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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Good morning. I'd like to call the meeting of the Independent Redistricting Commission to order.

Second item on the agenda 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 speaker slip, which are hopefully located outside. 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 and decision at a later date.

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

If not, there will be another opportunity for public comment later in the meeting.

Item III, presentation, discussion, and possible decision with respect to the operational
implications of citizen input and the development of the AURs, Arizona units of representation, for each area of the state.

Dr. Heslop, are you going to lead this one?

And, by the way, for those members of the public that aren't aware, Dr. Heslop was absent the last couple weeks having a fairly serious illness. We're delighted to have him back with us with color in his checks and standing upright.

We're delighted with your speedy recovery.

DR. HESLOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the public.

I'm going to make a presentation to you to discuss approaches with regard to operationalizing, using approaches of the process that you've been conducting up and down the state, the 24 meetings, transcripts for most of which, not all, unfortunately, have been received; summaries of which have been prepared and passed to you; citizen input forms which continued to arrive in substantial numbers, some in paper form, some to the website; e-mails which continue to come to us; written comments of many kinds.

Our effort, as you know, is to put all of this information in a usable form.
And so this morning, we propose to go through a short Power Point, which essentially is what is done and what is being done, and then to respond to your questions, and after that to demonstrate what we refer to as an interactive AUR map of Arizona.

This is essentially the tool that we are proposing to you for use in adjusting the grid.

So this is our effort this morning, and we'll begin with our Power Point.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think it might be useful for the Commission to take a different seat so we see it more clearly.

DR. HESLOP: So here we are.

Everyone will remember, I think, that the grid needs to be adjusted in light of Arizona units of representation. And I think everyone will remember, too, that AURs are developed from these sources.

The testimony that the Commission heard at the 24 public hearings around the state, citizen input forms and citizen comments, the maps and citizen kits that were completed by different groups, and, of course, finally, the census data which provides data with which we must meet the federal requirement.

Let's begin with AURs developed from testimony. Here's an example. It's the simplest
possible example.

I was at the Commission's meeting at Yuma County. Commissioner Minkoff and I heard just about a unanimous opinion that there was an Arizona unit of representation, and it was Yuma County that was the consensus. But meanwhile, another Commission meeting at the same evening was going on at Lake Havasu. And at that hearing, there was nearly unanimous testimony that the river communities formed an AUR. And you will notice that those AURs run across the Yuma County boundary.

This will be a theme of my presentation today. AURs do not necessarily coincide or fit neatly together like pieces in a jigsaw puzzle. They may and do conflict.

A rather more complicated example of an AUR developed from testimony, Commissioners who were at Casa Grande will recognize this as the strong result of the testimony at the hearing at Casa Grande.

So examples of the development of AURs from testimony at your hearings.

Meanwhile, of course --

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Dr. Heslop, you have some hatching. You have hatching.

MR. HUTCHISON: Talking here.
COMMISSIONER ELDER: Hatching above.

MR. HUTCHISON: City boundaries.

DR. HESLOP: Hatching is city boundaries.

MR. HUTCHISON: City boundaries and tribal boundaries.

DR. HESLOP: Second source, citizen input forms, putting into a still.

You've probably received by fax a summary of, by way of fax, summary of citizen input forms I completed this week which put a great deal of emphasis on county lines. We need county lines in our AUR system.

Another example of input from citizen forms, tribal reservations. So, yes, here's another AUR. We need those tribal reservation lines on our interactive AUR map.

Third source of AURs, citizen kits, maps.

A number of groups, you are familiar with them, came before the Commission and produced really well-worked-out, detailed maps. Here, for example, is the proposed Navajo Congressional District map.

Another example, another group, the Phoenix Historic District Association developed a Legislative plan. We turned this into another AUR because it was a well-developed citizen kit map.
A third source of AURs, Census data.

We know that the law requires us to pay close attention to minority population. And so we have in our map shadings representative of different levels of Hispanic concentrations. And here we have them by Census tract.

Equally, we know that the law requires us to pay close attention to Native American concentrations.

So, a second example on an AUR from Census data, here it is, Native American concentrations.

Now, this is apparently a straightforward process. It isn't quite as straightforward when you start to put AURs together, because they overlap or conflict with other AURs.

Here is the simple example of it. The City of Sedona may appear to us in the presentations to the Commission that they don't like that county line. And the reason they don't like it, of course, is that the city crossed it, as do some other cities in the state. They also cross county lines. So there's a simple example of conflict among AURs.

Why do you think I'm putting the emphasis on this? Clearly your consultants need to take instruction from the Commission when there is conflict.
We need direction from the Commission when there is conflict between or among AURs.

Here is another conflict among AURs. The Commission heard eloquent testimony from the Hopis that they don't wish to be part of a district with the Navajos, they wish to have their own representation. And that's true of the Havasupai and we know Hopi, and they brought testimony before the Commission.

At the same time, the Navajo were making testimony to the Commission about an inclusive district, that the Indian tribes should be included together and be included together with representation.

And here, another example, final example of this kind of conflict. Here are Hispanic concentrations which we know are important. We know we cannot dilute Hispanic representation. Here, superimposed, is the proposed Central Phoenix Historic District Legislative plan. Here, ladies and gentlemen, I demonstrated the kind of conflict of AURs we need to be prepared for.

Not all is lost. As you'll see in a later demonstration, we have developed a tool that not only presents these AURs but makes it possible, very quick, to see the sort of conflicts among and to make grid adjustments with real speed.
Well, what about conflict with AURs and the grid? No surprise. AURs and the grid. One of the conflicts is the grid and tribal reservation lines.

Here, and we heard abundantly from the City of Tempe, its representatives and residents, that they did not wish to be split up. Here is what our grid managed to do to the City of Tempe.

If you saw the number of citizen input forms from Tempe, you'll be aware of, I'm sure, of that problem.

So conflict between AURs and the grid. Conflict among AURs. How are we going to resolve it? Through the development of what we referred to as an interactive AUR map of Arizona.

Where are we on this? Well, unfortunately we have not received all of the transcripts of all of the hearings, all 24. We are missing four. But -- and we only this week received some of them. But if we can get our hands on those missing four, we will have completed all of the summaries within 72 hours of their receipt. These summaries, and you've seen some of them, I think, are enough to put on a page, one page, the essence of the testimony. In many cases, we have a somewhat longer summary because the testimony is complicated. In all cases we're attempting to put the
essence of the testimony. And at the bottom of the page we've put a recommendation or recommendations for development of AURs for that recommendation.

If these have been improperly summarized, or development of AURs improperly some raised, we're happy to go back, do it again.

We're also receiving citizen input forms, received an additional 40 or 50 yesterday. We are pretty much up-to-date.

We believe that early next week we can complete summaries of all of these.

Now, how are we summarizing? You have received by fax an example of a line summary of each of those citizen input forms. This is not something that we're delegating. It is something that Florence and Leroy and I are working on ourselves, because we think, we believe, it's our experience, that only by working through the citizen data can we really be in a position to advise the Commission on line development, especially these areas of input.

The second way of summarizing these input forms is to provide graphic detail, bar charts, graphs. Here is an example of the sort of graphic summaries that we will present.

You'll remember that the citizen input
form included a question, question Number 5, that asked people to rank order the criteria, basically, that they thought most important.

We've had a lot of experience in doing surveys of this sort. It was not our expectation that people would accurately rank order one through seven, but it was our expectation they would provide priorities. They did so so with regard to community of interest. We know there was a huge disproportion of citizens who marked their form as to priority, some number one for community of interest.

Man-made or natural boundaries, however, did not attract anything like that kind of priorities. People set it much lower on their priority list.

Keeping districts with whole cities or as much of a city as equal population permits, this was another high priority. I'm providing input only from the citizen input form. Soon you'll have all input forms.

Local government boundaries, we know from input forms, typically local government is high priority. Keeping Census tracts whole was on the form, not much priority at all.

Using freeways and major transportation
routes for districts and boundaries, not much priority.

You'll see in Metro regions, they'll have a higher priority.

Drawing compact and contiguous districts, not a major priority.

And here, community interest, whole cities, local boundaries, big priority, you'll see.

These summaries will be available to you next week.

Some will come in, continue to come in.

And we'll continue to keep you up-to-date.

Here is where we are currently on the second source of AURs, analysis of citizen kits.

Well, some of these citizen kits were wonderfully well, indeed professionally developed. We had wonderful presentation at South Mountain led by Mary Rose Wilcox. There's only one version of the plan, and we have not entered it into the data base. We will be entering it this weekend. Most other maps we have received we either will enter or are about to.

So all of these are things come together, finally, in the development of a great big grand sounding title, an interactive AUR map. Simply, through GIS, it's so you can look at the AURs. We think it will speed your process and do a good job for you.

That's the end of my Power Point.
I would pause at this point, take questions before we go into the demonstration of our interactive AUR map.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Are there questions for Dr. Heslop?

Mr. Elder?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, a comment, because I'm beating up on Tim on it, if possible, legends. I couldn't tell the most dense Hispanic to least dense.

DR. HESLOP: We'll have that.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I guess, could you do a breakdown on the statistics when you come back to us next week concerning what you heard in outlying or rural areas of the state? You made the comment when you got to rural areas, edges took on a different characteristic from what I heard in urban areas, see what the difference is there, that would be helpful.

DR. HESLOP: Two differences. One is summaries of transcript. Second, on citizen input forms and written comments, I've been talking about citizen input forms as a statewide pool. We'll break down by region, and you'll see very marked differences by region. And we'll certainly do that.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Last one. We
received a series of maps putting into the series AURs.

Can we get a sense of where, what coverage, for example, that Navajo one, Congressional District, the majority of the northern part of the state?

DR. HESLOP: We have entered the Navajo map completely. The major omission at the moment, and we're taking care of it today, is the map presented at South Mountain. There was only one copy of it. We were afraid to make use of it before copying it.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: The reason I asked for a list, I hope Legislators and political entities, the people that we know are interested, because of self-preservation, would have submitted a map saying this is what we'd like to see. I'd like to know if we've received any from political parties, Senators, Legislators, any of those sort of things.

DR. HESLOP: At the moment, I believe it's true there are only written comments.

Do we have a map?

DR. ADAMS: One map, from a previous meeting, delivered to Commissioner Hall early in the process. It was difficult to follow maps early in the process. We're in the process of entering that one.

Some came in materials we received yesterday.
The way the process goes, things go in to the Commission, get copied, then get sent out to us. We have a little bit of delay on that.

Also, I should mention, on the Supervisor Wilcox presentation at South Mountain, they did not provide the maps at that time. They presented them again at Avondale at the Estrella meeting and they were given at the presentation at that meeting and are yet to be copied and passed to us. We are going to be getting our hands on it today.

MR. ECHEVESTE: They were not given to them.

MS. HAUSER: They were not given.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Not given.

DR. HESLOP: We'd welcome any thoughts you may have.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: A couple things I recall, at one meeting I attended there was an individual Legislator that presented a proposed map. Is that treated as a Legislative map or treated as an individual that presented a map?

DR. HESLOP: Any map presented to us we use to develop. That doesn't mean the Commissioners need to regard it as an AUR map. It may be provided as a map for use.
DR. ADAMS: We've received testimony from a number of elected officials and Legislators. Most of them have prefaced comments saying "I'm speaking as a citizen, not speaking as a Legislator, am speaking as a citizen not for Casa Grande," and so on, and we'd treat that as citizen information and designate it as such.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: One other question. It's become very clear to me from some of the citizen input forms I read they are part of an organized campaign. There are any number of them the only thing changed is the name, address of the person that submitted the form, and wording is identical.

How do you treat that kind of thing versus something that may only come in from an individual that didn't call 27 friends, didn't tell them to say the same thing?

DR. HESLOP: We're also aware of an effort to concert and areas they didn't tell to concert. I, myself, Commissioner Minkoff, would tell you an effort to concert is not necessarily bad, does suggest lack of spontaneity the Commission may wish to take into account.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: If I may make a recommendation, with all the information received, if we...
can consolidate it, disseminate it, if possible,
consolidate so staff can place it in a large, three-ring
binder and have it constitute tabs for all maps. For
example, I've not had an opportunity to look at any
presentation made by Ms. Wilcox. I know fellow
Commissioners may not have had a chance to look at the
Navajo plan.

I don't know how best to make it happen,
but I think those can be reduced to eight-and-a-half by
11, put in a three-ring binder so all of us have an
opportunity to review it all, in addition to summaries,
have it in the same binder, all the maps represented, so
we can all be on the same page in the playbook.

DR. HESLOP: Sounds like a good idea,
Commissioner Hall, not only maps, the summaries alluded
to of the citizen input would certainly come to you.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Two three-ring binders
would be nice, and a four wheel cart with it, so --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Let me add
something to that, an excellent idea, and also
suggestions. People that didn't specifically draw maps,
said they believe the boundary of their district should
be this street on the north, this street on the east,
this mountain range on the south, et cetera, if those
could maybe be drawn out for us and also included as a map, that would help me.

DR. HESLOP: You have reference to Phoenix street descriptions there.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Also one from Cochise County referring to specific areas.

DR. HESLOP: We will definitely work those up for you and include those in the three-ring binder.

Our anticipation is that you will let us know if you don't like the way we're summarizing things.

Our one-line summaries of the citizen input forms, they're the best effort we could think of to bring information to you. We're happy to do it in any other way.

DR. ADAMS: I'm not certain everyone received those.

Did you all receive a fax of the summaries, one-line summaries, six, seven pages? Kristina said they were faxed out, confirmations were faxed out. They may not have gotten to you.

MS. HAUSER: Mine was illegible.

DR. ADAMS: If you would like, I'll pass this around. Then we'll give it to Kristina and ask her to go over, make copies of it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Just as a matter of
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mechanics, anything that can be disseminated electronically is in far better condition for viewing than anything faxed. If possible, make it available to Commission staff, then distribute it electronically, that's better.

DR. ADAMS: I understand. The fastest way for us to get it to you July 4th was to send it by fax.

What I'll do is make certain that data base gets on the computer to e-mail to you as well.

Would you like copies at this point, Commissioner Lynn?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Please.

DR. ADAMS: I think you'll see it's nicely summarized line by line here. You may not want all the paper forms once you see how this works.

Let me have Kristina copy it.

Commissioner Hall.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Following up, the Mary Rose Wilcox presentation on CD was just loaded on my laptop, a revised request. Whenever it's possible to do so electronically, we can certainly minimize that. I asked him to do that for all fellow Commissioners.

Let me say, Dr. Heslop and staff, we appreciate the tremendous amount of effort you folks have taken on with respect to these numerous meetings
and tremendous amount of information. And we recognize
there's -- the turnaround time is rapid. I want to
express my appreciation for your efforts in this
respect.

DR. HESLOP: I think we can surprise you
with the speed we can finish the summary process.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I had requested in
the summary process you summarized the summary form. I
found it overwhelming, as I found the citizen kit forms,
I think it better if grouped not in the order they came
in but by geographic area, so we can look at an area.

DR. ADAMS: The first step was to look at
all the information in a general sense, see how people
felt. Then the next step is to divide it into
geographic areas.

We have to have some way to keep it in
order.

Ones off the website, we're keeping in
order, Tim is sending to us. The others are actually
coming in by geographic area, coming from the meetings.
Then some are coming by mail which we designate what
area we put them in.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Even some from
meetings, I recall a meeting I think I went to in Mesa,
I don't know, they all blur, in the Phoenix metropolitan
area, someone came from Kings Canyon and also somebody from Tucson because they happened to be in the area. Their comments didn't have anything to do with the area the meeting was at at all.

DR. ADAMS: That's true.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Heslop, is there a way for linkage of information as it comes off individual forms to summary comments, not necessarily so we see them in terms of Lisa and Jose's presentation, but the DOJ documentation, paper trail, an attribute, click on it, attributes, this was found in 106, 104, 105, whatever response. We've given numbers to each one of the forms. I don't know whether a link, tracing --

DR. HESLOP: That's one of our staffs. Next week we'll take a look at each of the hearings and link the forms, that came at the hearing, and link forms from the same general area so there's a back-up to the summary of the transcript.

Now, of course, we're not going to do much about that if citizen input forms are not saying what the transcript testimony said. But if there is conflict, we definitely have to know that. That is one of the steps.
At the end of this process, not only will you have the state-wide detail, but 24 packages, 23 packages, with the citizen input forms and summaries.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other questions at this time for Dr. Heslop?

DR. HESLOP: Thank you.

DR. ADAMS: One comment. We were unaware there was a CD of the Mary Rose Wilcox plan out there. We'd appreciate receiving that as soon as possible. If other CDs, maps come in we're not aware of, I hope we can receive them as soon as possible.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I conveyed to Mr. Johnson I received a plan from another gentleman up north, another proposal from a man up north and conveyed to him to get that to you.

DR. ADAMS: Thank you.

DR. HESLOP: If you receive information, other thoughts, don't hesitate to call us.

This coming week it is our effort to complete this process. Now we'll go into a different kind of process.

We're now going to demonstrate the grandly titled interactive map.

Basically, what it is is the ability to
show different AURs singly, multiply, on the face of
the map of Arizona.

Here is the outlying map of Arizona.

There's an AUR. There's a map of the counties. So
there's our county line.

Now let's take a look at cities. And here
are our cities on the map.

Anyone who has used a computer knows what
we're doing. It's simple stuff but also very handy
stuff, and we won't demonstrate it here, but we can zoom
in and look at Sedona and the county line, or Peoria and
the county line.

So let's add something else, add tribal
reservations. And here we have our tribal reservation
lines.

Now all you have to do is imagine
superimposition of the grid and you'll understand how
easy it is.

Let's return to the state outline and try
other things.

Let's put the Census tract up. Census
tract, one of the things we're interested in, citizens
aren't interested in it, and again, we have the power to
zoom in and look at Census tract lines, so we won't
demonstrate it, but what about Hispanic, what about
Hispanic shadings to indicate concentrations? We will promise to provide a legend so shadings can be easily understood. If you don't understand shadings, we can recategorize and give you shadings.

Here we have Hispanics and different concentrations. Imagine superimposition of the grid and see how quickly we can perform adjustment or identify problem areas.

Let's go blank again, state outline, and try others.

Let's put interstate highways up here, freeways. Let's take a look at the freeway system. I mentioned in some areas freeways aren't much regarded. In other states they seem to be.

State freeways, here it is. Now how about superimposing Native American concentrations? And here they are. Coming up.

Chris, were you out late last night? You are usually faster than this.

There are Native American shadings on the map.

Let's go blank again.

Here's a Tucson map. Zooming a bit on our little map here.

Let's see school districts.
We know, we had some testimony in the state, schools are the focal point. So here we have the ability to put school districts on the map. Let's take a look at Hispanic shadings, the final demonstration of this effort, and we are able to see Tucson schools and Hispanic concentrations. It doesn't take a lot of imagination, won't take a lot more imagination. We have a lot of AURs up on our map.

You know we're developing AURs from testimony, from maps submitted, from citizen kits. We will have this map available for your use. We will be able to demonstrate what we think are major conflicts. We would intend to come back to you this time with some major AURs we think the Commission should pay particular attention to, and we should be able to take your instruction either on development of additional AURs or different approaches to them.

So if we could turn the lights back on, I'd be very pleased to respond to your questions at this time.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Questions for Dr. Heslop.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Start at this end.

Dr. Heslop, these are based on the 2000
Census, I assume.

DR. HESLOP: All of -- yeah. All of those that we showed you in this demonstration of the map are 2000 Census.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Is there a way of showing the Native American -- the percentage of change or historical, when we get final data input, the final package EDS data, '94 Census --

DR. HESLOP: Population increase? So we could identify, if this is what you mean, sir, areas of the state where the population increase has been greater than that of the state as a whole or less than the state as a whole? That's easy to do.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I guess where I was also going, can you go in there, put a cut-off line, say I want to see everything above 30 percent Native American?

DR. HESLOP: Yes indeed.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: So you see where concentrations are?

DR. HESLOP: We can categorize all of this any way you wish. Not a problem.

Certainly, if I may continue, it will certainly be the case as you get into the adjustment of the grid you will require fine detail, detail of a
particular kind. And we will be able to provide everything.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: If we asked to, in the Maptitude process, show all areas which contain all areas combined, we'd be able to get those?

DR. HESLOP: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other questions for Dr. Heslop?

Again, thank you very much for the presentation, and good to see you back.

DR. HESLOP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, members of the Commission.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Item IV, presentation, discussion, and possible decision with respect to the process and schedule for development of draft Congressional and Legislative maps, the 30-day public period, the second round of public hearings, and adoption of the final Congressional and Legislative maps.

I believe each member of the Commission has received -- I want to draw attention to two items. One is a document with a cover memorandum from Ms. Hauser, item time line for preparation of Congressional and Legislative maps. The second document, I believe, passed out this morning has a large
memo at the top from Adolfo Echeveste, outreach coordinator. That particular memo indicates a methodology for the second round of outreach. I think everyone received copy of that this morning.

So with that as background, Lisa, are you going to take us through this or how do you want to proceed?

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, I can do that.

The process for AUR development, obviously, has been laid out pretty clearly here.

The next meeting we're looking at having is July 16th, proposing it would be July 16th for purposes of giving direction, adopting AURs, officially.

And, of course, all of these dates are really done without checking all the Commissioners' schedules and whatnot. There will be some tinkering here. The idea is to give some idea of the flow.

Jose and I spent some time working with NDC, working with their experience in open member meetings in how best, how long it takes to go about making some fairly detailed decisions. That information we gathered is reflected in this particular memorandum.

The next step after developing the AURs is the process for grid modification.

NDC would first make recommendations
sometime really during the week of July 23rd, hopefully.

And once those recommendations are received, counsel
will prepare to advise the Commission and would do so in
what appears to be, probably, a couple of days of
meetings for that specific purpose to go through and
give specific legal advice with respect to
recommendations for modification.

Then what we are proposing is to provide
for a couple of days prior to the meeting, the public
meeting to adopt grid modifications, to allow for
individual Commissioners to work with NDC on their own
to test or explore alternatives that you are interested
in.

Maptitude is something that takes some
experience to be able to go ahead and operate. And it
is an opportunity that we wanted to provide. Different
Commissioners have different skill levels in this area,
of course. And we wanted to provide each of you the
individual resources you have to fully test different
resources you have to explore that.

Following that, some additional legal
advice is likely to be needed with respect to grid
modification, theories Commissioners are likely to need,
then two additional days to give to NDC on grid
modifications.
From that NDC moves forward to the phase of actually adopting the actual grid maps.

The reason this process is a multi-day event is in recognition of the fact each of the Commissioners has expressed at one time or another a desire to make sure that you have adequate time to consider and that you are not having a lot of stuff thrown at you that you are expected to just vote on, you know, on the spot. So this gives a substantial period of time to work through those issues together.

The adoption of draft maps, after NDC receives instructions on the grid modifications, they will return those within 72 hours and will document in a report the implications under each of the criteria, the Constitution and Voting Rights Act.

So they will then provide modified grids and reports to the Commission we're expecting somewhere around August 10th.

That will be followed by a public meeting of the Commission to review modified grids by NDC and the report. And a couple days, once you actually see what that report looks like, how the draft map will look, based on the instructions you've given to NDC, you may want another period to go to and test some of your own individual ideas at that point prior to a public
meeting.

So we've allowed a couple days for that and then a couple days of public meetings to instruct on final modifications to the grids. And you give that instruction.

Then those maps come back within 72 hours and you have another public meeting period to actually adopt the draft maps.

Then we move into the public comment period which, according to Prop 106, is at least 30 days long. The -- during that period, and possibly even extending slightly beyond it, the Commission would conduct a second round of statewide hearings.

It's important for us to give the members of the public an opportunity to actually study the state maps prior to beginning the hearings, so we've allowed a period of time for absorption, if you will, of those plans before going on the road again.

The public comment period under this scenario would end on or about September 19th, assuming that the plan came out, final plans were adopted around the 20th of August. And we're looking at perhaps having the public hearing process going on a couple days beyond that.

We just had, I think, 23 public hearings,
24 if you count the interactive one, using Monday through Thursday. The conversations counsel has had with NDC basically have resulted in a recommendation from us that we try to consolidate the hearings a little bit for the second round in the sense that we had some areas that were not well-attended or we have some areas where there is not a great difference of opinion, that we try to consolidate a little bit, we continue to try to use two teams for those hearings. We have some, what NDC calls hot spots, areas of great contention, that we select those areas and have full Commission hearings instead of having two teams operating on those particular days.

After we conclude the public hearings, the second round of final plans would be adopted. And in order to do that, again, we have a report from NDC on possible modifications to the draft plan, additional legal advice on possible modifications, and public meeting to adopt possible final Congressional and Legislative Districts.

Until we see the level of modification necessary, it's hard to predict a schedule in that regard.

Our feeling is if we spend an appropriate amount of time working on the draft maps and put our
efforts there, the hope is that we will have not so many
final modifications to make thereafter. We won't have
as burdensome a process to go through at the end.

Department of Justice submission,
conservative estimate, Jose and I put in basically to
allow four weeks for that. I think we both agree we can
probably do it faster.

MR. RIVERA: Lisa agrees.

MS. HAUSER: Depending on ability to get
started on those things while other things are going on.

We will try to shortcut the time we need
at the end by working in advance whenever possible. But
that is essentially the kind of schedule that we are
looking at to try to realistically give you an idea what
to do from here on out.

We'd like to get dates discussed with you
today so basically you can block out the time you need
from your personal calendars to accomplish this.

Anything to add?

MR. RIVERA: The other reason is, you'll
find out when Adolfo makes his presentation, in terms of
getting the broadest outreach into the community
possible, community outreach, and also since we used a
lot of junior colleges, schools, some will be when
school is in session.
MS. HAUSER: Basically outreach folks should be able to get out there even before we adopt, next, to start beating the drum and let them know we're coming to help improve the attendance and participation in those areas.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I assume rather than trying to coordinate a number of calendars in an open meeting what we should do is discuss blocks of time. Individual days may vary slightly.

For example, if we look at the block of time for public comment beginning after the maps are drawn and made public, and I'm thinking more of Adolfo's schedule -- which we'll get to in a minute, Adolfo.

The notion, if we're all agreed on the September 4th to September 19th time frame, that we'll hold that inviolate to begin planning outreach meetings at this point, that's the kind of thing we're discussing at this point.

MR. RIVERA: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: No.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Saw you move, thought you might want to say something.

MR. ECHEVESTE: I have a comment.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I --
first, again, my thanks to Ms. Hauser and Mr. Rivera and NDC.

I wonder if the two weeks we have there, the first section, second section, to condense these, if we were to eliminate the weekend interruption, in other words, take the first -- the top of page two there, condense July 30th to August 3rd and try to accomplish that all in that one week, I guess my feeling is, personally speaking, I'd prefer to work late into the evening rather than incorporate a whole other weekend and spend Monday Tuesday, drag over that time.

The same would apply, my recommendation would be for the following week, also, have it condensed to 8-13 to 8-17, not incorporating the weekend. If we have to meet longer, that's certainly my preference.

If, for example, on the days where individual Commissioners will have an opportunity to meet with NDC, if, to accommodate that idea, I'd be more than willing to meet later in the evening than have to go down up and come back down and back up. Simply from a work standpoint, I'd rather take one week rather than incorporate two weeks.

MS. HAUSER: Can you identify the second week?

COMMISSIONER HALL: 8-13 to 8-17, Monday
through Friday is it not?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm lost. We have a meeting, two days to meet separately, two days of meetings, two days of more meetings.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Again, I think as Lisa indicated, they erred on the generous side. We don't need all that time for that. Two days scheduled for NDC to meet with individual Commissioners. If you'll notice, take the first week there, we're meeting part of August 1. The other part could be utilized for maybe a meeting. I'd rather make the meetings of longer duration each of those days rather than extended eight days, nothing through the weekend. I think we can accomplish it in one week. I'd rather go -- rather do 12-hour days than nine days.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: First week I'm out of town Monday the 30th. I'll spend all day long four days if it's needed to and get it all done.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think -- I don't know the 30th is necessarily in play if we make some adjustments you are talking about that may be in play.

Mr. Huntwork?

MR. RIVERA: It's out already.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to accommodate, if possible, it's more difficult
for me to spend a block of four days than to break it up. I have work I have to do. I get up at 4:00 in the morning to do some of it. To work 12 hours a day four days in a row, that's very difficult for me to accommodate.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, let me ask a question.

Individual days, it's my understanding, it may possibly even be at our locations rather than all being all here in Phoenix?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: In terms of consultation with NDC, they're willing come to us where we are, for the individual meetings, at any rate.

The blocks of time they're indicating, ones we're concentrating on, day long, day long multiple day meetings of the Commission, are there specific objections to those? Note those for scheduling purposes, note objections to those. The week of activity, it's not all activity all together at the same location in a meeting. Some will, some is not.

MR. RIVERA: If I can answer some of Commissioner Hall's Friday-Monday concern, really the Friday-Monday concerns, the reason we blocked that is so NDC has time to go back, go back, put the modifications in, directions into effect, give them the weekend. The
Commission would go back on, come back Monday, come back, rather than try to do it in an overnight situation.

If you look at approval of draft maps, you want to have time, a day or two after you make the final modifications after the maps come back to look at those, then they come back, then adopt final maps, rather than overnight, thus giving you an opportunity to reflect on these and think about what you are going to be doing at that point in time rather than rush to judgment on those. That's the reason you see Friday-Monday meetings on the schedule.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: For me, personally, if we met over weekends, had consultants do the work over the week.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Anything wrong with a public meeting over Saturday?

MR. RIVERA: No.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'd like that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: May want a Friday-Saturday two-day meeting, compromise, open individual businesses, what we need to do during the week.

I think all members of the Commission are willing to give up as much time as is necessary.
Clearly we're respectful of the fact we all have gainful employment outside the Commission, thank goodness, and we want to make sure we don't need to disrupt that any more than necessary.

MS. MINKOFF: The only Saturday I'm not available is August 4th, right in the middle of this. That's right in the middle of this.

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Lynn, members of the Commission, we are flexible and happy to work the weekends with you, whatever you decide. We will make ourselves as flexible as possible to meet your needs.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

Is there any other comment on the flow of the work other than individual dates that need to be nailed down, flow, amount of time available, review, individual time with consultants, and individual comment?

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Final date, submission to DOJ, we were led to believe originally DOJ was supposed to give preclearance and any time DOJ asks for additional information the 60 days starts all over again.

MR. RIVERA: No.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If that's correct,
my concern is if at some time in December they decide
they want additional information, we may not get
preclearance until the middle of February, which is
really going to disadvantage people that want to be
candidates in the 2002 election.

MS. HAUSER: One of the things, we hope to
get the submission in earlier than that. We indicated
here the outside possibility.

When Department of Justice asks for
additional time, the clock can stop once and start over
again; thereafter, you just sort of toll the clock if
they ask for any other thing and then it just continues
to run as soon as you provide it. It doesn't
necessarily start a new 60-day period. That's a recent
change DOJ has undergone.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Explain that again.

It does stop or doesn't?

MS. HAUSER: My understanding, one time,
if they ask for additional information, it stops the
clock and starts over again as soon as you provide it.
With additional requests for information, for example,
day 30 of the second 60-day period they ask for
information and it takes three days. The clock stops
clicking for three days and picks up and starts up.

One of the things Jose and I talked about
doing to assist a speedy process with DOJ is after they
have the submission for maybe 10 days to two weeks is to
go there and meet with them to focus in on any
questions, concerns, problems they might have in an
effort to insure that we don't get questions posed on
day 59 of the first period. We're hoping that that
strategy would be a successful one for us. They seem to
be quite willing to submit jurisdictions. I think that
could be helpful.

MR. RIVERA: We're hopeful to submit
strategies.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think a balance can be
struck.

What we're talking about here, we
understand the necessity to have the process completed
so those wishing to seek office have a process and no
how to proceed.

What we need to do in doing our work is
have enough time for public input and review so as to
strengthen the case with whatever the submission looks
like at the end of the process. That's the balancing
act with what we're attempting to achieve. Both points
are valid. Do the best we can on the back end relative
to what we do on the front end.

Other comments?
Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I'm concerned about the amount of time for when we give direction to NDC as far as a final map and they come back to us with a final map, we review, and that follows up with a -- the beginning of the 30-day public hearing process. I personally was surprised with what the ramifications of some of the rules were when we did the grid.

When we give things back to NDC and they do it, we're expected to come back and say yes, that looks like what we have. I'd like to have time in there, submit two days. At that point, when looking at the map, review it, analyze it, take a look at it.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: What?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: He's referring to around the August 16, 17 time frame, that range.

One observation, I want to comment to Lisa and the consultant. The grid was a mechanical process. If you follow the rules, you get the grid. The grid was what it was. We'll be closer, my observation, closer to knowing what implications are, having sat with consultants prior to giving instructions. So the degree of surprise, if I use that term, as to what modifications ultimately look like, will be lessened by
virtue of that interaction.

I think we need enough time so we feel comfortable once you come back with something, we're not rushed to judgment on final adoption of a map, either map we're taking to the public. I take that point.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, what I'd ask, or look at, is I have no idea what Joshua's individual input will be to NDC nor does Joshua or Andi know what mine will be. Giving five sets of direction and coming up with a map, that concerns me. I'd like an amalgamation of those so we can take look at that prepared at the meeting. A two-day window, that doesn't give any time.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand.

Lisa.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons this is a fairly time-consuming process from August 6 through the 21st is because we tried to build in time to do just what Commissioner Elder is talking about in the sense if you look at the proposed schedule, after the modification instructions are given, NDC reports back, then there are meetings to review that, to review that report and give input.

Then you go off and have the opportunity for additional, like a second set of individual
And then we come back and the August 16th and 17th set of meetings is to get some legal advice on modifications, additional modifications that are in process or have been discussed. And that, of course, would include any individual requests Commissioners have been looking at.

So there is an opportunity to absorb each others thoughts and ideas prior to getting to the two days of public meetings.

That's what we were trying to do is build in time for reflection. That was the intent, to build in time to give you time for reflection of what everybody was up to.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Since we're not starting public hearings until September 4th, which is two weeks after the proposed adoption of the grids, would it be possible to move those meetings, the 20th and 21st, later in the week, to later for the reflection Dan wants?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It goes to the point the later for the public, for them to study them after we have and time for public comment.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If we had meetings Wednesday, Thursday that week.
MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Minkoff, that's the Commissioners' pleasure. We're running up into Labor Day, also.

The reason we didn't start until the 4th is because of the Labor Day holiday. How much time with that being the holiday weekend we have, various groups want to get together, and whatnot, it impacts their ability to do that.

This is merely our suggestion with respect to the amount of time. It's certainly the Commission's prerogative to shorten or lengthen that time as you see fit.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: My question is for NDC.

I assume that to respond to individual Commissioner's questions or ideas, how many, from their point in this room, do that -- I'm brainstorming here and thinking out loud. I assume in one day four people could meet with four Commissioners, right? We all have our own little computer. I don't --

DR. ADAMS: Actually, Commissioner Hall, members of the Commission, we'd have two, three persons qualified to do that with you. I think, again, you have the problem of coming together and coordinating all
information that came from individual people. I would
rather be there with someone like Chris.

I want to hear what is going on with each
of you. And I think it's important that Dr. Heslop and
I be there to hear what is going on with each of you
rather than having it filtered. That's the way we
typically operate.

Matters of testing things, though, very
quickly, say we move -- see what would happen if I moved
a Census tract to this district rather than this
district, we can do this quickly, do it over the
telephone, those kind of things.

So meetings themselves, sort of an intense
session with you, get most of your concerns out of the
way, and after that, we would be able to take your calls
if other issues come up, test them very quickly, and
give you a response very quickly.

COMMISSIONER HALL: The point is if you
guys had two teams to convince us, whatever, three
teams, with respect to communication, whatever, a
Commissioner has as an idea, it can be burned to a CD
and copied to everyone, like that.

DR. ADAMS: We can do that, if that's your
pleasure.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Why?
DR. ADAMS: These are all tests. Some tests you may check.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I understand they're individual tests. Same point, an idea there.

DR. ADAMS: I'll let the attorneys respond.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chair, Commissioner Hall, pressing the problem, having pressing problems if you put that on disk and distributed them, you run the risk of creating an open meeting law violation. Individual testing, it's continual frustration, having to -- it does take more time, clearly, to conduct any process this Commission will do in the sunshine. That is the tradeoff, one of the trade-offs that is made. And in order to do that, when your individual ideas are -- have Josh Hall's name on it and are sent around to everybody else, it does run the risk of creating a situation of violating the open meeting law. I discourage that from occurring.

MR. RIVERA: Every time you're stamping things with Commissioner Hall's name, it's one more block with a name, one more thing to present to Justice, and one more thing for litigation.

COMMISSIONER HALL: It seems to me we're subject to that regardless.
MR. RIVERA: Depends on the level. It depends -- as Dr. Adams pointed out, certain things are not stamped and punched.

COMMISSIONER HALL: We meet, make recommendations to NDC, amalgamate all five recommendations in addition to all they receive and will receive, and come up with a draft map.

MR. RIVERA: General process.

DR. HESLOP: May I make a comment?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Please.

DR. HESLOP: Changes, unless small, changes, unless very small, will create changes throughout the map. That's one thing to bear in mind.

Individual Commissioner's ideas, although they may relate to a particular area or region, will have consequences throughout the map. That's one thing to say.

And if I might respond to Commissioner Elder, I think by the time you get to this stage, the only surprises are going to be very little ones, not very important ones. Because at this stage you will know the problems. Problems will be very tough. They will be intransigent, and you will be longing for a surprise. There won't be a solution. I don't think that will be it.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork and then Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Back to the schedule for a second.

MR. RIVERA: It may be a good idea for the audience to talk, they're in the dark about the schedule, for somebody to read out the schedule.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Lisa outlined the schedule.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Lisa did a good idea of outlining the schedule. We don't expect public comment on this. We'll make it public as soon as decisions are made.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, the document that you have been provided contains some, you know, additional information and comments of counsel that were not appropriate to share publicly, so that's why I kind of walked through the schedule. As soon as we have general direction from the Commission, we can get a time line posted on the website and posted for distribution through the Commission offices as soon as possible.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I wanted to look at the caution. Mr. Echeveste proposed interactive TV.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Hold that thought. We'll
get to that proposal.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: It's relative to what we're talking about. Two weeks for hearings.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's do that.

Mr. Echeveste, we'll now take that into consideration, discussing that.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Given the outline I submitted, I'll discard that and leave you to read the first section, which is a synopsis and perspective on the hearings, preaching to the choir. It was an aggressive schedule. More importantly, there was tremendous feedback around the state. It was publicly stated and personally stated from you and to us that the community was very pleased with the extensive and aggressive scheduling we did provide. I think enough said there.

Regarding the second round, there is a piece of information I would like to zero in on as relates to the schedule as proposed by Jose and Lisa. I would like to consider it or think it's a minor one. That is -- the only reason I propose this is it has to do with the University and community student cycle. My only comment on that particular flow, or schedule, is that I would ask that you consider instead of showing the start of the public hearings on September 4th to
move it up a week to Monday, August 27th. And the only
time for that is according to my staff, in the
preparation for the first round, I'm being told that the
community colleges and university summer sessions end at
the third week of August. So there is a gap there where
we might, and I underscore "may be" able to utilize the
network unimpaired Monday, August 27th, and through the
first, end of the first week of September. So there may
be a two-week period there where there won't be classes.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: There will be
classes. Yeah, they begin in August.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Augusta.

MS. KNIGHT: I thought summer session
ended the 24th.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm almost positive
it's earlier than that. Fall semester begins earlier
than that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We can start out.

Regardless of that start date, you'll have a problem.
You have lead time to find locations, whether in or not
out of community colleges, work for us, lead time
becomes most important, it seems to me.

MR. ECHEVESTE: That's correct.

Second important part, consolidation.

While maintaining extensive linkages into the community,
with utilization, it's possible to have utilization of
the NAU interactive network in conjunction with the
community college network. The only information I was
given this morning, that's why I'm making comment, if
extended forward -- Commissioner Minkoff is saying no,
that is not the case, so end of that issue.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, maybe
at the combined request for all three consultants, one,
it appears we'll have a final map on the 21st, 22nd,
somewhere in that range from NDC. It jumps to Tim. I
heard in several instances when you come back, could we
have the maps three, four days in advance so when we
come to the meeting we're prepared to talk about
specifics.

A, after we get the map, break into areas,
can Tim produce those and get them to locations, as an
example, the city manager, clerk said "We'll post them
in the City Hall at Globe, post them in the library,
eight-and-a-half by elevens, post them in Walmart. I
don't know, if we shorten the time, can we produce maps,
get them to locations earlier than what the schedule
shows with Ms. Hauser?

Try to respond to that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Go back to Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: What I was driving
at, the question I wanted to ask was whether we reduce
the time at the back end, the public hearings, using
interactive television. Is it a better idea, reach more
people better with that than with the extensive travel
we did around the state? Let me just pose that
question.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think, having sat
through the one interactive television experience,
clearly the technology is much improved, but there are
still limitations. One of the concerns I have about
utilizing it, it doesn't mean we can't utilize it, the
quality of the video is less than desirable,
particularly when somebody is addressing a nuance on a
map at a remote location. My concern will be, even
though outreach people are present, outreach
coordinators are present at remote locations, regardless
of where you are viewing the interaction, that some of
that nuance may be lost and that nuance becomes critical
when drawing very fine lines on a map. There are some
advantages to cutting down the time frame, some
limitations. I'm concerned about those.

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Response, I think
we're better off doing that than not appearing at all.
Better off appearing that way than not at all. I think
we're better off doing that than doing 24 meetings.

When we did the interactive in Flagstaff, Kayenta and Ganado.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Yes.

MR. RIVERA: Kings Canyon and Chinlee.

COMMISSIONER HALL: We had comment from a participant from Ganado, someone whose comments wanted to be very detail oriented. "We think we understand what you are saying. Please also memorialize your comments to assure accuracy."

I agree with your assessment. It's better off with what you are saying. Make some attempt.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Maybe with protocol attempts so the citizen commenting does indeed state not only what concerns are, also say to him or her we're available to answer questions, have the consultant, so there's no misunderstanding what somebody is commenting on and comments are understood.

DR. HESLOP: I'd like to make a suggestion, Mr. Chairman. We've found correspondence with people who have attended the first meeting, letting them know, the sort of map Commissioner Elder was suggesting would cover interest at the first stage of interest and an invitation to respond to us when they get the letter and map and indicate comments on it.
It's not a very difficult problem. I think we have a fairly effective data base on those that attended the first meeting.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: At the end of the first round of public hearings, I think I was as exhausted as I've been in a very, very long time. And spending another three weeks doing that is not my idea of a summer vacation. However, looking at it from the point of view of people who attended those public hearings and who wanted to speak to us rather than to a television camera, I really think that except in those areas where the attendance was very poor and there perhaps was not enough input to justify going back, I think that we have to go back. And I think we have to go back in person. Because what these people have to say is very, very important to us. And they need to know that we believe that it's very important. And I'm not sure that psychologically you can convey that if they are in a room just with a staff person and no commissioners and talking to a TV screen, if they don't see the people talking to them.

If the limited way we use interactive TV in small areas makes some sense, for the most part, I think we physically have to go back to the places we
CHAIRMAN LYNN: There are two proposals: One, Mr. Echeveste's report, one is use interactive television; another is consolidation of live input opportunities.

I think, Adolfo, if you would, go over those. That's part of the equation as well.

MR. ECHEVESTE: If I may, then, just review quickly what I have underlined for a second round of public hearings.

I wanted to point out I felt it was extremely important to kick off the hearing process with extensive mass media coverage at the conclusion of your meeting where you decide what the map is going to be, I think it is newsworthy, that we get extensive media coverage. And I outlined various possibilities there: videotaping the presentation, to send that out to all the communities that have the public television, to make that ongoing. But the key point is to have extensive coverage up front.

What I pointed out in my memo is, one, what Commissioner Minkoff mentioned is option one, the repeat of what we did. And I have to point out that during the process, there were a number of comments made that we'll be back. So it's a judgment call given the
extensive and exhaustive process that we all went through.

The second option which you've asked me to comment on was a possible -- I just put it out conceptually to finetune it later with input from the Commission in terms of some possible consolidation in some areas of the actual hearings and then tying in interactive television.

Now the issue is back to scheduling. If we do the interactive TV tied to a host, central public hearing, with all the Commissioners or most of them present, the issue of when we can schedule them crops up. I thought, given staff input, we had a window of two weeks there. If Commissioner Minkoff is correct, we do not have that. The only way we can do interactive mass outreach is on a Saturday, Saturday morning, Saturday afternoon. You need to be aware of that. That’s the only time the interactive TV network would be available except, unless we went from 2:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., we were told this last round, anyway, was a dead time for them. We could do it then. The issue then, of course, is you don’t reach the working person.

Those are the kind of considerations we need to look at when talk about clustering.

One of the thoughts was cluster
regionally. For example, up north, northeastern up
north, move to Show Low, consolidate Show Low, possibly
Holbrook, interactive Holbrook, Window Rock, White
River.

COMMISSIONER HALL: St. Johns.

MR. ECHEVESTE: And a public hearing with the Commission in St. Johns.

In some areas, a public hearing, southern hearings, Sierra Vista Community College, pull in Bisbee, Douglas, doesn't reduce, augments.

Yuma, reduce probably to Arizona Western, pick up San Luis and Summerton, possibly, maybe La Paz, I'm not sure.

Those are the kind of things I wanted to bring to you for your consideration.

If I get a sense of this body, move to stack issues out and move when to have them, I sense nobody wants to have them at 2:00 to 5:00 o'clock, means Saturday, have consolidation, less hearings, move some to Saturdays. Those are the kind of considerations.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder and then Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I tend to fall for the first one, have repetitive hearings.

Every venue, I said, "I'll be back." I intend to be
back, if I can. It was exhausting. I had the four
corners, Bullhead, all four corners. Only one I missed,
Holbrook, Window Rock.

You did trade me Yuma. I appreciate that.

I think we need to go back. If we expand,
pick up Benson, or outlying areas, that's wonderful. We
need to go back.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Even if Saturday, weekday
to Saturday?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I think evenings,
6:00 o'clock or 7:00. I don't know we'd get
participation on Saturdays. I don't think it benefits
us.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall, Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, with all
due respect to my fellow Commissioners to my right, I
disagree. Option two is not only more feasible, it's
practicable. I think we have to do what we have to to
reduce. The areas I visited, there's no problem with
consolidation. There can also be a reduction in
Maricopa and Pima counties. It encourages a drive time,
get a larger location, which I prefer physically, but
it's not a problem. In light of that, I recommend we
pursue the second option with minor adjustments.

I don't think there's going to be anyone
who is going to be offended we may be in a general
location in order to accommodate an aggressive schedule.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork and then
Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I agree with Josh.
I'm going to point out a couple of things.
With the schedule we had before, the hearing process
took three weeks. With time being short, if there's a
way we can cover as much ground, more ground, and
consolidate it into two weeks, we certainly ought to
consider that possibility.
Secondly, it wasn't just we who were
exhausted from the first approach. Staff was exhausted.
Consultants were exhausted, tied up every day. There
were the logistics of getting from one place to another,
no time for us to pause and reflect on what we were
hearing, certainly not for me. It was kind of a
whirlwind. Maybe on the weekends, maybe then there was
a chance to catch up. But I think also on one side it
affects staff in not being able to be as proactive as we
wanted them to be and they very much wanted to be
working with communities that appeared at the hearings.

Part of the process is proactive work to
explain to people what we've done and why, interactive
communication before we show up at the hearing, make a
comment, or ask a question that might have been answered if we had the time.

I'm thinking a little less travel and more reflection and communication and consideration could be a better way to do the same thing.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I also think we need to be clear, regardless of which schedule is adopted, there's public input and the continual option of the website in terms of public comment.

Ms. Minkoff?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: A couple comments. You may be breaking a tie. I'm siding with my fellow Commissioner on the right.

If we're going to consolidate interactive TV, we cannot have evening TV. That's clear. We do not have television facilities in the evening. We only have Saturday sessions available to us during the public comment period. We could have it on Saturday, only if there is a Commissioner at each, five sessions feeding in, one of us at each of those, the public having one of us eyeball to eyeball, then consolidate some meetings on those Saturdays we had, not consolidate all of those. We cannot have 2:00 to 5:00 weekdays, only on Saturdays, which only gives us two Saturdays.

The other thing is in terms of condensing
three weeks to two weeks, while that might have worked
for our initial meetings, it doesn't make a difference
for the second round of meetings. It's a mandated
30-day comment period anyway. So whether we conduct the
meetings in two weeks or three weeks, we're not going to
speed up the process. It has to be a minimum of 30 days
for public comments before we move to the next step of
adopting final plans anyway.

So a mixture of interactive versus what we
did the first time, possibly do that, eliminate a few
meetings, that's the most effective.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, two
weeks for people to review plans, then the public
hearing process. Two weeks' review, three weeks for
public comments, that's five weeks, a lengthened period.
That math is wrong. Secondly, there are three weekends
in that period. In other words, if we start on
Saturday, there's another Saturday, a third Saturday,
essentially, plus two days rather than three full weeks.
We have a shortened period, three Saturdays. Finally,
and most importantly, it's not really true we can only
do this on Saturdays. The hearing Joshua and I attended
on a week night had an interactive TV network for remote
locations. I know those possibilities exist. We might
be able to do much better. This is the worst case.
MR. ECHEVESTE: Generally this is the comment coming out from a scheduler. We might get lucky. We can go and check, see if a localized regionalized TV network might be open on Tuesday or Thursday or Friday. I don't know.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's do this. First, we need a break fairly quickly. Let's -- perhaps what we might want to do, let's take a break, come back, give some specific direction, explore what, by next Monday, which appears is the next meeting date -- a week from Monday, the next meeting date, what you have been able to get into place. And if you need attention from the Arizona Heart Hospital, you -- I know that scared the heck out of you. A week from Monday.

What you are hearing, you are hearing a difference of opinion. Clearly some members of Commission wish to replicate the first session.

I think what is -- from my standpoint, what is more important than replicating or not replicating, we now have more than a month advance work that could be done we didn't have available to us that could be done, regardless of what schedule we ultimately come up with, an ability to tell the public about it, increase awareness, before we start the next round of hearings.
Let's do this. Without objection, take a break, come back in 10 minutes, give final direction to Adolfo, ask any more questions you have, and see if we can't get him to come back a week from Monday with a revised schedule.

Mr. Rivera.

MR. RIVERA: One comment on Mr. Huntwork's five weeks. The proposed time line, adoption of the maps is August 20th or 21st. 30 days starts running from that point. The hearing schedule, minimum, is off by a date. It should be the 20th. The minimum 30-day period is the 20th. Public hearing is scheduled from the 20th.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Option one, three weeks of hearings, Mr. Echeveste's proposal.

MR. RIVERA: We can't end before the 20th.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I understand.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: 30 days' public comment from the date of adopting those drafts to the time we'll again consider modifications.

Take a 10-minute break. Let's return promptly at 10:10 and move forward.

(Recess taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder, before we broke, I sense you were trying to get the floor to make
another comment. Let's start there.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: My comment was I feel we can probably condense the Maricopa County and Pima down from the three and seven or three and six fairly easily. But I would object, still, to trying to condense and eliminate venues that we hit in the rural parts of the state. Distances of travel, getting to other parts of locations, makes it difficult to participate.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: In terms of direction to Mr. Echeveste, so he can get to us with a more complete outline --

Apparently they are getting a lot of rain outside. There's been a brief interruption in power as well.

Comments on the overall schedule,

COMMISSIONER HALL: In response to Mr. Elder's comment, the rural areas, Show Low, I think, is very central. NPC does have feeds, St. Johns, Eager, Winslow, Holbrook, White River. And I think that is certainly an option.

I guess it's appropriate, Mr. Chairman, in the form of a motion, I think, to move we pursue this -- a consolidation schedule and that you present this to this Commission. There may need to be adjustments. I
move we do that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

Ms. Minkoff?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I would like to suggest something that may handle both considerations we've been talking about. We need to go back to places we were before and we need to condense some of the meetings somewhat.

Apparently the interactive TV is not as available on the week nights. We can't have meetings on weekday afternoons because it will eliminate people that want to come talk to us. We do have three Saturdays to work with. I suggest you take those three Saturdays, combine certain areas. Let's try to get a Commissioner at each one of those areas, even though we're combining meetings and we're having in a sense five meetings at once on a Saturday morning. That way people do have a Commissioner to talk to rather than a TV monitor. And then the other meetings we would have to schedule as we scheduled the earlier meetings on week nights during the week but they wouldn't be quite as burdensome, Monday through Thursday, for three solid weeks. Something like that I think would work.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: There's a motion on the floor.

Further discussion?

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I made some comments before suggesting that this approach might be better for the people who wish to participate in these meetings. I also want to add another thought to that as well. Particularly in the rural areas of the state, people have to drive potentially a hundred miles or more to attend a meeting on a week night. It's very inconvenient for people. And I think I observed, I'm not certain this was a trend, I think I observed people at those meetings tend to, by and large, be very close to where the meeting was being held. Certainly it would have taken heroic effort to get to something. To the extent we can get a way to provide more locations by way of use of multimedia, we're really doing a service for people. And to the extent we can have these on Saturdays, I think we're also affording people an additional opportunity to participate.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments.

Mr. Elder?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I agree with going ahead and extending other activities or other
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potential to participate would be good. I also contend that if, as an example, Sierra Vista, maybe we only got people close to Sierra Vista. Now it's three or four hundred miles to get to anyplace. We can't take away that access.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the motion?

Before we vote on the motion, let me make this comment. I think there may be some room for a middle ground. I do think that based on our experience, some communities, and again the experience is you have got to take it for what it's worth, this was raw input as opposed to having published maps and people reacting to those maps. I'm not sure you can gauge one set of input given this will be a different set of information. But having said that, I think where I come down on this issue is I do think there are some opportunities to consolidate the schedule, to some degree. Perhaps the number of meetings in Phoenix, perhaps the number of meetings in Tucson. I also think that there are some natural consolidations in some of the rural areas of the state. And I think with notice, the inconvenience may be minimal, or minimalized; because in some cases, presenters actually made more than one appearance, they actually came to more than one appearance, made the very
same presentation or similar presentation. With enough notice, they can be at the meeting.

I'm prepared to vote in favor of the motion insofar as it's general, option two is generally to be pursued with the idea some degree of consolidation is appropriate.

I think both Ms. Minkoff's comments and Mr. Huntwork's comments about utilization of interactive television on Saturdays, if necessary, where appropriate, are fine within the context of the time that we'll be on the road.

So having said that, any further discussion?

If not, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying aye.

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Those opposed, no.

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes aye. Motion carries.

Again, come back a week from Monday with your best scheduling with respect to outreach, also other options, not just one, either/or, so maybe you can give us some other option to discuss.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Having worked for 15 years...
with a five-member Board of Supervisors, I have experience with having an opportunity to glean the sense of the Board, and having received that, will come up with options to satisfy the Board.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Echeveste.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Echeveste, you don't have a sense, you have a motion.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Was that a motion or just a notion?

COMMISSIONER HALL: A motion.

Since we decided rather randomly to work backwards, since in reverse, no point in shifting. Working backwards then from the public hearings, Mr. Chairman, then, I again would like to reiterate my comments that I think it's possible to try to consolidate sections as identified on the time line, basically two-week seven, eight days, incorporating Mr. Huntwork's comment, utilizing weekends, as much as possible.

If doing that, back up the starting date for public hearings as much as possible to the week of August 27th to essentially allow the public one week between August 20th and 27th to review the draft maps and then give a little more flexibility with respect to public hearings, start in the last week of August and
moving through the end of September. 

So I just want to reiterate I feel like there's the capability and opportunity to maybe condense those two and maybe not make it overlapping a weekend on the first two sessions.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think that sense of utilizing perhaps Saturdays as an opportunity to meet but not bridging a weekend between meetings, that does make it difficult when from out of town, not that Phoenix isn't a lovely place to spend the weekend. Direction should be given to modify that as well.

Other comments as far as other parts of the schedule?

Mr. Elder?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Sure, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to propose, it doesn't make any difference which ones, I'd like to at least discuss the potential of having one of these or several of these meetings in the Tucson area, get out of Phoenix. It might be cooler, have more amenities in Tucson.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We had said from the beginning the Commission would meet in various places around the state. I certainly am not going to have too many objections to that suggestion. We might want to at least think about that.
COMMISSIONER HALL: Pinetop is nice this time of year.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Let's at least look at that as an option as we go forward with this.

I would like to continue -- I would prefer a Friday Saturday, if we're going to have a dual meeting, than doing a Friday and Monday, prefer Thursday Friday than a Monday, possibly eliminate some Mondays.

I know we did outreach Monday through Thursdays. That gave us in town, at least the first part of Mondays to take care of staff meetings, whatever we had from a business standpoint.

Mondays are a disaster. If we can skip Mondays, from my perspective, it's much preferred.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I concur. Mondays are tough, tough for me.

Other input at this time?

Let me ask legal staff and the consultants, have you heard enough input to modify from the way we're discussing?

MS. HAUSER: We need clarification with respect to the Monday comment. You are referring to meetings during the day during Mondays, not outreach meetings?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder's comment or
asking about mine?

MS. HAUSER: Both of yours.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder, outreach meetings in that last comment.

MS. HAUSER: Oh.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Me, generally, Mondays are not generally good days. I have other standing meetings scheduled.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: That's mine, also.

During the day, I have an ACC meeting. I cannot attend a meeting here. That's the way it is.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Reiterating my comment, two weeks here, Monday through Friday or Saturday, instead of bridging a weekend.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments or input to consultants or legal staff?

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, the Commission has been gratified by the public response, citizen comments. The second part, you'll be startled by the volume and intensity. You might keep that in mind.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you for that ominous point of view.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: The first round, no goring by oxes. Second round, pointed horns on the oxes. I imagine longer hearings, more specific comments

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
(602) 230-8440
by a broader range of people.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's move to the Executive Director.

Part we've had, Mr. Echeveste's report.

I'd ask if there are any comments anyone would like to make about the first round of outreach hearings.

I'd like to make a comment, to thank the staff very profoundly for the first round of hearings. As all of you know, with such a short period of time from the time we had staff on board to the beginning of hearings, everyone in the office is to be commended, which I'll express later today at a meeting with the staff. And I think by and large the meetings were well-organized and materials were available. Obviously there were some glitches here and there. That's to be expected. On a whole, staff did a fantastic job. They should be commended. I'm sure the second round will run as smoothly if not more so.

Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I echo that.

I'd also like to say that I think that the press was very cooperative in helping us to make known times and places of these meetings and to attract public interest and reporting on the results of the meetings.
And the public responded very well, as well. I was impressed by, in many cases, by not just how many cases we received but how thoughtful they were, and in some cases how creative they were. I think we received all kinds of input that couldn't have been generated any other way.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Huntwork.

Ms. Hauser.

MS. HAUSER: We need some clarification with respect to the time line.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is it my understanding the Commission wants Jose and I to redraft the time line based on the discussion today, redraft the time line to bring back to the next meeting.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, that's where we're headed.

COMMISSIONER HALL: E-mail it to us in advance.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: My comment also.

COMMISSIONER HALL: The only comment I have, be sure all the meetings are at the same time.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: All meetings start at the same time so there's no confusion if it's at 6:00 or 7:00 o'clock on a start date.

MR. ECHEVESTE: For direction, given we
had some at 6:00, 6:30, 7:00 p.m. meetings, do you
prefer 6:00, 6:30, or 7:00?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's not so much which.
6:00 may be close for people coming from work. Again, I
don't know what your pleasure is. 6:30 or 7:00 would be
reasonable.

COMMISSIONER HALL: In light of
Dr. Heslop's comment --


COMMISSIONER HALL: Already some went way
late. It's possible 6:30 is as early as we can do it,
get out of the gate.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any other comment from the
first round of the meetings?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I just wanted to,
regarding the starting time, I'm concerned about giving
people an opportunity to get there, particularly some of
the rural areas. It would seem to me 7:00 would allow
people a greater opportunity to arrive.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We may have time to
actually check out that perception and see what works.

Mr. Echeveste, do outreach investigation
on allowing people to get there in deference to the fact
we'll have much more public comment and pick a time and
make it uniform.
COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: One more comment about the public hearings. I was extremely impressed with the amount and quality of public comment. My concern was there were many group presentations, in some cases large group presentations, in some cases Power Point, and other people had to sit through not only our Power Point, but two or three presentations. We either need a time cap, no more than 10 minutes, or should they want to speak more than 10 minutes, have them come at the end of the meeting, not the beginning of the meeting.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments?

The rest of the Executive Director's report.

Mr. Echeveste, Ms. Rezzonico indicated she has nothing in particular to report this meeting. We'll put that on the agenda for the next meeting. We'll put on the agenda for the next meeting plan for outreach. Without objection, we'll defer that for the next agenda.

I'll suspend the rules and move items around in deference to the public.

We're going to have an Executive Session to discuss legal and personnel matters prior to items VI and VII on the agenda. In order to facilitate that and give members of the public an opportunity to speak,
without objection, I'll take item IX followed immediately by Executive Session.

Is there an objection to the change in the agenda?

If not, let me state 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 rescheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date.

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

If not, may I have a motion to go into Executive Session for consideration of both legal and personnel matters?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: So moved.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Those in favor, signify by saying aye.

(Vote taken.)

(Motion carried.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We will be back in a brief public session when we're through to deal with the rest
of the agenda.

MS. HAUSER: Legal staff only.

(Whereupon, the Commission recessed the Open Public Session at 10:47 a.m. and convened in Executive Session until 12:12 p.m.)

(Recess taken.)

(Whereupon, the Commission reconvened Open Public Session at approximately 12:15 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let me call the regular meeting of the Commission to order.

Item VI, discussion or consideration,

possible consideration concerning possible resignation of the Executive Director.

Let me, for the record, read a letter dated July 2nd, 2001, to Commissioners, Independent Redistricting Commission:

"Honorable Commissioners, I'm writing you this letter to inform you have my intent to resign as Executive Director of the Independent Redistricting Commission for the State of Arizona effective Friday, July 6, 2001.

"During the last three months, it has been exciting developing a start-up operation from nothing. At times personnel issues were a challenge but the ADOA Personnel ADOA staff are to be commended for their
support to the Commission. In regard to the State Procurement Office, I understand we set a record in processing a million dollar plus RFT in less than one month from inception to award.

"Lastly, I developed the administrative structure for the Commission, including the hiring of an exception and dedicated 14 member staff in one month. Those employees have shown their dedication and commitment to the work of the Commission by working an average of approximately 60 hours per week in order to manage 24 very successful hearings throughout our great state in a three-week time period. I want to thank them all for their work above the call of duty.

"I wish you all great success in your endeavor to redistrict our state.

"Sincerely, Enrique Medina Ochoa."

The Chair would accept a motion to accept the Executive Director's resignation.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I move the Independent Redistricting Commission accept with regret the resignation of Enrique Medina Ochoa and further authorize an additional $500 per month compensation retroactive from date of his hire.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's been moved and seconded.

Discussion?

Let me first indicate for the record that the accomplishments of the office under Mr. Ochoa are many and that the office has run in some very difficult circumstances very well considering the start-up time we had to move things ahead and to get meetings accomplished. Clearly we expect our challenges will remain difficult and we expect the staff will continue to perform at a very high level.

Is there further discussion the motion?

Hearing none, all those in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.

(Vote taken.)

The Chair votes aye as well.

Motion carries unanimously.

Next item says possible consideration, selection and consideration of a new Executive Director.

The Chair may vote, the Chair may vote to table this matter.

COMMISSIONER HALL: So moved.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's been moved and seconded.
All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Those opposed, say no.

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Motion carried unanimously.

Item X. The Commission will stand adjourned until its regularly posted meeting.

MS. HAUSER: Which is July 16th.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Probably. July 16th is the one we're talking about. It may move one day or something. We'll see what we can do.

(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at approximately 12:28 p.m.)

* * * *
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