

STATUTORY AMENDMENT DISCUSSIONS: Draft Summary

Suggestion:	Category of Suggestion*	Initial Thoughts for Inclusion	Discussion/Options:
Consortium Letter 1-17-12			
I. Start earlier	Statutory	Agree	Consortium suggested 4.5 months earlier (Aug. 16). Another suggestion per C. Forbes: start July 1 to correspond with the start of the state fiscal year
II. BSA to do "robust" outreach for applicants	Statutory/Policy	Disagree	The Commission agreed that BSA was successful in its applicant outreach but realized there was a need for assistance from an outside PR firm (and associated cost). The Commission felt that BSA's strength - and an appropriate use of resources - was in the process and creation of the Commission and not necessarily to increase outreach efforts. The Commission agreed that increased outreach for applicants is important but didn't necessarily feel it should be BSA's responsibility. Alternatives include linking with the Census outreach activities as well as the previous Commissioner's being utilized to do outreach.
III. Increased outreach and education by the Commission during redistricting	Policy	Agree	Policy recommendation to the next Commission encouraging increased outreach and education during the process. (Note: may need to be taken into consideration in the budget request.)
IV. Eliminate the transfer from BSA to SOS during the transition to full Commission	Statutory	Agree	There was agreement that continuing with BSA would save time and money as well as ensure consistency from applicants to full Commission. In addition, many systems will already be in place within the state to help the new Commission in their operations.
V. Increase the Commission's budget	Statutory	Agree	Suggestion of 4 areas to consider within the budget: (1) creation, (2) drawing, (3) litigation, (4) ongoing operations. (See all discussions for areas of increase.)
VI. Strengthen the hiring process	Policy	Agree	Policy recommendation to the next Commission. Suggestions included providing demographic information about the candidates, number of applicants, those removed due to conflict of interest, etc. Also noted (C. Raya and C. Forbes) that the next Commission should emphasize that staff works for the Commission and the Commission works for the public.

VII.	User friendly and transparent	Policy	Agree	Policy recommendation for the next Commission - an important aspect to continue in this process.
VIII.	Draft maps and timing of noticing	Statutory	Interest to include (but elements need to be discussed further)	If Aug. 15 is the deadline then: (1) select a date to release a "best intention" map - suggestions were either 21-days (July 23) or 30 days (July 15); (2) next, require a 14-day review period after the release of the "best intention" map; (3) after the 14-day review period change the review to 7 days; (4) finally, have a 3-day review period for the "no change" final map.
IX.	Do not exclude cultural and ethnic diversity in applicant process, review and selection of final 6	not applicable	Agree	There was agreement with this recommendation in its principle but that it is not needed in a statutory amendment. (Not within our authority.)
X.	Dependent care reimbursement	Statutory	Undecided (but inclined not to include)	Recognition that this is a barrier to applicants applying and will therefore reduce a certain segment of the public from applying. Suggestions to address this issue include a "flex" or FSA account for future Commissioners as well as encouraging the next Commission to consider non-traditional options for those needing dependent care.
Mr. Robert Neff 1-18-12				
1	Process of Information	Policy	Agree	The Commission understands the issues addressed in this suggestion and believes that the next Commission will continue to manage the information that is submitted.
2	Membership of CRC	Constitutional	Disagree	There has been some discussion of increasing the Commission by one "Other" but not in the manner or in the percentage of this suggestion.
3	Defining list of redistricting requirements - deviation requirement		Disagree	Policy recommendation that the next Commission consider the issues of deviation and other redistricting requirements but not to be included in statutory or constitutional amendments.
3a.	Split Section 2 & Section 5 of VRA	not applicable	Disagree	The Commission's discussion did not agree with this suggestion; it is also not within our ability to address the Federal Voting Rights Act as suggested..

3b.	Communities of Interest	Statutory	Disagree	The Commission felt that the current structure of having COIs included at the same level as cities, counties and neighborhoods is appropriate.
* Categories: Statutory, Constitutional, Policy Recommendation, Not Applicable				
Future Items for Discussion:				
1)	Mr. David Salavery - presentation on Feb. 1, 2012			
2)	Mr. James C. Wright - presentation on Feb. 1, 2012 (and revised letter)			
3)	Additional speakers at Feb. 1 hearing			
4)	Commission's Advisory Committee Recommendations			