



## Results of Public Mapping Contest

Hosted by  
Arizona Competitive Districts Coalition

The mapping contest hosted by the non-partisan **Arizona Competitive Districts Coalition** (ACDC) ended at midnight on July 15<sup>th</sup> 2011. The submitted maps were provided to the judges using a code name for each (based on Disney characters) assigned by co-chairs of ACDC, Roberta Voss (R) and Ken Clark (D). Scheduling and other meeting needs for the panel were overseen by Barbara Klein from the League of Women Voters of Arizona.

The rules state that there are two (2) winners for each category – not first and second place. This is to avoid any criticism of favoritism or prejudice toward some incumbent or group. Aside from obvious communities of interest that the panel attempted to respect, there was NO consideration or acknowledgement for effect on incumbents. The panel also found it necessary to include a Special Honorable Mention category separate from the two winners.

Results are the sole decision of the 3-person judging panel (biographical information of the judges can be seen on the website at [www.azredistricting.com](http://www.azredistricting.com)). According to the judges, decisions were unanimous, although admittedly ‘very difficult.’ No maps are perfect (probably no professionally-drawn maps, in any state, are perfect) and there are different approaches, all of which can be legitimate. The judges also took into consideration unusual ideas and comments from the participants. The panel included:

**José Peñalosa** (Republican, Maricopa County)

**D. Jay Stanforth** (Democrat, Pima County)

**Tricia Gerrodette** (Independent, Cochise County)

### **General Comments from the Judging Panel**

This job was “very difficult”, which was a great thing – it meant there were good maps to judge. There is “no way that the mappers did this for the prize money; they had to have real passion for this, and for creating competitive districts.” We have “immense respect for the mappers”; the process takes an astounding amount of time. It gives us a new-found respect for the whole process. We say “kudos to all the mappers who either submitted a map or even tried their hand at the process – we repeat kudos to all.”

[Note: the abbreviation “VAP” used in this report stands for Voting Age Population.  
The abbreviation “VRA” represents Voting Rights Act.]

## **Congressional Map Results**

The two winners in the Congressional mapping category are:

Code Name: Sleepy – author name **Stuart Wright** and

Code Name: Aladdin – author name **Jacques Glenn**

The Special Honorable Mention goes to Code Name: Mickey – author name **Marcia Busching**

### **Judges' Comments about Congressional Maps**

When comments mention a district number, it refers to the district number produced from THAT PROPOSED map.

#### **Code name: Sleepy, author name Stuart Wright (of Ohio)**

While the software lists this map as having 5 competitive\* districts (see endnote) there is another district at 56.8%. This is very impressive for 9 total congressional districts.

There was unconventional drawing of southern districts in this map, which can (at first glance) be startling. However, this takes the entire Arizona/Mexico border as one 'community of interest', which may very well be a useful approach.

While district 3 has some unusual partner-cities, it is one of the least competitive districts on this map since the behavior of the voters in that district correspond greatly to one another, despite any differences in economic levels.

Compactness was good, and all districts were within a 1% deviation for equal population.

Voting Rights Act (VRA) requirements were met with district 1 at 53.17% and district 8 at 50.12% Hispanic minority /majority districts.

#### **Code name: Aladdin, author name Jacques Glenn**

This map also did very well in regard to competitiveness (see endnote). It is listed as 4 out of 9 districts being competitive, but also has another district at 55.36%, which borders on being a competitive district as well.

When dividing Tucson, this map followed major streets and natural geographic boundaries more than some other congressional maps.

The compactness scores of this map were very good.

While district 3 may seem to leave Fountain Hills out in a rural area at first appearance, it is partnered with much of Paradise Valley and northern Scottsdale. As one of the least competitive districts, it does demonstrate a cohesiveness of voters in the area. So while not a competitive district, it does not appear unreasonably matched with the contiguous rural areas that are also in the district.

The judges felt that there was reasonable handling of clear communities of interest.

VRA requirements were met with district 4 at 53.32% and district 8 at 45.55% Hispanic minority /majority districts.

#### **Special Honorable Mention Map. Code name: Mickey, author name Marcia Busching**

This map had 4 out of 9 competitive districts; the next closest possibly competitive district is at 58.13% (see endnote).

Equal population levels and compactness were done very well in this map.

The Tucson region district was divided as in all (or many) of the maps, but judges felt that it was done in a reasonable way and kept areas of foothills together.

Some apparent odd couplings of different cities and counties are seen in district 6, which includes Fountain Hills, portions of Scottsdale, Gilbert, Apache Junction, Queen Creek and large rural areas. However, this particular district is not a competitive one, demonstrating that at least the voters there share some values.

VRA requirements were met with district 4 at 53.15% and district 7 at 50.08% Hispanic minority /majority districts.

---

## **Legislative Map Results**

The two winners in the Legislative mapping category are:

Code Name: Eeyore— author name **Sam Almy**

Code Name: Alice— author name **Jacques Glenn**

The Special Honorable Mention goes to Code Name: Dewey— author name **Stuart Wright**

## **Judges' Comments about Legislative Maps**

The Department of Justice ultimately decides whether the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission has created a sufficient number of voter protected districts, otherwise known as minority/majority districts. It is often difficult to know exactly what will be accepted from decade to decade, but the general rule is to avoid disenfranchising the minority voters that the Voting Rights Act is attempting to protect.

See endnotes for VRA requirements for legislative maps in Arizona.

When comments mention a district number, it refers to the district number produced from THAT PROPOSED map.

### **Code name: Eeyore, author name Sam Almy**

This map has developed an excellent level of competitive districts at 9 out of 30, with a 10<sup>th</sup> close at 53.7% (see endnote).

This map shows extremely equal population levels between districts; only districts 6 and 28 have a deviation beyond +/- 1%. This is almost assuredly acceptable in that in some states deviations up to 10% have been accepted. Here there was no deviation beyond 5%.

The judges would like to have seen a better score for the minority/majority districts for Native Americans. In 2001, there was at least 1 district greater than 60% Native American VAP. This map has one district favoring the chance of Native Americans to secure representation at 51.59%. This may or may not be acceptable to the Department of Justice. However, there seems to be enough potential for changes in district population in this map that small tweaking may improve that.

Tucson is split but in reasonable ways according to the judges. The only concern was the newer developed areas above (or including parts of) Oro Valley.

The Phoenix Metro area and Maricopa County as a whole appear to have resulted in reasonable applications. One must remember that with so many small districts that MUST meet equal population levels, there is no way to please every small pocket of communities of interest.

All VRA requirements for Hispanics were met. (See endnotes)

**Code name: Alice, author name Jacques Glenn**

This map has developed a very good level of competitive districts at a recorded 7 out of 30, with three other districts around 44%. (See endnote regarding competitive.)

All of the districts in this map are within + /- 1% equal population.

This map has a Native American minority/majority district at 61.74%, which would be of no concern if presented to the Department of Justice.

The judges would have liked to have seen a bit more compactness of the districts, and less 'odd' looking districts. However, they understand that sometimes less compact looking districts actually address communities of interest in a more adequate way. You cannot go by 'looks alone.'

This map had a better split for Sierra Vista than many. It includes affluent areas of rural Tucson and Sierra Vista.

D21 has lots of different cities, but does not indicate any unreasonable city splits (with the possible exception of Tempe). However, the judges felt that most of the Phoenix Metro area was drawn in a compact and reasonable way in regard to cities.

Casa Grande may be considered to be 'split' but the judges felt it was a reasonable geographical boundary handling of the area.

One district covers more than half the Arizona/Mexico border, and another completes that border. The judges saw this as a way to concentrate border issues and that these districts can be seen as a community of interest in that way.

Northwestern cities such as Kingman and Lake Havasu City are kept together. Some maneuvering gets Flagstaff, Chino Valley and Prescott in the same district but splits Prescott from Prescott Valley.

All VRA requirements were met. (See endnotes.)

**Special Honorable Mention Map. Code name: Dewey, author name Stuart Wright**

This map had 6 competitive districts out of 30, but it should be noted that it had 3 more close districts at 54.67%, 54.51% and 45.85%, all close according to the formula. (See endnotes.)

Compactness of this map was very good.

18 of the districts were not within the + /- 1% equal population goal but all were reasonable and were within 5% of the goal.

There would be a preference to see a better score for the minority/majority districts for Native Americans. This map has a district that does create a minority/majority district for Native Americans but at 54.41% instead of 60%. As was pointed out on another map, this may or may not be acceptable to the Department of Justice.

The judges would have preferred to see a small city like Surprise not divided.

Some of the newer developed areas above Oro Valley were put in the district with Florence and above; this seemed reasonable to the judges considering the more open and rural feel to the areas.

Tucson foothill communities were kept together and a nice handling of district 30 kept all of Cochise County and Sierra Vista together with Santa Cruz County and Nogales. All of these communities have border issues.

All VRA requirements for Hispanics were met. (See endnotes.)

## Endnotes

\* **Competitive Districts** used in District Builder (the software used by ACDC) are defined by the formula for competition as 50% +/- 3.5% meaning a range of 46.50% - 53.50%. It should be noted that the software was not developed in regard to the number of registered voters in that district but instead on the PERFORMANCE of voters in that district during key state office elections. With so many registered Independents in Arizona, this is a much clearer indicator of competition.

\* **Suggested requirement to meet Voting Rights Act** for legislative districts based on previous performance and acceptance from the Department of Justice (DOJ).

3 Districts for Hispanic minority/majority districts @ > 55%

4 Districts for Hispanic minority/majority districts @ between 40-55%

2 Districts for Hispanic minority/majority districts @ between 30-40%

1 District for Native American minority/majority district @ > 60%

[Note that DOJ may consider differences based on protection of minority voters.]

For contest purposes, the suggested requirements to meet the Voting Rights Act for CONGRESSIONAL districts was at least one district of at least 51.51% and one district of at least 44.47% or two districts of at least 50% Hispanic VAP.

Submitted to the public August 2, 2011 by:

Judges: José Peñalosa, D. Jay Stanforth, and Tricia Gerrodette  
and Members of the Arizona Competitive Districts Coalition