the -- the sort of committee reconciliation on
25 the leg ones and -- and create a congressional report

1 for tomorrow.

2 MS. BOE: Can Ryan do it?

3 COMM. CEIS: So what's our priority here?

4 MR. PHARRIS: We -- yeah.

5 COMM. CEIS: To have them start working on
6 the final leg reconciliation, or should we get an
7 initial analysis of the congressional district?

8 COMM. FOSTER: I think we ought to get an
9 initial -- I don't know what kind of reports we have
10 from anybody. But I think we ought to do like we did
11 today on congress as early as we can tomorrow in -- in
12 case we've got the same kinds of processes that have to
13 go through, and then we have 24 hours at least.

14 COMM. CEIS: We haven't heard back from any
15 auditors on congress, have we?

16 MR. PHARRIS: We have.

17 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

18 MR. PHARRIS: I know we heard back from King,
19 Douglas, I believe, Snohomish, and Pierce.

20 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

21 MR. PHARRIS: That's all.

22 COMM. CEIS: Not likely we'll hear back from
23 anybody tomorrow.

24 MR. PHARRIS: Probably. Yeah.

25 COMM. CEIS: So that may be the end of our

1 auditor comments.

2 John, have you had a chance to yet?

3 MR. MILEM: Yes. Other than Skagit County,
4 my comments are all of the sort that were not dealt
5 with today because they're all zero-population blocks.
6 There is that issue in Skagit County that I spoke about
7 yesterday.

8 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: John, do you want to come
9 forward and just speak at the microphone, please?

10 MS. BOE: That would be good.

11 MS. BUNNING: I handed that out yesterday.

12 MR. MILEM: John Milem, Vancouver.

13 The comments that I made on congressional-district
14 boundary problems were all zero-population blocks. And
15 Nick did not present the counterpart legislative
16 comments today; he just passed over those. I mean, you
17 were talking about populated areas.

18 COMM. CEIS: Right. Right. We -- there
19 was --

20 MR. MILEM: So there's nothing there in that
21 work --

22 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

23 MR. MILEM: -- that involved populated areas.

24 As I did tell you yesterday, in Skagit County
25 there were several places where there were small

1 populations caught between a municipal boundary and a
2 district boundary, and the -- I ended up finding a
3 place where I could get most of that population. Then
4 I needed to -- then I needed find some compensating
5 population. And then I needed to find some more
6 compensating population.

7 But basically one of those districts was four --
8 four people too small; the other one was two people too
9 small. And when I was done, they were each three too
10 small. So you're talking about transferring about 260
11 people and not changing -- not changing the population.

12 COMM. CEIS: And do you have that report and
13 those recommendations?

14 MR. MILEM: Well, I've -- the staff has it.

15 COMM. CEIS: The staff has it? Okay.

16 MR. MILEM: Yeah. Uh-huh.

17 COMM. CEIS: So you have that?

18 MR. PHARRIS: The report on your --

19 MR. MILEM: On the Skagit County suggestions?

20 MR. PHARRIS: Yes. Yes.

21 MR. MILEM: Yes. Uh-huh. So --

22 COMM. CEIS: So we could review the auditor's
23 information tomorrow and John's Skagit.

24 MR. PHARRIS: Yes. I -- yes. Yes.

25 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

1 MR. PHARRIS: I can have that for you
2 tomorrow.

3 MR. MILEM: Thank you.

4 MS. BUNNING: I'd also like to just add that
5 the Spokane county auditor in particular has been
6 constantly watching today and trying to keep up with
7 what may be happening there if there was any
8 opportunity to look at a shapefile. And we did put
9 your map up there for them to look at. So they may be
10 trying to get some extra time.

11 COMM. CEIS: My recommendation is that the
12 auditor not spend a lot of time on that shapefile until
13 we get something that's more final, if they're
14 listening right now, 'cause they'll just be doing their
15 work over again.

16 COMM. HUFF: I have one additional comment.
17 I too want to thank you, John, but we missed seeing
18 your wife.

19 MR. MILEM: well, we have family in town this
20 week, so . . .

21 COMM. HUFF: There you go.

22 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. I think the only
23 other thing we're going to try to do from the staff
24 point of view is bring to you tomorrow a list of what
25 we think needs to be done just to make sure we're all

1 on the same page. And if there's some things we've
2 left off, we'll just -- we'll fill in the blanks and --
3 just to make sure we just sort check off all the -- all
4 the items.

5 But the big thing is to get the shapefiles, the
6 finals, to the Legislature by midnight on the 1st, and
7 hopefully before that. So okay.

8 Any --

9 COMM. FOSTER: It's pretty clear that the
10 staff's going to have a couple long -- 48 hours. And I
11 will start by saying thank you. Maybe we'll say thank
12 you later. But just to anticipate, it's going to be a
13 long 48 hours.

14 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: And then after that,
15 getting the report done as quickly as possible after we
16 finish our job is going to be a little bit long, even
17 more hard work. But they're -- they've been working
18 really hard so far, and --

19 COMM. GORTON: Yes, you have.

20 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: -- we do appreciate it.

21 MR. PHARRIS: Thank you.

22 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Anything needs to come
23 before us this evening?

24 Okay. So we stand adjourned until 10:30 tomorrow
25 morning.

- 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

COMM. CEIS: Sounds good.
(Proceedings concluded at 5:25 p.m.)