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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. If I can ask your indulgence and patience, we do not have an amplification system set up for the Commission. So I would ask you to maintain as much silence as you can, and perhaps you can hear me in the back.

Mr. Rios, can you hear me?

SENATOR RIOS: Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

We will try to speak as loudly as we can.
We'll ask your indulgence to try to keep the room as quiet as possible.

The first order of business is public comment.

This is the time for consideration and discussion of comments and complaints from the public. Those wishing to address the Commission shall request permission in advance by filling out a yellow speaker slip. Action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter or
rescheduling the matter for further consideration at a
later date.

I have in my possession five speaker
slips. I know one group wishes to make a presentation.
We'll start with that presentation.
I've asked the group limit their comments.
We do have their material in both electronic and written
forms. That will allow us to have as many comments this
morning in the public comment section as we can.
Let me ask Supervisor Mary Rose Wilcox,
Aaron Kizer, and Steve Gallardo to come forward.
I believe, Supervisor Wilcox, if you hit
the on-and-off switch, that works. You are amplified.
SUPERVISOR WILCOX: Thank you very much.
We're here today, and we'd like to thank
you for having the public comment portion first. Many
groups should follow your lead.
We came before you as a coalition when you
had the South Mountain hearing. We gathered together to
show the commonalities of interest at the hearing at
South Mountain Community College. We gathered together
commonalities of interest from Maricopa and Southern
Arizona.
Since that hearing, we now worked very
hard in the second stage of the state redistricting
We are presenting today and we formally submitted yesterday to the Commission office, and I hope you will review it, our presentation.

We'll be abbreviated today. We have just myself and Aaron Kizer as speakers.

We've taken areas of commonalities, made ten majority-minority Legislative Districts districts, and are supporting Congressmen Ed Pastor's map with two revisions we'll talk about.

We'll immediately talk about, have Aaron come up, present the 10 Legislative Districts, majority-minority population. The reason we've done this is for compliance with the Voter Rights Act of 1965 which gave equal access to minorities, particularly in areas of commonalities.

Aaron.

MR. KIZER: I won't belabor the point. I thank you for your indulgence and time this morning. We've created 10 districts which we think allow minority voters in each district to elect voters of their choice. We understand you can do revisions, and you may have to do that.

We believe additional support, considerable support will come in from non-Hispanic minorities.
groups, Native Americans, other organizations that haven't had sufficient time to digest the maps.

Preliminary indications are there is strong support throughout Arizona.

There are a couple issues we want to talk about.

District 17, the salmon-colored area there, we did go up Agua Fria to Surprise and El Mirage. We know that configuration has been criticized as gerrymandered in the past.

What do El Mirage and Surprise, traditional Hispanic populations, have in common with Sun City, Sun City Grand? They get no vote whatsoever. That configuration, following the Agua Fria, has been approved by the Department of Justice in the past.

Again, it may not be the prettiest thing to look at, but it works, protects the interests of those communities, gives them a chance to have a meaningful decision in electing candidates of their choice.

Let me talk a little bit about District 8 which is purplish in color. You see it in Maricopa County. Again, that's a huge area.

Again, that's Pinal County, somewhat sparsely populated, doesn't have the density of Maricopa
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County. There are two reasons why it's spread out like we do in Maricopa County, the first is to gather Native American Reservations in Maricopa County in one district. You see Fort McDowell, Salt River, Pima, Maricopa County Reservations, Ak-Chin, Tohono O'odhom there, come into Avondale, pick up additional Hispanic, make it majority minority, 54 percent, I think, if I remember correctly.

Again, we had to do that to build a majority-minority district, keep the communities together, keep the Native American community together in districts that have a common interest in election districts.

District 29, we did select the Hopis out of the district at the request of the Hopis and link them into a Hopi district rather than with the Navajo Reservation.

Tucson, we have District 9, which at the very bottom, the green there, a majority-minority district, barely, 54 percent, again, we ran out of time in terms of tweaking numbers, but we did get up to majority-minority, barely. The area could use some more work.

The rest is pretty much self-explanatory.

One of the dilemmas for the Commission,
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the Constitution mentions competitive districts. There are two approaches to doing that. One, try to balance Republicans, Independents, and Democrats in each district to make it competitive. Another way of doing it, the way we suggest, and a way that recognizes disbursement of populations throughout the state, communities within a district, build Democratic districts, Republican districts, swing districts, and balance it that way. Doing it that way, you allow construction of majority-minority districts we're like doing here. Turn out heavily Democratic party registration, the Supreme Court recognized you can draw districts, safe political party districts, be it Republican or Democrat. That's what our districts do, Democratic party registration districts, Hunt vs. Comenterry (phonetic). We think it's the thing to do, the only thing to do, to build majority-minority districts and protect those interests.

Thank you.

SUPERVISOR WILCOX: In concluding the presentation submitted, you'll have available maps with 10 majority-minority districts for your review.

We're also supporting Congressman Pastor's Congressional map with two minor changes, one, separation of the Hopi and Navajo Nation, and also
honoring the Chicano policy submission submitted to you Thursday. Those two minor changes give us two minority, majority-minority districts.

I'd also like to take this opportunity to ask the members of our coalition to stand. Many people came out from Guadalupe and other areas of the state. If those here would stand, be recognized.

We have very good cross-state support. We're hoping the Inter-Tribal Council supports our map as well as the African American Congress.

We'll leave you now. We know now is not the time for questions.

Please honor the commitment that was made when you had the hearings. We were at South Mountain and really appreciated the 24 hearings the Commission had. We know it was grueling on all of you. It was very, very worthwhile. We'd ask you to duplicate that.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Supervisor, very much.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The next speaker is Bruce MacArthur.

Mr. MacArthur.

MR. MacARTHUR: Thank you very much.
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I'm here as a public citizen today, Independent, and a member of the Coronado Historical District where I'm a vice president.

We're here today to propose to you a separate Congressional District for the greater downtown Phoenix area. We think there's perhaps no clear distinction for the purposes of a community district between suburban and urban communities.

Unique areas of interest in our area are some of the following: Maintenance of the historical character of the areas is important to us; redevelopment of downtown historical neighborhoods; revitalization of the neighborhood down here; abatement of crime not associated with suburban life, prostitution, gangs, that kind thing, drug houses, issues relating to education that are unique to us.

For instance, I was talking with the principal of North High yesterday. She mentioned that the student-to-teacher ratio is 33 to one. That's very high. She didn't think that was in her interests as a principal and in the students' best interests, either. Schools often are poorly funded and certainly overcrowded.

Focus on redevelopment, not so much development.
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We believe that it's quite clear that while there are issues relating to suburban development, which we might share, they are relatively distinct from those which we have down in the central areas.

We don't have a particular map for you today. We are just proposing this in general. We think it will allow us to have representation at the federal level which we do not have right now.

As you know, the neighbors in the Central Phoenix area are part of the Greater Congressional Districts, the lion's share of which are outside of the Phoenix area, whether it be in Mesa, or North Scottsdale, or West Phoenix. So this proposal comes to you with not just the Coronado Historical Association's support; we also talked to other neighbors downtown.

We believe we'll participate in hearings in an active way in the month to come and come back to you again with more concrete proposals.

We hope that this meets with your receptive ears and we can make some headway.

Thank you. It's nice to see you all again.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. MacArthur.

Next to speak is Mr. Hartdegen, Jim Hartdegen.
MR. HARTDEGEN: My name is Jim Hartdegen. I'm here today representing the City of Casa Grande.

By the way, we appreciated the hearing in Casa Grande. I think the people who attended and people who didn't, people that heard about it a few days later, were very pleased.

I want to make a couple comments about the Congressional grid. We're very happy, by the way, on the Legislative side of it, and very happy with our presentation to you. But the Congressional grid, there are just several concerns.

If -- I'm doing this by memory now. It takes Yuma County, south of Gila, skirts around Yuma County, takes the southern end of Maricopa County to the Mexico border, the gunnery range, not much there, Pinal County, almost all of Pinal County, then swoops into a good piece of Pima County around the university area.

It's not a bad situation, actually, except it takes a lot of agricultural area through the Yuma area, Pinal area, and Marana Red Rock area in Pima County.

It's been my experience over the years that a lot of people in Pima County don't like agriculture. I'm not saying a person from Pima County would win and a person that wins from Pima County would
necessarily hate agriculture. It's my experience people
from Pima County don't like pecan trees, cotton, or
anything else like that.

   It would be terrible to have a good
portion of agriculture, a tremendous portion of
agriculture in that district, and have somebody
represent us in Washington that wouldn't fight for water
and everything else. That's just a concern we have.

   Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Hartdegen.

Next to speak is Steve Gallardo.

MR. GALLARDO: Good morning,

Commissioners. My name is Steve Gallardo, Redistricting
Chair, Coalition for Latino Political Action.

   I come representing the Hispanic minority
community this morning.

   This map not only increases the number of
majority-minority districts but, most importantly,
reflects the growth of the state's population. This map
takes into consideration communities of interest which
you heard from at the South Mountain public hearing, and
it allows minority communities an equal and fair chance
for fair representation in the State Legislature.

   Second, I'd like to comment on item number
seven on today's agenda. It is regarding the public
hearings. I would recommend to the Commission that the public hearings not be cut in half, that we have full public hearings as we did in the first round. It allows public comment, not only from the minority community but the entire State of Arizona. Cutting it in half kind of limits the input and participation of the general public for the State of Arizona.

With that, thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Gallardo.

The next speaker slip for this round of public comment is from Danny Ortega.

Mr. Ortega.

If others wish to speak, if they would get those slips in, I'd appreciate it.

MR. ORTEGA: Thank you.

I indicated if my questions were answered, I would not speak. Maybe I'll stay longer.

I'm representing Congressman Ed Pastor.

Last week, I understand from the consultant, the maps proposed by Congressman Ed Pastor have in fact been fact submitted. We hope to, in the next round of hearings, to present maps to all of you. And I'll be presenting them to you and telling you why I believe those are the maps you ought to follow as relates to following and drawing of Congressional District lines.
We appreciate your effort. We hope you will keep the same number of hearings so everybody can have their input, and we look forward to speaking to the Commission in the future so we can present our maps.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Ortega.

Thank you very much.

Are there other members of the public wishing to speak at this time?

We'll have another public comment session toward the end of the meeting today.

Seeing none, we'll close the public comment period.

And item III: Discussion and possible approval of the minutes of the Commission's April 5th, April 13th, May 10, May 18, May 25th, and June 7th public meetings.

I believe the Commissioners have received the minutes for all of those meetings.

Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER HALL: One motion for all of them?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I would.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I move we approve the minutes of the meetings mentioned.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

All those in favor, say "aye."

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes aye.

Motion carries unanimously.

Item IV: Possible Executive Session for discussion or consultation for legal advice with the Commission's attorneys pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.03(A)(3).

I understand from counsel this will be a brief Executive Session.

May I have a "motion"?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I move we move into Executive Session.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: All those in favor signify "aye."

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

(Motion carries.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I know when we go into Executive Session, I guess today this one is relatively short, probably 20 minutes is a reasonable number, so in 20 minutes or less we should be back in Public Session.
1 Thank you very much.
2 (Whereupon, the Commission recessed Open
3 Public Session at approximately 10:22 a.m. and convened
4 in Executive Session from approximately 10:25 a.m. until
5 11:00 a.m.)
6 (Recess taken.)
7 (Whereupon, Open Public Session reconvened
8 at approximately 11:05 a.m.)
9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Calling the public back to
10 order.
11 Presentation, discussion, and possible
12 decision with respect to the adoption of AURs, Arizona
13 units of representation, and deadline for citizen input.
14 We'd ask Dr. Heslop, Dr. Adams, to go
15 ahead and make the presentation.
16 I think for purposes of the presentation,
17 it's probably easier for us to sort of relocate while
18 doing the Power Point.
19 Will you be doing that first?
20 DR. HESLOP: I'll talk about the binder
21 very briefly, if I may.
22 We put together a binder, as requested at
23 the last session. It was shipped and, apparently, in
24 some cases, the binders came apart and materials may
25 have been reshelved. We'd be glad to work with the
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Commissioners to make sure materials are in the right order.

I should begin by saying the binder is our effort to summarize this very extensive public process that the Commission has been conducting and to include in it summary materials up to July the 10th.

Our intention would be to work this next week to bring the binder fully up-to-date as of today's date, July 17th. And we would anticipate coming at the next meeting with additional materials to insert in your already very bulky binder.

To say just a word or two about the use of this binder, the contents are described in a note immediately after the title page.

The report that follows the table of contents is going to be covered in the Power Point presentations NDC will make in a moment. The report is our effort to state what we believe to be the best approach to grid adjustment and AUR use.

Immediately following the report there are a number of colored tabs. The first colored tab, Arabic one, covers the summaries of meetings that the Commission held in different parts of the state.

Unfortunately, one of the court reporters, certainly not one in this area of the state, but one of
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the court reporters failed technically to get the materials into our hands until late last week. Although all summaries are here, we've not had an opportunity to excerpt summaries.

Following each summary sheet, there are excerpts. One word about the summaries. They've been read by NDC senior staff. This is something we took on ourselves, the summaries. These reflect our particular interpretation of what was done.

Our hope is that the Commission will today authorize these summaries to be put onto the web in both English and in Spanish. And we have full confidence in the citizens of Arizona, if they don't like it, the citizens of Arizona, they'll critique it, comment on it, and let us know.

If you want changes in the summary, we'll make them.

Our first recommendation today is these summaries and excerpts, if you wish, go on the web in both English and Spanish.

We'll receive this week the transcript from the 24th of the hearings and provide a summary and excerpt on that.

Next tab, tab two, covers our citizen input forms, CIFs, as we've begun to colloquially refer
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to them. There's a cover sheet with abbreviations.

We've added abbreviations when CIFs have a likeness to one another in terms of language that suggests coordination. We did this at the request of one of the Commissioners, and you'll see there are, in some cases, two asterisks, two citizens really designed responses together, in some cases a half dozen or more asterisks.

The first section up to the yellow sheet covers statewide CIFs reviewed as of July 10. And the volume continues to increase and is coming at us pretty rapidly.

We anticipate we'll summarize all CIFs as of July 17 prior to your next meeting.

The statewide review is simply as they came to us. We haven't arranged them by response, those who emphasize rural representation, those who emphasized freeways as something they wished used, those that listed something else.

Senior staff read the summaries, listed them. We read each and every one ourselves. There is a breakdown. You can look at the different areas of the state and use that in whatever way you wish.

Next week when we come back, our anticipation would be we'd provide statistical summaries so you can compare the areas in terms of different
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priorities as expressed by the citizens.

The next attachment, attachment three, letters and written comments.

Now, it is true that we have received an enormous volume of written comment. And it is perhaps invidious to select from among these written comments some and not others. What we have done is to select for inclusion here those written comments that suggested an opinion held broadly, or by more than one opinion, or, in a few cases, an opinion expressed by an individual that seemed to us to bear in on a very interesting or useful concept. Again, all letters and written comments were read by senior staff. It was not left to others to read letters. I know the Commissioners are reading them. It may be that you will wish to add some of these.

These letters and written comments come to us by the IRC office.

You have here materials that came to us as of July 10th. We will add suggestions for inclusion in this section by the next meeting.

You can see we have subtabs here, numbered subtabs, which again provide you a regional breakdown.

It is an index of letters, comments immediately following the tab.
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Next tab, section four, these are citizen maps that came to us. This is in some ways the least complete of the sections. We have concerns that when we receive a paper map we do the best possible job in representing the intent of the author. We much prefer, I might say, we receive statewide or complex maps in electronic form. We've done what we can with the citizen kits and maps that we received as of July 10. And you will see that we have produced maps of them.

Again, it would be our suggestion that among the Commission's review you consider placing some or all of these maps on the website.

Under tab five, we've provided what we hope are user-friendly statistics, Census data for counties, major cities, cities of 10,000 population or more, tribal reservations, and some other important citizen categories, Hispanic concentrations, Native American concentrations. These are things easy to provide. Anything Commissioners wish us to provide, we can easily provide. The attachment is to meet a major request today.

Here are the AURs. Each flows either from testimony at a hearing or from CIFs, in many cases, most cases, from both.
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Again, this is not NDC's point of view, it's citizen points of view with regard to what citizens perceive important communities to be on the map.

These are the shapes which we would suggest to the Commission. This is our second request to be placed upon the web for review by citizens.

So, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, that is our binder. We would anticipate it would be somewhat bulkier next time. We are also, of course, able to thin it down. We can take materials out as well as put it in. We await your instruction on that.

Mr. Chairman, if it is appropriate, I'll take questions on the binder or, otherwise, move to the Power Point presentation.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm wondering, Dr. Heslop, if we, as we move through this, take your recommendations, things you've asked us to consider, and do those as we move through the presentation, to keep those in close proximity to the discussion.

Questions or comments on the binder presentation so far?

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have one comment, actually concern. In the section where you, in the
section where you've listed the citizen input, various
letters and other submissions, Power Point presentations
and so forth we've received, we've had some technical
problems where some of these are obviously only partial
submissions, as one, I noticed we got every other page
of something. There may be others I haven't picked up
on yet. I don't know how to prevent this from happening
in the future.

We need some kind of review of this to
make sure materials we are getting are complete so we're
getting all information submitted to us.

DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Minkoff, my
suggestion would be we take the section, review it as
quickly as possible, and return next time with a
corrected, complete section.

DR. ADAMS: We also have more materials to
add.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments or
questions?

Then on to suggestions Dr. Heslop made in
terms of posting material in the binder to the website
insofar as we make it available to the public, both in
English and Spanish.

Is there a motion to that effect?

Ms. Minkoff.
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COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: So moved.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?
COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second for purposes of discussion.

What portions are we proposing be put up in English and Spanish?
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Heslop?
DR. HESLOP: The proposal is summaries go up in both English and Spanish. We -- I believe that the excerpts are a useful addition, that they help to add a kind of flavor to an otherwise perhaps excessively precede report. Add excerpts as well, summaries and excerpts.
COMMISSIONER ELDER: Excerpts. Citizen input forms? That would be a tremendous body, I'd think unnecessary.

DR. HESLOP: It is indeed. My reference to excerpts, that's the page immediately following the summary. If you open tab one, we have a summary of the meeting that took place at Yuma. It is on one page. And then on the page following, we have excerpts from the actual testimony.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?
COMMISSIONER HALL: I agree with the motion. Subsequent to any additions or input, we've
not had an opportunity to visit about some of these summaries. There's a couple where I feel like there should be some additional information. I mean, all of us perceive things through different eyes. Some valid points on some things I think need to be added. I just -- I support the motion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think we need to get as much information on the website as we can as soon as we can.

I do think these summaries should have a disclaimer, simply that they are the summary of our consultant, so they accurately reflect what they are.

I am concerned about -- I think the second part of the motion, which is showing the units of representation. I haven't had a chance to look at those. I don't know that it would hurt the process much if we waited a week, had a chance to look at those and comment on them. I think they're a very important part of this process.

I think I would like to have the opportunity to at least look at them and think about them a little bit before we present them.

Again, if we did do it, I would want to make sure it was properly labeled that they were simply
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the NDC product and we had not had a chance to review
them. I wonder how much value they'd have with that
type of disclaimer.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: A couple comments to
that. Several AURs are identified as either county
boundaries, or keep the entire county of Cochise
together, La Paz together, whatever it may have been.
Those are very easy to put in. My concern would be we
want to make sure that the disclaimer is these are not
complete yet.

I believe three areas we had completed,
section 26 on down, some things happened in
Amphitheatre, mentioned some AURs there, a meeting I
attended, a couple others. I asked NDC about it. Three
sections are incomplete. As long as we had this as work
in progress, incomplete, next week bring it up-to-date
to the 17th, or whatever the next cut-off date would be,
it's appropriate to put all the input we've received on
the website.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments?

Ready for the question?

All those in favor of the motion, signify
by --

MR. RIVERA: Hold on one second.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'll wait until counsel is ready. Apparently there is another meeting going on there we weren't invited to.

MR. RIVERA: Mr. Chairman, it's only that the motion, if you look at agenda item Number IV -- I'm sorry, agenda item Number V, only that the motion, I think Ms. Minkoff's motion, to the fact we put -- placing these on the website, it's a step into the adoption, eventual adoption of AURs, so it would tie into that agenda item. That's all.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Add to the motion?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: That was my note. I simply want them as raw data, not to necessarily be a step toward that.

Do we need a motion for this or can we simply ask our web master to put this material on the website?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We can ask things happen. When we make motions is how we decide to do that.

MR. RIVERA: Mr. Chairman, if it's not part of the process leading to adoption, leading up to AURs, I'm not sure you can make that motion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Then, in that case -- two issues. One is posting of material. Certainly any
material that has been gathered through the process can be made available to the public as material.

MR. RIVERA: Right. Then you don't need a motion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If we stop short of posting recommended AURs at this point and continue that for further discussion and consideration by the Commission, then we've accomplished essentially what Dr. Heslop asked us to do.

MR. RIVERA: You don't need a motion to do that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Then I'd ask the maker and seconder to withdraw that.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It's done.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd direct staff to put the material on the website, label it as work in progress.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Specifically talking about summaries, meeting summaries, correct?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The meeting summaries, at the end of each one, they have AURs listed. But those are just what you gleaned from the meeting, and they are nothing we have adopted or approved. I think an indication has to be made that

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
that is what those AURs are.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'll make sure the input
is appropriately labeled in that fashion.

Dr. Heslop, if you would like to continue.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, members of the
Commission, we have two very short Power Point
presentations.

I'd ask if the Commissioners at the head
table would care to move so we can shine our projector
on the screen.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission,
while waiting for the Power Point to come up, let me say
what these Power Points seek to do. The first, as we
promised last time we would do, refers to the problems
of grid adjustment.

It begins with a little account of where
we are in terms of our work. The second will deal with
our proposed solutions to problems of grid adjustment,
at least the first phase of grid adjustment.

So, Mr. Chairman, if I may move into this
first Power Point, I want to say very quickly what we
have done in terms of our recent work.

As I mentioned when we were discussing the
binder, senior staff have read all testimony, citizen
input forms, and dealt with citizen input kits and maps
and dealt with Census materials.

These are some of the AUR maps that were developed from testimony and from the citizen input forms.

I agree with all the comments made by the Commissioners. These maps are our understanding of the citizen testimony.

One reason to place them on the website is to get citizen reaction, whether indeed these were the AURs they were anticipating. And I expect that there will be a fair volume of citizen reaction.

Here is another AUR map that speaks to the bulk of testimony that we received and the bulk of citizen input we received. But we need to note also, and it is something we will do in terms of these AUR submissions, we need to note there are a number of people that said this AUR is not what they want at all. They want something very different indeed, as perhaps you can imagine.

Yet another AUR. Again, these come from testimony. They come from citizen input forms. They are merely our effort to summarize in map form what we heard, what we have read in reflecting on and going through this testimony.

Here is another AUR, again supported with
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a lot of testimony in this case, resolutions, and CIFs.

Now, as we have accepted these AURs, we have also become very conscious that there is quite a lot of conflict over AURs. We refer to these hot spots in terms of the heat of testimony, if you want, the conflict with regard to testimony.

Here, for example, is something that many citizens in Sedona agitated about but that fails to agitate citizens in, at least some citizens, in the county areas. Sedona divides a county line. How easy is it to adjust that grid to satisfy the citizens of Sedona? You've seen the map we displayed. How easy is it to use that information from hearings to reshape the grid line? And, of course, as we do so, if we do so, and this is only a hypothetical, we'd have to in each case relate it to the grid and give a reason in terms of citizen testimony for such adjustment.

I'm emphasizing ease at this point.

Here's another easy hot spot to adjust.

The Yuma testimony came at us forcefully. Yuma wishes to be together. They don't like the grid on the right. Well, then, how easy is it to make this grid adjustment?

We heard testimony, too, from tribal representatives that the Tohono O'odhom Nation had been disadvantaged by the grid. Okay. Let's correct it.
But, of course, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, there are problems not suggested by these very simple resolutions. There are problems of grid adjustment. And it is important that we face them at this early stage of the process.

You make a change in a grid unit, it has consequences. Change one factor, you change other factors in that grid unit. The change you've made may satisfy this aspiration, this AUR, but it may result in changing the grid unit that disadvantages some other community or component. No grid changes are without consequences.

I state the obvious here, but it is an important obvious to keep well in mind. Moreover, if you change one grid unit, you end up by changing others.

The first lesson in redistricting is something called the ripple. You change a unit here, it results in this change of a unit there. And the ripple effect can run extensively through the whole map. So that's a problem, too.

And here is a problem. The Commission has placed a great deal of emphasis on the public process.

I have read, senior staff at NDC have read this testimony. We've read the citizen input forms. And we're here to tell you that some of these AURs are
in conflict with one another. People in one community
want this AUR. People in that community want that AUR.
It's a bit of a problem for the Commission here. And
also, there are criteria, the questions of what weight
you give this criteria as against that criteria. So
there are many problems of grid adjustment,
Mr. Chairman.

And I'm going to say something about the
last two. I'm going to say something about conflicts
between AURs.

There is disagreement, sometimes sharp and
heated. Members of the Commission have seen it in these
hearings about this county, this city. Should it be
kept together? Should it be separate? And people have
taken very widely divergent views. "What about this
group? Should it be recognized?"

"You recognized that other group. What
about recognizing this group?"

"Is this a real community? I don't think
it a real community."

"I do."

That kind of conflict runs through the
testimony and the CIFs.

I don't want to exaggerate it, because
there's a lot of unanimity in these cases. In some real
As we know, Proposition 106 lists standards, criteria, and some of them, certainly, have a kind of legal Constitution priority. But then there are the others in Proposition 106. What about them?

Now, to be cynical for a moment, in many redistricting processes, indeed in all legislative processes I know of, the multiplicity of criteria is viewed by incumbents and their staffs as an advantage because you can choose this criterion here to solve that political problem and these other criterion there to solve another political problem and the underlying basis, and who's to criticize them? Perhaps we'd do it in their place. Perhaps the underlying basis for use of the criteria is not the criteria itself, incumbents, parties, or whatever.

Now, this is an occasion of a cross process using a very different perspective. How does the Commission resolve possible conflicts or prioritization of standards?

Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, I've ended with questions. We have another Power Point presentation that seeks to suggest answers to those questions. I can proceed directly with it or, if you prefer, I can pause for questions.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's go through the other Power Point, if you can.

DR. HESLOP: Yes, sir.

We suggest in this Power Point some resolutions for problems that we have described. Let me begin with a rehearsal of the Proposition 106 criteria, the federal mandates, and the grid adjustments.

No doubt as you read Proposition 106, it unequivocally requires equal population standards. There is the same kind of unequivocality as to the Voting Rights Act Amendments. But then we come to the Proposition 106 criteria as listed in Section 14 C, D, E, and F. And the question that I posed in the first presentation was how is the Commission to apply these criteria?

Which criteria should have priority?

What happens when a particular area, when you are examining a particular line of districting, what about competition among these criteria and how should that competition be resolved?

We think that the Commission, because it is involved in a very different process from legislative redistricting, needs a principal method of prioritizing these criteria. And we think that this method is found in the process set up by Proposition 106 itself and in
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arguments made on behalf of Proposition 106 at the time of its passage.

A center role for citizens is clearly indicated in Proposition 106. It anticipates that citizens will have the primary responsibility. And this indeed, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, is exactly what the Commission has done. You've involved yourself in an extensive statewide process of these hearings, citizen input forms, web sites, citizen kits, all volumes of testimony, and it has provided the Commission with clear evidence on prioritization.

What is this evidence? Community of interest is the paramount criterion that comes from this citizen process. It is also a criterion listed in Proposition 106 with the language that it should be used to the extent practicable.

So, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, we believe Proposition 106 itself and a very extensive statewide citizen process both utilize this as a general principle. It is not a principle that will solve all problems. As I point out, there are differences as to what constitutes community. But it is a general principle that we think can guide the Commission in some waters that might otherwise be pretty murky.
Now, there are areas where there is little controversy with regard to community, three big areas where the testimony, nine to one, eight to two, a big ratio, in some cases big unanimity of testimony supports the concept of community. These are very large communities. The rural areas of Arizona, the urban areas of Arizona, share an equal interest. It is having their particular and different interests dealt with by separate means, by separate representative institutions.

In the report that we submitted just now we have a footnote that lists some of the community hearings, some of the citizen input forms where this issue was embraced. That is only a scatter, a small scatter of the number of references to this rural urban community.

Hispanics. Again, there is a huge weight of evidence that Hispanics constitute a genuine community of interest. This is not merely an issue of voting rights or ethnicity, it is a community that culturally, in terms of its social, in terms of its residential, and many other aspects of its life and issue concerns perceives itself and is by others perceived as a community of interest. And with almost equal weight, the testimony, again, CIFs, all other sorts of public evidence, supports that Native Americans
are a community, again, self-perceived and perceived by others to be a community.

So, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, here is a concept, community of interest, that identifies with very little conflict or controversy these three major communities of the state. And in a moment you'll see why I am putting very heavy emphasis on these communities, because they offer a means of beginning this process on a fully principled basis.

Proposition 106, the citizen process, is now coming to a point where the Commission will be considering grid adjustment. Our strong recommendation, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, is that you begin by identifying on your map these three major communities of interest. We think that this is a principal starting point justified by the requirements of 106 amply identified by your public process. We also think that it is a practical approach.

Why is it practical?

Well, we've done this public process. What was it about if not to discover such an overwhelming principle as this?

Second, the Commission certainly needs to understand and needs to understand as soon as possible what these very big communities, and their location on
the map, what this means for other units of representation for other areas of the map. And, finally, two of these communities involve the Voting Rights Act, important questions of fair representation. And these two need to be considered at the earliest possible moment in your process.

What do we think is a second principle and a practical step in the AUR grid process? Well, second only to community of interest, and very, very close behind it, indeed, if you combine these you can indeed make, in a sense, a case that boundary integrity is one of the primary concerns of all Arizona and indeed overlaps with this concept of community. Second then to community of interest, and only second, is citizens' ranking of whole cities. Citizens.

Certainly this is true of all medium-size, some big cities. They want to be kept whole in the redistricting process. And they are concerned, too, with other local government boundaries.

In the CIF process, and again, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, in the report, footnote four to your report, I've listed out just examples of citations from testimony and CIFs, using here only CIFs. It's clear your public process has again underscored the possibility of using this
principle but also practical approach to grid resolution, namely the use of city, town, and county boundaries.

And to make one final statement about the two principles, community interest, city, town, and county boundaries, there are very substantial, many hearings, many CIFs, where people think of their city as their community. They think of their town as their community.

So, Mr. Chairman, it would be our suggestion to you with regard to our approach as we begin mapping for you, if you give us this instruction, we would intend to return on the occasion of our next meeting, we think scheduled for July 25th, with implementation of these proposals and report to you. We're not drawing districts at this point. We're really analyzing the effect of placing these communities on the map. We'd report to you on results and the implications of them.

A final word on this, Mr. Chairman. We think that this is the way the Commission, because it is a public process, redistricting, this is the way that you can do your task, remain faithful to Proposition 106 and faithful to the evidence that has come to you in the form of your process.
That's the end of my formal presentation, Mr. Chairman.

I would ask, if I could, at a later moment in your discussion, whenever you think it relevant, I would ask to suggest a deadline to the Commission for receipt of plans from citizens, because we need such a deadline for citizens, and for your purposes, and for your consultants.

Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Dr. Heslop.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If we adopt suggestions that you made and you come back to us with grid adjustments based on these three AURs and other communities of interest, county boundaries, et cetera, would you be able to provide us a statistical breakdown of each of the new districts in terms of ethnicity and also in terms of voter registration?

DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Minkoff, our intention would not be to create districts at this stage but rather to identify general areas where we think districts may be created. We can certainly provide statistics.

There is a question with regard to the political data base. I cannot at this point tell you exactly what information will be available in the
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political data base at that point.

Again, to make the distinction, we would not be drawing districts here. Some of these areas are going to be larger than districts. We would be presenting to you findings, suggestions, and some thoughts about the development of districts at that time. But our primary purpose here is to show you how much of the map would be used up, in a sense, by this process. The Commission would be entirely free, of course, to make any changes, develop any districts it wishes.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: My concern is in an attempt to understand the map, we're not dealing with real estate. We're dealing with people. So I would want as much information as possible as to not what is contained in these districts but who is -- not districts, these areas, who is contained in these areas so we can analyze them and implications they have on future decisions we're going to make.

DR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, we do have the Census array of data we can provide to you. And that Census array of data you've seen samples of, and they're attached to the AURs. You'd have that kind of data available.

We're awaiting receipt of some of the
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other information from Election Data Services. I've
just received a note on that. I think we'll be
discussing that a little bit later, what the dates will
be for the receipt of that. We will not have or we will
only just be receiving that as of the 25th, some of the
first of that data.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'd like to discuss
the three categories in the context of school districts,
also.

School districts have elected either
Boards of Governors, School Boards, taxing authorities.
That taxing budget is significant in the State of
Arizona. They act as groups. We heard that many times
in our meetings and hearings around the state. The
school district or school area represented a nucleus.
Would it be possible to overlay, see what the effect is
of a school district AUR on the fabric of the other
three in the process?

DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Elder, that's
easily done, and we'll commence to do so.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: A form of
categorization, it seems like boundaries, and the way
they're conceived, has a cohesiveness, rural to urban,
or whatever, so distinct boundaries are addressed. I'd
appreciate it if you add that in.

CHAIRMAN LYNNE: I wonder if you might, for at least my purposes, and I'm sure others may be curious as well, we seem to be unfolding the process sort of a step at a time, peeling the onion one layer at a time here. I wonder if you'd walk us through the remaining steps to put this step in context. You've made a very important point of not drawing districts yet as a precursor to drawing districts. Perhaps if it's easily done and not terribly time consuming, if you'd just summarize how it fits into the larger context of how districts then come out of the process in the near term.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, I have personally been involved in a great many very different redistrictings, but all of them involved three basic stages.

Stage I is the rough map stage where you identify major units, perhaps Phoenix, let's say, or perhaps Tucson on the map, how many districts, how many seats in this area as to that, what are the consequences of this allocation as opposed to that.

In this rough mapping process, too, there is identification of certain groups, or areas, whatever it may be, sometimes issue concerns, that need some priority.
We know we have a voting rights mandate sitting on top of this process, so that's obviously one of the things you need to deal with in the rough mapping process.

Once you are on the same page, there, you move into district development. And in that middle stage of the process you examine a variety of alternatives.

The great beauty occurs, in the sense of the redistricting process, is this is very easily done with computers. You can mix and match. In that middle stage of the process where you are applying those, let's say the middle category criteria of Proposition 106, I personally believe, as I said today, you need some principle guidelines, otherwise termed alternatives. There are going to be a great many alternatives. Using principal guidelines, otherwise alternatives balloon.

And the final stage of the process is when you, when you take your districts and you do what you have to with them to make them exactly right, to finetune them in terms of the population standard to make certain you can get a good bench mark, let's say, in particular districts, whatever the criterion may be; if it's an ethnicity factor, to finetune it. These are the three stages.
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Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to be responsive to your question. We're still very much in the rough map stage. The Commission deserves to know what some of the big limits on the process are. That's why we made the suggestion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Doctor.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I was thinking along the same lines as you were and asking myself how this fits in. It seems to me we have maps that show where physical features are located. We have maps that show where community boundaries are located. We don't really have a map that shows where these identified communities of interest are, are located. If I understand what you are offering, it is to fill in that piece of the puzzle so we can place this criteria on the same level as the others when we begin to plug in the demographic data.

DR. HESLOP: Exactly.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: So are you saying then with the AURs on the map, that does not constitute at this point an adjustment to the grid?
DR. HESLOP: I'm really making a distinction between AURs, as we developed them from testimony, and this attempt to identify, it is testimony, three big communities geographically.

Now it may be, I haven't looked at the maps that were represented earlier, it may be there is a great similarity between the maps presented earlier and the definition of the Hispanic community as we develop it. It may be, again, I haven't looked at it, that some of the maps that came to us as suggestions for rural representation will have a great deal of correspondence to how we identify this on the map.

No one, so far as I know, has gone through the state as we plan to do to examine city and county integrity against the grid. That's something technically we're the only ones that are going to do that.

Three things aren't AURs, as such, but give the Commission a lot better hold on the practical steps that have to be taken in the district formation phase we do at this point.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: When you were listening to how citizens prioritized the information in Prop 106, communities was first.
DR. HESLOP: City boundaries first, local boundaries second.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: You made the point those boundaries were viewed by many people as their community of interest.

When you listed rural versus urban as one of the three major areas identified, and if you were to translate that into essentially a map overlay, would you just be saying this is a rural area, this is an urban area, or would you be defining municipal areas people mentioned as important to them?

DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Minkoff, we'll be showing you some conflict in rural area definition, rural representation, and some other major communities. We'll also, certainly, be showing you some correspondence between criteria. My suspicion is that, I think, perhaps, you'll find that city, county boundaries offer a way into the definition of rural areas in many parts of the state.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Jose and I wanted to follow up on Commissioner Hall's question with respect to whether or not the AUR, AURs adopted, are in fact themselves adjustments to the grid.

Just as a legal matter, those AURs are not
themselves adjustments to the grid.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

I assume we are, getting back to

Mr. Huntwork's comments, I think we're on the same page
on this. We're trying to get prepared to adjust grids
into maps. And we need to translate the body of citizen
input into mechanisms a lot for that to happen. And
this is a stage in this process.

DR. HESLOP: That's correct. I believe
it's not only a practical matter, if I may emphasize,
but a matter of principle, principles of not only
Proposition 106 but citizen testimony.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes. I've got a
question. Maybe it's for counsel. Maybe it's for NDC.
We have some AURs that in themselves or on
the surface almost appear to be gerrymandering from the
standpoint they may be spreading population, or may be
compacting, or using compact areas, or packing, I guess
was one of the things we use in the first Power Point.

At what point will we get either counsels'
interpretation or recommendations of what constitutes
packing and when a community of interest has been very
well-defined and documented and represents an area, says
we think this is our area of interest, it can be
perceived as packing or disbursal? At what point in the
process will we address those issues?

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Hall -- I'm sorry, Commissioner Elder, that will be in

the next phase.

NDC is going to, in the next phase come

back with recommendations as to grid adjustment. There

will be a variety of options expressed at that point.

Jose and I will be giving you legal advice with respect
to the kinds of questions you just raised at those
decision points.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments or

questions?

NDC has asked that we take some action

with respect to directing them to produce the mapping of

these communities of interest and other facets of the

public input process. So at some point we'll need a

motion to give that direction.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, would such a

motion be consistent with the agenda?

MS. HAUSER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I so move.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Call the question.
COMMISSIONER HALL: You'll develop maps based on AURs of the three major communities of interest, the second criteria, county, city, and even more local governmental boundaries?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: And school districts.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the motion?

If not, all those in favor signify by saying "aye."

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

Motion carries unanimously.

With respect to another issue brought up, that being the deadline for input, do you have a recommendation along those lines?

DR. ADAMS: Actually, I believe -- is this on? Yes.

We will be talking about the process and schedule at numbers -- item number VI on the agenda; but I would recommend at this point, based on what we're going to be discussing then, that we have a deadline of August 1st for people to submit plans and input. That would give us time before the final, before we come back with the map we're going to present to you that you will be finally developing to send to the public. That will
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give us enough time to make any adjustments to the map.
That date schedule proposed to you is August 11th.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Just so I understand this deadline, you are saying then that if material is to be considered in the development of the draft map that is to go out for an additional 30 days of public comment, it must be received by August 1st.

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Minkoff, members of the Commission, that is correct. It should be also understood that after that there is another very ample period of time for citizens to comment and for further adjustments to be made, and that there will be implements for people to actually use similar to what we had before, citizen response forms to it, citizen kit type materials; so that any recommendations that come during that period of time we will be considering, presenting to the Commission, so you can make decisions regarding those materials.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: So if citizen input is received after August 1st, it's not that it won't be considered, it won't be a part of the development of the draft Congressional and Legislative maps. But it may be included in determination of any adjustments of those maps prior to determining the final map.
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DR. ADAMS: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I think as a practical matter we do have to place some deadline for this so that we can consider the information. I know, too, know that a lot of people were under the misimpression that we might already have closed the door, even perhaps that the opportunity ended when our hearing process came to an end. For many people, this would be viewed as an extension of the time it can be filed. I think it does everybody a service to actually adopt a date and let them know what the deadline is so that they can plan and target accordingly. So in that sense, based on the schedule we currently have, August 1 seems like fairly late in the process.

Are you going to be able to, obviously it's your recommendation, it just strikes me if you received a lot of input at the last minute, that's pretty aggressive.

DR. ADAMS: Yes.

Commissioner Huntwork, members of the Commission, I think that -- I may be going out on a limb here. I think we have, from major groups, we have received the input from the major groups. There may be
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some modifications to them, as we heard this morning. I
suspect the major maps and suggestions have already come
to us. So I think we're safe in saying August 1st is a
good deadline. Some of the material will probably be
repetitive and simply go to consolidate support for
particular maps and particular approaches.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is it appropriate to deal
with the deadline now or in the context of the overall
schedule?

MR. RIVERA: Either way.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Overall schedule, just not
lose the point as we go through it.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, it may kind of
get lost in the shuffle when you get in the next area.

I think August 1st sounds like a good
suggestion, although there could be perhaps a caveat to
it, not a date specific, that it simply says NDC asks
the deadline be perhaps a week prior to any adoption of
draft maps so in the event that that date moves, at
least you know what your cut-off date is, handle it that
way.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: To Mr. Huntwork's point,
to be fair to the public, I'd indicate two things. One
thing, there's an ability for public input, to provide
input, provide maps or suggestions of maps that runs all
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the way up to the point at which we make final
determinations and begin the submission process to DOJ
and that we will continually be interested in that kind
of input. But I think it's also fair to say if you want
to be considered, a date certain is better than a
floating date that may not be up to our -- up to speed
on our schedule.

MS. HAUSER: All I mean to say in -- if
you were to have a motion now that said the date for the
deadline would be a week prior to, then when you get to
the next phase of the agenda here and deal with the time
line, you'd know what the date is from the adoption,
then you'd know what it's likely to be. Then it's
fixed.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Fine. Or deal with it --
don't I don't want to deal with -- we'll defer the point
until the full discussion of the schedule and add that
date as a very prominent date we're dealing with.

Is there anything else NDC requires of the
Commission today?

DR. HESLOP: No, Mr. Chairman. Thank you
very much.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any other comment or
question to NDC under this item of the agenda?

If not, the hour is 12:15. I want to ask
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the Commission what their pleasure is with respect to taking a break midday or working through so I can judge the agenda from this point forward.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'd like to suggest we work through lunch.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, counsel, I think would like the opportunity to work with NDC for a brief period of time prior to the next agenda item. And if it would be possible to take even a 30- or 45-minute break to allow folks to grab some lunch, that would assist us in being able to make a better presentation for the next item.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Given that's the case, very well, we'll take a lunch break before that item happens.

I wonder if I might dispense with some items of less time requirement on the agenda so when we come back we have a cleaner afternoon.

Without objection, I'd like to first dispense with item IX on the agenda.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I'd move to ratify the individual items as listed on the agenda.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

All those in favor, signify by saying "aye."

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

Motion carries unanimously.

Is there, under item VIII, is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion we hire Adolfo Echeveste as our new Executive Director.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

All those in favor of the motion, signify by saying "aye."

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

Motion carries unanimously.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, same point.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Does the Commission have direction with respect to some additional negotiations with Mr. Echeveste to --

What is the Commission's pleasure with
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that respect?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I know there are some specific issues regarding his employment, in particular, that I think we should just either delegate to you, I think, regarding parameters and guidelines that the State has allowed us in terms of the position which still take precedent. As long as you are within those guidelines, as long as you are within that guideline, do that expeditiously, not in open session.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I wanted to make that clear. I'm happy to do that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: In that case, Adolfo --

MR. RIVERA: Welcome.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Congratulations.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: And condolences.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Thank you very much, I think.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's always subject to ongoing discussion, I think.

At this point, it may be appropriate to take a 45-minute break for lunch.

We'll reconvene at 1:00 o'clock and continue with the balance of the agenda.

(RECESS TAKEN.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd call the Commission
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Presentation of options, discussion, and possible decision with respect to the process and schedule for development of draft Congressional and Legislative maps, the 30-day public comment period and adoption of the final Congressional and Legislative maps. And within that context, also, the setting of a deadline for public input prior to draft maps being created.

So, Ms. Hauser, will you make the presentation or will somebody else do that?

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, you have in front of you two versions of the time line. I went through the concept in some detail at the last meeting. I don't think that needs to be repeated.

There are two versions. Version A is essentially the one from last time with some specific -- incorporating some specific requests made at the last meeting. The version B is essentially a set of suggestions, or developed from a set of suggestions made by Commissioner Huntwork. And I understand that there are probably some -- there is some modification that needs to occur toward the end of version B if the Commission chooses to go that route dealing with the dates in late September. Co-counsel is going to be out
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of the country at that time, and I had neglected to make
allowance for that.

The essential difference between version A
and version B is that there is, in version B, greater
consolidation of the meeting time on the weekends than
there is in version A.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay. And our task this
afternoon is to discuss the two versions and to give
direction as to which or a modification of either we'd
like to pursue.

So with that in mind, discussion.

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have a question.

Page two of both of them, I assume when you put day and
evening in parentheses, that refers to a particular day?
If you notice, version A, second day, day and evening,
day and evening, it's twice. Same thing for Friday the
3rd. I was trying to figure out whether in fact there
were additional days. You have the same thing on
version B, August 2nd. It first says day, then day and
evening. August 2nd again, day and evening.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: What?

MS. MINKOFF: This is B, the blue folder
that you got. So I couldn't really make sense out of
these.
MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Minkoff, I can see it more clearly on version B. That means a flow between those activities.

For example, version B, page two, Thursday August 2nd, during the day, anticipated time for Executive Session. If it didn't take all day, then the meetings with -- individual meetings with Commissioners could commence during the day and proceed into the evening. It's certainly impossible to specify exactly how long a session is going to take. So those are simply to give you an idea. And particularly with version B, because there was a greater emphasis on utilization of evenings, I went ahead and specified what Commissioner Huntwork had in mind.

He might be able to amplify that a little bit.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: My concern is let's assume August 2nd ends up being a very lengthy meeting and does run into the evening. Five Commissioners, two of them. Should we want to sit down individually with them before Friday's meeting, when do we do that?

MS. HAUSER: Commissioner Minkoff, clearly version B is a tighter schedule, more consolidation there. We would simply have to --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It may be so
consolidated, there would be three things going on at the same time, working from 3:00 o'clock in the morning --

I'm trying to figure out how everything gets done, if meetings end up being lengthy, as they very often are.

MS. HAUSER: Keeping to the Commission's instruction last time, we did not allow that set of meetings to move over into the beginning of the following week, not to split over the weekends like that.

Version B, again, was at the request that Commissioner Huntwork had made to try to do some additional consolidation and not take up so much daytime during the weekday. This is the result of that.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It's just a personal issue that I have that other members of the Commission do not have. I'm not available for meetings Friday nights. It's one night of the week I have no flexibility. I'm not available. Any meetings on Friday nights, they will occur without me.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other discussion?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Is discussion only on this first part?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: No, on the schedule,

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
either schedule.

Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Both versions potentially call for meetings on Friday night or Saturday morning, or -- and don't -- none of them call for meetings on Sunday. I'm wondering about that, too. At least for me, I'm willing to suspend my normal Sunday morning activities, if necessary. I don't know how other members of the Commission feel about that. But I do feel to the extent we can consolidate this over or around the weekends and have our consultants work Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday of the next week and do the same thing again, that's a very effective cycle and we should try to do that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Are the consultants comfortable with either version?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Both are just as bad.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: As I understood it from the last meeting, they were expecting to work over the weekends one way or the other.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further input or discussion or would somebody like to offer one of these as the way to go and we'll work with the one and either make modifications or adopt it or --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'd like to ask
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Lisa about the modifications. You mentioned modifications in late September.

MS. HAUSER: Jose.

MR. RIVERA: Option A is fine. Option B, I'd like to move the adoption of final plans, if you'd adopt the adoption of final plans schedule in A instead of B.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have September 19 as a religious holiday.

MR. RIVERA: B doesn't have it.

MS. HAUSER: That's counsel.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No problem. You can work.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: What is your pleasure? Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I will make a motion we go with option B attempting to work around weekends as much as possible.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'll second that so we can talk about it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall, you want to talk about it?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Let's talk about it.
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I -- can we get it all done is the
question, in that time frame.

We're talking, basically, in a four-day
period, just starting with August 2nd --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Three-day period.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Three-day period,
right.

I'm just interested if everyone agrees we
can get it all done in three days.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: That's just the
original grid modification.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Ask NDC.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Really, it's our
request. How long would the individual meetings with
Commissioners be?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is there time if
the Thursday meeting goes all day?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I'd
like to clarify.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The intent was our
meetings would be Thursday and Friday. Nothing says NDC
couldn't come Wednesday and meet with some
Commissioners, couldn't come on Monday and meet some
Commissioners.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Or go to where Commissioners were, if they weren't necessarily in Phoenix, in that regard. There may be an opportunity that week, earlier that week, to have individual meetings with Commissioners at the Commissioner's convenience.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser.

MS. HAUSER: The individual meetings with Commissioners probably should follow the Executive Session. The meetings -- individual meetings for legal advice with respect to grid modification. Individual Commissioner meetings would be shorter and more productive if the Commissioners have the benefit of that advice before the individual meetings.

COMMISSIONER HALL: What I suggest is start the July 25th meeting with an Executive Session.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If there is a July 25th meeting.

MR. RIVERA: There is none. There is no July 25th.

COMMISSIONER HALL: NDC --

MS. HAUSER: You'll get a report.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Could some legal advice come to us as a written report rather than
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Executive Session?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Or, as an option, this kind of flies in the face of what Mr. Huntwork was trying to achieve. If we were to take a day earlier, in other words, earlier that week, if we were to have the Executive Session earlier that week, and maybe that Executive Session, I don't know whether you view that as a day-long process or if it could be accomplished in a portion of a day.

MR. RIVERA: Depends on what NDC comes back with at that point in time.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I guess what I'm suggesting is to try to put it in an orderly fashion, do the Executive Session earlier in the week, allow a couple days for meetings with individual Commissioners, and finish the week with the Executive Session for as much time as it takes.

I'd be prepared, my understanding is Ms. Minkoff's concern and everyone else's concern is if we go, adopted the schedule, the intent is to start the Friday meeting as early as practical, do what people need to do Friday afternoon, evening, reconvene Saturday as long as it takes to finish the process.

I'm wondering if moving the Executive Session earlier in the week doesn't give two benefits:
One is it puts the sequence correct and it also gives
more time to meet with NDC earlier that week.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Why not Wednesday a
half-day meeting, start at noon or something?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I
would -- if at all possible, I would like to move that
meeting further, earlier in the week.

Do you mean Wednesday, Thursday, Friday,
Saturday, a four-day run, all at that time, if we meet
on Wednesday? Monday for receipt of the information,
Monday or Tuesday, and do the Executive Session for
advice of counsel, let there be three days, and schedule
independently with NDC when we meet on an individual
basis, meet Friday, adjourn for whatever time we need
to, meet Saturday --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm not available
Saturday. I'm available morning, not afternoon. If we
finish up in the morning.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser and Jose, also,
of course, need time to develop the legal advice once
the report comes in from NDC.

MS. HAUSER: We have built in some time to
do that. If you back up too much earlier -- I mean
we'll try to get a handle on exactly the legal advice,
go through those decision points as quickly as we can,
put as much of it in writing as quickly as we can,
attempt to shorten the Executive Session as much as
possible. We do need preparation time.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: On the schedule it looks
like you allowed a five-day period for that to occur.
I'm going to leave it to your own devices to see whether
or not that's sufficient or more than sufficient.

Jim, Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I need to
understand something a little better.

What is the relationship between the legal
advice you are going to give us and the time we're going
to spend with the consultant?

MR. RIVERA: Well, I think what you'll get
are general parameters in terms of where the
consultants' information fits into the whole picture.
And then the time you spend with the consultants, you'll
spend with the consultants possibly looking at
alternatives and changes. And then you have specific
legal advice, legal aspects come up that you may not ask
consultants if you have the general legal advice that
comes off the very first aspect.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Let me ask again
the question I asked very quickly earlier. Is there any
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reason why the initial legal advice has to be in
Executive Session? Can it be in written form, then if
individual Commissioners have questions, they can
contact the attorneys directly with questions, save
ourselves a meeting?

MR. RIVERA: It's an option. It's an ease
aspect. When you get questions that flow off a legal
memorandum, it may be generic. You can flush that out
better in a public meeting.

MS. HAUSER: Not public.

MR. RIVERA: I'm sorry, Commission meeting. It's flushed out fuller and with more ease
than based on exchanging e-mails with individual
Commissioners and faxing to Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Two executive
sessions to receive legal advice, I understand the
benefit of that. I'm wondering if one of them could be
handled in writing, then the interaction you're talking
about could be restricted to the second meeting and
eliminate one meeting.

MR. RIVERA: Well, except, and you can do
whatever you wish, Commissioner Minkoff, the two
executive sessions, the prospect of it, if you want to
eliminate the first session, you are missing that
interaction which I think is very important to narrow
the focus down and issues with NDC in that meeting. The second session basically may be a lot quicker, shorter, have a lot of answers done, a lot of answers done within the individual aspects of it. At that point in time we can discuss individual changes that came in through the Commission.

It would be hard to do the second one by writing. You had that conversation with NDC, and individual Commissioners, individual Commissioners have specific questions of them, and they may be applicable to the whole Board.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think what is confusing me is what we're going to be doing in our sessions with NDC. My view is it's a very wide range of sessions, asking questions like what happens if we move this thing over here; what happens if we draw a line north south instead of east west. I'm feeling in my own mind a very weak link between the very wide open process and specific advice counsel will give us on the specific proposals NDC will have generated at that time. That's what is bothering me.

I would feel just as comfortable sitting down with the consultants before I had that advice, after I had that advice, whenever, and asking those kind
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of wide-ranging questions.

I feel like we're being -- a schedule is being dictated between the two that may not exist.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, of course not having -- Arizona has not handled redistricting with a multi-member body of this type before. Some of the suggestions that we're -- that we've made here have come from NDC's own experience in dealing with city councils and the like and what seems to work best with respect to the give and take of information.

But appreciating the concern that has been raised about that, I suppose that we could do the first set of legal opinions with respect to the recommendations in some abbreviated written form and then I'm sure it will generate questions. But the attorneys plan to be at least, one or the other of us, present at each one of the individual Commissioner meetings. And perhaps we could address those, any questions you have, sort of on the spot, and handle it that way.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If I'm understanding that comment, then, the Thursday August 2nd Executive Session might be deferred and there might be some written instructions in its place with questions being answered
at the individual sessions. Is that what you are
saying?

MS. HAUSER: Yes.

MS. MINKOFF: Or, if possible, if we could
do those earlier in the week, replace the Friday
Executive Session with a Thursday Executive Session, do
Saturday's session on Friday. I don't run into the
problem Friday I'll run into Saturday afternoon. Then
all we'll have is a two-day meeting, do it on Thursday
and Friday --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.

I, having heard all I've heard, I would --
I agree we can handle version B. I think we can, with
Thursday, Friday, and Saturday morning, put everything
into those days that needs to occur.

I think logistical issues need to be
worked out.

I think what we need, for purposes here,
is basically to block days. I think we can block days
and, I think, get it done pursuant to this schedule.

My preference is versus to drive up and
down the mountain, my preference is to work from 6:00 in
the morning until 10:00 at night. That's my preference.
So I think I want to state my support for this version B with whatever changes Mr. Rivera needs to accommodate his particular schedule in the latter portions of September.

Just categorically speaking, I think all of us need to realize that from a personal standpoint, the month of August is over. And, folks, I just have said I just cleared my calendar.

I guess my point in saying that is I think we all just need to do that. And if there are holes that come available by reason of whatever, then we can go ahead and accommodate personal situations for whatever is available. Flat clear calendars for this job to get it done and make it happen.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: There is a motion on the floor to accept option B.

Are there any particular modifications we need to make before we accept that?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Do we need to put into the motion to eliminate the first Executive Session and schedule meetings Thursday, Friday and Saturday morning to accomplish what was going to be accomplished on the Friday and Saturday sessions? I think that's what I'm hearing.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd be happy to
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incorporate that without objection.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm not sure that's relevant. Block days, send a memorandum of legal advice. In the event there are subsequent questions that arise, we can agree counsel sometimes bounce questions off one another. A preliminary memorandum may abbreviate that process. Nevertheless, that Executive Session could go five minutes or five hours. But if we have the two days, two-and-a-half days blocked, I think we can accommodate it no matter what.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think the larger concern is if we formally decide not to have an Executive Session up front, it allows us the opportunity to extend the period time for NDC to spend with individual Commissioners and again preserve the meeting dates of the 2nd, 3rd, and as much of the 4th as necessary and allow us then to have that memo in hand earlier in the week and, we hope, allow NDC to make individual arrangements to meet with Commissioners, which I think is important.

I don't think one day, day, evening, affords us enough time to do what we need to do with NDC.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Is it my
understanding, or correct my understanding, during the
individual meetings with NDC one or the other counsel
will be with us so we can pose questions on regression?
I have absolutely no idea how that works. Conceptually,
yes. Statistically how it fits the law, all kinds of
things, if you do this, this, what happened, what does
the law say about it? If that's the case, I'm fine with
this.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The intent is to have one
counsel with the Commissioners when they meet with NDC.

MS. HAUSER: Hopefully both.

MR. RIVERA: Hopefully both.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Which would be further
accommodated if we elongated the time so everyone could
accommodate the schedule.

Ms. Minkoff?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: We also need to
incorporate the suggestion based on Mr. Rivera's
absence, the adoption of the final plan section of the
memo, use the version A time schedule.

Is that what you are asking for?

MR. RIVERA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Adopt version B up
to adoption of the final plan, then move to version A
because Mr. Rivera is not available.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Lose a week.

What days will you be gone?

MR. RIVERA: The 20th through Monday of that day.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Monday the first?

MR. RIVERA: 20th to 23rd -- 24th, evening of the 24th, back on the 25th.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Well, do we need -- in version A, the two-day meetings were immediately followed by Executive Session and a public meeting in version B.

Version A, the same two-day meeting of counsel and then the Executive Session and public session aren't for another week.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, when I prepared version B, and Commissioner Huntwork was not specific as to anything other than a couple pretty condensed periods of times around two weekend meetings, I sort of let it play out in the same sort of time frame as version A.

It ends up with concluding with the adoption of the final plan slightly earlier. If the Commission is comfortable with the final plan schedule in the A time line, where that ends up, what you could do is allow
extra time in version B, expand your time frame for
holding public hearings, which doesn't mean necessarily
mean you have more than we did last time but perhaps
have them on a schedule where they are spread out a
little bit more and won't be maybe quite as grueling on
everybody. That's another thing you might consider.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: There was also a point
that came up in the public comment period, or public
periods around the state, I want to ask a question
about, see if it was built in or if I may be missing
something, and that was several people asked if there
could be a period of time, again, a day, two days, three
days, some period of time between the time we actually
identify the final versions and the date at which they
would ultimately be adopted so as to have a final
opportunity for public comment. I want to make sure
that's built in here in some fashion.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, it is not
specifically built in here in the sense that you are --
the meeting for adoption of final plans, as I understand
that suggestion, would involve a meeting at which final
plans are adopted and then they are put out to sit there
for a period of time. And unless something occurs where
we actually have a Commissioner who calls Adolfo and
says, "Okay, we need to have a have a meeting to do the
final adoption, I assume that vote would be final. The
vote you take prior to sending plans out there for a
last look see for everybody would be final at that point
unless somebody asks to have them revisited. So you are
not guaranteeing a second meeting unless one is
requested. So it's not built in other than to --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay. The assumption
would be regardless of which end day we use, if it were
discovered that some ultimate modification had to be
made for whatever good proper reason, there always would
be the ability to call that meeting on a majority of the
Commission request and have a meeting.

MS. HAUSER: However the Commission
desires to handle that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Lisa, Mr. Chairman --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Lisa, it looks like
schedule B, September 10th, we would have a final plan
on the table for review for the 30-day period; is that
correct?

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner

Elder, I think, as far as the beginning --

Are you talking about the beginning or end

of public --
COMMISSIONER ELDER: The end --

MS. HAUSER: Yes. That's when the public comment period would end. According to the schedule that I had, public hearings are concluding at the same time as the public comment period. Public comment period is a minimum. It's not a ceiling. Therefore, if the period of time for hearings went on beyond the 30-day comment period, that's fine.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I suppose where I'm going, it appears, then, you'll have from September 10th to 19th or 20th to, in effect, prepare, I would call it, the DOJ submittal. Is that the correct window?

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Elder, we cannot prepare the DOJ submission until the Commission adopts the final plan. There are some parts we can be working on along the way. The time period you are looking at between the 10th and roughly the 20th is for NDC to prepare its report on final modification to the draft plans, based on the input received at the second round of public hearings, and for counsel to prepare legal advice based on those recommendations from NDC and moving into the final adoption of meetings on or about the 22nd of September, although that looks like it's likely to be changed more reflective of the version A adoption schedule.
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COMMISSIONER ELDER: The version B submittal is actually October 19th, plus or minus a day or two.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Elder, that would be sort of the outside time period. I think we're both hoping to be able to get a submission prepared sooner than that, but it's kind of a ballpark figure.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think the difference between these two, in version A we had October 2nd, 3rd to the Wednesday meeting date; version B, meeting of counsel a few days earlier, prior to Jose's planned trip, right?

MR. RIVERA: Right.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Then, if we were to meet on Tuesday and Wednesday, the next available Tuesday, Wednesday not --

MR. RIVERA: September 25th and 26.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: We've lost a week in there.

If able to end public hearings on the 10th; 18th for NDC to report; 19th, 20th for counsel to meet; 25th and 26th for us to meet, all of that would track pretty well.
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COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The only issue I would have with that, the 26th, that evening is the start of Yom Kippur holiday. I'd have to be through with the meeting by about 2:00 o'clock that day. It starts about 5:00 o'clock.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I thought it was the 27th.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: That's the day. Sundown to sundown. 26th, that evening, at about 5:00 o'clock the holiday starts. We'd have to be through in time for Lisa Hauser and myself to get home, get ready for the holiday. As long as we do it, I'm fine.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: My suggestion is we attempt to do that. If we can't, we simply recess and reconvene.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Would have to be Friday.

MR. RIVERA: Start early on the 25th.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Start very early on the 25th. That's fine.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: See where we are on the 25th.

We're concerned with option B as modified in a couple ways. Option B, modified first, that the first Executive Session in its current form as listed
for Thursday August 2nd would be in fact a written executive piece to the Commission and that we would actually begin Thursday August 2nd to take care of the Executive Sessions following individual meetings with NDC and move into modifications of the grid. That would be a Thursday, Friday, and as much of Saturday as possible or as necessary. Secondly, that we've modified B in final, the adoption phase as presented in B, Tuesday for adoption of the report, the 19th for counsel to meet, Friday -- no longer Friday. The 25th, which is a Tuesday, for the Executive Session, and then the 26th for the public meeting for final adoption with the understanding if that meeting cannot be concluded in time that we would recess and reconvene at our earliest option.

MR. RIVERA: With an option to leave open for an Executive Session and public meeting. Executive Session may be very quick.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Fine, combine the two and notice it that way. In many instances, multiple meetings, notice in a way so as to move through as expeditiously as we can in terms of the agenda.

The only thing I see missing, we said we'd take care of as part of this, is the August 1st deadline for public input, if the public wishes to have that
input included in the drafting of maps. It doesn't mean
they won't be able to submit later in the process.

Let's add the August 1st deadline to the time frame to
accommodate NDC's request earlier in the day.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'll accept the
modifications to the motion.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Now we have a revised
motion on the floor with those changes.

Ms. Hauser.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, the adoption of
the final plans phase calls for NDC's report on
September 18. If we could make that the 17th, since the
20th is one of the days Jose is going to be away, we
have at least that, and it would give Jose and I the
18th and 19th to work before he leaves, if that's
acceptable to NDC.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Adams and Heslop, can
you accommodate that?

DR. ADAMS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Does that change
the day of our meetings?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: This is the 17th and 18th.

MS. MINKOFF: I have a request, since
we've gone about this and changed A and B, et cetera --
MS. HAUSER: Yes?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: After the motion is adopted, if we can have an e-mail schedule, schedule of the Commission meetings, to make sure what we have in here matches what you've got.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, I've made a grievous error. Adoption of the final plan schedule called for NDC to deliver the report on the 18th, and that was not problematic because that did not require me to work on the 18th. And that is Rosh Hashanah. So we can't -- if we had them deliver the report on the 17th, Jose could get working on the 18th. I could meet with him on the 19th. That's -- I think we could leave it the same. I'm not able to work with him on the 18th.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand.

Let's leave it the same as previously stated.

Any further discussion on the motion?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Does the October 19th date stay the same?

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Hall, that's kind of a target deadline. That's not one fixed. We're hoping to do it earlier.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Great.

MS. HAUSER: Also, Mr. Chairman, can you
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clarify for me exactly on August 2nd and 3rd when you
plan to start the individual Commissioner meetings?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Actually those meetings
would start prior to August 2nd in the way we've
currently discussed this, because we would have a
written executive memorandum now, not a session from
counsel. Sometime that week we would, with NDC's
scheduling, actually have the individual meetings during
that week, but they wouldn't be confined to August 2nd.

MS. HAUSER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We would begin August 2nd
with a second, third, fourth possible meeting of the
Commission to accomplish what now is in the August 3rd,
August 4th date on the schedule.

MS. HAUSER: Okay.

Mr. Chairman, does that include Friday
evening, August 3rd, or is that out?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: What we'd do is schedule
it in such a way as to accommodate schedules Friday
evening and also Saturday, try to do that. If the
meeting could be concluded Thursday and Friday before
2:00 o'clock, or whatever --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: 5:00 o'clock.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Whatever time is
appropriate, 5:00 o'clock, if that's it, if we need to
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move over to Saturday, move over to schedule accommodating staff and Commissioners.

MS. HAUSER: Bypass Friday evening.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Not meet Friday evening.

Could we vote on this? It would be so refreshing, I couldn't tell you.

All those in favor of the motion as modified, signify by saying "aye."

(Vote taken.)
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

Motion carries unanimously.
COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Can we get this summarized?

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, for everyone's benefit, with such a moving target all along, for the benefit of the members of the public and press who are here, I think it would be a good idea for the Chair to give the key dates. I don't think you need to give the working dates, key dates for meetings.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right. Let me try to do it then.

What we've just adopted then is we have a tentative -- let's see. I don't know which are key --

COMMISSIONER HALL: I suggest you take the revised memo, give it to Amy --
CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think better than giving it today, do it actually by tomorrow, have it clear and on the website and distributed. It's easier than to go through this and parse it.

MS. HAUSER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: VII, presentation of options, discussion, and possible decision with respect to plans for citizen outreach and the second round of public meetings.

I know there's a draft memorandum the Commission has which has been circulated which is from Mr. Echeveste on the subject of the second round of proposed hearing schedules.

What is your pleasure on this item?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, if I may start this discussion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I think there's been some misunderstanding with respect to the motion made last meeting to condense some public hearings. I want to clarify my perception regarding this in an effort to try to convey my thoughts more accurately.

I feel like that given our experience in the first round of public hearings, that we were operating in two meetings a night and, therefore, had
different Commissioners at different locations. Having
read some meetings I attended and obviously some
summaries I didn't attend, and then listening to reports
from a variety of people, it's obvious persons'
perceptions of what was presented or occurs at meetings
is obviously different. And it's difficult to ascertain
the spirit of the input even though you may receive it
in writing after the fact without having been there
personally. Therefore, I feel it's important, if
possible, that all Commissioners attend all meetings of
the second round; because that, in essence, helps us to
all make sure we're on the same page of the play book,
if you will.

And with the proposed condensed schedule,
you know, there may be -- we may need minor
modifications. We're still contacting every area of the
state and providing opportunity for everyone still to
have an opportunity to make an appropriate amount of
input and, simultaneously, preserving, if you will, the
integrity of the input and assuring all Commissioners
attending all meetings and all say yeah, what did you
think of what was said, and have that same like
experience together.

For example, I have received all of the
input and again saw a brief review of the input at the
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South Mountain meeting this morning. I was not able to be at that public hearing. However, that input was presented then in much more detail and provided a clear perspective of the constituents represented there. It's difficult. Now, having that on my computer, or hearing it this morning, to properly interpret that. That's why I feel it's important to assure we're all able to attend.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay. A couple concerns I have.

Number one, with the first round of community outreach hearings, even when we had two hearings in the same night, there wasn't a member of this Commission that was at a public hearing every single night. None of us got to 12 hearings. There were always nights one of us or more of us had to miss a meeting. So I don't think it's reasonable to assume we're all going to get to every single one of the meetings.

I've looked at the schedule, and there are probably five I'd be unable to make. I'm sure others have similar concerns.

I'll still be relying on what other people tell me and I'm still relying on summaries from
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consultants.

I have another concern. And my concern is allowing people to react to an extremely important stage of the process, which is the draft maps that presumably are going to become the basis for final maps we're going to adopt.

When we went to the initial hearings during the first stage, we told everybody that we would be back to them with our draft maps and that they would have an opportunity to comment on those draft maps. And while I'm certainly supportive of compressing some of these, several of the meetings in the Tucson area, several meetings in the Phoenix area, I think we can probably, it's possible to cut those down, because it only requires people drive an extra 15 minutes. Although we're awfully lazy in urban areas, that's certainly doable. I'm concerned, in the original draft memo, listed as option one, option two, not necessarily in the same order, but it listed all of the different places we met last time. I want to make sure everybody that went to one of those 24 meetings has an opportunity, with relative ease, to get to a meeting in the second round.

So, for instance, the first one listed in Adolfo's original draft is Prescott. What I would
suggest is we go through each of these sites and make
sure that people who would have gone to a meeting in
Prescott, let's say, or who maybe went to a meeting in
Prescott during the first round, have an opportunity
without too much difficulty to get to a meeting in the
second round. Prescott, it seems to me, we have a bit
of a problem. Where do people from Prescott go, on this
session? Do they have to go to Flagstaff?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I'd
like to jump in here just a second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Is it the sense of
the Commission we have to go back to the same locations
to meet the same publics or is it something that, as an
example, we didn't meet in Florence. As an example,
Florence is not that far away from Globe. Florence is
not that far away from Coolidge. Florence is not that
far away from Casa Grande. Is it something we can
divide the space between original locations and
potentially get a broader coverage than we did the last
time through or different coverage to make sure we're
hearing from all the sectors of the community? I just
wanted to throw that out.

I think Ms. Minkoff's starting with
Prescott, Prescott may be an anomaly. There may be
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other areas where we could bring things together.

I, for one, I made that statement last time through. I had, I recall it, had people and said I'd be back, or we'd be back to listen to them, give an opportunity for input. I want to make sure we don't take that away from the process.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I want to echo that and add another dimension to it, as I said before. I want to dramatize the fact by meeting on weeknights, I think we might have not allowed as many people to participate as we could have. You know, it's very difficult for a working person to get home after work, feed the kids, or whatever they have to do, and get out to a public meeting at 6:30, 7:00. Some started at 6:00 o'clock. Furthermore, in rural areas, some people had to drive for an hour or more to get there. Some people actually did do that.

We had, you know, a lot of wonderful public participation. You wonder how many people, particularly working people, simply couldn't seriously try to participate because of the way we scheduled those meetings.

To the extent we could have more weekend meetings, I guess especially in the rural areas, say we
had a meeting Saturday morning in one place and moved to
a meeting Saturday afternoon in another, working people,
especially, would have more opportunity to participate.

I think picking the places so that --

Florence is a good example of that. If we had a
Saturday meeting in Florence, give people an opportunity
to drive there from other locations, we'd allow a whole
group of people that didn't have an opportunity to
participate before a chance to do so.

One other dimension. We're also asking,
to some extent, for a different kind of input this
second time around. And that worries me in connection
with the plan.

The initial plan was really designed to
get the type of input that we did. At this point we're
going to have maps. We may get -- we may get similar
comments: You missed my community completely, and so
on.

I would like to give the public an
opportunity to make a lot of specific comments that have
some demographic validity behind them.

In that respect, although I don't wish to
cut back on the number of hearings we're having, but I
do want to allow time in all schedules, including that
of staff and consultants, to design, participate in some
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process that allows people to provide statistically meaningful input.

We do have some organized groups that access computers and software, give us specific maps. The ordinary citizen can't do that. There's nothing in this process but public meetings that is going to afford them the opportunity to do that.

We have to do something else, in effect, if we're going to afford that kind of input. If we are, we're going to have to provide the means and time for it somewhere in the schedule.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments?

Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: There may be additional areas. Florence was referenced. You visited with representatives of Casa Grande. They were more than happy to, with the Florence location; is that correct?

MR. ECHEVESTE: I touched base with key players, that made a key presentation on behalf of the city, and asked whether there would be any negative reaction to that. And the comment was "No, that's fine. It's central and does get you closer to Gila County which is one of the areas there was some feedback faxed on last Saturday, was the mining areas of Ray, Sonora,
and all that mining area." I tried to put it in between Casa Grande and Globe which covers the mining areas and agriculture areas.

COMMISSIONER HALL: With respect to Prescott, I was the lone Commissioner there with Lisa. We had eight presenters total, probably 40, 45 people total there. Yes, they could have the option to come into the valley, or Flagstaff. It's certainly no greater distance to drive than any of the other rural areas, especially up in my neck of the woods.

I may add my additional caveat, talking about actual public hearings, for example, we on this proposal here, on the draft memo we have in front of us, Window Rock is not listed as a location to which we'd return. Well, with respect to the, my Navajo friends, they attended four public meetings via their own personal jet, Globe, Flagstaff, Holbrook, and Window Rock, I think possibly one more.

This schedule does not prevent us as Commissioners from going and meeting with these folks, as I've done on more than one occasion, if they feel like if they need additional attention. There's nothing wrong with me, or Mr. Lynn, driving to Douglas, or whatever, and saying: Look, is there something we didn't hear? Is -- I don't think this prevents some

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
additional opportunity for us to hear any amount of
input anyone may want to give us.

The fact of the matter is it's wonderful
for us to meet for three, four solid months, go to every
city in the state. We are crunched by an end deadline
for the DOJ presentation.

I just looked at the schedule. I'm not
sure how we can get any more aggressive than it is. I
feel like what we gain by doubling locations we lose by
not having as many Commissioners as can be there.

My perception, with the exception of
Saturday the 8th, is to be at every single meeting.

That's my intention.

I'm more than happy to compare schedules
with anyone. That's my desire to do so.

I did not have the opportunity to hear
representatives from South Mountain or Pima County in
the first round. I want to have the opportunity to hear
that. So I don't see that we lose anything through this
condensing process.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let me add just one
comment. I take parts of both arguments. Both have
validity.

I'm not so concerned we actually return to
every single location we actually hit in the first
round. Where I do have some concerns is use of interactive television. There are some benefits and severe limitations. Particularly it has limitations in that someone might be trying to make a point on a map at a remote location. Because this is not interactive TV with the most refined static camera, or very narrow field of vision for detail, what somebody is trying to tell us may be lost by the way in which that is done.

What I would like to see happen is that rather than doubling up with the use of interactive television, that perhaps on those occasions where we do have an opportunity to go to a couple of different remote locations, that we take that opportunity to consciously perhaps split the Commission in terms of their attendance, but to do it in person so people have the opportunity to address us face to face, to make those changes or modifications on the proposed maps in a way we can understand it and the consultants can understand it.

I agree, for the most part, we'd try to make as many meetings as we possibly could. I think in doing that what we might be able to do is restore just a couple places where we've consolidated but to give those places an opportunity to at least have a live meeting with live representation of the Commission present. I
certainly don't mind doing that on Saturday, which I think is a fine suggestion. But there are three occasions, actually two occasions and three instances where that might occur.

Certainly the 8th, we have a -- an enormous schedule in trying to pick up the three west river communities simultaneously and the Flagstaff Prescott area together on the 8th. I would like to see at least individual meetings held in those two locations rather than interactive television, whether the same day or not. The other is the northeastern part of the state extravaganza on the 15th, the number of locations there.

I'd certainly defer to Mr. Hall, he knows that area better than I, to figure out whether or not there might be a better way to handle that part of it. I'd like to see these not rely on interactive television. I'm afraid we'd lose something in terms of the richness of comment and detail we'll get.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I agree, Mr. Chairman, with not relying on the interactive except as a supplemental convenience.

With respect to September 15th, every one of those locations, with the exception of Polacca and Kayenta, is within an hour drive to Show Low. Given the rural and expansive nature of the area, I'm not sure
it's too much of an inconvenience. Most locations, given the opportunity to interact with interactive TV, it's no less than a drive to Holbrook or Window Rock. Most locations had to drive two-and-a-half hours. Window Rock, it's supplemental. If someone wanted five minutes, they could listen. You can be sure those that had a vested interest will drive the hour to be there. I agree that the river cities, it's appropriate to split up and try to accommodate them more fully.

The comment made about Southern Arizona, maybe, you know, Douglas or Nogales.

MR. RIVERA: Separate.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Nogales there.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Bisbee, Douglas.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Bisbee, Douglas.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Douglas is 25 minutes from Sierra Vista.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Not far.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay there?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay there. One Sierra Vista, one Nogales.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I recommend or throw out the idea to move the Nogales one to Rio Rico or Green Valley allowing the southern part
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of Tucson or Pima County area to go south. We had a few
people come from Green Valley. A few people from Green
Valley went to the Santa Cruz or Nogales area. Very few
people in the Nogales area would not come to something
in Rio Rico or model, split the difference there, get
our participation in the Santa Cruz Valley.

MR. RIVERA: Mr. Chairman, from a voting
rights perspective, it's not a good idea.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: In that case, we might
add. It's an idea.

I met with a group from Green Valley, 60,
70 people. It was not a scheduled meeting, outreach
hearing. We might want to accommodate that, not going
to Nogales.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Rio Rico is 15 miles
away.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Generally it's the same
community, just the other high school.

Mr. Echeveste.

MR. ECHEVESTE: I need clarification.

Regarding Saturday September 8, see if I heard you
right, the Saturday September 8 Kingman interactive
Bullhead City, Lake Havasu, you prefer to set up
separate hearing times and split up the Commissioners to
go to those different cities on the same day? Because
the point I was going to make, the only way to add any
more hearings here is if we end up having dual meetings
during the week.

    CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand that. I'm
not trying to add on either end of the schedule. Some
areas where -- I grant you that Bullhead City, Lake
Havasu are 30 miles apart. I don't know we necessarily
have to do both of those. I think it's reasonable to
have a meeting at one of those two places and a meeting
in Kingman. That's my suggestion.

    Flagstaff, Prescott, seems to me it's
reasonable to have a meeting in each of the locations.

    MR. ECHEVESTE: Split up the
Commissioners?

    CHAIRMAN LYNN: That's my suggestion.

    COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Four locations,
five Commissioners.

    COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The schedule just
adopted has the process ending on September 10th. What
I'm looking at shows September 15th as the ending date,
plan A --

    CHAIRMAN LYNN: September 10th, 30 days is
required. Nothing says we have to adhere to that.
That's minimum.

    COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Did say public
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hearings conclude.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Maybe that portion, I think, added in A, that language wasn't there.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: In B.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is there enough time Saturday September 15th and Saturday September 8th for NDC to do what they're going to have to do, reporting possible final modifications and draft plans?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think not.

DR. ADAMS: Actually, Mr. Chairman, members of Commission, I think that date also moved, talking about the 17th now. Meetings ending on the 15th. We come back on the 17th. Presuming, I'm probably just simply stating we will be looking at suggestions and modifications as the process goes along, I don't see a major problem coming back to report. There may be some modifications coming back. The only problem is getting back to you in a timely fashion so you have time to look at it before the 25th. That shouldn't be a problem. No meeting scheduled there. No meeting scheduled. I don't think it's a problem.

MR. HUNTWORK: Counsel has to review and respond to it.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, the problem I saw coming out of the last public hearing, assuming you
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use different court reporters at different locations,
NDC does need to have access to and time to summarize
the meetings that occur. And Dr. Adams is being very
gracious here, but I think that the Commission probably
would be better served by allowing more time for NDC to
get them a report so that, you know, you have it more
than a day in advance of when you need it.

MR. RIVERA: If you look at it, 72 hours,
72 hours goes to the 17th.

COMMISSIONER HALL: We have draft maps
August 11th. Not starting public meetings until the
27th. Bump the whole unit up a whole week.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The purpose was to give
the public ample time. Subject to interpretation, an
ample amount of time to take a look at maps, make
whatever judgment they want to make, be prepared to tell
us what those judgments are. There is some concern
about starting public meetings too soon after maps are
released. I don't know what the definition of "too
soon" is.

COMMISSIONER HALL: One week should be
sufficient.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Combine that with
two concerns and as much weekend activity as possible.

I think it gives a different group of
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people an opportunity to participate. To the extent we are able to consolidate, especially in rural areas, those meetings should all be held on Saturdays. People might need to drive an hour to come to a meeting. They'll have an opportunity on Saturday and not have to cope with that on a weeknight. In that regard, I don't see why we couldn't start on the weekend prior to August 27th.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The 25th?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Start the 25th.

My particular thought there is have multiple meetings in Tucson and Phoenix. We could have one meeting in Phoenix on that day and then, in the morning, go down and have one in the afternoon and get started that much earlier. Those are both areas where I think our information can get out that much more quickly than perhaps attending some of the rural areas. And because we're having multiple meetings there, we'd not deprive people in those communities of commenting more fully at a later time when prepared to do so at posted meetings. It's a chance to use Saturdays and get started earlier.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: By extension, it frees up two days taken up in the schedule to accommodate one of the meetings we were talking about splitting up.
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MR. HUNTWORK: Right. I'd also suggest
again, maybe an exception to those two meetings, other
Saturday meetings, probably in rural areas, again,
because people have to travel so far.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think they are.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Florence is
scheduled on Monday. We said we picked Florence so
people from other areas could drive in. I feel that
ought to be a Saturday meeting.

COMMISSIONER HALL: We only have so many
Saturdays.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Echeveste. We started
Monday the 27th. That was the time line we were working
from in collaboration with NDC and the attorneys. If it
is possible to pick up an extra Saturday, if we move it
forward and start on a Saturday, we can pick up a little
more operating room, if you will.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I notice, too,
nothing is scheduled for Saturday September 1st.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Labor Day weekend.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Real participation
there.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The presumption --

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Hold a meeting in
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San Diego. A lot of Arizona is there.


COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Huntwork's suggestion about the Florence meeting, I don't know that we need Phoenix and Tucson that first Saturday. With Florence as one of the meetings, we could pick up either Phoenix or Tucson as the second meeting that day and have even less travel time.

Florence is halfway in between.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Florence and Thatcher.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Florence and Thatcher.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Florence and Safford or Thatcher is easy in one day.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: That would seem to be --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Adolfo --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: First Saturday, Florence/Thatcher, Safford.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Move it to the 25th. Do Florence/Thatcher/Safford.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Flagstaff, Prescott or Kingman, Lake Havasu City.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let us not five of us move
individual dates. It would take more time than we have on the clock today. We're trying to give Adolfo, start on the 25th, make use of as many Saturdays as practical. We'd like to have Saturdays reserved in the main, unless it makes sense to combine rural communities, for Phoenix and Tucson communities.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: My only concern is the first Saturday, one thought seems important to me, I'm more comfortable using Saturday for Phoenix, Tucson because each of the communities has another opportunity later whereas the only -- whoever we put on that date anywhere else, it's the only meeting they get.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: They will have ample notice. The reason we're doing it now, we want to, A, publish the schedule.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: B, start outreach to the communities and get the press in support. We have, minimum, a month-and-a-half notice -- a month of notice if we come to some resolution.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Mr. Chairman, if I may, on the Saturday public hearings, we've had, the community college system, interactive, there's difficulty at times to acquire use of a facility, city, county. If we run, prioritize, acquire those, if we run into problems, we...
may have to go to some other facility.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: That's perfectly acceptable, even pay for a room, an easily accessible location that people know where it is, how to get to it. There's nothing sacred about community colleges.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Speaking to that, too small locations. Some were too small. And we're condensing. Make sure we have ample locations.

MR. RIVERA: Flagstaff was too small.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Accommodate -- we had to move Window Rock. It was too small there. Especially in urban areas, we need to insure, given as we're condensing, we have very large rooms.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'd like to make a motion that we basically adopt this schedule with respect to the second round of public hearings ranging from August 25th to September 15th and incorporating the changes that we have discussed. And I'm sure that there's going to need to be some finetuning, but how's that for a rambling motion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right.

Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I
want to take one more shot at getting one set of weekend
meetings, just one weekend meeting in Phoenix and one in
Tucson, in order to afford, really, the working people
in those two communities that account for 80 percent of
the population in the state a better opportunity to
participate. I just think it's hard for people who
maybe leave work at 5:00 o'clock to participate in every
meeting. And I would like to have one weekend meeting
in each of those places.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, one
way we might do that is utilizing the Saturday of Labor
Day Weekend, because these are areas where there are
other options. People not away for the weekend, other
meetings in Tucson, people that are not going to be away
for the weekend, some weeknight meetings, it might
achieve what Mr. Huntwork is looking for.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I will be in
Arizona that weekend.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Have fun.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Two Commissioners
then.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If that's necessary in
terms of accommodating the schedule, work on that, if
that works. I just think turnout will be miserable.
MS. HAUSER: Including staff.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Including if in town or not, they've probably planned other things to do.

Further discussion on the motion?

I'd incorporate by reference Mr. Huntwork's reference of trying to work Phoenix and Tucson into a Saturday somewhere.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Add on to the current --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Not add on, a tradeoff.

Three meetings in Phoenix, two are scheduled in Tucson.

Mr. Huntwork is suggesting one Phoenix and one Tucson be on a Saturday, one of three in Phoenix, one of two in Tucson, be on a Saturday.

COMMISSIONER HALL: But that doesn't have anything to do with the motion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It does in a sense.

COMMISSIONER HALL: It's not at all feasible. I can wish for a dozen Saturdays. With what we've done, it's not feasible.


COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Right.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'll leave it to scheduling. We've agreed to clear our calendars from the 25th to the 15th and commit to attend as many of
these as practical for each of these as we schedule for
the group.

Further discussion on the motion?

COMMISSIONER HALL: What is the motion?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: You made it.

COMMISSIONER HALL: You just amended it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I didn't amend it. I just
like to take into account when we're trying to do it.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Starting on the 25th of
August, ending on the 15th of September. We have
bought, in effect, another Saturday by doing that. And
we are attempting to reconfigure the Saturday, the
8th -- the day of the 8th, September 8, and --

MR. ECHEVESTE: Separate.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: -- separate them so
there's individual treatment of those locations.

Further discussion on the motion?

If not, all those in favor say "aye."

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Opposed say "no."

Motion carries.

MR. RIVERA: Mr. Chairman.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Mr. Chairman?

THE COURT: Mr. Rivera.
MR. RIVERA: The whole conversation started off with the 15th through 17th. NDC, I'm not sure if there's enough time. Dr. Adams is optimistic. With a 72-hour turnaround from the court reporters --

DR. ADAMS: Chairman Lynn, Commissioners, we could operate on our notes from the meetings. That would -- that would be what we'd have to do. There is a 72-hour turnaround for getting the transcripts. And then we previously asked for 72 hours after that to analyze transcripts. We can shorten that time, doing this as we go along, as I said. For the last couple meetings, we'll have to be relying on our own notes. If you'd prefer us not rely on our notes, then we would have to change the time frame.

THE REPORTER: There's also daily copy or dirty ASCIIIs.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Otherwise, you could get videotaping of those and take it with you.

DR. ADAMS: That would be fine.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Accommodate the back end of the process.

MR. ECHEVESTE: The last few.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Audio video, take that with you.

COMMISSIONER HALL: To digress a second,
the idea of accommodating Mr. Huntwork's desire of
meeting in the valley, why not split the 15th?

MR. ECHEVESTE: That's possible. Why not
split the Commission on the 15th? One in Tucson, move
one from Phoenix to Tucson on the 15th, do it that way.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Show Low would not
change, only Phoenix.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Add Phoenix and split
the Commission. Leave them Saturday --

MR. HUNTWORK: I want to accommodate
Tucson in the same way.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let Adolfo work that out.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Mr. Chairman, regarding
Roman Numeral II and III, I'll assume by your silence on
those two that implies consent?

Basically get a strategy for trying to get
as much publicity up front after you print the map --
after you approve the maps. That's number II.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Number II and III speak to
the process we believe is a really outstanding process
from the first go round given the amount of time
available to put it together. We learned a lot, we all
learned a lot from the first round of meetings, and we
can make some different choices in terms of how we
staff, the way we do outreach, and so on, from the first
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go round. It's implicit in the way things happen from
maximizing input.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I don't think it's a
problem this time around. It will be clear.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Item X, public comment.

Before we move into public comment, I'd
ask, first of all, by virtue of adopting the schedule, I
don't know that item XI has any particular relevance.
So without objection, we'll skip it, since we have a
schedule in place.

Item X is public comment. Before we begin
public comment, I want to remind members of the public,
if you wish to speak, fill out a speaker form. Those
are available in the back outside the back door. They
are yellow. I also want to advise members of the public
that because of a previous engagement, I may have to
leave during public comment. Vice Chairman Minkoff
certainly will be in attendance and will be able to
carry on.

Adolfo, before we move to public comment,
do you want to briefly do staff introductions?

MR. ECHEVESTE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's not on the agenda. I
don't know how much trouble we could get into.
MR. ECHEVESTE: We can do it another time.

MR. RIVERA: Go ahead.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Let me ask them all to step forward. I had it on my minutes here.

Here we go.

Yours truly, the new Director speaking.

Administrative services officer, Rudy Serino, he's not here. He's passing through. He's accepted a position with the State as a data center administrator. He'll not be with us any longer.

Press secretary, you all know Amy back there.

Office staff, we have Iva Rockwell, which she is back processing -- she's not here. She went back.

Administrator, Lou Jones, stand up.

That's -- Lou is going to be the point person to put together all the hearings, Commissioner meetings.

She'll be the person in charge of that.

Assistant staff receptionist, Kristina Gomez. She's back at the office answering phones.

Audrea Traun is also at the office handling the front office.

You know Augusta Knight, outreach coordinator.
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Cindy Le, outreach coordinator.
Myra Parker was with us. She's gone.
We'll have Jess Sixkiller replace her.
Theresa Pulido, want to thank her. She's leaving, accepted a position with a school district.
Greg Patterson, helped us with media activities. He's come and gone, is no longer with us.
Manuel Gutierrez, I gave him the consolidated hearing, public hearing information. He's back at his computer right now translating them into Spanish. He's on as needed.
And then our audio, visual aid staff person, on as needed, Paul Cullor. And we call on those as needed.
I do have a sheet here if anybody would like a copy of that.
That's the end of our introductions.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Echeveste.
The next item is call to the public.
This is the time for consideration and discussion of comments and complaints from the public.
Those wishing to address the Commission shall request permission in advance by filling out a speaker slip.
Action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter or
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rescheduling the matter for further consideration and
decision at a later date.

Are there members of the public that wish
to be heard at this time?

Seeing none, item XII, the Commission will
stand adjourned until further notice.

Thank you all very much.

(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at
approximately 2:50 p.m.)

* * * *
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