



Idaho's Citizen Commission for Reapportionment

Capitol Building
700 W. Jefferson Street
Boise, ID 83720-0054

Phone: (208) 334-4740
E-mail: redistricting@redistricting.idaho.gov
Web site: www.redistricting.idaho.gov

Public Meeting
Friday, October 14, 2011
Capitol Building, Senate Majority Caucus Room
10:00 a.m.

Present were **Commissioner Olsen, Commissioner Hansen, Commissioner Crow, Commissioner Martinez, Commissioner Grange, and Commissioner Beitelspacher**. Present from the staff were **Mr. Cutler, Ms. Ford, Mr. Bybee, and Ms. Gaudet**. Also present was the **Chief Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Brian Kane**.

Chairman Crow called the meeting to order at 10:17a.m. She said that it was a good day, and was the day that they could look at the map which they had been working on. **Mr. Cutler** noted that the plan would be named L87. **Chairman Crow** explained that they would go through the map, and the commissioners could make any comments at that time.

Commissioner Beitelspacher said that they also had the findings in front of them. He asked if it was the pleasure of the chair to match up the findings with the map, as they worked their way down. **Chairman Crow** said yes, they would do that, and asked if she could rely on him to present the findings. **Commissioner Beitelspacher** said that he certainly would, and if it pleased the chair perhaps they should start with the first few pages of the findings. He said that the findings were presented in a way that addressed the plan in its entirety, and as they moved through, those findings were reiterated in the individual districts. He suggested that as they went through the findings, if the commissioners saw something of concern, or had questions with what the Attorney General had written, that they note them, as this was a draft document. **Chairman Crow** said that it was not the time to go on forever on each one, as they knew what they were, so if they would be brief and just point it out, they could amend them and have them complete. **Commissioner Beitelspacher** suggested they make a note of anything they saw that jumped out at them, and then they could present that to the chair, and the chair could deal with the Attorney General about the changes that might need to be made.

Commissioner Hansen indicated that he thought it was important to point out that one of the key components of the commission was that they had worked hard to meet the legal requirements. He said, for the record, that they had the Federal Constitutional requirement of one vote for one person, which they had lived by. And they had the State Constitutional requirements and the State Statutory requirements that had all been part of their focus in putting the plan together, and he believed that L87 represented that to the best of their ability. He said that they had tried to divide counties as little as possible to keep the geographical areas of interest together.

Commissioner Beitelspacher said that in paragraph #11, on about the fifth page of the findings, there were references to the Idaho State Statutes, as well as the Idaho and the United States Constitutions. He indicated that the state statute required that there be some action as it related to Idaho Code §72-1506 (7), regarding precinct lines and nine connecting roads, and he moved that the requirement of Idaho Code §72-1506(7) be waived by the commission. **Commissioner Hansen** seconded the motion. **Chairman Crow** asked if there was any discussion. **Commissioner Beitelspacher** said that in the interest of drawing the map they had much testimony, from the county clerks, that they should try to draw the district lines so that they followed recognizable borders, lines, and roads. He indicated that **Commissioner Hansen** had done an incredible job, with the help of the other commissioners, to insure that was done. He said that in the course of doing that they did cross some precinct lines, so it would require this waiver to satisfy the statute. **Chairman Crow** then took a voice vote, and as the commissioners, who were all present, voted unanimously in the affirmative, the motion was carried.

Commissioner Beitelspacher said that additionally, to satisfy the statutory requirement, he moved that the requirement of Idaho Code §72-1506(9) be waived by the commission. **Commissioner Olsen** seconded the motion. **Commissioner Beitelspacher** said that section of the code dealt with what was known as the *road rule*. Unfortunately geography and the state lines sometimes made that difficult to achieve, while achieving the other requirements of the United States Constitution and the Idaho State Constitution. **Chairman Crow** took a voice vote, and as the commissioners, who were all present, voted unanimously in the affirmative, the motion was carried.

Commissioner Beitelspacher said that they would need to start with paragraph #11. He indicated that he hated hearings where someone handed out a sheet of paper, and then read from the sheet of paper. However it was necessary, as this was going out to the public, that they have the opportunity to listen to the commission as they marched through the plan. He then read *this Commission adopts Plan L87 as the Idaho Legislative Redistricting Plan. District 24 contains the largest population with a total of 46,887. This constitutes a deviation of 4.69% above the ideal district size of 44,788. District 25 has the smallest population with a total of 42,443 people. This constitutes a deviation of 5.24%, therefore the overall De minimus deviation is 9.92%.*

He indicated that he would then move to paragraph #12, for District 1, and there he was going to paraphrase. He said that Boundary and Bonner County combined had a population too large for one district; therefore the line had to be shifted south. The commission, when reviewing that, found that there were two contiguous counties, Kootenai County and Shoshone County. However Highway 95, the main north/south corridor through south Idaho, went into Kootenai County, so they utilized the combination of Bonner and Kootenai Counties to create District 2.

In District 2 they kept the city of Hayden Lake whole, and he wanted to point out that the commission had worked very hard, and that **Commissioner Hansen** was to be commended for his efforts in keeping cities whole whenever possible, and he did not believe they had divided one city.

District 3, he said, was wholly contained within Kootenai County. It was west of the city of Coeur d'Alene, and bounded on the west by the Washington State line, and included the majority of the cities of Post Falls and Rathdrum. He indicated that it kept traditional communities of interest intact, and they had made an effort once more to divide along easily recognizable borders.

District 4 was contained entirely within Kootenai County, and it included the majority of the city of Coeur d'Alene. He said they believed that the lady that had appeared before them in Coeur d'Alene, who had walked across the street for the meeting, was now also included in that. He indicated that they may smile about that, but it really showed the importance of people who came before the commission, not with some political agenda, but the application of common sense when they drew the lines. He said that they had done that in a couple of places because of the testimony they had heard.

District 5 included Benewah and Latah Counties, and was bounded on the west by the State of Washington. He indicated that they were two contiguous counties, and together they constituted one district. He said that it was important to note that this commission had endeavored to minimize the impacts on the Native Americans and the Native American Reservations in the state, starting with this particular district. He noted that the vast majority of the Coeur d'Alene Tribal members, that could be included in one district, were included in this district. He said that Idaho had a long history of working together with the Native Americans in trying to meet their needs, and trying to maintain them as a community of interest, and they had done that consistent with the mandate of one man one vote.

Commissioner Beitelspacher indicated that District 6 was bounded on the west by Oregon and Washington, and there were two contiguous counties (Lewis and Nez Perce) that allowed them to meet the mandates of both Constitutions while creating one district. He said that District 6 contained the majority of the Nez Perce Tribal members, again recognizing a traditional community of interest, and the history of this state and their dealings with the Indian Tribes to maintain those communities of interest for the tribal members.

District 7 was one of the two geographically largest districts in the state, and he said that he believed it was 14,000 square miles. He indicated that he would like to speak to that briefly, as a former Senator from that area. He said that was a tough area of the state as there were a lot of trees and a lot of cattle, it just did not have a lot of people, and it was tough to get around that. However, for a few cents per day, every legislator up there could utilize their computer and Skype so they could have a face to face visit with anyone in that district. He indicated that there were going to be times when they had to have boots on the ground, and to look folks in the eye, but it would still give them an opportunity, with the technology today, to visit with their constituents.

At that time **Chairman Crow** said that she would like to note that the good **Secretary of State, Ben Ysursa**, had joined them, and she welcomed him. **Mr. Ysursa** said that it was a pleasure to be there.

Commissioner Beitelspacher said that District 8 was a lot like District 7, and District 35 to follow. He indicated that when they tried to keep county lines intact, and have compact contiguous districts, they wound up with districts like District 8, with not enough people to make a smaller district. However District 8 was quite fortunate in that both Highway 95 and Highway 55 ran through the district. He indicated that they also had another road that went through Gem County to Emmett to make a whole circle, so someone could make a loop in one day if they had to, which was a little easier to do than in some of the other districts. He said that this district met the U.S. requirement of one man one vote, with one small exception in the lower corner of Gem County where they had to take a small portion and move it in with Payette County, which would be the third county split on this map.

District 9, he said, contained the entirety of Payette County, a small portion of Gem County, and a small portion of Canyon County to meet the one man one vote mandate. It had Highway 95, I-84, and Highway 20 that served the area, and was a nice, small compact district where the people should have no trouble being represented, or where there should be no trouble in representing them.

District 10, in Canyon County, as well as possible contained the majority of the city of Caldwell. **Commissioner Beitelspacher** indicated that it was a small, compact area with lines that were drawn along major roads and streets, so it would be easy to understand what district they were in.

District 12 was another Canyon County district, and contained as much of the city of Nampa as possible to try to preserve those areas of community of interest.

District 13 contained more of the city of Nampa, which because of the population, had to be divided and not put in its entirety into one district.

District 11 contained a portion of Canyon County and a portion of Owyhee County. He said that once more the commission was faced with making a difficult choice when it came to the division of counties, as they were bounded on the east by Ada County, and on west by Oregon, and they lacked population. However because of the huge area in Owyhee County with not much in it, they took the populated areas that were close to Canyon County, and merged them with Canyon County, to make an entire district in Owyhee and Canyon Counties, with a minimum disruption of the people in both counties. **Commissioner Beitelspacher** then said that if it pleased the chair, as he was not as familiar with Boise, that he would prefer to yield the floor to **Commissioner Grange** to continue.

Commissioner Grange said that District 14 contained most of the city of Eagle and the city of Star, and that on the west side was the county line, and on the east side was the highway.

District 15 was the western side of the city of Boise, in Ada County, and was within the deviation.

District 16 was the entire city of Garden City, and on both sides was the city of Boise. She said that they took great pains to make sure that they took all of the district lines to the streets.

District 17 was wholly in the city of Boise.

District 18, again, was entirely within the city of Boise, up to the county line, and then from the county line they had followed the freeway.

District 19 was again within the city of Boise, using the highway as the boundary.

District 20 was the city of Meridian. She stated that they had testimony in their Boise hearing, from a variety of people, asking that Meridian have one entire district that was just made up of them, so that was what they had tried to do there. **Commissioner Grange** indicated that they had used the roads to make a very clean district.

District 21 was a little bit of Meridian, and then picked up some of the outer population, again using roads.

District 22 was the city of Kuna, and then to the edge of the county all of the way around.

Commissioner Beitelspacher indicated that they were then into Twin Falls County, and that if he may, he would yield the floor to the commissioner from Twin Falls County, **Commissioner Hansen**.

Commissioner Hansen said that the unique thing when considering Owyhee County, Twin Falls County, and the Mini-Cassia area was that although Twin Falls had continued to grow extremely fast, much on the pace that the state had, the counties surrounding it had not. As a result they had to go into Twin Falls County to get some of their population. So in District 23, to keep the two counties intact, they had combined Elmore and Owyhee Counties, however they were short about 7,000 people, and had to go into Twin Falls County. He indicated that they took Buhl, Filer, and those areas which had many of the same interests, with Highway 30, that went across there. He indicated that the watersheds for Elmore and Owyhee were similar and that they combined them and took a portion of Twin Falls.

In District 24, they specifically got about 99% of Twin Falls proper, within the city limits, so they would have their own voice.

He said that in District 25 there was a natural divide between Twin Falls and Minidoka, and that was the Snake River Canyon. As a result of putting Jerome and Minidoka together, it was perfect to keep those two counties together, and in following one vote for one person, they were able to keep those two counties together, and create District 25.

District 26 was another area where they struggled to find population, so to keep counties together they combined Camas, Gooding, Blaine, and Lincoln, which put them at 3.62%, which was well within the variance.

In District 27, **Commissioner Hansen** indicated that Power County and Cassia County had not grown a lot. As a result of that, they had to go into Twin Falls to get population, so Kimberley, Murtaugh, and Hansen went over with Cassia and Power to establish District 27. He said that he thought that defined the Magic Valley, and he would like to yield to **Commissioner Martinez**, who lived in Pocatello.

Commissioner Martinez said that he would like to begin with District 29, and then go back to District 28. He indicated that District 29 was the core of the city of Pocatello, and that the boundaries were outstanding. On the north they had the major Interstate, on the east they had another Interstate, on the west they had a county line, and then they had to go south to pick up the remainder of the population.

District 28 was a section of Bannock County that included south Bannock County, and reached down to Oneida to pick up the population that they needed there. Then it went up into part of Bingham County in order to keep the community of interest concept alive regarding the tribe. He said that the district was tied together by a major Interstate from Malad all of the way up and through the reservation. He indicated, as had been stated before, that they made the effort to keep the tribal interests, as a community of interest, alive within the state. With the geography in our state, they all knew how difficult it was to make everything work out, but this, they felt, was one of the best ways to keep that concept going, and keep the concept of community of interest strong.

Commissioner Beitelspacher then addressed District 31, and said that it combined Bingham and Butte County to achieve one man one vote. He indicated that there had been some discussion about the perfect district that existed in Bingham County. However, they had a lot of testimony from many people who had a perfect plan, with a perfect district, but it usually included only that district. When they took the perfect district, and tried to make the rest of the state fit around it, they started to run into problems as they were one county away from the Wyoming line, and one county away from the Utah line, and it was necessary to move population and combine contiguous counties in order to achieve a district. He said that this district had much in common with the Idaho National Laboratory, and the flow of people back and forth from the two counties where they worked together, they lived together, and they had a great deal in common, and it was going to make a good district. He indicated that they had roads all over so they could get back and forth, and they were not faced with some of the issues that existed in some of the other districts in the state.

Commissioner Olsen indicated that in District 30, Bonneville County had a large enough population that two complete legislative districts may be contained within the county; however, it was not large enough to form three inclusive legislative districts. Therefore, the commission found that Bonneville County must be split in order to comply with the one person one vote requirement. District 30 was contained entirely within Bonneville County and included local communities of interest that shared the area's agricultural emphasis. Further, the district included the majority of the cities of Lincoln and Ammon, communities of interest in themselves. District 30 contained 46,525 people, a deviation of +3.88 from the ideal district.

She indicated that this had been a difficult challenge to meet, but they were going by the population. District 32 included Bonneville County, Bear Lake County, Caribou County, Franklin County, and part of Teton County. District 32 was another example of how Idaho's unique geography and the sparsity of its population in certain areas of the state necessitated the creation of large districts. District 32 included the entirety of Bear Lake County, Caribou County, and Franklin County, contiguous counties that shared a border with Utah or Wyoming. Together those counties did not have sufficient population to create an entire legislative district and must be combined with portions of other counties in order to meet the one person one vote requirement. Therefore, these counties were combined with the remainder of Bonneville County which was contiguous to Caribou County and the Wyoming border, as well as the southern portion of Teton County, contiguous to Bonneville County. Teton County must be split because it did not have enough population to form one entire legislative district and, due to Teton County's geographic location, its population must be divided between District 32 and District 34 in order to meet the one person one vote requirements in both districts. She indicated that this was a natural division as the southern portion of Teton County flowed naturally to the south, and the western part of Teton County flowed naturally into District 34. Teton County was divided in accordance with Idaho's statutory requirements, keeping the entirety of the cities of Driggs and Victor, traditional communities of interest, within District 32. District 32 included 46,089 people, a deviation of +2.90% from the ideal district.

She said that the majority of the city of Idaho Falls was included in District 33, which was contained entirely within Bonneville County. Idaho Falls was a community of interest requiring statutory protection and the district was compact with easily identifiable boundaries. District 33 had 45,964 people, a deviation of +2.63% from the ideal district.

Commissioner Olsen said District 34 was Madison County, Teton County, and Fremont County. Madison County was kept whole within District 34 but it did not contain sufficient population to form an entire legislative district. In order to meet the one person one vote requirement, the commission included the northern portion of Teton County as well as the southern portion of Fremont County. Fremont County was also not large enough to constitute an entire district, and its combination with adjacent counties was necessary to meet the one person one vote requirement. The lines dividing Fremont County and Teton County were drawn in order to keep communities of interest whole. The entirety of the city of Teton, located in Teton County, was included in this district as well as the entirety of the city of St. Anthony in Fremont County. This district was directly connected by Highways 32, 33 and 20 creating commercial corridors and commonality of interests. District 34 had 46,012 people, a deviation of +2.73% from the ideal district.

District 35 included Clark County, Custer County, Fremont County, Lemhi County, and Jefferson County. District 35 was contiguous, bounded by Idaho's borders with Montana and Wyoming, and made up of all of Clark, Custer, Lemhi, and Jefferson counties. Combined, the population of those counties was insufficient to meet the one person one vote requirement, and therefore the remainder of Fremont County

must also be included. This was another large geographic district that must come together to create a population adequate to satisfy the one person one vote requirement. As vast as the area was, it did share a community of interest in natural resources, farming, ranching, and recreation. District 35 contained 45,753 people, a deviation of +2.15% from the ideal district. **Commissioner Olsen** said that she wanted to express her appreciation for the hard work that went in to make the large and unwieldy number of counties work into such a smooth district.

Commissioner Beitelspacher indicated that would conclude the discussion of the findings in the districts before them, and asked that if they had made notes along the way, to provide those to the Attorney General for review. He then moved that the commission adopt the findings, boundaries, maps, and supporting materials for Legislative Plan L87. **Commissioner Hansen** seconded the motion. **Mr. Kane** noted that they should be adopted *as amended*. **Commissioner Beitelspacher** then moved that the commission adopt the findings, the boundaries, maps, and supporting materials for Legislative Plan L87, as amended. **Commissioner Hansen** seconded the motion.

Chairman Crow took a voice vote which was unanimous, with all six commissioners voting in the affirmative, and as such the motion carried.

Commissioner Beitelspacher then moved that the Commission adopt L87, and **Commissioner Martinez** seconded the motion. The motion passed, and the plan was unanimously adopted, with all six of the commissioners, **Commissioner Beitelspacher**, **Commissioner Grange**, **Commissioner Hansen**, **Commissioner Martinez**, **Commissioner Olsen**, and **Chairman Crow** voting in the affirmative.

Chairman Crow said that she had worked on a lot of committees and commissions, and had worked in the House for many years, and she had never seen a group come together like that. She indicated that they should send this to Washington D.C. to show them how it was done, that they could work together, and that she could not thank them all enough.

At the suggestion of **Mr. Kane**, **Chairman Crow** stated that the votes on the statutory requirements were unanimous, with all six commissioners voting.

Commissioner Beitelspacher asked **Mr. Kane** if he wanted a roll call vote on the statutory requirements. **Mr. Kane** said that a roll call vote was cleaner, but if they had it reflected in the minutes as unanimous, with a note that all members had participated, that would be the same thing.

The **Secretary of State, Mr. Ysursa**, said that he had only one word, which was "*bravo*".

Chairman Crow said that she did want to add that they had done this in less than two weeks. **Mr. Ysursa** suggested that there was still a small piece left. **Chairman Crow** asked him to let them have their day in the sun, and that they understood that quite well. She then said that they would take a ten minute break, and she would expect everyone back at 11:15 a.m.

Chairman Crow called the committee back to order at 11:25a.m. **Commissioner Beitelspacher** said that having voted on the prevailing side of which the motion to adopt L87 had passed the commission, he then served notice that he may, while L87 was still within their jurisdiction, ask for reconsideration of the vote by which the commission adopted L87.

Chairman Crow then put the commission at ease.

As **Mr. Bybee** asked if the commission wanted to post L87 online immediately, and how they wanted to receive comment, if they wished to receive comment, **Chairman Crow** brought the commission back to order. **Commissioner Beitelspacher** said that as the Attorney General had advised them that it was a public map, they might as well get it out. **Chairman Crow** agreed, and **Mr. Bybee** said that they would have it posted in about half an hour.

Chairman Crow asked if there was anything they wanted to add to the posting. **Mr. Cutler** said that there were comments that the commission could put on the plan, and asked what they would like. **Commissioner Hansen** said that as he had talked with citizens about the process, he thought that one of the things they might add were the criteria that they had used to make the map. He indicated that he thought it would be helpful to include the definitions of some of the language, such as one man one vote, and what that meant. **Commissioner Olsen** said that was part of the oath that everyone took, and she suggested that they outline the oath, and then what each portion meant. **Mr. Cutler** said that there was room for one line on the website, but they could put anything they wanted as a PDF attachment. **Commissioner Hansen** suggested that the one line might be what the criteria were, and then to see the attachment for the definitions. **Mr. Bybee** said that he and **Ms. Ford** would work with **Mr. Cutler** to make sure they got the language onto the website regarding the criteria that the commission had used in order to adopt the plan. **Chairman Crow** agreed, as she said that they knew what they wanted on there, and where it was to be located.

Commissioner Martinez suggested they add that the commission would hope that the citizens, when looking at the map, would look at it in its entirety, and realize that the commission had to focus on the state as a whole, and not just on a particular district. He indicated that there was a tendency for people to look at just the area they were from, and not realize the impacts on the lines that were drawn on surrounding districts, and how important it was to look at the state as a whole. **Commissioner Beitelspacher** asked if the findings were

also on the website. **Ms. Ford** said that they would be, but she thought they should get the amendments made first. **Commissioner Beitelspacher** suggested that they post the map as soon as they could, but that the findings, as they were public information, should also be posted, the sooner the better. He said that most people probably would not read the findings, but it would help all of them in their areas if they could refer people back to the findings, as they would explain that this was a statewide plan, not a county plan, and it spelled out the very things that **Commissioner Martinez** and **Commissioner Hansen** had addressed. **Commissioner Hansen** said that he wanted it available to public as soon as possible, but he was not sure that someone who lived in a particular county was not going to read the findings. He said that they might not read the whole state, but they would read why they did what they did. He indicated that he did not know what the time frame was for the findings to be compiled, but maybe they were making a mistake putting the map out without the comments, and he was a little concerned with that, as it was pertinent information for each one of the districts.

Commissioner Beitelspacher suggested that they get the Attorney General back, as he had spoken to some of that. He indicated that some of it they did not have a lot of choice on because once they had done it, it was there. He suggested that the Attorney General either come up and visit with them, or some of them could go visit with him, to get clarification. He said that if there was any doubt about when it should happen and how it should happen, it would be best if he were there to explain that again. **Ms. Ford** said that she did not think there was any problem thinking of it as a package, and not presenting part of it, meaning the map, before they had findings ready, particularly with the idea that the findings were going to be done that day.

Commissioner Hansen said that maybe the idea was to put the maps out, and then have a note that said later in the day they would have the information. **Chairman Crow** asked if that sounded all right to the commission. **Commissioner Beitelspacher** said that was all right with him. **Commissioner Martinez** asked how long the Attorney General's office gave as a time frame to have the corrections done. **Commissioner Beitelspacher** said that was why he thought they should have the Attorney General up there to clarify what the time lines were, so they were not working in a number of directions. **Chairman Crow** said that she had a better idea, and she appointed **Commissioner Beitelspacher** to visit with the Attorney General's office before he went to lunch.

As there was nothing else that needed to come before the commission, at 11:35 a.m., **Chairman Crow** said they would be at ease subject to call to the chair.

Mr. Kane came into the room and explained that there was a catch up period where the maps would be out, and then the findings would come out in about an hour, or an hour and a half. **Chairman Crow** asked if the map had to be out there that soon, and **Mr. Kane** said that it should be as they had adopted it and there was no point in delaying it. He suggested that they may want to include an asterisk that said *findings will be issued as soon as they are completed*. **Commissioner Beitelspacher** suggested breaking into subgroups to begin looking at congressional plans.

Commissioner Beitelspacher made a motion that the committee adjourn for the day, and that they meet at a time certain on Monday at 9:30 a.m. **Commissioner Grange** seconded the motion. As the commission voted in the affirmative, they were adjourned.

The commission was called back to order 1:40 p.m. **Commissioner Beitelspacher** explained that he and **Commissioner Hansen** had called **Chairman Crow** to explain to her the problem that they had with all five of them looking at the congressional plans together, as that put them in violation of the open meetings law. He said that it was foolish for them to be running around in circles while they were trying to look at the plans, so they had called **Chairman Crow** and explained to her what they were doing, and they had asked her to call back if she had a issue with it. He said that they were going to go ahead and start looking at the congressional maps, and asked the secretary to make note of the presence of a quorum, and to take a silent roll.

Present were **Commissioner Martinez**, **Commissioner Grange**, **Commissioner Beitelspacher**, **Commissioner Olsen**, and **Commissioner Hansen**.

The commission first reviewed C50. **Commissioner Hansen** said that he wanted to remind the commission that the numbers had to be exact. **Commissioner Olsen** asked if he meant population numbers. There was then a discussion regarding population deviation, and **Commissioner Hansen** pointed to the deviation on C50, which was a difference of eight people, and said that they should be that close, and as close to zero as absolutely possible.

Commissioner Olsen asked if the reason that District 2 was so large was due to sparse population. **Commissioner Hansen** said that the problem was that 60 or 70% of the population of the state was in Canyon and Ada Counties.

Chairman Beitelspacher asked why they had started with C50 instead of C1. **Mr. Cutler** said that C50 was the last plan submitted by the previous commission.

Commissioner Hansen indicated that C50 appeared to follow county lines along Idaho, Valley, Boise, and Owyhee, and it looked like Ada County was split in half. **Commissioner Grange** said that in C50 most of the city of Boise was in Congressional District 2, and that Garden City and the remaining part of Boise were in Congressional District 1. She explained that Garden City sat in the middle of Boise, with Boise surrounding it, so C50 took Garden City and put it in CD1 with Meridian and a portion of Boise, and it put three-quarters of the city of Boise in CD2. It was also discussed that Eagle and Kuna were split in half. **Commissioner Hansen** asked what the boundaries followed, and

Mr. Cutler advised that they followed roads. He said that he believed that the boundaries on C50 were an attempt to follow legislative districts on a particular plan, and that the other commission plans which split Ada County used major routes.

There was then some discussion about following the legislative districts which the commission had adopted in L87, to see what the deviation would be. **Commissioner Grange** said that she would like to see if there was a way not to split Ada County, and have the deviation below 1%. **Mr. Cutler** indicated that there had been three or four plans submitted which kept all the counties whole, and within those there were several combinations of counties.

Chairman Beitelspacher said that they had a constitutional mandate that they have a population deviation of less than 1%, and that they had a state statute, he believed, that said that they shouldn't split county lines when redrawing the congressional lines. He indicated that if they could do that, and not upset all of the political apple carts, he would like to see that. He said that it bothered him when the congressional line was not straight, and the commission had been able to create rectangular shapes when drawing their legislative lines. **Commissioner Olsen** said that they may not be able to do that due to populations, but they should see.

Commissioner Hansen indicated that they had heard testimony that the problem in Ada County was that they had people who did not know what congressional district they were in because they were split.

The commission then reviewed C1, which kept all counties intact with a deviation of 788 people, or .1%. **Mr. Cutler** said that he believed it was the closest deviation on a non county split map that they had. **Commissioner Olsen** said that one of the problems she saw with that map was the separation of the district that went from the panhandle to eastern Idaho. She said that she thought that they had to go out of state to get from eastern Idaho up to the northern portion as they had a mountain and a lot of wilderness in between, and there were no roads there.

C3's description was that it split the state between north and south, with Ada County in District 1, and Canyon County in District 2. There were no county splits and the variation was .6%, which was a little over a 4,500 population difference.

Chairman Beitelspacher said that they wanted to prepare a letter of recommendation for **Mr. Cutler**, to be signed by all of the commissioners. He indicated that more important than his technical ability was his ability to work with the commission.

There was some discussion regarding how the legislative districts, which they had adopted, overlaid onto C3. There was also discussion regarding how the different areas may feel about the division, and the travelling distances. **Chairman Beitelspacher** pointed out that all of the congressmen were flying, and were not driving. **Commissioner Olsen** asked if northern Idaho had always been in the 1st CD. **Commissioner Beitelspacher** said it had been as long as he had been here. **Commissioner Grange** explained what they were looking at on the screen, and that in the county whole plan Ada County would go with the north, and Canyon County and Owyhee County would go west. **Commissioner Hansen** said that as he understood it, every county was whole, and that communities of interest were basically tied together. For southern Idaho the interstate system was there and accessible all the way, and in northern Idaho, even though it was not what they wanted it to be, they still had an artery running all the way from Ada County.

The commission then reviewed C4, which was also a non county split plan with a variation to 1%, and then reviewed C5 through C8.

C9 was described as an attempt to redraw the congressional districts to reflect changed population with all counties intact and communities of interest preserved. There was a discussion regarding the difference between C9 and C3. It was pointed out that by moving the line around Lemhi County the deviation had been lowered to .4%.

The commission then reviewed C10, which divided several counties, and also reviewed C11 through C22.

C23, which had a deviation of .05%, was reviewed. It was noted that Ada County and Canyon County were split in that plan.

It was discussed that C24 and C25 were the same as C9, with a deviation of .42%.

C26, an Ada County split plan, was reviewed next.

The commission reviewed C27, which was also the same as C9. It was discussed that all of the plans which were the same as C9 had been submitted by different people who had come up with the same conclusion.

C28, which was a whole county plan and kept the Treasure Valley together, was reviewed by the commission. They also reviewed C29 and C30.

C31 was reviewed which had a 0% deviation, and split Canyon County.

The commission reviewed C32, which had a 0% deviation, or an 18 person difference. It was discussed that it had several county splits.

C33, a plan submitted by the previous commission which split Ada County, was reviewed.

C34, also submitted by the previous commission, was reviewed. It was discussed that it split Ada and Canyon Counties, with a .01% deviation.

After reviewing C35, the commission looked at C36 which was an Ada County split plan, and then reviewed C37. They then re-reviewed C9.

C38 through C47 were reviewed. It was discussed that C47 split Elmore County, and was a 0% deviation plan. Plans C48, C49, and C51 were also reviewed.

The commission again reviewed C9, and it was discussed that it was the same as C24, C25, and C27. The deviation was .42%, which was a difference of 3,269 people, with no county splits. The advantages of keeping Lemhi and Custer Counties together were also discussed.

Commissioner Beitelspacher suggested that they adjourn for the day as **Commissioner Crow** was not present; however, he was glad that they had gone through the plans as it would save them time the following week. **Commissioner Hansen** said that he knew there had been a lot of work done on the plans, and it was apparent that a lot of the plans had a lot of thought put into them. **Commissioner Beitelspacher** said that the chair would entertain a motion to adjourn to an hour certain the following Monday morning at 9:30 a.m. **Commissioner Martinez** moved, and **Commissioner Hansen** seconded the motion. As the commissioners who were present, **Commissioner Martinez, Commissioner Grange, Commissioner Olsen, Commissioner Hansen, and Commissioner Beitelspacher**, all voted in the affirmative, the motion unanimously passed, and the commission was adjourned at 2:28 p.m.