

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

January 13, 2012

1063 Capitol Way South, Room 105
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 APPEARANCES

- 2
- 3 LURA POWELL - CHAIRWOMAN
- 4 TOM HUFF - COMMISSIONER
- 5 TIM CEIS - COMMISSIONER
- 6 SLADE GORTON - COMMISSIONER
- 7 DEAN FOSTER - COMMISSIONER
- 8 RUSTY FALLIS - ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
- 9 GENEVIEVE O'SULLIVAN - COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR
- 10 NICK PHARRIS - GIS MAP & DATA SPECIALIST
- 11 RYAN WILKE - GIS MAP & DATA SPECIALIST
- 12 HEATHER BOE - OUTREACH COORDINATOR
- 13 RACHEL GAY - OFFICE COORDINATOR
- 14 EMILY WALTERS - ANALYST FOR COMM. CEIS
- 15 ADAM BARTZ - ANALYST FOR COMM. FOSTER
- 16 KAREN MARTIN - WALLA WALLA COUNTY AUDITOR (by phone)
- 17 DEBBIE BENAVIDES - WALLA WALLA COUNTY ELECTIONS (by phone)
- 18 THAD DUVALL - DOUGLAS COUNTY AUDITOR (by phone)
- 19 VICKY DALTON - SPOKANE COUNTY AUDITOR (by phone)
- 20 DAVID WILSON - KING COUNTY GIS SUPERVISOR
- 21 MARY JOHNSON-HALL - PIERCE COUNTY ELECTIONS
- 22 DAVE VALIANT - PIERCE COUNTY ELECTIONS
- 23

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

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

PAGE

Proposed line adjustments - Mr. Pharris	11
Executive Director's Report - Ms. Bunning	82
PUBLIC COMMENT	
Mr. John Milem	85

1 BE IT REMEMBERED that on Friday, January 13, 2012, at
2 10:34 a.m., at 1063 Capitol Way South, Olympia,
3 Washington, the following proceedings were had, to wit:

4
5 * * * * *

6
7 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. I think we're
8 ready to get started. I'd like to call this meeting of
9 the Washington State Redistricting Commission to order.

10 And I'd like to start with some introductions of
11 those who are here at the table.

12 So, Ryan, do you want to just state your --

13 MR. WILKE: I'm Ryan Wilke, GIS analyst.

14 MS. BUNNING: I'm Bonnie Bunning. I'm the
15 executive director for the Commission.

16 COMM. GORTON: Slade Gorton, the Republican
17 Senate appointee.

18 COMM. CEIS: Tim Ceis, Democratic Senate
19 appointee.

20 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I'm not sure I said my
21 name. So Lura Powell, I'm chair of the Commission.

22 COMM. FOSTER: I'm Dean Foster, House
23 Democratic caucus appointee.

24 COMM. HUFF: Tom Huff, House Republican
25 appointee.

1 MR. FALLIS: Rusty Fallis, general counsel.

2 MR. PHARRIS: Nick Pharris, GIS analyst.

3 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. And I -- I wanted
4 to check and see. We had some folks that wanted to
5 join us by phone today, and I wanted to see if they
6 were on.

7 Is Karen Martin on the phone?

8 (No audible response.)

9 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Debbie Benavides?

10 MS. BENAVIDES: Yes, I'm here with Karen
11 Martin.

12 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Oh, the two of you are
13 here. Okay. Great.

14 And then Jim Troyer?

15 (No audible response.)

16 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Thad Duvall?

17 MR. DUVALL: Thad Duvall's on the line.

18 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Vicki Dalton?

19 MS. DALTON: Vicki is on the line from
20 Spokane.

21 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. Anybody else
22 that's joined us?

23 (No audible response.)

24 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. Thank you very
25 much.

1 First order of business is approval of a whole
2 bunch of minutes. So I hope you all have had a chance
3 to take a look at these ahead of time. If not, I want
4 to make sure you have a chance -- you know, you do have
5 a chance to look at them. So we can let you do that.

6 But the -- the first ones I'd like to consider are
7 the minutes of December 29th.

8 COMM. CEIS: Move we approve.

9 COMM. FOSTER: Second.

10 Oh, I guess we don't do that anymore.

11 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: There's been a motion to
12 approve the minutes of December 29th.

13 Is there any discussion?

14 Okay. All of those in favor say "aye."

15 COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

16 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Opposed?

17 Okay. Thank you.

18 The next minutes are those of December 30th.

19 Are there any additions or corrections to these
20 minutes?

21 COMM. FOSTER: I move we approve.

22 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. There's a motion
23 for approval.

24 Is there any further discussion?

25 Hearing none, all those in favor say "aye."

1 COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

2 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Opposed?

3 Okay. Thank you.

4 The next ones are December 31st. Are there any
5 additions or corrections to the minutes?

6 COMM. GORTON: (Indiscernible).

7 COMM. HUFF: So moved.

8 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. There's been a
9 motion for approval of the December 31st minutes.

10 Is there any additional discussion or additions or
11 corrections?

12 Hearing none, all those in favor say "aye."

13 COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

14 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Opposed?

15 Thank you.

16 Now we come to January 1st. Are there any
17 additions or corrections to the minutes of
18 January 1st?

19 COMM. FOSTER: Did somebody proofread this,
20 the motion, to make sure we got the -- it's
21 complicated.

22 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: which one are you talking
23 about?

24 COMM. FOSTER: The --

25 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: The final one?

1 MR. FALLIS: I read it.

2 COMM. FOSTER: Yeah. That's the one that
3 ought to be right.

4 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: We passed everything
5 through Rusty to make sure.

6 Okay. If there are no additions or corrections,
7 can I hear a motion for approval?

8 COMM. HUFF: So moved.

9 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. It's been moved to
10 approve the minutes of January 1st.

11 Are there any additional discussion?

12 All those in favor say "aye."

13 COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

14 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Opposed?

15 Okay. And then our last minutes for approval
16 today are January 4th. And we do have one minor
17 correction that Rusty gave me just before the meeting,
18 and it's under Archive Requirements. And it's the --
19 is it one, two, three, four -- fourth line down. And
20 insert -- strike the word "is," which is the fifth word
21 in, and insert "virtually every document is likely to
22 be."

23 MR. FALLIS: As it reads now, it has me
24 saying everything you have is a public record, and that
25 isn't what I said. I said it's likely that everything

1 we have is a public record. So -- but I haven't seen
2 them, so I can't say they all were.

3 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. Are there any
4 other --

5 COMM. GORTON: But we don't need to keep
6 (indiscernible).

7 MR. FALLIS: That's correct.

8 THE REPORTER: If everyone could speak up
9 because there are no microphones, that would help out.
10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: All right. We will try
12 to do that. And just remind us if we're getting too
13 quiet.

14 Okay. Are there any other additions or
15 corrections to the minutes?

16 If not, can I hear a motion for the approval of
17 the minutes as amended?

18 Maybe I can -- I guess we have to vote on the
19 amendment first. Trying to think.

20 MR. FALLIS: Technically.

21 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: So let's -- let's just
22 vote on the amendment that Rusty submitted as stated.

23 So can I hear a motion for -- I guess if the
24 amendment -- he can't make the --

25 COMM. GORTON: Move for approval of the

1 amendment.

2 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. All those in favor
3 of the amendment to Section 2, Archive Requirements,
4 that was submitted by Rusty Fallis, say "aye."

5 COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

6 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Opposed?

7 Okay. Are there any additional amendments to the
8 minutes?

9 Hearing none, can I hear a motion for approval as
10 amended?

11 COMM. HUFF: Aye.

12 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. So we have a
13 motion to approve the amended minutes of January 4th.

14 All those in favor say "aye."

15 COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

16 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Opposed?

17 Thank you.

18 COMM. HUFF: I have a question.

19 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Yes.

20 COMM. HUFF: The minutes for the 28th, did
21 we ever see those? Maybe passed me by. I don't know.

22 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I thought we
23 approved them --

24 COMM. GORTON: I think I saw on one of these
25 we approved them.

1 COMM. CEIS: Yes, they were approved.

2 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: would have been
3 probably --

4 COMM. HUFF: The 29th, I would think.

5 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: -- the 29th.

6 COMM. GORTON: No. 27th. Minutes, yeah,
7 it's on the first -- it's on the first page of the
8 January 1st minutes, the 28th minutes were
9 presented and approved.

10 COMM. HUFF: Thank you.

11 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: There's been a lot of
12 them.

13 COMM. HUFF: I know.

14 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: And I got to say the
15 staff really worked hard to make sure they were as
16 accurate as possible. And we appreciate those of you
17 who gave us some feedback.

18 COMM. HUFF: Thank you.

19 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. So I guess the
20 next thing -- order of business is the county-auditor
21 and public feedback.

22 And so, Nick, you going to walk us through this?

23 MR. PHARRIS: Sure thing.

24 So we actually have four presentations here. One
25 and three are comments we've received from the county

1 auditors on the congressional and legislative plans as
2 adopted respectively. Two and four are from other
3 sources, from the public, from Commission staff, from
4 other interested parties.

5 we'll start with the comments from the auditors.
6 I have inserted staff recommendations in here where
7 they're relevant to requests by the auditors. Many of
8 the issues that have been brought to our attention by
9 the auditors and their staffs are problems with census
10 geography or inaccurate city limits, inaccurately drawn
11 streams, other -- other boundaries, other features.

12 Effectively in the -- in the resolution adopted,
13 the Commission gave discretion to county auditors and
14 other elections officials to -- to use boundaries and
15 visible features in the locations where -- where they
16 really are. They don't have to use the line that the
17 Census Bureau mapped for, you know, Smith Creek. They
18 can -- they can draw their line between the districts
19 where Smith Creek actually lies. And we believe this
20 will be a great help.

21 we've also received many comments from our
22 faithful friend John Miley, who has also been working
23 with the county auditors.

24 The first suggested change is a move of 11 people
25 from Congressional District 9 to Congressional

1 District 8. This is a request from King County to
2 avoid having these 11 people trapped between a
3 legislative and a congressional line.

4 The staff would actually recommend more or less
5 the opposite change. Since population variances --
6 population-variance allowances are rather greater for
7 legislative than congressional districts, we would
8 suggest moving these 11 people from the 11th to the
9 5th Legislative District, thereby harmonizing the lines
10 between the two -- between the legislative and
11 congressional districts and avoiding having these 11
12 people trapped in a precinct.

13 COMM. CEIS: And what does that do to the
14 legislative deviations?

15 MR. PHARRIS: We actually have a series of
16 recommendations.

17 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

18 MR. PHARRIS: Taken as a whole, the -- there
19 are a number of them. Since the 5th District is so
20 large and borders so many districts, there are quite a
21 number that affect the 5th District. But if all of the
22 staff-recommended changes were adopted, it would end up
23 short by 26 people and the 11th would be high by 42.

24 COMM. CEIS: Okay. So can I ask in your
25 tally -- and, I guess, do you have that in front of me?

1 MR. PHARRIS: Yes, it's --

2 COMM. CEIS: Is that what this is?

3 MR. PHARRIS: Yes. Very back page you have,
4 the very bottom. All those are of small print.

5 COMM. CEIS: So are we -- we had kind -- had
6 set 50 as our tolerance level. So we stayed within
7 that with all of staff recommendations?

8 MR. PHARRIS: I believe -- I believe all the
9 districts are now under 50. There were two -- 13th
10 is at 51, and --

11 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. There was couple.

12 MR. PHARRIS: -- the 5th is at 56. They're
13 now all under 50.

14 COMM. CEIS: Okay. Thank you.

15 MR. PHARRIS: Returning to congressional
16 recommendations.

17 COMM. CEIS: Just ask a process question,
18 Madam Chair?

19 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Yeah.

20 COMM. CEIS: So how do we want to deal with
21 these? One by one? Any sense of the Commission? Like
22 we did last time? Or as a package? Or what are we
23 doing here?

24 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: what's your pleasure?

25 COMM. GORTON: I think at this point, when

1 we're deal dealing with actual changes and some change
2 in population, we ought to do them one by one. And I
3 think we ought to require unanimity to adopt changes.

4 COMM. CEIS: Okay. So a vote on each one
5 then, or --

6 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

7 COMM. CEIS: -- at least --

8 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Get a consensus.

9 COMM. GORTON: (Indiscernible) zeros, we
10 can --

11 COMM. CEIS: Perhaps just ask if there's any
12 objections.

13 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Right.

14 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

15 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Yeah.

16 Does everybody agree to that?

17 COMM. HUFF: Yes.

18 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay.

19 COMM. FOSTER: That's fine.

20 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. So on this first
21 one that --

22 Nick, put the last one back up.

23 -- are there any -- is everyone in agreement?

24 COMM. CEIS: Any objections?

25 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objections? Thank

1 you.

2 COMM. FOSTER: So this is the King County --

3 MR. PHARRIS: This is a counterproposal to
4 King County's request.

5 COMM. HUFF: We're agreeing to staff
6 recommendation, I take it.

7 COMM. CEIS: Yes, we're agreeing to staff
8 recommendation to move from the 11th to the 5th.

9 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. Any objections?
10 Hearing none, let's go forward.

11 MR. PHARRIS: This is a request from Pierce
12 County. The blue line here is the congressional line,
13 and the red is the legislative line. As it stands
14 these two blocks with a total of four people will be
15 trapped between the two and would have to constitute
16 either one discontinuous or two precincts on their own.

17 The County requests that Military Road be used as
18 the boundary for both the congressional and the
19 legislative district in this area. This would move
20 four people from Congressional District 10 to
21 Congressional District 8. And this move is compensated
22 by other changes, which will be suggested later.

23 COMM. CEIS: This was one that our staff
24 looked at, and I think they had an issue with this one.

25 MS. WALTERS: There was just continuity

1 between -- if you look up, I think that says 13 and
2 maybe 36 up in the northeast corner --

3 MR. BARTZ: That also don't follow.

4 MS. WALTERS: -- that also don't follow the
5 line. So you're fixing part of the problem but not all
6 of the problem.

7 MR. PHARRIS: That will be addressed in later
8 recommendation.

9 MS. WALTERS: Oh, will it? Okay.

10 COMM. CEIS: Okay. So you have something
11 else dealing with that?

12 MR. PHARRIS: That one, the leg line will
13 move to the congressional line.

14 MS. WALTERS: Okay. Great.

15 COMM. CEIS: All right.

16 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objections?

17 Okay. Let's move forward.

18 MR. PHARRIS: This is a request by Skagit
19 County. As -- as part of a population-balancing
20 operation, these eight people, this small block with
21 eight people, were moved from the -- the 2nd into the
22 1st District? Yeah.

23 But this feature here is apparently not a real
24 road, and it's cutting through several tax parcels.
25 And they would prefer that the boundary be moved back

1 to West Big Lake Boulevard. This is compensated by the
2 next couple of changes.

3 COMM. HUFF: How many people live there?
4 Six?

5 MR. PHARRIS: Eight.

6 COMM. HUFF: Eight?

7 COMM. CEIS: So this keeps the deviation
8 under ten --

9 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

10 COMM. CEIS: -- when we make the other
11 adjustments?

12 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

13 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. Any objections?
14 Okay.

15 MR. PHARRIS: One second.

16 MR. WILKE: Sorry.

17 MR. PHARRIS: Did those other two not make in
18 here? I guess those are staff recommendations. That's
19 all right. Move forward.

20 This is a -- a problem with the boundary between
21 the 5th and 4th Congressional Districts. In this area
22 the boundary basically follows the boundary of Touchet,
23 T-o-u-c-h-e-t, School District. But this small sliver
24 of a block was left out. So this is zero population.
25 would reconcile the two boundaries.

1 COMM. HUFF: Okay.

2 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objections?

3 MR. PHARRIS: We received a communication
4 from walla walla County objecting to the use of Sand
5 Pit Road as the congressional boundary between the 4th
6 and 5th Districts. Apparently Sand Pit Road is not
7 actually continuous through here. It becomes dirt.
8 It's basically somebody's driveway.

9 There is a zero-population block just north of
10 here, which respects parcel boundaries and can could be
11 added to the 5th District to -- to keep this property
12 whole. There would be no population.

13 COMM. FOSTER: So the yellow line is a -- is
14 that a road?

15 MR. PHARRIS: Yellow line here, it's an
16 existing precinct boundary.

17 COMM. FOSTER: Oh.

18 COMM. HUFF: Okay.

19 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objections?

20 Okay. Move forward.

21 MR. PHARRIS: That's it for the auditor
22 comments.

23 COMM. GORTON: This shows what the deviations
24 will be with all of these changes?

25 MR. PHARRIS: These are the original

1 deviations, actually.

2 COMM. GORTON: Oh, I see.

3 MR. PHARRIS: The projected deviations --

4 MS. MARTIN: Excuse me. This is Karen from
5 Walla Walla County.

6 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Yes, please.

7 MS. MARTIN: Can I --

8 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Yes, please.

9 MS. MARTIN: That line from Sand Pit Road,
10 the yellow line, that is not a precinct boundary.

11 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Can you explain what it
12 is?

13 MR. DUVALL: It's a census block. It's a
14 census-block boundary that you guys had. But nothing
15 actually exists under that.

16 MR. PHARRIS: That's --

17 MR. DUVALL: It goes through a like a farm
18 field. Doesn't follow property boundaries or anything.

19 MR. PHARRIS: Sand Pit Road does, yes, and
20 the census line -- the line to the north of that,
21 though, it's the boundary between Frenchtown and
22 Touchet precinct.

23 MS. MARTIN: Um . . .

24 MR. DUVALL: Oh, okay. Yeah, that would --
25 could do that (indiscernible).

1 MS. MARTIN: (Indiscernible).

2 MR. DUVALL: If you go up to Frenchtown
3 voting district north and then go west toward Barney
4 Road --

5 MR. PHARRIS: Right.

6 MR. DUVALL: So that would be zero
7 population. Is that what you're talking about?

8 MR. PHARRIS: That's what we're proposing,
9 yes.

10 MR. DUVALL: Okay. I think that would make
11 sense.

12 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay.

13 MR. DUVALL: It would make two less
14 (indiscernible).

15 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Thank you.

16 Any objection?

17 MS. MARTIN: Thank you.

18 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objection?

19 Okay.

20 MR. PHARRIS: So that concludes the auditor
21 comments on the congressional districts.

22 These are comments on the congressional plan from
23 other sources, Commission staff, including some that
24 were inspired by public comments.

25 This is a suggestion from Commissioner Gorton to

1 move the Alpentāl area -- ski-resort area, I believe,
2 near I-90 from District 1 into District 8. This would
3 move 22 people. And to compensate, 28 people would be
4 moved in the Fall City area from the 8th into the 1st
5 District.

6 Staff have examined this. And unfortunately
7 the -- the boundaries proposed around the Alpentāl area
8 do not respect parcel boundaries, and they do appear to
9 leave out some of the population in this area.

10 As a counterproposal we would suggest -- this
11 looks like a large expansion area, but it's not that
12 many additional people. Original Alpentāl suggestion,
13 I believe, is in here. This is a block with 53 people
14 and then a few more along the highway that had to be
15 added, as well.

16 I had spoken with Dave Wilson from King County GIS
17 about this proposed boundary. And they are happy with
18 it. This would move 136 people from District 1 to
19 District 8. And it would be compensated by a move of
20 142 from District 8 to District 1, again in a kink of
21 downtown Fall City area.

22 MS. BUNNING: This is on page 7 and 8 in this
23 handout.

24 COMM. FOSTER: Well, I'm not very excited by
25 splitting Fall City.

1 COMM. GORTON: Does it split Fall -- does it
2 split the City of Fall City?

3 MR. PHARRIS: There's no corporate limit.

4 COMM. FOSTER: There's no City of Fall City,
5 but there's a school there that's been a community
6 for --

7 COMM. CEIS: Long time.

8 COMM. FOSTER: I was raised in Carnation.
9 It's very close. So I mean, it is --

10 I think splitting a small unit like that -- I
11 can't call it a city, even though it's Fall City. I --
12 I don't like that idea.

13 COMM. GORTON: Okay. Well, when this was --
14 this was originally suggested by Charlie Murray
15 (phonetic) from the Sierra Club, at which point it was
16 advertised as 14 people in Alpentāl. It seems to have
17 grown to about ten times that size. And Tim has
18 expressed some objections to it, too, so . . .

19 COMM. CEIS: Well, I -- you know, with the
20 staff recommendation on Alpentāl, I don't object to
21 that. The earlier Alpentāl boundary I did; I thought
22 it was not a logical boundary.

23 COMM. GORTON: You were right in that.

24 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. And I know we're trying
25 to accommodate Charlie and the other environmental

1 organizations involved in -- up there.

2 Is there no other option for a more logical offset
3 than the Fall City split?

4 MR. PHARRIS: The -- the boundary is already
5 wrapped pretty tightly around the city limits.

6 COMM. CEIS: Yeah.

7 MR. PHARRIS: The other option with
8 Snoqualmie or Bend or Sammamish --

9 COMM. CEIS: which -- yeah.

10 MR. PHARRIS: -- which are all appropriate.

11 COMM. CEIS: Yeah.

12 COMM. GORTON: I've -- this now seems to me
13 to be too much.

14 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. We tried --

15 COMM. GORTON: I tend to agree with Dean.
16 Yeah. We tried. But I think we can't have it.

17 COMM. CEIS: All right.

18 MR. PHARRIS: Okay. Moving on back to
19 slide 4, this is an area -- the congressional district
20 is running along the Mount Baker Highway. There are 14
21 people trapped here between the City of Bellingham and
22 the proposed congressional district.

23 We recommend moving these blocks to avoid having
24 to create a very small precinct in this area. It's a
25 move of 14 people from Congressional District 2 to

1 Congressional District 1.

2 COMM. CEIS: And where is the offset?

3 MR. PHARRIS: The offset for -- this is the
4 Skagit County change again. The offset is here
5 southeast of --

6 COMM. GORTON: What page number?

7 MR. PHARRIS: Sorry. This is page 6.

8 COMM. GORTON: Okay.

9 MR. PHARRIS: This is -- this is just
10 repeated. These are all changes that involve
11 Congressional Districts 2 and 1.

12 COMM. CEIS: So there's a group of them as we
13 go through. And what is the net?

14 MR. PHARRIS: The net is a five people from 1
15 to 2, which brings 2 to exactly where it should be.

16 COMM. CEIS: Zero?

17 MR. PHARRIS: Zero.

18 COMM. CEIS: Okay. And where does 1 end up?

19 MR. PHARRIS: Let's see. Without the
20 Alpentā change, that would be . . .

21 MR. BARTZ: It would be ten under.

22 MR. PHARRIS: 1?

23 MR. BARTZ: It would be ten under.

24 MR. PHARRIS: Without the Alpentā change, 1
25 is now ten under.

1 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

2 MR. PHARRIS: Okay.

3 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objections on that?

4 MR. PHARRIS: On a further note, this would
5 also form a bridge of unincorporated area between this
6 unincorporated area and this unincorporated area.

7 COMM. FOSTER: So is this -- we're -- we're
8 not talking about the Big Lake one; we're talking about
9 the page 4 and 6?

10 MR. PHARRIS: Actually --

11 COMM. FOSTER: Or does it include 5, also?

12 MR. PHARRIS: It includes 5, as well.

13 COMM. CEIS: The net of all these
14 congressional changes that you're recommending now
15 we've taken Alpentā out is that 2 is exactly at zero,
16 and 1 is ten under -- or ten over? I'm sorry.

17 MR. PHARRIS: Over.

18 COMM. CEIS: Ten over.

19 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objection?

20 Move forward, please.

21 MR. PHARRIS: And that concludes the staff
22 suggestions.

23 COMM. CEIS: What --

24 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: What happened --

25 COMM. CEIS: What happened to the others?

1 COMM. GORTON: Well, those were --

2 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Oh, they were the
3 offsets.

4 COMM. GORTON: -- for Alpentā.

5 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Got it. Okay.

6 COMM. CEIS: Oh, okay.

7 MR. PHARRIS: That was the counterproposal.

8 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: So this variance page
9 is --

10 MR. PHARRIS: It's the original.

11 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: They're still the
12 original. Okay.

13 MR. PHARRIS: 1 it's actually low by 10, and
14 2 is now even.

15 Moving on to the legislative-district comments
16 we've gotten from the auditors, the first from Clark
17 County, this is at the boundary of the 14th and
18 18th Legislative Districts. The boundary follows
19 Little Matmey, M-a-t-m-e-y, Creek to its source, then
20 proceeds in a straight line to the end of Northeast
21 59th Street.

22 This -- Northeast 59th Street as mapped by the
23 Census Bureau splits a house. But the real Northeast
24 59th Street does not. So with the discretion we've
25 given them to use the real feature, this becomes less

1 of a problem, and no actual houses will be split.

2 I searched around for an offset. The County is
3 requesting this block of 85 people be moved into the
4 14th District. Unfortunately there are not many
5 roads that actually connect up with each other in this
6 area, and so any offset would pretty much also be
7 doomed to using a nonvisible feature or creek. I spoke
8 to the County yesterday, and they said they can live
9 with this line as is.

10 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: So no change, then?

11 MR. PHARRIS: I recommend no change.

12 COMM. FOSTER: Is this the line that's been
13 in all our maps from the beginning?

14 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

15 COMM. CEIS: (Indiscernible).

16 COMM. GORTON: (Indiscernible).

17 MR. PHARRIS: This is a proposal from King
18 County. It -- we've seen it before -- to move 385
19 people from Legislative District 5 to Legislative
20 District 45. This is near Duvall. Their objection is
21 that a number of parcels are split by the line as
22 proposed.

23 I spoke again with Dave Wilson at King County
24 Elections yesterday and we came up with a sort of
25 compromise proposal that wouldn't involve quite so many

1 people, and that's here, just moving two blocks with a
2 total of 139 people so that the boundary would follow
3 roadways and not split parcels. This will be offset by
4 moving these 113 people from District 45 to District 5.
5 And again this new boundary would also follow roadways.

6 COMM. CEIS: And the King County office has
7 agreed to this?

8 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

9 MR. WILSON: Yes.

10 MR. PHARRIS: Hi.

11 COMM. GORTON: And so the total -- the total
12 population change is what?

13 MR. PHARRIS: For this change it would be 26.
14 But again, there are several changes that affect both
15 45 and 5. The ultimate -- if all staff recommendations
16 were adopted, 5 ends up 26 low, and 45 ends up 45 high,
17 so both within 50.

18 COMM. GORTON: And how many changes are there
19 altogether?

20 MR. PHARRIS: Probably about 20.

21 COMM. GORTON: Okay. So we've only --

22 COMM. CEIS: -- just begun.

23 MR. PHARRIS: -- just begun.

24 COMM. GORTON: -- begun. I see. I see.

25 There's a whole stack. Okay.

1 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. Is there any
2 objection to this change? These two changes?

3 COMM. GORTON: Well, we've got -- I want to
4 look at all of them.

5 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: You want to wait? You
6 want to take longer and check? You all want to take
7 longer?

8 COMM. FOSTER: Check. This is a --

9 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay.

10 COMM. FOSTER: This is massive between two
11 districts.

12 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

13 MR. PHARRIS: Mini pieces.

14 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay.

15 COMM. HUFF: What's the net between moves?

16 MR. PHARRIS: For this particular change, the
17 net would be 26 from 5 to 45.

18 COMM. FOSTER: Can you characterize what this
19 does for King County? Are there errors here? Is it
20 more convenient? Is it that there are blocks that
21 aren't on a map? What is this about?

22 MR. PHARRIS: This is about -- it's
23 essentially about not running lines through properties.
24 You can see the tax parcels on here. This line as
25 proposed runs through a number of tax parcels. This

1 line, as well, is -- this is a -- it's a sort of
2 nonvisible connecting line from the end of this road to
3 some random point on this creek, which makes it, you
4 know, more difficult for the elections office to figure
5 out which side of the line a particular voter is on.

6 COMM. FOSTER: And how were these lines
7 created? Are these census lines?

8 MR. PHARRIS: These are census lines.

9 COMM. CEIS: One case --

10 COMM. FOSTER: Has King County been living
11 with them?

12 MR. PHARRIS: They're not currently precinct
13 or district boundaries.

14 COMM. CEIS: well, your description on this
15 page says that this follows an existing precinct.

16 MR. PHARRIS: Oh, yes. The original King
17 County proposal, which would move 385 people, would be.

18 COMM. CEIS: I see. It would be.

19 MR. PHARRIS: It would be.

20 COMM. CEIS: So the census boundary is the
21 one that's causing us the problem?

22 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

23 COMM. FOSTER: We get into real chicken-and-
24 egg questions here on some of these. I don't know if
25 we can revise the census lines for the next ten years,

1 but somebody ought to be looking at it.

2 MR. PHARRIS: would be nice.

3 COMM. FOSTER: And the other part is probably
4 growth, I mean, growth areas where people are creating
5 new --

6 COMM. CEIS: New developments.

7 COMM. FOSTER: -- developments. And all of a
8 sudden out of trees come houses.

9 MR. PHARRIS: And, of course, many of the new
10 developments, you know, the streets aren't gridded, so
11 you end up with large, unwieldy blocks.

12 COMM. CEIS: So we going to just keep moving
13 through these, Dean? Is that what you're --

14 COMM. FOSTER: I think we ought to keep --
15 I'm -- I'm a little nervous about this. But I think we
16 ought to go through the whole package first.

17 COMM. CEIS: All right.

18 MR. PHARRIS: This is a request from King
19 County. Not -- sorry. This is page 6. They request
20 using roadways as the boundary rather than putting the
21 boundary along Juanita Creek. This particular
22 change -- this is moving a block -- would move 124
23 people from District 45 to District 1.

24 They've proposed an offset for this. This would
25 move 112 people from District 1 to District 45. This

1 is slide 7. This shaded area is the City of Kirkland,
2 this area here is already in District 45. So this
3 would just be enlarging the unincorporated area that's
4 in District 45.

5 COMM. GORTON: It's in 45 before
6 redistricting, you mean?

7 MR. PHARRIS: No. I mean these two blocks
8 here are already proposed to be included in
9 District 45. This red line is the district line. So
10 we're not --

11 COMM. GORTON: I'm sorry. What page are we
12 on?

13 MR. PHARRIS: Sorry. Page 7. This is King
14 County's proposed offset for the Juanita Creek move on
15 the previous page.

16 COMM. CEIS: Didn't we discuss the Juanita
17 Creek boundary --

18 MR. PHARRIS: We did.

19 COMM. CEIS: -- when we were last together,
20 as I recall?

21 MR. PHARRIS: We did.

22 COMM. CEIS: And we stuck with Juanita Creek
23 at that time.

24 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

25 MR. WILSON: Can I speak to that at all?

1 MS. BOE: If he's going to speaking, can he
2 go to the table over there where he can be heard
3 better?

4 COMM. CEIS: Sure.

5 MR. WILSON: David Wilson.

6 THE REPORTER: Spell your name for me,
7 please.

8 MR. WILSON: David Wilson, King County GIS
9 supervisor.

10 The creek does not -- it is underground. It
11 doesn't really exist. And it actually splits right
12 through a condo complex. So you've got certain units,
13 then, within the complex on one side.

14 COMM. CEIS: So it's a pipe.

15 MR. WILSON: Yeah. So it's kind of a
16 nonvisible.

17 COMM. CEIS: I would guess.

18 COMM. HUFF: I guess so.

19 COMM. CEIS: (Indiscernible) elected.
20 (Indiscernible).

21 MR. WILSON: Thank you.

22 COMM. GORTON: Could run through one of the
23 basements.

24 COMM. CEIS: Exactly. Have fish running up
25 there.

1 COMM. GORTON: Sounds pretty (indiscernible).

2 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. Thank you for that
3 clarification.

4 MR. WILSON: Sure.

5 MR. PHARRIS: So are we --

6 COMM. CEIS: Moving along?

7 MR. PHARRIS: This pair of changes -- okay.
8 I need to move along.

9 This is another request from King County. The
10 proposed boundary between the 41st and 45th
11 Legislative Districts runs along a school-district
12 boundary or a school-district boundary drawn to
13 parcels. King County would like to move that to
14 Windsor Drive Southeast -- Southeast Windsor Boulevard,
15 and this street here. It would be a movement from 39
16 people from the 41st District into the 45th.

17 COMM. GORTON: You're actually moving some
18 from the 45th into the 41st, too?

19 MR. PHARRIS: There's some area moving, but
20 no people.

21 COMM. GORTON: Okay.

22 MR. PHARRIS: Slide 9, a King County request.
23 The northerly portion of this boundary is a nonvisible
24 line. It's not a real thing. They would like to move
25 32 people.

1 COMM. GORTON: Wait. Have we now finished
2 all the ones that are a collection?

3 MR. PHARRIS: These are actually sort of
4 coming in pairs now. The slides 6 and 7 are a request
5 that is offset. And slides -- slide -- slide 8, I
6 guess, is kind of enabled by 6 and 7 because it -- it
7 lowers the overage on District 45, so it allows the --

8 COMM. GORTON: I think we're at a point where
9 we should make a decision before we go on to do that,
10 shouldn't we?

11 COMM. CEIS: I just don't know what's left in
12 the rest of the packet, if we're going to be bouncing
13 back and forth, or is this geographically --

14 COMM. GORTON: You've been doing 45 and --
15 you know, mostly 45 and neighboring districts.

16 MR. PHARRIS: Yeah.

17 COMM. GORTON: And this next one moves to 11
18 and 37. So shouldn't we have made a decision on this
19 whole bunch probably from -- from page 3 through
20 page 8?

21 COMM. HUFF: 8.

22 COMM. GORTON: Aren't they a collection?

23 MR. PHARRIS: Yes. They're -- they're pretty
24 much a collection because they all affect District 45.

25 COMM. GORTON: I think we ought to deal

1 with --

2 COMM. FOSTER: Except a couple more down the
3 road are 5.

4 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. There's a 47 and a 5
5 shift, too.

6 COMM. GORTON: 47, a 5.

7 COMM. CEIS: why don't we just go through
8 them all, and we can come back, Slade, and say if
9 there's any of them that were objectionable to us.

10 I'm still assuming you've netted this out so we're
11 within our deviation tolerance.

12 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

13 COMM. CEIS: And if we decide to make a
14 change, we're going to have to revisit that. So might
15 be better to just to hear you out all the way through.

16 COMM. GORTON: Okay. Good idea.

17 MR. PHARRIS: This one is kind of independent
18 of any other. It's a movement of this block of 32 from
19 District 37 to District 11 to follow roadways rather
20 than nonvisible boundary.

21 Moving on to slide 10, this is an area where there
22 are some nonvisible lines drawn from the ends of roads
23 slicing through tax parcels and houses. King County
24 requests moving these 86 people from District 47 to
25 District 5. And, in fact, the staff would suggest also

1 moving this block of 42, bringing the total to 128 from
2 District 47 to District 5 to follow major roadways and
3 because the number is balanced pretty well.

4 COMM. CEIS: Does King County agree with your
5 suggestion?

6 MR. WILSON: Yes. I'm sorry.

7 MR. PHARRIS: This is their original
8 suggestion.

9 COMM. CEIS: We looked at this one before,
10 too.

11 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

12 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. Okay.

13 MR. PHARRIS: On slide 12, this is part of
14 the compensatory change for the last one. This would
15 move 70 people from District 5 into District 47. This
16 area is adjacent to Black Diamond but outside of its
17 urban growth area. So there's kind of a natural break
18 there.

19 And this is the other half of the compensatory
20 change moving these blocks, total of 77 people, from
21 District 5 into District 47.

22 This is a zero-population-area proposal by King
23 County. This is an area -- kind of a difficult area.
24 It's not part of the City of Auburn.

25 COMM. HUFF: which slide you on? I'm sorry.

1 MS. BUNNING: 14.

2 MR. PHARRIS: 14.

3 It's not part of the City of Auburn, but it is on
4 the same side of the river as the City of Auburn and
5 has been included in the 31st District with the City
6 of Auburn. County proposes moving this unpopulated
7 block into District 47, which phases it across the
8 Green River.

9 COMM. CEIS: So you're crossing the river
10 with the 47th here by doing this?

11 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

12 COMM. CEIS: And is that developable land?
13 Is that something that's going to be platted in the
14 future, or is that -- it looks like it.

15 MR. PHARRIS: Dave, can I --

16 MR. WILSON: I don't think so. I think it's
17 undevelopable.

18 COMM. CEIS: Really?

19 MR. WILSON: But, I mean, it's been zero for
20 quite some time.

21 COMM. CEIS: I guess my concern is that
22 you're -- by doing this, if it does develop, you've got
23 a little --

24 COMM. GORTON: It's across the river.

25 COMM. CEIS: -- pocket across the river

1 that's hard to get to for whoever represents the
2 47th.

3 MR. PHARRIS: I would tend to agree.

4 MR. WILSON: well, actually the boundary for
5 47th is --

6 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: want to come up to the
7 table?

8 MR. WILSON: Oh, sorry.

9 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Restate your name for the
10 record, please.

11 MR. WILSON: David Wilson.

12 And actually the boundary for the 47th up above
13 is actually that main street there. So it's actually
14 not even that far from -- I mean, that's part of the
15 47th, as well.

16 COMM. FOSTER: Is that a precinct now?

17 MR. WILSON: It's what we call a portion
18 precinct because it's the only part of the
19 47th because then the part down to the southeast is
20 also in the 47th and it's unincorporated.

21 So this way it would be -- it would just put this
22 piece of unincorporated with all of the unincorporated
23 area on the other side of the river.

24 COMM. HUFF: 31st into the 47th?

25 COMM. CEIS: The Auburn city limit is where

1 here?

2 MR. PHARRIS: It's the nonshaded area.

3 COMM. CEIS: So everything that is nonshaded
4 is not Auburn?

5 MR. WILSON: Is unincorporated.

6 COMM. CEIS: Can we make Auburn incorporate
7 that?

8 (Interruption by report to request
9 parties speak louder.)

10
11 COMM. FOSTER: Well, zero population, I would
12 be inclined to defer to the County, but --

13 COMM. CEIS: Yep.

14 COMM. GORTON: I would, too.

15 MR. PHARRIS: This is another county request.
16 The proposed boundary from the 5th and the
17 11th Districts runs up here along the shore of Spring
18 Lake and along some nonvisible boundaries here. They'd
19 like to kind of --

20 COMM. GORTON: What's the figure eight there?

21 MR. PHARRIS: That's Congressional
22 District 8.

23 COMM. GORTON: Oh.

24 MR. PHARRIS: Yeah. That can be ignored.
25 We'd like to kind of regularize the boundary of

1 District 5 and also run it along roadways.

2 COMM. GORTON: Well, does this, then, not
3 affect congressional-district population?

4 MR. PHARRIS: This does not, not -- this is
5 purely a legislative move. The congressional district
6 is immaterial.

7 COMM. GORTON: Okay.

8 MR. PHARRIS: This is part of a compensatory
9 change suggested by the staff, would move two blocks, a
10 total of 67 people, from east end of the 11th into
11 the 5th.

12 COMM. GORTON: And then the next one, as
13 well?

14 MR. PHARRIS: The next one, as well. This
15 would have a -- this would move 45 people from the
16 11th into the 5th. would have the additional
17 advantage of harmonizing the legislative and
18 congressional boundaries through here. Currently this
19 area of 45 people is trapped between the legislative-
20 district line, the congressional-district line, and the
21 Renton city limits.

22 COMM. GORTON: So these three go together?

23 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

24 COMM. GORTON: The last three in the pack.
25 That sounds reasonable.

1 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Well, we -- well, you
2 want to -- okay. So that's -- that leaves -- that
3 finishes King County?

4 MR. PHARRIS: There are some --

5 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: We haven't really acted
6 on the other ones.

7 So do you want to take all the King County
8 together, or do you want to continue (indiscernible)?

9 COMM. CEIS: Let's do -- finish up, and then
10 we have any objections, we can take them.

11 MR. PHARRIS: There is a staff recommend -- a
12 further staff recommendation in this area. But that's
13 an exact swap of 55 people.

14 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: But that's going to be in
15 the next packet; that's not in this packet.

16 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

17 COMM. GORTON: Well, when --

18 COMM. CEIS: We'll deal with this packet,
19 though. We haven't finished this one.

20 MR. PHARRIS: No.

21 COMM. CEIS: Let's keep going.

22 MR. PHARRIS: That's the last King County
23 one.

24 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

25 MR. PHARRIS: This one we mentioned earlier.

1 This is to harmonize the legislative-district boundary
2 and the congressional-district boundary, in this case
3 moving the leg boundary to the proposed congressional-
4 district boundary. This would move 49 people from
5 District 31 to District 25.

6 And since District 31 was already underpopulated,
7 this is -- the proposed offset would move 77 people
8 from District 25 to District 31.

9 COMM. GORTON: And the populations are
10 closer.

11 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

12 COMM. GORTON: Okay.

13 MR. PHARRIS: This is a Skagit County
14 request. We've seen this one before. The original
15 proposal by Commissioners Ceis and Gorton ran along the
16 power line here. The County objected to that. They
17 asked that it be moved to the road here.

18 John Milem counterproposed that it be moved to the
19 river. The County objects it that, as well. They
20 request again that it be moved to the road.

21 This would move 21 people from District 39 to
22 District 40.

23 And it is partly offset by this staff-recommended
24 change. This is an area with five people. So this is
25 slide 21 now, an area of five people currently trapped

1 between the legislative-district line and the Mount
2 Vernon city limits. These five people would move from
3 the 40th into the 39th District.

4 COMM. GORTON: So you would have a total
5 change of 16?

6 MR. PHARRIS: Net would be 16.

7 This is a request from Snohomish County, similar
8 situation where these 28 people are trapped between a
9 legislative-district line and the Everett city limits.
10 The proposal is to move these 28 people from the 21st
11 to the 44th District.

12 This will be -- compensated by a shift of 20
13 people -- yes, a shift of 20 people into the 21st
14 District in a later -- in the other packet.

15 Slide 23, now, this is from Thurston County.
16 There's an area with 97 people between a legislative
17 district on the northwest and a congressional-district
18 line on the southeast. They would like to close up
19 this gap. And our proposal for offsetting this is on
20 the next page. Apologize for color. The line proposed
21 runs down here.

22 This is the urban-growth boundary for City of
23 Rainier. This would move 111 people from the 2nd into
24 the 20th to offset the 97 moved from the 20th to
25 the 2nd.

1 This is a proposal from Yakima County. This
2 north-south line here, I believe, where the proposed
3 legislative-district line is, an old inaccurate Census
4 Bureau school-district line. And they request that the
5 line be moved slightly west to the real school-district
6 line, which does not divide.

7 COMM. GORTON: So it moves from the red line
8 to the yellow line?

9 MR. PHARRIS: The yellow, right. The
10 district boundary would move from where it is now to
11 the -- to the west of the yellow area.

12 Unfortunately, Yakima County seems to be working
13 with some sort of normalized census blocks. This is
14 not actually how the south boundary of this block
15 looks. So staff proposed this change, which again
16 would move the line to the Census Bureau -- to the
17 school-district boundary and then follow South Wenas --
18 that's w-e-n-a-s -- Road. This would move 18 people
19 from the 14th to the 13th District.

20 COMM. CEIS: It accomplishes the objective
21 Yakima County has?

22 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

23 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

24 MR. PHARRIS: A second proposed change, again
25 this is a creek that cuts through a number of tax

1 parcels. They would prefer to use this road, Pheasant
2 Haven Road, for the boundary between the 13th and
3 15th Legislative Districts. This would be a move of
4 ten people from District 15 to District 13.

5 As District 13 was already somewhat overpopulated,
6 this is a compensating move. It would move 35 people
7 from the 13th into the 15th District, now slide 28.
8 Proposed line runs along here. Again I apologize for
9 the poor picture quality.

10 COMM. CEIS: what is that boundary?

11 MR. PHARRIS: This is -- these are roads.

12 COMM. CEIS: So the one to the right is a
13 road?

14 MR. PHARRIS: This one is a road, yes.

15 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

16 MR. PHARRIS: This is East Pomona Road.

17 COMM. GORTON: (Indiscernible).

18 COMM. CEIS: Yeah.

19 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. So that's the
20 package.

21 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

22 COMM. CEIS: Now, does that package in of
23 itself balance, or are there others that are in these
24 other packages that are part of the balancing?

25 MR. PHARRIS: Let's see here.

1 MR. WILKE: This one's on the last page.

2 MR. PHARRIS: This was the last page? Right.

3 Just taking the changes in here, I think the only
4 one outside of the 50 range is the 11th, which would
5 be up 53.

6 COMM. CEIS: Is there something in this other
7 packet that's going to change that?

8 MR. PHARRIS: Actually, that would be changed
9 by the early -- where King County suggested moving the
10 legislative to the congressional -- the congressional
11 to the legislative line, we suggest moving the
12 congressional to the legislative. That offsets that
13 (indiscernible).

14 COMM. CEIS: So if Commissioner Gorton wants
15 to do -- we accept these two packets that we've already
16 reviewed, that would be appropriate at this time, I
17 assume, from what you're telling us.

18 COMM. GORTON: And we're all under 50.

19 MR. PHARRIS: With that additional change,
20 yes, they would be under 50.

21 COMM. CEIS: They would be under 50. And on
22 the congressional changes we're still within ten, just
23 barely.

24 MR. PHARRIS: I believe so.

25 COMM. CEIS: We have one district that's

1 right at ten.

2 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: And then we have another
3 packet of legislative yet to go.

4 COMM. HUFF: This deviation, is this what the
5 change is?

6 MR. PHARRIS: No.

7 COMM. HUFF: That's the old deviation.

8 COMM. CEIS: (Indiscernible).

9 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: well, but this one comes
10 up (indiscernible).

11 COMM. CEIS: -- (indiscernible) county
12 auditor.

13 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: The first one we did.

14 COMM. CEIS: We haven't done this one.

15 COMM. GORTON: I think we ought to --

16 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: We ought to.

17 COMM. GORTON: -- when we deal with these
18 outside so we know where we are.

19 COMM. CEIS: I agree with you.

20 COMM. FOSTER: I have a --

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's good.

22 COMM. HUFF: Okay.

23 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: So you have a --

24 COMM. FOSTER: You're okay?

25 MR. BARTZ: Yeah.

1 COMM. FOSTER: Yeah. The auditor's here. We
2 could ask her.

3 MR. PHARRIS: I spoke to Thurston County
4 Elections that --

5 COMM. FOSTER: Okay. Okay.

6 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. Are there any
7 concerns about anything in this legislative-plan packet
8 from the county auditors anyone would like to review,
9 or . . . ?

10 COMM. CEIS: I have no objection to the staff
11 recommendations.

12 COMM. GORTON: Nor do I.

13 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Everyone else fine?
14 Dean, you want to --

15 COMM. FOSTER: Let me -- I didn't expect to
16 be dealing with this much population shift. So . . .

17 MR. PHARRIS: I --

18 COMM. FOSTER: And on the Yakima one, it's
19 staff recommendation No. 9 as opposed to the County's
20 proposed change; is that right?

21 MR. PHARRIS: That's right.

22 COMM. FOSTER: Okay.

23 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. Everyone ready to
24 move on?

25 COMM. GORTON: Yep.

1 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: All right.

2 COMM. GORTON: (Indiscernible).

3 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Go forward, Nick.

4 MR. PHARRIS: Is that just moving on, or is
5 that --

6 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Well, yeah. We're
7 moving -- in other words, people are comfortable with
8 this packet. So let's move into the one from Senator
9 Honeyford and the Commission staff.

10 MR. PHARRIS: Yes. These are comments on
11 legislative-district boundaries from basically sources
12 other than county auditors, from staff, from the
13 public, and from elected officials, including Senator
14 Jim Honeyford, who requests this change moving 78
15 people in Klickitat County, including the
16 unincorporated community of Bickleton, at least move it
17 from the 14th into the 15th District.

18 This would be at least partially offset on slide 4
19 by the movement of 34 people from the 14th to the
20 15th.

21 COMM. GORTON: This request came from Senator
22 Honeyford to me, and I have put it on. His rationale
23 is that the people in Bickleton go to high school in
24 Mabton, was the justification I got. A little more
25 closely -- they're a little more closely connected, you

1 know, with Yakima County.

2 I don't know what to do, whether state
3 representatives agree with it or not, do you?

4 COMM. HUFF: We haven't had the request to
5 make any change. We met with them the other day,
6 so . . .

7 COMM. GORTON: So, you know, that's it. And
8 the justification was it would be more connected with
9 Yakima than with the rest of Klickitat.

10 COMM. HUFF: Kids go to a different school,
11 high school?

12 COMM. GORTON: Yeah. They go to high school
13 in Mabton, according to Senator Honeyford.

14 COMM. HUFF: Certainly he has local
15 knowledge. But I haven't heard from representatives,
16 so I can't speak for that. I have no problem with it,
17 but . . .

18 COMM. CEIS: This results in a new county
19 split.

20 COMM. GORTON: Yes, it does. That's the --
21 it's not nearly as elegant a line.

22 MR. PHARRIS: It also extends the 15th
23 District outside of Yakima County.

24 COMM. GORTON: Only place that it would go
25 outside of Yakima County.

1 COMM. CEIS: All right. Working hard on --
2 Bickleton was part of what district previously?

3 MR. PHARRIS: Prior this? It's up to now
4 part of the 15th District.

5 COMM. GORTON: It is the 15th.

6 COMM. CEIS: Historically.

7 COMM. GORTON: (Indiscernible).

8 COMM. HUFF: Apparently Klickitat County says
9 it's okay with them.

10 COMM. CEIS: I see that.

11 well, I'm inclined not to want to do this just
12 because I'm not excited about another county split and
13 the 15th outside of Yakima County. I can be
14 convinced otherwise, I guess.

15 COMM. GORTON: I'm just putting it to you.

16 COMM. CEIS: No. I understand.

17 Dean, you have any view on it?

18 COMM. FOSTER: Well, I -- we've been dealing
19 with more technical changes. This is a more
20 substantive change, in my mind. And Senator Honeyford
21 certainly could propose this in the Legislature. I'm
22 inclined not to support this as a recommendation from
23 this group because if we open this door, we may be
24 opening all kinds of doors for other people.

25 COMM. GORTON: I think --

1 COMM. FOSTER: I'm real -- I said okay on the
2 other -- on the other -- the last one we did, and I'm
3 awfully nervous about the Legislature looking at that
4 much population change. There's going to be a lot of
5 members of the Legislature who know people in each of
6 those areas; and we're going to have a hard time
7 selling those. And now this is -- this is a more
8 convenient kind of thing --

9 COMM. GORTON: Yes.

10 COMM. FOSTER: -- for Senator Honeyford,
11 which is fine. But I would be inclined not to go along
12 with this.

13 COMM. CEIS: That's fine. We'll just --

14 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I'm not familiar with it.

15 COMM. HUFF: I'm not familiar enough with it
16 to go one way or the other.

17 COMM. CEIS: I agree with you on the
18 population change on the previous packages we looked
19 at. But because they're backed by the auditors, I
20 think we have a different rationale for them --

21 COMM. FOSTER: We do.

22 COMM. CEIS: -- than for taking this request
23 for some other purpose.

24 COMM. FOSTER: And the auditors have been
25 good to us all year. I mean, they've been cooperating

1 with us a lot and working hard. So . . .

2 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

3 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Just have to deal with
4 the lines.

5 COMM. CEIS: Okay. So we're saying no to --

6 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: No to that request.

7 COMM. CEIS: -- first -- how many of these is
8 there? Four?

9 MR. PHARRIS: Up to slide 4, yeah.

10 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: We're up to slide 5 now?

11 MR. PHARRIS: Yeah. Now on slide 5.

12 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I think the rest of these
13 are staff recommendations.

14 MR. PHARRIS: Yes, they are. We -- we did an
15 analysis to check for areas of low population that are
16 trapped by legislative and congressional lines and
17 municipal and county boundaries. This is one of the
18 results of that. This orphan block of zero people just
19 outside the Oakville city limits got put in the 19th
20 District, and we recommend that it be moved to the
21 24th.

22 COMM. GORTON: This one as --

23 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Pardon me?

24 COMM. CEIS: No objection to it.

25 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: No objection?

1 COMM. GORTON: No objection.

2 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: You want to just take
3 these one by one now?

4 COMM. GORTON: I guess so.

5 COMM. CEIS: They look pretty small.

6 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay, go ahead.

7 MR. PHARRIS: This one again is no
8 population. It would harmonize the legislative and
9 congressional lines in Snohomish County just outside of
10 Everett.

11 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Objection?

12 COMM. HUFF: No.

13 MR. PHARRIS: This is just cleaning up the
14 legislative and congressional lines out in Bellingham
15 Bay.

16 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objection?

17 COMM. HUFF: No.

18 MR. PHARRIS: This is a zero-population block
19 trapped between the Sammamish city limits and the
20 proposed legislative-district boundary.

21 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objection?

22 COMM. GORTON: No.

23 MR. PHARRIS: This area -- this is part of
24 the City of Vancouver. It was included in the 17th
25 District. There are only 18 people here. It is not --

1 the remainder of the City of Vancouver that is in the
2 17th District is not adjacent to this area. So
3 either have to be its own precinct or part of a
4 noncontiguous precinct. We recommend moving these 18
5 people from District 7 to District 18. Also helps
6 battle population.

7 COMM. HUFF: Is it a compensating move, too,
8 or just . . . ?

9 MR. PHARRIS: I believe 18 is already low.
10 18's already 37 people low.

11 COMM. HUFF: Okay.

12 COMM. GORTON: No objection.

13 MR. PHARRIS: This is sort of a very
14 technical correction. On paper it looks like there's a
15 split in the City of Everett. In fact, this is a block
16 that's between I-5 and its right-of-way line. It was,
17 you know, one of those poorly drawn city limits. We're
18 just on paper putting Everett back together in one --
19 well, this part of Everett back together in the 38th
20 District.

21 COMM. HUFF: Okay.

22 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objection?

23 COMM. HUFF: No.

24 MR. BARTZ: Wasn't this the one that wasn't
25 actually in Everett but the censuses and Everett and

1 the County say it isn't?

2 MR. PHARRIS: Yes. The block boundary over
3 here is supposed to follow the right-of-way line of
4 I-5. That much is in the City of Everett. The block
5 as drawn actually lops over into some adjacent parcels.
6 But since the Commission has given the county the
7 authority to use the real city limit, it's not an
8 issue.

9 This is a shift of 20 people from District 32 to
10 District 21. It is to keep the boundary along Olympic
11 View Drive. It also helps compensate for the change we
12 saw earlier where there was a trapped polygon between
13 the Everett city limits to the leg boundary. Brings 21
14 up to (indiscernible).

15 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objection?

16 COMM. GORTON: No objection.

17 MR. PHARRIS: This is just to restore an
18 existing precinct boundary in -- in Thurston County.
19 The boundary as drawn just looks a little weird. No
20 people involved.

21 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objection?

22 MR. PHARRIS: This line also follows tax
23 parcels.

24 This is, I believe, part of that problematic
25 former power line at the south end of the 4th District.

1 COMM. FOSTER: The famous power line.

2 COMM. GORTON: The famous power line.

3 MR. PHARRIS: We recommend following
4 Arrowleaf Lane. That's A-r-r-o-w-l-e-a-f. I've
5 checked and this -- the road does not split parcels.
6 The power line does.

7 COMM. HUFF: Okay.

8 COMM. FOSTER: So I have a question about --
9 why didn't Spokane make this recommendation?

10 MR. PHARRIS: I don't know.

11 COMM. FOSTER: Do you know? Have you talked
12 to Spokane about this?

13 MR. PHARRIS: I have not.

14 COMM. CEIS: Spokane on the phone?

15 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Yeah. Spokane is on the
16 phone.

17 Vicki, are you on with us?

18 MS. DALTON: Hi, this is Vicki from Spokane.

19 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Do you have -- are you --
20 were you tracking with what we were just talking
21 about?

22 MS. DALTON: I can catch parts of it.
23 Sometimes people kind of fade out, and I can't hear
24 what's going on.

25 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Nick, why don't you

1 review that.

2 MR. PHARRIS: Yeah. I'll try to speak up.

3 This is an area at the south end of the 4th
4 District where East Arrowleaf Lane crosses the district
5 boundary several times. And I'm suggesting using
6 Arrowleaf Lane as the district boundary because it
7 doesn't split parcels in that area.

8 MS. DALTON: And that goes back to our old
9 power-line problem?

10 MR. PHARRIS: Yes.

11 MS. DALTON: Okay. Then that means we just
12 missed that one, and it's probably a very good change
13 to make.

14 COMM. CEIS: Okay. Thank you.

15 MR. PHARRIS: Thank you.

16 This is another change between the 5th and the
17 11th Districts. The difficulty out here at the east
18 end of Renton is the kind of intertwining of the
19 legislative and the congressional boundaries as
20 proposed. This would move 95 people from the 5th to
21 the 11th and harmonize the two boundaries, bringing
22 them together.

23 COMM. GORTON: And it's balanced by the next
24 one?

25 MR. PHARRIS: This change is perfectly offset

1 by the next one, which moves Milwaukee precinct from
2 the 11th into the 5th District and runs, then, a
3 large portion of the boundary of the 11th District
4 along the Maple Valley Highway.

5 COMM. GORTON: I see.

6 COMM. CEIS: Yes.

7 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Everybody -- any
8 objections for these two considered together?

9 COMM. HUFF: We want to check something out.

10 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. One moment.

11 COMM. HUFF: We can move on with the next
12 one.

13 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Oh, okay. We'll just
14 hold these.

15 COMM. HUFF: Yeah.

16 MR. PHARRIS: This was one that John Milem
17 suggested. There are two people in Auburn School
18 District where -- whereas, the adjacent -- in the 5th
19 District; whereas, the adjacent portion of Auburn
20 School District is in the 31st.

21 COMM. GORTON: Okay.

22 MR. PHARRIS: This is just recommending
23 moving the legislative-district boundary to the center
24 line than the shore.

25 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objection?

1 MR. PHARRIS: Slide 18 suggests using the --
2 the school-district boundary between Richland and
3 Kennewick School District as the legislative-district
4 boundary, which -- it also is farther east. No
5 population involved.

6 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objection?

7 COMM. HUFF: Okay.

8 MR. PHARRIS: Vicki, are you still there?

9 MS. DALTON: I'm still here. Sorry. I was
10 checking in with staff on that power-line/Arrowleaf
11 Lane issue.

12 MR. PHARRIS: Okay. Got another suggestion
13 at the south end of the 4th again where the boundary is
14 running along -- oh, boy. Can't read that the name of
15 the creek. Quinnamose or something like that?

16 MS. DALTON: Along -- along what?

17 COMM. CEIS: Quinnamose.

18 MR. PHARRIS: At a creek, Quinnamose Creek.

19 MS. DALTON: Can you spell that for me?

20 MR. PHARRIS: Q-u-i-n-n-a-m-o-s-e.

21 MS. DALTON: F-e as in Frank?

22 MR. PHARRIS: S as in --

23 MS. BUNNING: Sam.

24 MR. PHARRIS: -- Sam.

25 MS. DALTON: Okay.

1 MR. PHARRIS: It is a proposal to run that
2 boundary between the 4th and 9th along East Saltese
3 Lake Road instead rather than along the creek.

4 COMM. GORTON: No population change.

5 MS. DALTON: Okay. I'll send that one to
6 staff, too, to have them take a quick look at it.

7 MR. PHARRIS: Okay.

8 MS. BUNNING: Looks like it splits parcels.
9 Is that --

10 MR. PHARRIS: The creek's -- actually this is
11 the intersection of two creeks. And those two split
12 parcels; the road does not.

13 COMM. GORTON: That makes it --

14 COMM. CEIS: Yes.

15 MS. DALTON: Okay. And we probably didn't
16 turn those in because they don't actually impact any
17 population. Again, we were only going for changes that
18 were just absolutely necessary in order to do our
19 precincts. So it was just a nicety. We didn't submit
20 it.

21 COMM. CEIS: Okay. Well, I mean, I'd rather
22 follow a road than a creek. So . . .

23 COMM. GORTON: Uh-huh. Let's do this one
24 unless they come up with --

25 COMM. CEIS: Vicki, unless your staff comes

1 back with an objection, we're going to go ahead with
2 it.

3 MS. DALTON: That's fine.

4 COMM. CEIS: Thanks.

5 MR. PHARRIS: Actually there's one more here.

6 COMM. GORTON: Another Spokane?

7 MS. DALTON: And here we were trying to be so
8 nice to you and not -- (indiscernible) special
9 requests.

10 MS. BUNNING: A gift.

11 COMM. HUFF: Staff needs the work.

12 MR. PHARRIS: Yeah.

13 There's a portion of the east boundary of the 4th
14 District with the 9th District that's running along
15 some unidentifiable apparently invisible feature that
16 splits a bunch parcels. And I'm proposing running that
17 border East 44th Avenue and Rural Route 1 instead,
18 which would move 14 people from the 9th into the 4th.

19 MS. BUNNING: Zero on the slide?

20 COMM. GORTON: which is population shift
21 zero.

22 MR. PHARRIS: That is incorrect. This is a
23 shift of 14.

24 MS. DALTON: So that's east -- so move it to
25 East 44th and what?

1 MR. PHARRIS: Rural Route 1.

2 COMM. FOSTER: So which is incorrect? The 14
3 is incorrect?

4 MR. PHARRIS: Fourteen is correct.

5 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Fourteen is correct. The
6 zero is incorrect.

7 MS. DALTON: And I'm saying, unless you hear
8 from me, that is probably an acceptable change.

9 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: And what does that do to
10 any offsets? Deviations?

11 MR. PHARRIS: The 4th is up to 40 -- it's 45
12 high, but it's still under 50.

13 COMM. CEIS: But the error on the sheet is --

14 MR. PHARRIS: Those 14 are calculated in
15 here.

16 COMM. CEIS: Okay. Thank you.

17 MR. PHARRIS: So they're purely an issue of
18 duplicating the previous slide.

19 COMM. CEIS: I understand.

20 MR. PHARRIS: I apologize.

21 Moving on, this portion of boundary from the
22 12th and 13th in Grant County, part of it is a
23 nonvisible boundary, and suggest moving to it a nearby
24 railroad. No population involved.

25 COMM. GORTON: Okay.

1 MR. PHARRIS: This is one suggested by John
2 Milem. Simplify the boundary between the 20th and
3 18th in north Clark County, run it along North
4 Pacific Highway rather than having this -- these jogs
5 in here.

6 COMM. CEIS: Yeah.

7 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objection?

8 COMM. GORTON: No.

9 MR. PHARRIS: The next three slides, 23
10 through 25, are just harmonizing the boundary of the
11 28th and 29th District with the boundary of Joint
12 Base Lewis-McChord. No population involved.

13 COMM. GORTON: Okay.

14 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objection?

15 COMM. HUFF: No.

16 COMM. GORTON: No.

17 MR. PHARRIS: On slide 26 the boundary
18 between the 29th and 2nd Districts runs along Canyon
19 Road except for this area where it jogs off on some
20 sort of phantom duplicate of Canyon Road that doesn't
21 really exist and cuts through a bunch of parcels. No
22 population change.

23 COMM. GORTON: Okay.

24 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objection?

25 COMM. HUFF: No.

1 MR. PHARRIS: This is a tiny population --
2 tiny zero-population block. Suggesting rather than
3 using the school-district boundary, using the urban-
4 growth boundary, which jibes better with Pierce
5 County's parcels.

6 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objection?

7 COMM. HUFF: No.

8 MR. PHARRIS: And the same on the next slide,
9 slide 28.

10 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objection?

11 COMM. HUFF: No.

12 MR. PHARRIS: slide 29, moving the boundary
13 between the 25th and 31st to a river center line
14 rather than the shore. No population.

15 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objection?

16 COMM. HUFF: That's the Puyallup River,
17 right?

18 MR. PHARRIS: That is the Puyallup River,
19 yes.

20 Number 30 just moves the boundary to the opposite
21 lane of State Route 509 to jibe with the -- the new
22 incorporated boundaries of Burien, which actually
23 follow the right-of-way line with the highway, but
24 we've given the auditor authority to use that.

25 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objection?

1 COMM. HUFF: No.

2 MR. PHARRIS: Slide 31, area where the
3 Bremerton city limits out in -- out in the water top
4 over the proposed legislative-district line. No
5 population.

6 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objection?

7 COMM. GORTON: Oh, it's -- this is all --

8 MR. PHARRIS: It's all water.

9 COMM. GORTON: All water. Okay.

10 COMM. FOSTER: Houseboats.

11 COMM. CEIS: And fish.

12 MR. PHARRIS: Fish, yeah.

13 This is just bringing the boundary between the
14 36th and 43rd Districts back to Eighth Avenue
15 Northwest. Zero population shift.

16 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objection?

17 COMM. GORTON: Gosh, I didn't think there
18 would be a line between those two that would have no
19 people in it.

20 COMM. CEIS: The Burke Gilman Trail.

21 MR. PHARRIS: Yeah.

22 COMM. GORTON: Okay.

23 MR. PHARRIS: This shift of nine people on
24 slide 33 would restore a precinct -- an existing
25 precinct boundary in Snohomish County and also avoid

1 splitting parcels.

2 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objection?

3 COMM. GORTON: Okay.

4 MR. PHARRIS: And on Slide 34, this is just
5 avoiding making a jog in the boundary around this area,
6 just running it along the railroad. No population.

7 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Any objection?

8 Okay.

9 MR. PHARRIS: That's it.

10 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: We are done.

11 COMM. FOSTER: I think Tom had --

12 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: That's right. Tom, you
13 had --

14 COMM. HUFF: I'm okay with it.

15 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Are you okay with that?

16 COMM. HUFF: Slide 14 and 15. We're okay.

17 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. Everything's fine?
18 Okay.

19 MR. PHARRIS: You're okay with those?

20 COMM. HUFF: Yes.

21 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. So probably need
22 at this point to have a motion to have these
23 incorporated and forwarded to the Legislature.

24 COMM. GORTON: So moved.

25 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. We have a motion

1 on the floor to approve these changes to -- and forward
2 them to the Legislature for their consideration.

3 COMM. GORTON: The ones we have, in fact,
4 approved.

5 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: The ones that we have
6 approved, right. Yes.

7 All those in favor say "aye."

8 COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.

9 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Opposed?

10 Okay. Thank you.

11 Okay. Our next item of business is to talk about
12 future agenda items and scheduling of meetings. The
13 only things that I know of that -- you know, we'll need
14 to obviously approve the minutes of this meeting at
15 some point. We may have some close-down minor issues.

16 COMM. GORTON: I think Dean said that ten
17 years ago you had a meeting in June just before the end
18 of it. What --

19 COMM. FOSTER: We did.

20 COMM. GORTON: What was that for?

21 COMM. FOSTER: We purchased a lot of material
22 ten years ago, a lot of inven- -- a lot of assets. And
23 we had to approve the disposition of those assets.

24 COMM. GORTON: Okay.

25 COMM. FOSTER: I believe the Legislature got

1 most of them. But there were some that I think we sold
2 to highway -- the cartography people and highways and a
3 variety of things like that. So --

4 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: So we could have
5 something like that.

6 Bonnie, do you have a --
7 we don't -- we actually got a lot of the stuff for
8 free from surplus. So we do have a few computers and
9 things. But . . .

10 MS. BUNNING: Our most valuable asset is
11 probably our plotter and some ink and paper to go with
12 it and a few computers.

13 COMM. GORTON: So any other thing, we could
14 always do that by phone.

15 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Yes. And we'll just sort
16 of try to accumulate things and work with you all on
17 your own time. But this will be the last expected
18 in-person meeting that we would need to have.

19 COMM. FOSTER: I just like to say that the
20 difference between -- one of the differences between
21 this time and ten years ago is -- this is the
22 disadvantage of having all these -- all this GIS stuff
23 and all this detail that we have. We didn't run into
24 these kinds of technical problems, maybe until the
25 auditors found them later.

1 And it'd certainly be interested in the next ten
2 years if there can be some correlation done with the
3 census people. We're -- we're putting on top of census
4 people what we've seen so far as lines of cities that
5 sometimes don't make any sense or that aren't very well
6 defined, school-district lines, all kinds of things
7 like that, on top of growth and development in areas.
8 And I would hope that somehow we go get to the census
9 people and maybe help them draw some clearer lines
10 because that's clearly been a problem for us all along.

11 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: I think that's a --

12 COMM. FOSTER: I've seen the auditors sitting
13 over here just about breaking their necks in agreement.

14 MS. DALTON: Madam Chair, this is Vicki in
15 Spokane, if I may.

16 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Yes, please.

17 MS. DALTON: Since this is your last
18 in-person meeting, if I could take just a moment to
19 thank the commissioners as well as the staff of the
20 Commission for everything that they've done. I was
21 here ten years ago for the last redistricting, and I
22 can honestly say this has been much more positive, much
23 more productive, and much cleaner than anything we've
24 ever had for redistricting. So thank you for all the
25 hard work from the staff, from the -- the relationship

1 that we've had at really being able to work together.

2 And I do think the suggestion of working with the
3 Census Bureau is one that the auditors agree with
4 greatly. And as president of WSACA, I'm starting to
5 make plans to find away to work with the cities to work
6 with the Census Bureau, also, to get those lines much
7 better within the next seven years.

8 But I do have to say, having lived through two
9 redistricting commissions, as good as the last one was,
10 this has been a very positive and productive endeavor
11 to get good lines throughout the entire state. So on
12 behalf my association and all of our staff that have to
13 live with these lines for the next ten years, thank you
14 for everything that you've done and for working with us
15 so closely.

16 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: well, thank you very
17 much. And we really appreciate how you have worked
18 with us and sometimes on very quick turnarounds to, you
19 know, help us be able to do the right thing, as well.
20 So we appreciate all of you.

21 COMM. CEIS: Madam Chair, one last item for
22 the auditors and the county GIS and their elections
23 office. We're going to be sending these corrections to
24 the Legislature, and, I think, as Commissioner Foster
25 pointed out, some of them involve some fairly large

1 population changes. And it would be helpful, I think,
2 for the Legislature to know from your perspective that
3 these are technical changes and that you support them
4 so that that's clear that these are not political
5 changes we're making.

6 MS. DALTON: Thank you. We appreciate that
7 clarification, and that -- that is the point that we'll
8 need to be driven home when these suggestions go to the
9 Legislature. We have no care or concern for politics;
10 all we care about is being able to draw these precinct
11 lines and administer the elections.

12 COMM. FOSTER: And remember the Legislature
13 only has 25 days left to do this. It's not like they
14 have the rest of the session. So --

15 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Nick --

16 Oh, I'm sorry, Tom.

17 COMM. HUFF: No. Go ahead.

18 MR. PHARRIS: Sorry. To revisit, I did have
19 one thing I wanted to make you aware of. Without the
20 compensatory balancing that would have been introduced
21 by the Apental change, moving these four people into
22 the 8th District does put that district over by 13
23 people.

24 COMM. CEIS: That's not good. What do you
25 want to do?

1 COMM. GORTON: which four people?

2 MR. PHARRIS: These four people in Pierce
3 County, in Puyallup, that are trapped between an
4 existing leg line and congressional line.

5 MS. WALTERS: Can we change the leg line?

6 MR. PHARRIS: Probably could.

7 MS. WALTERS: will that keep us under the 50
8 deviation?

9 MR. VALIANT: There's a county-council
10 district line; so it's already isolated.

11 MR. PHARRIS: 25 would go to minus one, and
12 31 would go to -- yeah. They both still be within 50.

13 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay.

14 COMM. CEIS: So can we make this a leg-map
15 change, then, instead? Then will that work.

16 MS. JOHNSON-HALL: It really won't have an
17 effect because Military Road is already a county-
18 council boundary. But if this is what we have to live
19 with -- I mean, you guys have done incredible job. We
20 can -- we can make this work.

21 COMM. CEIS: Yeah. We just would not like to
22 have an exception of the deviation set for
23 congressional.

24 COMM. GORTON: Yeah.

25 MS. JOHNSON-HALL: We appreciate that being

1 done for us.

2 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay.

3 COMM. CEIS: So we'll amend this to be that
4 this is a leg change then rather than a congressional-
5 district change.

6 MR. PHARRIS: Go ahead and do that?

7 COMM. CEIS: Yeah.

8 COMM. GORTON: (Indiscernible).

9 MS. BUNNING: So they'll move from 31 into
10 25; is that correct?

11 MR. PHARRIS: They will, yes. And this is
12 just the eastern block. The other one's no population.

13 COMM. CEIS: Okay.

14 MR. PHARRIS: Thank you.

15 COMM. GORTON: Let's follow up on this whole
16 census thing. Can the staff working with the auditors
17 come up with a formal message to the Census Bureau
18 about, you know, problems they've created and about
19 what changes in census lines would be appropriate?

20 And now that there will be precinct lines and
21 legislative and congressional-district lines and so on,
22 I think we should formally as a group make a
23 presentation to the bureau of the census. And if it
24 comes not only from us but from the auditors'
25 organization, maybe they'll pay some attention.

1 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Yeah.

2 MR. PHARRIS: Well, Dave and I have been
3 complaining about this for four years now, so . . .

4 MR. VALIANT: Yes.

5 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: It might give it more
6 teeth and more clout.

7 COMM. GORTON: If there is a formal
8 resolution of this group and the auditors --

9 COMM. CEIS: Well, is there any -- is there
10 any way that, since the Legislature is going to have to
11 take action now, right, that they can make some
12 statement about this in their legislative acts to make
13 these boundary changes?

14 COMM. FOSTER: Well, they can make a speech,
15 I guess. I doubt very much whether -- I doubt very
16 much whether they would include that in the -- in the
17 current resolution or anything like that.

18 But I would like to suggest, however, that we --
19 we add the Secretary of State's office. When we
20 disband sometime in the next couple months, this all --
21 this is the one agency in the state government that
22 disappears every ten years, and -- but it is all turned
23 over to the Secretary of State's office. And actually
24 in about four or five years this whole process will
25 start again through the Secretary of State's office.

1 And that's where it could be led by -- with our -- with
2 our push.

3 COMM. GORTON: Secretary of State should be a
4 part of it.

5 COMM. FOSTER: Yeah.

6 COMM. HUFF: I'd like to make a suggestion.
7 We -- we sometime back decided that we would probably
8 end this process earlier in the year than rather than
9 2012. And I know the auditors were in favor of that,
10 and I know a lot of other people are in favor. And I
11 certainly was in favor of it. So I would certainly
12 like to certainly see some notation somewhere that we
13 ought to consider ending this not on New Year's Day,
14 number one.

15 Number two, I think it would be helpful to the
16 auditors, because it was holiday season, and we tried
17 to get ahold of some auditors so forth, very difficult
18 doing that -- and I think it ought to be at an
19 appropriate time when people are available. That --
20 that is one suggestion.

21 Also, I think, I'm sure that Bonnie and Lura and
22 staff are making notes of what to consider for the next
23 time we do this ten years from now, what items we
24 should try to avoid, what items we need to do better
25 at. However, I think the process has gone quite well,

1 right. But I think there could be some changes there,
2 and I would strongly urge that.

3 I have one more question. This is a political
4 question. I was just talking to our attorney general
5 over here. And as commissioners, we are not supposed
6 to be involved with politics during the time that we're
7 a commission, which means we don't contribute money and
8 we can't be involved with legislative campaigns.

9 COMM. GORTON: I feel much wealthier.

10 COMM. HUFF: Pardon me?

11 COMM. GORTON: I feel much wealthier.

12 COMM. HUFF: But I want to know how soon we
13 can get into your money.

14 COMM. GORTON: July 1st.

15 COMM. HUFF: Is it June 1, or when it is?

16 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Rusty?

17 COMM. HUFF: He says it's June 1.

18 MR. FALLIS: I think it's -- I think it reads
19 as long as you're commissioners.

20 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: which would be through
21 the end of June.

22 COMM. GORTON: Yeah. But I suppose we could
23 resign.

24 MR. FALLIS: Theoretically.

25 COMM. FOSTER: I was hoping we could extend

1 that, just call us commissioners for ten years but
2 disband the Commission.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The money you'd save.
4 Holy cow.

5 COMM. HUFF: All I want --

6 MR. FALLIS: In terms of campaigning for
7 elective office or participating in or contributing to
8 political campaigns, it's while you're a member of the
9 Commission.

10 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: And we're officially
11 until the end of June.

12 MR. FALLIS: Unless you would resign,
13 or . . .

14 COMM. GORTON: But it's July 1st unless we
15 resign, then.

16 MR. FALLIS: Right. Yeah.

17 MR. PHARRIS: They reconvene.

18 MR. FALLIS: Right. That's right. If you
19 were to reconvene, you'd have --

20 COMM. GORTON: Yeah, that's true.

21 COMM. FOSTER: So I have a -- the next
22 question is about lawsuits. Is there a time limit on
23 when lawsuits could be filed?

24 MR. FALLIS: Well, under state law a suit
25 wouldn't be ripe until 30 days after the plan becomes

1 effective. So somebody's going to have to wait that
2 long.

3 As a -- you know, as a practical matter, somebody
4 would have to file a case before the election if they
5 want to prevent this from affecting the next election.

6 COMM. FOSTER: And our work will be effective
7 30 days after -- 30 days from the start of the
8 legislative session?

9 MR. FALLIS: Well, it's either -- if the
10 Legislature -- it's the sooner of a legislative
11 amendment or 30 days from the beginning of session.

12 COMM. FOSTER: Okay.

13 MS. BUNNING: Which is February 7th.

14 MR. FALLIS: Right.

15 MS. BUNNING: If nothing happens, the plan is
16 effective.

17 MR. FALLIS: Other than what I read in the
18 papers, I don't know any more than you do about --

19 COMM. FOSTER: I know.

20 MR. FALLIS: -- what people may be thinking.

21 MS. BUNNING: Just for clarification, we can
22 work with the Secretary of State and the auditors to
23 draft up a message to the Census Bureau and then shift
24 it or send it around to you all.

25 COMM. GORTON: Please do that.

1 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: And is this something
2 that might be good for all of us to sign?

3 COMM. CEIS: Uh-huh.

4 COMM. GORTON: Oh, yes, I think so.

5 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay.

6 MS. BUNNING: And to Commissioner Huff's
7 point, I haven't yet, but it's my intention to leave
8 behind recommendations and suggestions for or even a
9 pathway to follow would be nice for the next
10 commission.

11 COMM. HUFF: Just remember what you went
12 through, right?

13 MS. BUNNING: while it's fresh. But it's
14 been a challenge, and an interesting one, but a
15 challenge in figuring out what all this entails. And I
16 hope to leave something behind. So if there are
17 specific suggestions and things that you all have, let
18 me know.

19 COMM. HUFF: I think you have and your staff
20 have done an outstanding job. Thank you.

21 MS. BUNNING: Thanks.

22 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Okay. Our next item on
23 the agenda is executive director's report.

24 MS. BUNNING: Yes. And I will be brief.

25 Just wanted to point out to you that you've each

1 now had a copy of your final plan. Those have been
2 delivered to the members, staff, and separately elected
3 officials. And we did a fairly small run of the report
4 because, of course, it's likely to change some in the
5 legislative process.

6 And just a note on what those next steps are, as
7 soon as we're done here, we'll produce a -- a list of
8 the blocks -- block groups, tracts, by district that
9 will become the source document for changes. And
10 working with the code revisor, I'll be drafting up a
11 resolution, concurrent resolution, to make the changes
12 that you've talked about today based on that first
13 document. Hope to have that available to the
14 Legislature no later than mid next week because, as you
15 know, time is running on their clock.

16 So it's -- it's exacting work, but I think we
17 can --

18 COMM. GORTON: I think it might be well to
19 notify them today that that's coming --

20 MS. BUNNING: I did yesterday.

21 COMM. GORTON: -- so that they can -- okay.

22 MS. BUNNING: I let them know --

23 COMM. GORTON: -- so that they can set their
24 hearings.

25 MS. BUNNING: And, you know, if the timeline

1 doesn't work for them, we'll work with them to do
2 whatever we humanly can to get it done.

3 Just wanted to point out that there's a sheet in
4 your packet of the budget. This includes 2011 and 2012
5 that we discussed briefly last time. I corrected a
6 couple of dollars here and there, but this is the
7 status of where we left '11, what portion was for
8 caucus staff, what portion was for the Commission,
9 where we are as of December 15th, and what kind of
10 money is in play.

11 It is my hope that we can complete our work before
12 the end of June. But at this point we have a number of
13 things to do, including producing and designing a final
14 map. I expect that to come out around March or April.
15 And then work with the counties on the legal
16 descriptions, get it to the code revisor to codify, a
17 number of follow-up steps with all of this work that
18 you've done. So we'll be hard at that. And then we'll
19 ask you, if we need to -- if we have any assets at the
20 end of the day, we'll send those off and be done.

21 And the last thing I just wanted to say was to
22 thank you all for having me do this with you. It's
23 been really fun, very interesting, a complete
24 education. And I admire you all. I've been watching
25 how you operate and learned a lot. So thank you. And

1 thank you to the staff who -- without whom nothing
2 would have happened. They did great.

3 COMM. HUFF: Praise the Lord.

4 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Thanks to all of you.
5 It's just -- we're glad we found you and all the staff.
6 And, you know, the caucus staff have been great, as
7 well, and we really appreciate everybody's incredibly
8 hard work.

9 Do we have anyone signed up for public comment?

10 Okay. Just one. And I -- I apologize. I have
11 got a flight I've got to catch. And if I don't, it's
12 going to be hours and hours before I can get another
13 one because of the holiday weekend. So if I could
14 defer, you know, I'll read the transcript of the public
15 comment. If you all would agree for me to leave, that
16 would be really appreciated.

17 COMM. CEIS: Safe journey.

18 CHAIRWOMAN POWELL: Thank you. I'll pick up
19 what you say with the transcript.

20 (Ms. Powell exits.)

21
22 MR. MILEM: I would just like to say a word
23 for the Census Bureau.

24 Oh, John Milem from Vancouver.

25 I would just like to say a word for the Census

1 Bureau. I have sat through no end of meetings at which
2 Census Bureau people have pleaded with people in the
3 states and the localities to respond to Census Bureau
4 requests for information and to respond once the Census
5 Bureau sends out, "Here's how we understand what you've
6 sent us." A lot of times they get no feedback. And so
7 this is a two-sided thing.

8 There has to be better effort made, I think, on
9 the Census Bureau's side, but there also has to be
10 better effort made on the side of the localities, the
11 counties, and the school districts, and cities to let
12 the Census Bureau know where their boundaries actually
13 are and to take seriously when the Census Bureau does
14 send them, "Here's what we understand. Is this right?"
15 If you say nothing and then two years later you say,
16 "Well, that was wrong," you know, it's hard to pin that
17 on the Census Bureau.

18 Second point I would like to make is in support of
19 the comment that Tom Huff has made several times
20 regarding scheduling. We have the rather peculiar
21 situation that the counties are required to redraw
22 their districts before the state districts are drawn,
23 and that creates no end of issues, then, about how --
24 you know, they want you to coordinate your district
25 boundaries with the district boundaries they already by

1 law had to draw. To me that doesn't make any sense at
2 all.

3 I think that, in line with the comment that Tom's
4 making, I would suggest that there be a date set. And
5 I was thinking first congressional, but maybe
6 legislative ought to come first. You know better about
7 that than I do. Just for example set a deadline of
8 August 1st for congressional or legislative, a
9 deadline of October 1st for the other, and then the
10 deadline for the counties as about December. So that
11 way you get one set of lines set, and then you can draw
12 the next set of lines knowing what that first set is.
13 And then the counties don't have to draw their lines
14 until they see all your lines.

15 Now, I think this probably requires a
16 constitutional amendment because, if I remember right,
17 the January 1 date is in the constitution. So it's a
18 constitutional amendment involved there. On the other
19 hand, it's certainly within the -- within the scope of
20 any agency to say, "well, that's what our outside
21 line" -- "outside date is, but we can set our own."
22 Now, the question is how you enforce it, and, of
23 course, we know what happened with November 1. So
24 ultimately I think it probably does have to be the
25 constitution.

1 The third -- the third point I would like to say
2 is just this is the first opportunity I've had in
3 public to say thank you for your kind of words, both in
4 writing and orally, and I appreciate them. And thank
5 you very much.

6 COMM. HUFF: Thank you.

7 I guess we're adjourned.

8 COMM. GORTON: I think we're adjourned.

9 COMM. CEIS: I think we're adjourned if
10 there's no other --

11 (Proceedings concluded at 12:14 p.m.)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me on the 13th of January, 2012, and thereafter transcribed by me by means of computer-aided transcription, that the transcript is a full, true, and complete transcript of said proceedings;

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

IN WITNESS HEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this February 23, 2012.


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