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PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN LYNCH: I'll call the Independent Redistricting Commission into session. I'd indicate all Commissioners are present as well counsel, all consultants, and lead staff.

The first agenda item, as always, in our meetings, is public comment.

This is the time for consideration and comments and complaints from the public. Those wishing to address the Commission shall request permission in advance by filling out a speaker slip, yellow speaker slip, in advance. If you've not done so, staff will get you one. 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 time.

First is Ron Drake, Mayor of Avondale, in the Southwest Valley.

Mayor Drake.

MAYOR DRAKE: x, I appreciate you having me...
this morning. I have a letter I'd like to distribute, if I may. On behalf of various jurisdictions and individuals, including Avondale, Buckeye, Goodyear, Litchfield Park, Tolleson, County Supervisor Mary Rose Willcox, Supervisor Janice Brewer, Congressman Bob Stump, and Bob Pastor, we'd like to request a Southwest Valley meeting be held consistent with the previous conversations on June 26.

I would request the Independent Redistricting Commission does add this to the list of meetings that has been currently released. The Southwest Valley was not on that list. But on the 26th it was stated by then Executive Director Enrique Ochoa, IRC Director, and Commissioner Andrea Minkoff, at the Avondale meeting, at which there more than a hundred persons that turned out, more than the average of between 50 to 80 at other meetings the Commission has held. It was a good turnout, I think, due to the ease of access to the location, I think the quality of the location, and the interest that the people in the Southwest Valley have about this issue.

We do have different issues than what the Northwest valley has versus the Southwest valley. And one of the biggest reasons is we have a very divergent population.
I understand that the Minority Coalition for Fair Redistricting is also making this request of you.

I would respectfully request that you reconsider the list of meetings that you are having and make an addition for the Southwest Valley at the Estrella Mountain Community College at some time in the near future so we can talk about the redistricting plan. I believe that's consistent with Prop 106, the US Voting Rights Act, and the Arizona and United States Constitution.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

The next speaker is Pete Moraga, partner with GSSC.

MR. MORAGA: My name is Peter Moraga representing Willow Historic District.

I come bearing gifts. I'll hand them out as soon as I'm done.

I'm a private citizen that moved into the Historic District about three years ago and have been watching the mounting creation.

As we look at the district, we thank you. You've done a good job in certain respects. There are small minor adjustments that can be made, and we've
done some work for you already. And you'll see it in
just a second.

The Historic Districts, like you know, are
like interest groups. Conversations have taken place
already. I won't create a dissertation recreating that.
I do think it makes more sense for those
districts to be together so they get represented and the
interests and concern of the district get represented
effectively with small adjustment, and I'll hand these
to the Commission now.

You'll see we sketched them out. They're
pretty easy to follow.

Also, for information, I'm submitting
this, which just outlines what the current Historic
Districts are. And this is the map that will show what
adjustments we recommend, sir.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Moraga.

The next speaker is Frank Seanez, an
attorney representing the Navajo Nation.

Mr. Seanez.

MR. SEANEZ: Good morning, Chairman Lynn,
Commissioners.

The Navajo Nation would like to defer
comment until following the comments on the Navajo
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Seanez.

The next speaker is Ed Casper representing himself.

Mr. Casper.

MR. CASPER: Good morning. Thank you.

I just wanted to echo the point the of gentleman that was asking you about to keep the Historic Districts together. That's really the only request I have of you. I won't take a lot of time. The only other thing, I'm an average Joe citizen. I'm very impressed by the whole thing. I think you are doing a wonderful job. I want to thank you.

I came down yesterday to see what the process was all about. I see all the compromises you have to make. You are doing a heck of a job. I want to thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Casper.

The next speaker, than during the speaker I have this session for public comment, if there are others, please raise your hand, we'll get them to me, we'll certainly take comments, the than during the speaker I have is Supervisor Mary Rose Willcox, Supervisor for Districte5, Maricopa County.
SUPERVISOR Willcox: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to read a statement from the Minority Coalition on Fair Redistricting. I'm joined by some of the members. There are a whole lot of others that couldn't be here.

After reviewing the preliminary drafts of Congressional and Legislative maps, the Minority Coalition for Fair Redistricting strongly commends the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission and the work of their consultants, National Demographics Corporation.

Section 2 of the Voter Rights Act of 1965 protects voters from any practice that deprives them of their right to vote based on race, color, or language minority. The Coalition is pleased that minority population growth and recommended communities of interest AURs have been taken into consideration.

While it was evident in discussions at your meeting yesterday that these maps will most likely be changed, we would like to thank you for listening to our presentations and following the guidelines of the Voting Rights Act. As a Coalition, we believe we can support the preliminary Congressional map drafted by the
NDCC, without any major changes. As the Voting Rights Act supersedes any state law, we ask that the Commission keep both majority-minority Congressional Districts intact; any vital changes should be made around them. Although modifications may be necessary, we have no qualms with suing should changes be made at the expense of the minority community.

On Legislative Districts, although we are still studying the preliminary Legislative map, at first glance, we believe it largely complies with the Voting Rights Act as it takes into account communities of interest AURs and the establishment of majority-minority districts. While the map is a good start, adjustment requests will be coming from communities in Pima County and other parts of Southern Arizona. Should these changes be made, we believe we can support the current Legislative map. Should all the districts become reconfigured, we have no reservations with taking this to court.

We recognize that competitiveness is an issue in Proposition 106. However, compliance with the Voting Rights Act and adhering to communities of interest preempts this state law; this is made clear in the wording of the proposition. Any effort to dilute the minority districtsoorianythingnelse should split our
communities and we are urging changes be made outside of areas covered by this federal mandate.

The challenge to the Commission and your consultants will now be to achieve competitiveness without damaging our communities. We believe the preliminary maps drawn by the consultants could easily be the basis for any lawsuit. As neither the Congressional nor Legislative maps are final, the Coalition is confident that each member of the Commission will continue to take our voice under advisement.

We're very pleased with the work thus far and hope to stay an active member.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Supervisor, I'd like to remind you, if you have a written copy of your remarks, we'd appreciate having them.

SUPERVISOR Willcox: There's one minor change. I'll submit it as soon as I make that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I know we're scheduled to have a presentation from the Gila River community. I don't know that they're present yet. Without objection, I'd like to move into our next session. We would take them when and if representatives of the Gila River Indian Community join us, and we'll accommodate them since it was a special arrangement for them to come to
this meeting. Without objection we'll do that. I'd also like to point out to the Commissioners you've been handed this morning a memorandum, the subject of which is our agenda tomorrow. I'd also like to state publicly, for the record, that we are considering noticing continuation of this meeting for Sunday. Again, that's a precautionary measure because we need to do a significant amount of work both today and tomorrow in order to complete our task this weekend. Should it be necessary to finish up on Sunday, we want to be sure we've properly noticed that date as a meeting date. Consider we may be here until Sunday. We need not be if we get everything done by tomorrow.

Lastly, for those that were not with us yesterday, I would like to state again that this process is not unlike a journey cross-country in a car with a number of people. And the phrase often is uttered in such a long journey "Are we there yet?" and "When are we going to be there?". And this process is not only lengthy but quite complex. Those with us yesterday understand the maps you see on the boards are certainly not final. They say "draft" and they mean "draft." And, in fact, there were certainly some long discussions yesterday about possible changes to those drafts.
our map development, those maps will be taken around the
state for public comment. But those maps will not be
finished or final as well. We will not be there yet.
As a result of input from that round of public hearings,
as well as further refinements and analysis by staff and
Commissioners, there will be additional adjustments to
those drafts before final adoption by the Commission
sometime in late September or early October.

Please understand the journey is complex,
goes through a number of iterations and changes as we go
forward, and to focus on any one feature, other than to
give us the benefit of your wisdom other than how that
feature could be improved or changed, would be
premature.

Maps will be final when all features are
in place, all testing is done, and we're confident those
maps are the best we can do and they're then approved
for submission for Department of Justice.

That trip continues. We're still on the
journey.

With that said, I'd like to offer any
member of the Commission to make a similar statement or
statement based on things they think you should know.

If not, let us move back into the
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consideration of Congressional mapping.
We will turn to NDC for an update on direction given them yesterday and to see the work product of, I take it, a fairly long evening. We thank them very much for their hard work.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: A comment.

We had a representative ask for an additional site during our travels around the state coming up. I wanted to make sure the public understand and is cognizant we're not going back as many times to the same place. Sometimes we're going to where we can spread the context into another area of the state. A example, I don't know that we're going to Globe or Florence. We heard the Globe meeting area would really like to have further input. It's difficult to get to that site. We'll try to make every effort to get back to areas we can and take requests under advisement.

I did want to make clear we're trying to go to other areas within the state to make sure we've gotten as much input and coverage of the state during the public outreach process.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Elder.

Dr. Heslop.
Commission, thank you. It was a long evening. I think that most of the members of the NDC team had two hours' sleep. Chris Hutchison did not. In fact, I don't think he's had two hours' sleep in the than during the 48 hours. But good work was done. And we are here to present it this morning.

I'm going to call on Chris later to do the presentation since he has done the bulk of the work.

Let's move on to the slide.

There's a list of instructions that we received.

These are the items that we worked on than during the evening. We think that we have done all of the things that we were instructed to do. We have a copy of the transcript and have done our best to interpret those instructions, but here's, at any rate, what we worked on. And here, ladies and gentlemen, is the major product of our work.

Here is the new plan.

The initials NDC are beginning to erode from this draft plan and the initials IRC are beginning to take form, or at least that is our hope.

Chris, why don't you speak to the plan and tell how it has developed and why.

MR. HUTCHISON: Obviously can't see
every area of the state. Also, afterward, we can zoom
in and use Maptitude to go in and show the Commissioners
any area you wish.

As you can see, we prepared the Northern
Arizona District according to the Northern Arizona
proposals showed than during the night. Step one, the
Northern Arizona District, Southeastern central borders
include all of Gila, Graham, and the Greenlee borders,
divide Maricopa and divide Fort McDowell, and Mohave and
east the Verde Valley, unites Verde Valley, Flagstaff,
and Prescott also in the northern district. Yavapai
moves west. Yavapai moves west. Yavapai west, Dewey,
Humboldt, and Bagdad. I'll move back so you can see
that graphically.

Along the east there you see the foot of
Yavapai. That's where the Verde River goes north and
then west, south of Dewey-Humboldt and Bagdad. In terms
of Mohave, it is north of Lake Havasu and north of the
Colorado River Indian Reservation. It does stay south
of Kingman, however, and does not go into Kingman at
all. There is no city split in Mohave there. It's
completely contained, unincorporated, the longest, that
line is.

Goals established that were met, it is a
completely rural Congressional District, as was the
issue driving its creation. It does not reach into
Maricopa County or Pima County. In fact, it even stays
out of suburban areas in Maricopa County. In southern
Yavapai it unites the tribal areas of Southern Yavapai,
Yavapai, San Carlos, the White Mountain Apache,
Hualapai, Havasupai.

The Hopi Nation is another issue in our
thoughts. In the map you saw previously they were
included. However, as we mentioned yesterday, they can
be included or excluded depending on the Commission's
instruction. It's just a matter of how far to include
or exclude them from another area.

This does unite the Eastern Arizona
communities, including the entire Eastern Arizona AUR,
all of Gila, Graham, Gila, Southern Graham, Gila, south
of Eastern, unites the entire Southern Grand Canyon in
one strip.

You can see graphically, it united more
than the Grand Canyon area which is hatched on the
screen. And other borders are Census places, cities,
towns, and designated places.

The second instruction we received was to
attempt to include the area of the University and Tucson
into District G, the southwestern district. We were
able to achieve that. You'll see the black line was the
draft plan line. And the new line, or amended line, follows with the shading, the brown shading there, goes around the University, taking in the University. We did nothing around the entire area, as can you tell. We did not take in all the surrounding community around University. It was a fair amount of population. We felt there were some significant questions as to possibly voting rights concerns if you tried including a lot more significant area than that. But we were able to achieve it, and the southwestern district is still a majority Hispanic district.

Down in Santa Cruz County, to help with this, we divided it according to the same boundaries as it was divided in the legislative plan which I realized we have not addressed yet. It does track along one Census tract, the eastern part of Santa Cruz county there, now in District H, and all of Cochise, Eastern Tucson, and North Eastern Tucson.

It also does unite the I-19 corridor, still keeps Green Valley to the east rather than the west.

Highlighting again.

DR. ADAMS: The University area, it reflects a lot of citizen input the Commission received from the Tohono area and Tucson area. We failed to
mention before, it reunited Sahuarita, which was divided
along the black line there. I realize we reunited that.
It’s one of the few incorporated areas on the map.
Green Valley is not incorporated east of Sahuarita.
It’s reunited to reflect that. It’s reunited to reflect
Padagonia and other areas to the east.

MR. HUTCHISON: Changes in District G,
Hispanic, total population is 51.27 to 50.97, drops
three points of a percent. Voting age drops a little
more than that, roughly. What is that, 4.44 percent.
Total minority goes down even more slightly, six
one-hundredths of a percent. And voting age is little
more than that.

So just to summarize, Hispanic percentage
and total minority voting age both stay above 50 percent
and change. Eliminate one city split, Sahuarita, the
total county, it splits an additional county. Split six
counties now. Split Santa Cruz, Pima, Pinal, Mohave,
Yavapai, and Maricopa County.

Again, to see the area shifted.

District H, impact on that, since moving
things, District H to D and G to H, Hispanic goes up
slightly, about three-tenths of a percent. Voting age
is slightly less than that. Total minority tracts, five
one-hundreds of a percent.x, Arizona
Here is a map of Yavapai County. You can see the Gila River comes up from Maricopa right through here, tracks the Gila River to the Verde Valley. When working with cities and communities here, it tracks west along Census tracts beneath Dewey-Humboldt and west along Humboldt, west and is united south into Maricopa County.

Again, Yavapai County, unites Prescott, Verde Valley, Sedona, and the Flagstaff, Grand Canyon areas to the north.

Here's a blowup of Maricopa County. You probably couldn't see it very well. I couldn't on the other map.

You can see, you can see, okay, let's start from the west and move to the east.

The old District A, if you remember, went all the way up and included Mohave County, came over to Northern Coconino to take in the Hopi Reservation, also included La Paz. In the district line, it was the black line coming down and around. Now we were able to do some fairly significant work in Maricopa. We were able to completely unite Glendale into one district. Before it was in three. We, instead of having district B, which used to extend all the way around -- B essentially just moves east a little, now stays entirely within the
City of Phoenix rather than going into Glendale. Areas to the north now are split among two different districts to account for growth areas not united in one district. We did receive some input from the Commission on that. Now, District E and A share growth areas in the northern portion of Maricopa.

Another significant change, in district D, the South Mountain area, we received input to remove the portion of Glendale, see what happened when we remove a portion of Glendale, this right here, which totaled, if I recall, 58,000 persons, roughly, and add in Ahwatukee which had been split previously under the draft plan. I'd report back Ahwatukee now is completely whole within this district.

I'll talk about changes in terms of percentages in a moment, but you do, you now no longer split Ahwatukee and you do not have, as Mr. Huntwork said, you don't have a salamander any longer.

District E now includes Tempe whole as before. Chandler is now split on the plan, is split on Dobson Road where they requested to be split, if they needed to be split, and the western portion of Mesa totals roughly 90,000 people, a little less, a little more, they are split into this district. However Mesa, the remaining portion of Mesa constitute roughly...
Continuing with E, it takes in the Arcadia area south of Paradise Valley, all of Paradise Valley, all Scottsdale, all of Cave Creek, and moves east to Fountain Hills, the unincorporated area of Rio Verde, and the unincorporated areas of Phoenix to an ideal district size.

District F, the rest of Mesa, Chandler, Sun Lakes, Queen Creek, Sun Lakes, Gold Canyon, Queen Creek, and the line is State Highway 79.

And again, this area out here goes into the northern district. The Salt River and Fort McDowell Reservations are included, and then tracks along the Verde River north into Yavapai. Out here, the northern portions of Yavapai have changed according to the Commission's modifications. It unites Glendale.

District B is entirely in the City of Phoenix. And we're going to speak to other issues in a second.

The impact, speaking to that, it does combine Ahwatukee, South Mountain, as a Hispanic area. You can see the impact of the percentages. It drops roughly four-and-a-half percent, a little more, in total population, drops it to roughly five percent, or close to it, on voting age population, but does allow for
unification of the City of Glendale. It does drop the
Hispanic within the district, the total minority
percentages, by about five percent. Again, there, you
can see the map.

These are district registration figures.

I aggregated these this morning. You can see the
asterisk next to district C. I'll explain that.

District C includes Gila County whole.

The data received, issues in it are noted on the spread
sheet received with registration figures.

Gila County only contained identifiers of
Republican voters, did not include only voters shown
with registration figures, 10,198 Republicans. The
correct figures, if you look at the Secretary of State,
I have them. I looked at the corrected figures, and
there are roughly 16,000 Democrats, 10,000 Republicans,
not registered. So on the spread sheet, 10,000 voters,
and so on, something which easily factors in as Gila is
counted as a whole. We do have the raw numbers for how
many voters are counted in each category.

I'll throw the map back up there.

DR. HESLOP: That's the end of the
presentation, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission.

We'd be glad to take questions.
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CHAIRMANOLYNN: AComments or questions for
the consultants?

Mr. Huntwork and then Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The question I asked during the night and wanted to get advice on was if you just looked at the Phoenix Metropolitan area, and recognize that we needed to add .2 from somewhere, of the .2 addition, where would the ideal place to add that be from? It appears to me that all you have done is create a Northern Arizona District as directed and then by default assign whatever was left over to western Phoenix and adjust accordingly. I'd like to ask the question again, if you don't do that, what is your advice regarding the best way to add the Phoenix area?

DR. HESLOP: That can be answered in a number of ways. We are happy with this particular design. These are a very good design. It works very good in the context of the overall plan. Obviously Phoenix can be designed in other ways. This is the way we have it tested in this plan.

MR. HUTCHISON: Commissioner, I'll speak to the specific population figures.

If you recall, I went through a list yesterday of populated areas around the Phoenix Metropolitan area. We feel the best method is not to pick one area to bear the brunt of the 125,000 persons
Maricopa County needs. If you see what we've done here, the Apache Junction, Gold Canyon areas, which worked out with the Northern Arizona Congressional District in this case, can be modified, of course, the point is to coming up both sides. By splitting it up, you don't have as much impact on various areas. If you took all 125,000 persons from Pinal County, you would have to include Casa Grande in some form or another. This method achieves a lot of our AURs and it doesn't split any cities in trying to do that.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The representative from Casa Grande last night indicated including Casa Grande would not be the worst thing that would happen.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork, if you'd talk into the microphone. We can't hear you.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The representative from Casa Grande indicated being included with Maricopa County was the lesser of two evils, as he put it. Why not have you put it as a consideration. You indicated not putting Casa Grande. You are thinking of something I do not know.

MR. HUTCHISON: I believe -- I'm not an attorney.

DR. HESLOP: Why don't I respond to that.
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I think that the representative from Casa
Grande last evening made a statement that I personally
had not heard before. What we did have in statements
from representatives of Casa Grande was the point keep
the plan as it does. That was the primary objective of
Casa Grande.

COMMISSIONER HALL: If you remove Casa
Grande, what does it do to the Hispanic AUR? Does it
not affect it significantly?

MR. HUTCHISON: We believe it does affect
it significantly.

MS. LEONI: Yes. We believe it would have
an impact. If you would like us to test it, we will.
It will require invasion of the Gila River Indian
Reservation. That's important to the total minority
population of District G.

MR. HUTCHISON: Also a large Hispanic
presence in Casa Grande. And it would affect
percentages, the presence of the Hispanic community in
District G.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I understand. Why
it would require invasion of the Gila River community?
Why would it require invasion of Gila River community?
Why not come down and around?

MS. LEONI: I was thinking of direct work. You are thinking of working, through an arm?
COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes.

MR. HUTCHISON: Going south of the Gila River Indian Reservation through?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: That would be a way to. I'm making a point. Separate the sheep from the goats.

MS. LEONI: I understand.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I do understand the point.

MS. LEONI: Casa Grande, if I understand the graphics correct, Chris can give any more details, itself has a significant Hispanic population.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think you've done an incredible job with the instructions you were given. I like it better.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Into the mike.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: My question is the same question I had yesterday and we didn't have the answer yesterday. I would like an update on where we stand now.

Except for the issue of competitiveness, I think a lot of these districts do make more sense than the districts we had yesterday. In terms of competitiveness, the only figures we have are
registration figures. While there have been minor
changes, there really haven't been dramatic changes, and
we're left with the same types of districts we had
yesterday in terms of party registration with two that
might be considered competitive and the other six with
very great majorities for one party or another. My
question is where do we stand in terms of the
competitiveness data that you said you didn't have
yesterday, would be forthcoming, and are there
adjustments that can be made to these districts to
achieve more competitiveness without sacrificing some of
the other issues we've been dealing with.

MS. LEONI: On the issue of
competitiveness, we have basic data being delivered here
today. We had a satisfactory conference call this
morning. I don't want to promise an index by this
afternoon. By tomorrow morning.

    Am I accurate on that, Jose?

MR. RIVERA: Yes. The hope is that we can
do a preliminary of the competitiveness analysis within
24 hours and more detailed once so we can finetune
within a week. The hope is once we get some election
data, Tim can start working on it, our expert can start
working on it, and we can get something to you within 24
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hours. And finetuning would take a week. I think you
want something you can look at. Hopefully by tomorrow morning we can get that to you.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: With that information, what I would like to suggest is we go through this, deal with all other comments we have to deal with, make adjustments if there are adjustments the Commissioners want to make, hold off approving the Draft Congressional map until we have that information, and see if it can be added to what we have already so that when we take this out for public comment, we can address the competitiveness in these districts and maybe even make some adjustments to make them more competitive before we make a draft. I'd like to propose that.

MS. LEONI: If I can respond to the second part of your question, you asked if it's possible to make adjustments. There are several crucial areas of the state that are getting to a point where I think we are perhaps in danger of impairing one of our Hispanic AURs. In those areas, adjustments for competitiveness may do further damage. So I do want to point that out to you.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I understand that. That still gives us six other districts to move around.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments?
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Mr. Huntwork., Arizona
COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I have several detailed comments on this proposal here. First I want to zero in to the Phoenix Metropolitan area.

First let me say I don't understand why we would combine, why we'd take the Hispanic area out of D and combine Ahwatukee. That strikes me as being -- violating a number of our principles. The Ahwatukee area has much more in common with the southeast valley, and obviously there's -- the area to the north has much more in common with area D. We don't have any statistics or information which would evaluate the total effect of this on competitiveness at this time. And I would strongly suggest we reverse that. It would be interesting to see, but in my view in terms of making history setting, reflecting communities of interest, it makes no sense whatsoever.

The second thing I really want to focus on is B. For some reason, which I still don't understand, B is still confined. And we have the opportunity here to divide the high growth areas, really, at this point, among three other districts. And I think we ought to take advantage of that opportunity. There's no reason at all why we can't take some of the population out of parts of B and trade it for everything that goes up to the north. To me that would make more sense in terms of
keeping populations of these districts even over a period of time.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Can I ask a question relating to Mr. Huntwork's last comment? Could you describe for me the current northern boundaries of District B?

MR. HUTCHISON: Let me put it up on the map for a second. It will just take one second.

It starts at Alameda Road, goes east to 44th Road, north to Alameda Road, east to Shored Lane, goes to Happy Valley, up to Happy Valley, follows Happy Valley east, tracks up 19th Avenue in the area of Jomax Road. I believe that's the city boundary. In the area of Jomax Road going to the east, and then it goes down Cave Creek Road, and east again on Pinnacle Peak, and that would be the northern boundary.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The eastern boundary --

MR. HUTCHISON: That's the Scottsdale boundary.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It seems to me, looking at that, there's some growth that's going to take place there, too. There's lots of areas without any streets in them. And within the next 10 years I'm sure there will be lots of streets in there. They may
not have potential in other areas. North Pinnacle Peak
up to the Jomax area, there's lots of development, lots
of population growth there.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Finish the tour.
MR. HUTCHISON: It follows the Scottsdale
boundary, western Scottsdale boundary around -- oh,
that's the Census Bureau's river bottom. It goes down
to the border, still the border of Scottsdale, and here
it does not track the border of Scottsdale. It follows
Yucca Street, 22nd, Desert Cove, then down 60th to Shea,
follows Shea, then south on Tatum, then to Mockingbird.
That's all city boundary there. I highlighted the City
of Paradise Valley. That's probably the easiest way to
see it. Then down here is where the Arcadia area is
included. 32nd Street going south of Lincoln, the
southern border there is Indian School going west. Then
north on 15th Avenue, west on Camelback, a fairly good
distance. I believe that's the city boundary, Glendale
city boundary.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Can you zoom back
down, please.

Show me City of Glendale.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Can you get rid of
the water?
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as a boundary.

City of Glendale. Wrong line.

COMMISSIONER HALL: So if I understand Mr. Huntwork's comment, he's saying split the growth area to the north, in essence trading green for gold, is that correct, trade green for gold?

MR. HUTCHISON: Or gray for gold.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Gray for gold.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Next question. What is the issue of Paradise Valley as far as is there a reason it's in E? Maybe I'm not --

MR. HUTCHISON: We have an AUR of the City of Phoenix. The attempt here, since there's an additional population center, district, completely within the city, if we could, there are 13,000 people in Paradise Valley.

COMMISSIONER HALL: How would you propose Mr. Huntwork trading gray for gold versus green for gold?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Josh, number one, we're just looking at these for the first time and there's lots of different ways you could do that. The most simplistic way is take the other off the east side of E and move it to the north, wouldn't have to shake very much. The area to the north is relatively sparsely
populated at this point. But as Andi points out,
there's quite a bit of growth area in the north left
within E. Seems the boundary is interesting, what I
really want to think about before I decide whether I
think it's really important; and secondly, if we need to
do it, how we'd go about it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd like to make a
comment.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes. I, in looking
at this, I made the comment yesterday as we were looking
at how to do a five-district metropolitan Phoenix area
concept, that you could put the .2, or whatever the
number was, as growth areas on as many of the districts
as we could. It appears as though D and B in effect are
in held districts, don't have as much potential growth
as whatever, green and purple or blue. My sense is to
give that potential, I would like to see some sort of an
outgrowth area both on D and B, if we possibly could. I
don't know where that might follow. Might follow D,
looking at Avondale, and D looking to the west, possibly
there. Should have two districts that should be looked
at a little further there.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.
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COMMISSIONERxMINKOFF:a I think you make a
good point about district D, could add areas looking
west, Goodyear, Estrella, that area, even Buckeye, which
does have growth potential going forward. I don't think
the problem is as serious with District B. All we're
talking about is 10 years. And there's a lot of areas
in District B to fill in. And while 30 years down the
line the growth may not be there, in the next 10 years I
think there will probably be as much growth in the
northern areas of District B. It's in-fill. It will
develop before the further north areas that are in A and
B -- A and E develop.

I don't think it's as much of a concern as
District B.

I understand Mr. Huntwork's point about
spreading growth among as many districts as we can. I
think it's there in district E.

If we wanted to add some to district D, we
have to go west; but also have to see how that affected
some of the other considerations, voting rights
considerations, and so on, as Ms. Leoni pointed out.
There is growth that will take place to the west of D.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think Avondale
is growing rapidly right now. There is a lot of growth
potential. Look at that area, and we'll see, I think,
now. I think that and B are very analogous for growth.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Adams.

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Lynn, members of the Commission, I'll deal with this in area D at this point. We would have concerns about moving further over and how we would compensate for the minority population. If you have some suggestions, we'd be happy to test them.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd like to make a couple. Instead of specific microcomments, Chris, if you zoom out with the entire map, there are a couple of areas that in general terms I want to just pose some questions.

Two, in particular, concern me. I need to understand from the consultants, because all of this is a matter of compensating balances. There is not an opportunity to achieve all the things we'd like to achieve simultaneously without some negative effects on some parts of the state. Two things concern me about this map, although generally it's an interesting prospect. The first is that the district A on this map unites the west end of the Metropolitan Phoenix area with the river communities on the Colorado River. And to suggest that there is commonality between those two groups of people is ahstretch.riButaI understand with
congressional districting, because of the size of the
district and the number of people that are the target,
that some large expanses of territory as well as
differences in community need to be accommodated. It's
of concern, but I don't know that there is a better way
to achieve what we're trying to achieve and not have
that be the case.

I think we said yesterday there was,
practically speaking, no way to achieve some of the
things we were talking about without linking the Phoenix
area with, we said, Parker; but it may as well have been
any number of the small communities of the Colorado
River.

The second area that is troublesome, based
on continuing testimony that we've heard, is the area of
Pinal County. And we have taken some care elsewhere in
the state to avoid a situation where counties are split
numerous times. There are a number of places where
counties have that situation Legislatively and
Congressionally. But Chris, do you have the detail in
Pinal County to look at? Can we get a little closer?

In this configuration, first of all, the
little appendage, if you will, to the south, I fully
understand and personally support. That's Saddlebrooke.
As a community of interest, it really does tend to go
south to Sun City, Histoso (phonetic), and Avra Valley.

We believe we then have three other districts, correct
me if I'm wrong, represented in Pinal County.

If you forget the little appendage to the
south, Pinal is split three ways. Again, in terms of
achieving other things that we are trying to achieve, it
may be impossible to avoid that, but it's of concern.

I would like you to take a look at, I
understand we have an issue with the Southern Hispanic
AUR. I understand that and the significant percentage
in Pinal County, in that southern district, may make the
issue moot. I'd like you to take a look at it.

With respect to Phoenix, Chris, if you
zoom in on the Phoenix area, if you go to Phoenix area.
I share some of Mr. Huntwork’s concern with the southern
portion of E. I think, it's very clear to me,
Ahwatukee, as an example, and as a community, would be
far better linked eastward than it would around the
mountain and westward. But, again, that may be -- that
may be possible, given you might be able to do some
trading to the east of District D and expand it to the
west on the other end. I know it currently mirrors
Avondale's corporate limits, but there may be some
additional communities either -- area unincorporated to
Avondale area than Ahwatukee does with the rest of District D. I'd like you to at least take a look at that.

To me, I'm intrigued by the map in a number of ways. I think it does a number -- I'm pointing out things I think are problematic. I think it does a number of interesting and positive things in terms of a number of communities of interest, a number of good affinities, maintain commitments we maintained with both AURs and the progression to grid areas we originally set forth.

I'd like you to hook at those, and be given some time to review them, decide what you might be able to do to tweak the maps in that way. And I understand that you may come back and say it's not possible without doing harm elsewhere.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: We should switch sides. To do what you suggest, it doesn't seem that hard. If you put Ahwatukee back where it was, the Hispanic area back at the top of D, you then have to adjust the green district on the left. Presumably that comes further into the growth area. But you could also take it from D. Then you move D further north and further east. You have Paradise Valley and Arcadia into
B, which make up about 90,000 people in E. We've added 90,000 people. You have to take them out. You could simply move B a little further to the east, add that. I don't know what happens if you add a portion of B, if there's a portion of I 17 to add. That might make just about the right number.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think there are a number of ways the problem might be solved. I'd like to make options. I didn't necessarily want to dictate one or more. I think what I'd like to accomplish in what I'm saying, I believe in the community of Ahwatukee it has more affinity to communities to the east than around the mountain and to the west. Having said that, in general terms, the fact that all of Scottsdale, Paradise Valley, and Tempe are contained in a district, that to me makes some sense, as well as the east district, as well as, quite honestly, the Central Phoenix District makes some sense, District B, to me, as well. So -- again, I understand -- I understand your suggestions. I wasn't necessarily suggesting how to solve the problem.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I understand if we did that, did that shift, obviously there are some things I would like to see myself. I guess I'm asking that the consultants take a look at that specific approach.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Up to a point I agree. The only thing that concerns me is taking that northern portion of B, D, what was in D, putting it back in A, because that splits Glendale again. Making the shift, we were able to unite the City of Glendale. If we do have to add to D, rather than doing that, you move west, and there is a connection that could be made between Goodyear, Avondale, Tolleson, those west valley communities, possibly Litchfield Park. I think they mentioned at the meeting had at Estrella they did have a connection, to take that out of A, have some area of the northern area to equalize population.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Andi, I couldn't hear what you said about Litchfield Park.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I wouldn't want to redivide Glendale since we just united them. If you took the Ahwatukee area out of D, that's the area we should look to add, rather than move north, move west, Goodyear, Litchfield Park. At the meeting at Estrella, those west valley communities indicated they did work together on a lot of things, a lot of regional issues. They have similar issues involving growth, transition from agricultural to more urban development areas. So I think it would be a better...
that it would impact voting rights issues, since the area you are taking out of D is not an area with heavy minority concentrations, minimal minority concentrations. I don't know what the concentrations are moving west. It wouldn't have negative impact. Might have positive impact on that concentration.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

Can we zoom out?

I share concerns you alluded to,

Mr. Chairman. I think we need to continue to tweak this in an effort to accommodate some issues the best we can. I certainly hope for solutions. Meanwhile, I think points made with respect to the metropolitan area are very valid. I recommend the consultants come back with maybe with two, three options and give us an opportunity to maybe to look at some of those.

I did want to point out a couple facts important from a positive standpoint. In district C, the total Native American percentage of that district is over 24 percent. I think that is an outstanding job in combining as many Native American tribes as possible.

Furthermore, I think that that number is higher than any other plan we have seen or any other alternative that
has been proposed. And certainly with respect to the
issue of our communities of interest, that that
particular district addresses that -- two of those in a
very powerful way, the interests of Native American and
the interests of rural Arizona.

With respect to the other community
interest of Hispanics, if you look at Districts D and G,
again, as was pointed out, the total Hispanic percentage
of D is over 49 percent and total Hispanic percentage of
G is nearly 45 percent. Total minority population of D
is over 67 percent and total minority population of G is
over 61 percent.

Again, I think that those are some
powerful figures in providing an opportunity for those
particular communities of interest, and most
specifically the Hispanic population, to have a very
powerful potential for a very powerful voice in Arizona.
Therefore, I would like to make a suggestion, having
made those points, Mr. Chairman, that in essence we, as
a Commission, table this map and instruct our
consultants to go and bring back some alternatives
pursuant to the recommendations that have been made and
that this Commission then utilize our time while that is
occurring in pursuing and moving to the legislative
issues.

Phoenix, Arizona
CHAIRMAN LYNN: I want to be sure we have,
I understand your suggestion, want to be sure we have a
full opportunity for all Commissioners to do that. I
think it a reasonable suggestion.

Mr. Elder, Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Chris, zoom back in on the A, B, D, E
area. Maybe come in closer on this area.

I guess following the lead given,
suggestions, or things, might very well lead us in the
right direction, and changes made overnight based on our
directions, we took out a piece of area from D to
reunite Glendale. I think that is a good approach
there. If you look at this area right here, and then
the consequence of that was to reduce Hispanic and
minorities in D. Look at the area here, a fairly heavy
concentration, relatively Hispanic area, that could be
added into D to bring numbers back to some extent.

The other area would be to take the area,
these areas here, and reunite some of the west valley
communities of Litchfield and, I don't know exactly
right in here, fairly low Hispanic population at that
point. I don't know whether that conflicts with the
AURs we had. If that was taken out of this green area,
could expand into, you know, some undeveloped area to allow that undeveloped area expansion. Look at rotating those around, make sense of the Hispanic population as well as the west valley community amalgamation of the area B to the north.

MR. HUTCHISON: That area, not a very Hispanic area there, right here. That's actually within the City of Avondale. The City of Avondale is south and goes all the way around.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think when we look at District D, it's a district with the largest minority population that we have, certainly much more significant than G, which is the other majority-minority district. I think it's pretty safe there also. I'm not sure what areas you are talking about that have enough significant population. I'm not sure there's enough population for what we're trying to achieve.

I support Mr. Hall's proposal. It makes a lot of sense. See if there's any finetuning NDC wants to do, that gives NDC time to look at the issue of competitiveness, adjustments that can be made that don't negatively impact the issues that can be achieved to get at the issue competitiveness, support what Mr. Hall is suggesting. And I'd like to remind the
Commissioners we're not going to achieve perfection this weekend. We need to come up with something close enough that the plan works, take it out for public comment, and then it will be readjusted after the public comment period and the second round public comment periods.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I agree. I think we can leave this quickly and get at the other issue.

The only thing I wanted to add is the original proposal before D was an excellent proposal, mirrored the Hispanic AUR very well. The testimony in Glendale was not, by any means, unanimous in terms of keeping the city together. There was a lot of testimony that stated a natural divide that pretty much reflected that community there. I think that the original configuration of D, switching Ahwatukee and left it back to where they were in the first place, is still a very viable option.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any other comments at this time?

What I would propose, then, is that we take -- I'd ask everyone's indulgence. When take a break, breaks tend to last longer than they should -- 10, I mean 10. I'll call everyone together after 10, after the break. Phoenix, Arizona
We have now representatives of the Gila River Indian Community. We'd like to hear from them immediately after the break, finish up any discussion we have in terms of Congressional options we'd like to see from the consultants, and then move immediately into a presentation on the legislative map.

Without objection, take a 10, please hold it to 10, a 10-minute break.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ladies and gentlemen, take your seats, please. We'll reconvene.

The Commission will stand in session. The record will show all five Commissioners are present.

We have a presentation from the Gila River Indian Community.

I do want to make one or ask one question before we have that presentation.

Dr. Heslop, I want to be sure that NDC, as a part of their work for us, is creating a record that will document in sufficient detail the movement from grid to map and then revisions from map to -- from draft map to final draft which then will go public. And I want to be sure that is going to be a part of your report to the Commission as we go forward.
for each district for all of these tests we've made
otation on the grid estimate involved and will report
to you on the congressional map that you finally adopt
which will have a full record of grid adjustments.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Dr. Heslop.

If we now may have the representatives of
the Gila River Indian Community, with apologies for the
delay, Richard Narcia, Lieutenant Governor of that
community.

Lt. Governor Narcia, thank you being with
us today.

LT. GOVERNOR NARCIA: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman and Members of the Redistricting
Commission.

As was mentioned, my name is Richard
Narcia. I'm Lieutenant Governor for the Gila River
Indian Community, the largest Indian Community in the
Metro Phoenix Community.

Thank you for allowing me to come before
you and provide general comments with respect to the
Gila Indian Community with respect to this redistricting
exercise.

I am hopeful you'll give due consideration
to the community's position as you continue with
refining your redistricting, maps, and proposals.
The community has been taking an ongoing
analysis of the proposals, and we're looking to provide
you with a more detailed proposal as time permits and
before very shortly.

The community applauds the mandates of the
Commission and appreciates the extremely difficult task
you are faced with in creating the Congressional and
Legislative Districts that are fair, competitive, and
consistent with the principles of the Voting Rights Act.

I would like to, this morning, emphasize a
few of the principles that the community believes the
Commission should consider as you move through this
process.

In a letter provided to you dated August
3rd, the community emphasized upholding the concept of
community interest, the belief in the importance of
combining four Metro tribes in the same Legislative
District, similar to the current Legislative District.
Comments based on the fact that four independent
communities, Fort McDowell, Ak-Chin, the Gila River
Indian Community, and the Salt River Gila River Indian
Community, share the same basic cultural, economic,
political health, education, and social ties. Further,
the Voting Rights Act insures that any district created
does not dilute minority voting strengths. We believe
that keeping the four metro tribes together provides for keeping significant community interest intact.

With regard to the most recent maps, and with respect to the redistricting, the community believes the Commission has made some progress in the fact the currently districting proposal incorporates the Tohono O'odham, Gila River Indian Community, and the Ak-Chin Indian Community in the same district. In this regard, the community or the Commission has recognized the communities of interest in combining three Indian communities together.

It is our position that in not including the other two areas, metro tribes, the Commission will fall short in recognizing the distinct interests that create the relationship between the four metro area tribes. The community also believes that a Legislative District can be drawn that incorporates the four metro tribes while also building upon the current plan proposed by the Commission. It's clear that the Gila River Indian community's interest, as defined by community interests, do not parallel that of the City of Casa Grande. That is to say that a refinement to the Commission's current plan could be modified slightly that would accept all -- be acceptable to all interests.

With regard to the Congressional
Redistricting, we believe the current proposal by the Commission goes a long way in a positive direction in considering communities of interest, combining most of all, the Southern Arizona and Indian communities is a step in the right direction. We applaud the Commission for the work in that regard.

I would, as I said, my comments have been pretty general. The community will provide the Commission with a more detailed proposal in the coming weeks, and it is my hope that you will strongly consider the concepts and recommendations provided to you. And I believe that we can all work together to come up with a workable redistricting that benefits all communities and the citizens of Arizona.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Narcia, very much, for being with us.

I would ask as the Gila River Indian communities develop their plan and suggestions, to the extent that it is possible, to the extent that there are like or congruent ideas that you would like to share with us, that your communication with us speak directly to the plans that are on the table, that is to say as we move through this process, we have preliminary drafts. We will refine those drafts over this meeting period.
To the extent you can take a look at those drafts and make your comments relative to them, they will be most particularly helpful to us.

LT. GOVERNOR NARCIA: We will do that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you very much.

I would like to now move to the presentation on the Legislative Draft rough draft map.

We will follow a similar procedure with respect to an NDC presentation taking us through the draft map itself. I've asked that we move as rapidly as possible. And again, I want to state this is dynamic both for the public and for the Commission. I'm going to try to push the agenda, not for one reason, but I'll try to move us along as rapidly as we can without sacrificing reasonable discussion or input from Commissioners, certainly trying to invite the Commissioners from trying to push back too much, have today be productive, not too long, followed by a long day tomorrow.

If we do not have to meet Sunday, have tomorrow be long, try to move the agenda along as forward as possible, I'd ask all of us to keep our comments and attendance sharp, make them as concise and complete as possible.

DR. HESLOP: We'll proceed as speedily as
possible but will go through each of the districts
briefly.

Another note on schedule, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, Florence will be returning within an hour, hour and a half, with the analysis you require on the various points you require on the Congressional plan.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

DR. HESLOP: Doug Johnson and Christiana Dominguez will take us on through the Legislative plan on a speedy district-by-district dissertation.

Doug.

MR. JOHNSON: Members of the Commission, many of the issues we're going to cover on the Legislative Districts you are now very familiar with, as a result of discussing through the state. I'll try to cover them fairly quickly. Also it's in the legislative packet, binder, section four.

Let me start, starting with the Southwest portion of the state, District Q. This district, we followed the instructions to create a Yuma County, entire Yuma County Legislative District. Yuma County, of course, was a little short, so we go up into the far southwestern Maricopa County, I think like 4,000 people, off top of my head, in that region of the district,
about 3,900 in this region of the district up to the 
Tohono O'odham district line, not into it. This 
district is about 49 percent, almost 50 percent 
Hispanic. It is 55 percent total minority. Most of the 
population, as well you might imagine, is centered right 
around Yuma. This district had very minor changes.
The grid, what it did, was add the 
Maricopa County portion in order to get total population 
equality, to get the total population split by the grid. 
We also looked at possibly taking Yuma 
County authority into La Paz, but that would greatly 
reduce the minority population, drop it below majority. 
So we decided pick up small population areas outside. 
Going to the next district, district F in 
your books, the labeling system we have here appears 
fairly random, is fairly random. With this many 
districts when drawing, essentially what did, we started 
where there were specific instructions. 
Here, there was no conflict, S district, a 
Hispanic district. It was Native American communities. 
We worked inside. So labeling will jump around a bit 
for final maps. We'll prepare more North-South 
labeling. 
Eastern Maricopa counties very well 
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supported the community proposal. It does tie in with
our, what I believe is the next district -- no, with our
Yavapai district. These two districts are kind of the
linchpin of this plan. And based on the Commission's
directions, the Commission's direction that we attempt
to create these districts and see what the result is on
the rest of the state. As you can see here, the Eastern
Arizona County's District and the Yavapai County
District that we created, together with the Maricopa
areas, we try to isolate from rural districts. We're
blending where it drives this. And everything kind of
drives that.

I won't go into all detail, as much as I
did in an attempt to get through this.

The Eastern Arizona Counties are very
familiar with this from hearings to keep counties whole,
except one piece of the San Carlos Reservation. They
are all familiar here with the takes in the southern
portions of the Navajo Apache Counties. As requested,
different groups requested, it does not cross into
Apache lands, but it does cross into distant, semi
distant regions.

The next district is G. This is an area
you are very familiar with after looking at
Congressional District H. It is -- let me put the
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places on here so you can see the towns. If there are
any towns you want, I'll add them later.

This area is very similar to H, doesn't go anywhere near as far to Tucson as H did, does follow the same line as the Santa Cruz County. As proposed in the Congressional plan, it separates Nogales at the I 19 area from separated defined communities of interest. And geographically, a set of hills or a mountain range runs through there.

Cochise District, as with congressional District H, is a heavily majority non-Hispanic white. And it is unlike H, also a majority population lives in rural. It is a blending area, high growth areas. It is a rural influence district.

The next area we focused on was the Tucson area. I think I'm going to need to import this later. Give me one second here. Let me put the places on here. I'll put the place names on so you can see what we're looking at.

Okay. Let me put this on here so it's a little clearer.

Okay. There we go.

District H. This is a -- just over 50 percent Hispanic district, 60 percent total minority.

We worked very hard in the Tucson area to match both Hispanic and goals creating
the most districts that would be enclosed within the community of shared interests that we've identified as a -- in our Hispanic AUR.

You have H, which is a majority Hispanic district. It gives up a portion from the grid district, gives up portions and goes into Santa Cruz County in order to keep unified the Tucson District. Some may not the area well.

Here's Tucson Air Force Base, areas we were looking at earlier today. And this is obviously entirely within Pima County.

One thing with the configuration of the districts, as you'll see as we walk through these, Hispanic percentages are just above 50 percent. When looking at different options, it will be a challenge, obviously, to do a lot, any major reconfiguration without any effect on districts with a major Hispanic percentage.

Let me go over to district I, which is also in this area.

District I is, again, just over 50 percent a Hispanic. This one is 59 percent total minority. It is entirely contained within what we define the Hispanic AUR. We also attempted to follow the city borders as much as we could while meeting our other goals. You'll
see Marana gets divided up, really Picture Rocks and
tother towns, like this is completely outside of it. So
where we could, we followed the city borders while
meeting the other community definitions we have of AURs,
and that is defined by the community.

So this one takes in part of, I believe
it's pronounced Marana, forgive me if I'm mispronouncing
it, South Tucson, unified that, and portions of Tucson.
The next district is J, to the side of
this here. J is not a Hispanic majority that is
strongly a majority white. Essentially our goal here
was to keep it within the urban Tucson area. The grid
district extended out past Tucson. And we also, this
districts configuration is also an attempt to stick with
Tucson's clear Northeast Southwest configuration. The
grid came in and the result tracks how the grid came in
with both the result of the grid and congressional
layers with the wrong crossing line, as the community
testified, extensively.

So, let me see, the grid district in this
case included this community to the east. We attempted
to unify this entirely within Tucson to avoid dividing
up surrounding communities.

Next district -- if you have any questions
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about these as I go letemexknow.xoTrying to meet with
the goal of doing this quickly.

District E is the district right in here, primarily centered on the Tohono O'odham Reservation. It also goes up, takes in the Gila River, Ak-Chin, and takes -- this is actually a relatively unpopulated, no population here, and it's in our I-19 AUR, takes in this area in an attempt to unite the Tohono O'odham Reservation. Also takes in the Casa Grande here. On the AUR front, it matches both goals to unify the tribal reservations, takes into account the Casa Grande AUR and the I-19 corridor as your Congressional level. Due to community input, we've placed Green Valley on the eastern side of that AUR.

Next district, just walking through in the order through that you have in your binders, is district K. This is in the north Tucson district. Starting to get up into heavy growth areas of Tucson here. Again, it's a majority non-Hispanic white district. And it, in relation to it's grid district, there was a southern leg extended down into Tucson. We've more unified the district in what would be the hills area of Tucson in an attempt to keep it with a community of interest and to keep our Hispanic community of interest that we've established in the AUR to get it down here.
places and strongly attempts to respect city borders as much as possible.

So the next district is district L, which is right there, and departing the Tucson area. This is the east Pinal County area.

We had had the goal of keeping Pinal County together in one Legislative District as much as possible. We ran into the problem at the Legislative level the same as the Congressional level, in this case tribal reservations playing more of a factor. In this district, there are mining communities, the rural communities of Pinal County, high growth areas of Tucson, high growth areas of Maricopa, both will heavily influence this district to begin with and fairly soon dominate it. We do succeed unifying Queen Creek.

Again, the town identified itself as having a more rural character than a Phoenix character, so we do want to, to the greatest degree possible, keep it with a similar community.

Again, as we went through with the Congressional District, this isn't a really rural district. It does have a rural flavor to it.

The next district in the books is B. This is Yavapai.
point the goal to keep united the Legislative Yavapai District became key in this area and that drew this next succeeded drawing, united Yavapai County. United Yavapai. Still population short. Picked up a few neighboring unincorporated and small places around Sedona to bring up that population level. It's fully rural, as much as Yavapai County is a rural district, and succeeds in unifying Sedona, as I mentioned. The only city split included in this is Peoria down on the county line, split down on the county line, I believe one person.

We head to CC is our essentially Navajo reservation district. It does exclude the Hopi reservation. It also comes down to the small pieces of the reservation that are noncontiguous but nearby and works its way over to Flagstaff, combines Flagstaff with the reservation.

Obviously this decision, what population is taken in with the reservation, is driven to a large part by the already defined eastern counties and district. We do have some changes, choose different populations, because the amount of population needed to drive us either south of Yavapai is really not enough people to take out Flagstaff. Flagstaff, you have to go around, it is so this district ends
up being 63 percent Native American and fully outside of Maricopa, obviously. The only cities towns incorporated Flagstaff and Page. Other names you see are the Census designated places.

The next district, sliding over, now we've configured this area left with the northwest region. This is a real challenge for us to draw in part because of our desire to keep these two districts drawn in two communities. And the way defined, the way citizens requested they be defined. We had the Hopi that wanted to keep the Native American reservations together and shared the district, picked up reservations to the west as they had requested. Then we ran into this western issue. We didn't have enough -- we had too much population to take in all of Mohave, all of La Paz, so the decision where to divide them was a difficult one.

What we ended up doing was going to the river AUR the Commission defined. It makes an oddly-shaped district. There is a definite community that is shared, river shared, an AUR that runs through the Grand Canyon and along the border, some degree of tourist oriented community district, and we have tribal reservations along the river and tribal to the north.

It's noncompact, one driven in large part by the creation of these districts, inorder to adjust this
need, revisit the instruction on these two districts.
The side effect after doing that, you're left with
District D, the inland Mohave LaPaz District. As we've
discussed at length, it's the Congressional District,
drawing this district, dominated in the west valley
regions, Peoria, Surprise, Buckeye, all in here, both
Sun Cities, El Mirage, the Sun City plan did achieve the
goal of the Commission in keeping El Mirage separate
from the Sun Cities. We have those two.

To move on, District D is obviously, looks rural. Because of the Maricopa population, it really isn't.

Working Maricopa now, the next district in the binders is district Y. District Y is really a
Peoria north Glendale district, takes in a similar split. Obviously these plans were made before we made the revisions in the last two days. It has a similar division in Glendale to what we drew in the Congressional plan originally.

District Y, the majority of the non-Hispanic white is drawn, in part, to accommodate the goal to keep the Hispanic community of interest that has been defined previously in the AUR together.

In terms of cities, just Glendale and just Peoria, it does stay completely outside of Phoenix.
As you'll see when we go into detail,

other Maricopa Districts, there is the most representation for AURs we've defined in there. It is going to be somewhat more difficult at a Legislative level to move districts around than it was at a Congressional level, although we do have some options to the north.

The next district is district T. This is the south Glendale to the west district. You'll see Luke Air Force Base out here, comes all the way in along Glendale. It does include pieces of Phoenix that stretch out here where Glendale and Phoenix' annexation arms tend to mix, and dense population areas in here as well.

This also, if you notice the split with Surprise, we went along and Surprise, the road there is Bell Road. It was a difficult decision, obviously, in order to accommodate, keep the Sun Cities together. And El Mirage, what in district T is 44 percent Hispanic, 55 percent total minority district, that Surprise there is having to be split. The area out here is a couple annexation arms from Glendale, mainly unincorporated; however, there is a significant population out there.

Other notes on this, oh, adjustments to the grid, this actually extended into Phoenix and did
not include El Mirage and Luke Air Force Base. But in response to the testimony we've heard in the various hearings, and in the goal to keep Phoenix away from dividing it from as many districts as possible, we did redraw it in this way.

The next district is District P, jump to that.

This one actually has as many similarities that we were discussing as District D today. This district is Avondale, Goodyear, Litchfield Park, Tolleson, and Phoenix. Despite the division of the area out into the west valley, populationwise this district is based fairly heavily in the east. It does work out to be just over 50 percent Hispanic, 60 percent total minority, and is another district that is attempting to maximize representation for the area of the AUR that we've drawn in this area.

In terms of cities, we split just two cities in this district, Phoenix, which obviously almost has to be split, and also there is a piece of Buckeye that is incorporated in this district as well.

Go to the next district which is U. Jump there.

Zoom out a little bit.

Again, we're still in the Phoenix area.
District U, a non-Hispanic white district
whose lines in the south are driven by the Hispanic AUR.
And where there was flexibility there we followed to
the greatest degree possible the AUR Central Phoenix
Historical District given the priorities of the
district. Prop 106 followed the AURs, the First Central
Historical District, to the greatest extent possible for
the Central Phoenix valley to the greatest degree. It
does not cross the Scottsdale line. You see I-17 in the
west, it goes up to the street borders, Thunderbird Road
and Shea Boulevard and is similar to what we were
looking at today.

Next we go to District R.

This is primarily the South Mountain
District, shows a little better differentiated. And you
are all very familiar with this area at this point. It
does go to Guadalupe, follows the edge of South
Mountain, works it’s way up to a mixed Phoenix,
unincorporated areas down here.

This area is 62 percent Hispanic, 79
percent total minority. Obviously it is surrounded on
the north by Hispanic or total minority-majority
districts. It’s limited and can expand without diluting
populations or crossing city lines in the east.

This is included entirely within the City
of Phoenix, as well, except for inclusion of the City of
Guadalupe in the east.

This district was modified from the grid
as were most districts slightly. We added in Guadalupe
in response to some testimony from the Coalition for
Fair Redistricting and other community interests. We
also picked up a couple of additional areas in the
northern part of this district in order to achieve
population equality without splitting city borders.

That brings us to the neighboring District S.

This district is 51 percent Hispanic, 63
percent total minority, and changes from the grid
district that was similar in this area. We moved it
south out from what was the Arizona Biltmore Country
Club area in order to make both a district that
represented a Hispanic AUR better that the Commission
had created.

The other things that it did, in the
southeast we picked up a little land in order to get to
the city border and use it as a city line rather than a
more random line and brought it into Phoenix more. We
also attempted to respect -- this is both the Scottsdale
City border and Tempe City borders down here.

District D, as we move over, this is the
Gilbert and East Mesah District.

As you can see, as we
worked out of the Hispanic AUR, we're facing the east valley area around Mesa, Gilbert, and Chandler.

We started where the southern districts had come up into this area, attempted and succeeded in unifying all Gilbert within this district taking in, this is actually the eastern and southern Mesa, both some heavily populated areas, mostly annexation arms and unincorporated areas. Gilbert, as I said, was unified. Mesa is split in this district.

In changes from the grid. The grid split Gilbert, the grid of Chandler. It changed that to unify Gilbert.

This brings us to District Z, Chandler. It unified Chandler to the greatest percent possible, 88 percent. There is only part, this section here, part of Ahwatukee.

What happened when drawing District X, we needed additional population to get to the ideal level. It’s penned in, the City of Guadalupe. They expressed community interest, and the tribal area, and led us to pick up a piece of Chandler. This district, as you might imagine, is a majority non-Hispanic white.

The next district is X, the district just referring to -- oh, the colors -- change the colors.
Going all the way through Mesa would be far too big. This one Ahwatukee region, the little piece of Chandler, and southern Tempe, more or less to the highway. Respecting the city borders of Tempe, Chandler on the southern side, Tempe, Chandler, another majority non-Hispanic white, respected from the grid district to respect a number of communities. The grid district had this combined Gila River, or portions of the Gila River, portions of South Mountain, included Guadalupe, did not include as much of southern Tempe. We attempted to identify the different communities of interest in the district, included in the area of Tempe and South Mountain area. We attempted to draw districts that respected those communities a little more than the grid districts.

Next we have AA.

Zoom out so we have a sense of where we are.

This is one of two overwhelmingly Mesa districts. I should point out one thing on this plan that we realized. The Census Bureau, and we confirmed with Maricopa County and have done a lot of other research to make sure this is accurate, misidentified the Salt River Reservation crossing over into Mesa, the Salt River completely out of Mesa. Despite how it
looks, the reservation is not in Mesa. Only part is
Mesa, only portions, small pieces here, small annexation
arms and small growing arms. It's entirely within the
City of Mesa and does not affect Gilbert at all. It's
another majority non-Hispanic white.

In relation to the grid, we separated out
the tribal reservation, it clearly reflects a community
of interest, on the grid, and combined the two areas.

BB, companion Mesa district, adjusted with
respect to the tribal border. It does have 29 percent
Hispanic population, what some might term a Hispanic
influence district, not part of the Hispanic AUR, not
linked to the Hispanic AUR. Again, it changes to this
district as a minor, respected the tribal border, picked
up a couple blocks in the Southwest portion to allow
unification of Chandler Gilbert in other districts
nearby.

This one is also entirely within the City
of Mesa.

The last Mesa District is CC, ended up
with the rest of Mesa and most of Tempe. You'll see
where the old line is. It takes in Tempe north from
Southern Avenue and then the highway here. It also
includes a portion of Scottsdale. The very far southern
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arm of Scottsdale is included. Another majority
non-Hispanic white. Separated out changes from the grid
to keep city lines.

Next district, far eastern valley
district.

You'll see -- it incorporates the entirety
of two tribal reservations surrounding the far
eastern -- I'm sorry, Maricopa County, and the majority
of Scottsdale is in this district. It also includes the
City of Fountain Hills, another majority non-Hispanic
white district.

Changes from the grid, changes from the
City of Phoenix, with respect to city boundaries, we
dropped those in order to unify the reservation.

Here in Scottsdale, I should note it is
divided, but Scottsdale's population is larger than a
Legislative District; so there is no way to avoid doing
that.

Now we move over into north Phoenix,
District M, another majority white district. Very few
adjustments from the grid. The only things we did are
give up small pieces of Glendale and Peoria to unify
those pieces, pick up more pieces of Phoenix than the
grid had done, pick up pieces of New River, Cave Creek,
and Carefree. I'm not sure where that was. It
respects -- does takehinnaxsmallxpiece of Scottsdale,
East-West side projects out, to make population equality in that area.

This district, I'd note, is an extremely high growth district. We regarded it, as discussed in the plan, as having shared interest high growth with this area.

Other than the City of Scottsdale AUR, and Yavapai County area here, there is flexibility in how this area is divided, if that is the Commission's wish.

Next, District N, Central Glendale, Central Phoenix, which is the corner district here zoom in a bit.

This district's shape is driven in large part to respect the borders of the Hispanic AUR and is driven, drawn, sorry, does regretfully cross into Glendale, very similar to the grid district as well.

Just minor adjustments.

We took a extra little piece here to drop a small piece down here to improve the representation of our Hispanic AUR identified and improve the unification of that AUR. This only includes the cities of Glendale and Phoenix, and both of those are split. Phoenix, as you well know, has to be split.

District O, the Northeastern Phoenix, a little bit to give perspective, this is the area between
Northern Phoenix, is a high growth suburban district. Down here, Central Phoenix, the Paradise Valley District. Again, majority non-Hispanic white. It changes from the grid with respect to the Scottsdale City line and gave up portions of the north Phoenix area. And we picked up the Altadena Park Lookout Mountain area to make up for dropping of those two areas. It is entirely within the City of Phoenix. It does not cross into Paradise Valley nor into Scottsdale. Last but certainly not lease, District V, Central Phoenix. This is a 54 percent Hispanic district, almost 66 percent total minority district. Zoom in a little bit. And it also the entirely within the City of Phoenix. It respects the City of Glendale city line, and I-10 and other freeways are fairly marked on the south, and marking on the east.

That's quick run through of the individual districts.

We welcome your responses and instructions.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, I was going to ask Christiana Dominguez to give you more detail on the Hispanic and Native American details. In the interests of time, perhaps if questions come up, she can respond.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Dr. Heslop.

I would like to suggest a format. Please, this is off the top of my head. If you have a better idea, I'd be happy to entertain that. Because in this instance there are 30 inter-related, changes in one ripple through 30, as opposed to the Congressional maps we had been dealing with prior to this.

What I'd like to do is deal with one of to things, either start with general things, the map as it exists, general reactions, as opposed to District O or L, what might need specific attention, and/or go back through the list, a district at a time, and take comments about each of the districts, again in general terms.

I would ask the Commission if there is a perceived issue or problem with a district, that we merely state the problem and ask the consultants to attempt to correct the problem but not dictate the correction. Because once we do that we will have affected every other district around it and will have rendered other suggestions not possible to correct.

We'll need to look at this in totality, which means that -- let's talk about what we find troublesome or conversely what we really like about the district and ask it either be corrected xor preserved depending on the
point of view and provide sufficient time for the consultants to work those problems through and come back to us after a recess with suggested corrections.

Does that seem reasonable?

Would you like to go through it a district at a time? I'm hearing yes and no and that's useful.

Mr. Huntwork and then Ms. Minkoff.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: More with this, more with this map than others, we talk about the rest of Arizona, rural areas of Arizona. One section, Tucson in another, Phoenix in another, it might make it easier to keep track.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: In other words, instead of each of the 30, cluster them geographically, as you suggest. Again I'm open.

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Actually, as we went through them, with certain exceptions, it was done that way.

I'm pleased you suggest we ask for changes and don't have to tell them how to do it. That's a very daunting process.

One general comment I have to make. I think I'm beginning to sound like a broken record.
Whatever adjustments are made to the entire state,
Legislative Districts, that the issue of competitiveness
be considered to the extent that we have the data to do
it at this point.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, if I may
come back to what you said, I'm agreeing with the
general outlined principle. Simply looking at the hour,
which is approaching lunch time. In light of that, I'm
saying I wonder if it would be better for us to take
this in a more piecemeal fashion. Already we have them
looking and working on issues we said with respect to
the grid. If we were to take an extended lunch and
provide the consultants some general feedback, in other
words, each Commissioner take an opportunity and talk
about some general issues relative to general concerns,
and then go to lunch and let them tweak, based upon some
of those general issues, then I think it would be more
useful and relevant come backing district by district,
try to eat the sandwich a bite at a time and accommodate
as best we can as far as the efficiency of the schedule,
also.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: That's two extended
breaks today, an extended break it would be that, and after
the district by district, another extended break. It's only a quarter to 12:00. I suggest we spend about an hour going through this, see how well we do the district by district. I don't know how it will long take. I only have five, six things at this point. Let's see if there's more to do at this point. When it comes back to us later on, maybe there will be fewer adjustments we have to make.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think I tend to favor Ms. Minkoff's scenario just from the standpoint if we're going to keep the comments relatively general with respect to the districts, my sense is it's going to take more than a couple hours for those adjustments to be made for districts. That one break, if we limit it to one break, keep it limited to one break for the consultants, I do think your suggestion means we'll need to have two extended breaks.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I agree with that, Mr. Chairman. If brevity, all in favor, in light of the fact one break for Congressional Districts, if in reality we go through, say, within a short period of time, here are ideas, I think that's feasible; if that doesn't appear to be possible, given I can't predict for the other Commissioners, only for myself, I can go through relatively rapidlyxandrgiveageneral principles
on districts. That's certainly a feasible plan.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's give it a go, see if we can get it done.

Mr. Huntwork's suggestion, take it in clusters, as opposed to district by district, let's start as the presentation started.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Prior to that, Mr. Chairman, can I make request we receive first of all a summary of districts relative to the three communities of interest, in other words, a summary of Hispanic, a summary relative to Native American interests, and a summary relative to rural versus urban interests?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, Dr. Heslop, can you, or the consultants, can you give us a summary with regard to those AURs?

DR. HESLOP: A brief summary or rather more extended summary?

COMMISSIONER HALL: For example, how many Hispanic majority minority Legislative Districts are there based on the predraft plan are there, if you will?

DR. HESLOP: There are nine Hispanic and one Native American.

COMMISSIONER HALL: How many districts are there that are rural that are unaffected by any urban area?
DR. HESLOP: Well, there's -- you know we've had a little difficulty defining that. But I think perhaps you could say four to five rural districts.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Leoni.

MS. LEONI: May I make a clarification. I'm not sure if Dr. Heslop meant to say.

DR. HESLOP: Hispanic communities.

MS. LEONI: Nine total minority-majority districts.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I can't hear you.

MS. LEONI: Nine minority, total majority-minority districts. Six Hispanic majority districts, six districts are majority districts. There are nine total majority-minority districts. There are six Hispanic minority districts. And there are three Hispanic influence districts with percentages over 40 percent. And this is set forth in the binder, Commissioner Hall, tab two.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Are the three, placed on the record, are the three part of the nine?

MS. LEONI: Yes, they are. These three influence districts are in majority-minority districts in terms of total population. For example, District T
is 44 percent Hispanic in total population. The total
minority population of District T is 55 percent.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Ms. Leoni, when you
describe majority-minority population, are you using
total population or voting age population?

MS. LEONI: I gave you figures of total
population. I also have voting age population, as do
you. Tab two, page six, has this data in it.

Now there is also a total minority
district. Excuse me. Let me check this before I say
it. There is also a total minority district which
includes a large majority of American Indians, and that
is district C.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Which is not listed
on page six.

MS. LEONI: That is not listed. That is
the Hispanic chart. It is listed in the second
paragraph below.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right. If we could,
then, move through geographically and make comments
relative to that area of the state and the districts
contained therein.

Does it make some sense to follow the same
order as was presented?

So, Doug, you could perhaps zero in on
the cluster of districts that make sense geographically
that mirror the presentation, we'll give you some
comments.

MR. JOHNSON: Started out with Yuma
district, a sort of geographic area. Start there or go
with Tucson?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: No. Let's start where you
started. Comments on District Q or that portion of the
state.

While others are focusing in, I note that
because this AUR takes more -- because this district
includes more than Yuma County, it includes parts of
western Maricopa County and also western parts of Pima
county. Ajo, which legislatively has been linked east,
is now linked west. And I would ask if there is a
practical way to correct that situation only because
that linkage is -- has been traditional. And many of
the issues that are appropriate to be dealt with in
eastern Pima County are centered in the county seat
which is Tucson. I understand you can't keep the county
whole, but in that instance, it is clearly something I
would like you to take a look at.

Other comments for this area of the state?

If not --

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
COMMISSIONERxHALL:zoThere are. I didn't
know if going in any order.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: My question is it's my recollection there was some desire for linkage between La Paz County and Yuma. Was there a reason or maybe I -- we didn't go north on that?

MR. JOHNSON: Yuma County is 160,000 people, so the entirety of the non-Yuma area is only 11,000 people. We could certainly have picked up La Paz, but we'd have not gotten far enough for it to be a significant piece, La Paz. And it's a significant piece of an AUR and would have disrupted that.

COMMISSIONER HALL: What is the -- what is the community in the northeast portion of that district right --

MR. JOHNSON: This area here?

COMMISSIONER HALL: The community there --

MR. JOHNSON: The noncontiguous piece of Buckeye centered on the prison there. The total Maricopa district is right about 7,000 people. We don't get into any of the truly dense population.

COMMISSIONER HALL: What is the population of Ajo?

MR. JOHNSON: Ajo is 3,700, and the rest of that section of the countyAisz200 other people.
COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Pardon me?

MR. JOHNSON: The rest of Pima County is 200 people and 3,700 in Ajo.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any other comments on this section?

If not, move on to the next section. Probably around Tucson.

MR. JOHNSON: Excuse me, eastern Arizona counties.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Comments on this portion of the map?

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The only comment is that's what they asked for. It seemed to work. I think it looks fine.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: There are a couple pieces that we fixed that result in the shape of the whole series of districts across Northern Arizona. And this is one of them, and Yavapai is the other. Had we not done that, the map I think would look quite a bit different. The ripple effect basically does two things. It doesn't look very good when you get over to A and D.

Those districts really bear the brunt of what we did over here, I believe.
I think it would be -- I think it might be possible to create things that make a lot more sense around Flagstaff, Verde Valley, that area, the river communities, portions of Mohave, La Paz counties that have been carved out if we had greater flexibility in some of those other areas.

I would like to see how, one, fixing essentially both P and B and F are --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Basically Eastern Arizona and Yavapai.

MR. HUNTWORK: Yeah. I would like to see what would happen if we, one, fixed those and let the consultants propose something we do based on other communities of interest, how it would work out.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I don't know that that is sufficient direction to assist. I share the concern. It seems clear that the map as developed was, and maybe I overemphasized, to Doug, I don't know, driven by those fairly large geographic pieces we understand are part of the AUR process in terms of legislative processing. What it did do, it had significant impact where you then had to configure surrounding territories in order to make the entire map work. So I don't know what specific instruction we can give you about that.
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I do share the general concern raised by
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1 Mr. Huntwork.

2 Ms. Minkoff.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Let me respond. I
4 look at F, and I liked it, because it's what people
5 asked for and we were able to achieve it. On the other
6 hand, as we go throughout the rest of map, I'll point
7 out, I'm sure other people point out, people asked for
8 things and the map doesn't treat them quite so well.
9 I think it's important we respect AURs.
10 This was AUR was respected. There were other AURs not
11 quite so respected.
12 The direction I'd possibly give to NDC is
13 to the extent possible, continue to respect the AUR
14 represented by District F; however, not over and above
15 other AURs. I consider them to be equally important.
16 While I'd like to see this district be maintained, if
17 some adjustment to it allows us to be more responsive to
18 several other AURs that were presented to us, then I
19 think that's appropriate.
20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.
21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I probably voiced
22 Ms. Minkoff's comments in the beginning. If, that's
23 what we have as an AUR, that's what the response is of
24 the people in hearings as expressed in the southern part
25 that I went to. Phoenix, Arizona
My concerns are going to focus primarily on L, when we get to that.

There's some adjacency there we have pretty good-sized problems in that may very well affect F. It relates back to the same mines I brought up several times, other things as far as Mammoth, Globe, areas to the north.

I'm really concerned with L, that it's going to affect F and the surrounding areas.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: And E.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yeah, and E.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments?

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: One plan specifically that was presented to us was the Navajo plan. Came down F, the Apache reservations, united them with the Navajo reservation. And that is another plan and reflects obviously a community of interest very strongly. It might be a starting point to -- an alternative approach, if we wanted to look at one.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments about this portion of the state?

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: This was, without question, the most well-supported plan by the
constituents within the area, a resolution by all County
Supervisors and all City Councils and city managers.
Therefore, I think it was a building block because of
the unanimity because of those within there. Because of
that, there are some questions within that that have to
be addressed. We all have similar concerns.

With respect to L, certainly as mentioned
by some in public input, that linking L with Casa Grande
may well make more sense. I think that there are
solutions that still respects the communities of
interest as were heard on the record.

For starters, we heard what you said, give
it to you because we don't like the lines; we're not
going to give it to you. I think it violates a
fundamental principle of a community of interest. At
this point here, what I'd say, to instruct the
consultants, and then tell our consultants to do
something -- to do something different, I think is
counterproductive.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments?

Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I hear that and
agree to a large extent. The only problem, it's very
complex. When we gave the instruction, we didn't know
what the consequences would be. I remember talking, you
know, about it to the point of just re-repeating myself until Commissioner Hall and others were losing patience with me to say these are tentative decisions and we have to see what the ripple effect was before it was cast in concrete. I said that about F, said it about B, said it about the Pinal County direction we gave as well which wasn’t followed nearly as well as the Eastern County’s direction was.

So, again, this is an initial approach and we may very well be able to use parts of it. But it obviously creates problems elsewhere and we need to look at alternatives before we can make a decision on the bottom line.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I’ll speak to it more before we get to the map, the Pinal County plan Mr. Huntwork mentioned, which happened to be one county rather than five counties, an extremely well-supported plan by the residents of the area, not supported in the draft map. I’ll address that when we get to that area.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next area, Mr. Johnson.

Next is area G.

MR. JOHNSON: Next go down to the Tucson eastern area.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let’s start with G the
difficulty, as I see it with G, is that it extends from
the eastern part of Tucson, and not so much even the
Vail area, Tanque Verde area, that area of the state all
the way to the New Mexico border down to the Mexico
border. It may very well be -- give us an idea when you
come back to what the Metro Tucson influence is on that
area.

MR. JOHNSON: I can do that now.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay.

MR. JOHNSON: There are 117,000 people in
Cochise and 2,700 in this portion of Santa Cruz. So
that's 120,000, leaving about 50,000 coming from this
portion of Pima County.

I can come back with what more specifics
are right in the Northeastern Tucson area, if you like.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I guess my concern would
be, to the extent possible, I'd like to see that the
characteristics of this district remain rural without as
much Tucson influence. I have a concern about that.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Isn't that some of
the Green Valley, Vail, some of the smaller communities
around Tucson as well?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Small communities,
MR. JOHNSON: 50,000. I can come back with what is exactly Metropolitan Tucson.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The other concern is Green Valley probably has less in common with the border communities than it does with East Valley, Tucson, as we configured it in the congressional map. I'd like you to take a look at some scenario that would reunite that relationship as opposed to going all the way east.

COMMISSIONER HALL: What you are saying is include more of the border?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: That's one possible solution.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I concur with that suggestion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other suggestions on this area?

Let's go ahead and do Metro Tucson then. Comments on this portion of the map?

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, this is a comment, once again, I'll make when we get back to the central part of the state; but looking at the northern part of the Tucson metropolitan area, I see places like Avra Valley, Catalina, Oro Valley, et cetera, placed with the rural mining communities of
Tucson. I'm not sure that's good. The gold-colored portion, to bring that back into Metropolitan Tucson, I think would be a better fit.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think, this is the southern border district of L, is problematic in several ways. It links portions of east Mesa, et cetera, the suburbs, et cetera, and is taking much of Pinal County in between. There has to be a solution to that. If that's influenced by the eastern valley AUR, there are suggestions for that.

Another technical piece I want to suggest is a dividing line between district I and district A, I believe. I'm not necessarily asking you to do that now. I believe there are portions North-South along North Sixth Avenue. Traditionally South 12th Avenue is naturally the dividing line between those portions of the community. I suggest looking at adjusting that line westward to South 12th.

The other thing, these are so, I know, all interdependent, the difficulty of excluding Avra Valley into the district to the far northwest, and maybe it can't be helped, doesn't seem to me like it fits.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: We addressed Avra Valley. That area is probably not of the larger
agriculture areas. Picture Rocks and beyond is pretty much native desert, a nonagricultural area. The area to the east of Marana is agriculture, although in expansion. It seems as though it would link better to there.

I keep going back to L as a problem area. But it may work. I don't know what the populations are. What are the populations of Mammoth, the San Manuel area, in relation to Catalina, Oro Valley? What I'm wondering, if we look at the area, District G, looking at trying to make, remove the influence of Tucson, if we extend up across the border, picked up the mining communities, there is mining in Douglas, smelters, things that relate through there. Maybe that's a way of taking that anomaly out of the equation in area L and bringing it back in Oro Valley, into the district. It might be one solution possibility to look at, even though it does break the county line. Seems like Pinal County has been broken all to heck. I would like to avoid it.

Like communities, the AUR, the glue aspects might be better served if we can't bring it into the area that -- eastern counties, you know, the AUR.

To the area to the south, we're looking at ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE H initially. There is an fairly strong Hispanic area
that is near Summit. And I was wondering what the shift
was in that area. If we took the area along I-10 and
brought it over to include Summit but left the area
north of Tucson, raised it further, that doesn't have
much population. Would that not reflect the total
Hispanic community? Might be a shift or change you see
there, looked at. May not work but it may.

I'd like to -- stay on H or talk about the
whole valley.

I'd like to look at K, problems with K,
and probably J, say the basin.

We have barriers there that have been
traditional problems with access campaigning Mr. Owens
made comments about, the large campaign areas, areas you
have to drive 13 miles around the barrier to get to a
polling place.

If we could look at the river as an edge,
and maybe we have to extend the area that had been the
Tanque Verde River marker to include that in K, taking
it out of the Cochise area when we look at San Manuel so
the whole series of ripple effects, similar areas,
foothill areas, to bring to the south of the areas, San
Manuel, I guess area J, there's an I, it must be J, the
salmon brown, that would seem to make more sense.

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hall.
COMMISSIONER HALL: Based on some of those comments, I think that given some of the suggestions and testimony we've heard with respect to Pinal County, I'm starting there because I think if you work out to the end it makes it cleaner. I think we've proven that. If you take some suggestions, include Casa Grande with portions of the eastern valley, that cleans up whatever district that is to the south. I can't see it on my computer. Mr. Lynn previously indicated that area was more influenced via Tucson. Take, as suggested by Mr. Lynn, what Pima County cleans up there, with suggestions relative to internal Tucson, utilizing rural portions of Pinal, and tying it into the southeast, and it cleans a lot of that up, protects rural versus urban, and accommodates all surrounding areas.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: To go along with that, now we're looking more specifically, looks like you divided North-South, and it almost makes more sense East-West, or the line horizontally at Dudleyville going west and leaving Casa Grande to the north, and Mammoth, and those to the south as opposed to dividing East-West now.

MR. JOHNSON: Which are you talking about, Pinal County? Phoenix, Arizona
COMMISSIONER ELDER: Zoom out so we at
look at Pinal.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: In other words, I was
looking at here where you have the mines, Dudleyville,
south to intersection of 10 and eight, 10 and five,
whatever that is, north of Eloy, south of Casa Grande,
divide Pinal County North-South as opposed to east and
west, might lead to other ideas. I can look at Mammoth
San Manuel as part of the mining community, the
community of Green Valley, easier than saying San Manuel
and Oro Valley, Gold Canyon. Those all fit together, or
in one district, excuse me, not an AUR.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further comments on this
portion of the state?

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: As long as we're
talking about L, I think we ought to take a hard look at
the Casa Grande plan itself, just as it was presented.
It provides division between Phoenix and Tucson, and it
does connect communities very well.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'd like to agree
with that. I think Pinal County has been chopped up not
because of any competing plans, just because of where
they're located in the state. I don't recall anybody saying that the Pinal County plan was not a good idea and messed up their AUR. I'd like to see if we can achieve as much as possible. The areas maybe in play are Saddlebrooke, which probably fits much better with Pima County than Pinal County and Apache Junction, depending on population, and may stay best with Pinal County or may work best with the greater Phoenix Metropolitan area. Those are areas to be flexible, Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, Saddlebrooke, as much as possible. Let's try to see if we can adopt all or most of the Pinal County plan.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay. Ready to move on? Yavapai.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I realize we have yet to make a determination relative to the final determination for draft purposes relative to the Hopi Navajo issue which I'm sure we're going to address again. It's my opinion whatever we do, we have to do for both. So given that proviso, as Mr. Huntwork indicated earlier, there is some testimony that the northeastern portion of Yavapai, on the other side of Mingus Mountain, some want it to
be separate, and there are alternatives, given the
variables, in the other Northwestern and eastern
portions of the state. There are other alternatives, I
think, within this area. One of the, you know, and
again, it's hard to talk about one without the other.
There is certainty, however, some tremendous
conveniences and strengths of maintaining county numbers
we've done with the exception of the City of Sedona. So
we can maybe look at, I guess, comments we've had on
two, three other issues. I think generally are we going
to say to our consultants come back with two, three
alternatives. Is that what we're saying?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We can do that or may
offer some, in attempting to follow the direction
they're given they may offer more than one alternative
in terms of a solution or choose between or among them.

COMMISSIONER HALL: It's likely
consultants will offer what alternatives are in Yavapai.
I think it's pretty clear. And -- but nevertheless, I
have a tendency to want to support maintaining talking
about those to the extent we can. This is certainly the
time I support that.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: One thing we heard
loud and clear, I don't recall much dissenting testimony

at all, the desire of Verde, Valley to remain united,
one district, and not be split. Of course, this plan
doesn't. But the other issue was where do they go. And
when I say Verde Valley, mostly it's who they hook up
with. While I recall there was testimony both
directions, the majority of testimony said we are linked
more to the north than we are to the west, that our
commonalty of is that it really falls more with
Flagstaff than they do with Prescott. Looking at this
map, we had to take portions of Coconino County to unify
Sedona, then it goes up and takes part of Munds Park.
And Munds Park is south suburban Flagstaff. That now is
partially hooked up with Prescott rather than with
Flagstaff. I would say when you look at Yavapai County,
in a sense, seconding what Mr. Hall said, that Mingus
Mountain is a natural divider. And it seems to me that
the entire Verde Valley Sedona area is really a better
fit with Flagstaff than Prescott and the rest of Yavapai
County. I'd like you to look at that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman,
there was a lot of testimony that linked Sedona and
Verde Valley. That was absolutely true. I think there
was very little dispute about that. There was
absolutely conflicting testimony about where it should
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go. I think it was --it's, inaccurate to say that
predominant testimony was one way or the other. I just think it was conflicting.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Correct. Some say they preferred to be with Prescott. Conflicting, that's correct. There were a multitude of alternatives. Hook them with the west, you are talking, by doing that, though, automatically split about three more counties. And so the ripple effect is significant. One of the factors in this consideration is, at some point, is this Hopi-Navajo issue. And that would significantly affect I think all of the portions of what we do.

We haven't got there yet, but A is a rather ugly district. There is strength with respect to the -- with respecting the AURs that are represented in public meetings.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I would weigh in on the side of the Munds Park area which relates extremely well to areas to the south a ways. Flagstaff, the golf course area, resort, similar to Sedona, from that area. Reading testimony, I don't see a strength one way or the another of where Sedona and that part fits. It was conflicting at best.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, as the crow flies, MundshParkxisAaszclose to Sedona as
Flagstaff. To get to one place, Flagstaff, I-17, you go Sedona, go through Oak Creek, it takes closer to a half hour, 40 minutes. People that live in Pine Wood don't go into Sedona nearly as often as they go to Flagstaff.

COMMISSIONER HALL: But it's a beautiful drive.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: When we take our mother's to dinner, we go to Sedona.

COMMISSIONER HALL: My opinion, it is indisputable relative to splitting Sedona. I think we made the right decision regarding maintaining that community as a whole.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If we may move on to another section.

MR. JOHNSON: The next area closely related is District C, the Navajo Reservation District with Flagstaff.

One item I might point out, might help clarify, the instruction from the Commission, also testimony from Hopi, did mention they were fairly adamant in wanting to be separated on the Legislative level. They did refer to, they did mention -- the Commission mentioned it was a lower priority.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I had a couple questions. There are some fingers coming down on the
southern border. Is that reservation boundary lines all
the way across the southern boundary of this district
until you get to by Winslow? Is Winslow in it or out of
it?

MR. JOHNSON: That shows the reservation
border.

Let me double-check on Winslow.
Winslow is out of this district.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Winslow is out. Is
Winslow West a split?

MR. JOHNSON: Winslow West is split. It's
a Census designated place. When we could, we also tried
to make those.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Holbrook split, or in,
or out?

MR. JOHNSON: Holbrook is unified outside
of district C.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Particularly with
this district, I think we have to compare it with the
Navajo plan that was proposed. The main thing about the
Navajo plan, the main thing in this avoids the
relatively dense non-Native American population in
Flagstaff and included additional reservations both to
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the west and to the south.x,Soritocreated a district
which unquestionably we have a much higher percentage of Native Americans, two plans on my screen. I don't have this data.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Talking about the Navajo?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Navajo.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The issue I had with the Navajo plan, my major concern about that, was there was a small area of Apache County kind of isolated among all the Indian reservations, and it didn't seem to be a good fit. They were similar to the issue we had with Congressional Districts of Ahwatukee. It just didn't go there.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments?

Okay. Move forward.

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Next one I think is District A.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I don't know what to tell to do with this district, but please do something. I am imagining an individual campaigning in this district or having been elected representing this district, and it's an absolute nightmare. You have to go from Parker, and the riverAcommunities, and somehow
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get up to the Arizona strip to Fredonia, to Colorado City, and/or to the Hopi Reservation and Williams, and it's just an impossible district to cover. I think that wherever a representative lives, the rest of the district will never see him or her because it's just going to be impossible. I think something has to be done to create a district to get from place to place and create a district to connect with the people that live there.

COMMISSIONER HALL: With all due respect, we're not drawing districts for the candidates, we're drawing it for the people. One of the strengths of the district, while excessively ugly, it's while pointed out in the presentation, this would not only it keep intact in the river AUR. Simultaneously, all areas have a very similar interest with respect to tourism, the Williams link to Grand Canyon. Grand Canyon, if not the highest tourist spot, Lake Havasu, the bridge, et cetera, all rely on tourism. With respect to an economic analysis, I think there is a significant similarity within that district.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Just want to make sure you understood my previous statement. I wasn't being sympathetic to candidates or elected officials, it's the people they represent. They have a right to
see those people from time to time. I'm not concerned with making it easy on the candidate except we've heard in many public meetings where current districts are very oddly shaped and people campaigned, they never see their legislators, "They're never here. They're supposed to represent us, but we have no way to connect to them."

So that's my point.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: With respect to that point, as a way to indicate population, the cluster is?

MR. JOHNSON: I didn't develop a specific cluster by county. The population density is heavily along the river, about 7,000 in the Hopi Reservation. I believe there's around 60,000 total through this region.

I'm not exactly sure how the notes appear to go through or where the dividing line is. I can give you specific numbers.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: In general, the situation -- in a couple situations we did hear citizens say the representative of my district never comes to see me. Some people say this is my representative and he didn't know he represented them. Not only the more spread out it is, the more clustered the population is in one area, I think that problem becomes.
I do think, Andi, I think you put your finger on an extremely important point.

CHAIRMAN LYNNE: You get the sense of the comments of the Commission.

Moving on.

CHAIRMAN LYNNE: Next section.

MR. JOHNSON: Next section, District D, in land and the Maricopa district.

CHAIRMAN LYNNE: Any comments on this section?

I think, to the extent, one of the things is talking about to the extent you are going to do something with that western-northern-eastern district across the top of the state. It might have some influence in terms of at least section D in this part of the state. So -- okay.

Moving on.

MR. JOHNSON: Now we move on into the Maricopa County. Let me pull this.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have a couple questions about District Y. First of all, I notice you split Glendale. There was some testimony from Glendale saying it was okay to split them. They gave suggested lines as to where they would like to be divided,
Northern. That's where we divided them.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The other question is about Peoria. Westbrook Village is part of the City of Peoria. Is that a Y or is that in the area of the Sun Cities?

MR. JOHNSON: I don't know Westbrook Village.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Westbrook village is North of Union Hills and east of Sun City. I don't know the exact boundaries of it. It's part of City of Peoria but linked much more in terms of commonalty of interest with the Sun Cities.

MR. JOHNSON: The district line followed is the city border there, so it's east of Sun City and within the District Y Peoria district. If it's north, I can give you the street border, if you like.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The printed information you gave us says something about the Peoria border southwest of Westbrook. I'm not sure I understand that.

MR. JOHNSON: I'm sorry, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Reading from the printed material you gave us, go with District Y. I'm not sure what you've written about Peoria. Peoria, split the city border southwest and west, Westbrook Drive.
MR. JOHNSON: Let me pull that up here. Westbrook Drive is the curvy northern border here. It appears that, assuming from the Census blocks, these are probably Westbrook.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think that's probably Westbrook Village.

MR. JOHNSON: The majority includes Peoria, Westbrook Village.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I suggest since a portion is the gray district, what is that District D, the gray colored district.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Look at including Westbrook Village, that portion right next-door to Sun City. They do a lot of things together. It seems to be a better fit.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments on this section?

Let's move on.

General Metropolitan Phoenix.

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes. I had a suggestion on District S, S as in Sam, in the central part of the city. I'd like to echo the comments earlier today from a representative, from the Phoenix Historical
District AUR. A lot of it is contained in District S. There is a small area to the west and south of District S, currently a part of District R. It makes District S a little more of compact shape and it unites, I think, four Historic Districts that really have much more of a connection with the current population of District S than they do with District R, the neighborhood, historic neighborhood Palmcroft, and I think one other there. But they are all in that little tongue of R that juts into S.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: For what it's worth I would like to ditto that. I'm familiar with that area of Phoenix. I think that would be relatively obvious. One other thought on top of that, I had more of a chance to study some of the other plans than our own plan because of the amount of time we've had it, and a group of folks in the Congressional, in the last couple days, it makes difficult to be specific about other things. If you look in general areas, when you get in the north, the things above I-10, in general, I think as it goes out, it's a vague comment. If you look at the minority plan, Hispanic plan, it comes closer to describing the way people live and travel, and so on, in those areas than the horizontal district, particularly O
U and S, a chance to spread out. So . . .

CHAIRMAN LYNN: You are suggesting that
the districts just to the east of I-17, in that
depiction, might be better represented with a vertical
rather than a horizontal representation.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Primarily, yes.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: In other words, to
combine that -- to combine U and O and redivide them
along a North-South axis?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Something like
that, yes. It's not quite that simple.

It's very hard to see. I have several
maps in front of me.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes, you do.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The red lines are
the Hispanic plan.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Again, the instruction to
the consultants is along the lines of what we've said.

Take a look at those two particular
districts and look at a vertical rather than a
horizontal division.

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: We can do the east
valley, also.
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I recallohearing during testimony from the City
of Tempe begging us to put them into one Legislative District saying it really seemed to work, that the community is just sort of a model community, landlocked community, is not going to grow north, southeast, or west. Maybe up. They asked us to please, please, please, please put them into one Legislative District.

I would ask you to please examine doing that.

Population is a little low. If I recall, population is just shy of 160,000.

I had input from people in Guadalupe that said while they are very, very comfortable being in the kind of district that they were put in for Congressional Districts, they felt in terms of a Congressional District, that is where their interests lie. In terms of a Legislative District, the Justice Courts they use are in Tempe. The school districts their children go to are in Tempe. There are a lot of intergovernmental agreements sharing sales tax for Arizona bills and development just down road. It might be a way to pick up extra population, five, six thousand, put them with Tempe. And then the very southern portion of Scottsdale, to fill that out. I think that taking Scottsdale as far north as Camelback Road, combining with Tempe, is really combining apples and oranges, two communities that don't connect that well.
The extreme portion of Scottsdale, south
McDowell, wherever you need to go to get population,
makes a much better district, also responds more closely
to the public comment we had and meetings we went to.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Correct me if I'm
wrong. Wasn't Guadalupe included in R to supplement
Hispanic equals in that district.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: R is pretty heavily
Hispanic. Guadalupe is Hispanic.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I asked a question.
NDC, what would that do with respect to the minority
issue, if you take Guadalupe out.

MR. JOHNSON: I don't recall exactly what
the numbers are. Prior to saying that, one of the
reasons for linking that, as the Commission, the Mayor
of Guadalupe requested, put it with Tempe, the past
Mayor asked -- we were torn both ways.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yeah. Guadalupe,
because small, is probably an area that's going to be in
play. I'm suggesting if you need to find more people to
add to add to Tempe, it's too small to be a Legislative
District. It may be an area you look at. I'm not
suggesting it's the only area. I think there's
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consideration -- incidentally, District R, as currently
drawn, is 62 percent Hispanic; and it's only about 21
percent non-Hispanic white, non-Hispanic. It will
remain a strong majority-minority district regardless of
where Yuma ends up.

MR. RIVERA: Just for clarification, the
person she referred to was Mayor at the time she said
that, is now no longer Mayor, has been voted out since
then.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: They had a coup.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the
east valley area?

Comments on district L, earlier impact all
the way up into Apache Junction, the Queen Creek area,
again, restate those.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Go back again over
the dividing lines of the districts in Mesa, primarily
the districts in Mesa, the south dividing line.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: North-south -- southern
boundaries.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: East-west and
southern dividing lines?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: There's time to accomplish
that.
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MR. JOHNSON:x, The big picture, the border
between the western most Mesa District and Central Mesa Districts, North Country Club Drive and Main Street.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd like to remind members of the audience, if you think you are having a private conversation in the corner of the room, you are not. The acoustics are such we all hear what is going on on cellphone conversations, even what's on the cellphones themselves. So if you'd be so kind, if you keep your cellphone on, put it on stun rather than ring. We'd appreciate it. It would be helpful.

MR. JOHNSON: Continuing along, the border on the west is the city line here between Mesa and Tempe. Continue around the southeast arm, stick with the city border. Going back to divisions within Mesa, essentially along Gilbert Road, this is East Broadway Road. After it comes up --

Oh, this is a city line. And here, this jogs around to population equality requirements. Roughly it comes up to Main Street and then runs up to East Booth, up around 97th to Brown, and continues northward, jogs along Norris Street to Nursery Pass Road. I believe this is the reservation, yes. And then over in the far east edge, District L, the lines there, Meridian line, picking up again on East Broadway, no, Crismon Road there, thee Mesa Districts.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments or questions?

Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I'd like request when we come back we have statistics with respect to proposed alternatives and party registration data.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: As I understand, those are available, can be made available to us as we --

MR. JOHNSON: Yes. We do have the data.

The only reason we don't have it at this point, Chris, is the one, the party registration expert, he might have passed out at this point.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right. Other sections of the general Phoenix area map you'd like to discuss?

We may be almost finished.

Any additional comments on the legislative map before we ask the consultants to do their work?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I don't have any more.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I think plenty have been made.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let me ask this question. Is this then the appropriate time to break to allow the ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE consultants to do their work? Arizona
Lisa, bear with me. We're about at a place we can take a break.

Dr. Heslop, I want to ask this question: We sent one part of the team to work on Congressional adjustments as we directed.

DR. HESLOP: I'd like to think they're working. They may be sleeping. However, I'm sure they're finished.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I guess my question is this: You'll give us an estimate of how long you think it will take to look at this. What I'd also like to hear is when the other material we asked to be developed might be available so, again, we don't lose time in terms of waiting for some of it to review it.

DR. HESLOP: My suggestion will be we complete the analysis on the Congressional plan. I'm not sure of it. I'm not certain. I'm pretty certain with the time involved, the time involved is sufficient to have completed the work and when you come back that could be presented to you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Leoni.

MS. LEONI: Commissioner Lynn, with the indulgence of the Commission, I'd like to place a cellphone call to the other half of the team to confirm that progress has been sufficient.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand what you are asking for. My assumption, Dr. Heslop, you're telling me the Legislative adjustments will take four hours to make. I'd simply reverse out a portion of that to cover other work, break for a shorter duration is all I'm asking for.

DR. HESLOP: Exactly what I'm leading to. I suppose if the Congressional plan took an hour, we'd like four hours, so you take three.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is that a reasonable amount of time for you?

Again, the goal is to make substantial progress in this break to be able to have us look much more closely at the revisions to the Legislative map when we return.

Is four hours sufficient?

DR. HESLOP: It is, sir.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's wait for a moment, get confirmation on the Congressional revisions. If so, it appears as though we'll shortly stand in recess for approximately three hours.

MS. LEONI: Commissioner Lynn, we were simultaneously calling each other. I got her message system. She doesn't have mine.
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They are on the last of the
I feel within a short time, a reasonable lunch break, they will be prepared to be back.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Then we will take a three-hour break so as to give this team sufficient time to begin the Legislative work, hear from the other team, and move expeditiously into the Legislative report.

Any objection to that schedule for the balance of the afternoon?

Is that acceptable?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Are you saying 4:00?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: 4:00. We'll recess until 4:00 p.m., at which time we'll hear back from the Congressional group and then subsequently the Legislative group.

Without objection, we're in recess.

(Recess taken at 1:00 p.m. until approximately 4:00 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd like to call the Commission back into session.

I'd like the record to reflect all five Commissioners as well as legal counsel and the consultants are present.

We'll return to NDC for an updated report of the Congressional following this morning's
instructions.

Dr. Adams.

DR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, it sounds like I have a mike here, so let's move forward.

The first thing that we were asked to do, first thing discussed by the Commissioners, was the reverse move of Ahwatukee. We were asked to move that territory into District B. And what we have now done is move it back out. There were several options for the consequences of such an action. And I want to just talk to you a little bit about that. We tested, added back the Hispanic community, a very simple test. All you have to do is go back to the plan we presented to you and you will see we have about 20,000 persons from Ahwatukee in that particular map, so Ahwatukee was divided and then Glendale was also divided.

We also tested adding the West Valley cities. The consequence of that, there was insufficient population to add to that territory in that area. I'll show you a slide in just a minute that will show you that. And then as a result, I'll also show the diluted result of the Hispanic community. And then the third test we did, I'll get into this a little more, adding territory from District B, that is in the
sort of North Central Phoenix area, into District B.  
And this did strengthen the minority district. It also 
facilitates another concern of the Commissioners, which 
was the possibility of moving District B to the north to 
take in some of that growth area. 

Now here is a map that shows you the 
populations, that was point two on the slide, a possible 
move over to the west. I have little notes. I hope you 
can read the numbers on the map. But as we can see, we 
have 3,810 persons in Litchfield Park; 18,911 in 
Goodyear; Tolleson, that's 4,974. If you move over 
Buckeye, 6,537. You are still short if you move all 
Ahwatukee out, moving 67,000 persons out of area. Still 
short even if you go up to Surprise, still short four, 
five thousand persons. 

So what you are doing, a little pointer 
here, now you can see the cities. So you would then 
even have to fill in possibly Sun City West, Sun City, 
those areas, or the one scenario, if you didn't go up as 
high as El Mirage, Surprise, on the border, it's very 
difficult to pick up population in that area. 

I don't know, Marguerite, if you want to 
speak to the effect of that. We'll wait until there are 
questions on that, if that's all right. 

Okay. So now, we'll look at the results of
the Ahwatukee reverse. District D gains population from
District B. Glendale south. That's not correct. It's
Bethany Home south. Sorry for that correction. It was
actually Bethany Home south. Ahwatukee moves east to
join Tempe, Paradise Valley, moving up north to Paradise
Valley, Scottsdale District E. You'll recall that that
is similar to what we had before. And we talked a
little bit about the consequences of moving east as
well. I know that that is a question in the
Commissioners' minds. District B moves north to the
county boundary sharing growth areas with district E.
Okay. So here you see a map of the
consequences. You can see that that territory, that the
black line is the line of our previous districts. And
I'm going to point to the area that was in our original
map you saw last night, that area. A portion of
Glendale which was not restored back to District D is
still united with the rest of Glendale. The territory
that we took into the district is right here and came
out of District B and came into District D. I'm going
to let Marguerite Leoni tell you the numbers, telling
District D --

MS. LEONI: The iteration of the plan that
we discussed with you this morning had resulted in a
impairment of the community, the South Mountain Hispanic
AUR. It had brought in communities that had not been identified with it. And the result of that was also a reduction in voting strength from an original 59 moving up to 60 percent, which was the original proposal, to about 55. We also confirmed that as a result of that, the voting age population dropped just slightly below 50 percent. This modification of that brings the district back up to about 57.2. And once again the voting age population is over 50 percent.

Moving, as an alternative to taking in the South Phoenix area, moving this district to include territories west, once again brings in largely dissimilar neighborhoods but once again results, because of the numbers and the percentages, results in a great dilution of voting strength in District D. A not heavily Hispanic area becomes less and less so as you move toward the California border.

DR. ADAMS: Thank you, Marguerite.

Okay. Moving on. I'm sure that it's in the Commissioners' minds the possibility of moving the Ahwatukee area into the Chandler, Mesa, and Gilbert area. To do so would cause a ripple effect on District C, the rural district, and/or possibly District G. It would necessitate the division, major division of the City of Mesa and likelyedivisionzofaother east valley
cities. So let's just take a look at that area. And I'll try to point out to you the concerns.

If you move this territory through this way, you are going to have to somehow take population out this way or this way. The population that you would pump out this way into G is going to cause problems with G. Any ripple effect is going to cause you difficulty, because you've got 76,000 persons moving through here. The impact on C would be the possible addition of urban areas to the rural district, which I know is a difficulty and goes against what the Commissioners had hoped to achieve.

As you can see, we have a boundary up here. Say we contained it to this area and just rippled around through this district and back this way, then you would have a very awkward connection of Mesa rippling around this way into District F. And the problem right here has to do with basically a rock and a hard place.

You have an Indian Reservation here that is part of District C and is united with other Native American populations, and you have the Hispanic AUR district right here. And, therefore, you are going to have this corridor.

We did have, though, a lot of testimony that it is appropriate to connect to Ahwatukee to the
Scottsdale area. So that is what we have done in this particular map.

Now, there were some other concerns. And one of those concerns was the Mohave County connection with Maricopa County. One alternative to that creates a U district, basically upside down U, an umbrella. It would take in the rest of Mohave and La Paz into District C and drop most of Yavapai County into District A. I think Chris has described that configuration for you before. Another alternative is a return to a modified draft District C as we presented last night. And so that is another possibility.

I know if you want to revisit that, we could present that to you. Another possibility, Pinal County splits, we have Saddlebrooke, that didn't seem to be a concern to Commissioners, or at least one Commissioner. The mining portions east of Queen Valley is another split. And then the third split is the Apache Junction split, if I can find my little notes here.

The mining portions of -- portions east of Queen Valley, in fact what I'm going to do, I think I have it up here -- well, here we go. Let's address this one, and then I want to get -- no, I want to go back to the map.
Let's go back to the map and see if we can take a look at that.

Doug, if you could -- why don't we bring up that map.

I really want to speak to the situation in Queen Valley and Apache Junction. The splits. Yeah.

I'm not going to be drawing.

What I want you to see here are the consequences or problems with the splits.

This split moves Apache Junction, which is a heavily nonminority community area, into the -- into a connection with the City of Mesa and, thereby, keeps this area as a fairly strong minority district. So that's one split that you have here. Then you also have the mining communities here. Again, restoring those communities back to Pinal County will give you issues with the minority community in District G.

And we've already spoken to Saddlebrooke.

Marguerite do you have anything to add to that?

MS. LEONI: Yeah.

DR. ADAMS: I should think there's some.

MS. LEONI: I want to point out that Apache Junction is less than 10 percent Hispanic. So bringing that town into the southern Arizona AUR would
be dilutive of voting strength.

DR. ADAMS: Okay. Doug, let's go back to
the -- let's go back to the presentation.

Okay.

Okay. An additional voter concern was the
Apache Junction Casa Grande with the Phoenix Metro area.
Here you see some actual numbers on that situation, if
has been addressed a little bit before talking about the
Pinal County splits, the consequence is more than 25,000
persons in District F, the alternative one for balancing
those persons, we would ripple through the Hispanic AUR.
A second alternative for balancing that population,
those 25,000 persons, if you move them down in -- if you
move the Casa Grande area into, into the Phoenix
Metropolitan area alternative, would be to add
population from Ahwatukee or Sun Lakes that border
District G. You know the consequences of both areas
being added to District G, the alternative three for
possible balancing would be to move population into
District C.

You see we have numbers for Apache
Junction and Casa Grande with their Hispanic
populations. And I believe that addresses all the
concerns raised.
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Here is the map of that area so you can
actually see what I was talking about.

Moving Casa Grande into the area with
Apache Junction into what we're calling the Phoenix Metropolitan area district would be causing ripples through this way, possibly, and might balance population by pulling population out here, just doing it within the city district and pulling population out of Sun Lakes or possibly pulling population out from Ahwatukee. Another possibility is to ripple through the Hispanic AUR and pull population in this area from there. So those are the consequences.

And Marguerite and I would be happy to answer any of your questions.

I hope I spoke sufficiently to the move of District B up into that northern territory. I don't have the final numbers on that, but that is something that can be fairly simply adjusted.

It very likely would necessitate splits of Scottsdale, and you should be aware of that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I want to go back to the issue about the mining communities in eastern Pinal County.

DR. ADAMS: Uh-huh.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: AAndi, ainto the mike.
COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm not sure I understood. I'm not sure I understood your explanation of that.

DR. ADAMS: We have one more.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It looks like that's an area of about 7,000 population. I'm not sure if I'm completely accurate. I think it's somewhere around there. And if that were added into District G, it seems to me from a voting rights standpoint, it enhances the district rather than detracts from. The only question is where do you take the 7,000, approximately, people out of District G from someplace else? I don't have an answer.

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Minkoff, we looked at the area, and it does not enhance that territory. I have the numbers on a note here, and I'm not finding it. There's a mining area of 7,295 persons, and the percentage Hispanic population is 46.4 percent Hispanic population, 3,383 persons.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is there a significant Native American population in that area?

DR. ADAMS: I'd have to check that. I'd be happy to check that for you.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It seems to me it's not going to make a great impact on District G from a
voting rights standpoint. My only concern is if you put 7,200 people in, where do you take 7,200 people out?

DR. ADAMS: Exactly. We'd certainly be happy to explore that for you. My concern is particularly about District G. The attorneys can speak more eloquently to this. It is the fragile majority total Hispanic population already. And I don't know whether there's any comments from the attorneys on that.

MR. RIVERA: We spoke about it yesterday.

I have to look at the numbers, as I stated yesterday, once you start looking at the total minority total population, the plus 18 voting population, start dropping close to 50 percent, the closer you get to -- below 50 percent, it becomes a bigger concern.

I'm not quite as eloquent as Dr. Adams.

DR. ADAMS: Say again?

MR. RIVERA: I'm not quite as eloquent as Dr. Adams.

MS. LEONI: I want to point out another concern about this particular district. There is testimony and testimony in the record that the numbers in the south Arizona AUR need to be higher than in other areas, because of other complicating voter disenfranchisement issues, such as noncitizenship, a significantly higher level of underage persons in an
urban area. So the numbers that might be functional in
a South Phoenix more urbanized group just aren't going
to work there. And we have testimony and written
testimony to that effect in the record.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: It looks to me
like common sense is we have the choice really between
adding the population back into D, back the way it was
originally, or by taking the population out of B in the
way it's being proposed in this map. I would like to
take a closer look at a new B to see what has happened.
One particular question before we do, in making those
adjustments, did A stay the same so that only
essentially B and D, B, D and E were adjusted?

DR. ADAMS: A has stayed the same to this
point. As we made -- as I said, we haven't made the
final adjustments to that B district and the Scottsdale
district and E district. We haven't made the final
adjustments to that. When we do, we could possibly have
some sharing and rippling of the western border of B
with District A just -- just to equalize population
there and to make the lines a bit cleaner.

Do you want to actually bring the map up
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and take a look at it? We don't have final numbers. We
can show you the configuration, and I can point out to
you the areas I'm talking about.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes. I'd like to
see that.

DR. ADAMS: Okay. This is the
configuration of District B. District E at this point
is a bit overpopulated. As I said, it would necessitate
probably some revision of Scottsdale. What I'm
suggesting is possibly over in this area we could do
some straightening out of the line possibly with some
trades of territory.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Essentially A
would move some further east.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Into the mike.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: A move further
east. B moves further east.

DR. ADAMS: B move further east
straightening the line, moves further that way. B moves
further that way.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: You said under this
configuration, E is overpopulated?

DR. ADAMS: E is overpopulated.

DR. ADAMS: E is overpopulated. We have
44,000 to many in E. You have too many people in
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Scottsdale. TalkingPaboutxmovingo44,000 out of
Scottsdale and dividing Scottsdale.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: More than a little bit.

DR. ADAMS: Talking Congressional Districts? Not really that much.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Zero in on the southern boundary of B. I want to understand where that has moved to at this point.

DR. ADAMS: This is Bethany Home. And you probably want streets. Let's see if I can get you streets.

I have the streets but not the labels, so -- I may get Doug over here to get the labels on here for me.

Okay. Now you can see the labels. I don't know if you want to walk around the district. I'd be happy to walk around the district.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: See the box.

That's all I want to know.

DR. ADAMS: Just move the box down.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: There. Okay. Just in terms of the effect on D, tell me again, is this as good as the original configuration in terms of the --
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DR. ADAMS: This isn't quite as good as
the original configuration of D. It's two percentage
points below the original, two, to and a half below.
Is that correct, Marguete, two,
two-and-a-half percentage points below?
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other questions?
Mr. Hall.
COMMISSIONER HALL: So what is your
recommendation to do, what to do with the extra
population?
DR. ADAMS: Extra population in E? If you
want to achieve what you want to achieve, having those
districts go north, I would recommend a small division
of Scottsdale. When I say "small," talking about 44,000
persons in Scottsdale. There is a little bit, could
move Paradise Valley in there, you narrow that, and let
me move back out, take a look at that.
COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: That's only about
13,000 people I think.
DR. ADAMS: Also territory just south of
that, have to include part of the City of Phoenix.
COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Arcadia.
DR. ADAMS: Come into that as well. I can
show you that.
COMMISSIONER HALL: The question is,
correct me if wrong, then question is whether to have
districts go north or to divide Scottsdale, right?

DR. ADAMS: Well --

COMMISSIONER HALL: Well --

DR. ADAMS: One or the other. You run into a problem of going into the eastern area.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

DR. ADAMS: You can have -- let me turn off the streets so you can see this a little bit better here. Paradise Valley. A small portion of Phoenix here. This territory could move back in here, does make a longer V and narrow neck between the Ahwatukee, Tempe area, Scottsdale, move Paradise Valley into District E.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: In terms of principles, B perhaps E, less compact, but would preserve the preservation of Scottsdale.

DR. ADAMS: Preserve Scottsdale.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other questions or comments?

DR. ADAMS: Chairman Lynn, members of the Commission, one more slide. We were also asked to look at what the Hopi connection would be. So I went ahead and took a look at that. If it's the Commissioners pleasure, I'd be happy to show you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection.
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Okay. PThe corridor that we have in the
slide is the following: It affects four persons. And
this is the connection. You see it's a fair narrow
connection. In our other map we have a somewhat wider
connection went through the Moenkopi Village, and then
so we only have one neck connection. But in this
particular connection we have two. We have one up to
the Hopi Reservation, and then we have a small original
Hopi Village.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: As I recall, the
population of the Hopi areas is about 7,000 people?

DR. ADAMS: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Then we would have
to move 7,000 people out of District A into district C
to achieve this. Do you have any suggestion where that
population would come from?

DR. ADAMS: That's correct. I'd suggest
we'd probably be moving some lesser populated areas.
I'd be welcome to suggestions from the Commission as to
what the lesser populated areas of District A are to go
back into that district. We do have some area areas in
Yavapai County and some underpopulated areas.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: In terms of the effect --

I'm sorry.
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DR. ADAMS: niThat'szall right.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: In terms of the effect, overall effect on C and A with this switch.

DR. ADAMS: Uh-huh. The actual numbers on that we have not run. I will run those numbers for you. I believe it's a small percentage. You've seen maps with the Hopi, in fact our original map have the Hopi out. And it will be similar to those numbers.

COMMISSIONER HALL: How many people does the corridor affect?

DR. ADAMS: Four persons.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The small corridor with Moenkopi?

DR. ADAMS: I don't believe that affects any persons.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Does the corridor, little island of Navajo, affect any Hopi?

DR. ADAMS: I didn't hear the question.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Right there, in Navajo land. Does that corridor affect any Hopi?

DR. ADAMS: Not that I'm aware of. Mainly we're looking at a connection of District A and a Hopi connection. I don't believe there's a great effect.

COMMISSIONER HALL: So the numbers -- Doug, could we bring that map up. It's fairly simple to let you know what that right now.
I have all these wonderful young men that are absolute wizzes on the technology of this. I'm very slow. I can do it. It just takes me longer than it does them. Thank you for bearing with me on that.

Here is the actual interactive map. Let's go ahead and zoom in on that area. See if we can take a look at it.

Doug, I'll ask you to come back again.

I have numbers here, hard to read. Looks like zero, zero -- it looks like zeros in both of those spots. I don't know if you can see that there. I see here.

I'll turn off the reservation land and we'll be able to see that better.

There you see zero, zero -- so it is not affecting any population to do that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments or questions?

All right. Can we -- Do you have a full map incorporating the recommended changes?

DR. ADAMS: We have a map incorporating the recommended changes except for the Hopi connection.

That's on a separate map.
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As I said, we have the alterations that
we would need to make to those districts that would be.

We'd be happy to make those on instruction from the
Commission. We'd be happy to make any final changes
that you would like to see, bring them back to you, not
final changes. Of course, it's a working map, at this
point. If these are the recommendations that you
approve of, we'd be happy to finalize those
recommendations and bring it back to you with the data
so you can take another good hard look at.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Taking them
separately, there's a common principle the way I would
look at these two situations, that is generally people
over geometry, where we have to choose between those two
criteria.

With that in mind, it looks to me as if
the best solution for B is the new configuration, adding
Paradise Valley, Arcadia, to primarily make up the
population difference. And that way we divide
Scottsdale as little as possible, that being one of the
units of representation that we have recognized. And
furthermore, a city that we're otherwise told to keep
intact as much as possible. Secondly, and equally
importantly, from my perspective, I believe we should
separate the Hopi and the Navajo. And this provides us
a way to do it. It is not aesthetic. It is not compact. But it does recognize communities of interest. And that -- I believe that allows us, within the meaning of Proposition 106, to do this. And I think that it is the right thing to do.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Those are two separate issues, obviously.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: At least --

COMMISSIONER HALL: Two separate issues.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Deal with them separately.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I wanted to know if Mr. Johnson, Dr. Adams, zoom out, hold the north area, its affects of the Hopi separation.

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Elder, as I said before, we're looking at a partial map here. What we did was actually look at that connection. But -- so we're not looking at the other map that we had previously done. But I can add this particular -- if this is something of which you approve, we'd be happy to add it to the map.

I don't know why it's not coming back.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.
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COMMISSIONERxHALL: For those of us that
kicked dust off our boots before we stepped into the valley, I wonder if we can handle some metropolitan issues one at a time. What I heard is five to six or seven changes. What I'm trying to understand in my mind are the cost benefits of each of those changes. Some of those appear to me to make sense. Some of those appear to be merely convenient for whatever purposes, and one can only expect what some of the purposes may be. At the expense in my opinion of splitting cities, municipalities that unnecessarily need to be split, so I'm wondering if we can kind of take, start with the changes made south in B and go through those one at a time and determine a little of those internally, address them one at a time. I'll address the rest of the Hopi-Navajo issue, also.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Adams, can you walk us through those changes specifically?

DR. ADAMS: I'm not sure, Commissioner Hall. Changes south of Tempe?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Start wherever you prefer.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Essentially changes to District E.

COMMISSIONER HALL: B, D, and E.
COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The whole thing starts with pulling Guadalupe out of Ahwatukee.

COMMISSIONER HALL: That's what I'm saying. Show what occurs.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: My understanding is we didn't change F.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, we have overpopulation in E, so the -- reason says that those goes east, she indicated, or south. E has overpopulation which trickles to E or C.

MR. HUNTWORK: Doesn't trickle to F. Ahwatukee was never in F. Zero sum game.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Excess population in E.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Comes out in B or D, entirely three districts.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The original suggestion, part of Scottsdale, put it in with Northern.

COMMISSIONER HALL: In other words, trade a portion of Scottsdale for Ahwatukee?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: My question, if E is overpopulated, then something has to be underpopulated. Is that District D or B?

DR. ADAMS: B.
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COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: a E is overpopulated.
B is underpopulated.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Originally B, D, and E had population of three districts. They still do, because the all movement has taken place among the three districts. Therefore, we would -- in order to make a change, if we decided we wanted to do it, we'd find the appropriate population from District E and presumably move it into District B.

DR. ADAMS: That's correct, Commissioner Minkoff. As we discussed previously, and the point here again, starting in this area, as we move up through this area, you can pick up Arcadia, can pick up Paradise Valley and put it into B. It does, again, elongate B a little more and narrows this neck. That's one thing you can do. That would make it less of a problem as far as adjusting the population of Scottsdale and a split of Scottsdale.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Can you zoom out so we see all the moves in figure B and E?

Fine.

DR. ADAMS: Is that far enough?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Fine.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Do you have the party registration figures on the proposed adjustments?
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DR. ADAMS: We haven't run those figures
yet.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Have not?

DR. ADAMS: We had a fairly tall order this morning. We'd be happy once we made -- if this direction suits the Commissioners, if we're going in the right direction, we'd be happy to make a final, some sort of final adjustments to bring it into population compliance, run the numbers for you. So --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion they incorporate those changes and let us look at that, including the division of the Hopi-Navajo District, and let us see what the impact is in the overall map.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I wonder if we can separate those.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I make a motion we make proposed changes in B, D, and E.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's been moved and seconded.

Discussion?

If not, all in favor, say "aye."
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(Vote taken.), Arizona
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

Motion carries unanimously.

If you will effect those changes for draft map purposes, do the appropriate analysis that has been asked for in terms of all the variables that we're trying to balance, and we'll take a look at that when that's ready to come back.

DR. ADAMS: We'll be happy to.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, I guess for purposes of discussion, really, I guess we want to analyze, so for purposes of discussion I'd make a motion we look at the overall map effects of Districts C and A similar with the Hopis, Hopis and Navajos.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I suggest if we have to move population out of District A and into District C that you look to Yavapai County to do that, and there's certainly enough population to strip Yavapai County, part of District A, and get approximately the 7,000 people you need.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I would like to leave that to NDC's recommendation. I am not so
sure that I would want to look at a specific location to
pull that from. The division we started with over
dividing Yavapai one way east or west appears as though
it takes into act what the citizens gave us in our
meetings from the standpoint of Mingus Mountain, where
they wanted things divided. So I would rather not go in
there and modify that unless NDC comes up with good
reasons as to why we should or should not. I'd like
them to review it, report back to us based on our
citizen input where we should get population as opposed
to directing them to one location.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: As always, we like the
benefit of your wisdom on any issues if you see a better
or more preferable way to accomplish the concept we're
trying to achieve, regardless of the methodology to get
us there.

There's a motion on the floor.

Further discussion?

I guess for me, this goes back to one of
the more difficult decisions we have to make. Again,
the final decision is some weeks off, in fact, more than
a month off. The question in my mind is which map we
want to take out for public comment. Is that a map that
has a, I'll say, a more contiguous and compact northern
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district, for lack ofhaebetterrrdescription, or one that
separates the Hopi and Navajo which we all understand is possible. We all understand that it can happen with minimal impact on other communities in the state. And I don't know that it matters much. We're going to get testimony from all sides on whichever configuration we show. I'm not so sure we shouldn't -- well, that's fine. We'll just figure out which way the motion goes and do it that way and get testimony.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I think we've looked at, earlier in this series of meetings, looked at districts without, I'm suggesting by reason of the motion, we look at the districts with it, make a decision. I'm not suggesting by reason of the motion we make a decision which map goes out for public comment. I'm not sure we may or may not be close. We looked this morning at what the other one looked like. Let's look now at what this one looks like. In light of the additional changes of the Phoenix Metropolitan area, we have the two, maybe put them side by side, then try to come to a final conclusion is what I'm trying to suggest.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: On that basis for that purpose, I'd certainly support the motion to look at it. Further discussion?
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If not, halliin favornsay "aye."
(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

Motion carries unanimously.

DR. ADAMS: Dr. Adams, if you can, put the maps in place. See the totality of the changes we've asked you to present.

COMMISSIONER HALL: If I may reemphasize without being redundant, I would like, as we look at both situations, both in metropolitan and rural, we do have, as party registration figures also begin to move down, an avenue for those important considerations, also.

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Hall, I'll assure you, all reports that come out from us now that we have, that registration data will be accompanied by -- will be part of our data sheet.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Are there other adjustments you wish suggest relative to congressional maps for this next round of review? Are there other portions of the map you'd like the consultants to model and look at in terms of any other adjustments?

Mr. Elder?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
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Dr. Adams, there was a discussion in the
Power Point that made the comment I believe there was --
area G was fragile and that there was something we were
doing to either F, either F or A, which had the affect,
or may have affected G. Is that the case?

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Elder, in the
instructions you have given me, that should not be a
problem.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'd just like to be
reminded, how much of the Tucson metropolitan area
population, approximately, is in District G?

DR. ADAMS: I'd have to take a look at --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I don't need to
know right now.

DR. ADAMS: We need to bring the
information back.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'd like to know
how much in Tucson. Is that truly going to be a second
rural district or is it going to be a urban dominated
district? I think we need to know that.

DR. ADAMS: I can look it up for you now?

Could be okay if I brought the information back?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: That's fine.
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CHAIRMANoLYNN: AMr.oHuntwork.
COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: In the interest of leaving no stone unturned, one thing we learned is there still remains an area of the Hispanic AUR in southern Glendale which contains approximately some 7,000 people, if I understand correctly, because it was the -- essentially the compensating balance for Ahwatukee. That raises the question of whether you could enrich G by coming down the, on the western side of the valley and connecting, as there is a reservoir of Hispanic population currently not being used for -- in that way. There seems to me to be a lot of reasons not to do that, but with G being as fragile and close to the line as you seem to be suggesting it might be, I would submit that we can't -- we have to consider that possibility.

DR. ADAMS: Mr. Huntwork, I just want to be clear. So you are thinking that if we redivided Glendale and brought that population and rippled it through District D, is that the suggestion?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yeah.

DR. ADAMS: You want to look at what that would do or the possibility of moving some population from D into G.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Put back into D.

And that means the western part of D would become part of G which is already contiguous to, I believe.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I understand the objective of trying to do that, but I think it really wrecks havoc with the South Phoenix AUR. The area that probably would be taken out of there is Avondale or some of the extreme southern part of the district, and that's really the heart of the district, the northern part.

The stretch of Glendale was not.

I think we really need to get some advice from NDC as to whether we need to put more people into District G. If we don't, I think that we're really causing detriment to an AUR that was very strongly presented and very carefully thought out.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff just asked a question a moment ago that goes to another point that should be made on that suggestion. Ms. Minkoff asked what percentage of the Tucson population has influenced that district, if it also had a Phoenix neighborhood and had a dual urban influence on that AUR. And I don't think that gets us where we want to be, where we want to be, either.

Those are some of reasons, Jim, it might be good and proper for not considering that. But take a look at it, if you like.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I
recognize those things and I agree with them. On the other hand, I heard Ms. Leoni say 10 times G was fragile, haven't tested it completely, so on and so forth. I'm wondering if there was that possibility. With the changes identified in B, it became clear it was possible and we ought to take a look at what it would do, not that anybody is pushing it at this moment.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think if there's a need to change the composition of District G, probably a better place to look is part of Santa Cruz County, which we took out of it. That might work a little bit better, then we can pull some of the Tucson Metropolitan Area. There's a lot of flexibility on which parts of Tucson we'd pull out of G and put in H. If we need to make any adjustments from a voting rights standpoint, that might be a better way to do it.

DR. ADAMS: Chairman Lynn, Commissioner Minkoff, Members of Commissioner, my recommendation would be certainly to take look at that, not to make any moves, however, at this time, until we have our further analysis so that we find out just how -- what sort of solid ground we are on there. We do have a body of evidence from the Hispanic Coalition showing a community of interest in that AUR...
touch it without having a good, sound reason for doing so.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I recommend we move on to Legislative Districts. I think they have enough information. There's such a thing as too much. I recommend we switch gears.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Do the consultants feel sufficiently tasked with changes to the Congressional maps at this point you can get that done for us before the evening is out?

DR. ADAMS: I will be returning to work on this, going back into the part of this complex, and working on that, and Doug will come assist me with the numbers. If you give me some sort of idea of what the time is going to be for the rest of afternoon and evening, that would be helpful to me, what you have in mind.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Are we prepared with the Legislative report?

Our goal would be to hear legislative report at this juncture, to -- once we've heard Legislative report, I think it would be appropriate to have our second call to the public of the day so that ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE that does not occur too late in the evening and so the
public can have the benefit of both reports having come
back to speak to us. At that point we'd be prepared to
revisit the Congressional, if they are ready.

DR. ADAMS: Okay. I will -- I will be
working on the map. And with assistance from Doug, I
will be preparing the numbers. One difficulty we have
is at 5:00 o'clock the office here closes where they
have the printer. But we can get you, as he's tell you
what numbers are, show you a spread sheet up on the
screen, possibly put the spread sheet onto computers, I
believe.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: There's that very
important word, graduated into plastics today, kin Co.

DR. ADAMS: Five miles away I'm told.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'll be flexible.

The sense is we won't have a complete and
quick concurrence on the entire Legislative map. We'll
have plenty of time for you to work your will on the
Congressional map.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: There's Fry's
across the street, the cheapest place in Arizona to buy
printers. Keep that in mind, too.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right.
Let's take -- make -- we're becoming famous for, A, starting late and, B, taking 10 minutes for a break that last a half hour, neither is something I like being famous for. Take a 10-minute break, and I mean 10 minutes.

(Recess taken from 5:18 until approximately 5:41 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If the Commissioners will take their seats.

Dr. Heslop.

DR. HESLOP: Chairman Lynn, you asked a number of questions and asked for a number of experiments or tests to be made of the Legislative draft plan. Doug Johnson's efforts are recorded on the Power Point that he's going to share with you. You will, of course, remember that we haven't had much time to develop responses to your questions.

Doug.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, we obviously received a large number of requests in the earlier session. And so this is an effort to walk through the different ones and address issues raised and present to you both significant problems, if there are any with an issue, how an issue might be resolved, and where we're at with creating maps, creating resolutions.
The first question brought up was the question of putting Ajo with the rest of -- or with Tucson to unify it with more of its county. We have some definite options that we can take with that. Let me zoom in and show you on the map here. There are only 3,900 people in this whole area, as we talked about, I think about 3,200 in Gila.

Options here, number one, just pick up some more unincorporated people closer in to Phoenix, put this with the rest of Pima County. Option two, these somewhat resolve themselves I think when get into the larger picture issues, would be to create a Yuma, La Paz Legislative District, given the populations of the two counties, and have La Paz remain divided; however, we could move up that way, would be working with the established river AUR there.

So I just want to take these largely in the order raised. Obviously resolution of this will depend on the larger question going on up north, how that is resolved. We have looked at it. Even if we do end up needing to take suburbs around Phoenix, there's only 3,900 people of what we're looking for. It would not significantly alter the character of this district. It would remain dominated by Yuma.
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I'll come back to that when we get to the
large questions.

In Maricopa, we had a couple of questions. The first two I’d like to address are in Districts Y and D, unifying the Westbrook neighborhood. Let me zoom in on this area. Actually I’ll change the color of District Y so you see this a little bit better.

One more time here.

We looked to this and don’t see any significant problems achieving this. What would happen is that the Westbrook area of Peoria here would move over into the western district, which is District D. This is already a split of Peoria. Essentially this split of Peoria could move further or allow us with more city splits no significant impact on AURs. When we finish that we’ll do that.

The next question raised was the Central Phoenix historical area, Districts R and S. Central Phoenix is an area we actually looked at a lot when drawing these lines because it is one of those difficult areas where two AURs overlap. The request was to take more of this population in District R and perhaps instead of a leg going up here make more of a straight across dividing line.

We looked at this issue. The problem that occurs here is it improves representation and
unification of the historical AUR; however, the
character of District S is actually affected
considerably. District S is a borderline majority
Hispanic district, and we drop well below 50 percent
Hispanic for that to occur. The reason for that is that
the character of the communities right in this region
are simply different from this region, and it would
alter S's overall character significantly. So we'd
recommend not doing that because of concerns about
dividing those communities and maximizing representation
for the Hispanic AUR, regretfully, at the expense of the
Central Phoenix Historical.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Could you show me
where the break between Sun City and R is in this
scenario?

MR. JOHNSON: The computer does well when
doing eight districts, not so well when there is 30.
Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have a question
about that. If you put those areas into District S, you
have to take something out of District S.

MR. JOHNSON: Right.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is there a
population in DistrictoSnthatAiszsimilar in composition
to what you are putting in that you could pull out and, therefore, retain the characteristics or makeup of District S?

MR. JOHNSON: That's definitely the question we looked at in considerable depth. Not only is this Smith Historical District also not the most compact approach to take, the issue we encountered is the nature of the community right along the line here, the character and concerns of that are distinctly different than the community up in the northern reaches of this district.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: What about the extreme eastern end of the district?

MR. JOHNSON: Pardon me?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The extreme eastern end of the district?

MR. JOHNSON: Where we try to go would be kind of move this into S, R, pick it up somewhere along a different border.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm talking about --

MR. JOHNSON: Over here?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I lost my district labels. The extreme eastern end of the district borders
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Phoenix, Arizona
MR. JOHNSON: Oh, right in here.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yeah.

MR. JOHNSON: We could look into and did look into bringing District R into here. It would help the historic district. This is a fairly lightly populated area. We'd actually have to come significantly into the population here.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: What kind population shifting here?

MR. JOHNSON: Numbers?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: With the historic and --

MR. JOHNSON: Let me put numbers on here. Let me zoom in here so we can make more sense out of this map.

Zoom in, population of each block in the area, you see it's extremely densely populated and you're getting into thousands of people here. Let me jump over to the area you're talking about in the east here.

In here we do have a couple of thousand in these three blocks right through here and somewhat of the population down here, not nearly enough to get equality with the areas we're talking about moving on the other side. We'd have to come--
Let me show you a little bit here. We'd have to come fairly significantly over and end up, on the compactness side --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Actually have to come further over. I think it helps compactness rather than hurts it, connects more easily to R as you move over.

Doug.

MR. JOHNSON: As you move over, it's less of a compactness problem in terms of horizontally, moving the vertical leg up. Into the vertical leg I think -- when I first looked at this, we looked at 10 configurations of this board. You end up all way to the district above it.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: That's all right if you carved out the hole, if you -- if you went all the way up to the district to the north, the one, there's Country Club, Arizona Biltmore, et cetera, and cut the north-south line at the eastern end of that district. My concern is for these four neighborhoods that I suggested putting into S, knowing the character of those four neighborhoods, their community of interest is not with District R, you know, any more than Ahwatukee is with -- Ahwatukee is with the Congressional District we wanted to take them out of. It would do a real
disservice to the people to take them out of District R if we moved them to District S and we look at S and try to find comparable population to try to move into R so that the districts remain balanced, because they just really belong in District S.

MR. JOHNSON: We can certainly do that.

The option focused on in at the time, we had the population here.

You make a good suggestion, and we'll check out the impact of doing that with the district.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: The next question raised was the -- almost MOUS combination of districts. It was kind of fun making this slide. Very similar to what Dr. Adams was talking about earlier, the Congressional front, involving a few more districts. And we also, MOU and S, M is here, O, U, and S. The discussion was the east-west nature of these districts as they're drawn, how in this community, the more community of interest tends to be on the north-south access. S as I just described is a very touchy district similar to G in the Congressional plan. But for M, O, and U, we can certainly do that. We don't anticipate any impact on local communities.
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Scottsdale, already as split in a small
piece up here.

The issue you ran into in the Congressional plan having to do an additional city split doesn't enter here. We can do this.

I apologize for any not having maps of these done during the time. I preferred to answer more questions in a general manner than have details. We can draw the plans, if it's the Commissioners' wish.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If splitting those, changing the configuration, the two to really look at are O and U. If you start trying to split M, you know, it covers such a large area and it's already got sort of a north-south configuration, it's going to become a couple awfully long skinny looking districts. O and U, it makes sense to explore them.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I mentioned this earlier. I was also talking about S, partly because of the reason Andi has been focusing on. By taking out that historic area it then causes S to become pretty elongated. But really, if you manage to consolidate that less, and it's more vertical as well, and it may drive some of the other changes.
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MR. JOHNSON: The next question that arose
is Maricopa Tempe. And the goal was unite to Tempe.

The discussion was, instruction was to look to putting
Guadalupe with Tempe, if necessary, and maybe a small
edge of Scottsdale. And as is discussed at the time,
Tempe and Guadalupe come up 7,000 short. The small edge
of Scottsdale is probably an acceptable option. We did
analysis of numbers here. 61,000 people are currently
included in CC, 61,000 Scottsdale residents. We have to
find a place for 54,000 to go north from that. This is
not to say that cannot be done. Certainly it can be
done. What will be the impact of this? Go to the map.

It is a larger issue. We're talking about CC down here,
which currently consists of north Tempe, south
Scottsdale, and Mesa. People in Scottsdale go north,
given we've discussed S, they can't go north without
altering S. They hope to preserve the city borders they
do preserve. They do have various options and we
discuss in more detail exactly what the impact is.

Following our discussions -- no, wait.

But following our discussions coming up later in the
presentation, what is going in Yavapai, the edges here,
the eastern edges, as you know well, will impact the
edge of Phoenix here.

I want to say we can certainly do this.

We can look into it.

What we'll need to do is prepare
options based as they relate to options we relate to the
outside.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Just one addition.

It appears we've had further communication from
Guadalupe, it appears now unequivocal they don't want to
be with Tempe. About 7,200 people. Now shifting less
of Scottsdale, now 14,000. Most would stay in that
district.

MR. JOHNSON: That actually would simplify

that.

So, as I said, we'll look at this in toto

with the other questions we're talking about here.

Issue number two, I should mention as

well, down in the south of CC, currently Tempe is split

almost in half, as you know, and the lower half is

merged with the Ahwatukee neighborhood.

Let me -- each time I change color, a
different color of the map, it messes up a section I go
to next.

See this district, what would happen is

this population unites with the northern population. As

you discussed, Ahwatukee is a big issue. However, this

would have one -- this is already a piece Chandler with

Ahwatukee. Come south, and we put Ahwatukee with

Chandler. An option...
options, there's a ripple effect, and things to consider, moving on to Tucson, the area in question, there was a question of how much of the Tucson metropolitan area is in this far eastern district.

Get the big picture here to begin with. The District G is all this area. Running the numbers, we're essentially looking at the population located in the area around the eastern edge and down, not going very south, around Vail and right along the southern border of Tucson here. What I came up with from those numbers is there are 16,000 people in Tanque Verde and about 10,000 people in the other unincorporated areas around there. Works out to about 15 percent of District G is what we might consider the Tucson immediate metropolitan area. An argument might be made the Tucson metropolitan area is growing further and further. That's the area immediately in the vicinity of these towns. We're looking at options of how to reconfigure this district. The first and most obvious one is to unify the Santa Cruz County within District G and to drop the 25,000 people that are in the more Tucson metropolitan area. This is a very appealing option because we always enjoy reducing the number of county splits in this plan. It does have one concern, the I-19 corridor, we try to unify, with the exception of Green
Valley, given we've already divided partially Green Valley, it's not a huge concern. We're not dividing something not previously divided. The only concern it raises is 9,000 more people here than there are right around Tucson. We could go further out, take a very small piece of Pima County into this district, which actually is a pretty good option; however, it will impact a larger question as well.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think that also raises a problem for the adjacent district which I believe is District E. If you pull out the western Santa Cruz county, you change the composition of that district.

MR. JOHNSON: That's a concern.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I would echo that.

E, without having Santa Cruz, a portion of the Hispanic, that's a majority Legislative District right now. Without Santa Cruz in there and picking up other areas adjacent in there, I don't think it would be, anymore.

MR. JOHNSON: The other two options that we considered would be more of a northern move, could be done in two ways. One, this is a larger issue I'll get into in the Eastern Arizona Counties area. If the decision were to divide up, it would be fairly compact.
I realize that given the level of community support, the fact is the AUR option is not very excited by that. And it has a piece I looked at that would work but would also have some impacts we're not thrilled with which would be just to work our way north through here, pick up some of these communities we talked about that share a somewhat rural character.

I should point out District G is not what we consider up here a rural district, even in this configuration. It is part of Tucson, and this area is also somewhat urban. It's what we consider a rural influence or heavily rural district but not dominated. So that is an option, of course, we can look at to bring up more into Pinal County and take in these communities. Or if the decision is probably elsewhere to divide the Eastern Arizona Counties, pick up the area down here.

It's not something I'm looking for any direction at this point until we look more at the larger issue.

I think last, two kind of relatively minor to the northern issues. Tucson, there was a question actually when we were looking into it, I wanted to ask for a little more clarification from the Commission.
Sixth Avenue as a division between Districts H and I in here. This is the Sixth Avenue border. 12th Avenue is a little further to the west, I believe. I was wondering if the Commission could describe, were you interested in using a dividing line all the way far south or just above Tucson? I notice you were not giving clarification earlier.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Actually, it would be most helpful south of downtown.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: South of downtown. Not south of Tucson, south of downtown Tucson.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Running directly south on 12th.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay.

When we looked at this area in general terms, I think we can fairly swap out some pieces of this border as long as we're not looking at the whole thing, given the additional direction, we can go look at that in more detail. We'll need to clarify that area. I think we can do it without any significant impact on the character and the local communities, the character of these districts and local communities. We'll need to check that given additional instruction.
The other requests in the Tucson area was the I-10 portion of District H. And moving with the Summit district, and swapping that with the Corona de Tucson area into a Tucson district. And let me show you what we're going to do here. This is south of I-10 here. Again, this is one we seek a little clarification from the Commission on, because we have two different communities south of I-10 here, one south of I-10 at the Y, the other is the region here. This can be swapped fairly easily and brought out. This region, as you discussed, is sensitive in character, a borderline majority-minority, due to the arms here are not very compact, if significant communities here could justify. I was wondering if the Commission could provide additional instruction on which neighborhoods.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Last question or was it which?

MR. JOHNSON: Or was it the area south of the 10 and 10, 19, Y, or were you more interested in the area south of the 10 down near the area south of the district?

Essentially this area we can do without too much trouble.

This area ends up significantly impacting this district and hashproblemsrwiththe Hispanic AUR in
that area.

It's fine. We don't -- if you have additional direction at this point, or come back at later point, too, if you like.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Well, initially what we are trying to do is get an urbanized area, thinking it has considerably more impact to the southeast than it is. I thought there was like 40, 50 thousand there, as opposed to 14 thousand plus the ten. Corona de Tucson is an extreme growth area. And it's new housing, probably non-Hispanic if we looked at the numbers there, as well as area over by Vail and eastern Tucson.

If we trade any area at all, that could dilute Hispanic area. It is also in a growth area where it relates more to Tucson than it relates to rural areas around there.

That lower yellow area south and west of the I-10 has just been annexed into the City of Tucson, and I believe in that boundary. So within the City of Tucson there's like 15 people, maybe more than that, it seems like 28 square miles, and almost no people to vote for the annexation. So it could go any direction and not affect us one way or another.

MR. JOHNSON: We can follow up on this and
get a little more definition of the community on this
issue.

So now in terms of more big picture
issues, the Pinal County question, this was actually a
heavy focus of the time during the break there. And
they were really to -- I mean the main interest is in
unifying Pinal County, at least up to the Apache
Junction area. One of the suggestions, a good one was
to look at the Casa Grande Legislative plan or
Legislative proposal. And this is the border of the
Legislative District proposed by the Casa Grande group.
The issues that we encountered with this district
primarily impact Legislative District E which, in the
draft proposed plan is the Tohono O'odham
majority-minority Gila River District.

What happens when you unify the majority
of Pinal County which a division of the Gila River and
Casa Grande area from the Tohono O'odham and the border
communities? Again, we have two AURs really overlapping
each other and presenting us with these difficult
decisions? The concern that we have with the Casa
Grande proposal is that it would divide those
communities. Both of them would have some Hispanic and
total minority percentage, but neither would be a
majority district. Both of these would become
nonmajority-minority districts. And that raises significant concerns for us given the division of the Hispanic AUR that we have there.

The other ideas we took to unifying this area essentially all run into the same problem. The Casa Grande, Gila River areas are so key to E, maintaining E and the area the Commission defined as a difficult question. The only way to unify Pinal in a significant way is to divide the AUR we defined in the district E.

So even if we change the Apache Junction nature of this AUR, take it out as discussed, Pinal County as a whole is 29 percent minority. Obviously there is significant population outside the AUR. We're unable to come up with a scenario we'd be comfortable recommending to the Commission.

If the Commission so chooses, we can certainly recommend something along that line.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I seem to recall that the original proposal excluded the Gila River Indian community. Are you sure that it was included?

It was included.

MR. JOHNSON: This is the only proposal I've seen. If there's another proposal, we'd be
willing to look at that one as well and see if it has
other options.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: If the -- if the
reservation, Gila River --

MR. JOHNSON: This is Ak-Chin.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Ak-Chin, if those
were excluded, what effect would it have on the
population?

MR. JOHNSON: You would still be losing
the significant Hispanic population of Casa Grande, and
this district, district E, being so borderline in its
character, it would drop below a majority-minority
district. It would be a much more minority influenced
district than if you took all of it out. It would still
drop below that percentage.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Nobody ever said
this was going to be easy.

MR. JOHNSON: That's for sure.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: But the problem
that I see with the districts as they are currently
drawn is more in district L than it is in district E.
District L is really a nightmare. You have a
significant portion of the Phoenix Metropolitan area.
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You have a significant portion of the Tucson
metropolitan area. It is the only district with both metropolitan areas. And then you have the small communities of eastern Pinal County trapped between two metropolitan areas and really kind of left out in the cold. And so when I suggested you go back and look at the Pinal County AUR. It was really out of concern as to what district L does to the three communities. Because it leaves the part that is part of the Phoenix Metropolitan area vying with the Tucson area, leaves Tucson vying with Phoenix, and leaves the rural part of Pinal County with no one to speak to them. 

So I really think that that district L should not stand as it is currently drawn. I'm looking for some guidance as to ways we can change that so that -- it's not good for any of the communities. It just creates problems for the three communities, doesn't work for any of the three communities in the district. That's my concern. Trying to go back to the Casa Grande AUR doesn't do it. There has got to be some other way that doesn't create a district that I don't think works for anybody in the entire district.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I want to reinforce that comment in its entirety and indicate that even if it means going back and configuring many of the southern
Arizona districts in order to come up with an appropriate configuration that doesn't result in district L being anything like it is now, at least take a look at it. I'm not sure how many different moves on the chess board need to be made to do it. I would hate to take that district out and try to defend it in any way against any principle that we've come up with so far.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: It depends on where you start. And you end up -- this seems like it's almost been painted into a corner. L is such a bad configuration, it looks like what is left over after --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The other 29.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Start off in a different place, end up in a different place. I have the Hispanic Plan for Fairness, Fair Redistricting, superimposed. I think if I'm reading correctly, it basically, it's most of Pinal County in a single district.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: So much information.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'm pretty sure. But it's an approach and started at a different place,
interests. And if you are going to think about starting
in a different place, you might take a good hard look at
that plan, because it certainly doesn't have this
problem.

MR. JOHNSON: Commissioner Huntwork, if I
may, you mentioned earlier how many of the issues
interrelate here. One of the hopes I've not yet had
time to look at in detail, the south Tempe question,
actually will prompt a lot of this urban population and
the Mesa moving east. So there is some chance, and I
have not looked at the details and numbers, that will
take out a significant portion of Apache Junction into
that area. So might have two problems that help to
solve each other. It will, however, still leave these
rural areas with the southern, a part of it, the Tucson
part of it.

As you say, we're trapped between AURs
that overlap and the border regions down south. It is
difficult decisions. We're definitely, keep it as a
priority to look at in terms of not having at least both
urban areas like we did.

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

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Johnson, do you
have any idea at all?
AUR, Casa Grande submitted what population, what we now currently called L, is in relation to district E, and say everything in Pima County, how much of E, do those populations balance? It almost looks as though let's take L, to an extent, all the way west, and approximate the Casa Grande AUR, take everything that was in Pima County and move it toward -- so it matches up with the population there. I'm wondering if those two balance.

MR. JOHNSON: Essentially moving toward --

E, take in the green area here, the south end of L, is that what you are referring to, L west?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes. L moving west.

It might mean that that brown area, now Picture Rocks, ends up moving south. And that would allow us to unite the E with parts of Oro Valley and the area out there.

The problem with that is we heard testimony saying that the Tohono O'odham really don't have much to do or there's no glue really between them and Oro Valley and resort valleys up near Catalina. I'm not sure if it's Catalina, Marana, Picture Rocks. It all becomes one district. Then whatever it is Valencia, another one I never heard of, Valencia Wells. Three Points come into the southern district.

I'm with Commissioner Minkoff. We need look at the whole region from AL, whatever the
other one is to the west.

So I -- I have a hard time trying to justify any of those three, four districts, yet having characteristics that makes them whole or unified. We have dichotomies all over that area.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: As I look at this more, trying to find a solution for the problem, which I haven't found yet, it really seems to me that the entire southern portion, all those districts, beginning with Q going across E, Q, G, not way into Metropolitan Tucson, I'm not as familiar with that community, where decisions should be made I'd defer to our southern contingent on the Commission for those. I think we need to relook at all districts is the only way. If we say what we move out of E to put into L, what do we put into E to make that work? Then -- I'm not sure that's the way to do it. This portion of the state, maybe the way to do it is to partially start over. I can't see anything we can do with these existing districts that's not going to cause a nightmare in Pinal County.

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

COMMISSIONER HALL: Is -- what is the letter of the southeasterndistrict?onWhat is the letter?
MR. JOHNSON: G.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Is G a minority-majority district?

MR. JOHNSON: No. G goes all the way to Cochise County.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Here's my question. We all talked about problems. Here's a solution. We all see problems. I'm wondering, per chance, make G majority-minority. The concern was minimizing E as majority-minority, if I understood what you said correctly.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Make G majority-minority by coming further west along the border. I think that would address that issue. Then E is obviously going to have to go further north, likely incorporate some more of Metropolitan Phoenix, just speculating here, which then I believe leaves more room for Pinal, more wiggle room with Pinal to accommodate something that may more closely reflect maybe even what Casa Grande proposed, or something to that effect.

It's my opinion that the combination of Pinal ought to come from Casa Grande and work to the eastern portion of Pinal and then come west. And if that's going to be too much population there for the...
most urban portion of Pinal, it would be tied to the
urban portion of the valley and connecting the more
outlying areas of Pinal.

I'm just simply throwing out an idea. And
I think as Mr. Huntwork indicated, there are other
suggestions that have some components that may correlate
with that, with some of those suggestions.

But our goal, as I understand it, is to
have sufficient majority-minority representation, and
maybe shifting that to the southeast and then allow the
flexibility of what you currently call E, would address
the Pinal problem so they're not, if you will, in a box,
and still leave other additional AURs intact. And maybe
that would be a solution.

MR. JOHNSON: We can definitely look at
that, see where it takes us.

COMMISSIONER HALL: What I said, does that
make any sense to you, Doug?

MR. JOHNSON: It does. Conceptually it's
a very appealing proposal.

The concern, not having looked at it in
specifics, is it would almost definitely require
splitting Cochise County between the border, just
because Cochise is also not a majority-minority
district.
COMMISSIONER HALL: I think Cochise stays completely intact as it is. You pull population out of eastern Tucson, that urban area, come down and pick up more of the border communities, accommodate population needs, simultaneously pick up additional Hispanic population there for making it majority-minority, purely speaking theory. I'm simply asking you to test that to determine in reality if that theory is true to allow more flexibility with respect to E. If we gain population in the north, it may well allow more flexibility with Pinal.

MR. JOHNSON: We can certainly test that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I want to point out, I think Joshua pointed out the equivalent of G pretty much as it stands, the Hispanic plan. I think also part of the component of freeing up Pinal County was that the Tohono O'odham Reservation, which would remain intact, went west, and that Yuma County was united with parts of La Paz County going north, which had another component to it, the river community component. If those have to go up to the Phoenix Metro community at all, they should all stay south and, in my opinion, stay south as a unit.

The difference being,
Mr. Huntwork, between what I heard, from I've heard Representatives from the Cochise Board of Supervisors, is they view themselves as rural. Some plans proposed, I think, to make that district urban influenced. To what degree, I couldn't tell you. What I'm suggesting is there ought to be an attempt, and I welcome consultants to correct my perception, what I have heard the perception to be, an attempt to unify the border communities and maintain the capability of the majority-minority district and rural influence district.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Josh, that's exactly -- I'm looking on the Hispanic plan.
COMMISSIONER HALL: So am I.
COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: It looks like, just barely, Cochise entirely, Santa Cruz entirely, picks up primarily rural areas.
COMMISSIONER HALL: Does not in L, the upside down L to the north of that goes right into Tucson.
COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: It's very hard to tell.
COMMISSIONER HALL: It does.
COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Does indeed.
COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No, they are not.
into urban areas.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Okay. I understand then.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: That district is numbered nine in the Coalition for Fair Redistricting plan and it's not a majority-minority district.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm saying that's maybe an idea. It's obvious we're all concerned about Southwestern Arizona, and I think that that may get us to where we need to go. And, you know, nothing is going to be hundred percent win-win, but I see there's more winners or losers in some of those ideas.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'd like to propose another option alternative I would like NDC to look at. We had fairly good testimony from this region here, this is the Rio Rico, Nogales, Santa Cruz area, they had more links to the Tucson area, the highway, socioeconomic, NAFTA, a whole series of things there, and it always tended to seem like when we were getting out and voted on the issue in Sierra Vista, it was different from what the issues were in Santa Cruz and they would like to potentially be separate from that. I was somewhat surprised when I saw that plan that was, you know, I guess called Hispanic—nix, Arizona
COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Coalition for Fair --

COMMISSIONER ELDER: The Coalition that connected those two. Conversely, it makes sense in the border area of Douglas, Naco, and that, it relates to the border issues on Nogales, I'd like you to take a look at if it takes a look at taking urban areas out so it does not affect G.

Look at this area up here. San Pedro Valley runs right down through here and links up some fairly strong environmental groups as well as it brings in the mining groups, and it has things, Bisbee, Douglas had in common with Mammoth. Instead of rotating around clockwise, maybe look at looking and questioning whether that's the Southern or Southwest portion of the EACO plan in F, whether it might not be something we look at that inclusion as opposed to this inclusion, test both, have a test of the numbers of how it relates to numbers, and Hispanic, and those.

MR. JOHNSON: That is actually a very appealing option from the communities' view, working way up, because of shared interests. It won't be a very pretty district. To unite the community, achieve other goals, we may put up with that, or the Commission may put up with that. Phoenix, Arizona
We'll test that and a draw map on it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's quite clear because of the communities of interest, population distribution, and land configured in the State of Arizona, it's very difficult to win a beauty contest drawing districts. The best you can do is draw districts connected by community of interest and other perspectives that make them similar as opposed to the geography, because there is too much distance between groups of population.

When you get into urban areas, it's just a matter of finding an appropriate fit. What you are trying to do is find patterns already established in a community rather than drawing something that looks regular or, you know, in some way an ideal. You are working with the existing patterns that are already well-established.

All right. Other comments on this portion of the legislative grid or the map?

Let's move ahead.

MR. JOHNSON: Final, we've talked B. District A. This is the big issue. And because it requires a considerable amount of drawing, I was not able to complete a plan in -- before this readjournment. Let me walk through where we're at on this issue. Let me move the coalition line here. And
let me move Casa Grande.

As we look at this area, and based on the discussion earlier today, this darker region is not an actual proposed district. This is really what we look at as the population influx, is how we look at it.

We're kind of caught between this is Verde Valley, Sedona, and Flagstaff, which share a considerable community of interest and yet are similar to Maricopa desperately looking for other .2 percent or so of their district. There are a couple of factors in play here.

One, as we discussed earlier, Yavapai would be -- we would like to keep intact as a community of interest.

Given the maps we saw this morning and the conflict of interest that are represented by those maps, it is very difficult to keep Yavapai intact. We're still needing to find an area for this population to go into. One option that we will definitely look at very seriously when we have more time to draw lines is Navajo with the Arizona strip district. I think there's definite appeal to such a district. That will not answer all of our questions in that it will solve what do we do with areas up here. We still have this section of area in play and the remainder of Yavapai. Another approach we would like to take and test and bring back to you the results of that test is kind of working our way up from Yuma.
I started off the list of issues today, option issues, north from Yuma taking in most of La Paz County, unifying the rest of La Paz with Mohave. And that approach leaves a small remainder of population, then fairly compact, that would be merged with pieces of these two of our population in the Mesa area and portions of Yavapai.

One thing that I've tempted to do throughout this part of the testing is to see if we can minimize our splits of AURs. We pretty much realize have to split Yavapai in attempting to find an answer not to split the Eastern Arizona Counties.

I would like, if the Commission is agreeable, to definitely consider that so you have an understanding if we did have to divide the Eastern Arizona Counties, what would that achieve on other fronts.

So if that is acceptable to the Commission, we will look at that as well.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Doug, that's -- that last scenario is appealing from a number of stand points. I direct you, if you have a copy of the large binder, take a look at testimony from the river communities about that scenario relative to the Legislative Congressional Districts. It's very instructive.
Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: With the proviso I recommend with respect to Mohave you take the reservation, make sure that both those reservations are with the Navajo reservation, know what I'm saying?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Come across there, combine the Native American influence as much as possible.

Is the Native American reservation in the orange area, approximately --

MR. JOHNSON: 130,000 people in the orange area there.

COMMISSIONER HALL: You are saying --

MR. JOHNSON: It's a nice, compact district going up here. The problem is this side is also short population.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Where are you suggesting we get the additional population?

MR. JOHNSON: It's probably, I'm reluctant to take a guess at it, my instinct would be, inversion keeps the Eastern Arizona Counties intact. This population would come across the Arizona strip, and the orange area uniting more with Mohave, possibly with Western Yavapai. Yavapai would intermingle with
significant --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If you keep the Hopi community as part of that district, you add another 7,000.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I don't think it changes anything, if you pull into and extend that orange area into the Hopi areas and do that as well.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: One area I would like, I guess in the same vein, is we've got this area, I guess District D, in here. One of the things I'd like to take a look at, there were several comments from communities that said the road runs right down the middle of the community, though it happens to be a good divide for us, don't divide the town, don't divide our city. The Town of Kingman, city there, if possible when looking at that district, if there is potential that there is population, population I guess from Black Canyon Highway to Black Canyon City across, if we're going to divide Yavapai, maybe that part goes to the south, and this part comes down to make a more compact, regular District D. I believe that is what it is. And

that would make sure Paround, the Kingman area,
development along the highway gets included in the entire district.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: What is the population left in C after we've taken out Flagstaff? How much has to be added to that?

MR. JOHNSON: At this point in the drawing, it is essentially exclusively Navajo Nation, 104,000 people.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: If you added the Arizona strip, how much would that be?

MR. JOHNSON: Gets close. Have to come down somewhat into Mohave here.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Don't come down into Mohave. Just address the reservation.

MR. JOHNSON: Just reservation, not enough.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: How much is it?

MR. JOHNSON: I don't know off the top of my head.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Basically, that proposal is basically that northern district which he's proposing, it is the same district that is on the map.

If you pull it up on the map, you can look. You have to come down and add Mohave.ix, Arizona
COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Have to get from down in Mohave or come down into Navajo and Apache.
MR. JOHNSON: Right.
COMMISSIONER HALL: Not enough in either.
They only have 104.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments in this section?
COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, please bear with me. What I want to see is the Navajo plan. Can you show the Navajo plan?
MR. JOHNSON: Oh, yes. I was just doing a selection here to see the selection. Doing it earlier, the Navajo plan actually comes down, it fairly compact up north. The way to achieve that is essentially coming down into the Eastern Arizona Counties, picking up two reservations down here encompassing most of --
COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: It's hard to see. The Navajo plan is the way we would actually look at it.
MR. JOHNSON: As soon as it finishes running. I'm checking population of the plans.
COMMISSIONER HALL: While pulling up, Jim, the Navajo plan is not supported by the White Mountain Apache plan. They supported theEACO Plan.
COMMISSIONER ELDER: E A C O.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I also have a problem with what the Navajo plan does to Apache County. There's just a small area in Apache County that is stuck in the middle there and doesn't seem to fit in.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Not only that, but it looks like the pelican on some side station show with a beak up here and feet down here.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Do we have to characterize districts?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is the Reservation on the state split or is it a separate reservation?

MR. JOHNSON: It actually is divided. It is divided. The hatched area is the reservation. And the line is here. They come down the county line.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think that's --

COMMISSIONER HALL: There's legal issues with this, if I'm not mistaken.

Is that right, Mr. Rivera.

MR. RIVERA: I didn't hear it.

COMMISSIONER HALL: With this plan, there's legal issues, packing and others, if I'm not mistaken?
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MS. HAUSER:ixNotnecessarily; but yes,
there are legal issues there.

MR. RIVERA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further comment on this portion of the map?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Do you think you have --

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I would like to be briefed more fully on what the legal issues are at some point soon.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: One question --

COMMISSIONER HALL: All evening, Jim.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'll have that information.

Doug, do you feel you have significant direction on this section of the map to test some options?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes. Again, I apologize for not being able to come to you with more highly developed proposals. I do appreciate the additional direction. And we'll test out the things we've discussed here.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay.

Is that it?

MR. JOHNSON: The last point is party registration data. We actually have data on one of the laptops. That was the laptop preparing Congressional
data.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Tomorrow, if it is tomorrow when you return with the work product assigned to you, if those calculations could be included, that would be helpful.

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'd also like to suggest when you are doing these, if you have that information, as long as it does not negatively impact other things we're trying to achieve, you look at that data and when trying to decide where to draw a line, draw on the side of competitiveness.

MR. RIVERA: Mr. Chairman --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: One second.

Mr. Rivera.

MR. RIVERA: I would make the recommendation to hold off until after we have --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Can't hear you.

MR. RIVERA: I make the recommendation to hold off on that instruction until Executive Session.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Executive Session later this evening for that will be addressed. We can convey that instruction subsequent to that Executive Session to consultants after we give consideration in Open Session.
MR. JOHNSON: That is all the issues I have done.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Are there other legislative inputs at the moment before we move ahead?

Then let me suggest the following.

First, a 10-minute break. Again, try to keep it to 10 minutes. We are close to 7:00 -- it's almost 7:00, and it's getting late. I would then suggest, following the 10-minute break, we have call to the public. The public has now seen the Legislative and Congressional mapping and draft form and instructions we've given, and we'll give people an opportunity to comment. And that means we need to place a phone call. There was a member of the public that wished to speak, and we were going to contact him by phone. Now would be a good time to do that. I'd then suggest we go into Executive Session following the call to the public and that at the end of the Executive Session we determine whether or not we need to continue the meeting this evening or whether we could recess at that point and wait until we have work product tomorrow morning on both the Legislative and Congressional maps.

Does that sound reasonable?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have a question.
COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If at the end of Executive Session we determine --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We don't determine.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: We need to go back into Open Session.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Anything we need to do with consultants, we do that following Executive Session in Open Session.

We'll proceed in that fashion.

Following the 10-minute break, we'll proceed in that fashion.

Try to keep it to a 10-minute break.

(Recess taken from 6:51 until approximately 7:03 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd call the Commission back in session.

For the record, all five Commissioners are in the room.

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 by filling out a speaker slip in advance. 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.

The first speaker slip is from Sylvia Laughter. I don't see her here. I hope she'll join us at a later date.

John Mills.

MR. MILLS: John Mills. I'm a resident of Arcadia. As far as the Congressional District for Arcadia goes, I'd like speak to that.

Currently in District E, as you've lettered it, you're talking about moving it to District B, as you've labeled it. I support that. Paradise Valley and Arcadia have much more in common with that area than Phoenix and going north than it would with the Scottsdale and South Tempe and Ahwatukee area as you have drawn.

There are a number of issues between Scottsdale, Paradise Valley. In many things, it's much better if we were with Phoenix than we were in with the Scottsdale area.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Mills.

Next is Kathy Hancock representing -- with Jamieson and Gutierrez representing the Hopi Tribe.

MS. HANCOCK: Thank you, Chairman Lynn, ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE and all Commissioners, Phoenix, Arizona
I'm here today on behalf of the Hopi Tribe. Chairman Wayne Taylor asked me to be here.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If you could speak into the mike.

MS. HANCOCK: I didn't want to blow you away.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The acoustics are poor.

MS. HANCOCK: I guess I'd never --

Chairman Taylor asked me to appear here today to reiterate the Hopis' strong desire to remain separate from the Navajo Nation in both its Congressional and its Legislative representation.

I understand and appreciate the desire to address compactness or contiguousness. My English teacher in high school would shudder to hear me say it that way, contiguousness; however, it is critical to remember that the Hopis' isolation inside the Navajo Reservation surrounded by a population 10 times its size is a result of federal, so-called, management of Native peoples it little understood over a hundred years ago.

The Hopis represent a highly disparate community of interest from the Navajo. They cannot remedy their geography. But they can strive for a political voice free from the much larger historic opposing voice of the Navajo. Their numbers are not
greatly significant relative to district population numbers. Their urgent need is significant. Their access to the political process in both our Nation's and our State's Capitols rests with you.

They respectfully request this access be supported over a geographic trip of history on a people who have lived on the mesas of the Colorado Plateau for over 1,000 years.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Hancock.

Next, Jim Hartdegen, representing Casa Grande, Casa Grande Chamber of Commerce.

MR. HARTDEGEN: Mr. Chairman, Commission members, if you thought I got upset over the Congressional stuff, it's really nothing. I'm here to talk about the Legislative stuff.

You know, I'm learning a lot, and every day you should try to learn something new. All day, I learned a whole bunch. The trouble is Mr. Johnson and the gang was here, and I guess we're kind of naive in Pinal County, trying catch up with the rest of the world.

After 106 was passed, some of us got together and we viewed, voted for the passage 106. We were so chopped up in the political process in the last
reapportionment for personal gain from people that
wanted to run for Congress and the rest that really
didn't care about the constituents, they chopped the
place up for their own political gain. That's the
truth. We thought we'd get together and we'll try to
follow the Voter's Rights Act, try to follow 106, and
we'll try to do everything right, try to make sure
there's balance, spend money, and we spent time, and we
came up with our map that we have. And as far as we
know, it meets those definitions. But we didn't know we
had to satisfy the border. We didn't understand that.

I guess we didn't have all the rules in
front of us to understand that Casa Grande, Pinal
County, Western Pinal County, had to satisfy the border
question.

Mr. Johnson blew you guys off when you
wanted to see it. He was up hear listening. He's not
going to react to this, because he's -- they already got
their mindset, guys. I'm sorry.

Sitting down here in the audience
listening to you, you have great questions, listening to
you guys. I'm an expert listener, professional meeting
goer. These guys are not going to go back with anything
that looks like this. I want to tell you that.
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And, you know, again, I don't know what we
can do. If you go along with their recommendations, you
might not go -- why even come to Florence September 8,
whatever the day is? Why even come? It will be too
late.

Chairman Lynn, the car, we're already at
Disneyland. We don't have to ask: Are we there yet?
Because we're playing by rules we don't understand.

Pinal County, you know, we're worried
about this county being chopped up, that county being
chopped up.

Pinal County is the slice and dice of 106.

It is. And I realize we're in a very particular
situation between two big metropolitan counties of the
state, populationwise. We realize we have tremendous
Indian communities to the north and south of us. You
know, we know that, because we live down there. But I
didn't know that we had to satisfy somebody's whim on
Nogales down there.

This is a good plan. I don't care what
the travelers to the west say. This is a good plan.

And I think that you ought to take a look at it and you
ought to tell your paid staff to take another good look
at it.

You know, I -- I'm sorry. I have got to
say this, because I represent a community that is just
as passionate as I am that this thing. We thought about
it for 10 years. We've griped about it for 10 years.
The people in Casa Grande said our salvation is 106.
And so I would hope before this weekend is up that you
ask your staff to look at this plan one more time. It
will solve your mining problems. And that eastern
county shouldn't be sacrificed to East Mesa and Casas
Adobas. I mean -- East Mesa is on Mars. Casas Adobas
is on Jupiter. A conservative Republican on Casas
Adobas is a liberal in East Mesa. They have nothing in
common. But I would really, really ask you to take a
look at this.
I know that you have -- I know you like
our presentation. And I know that a bunch of you guys
like this map. And it's you that has to make up your
mind and vote and not Mr. Johnson.
Thanks.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Andrea Gonzales, also from
Casa Grande.
Ms. Gonzales.

MS. GONZALES: Mr. Chairman, Members of
the Commissioners, thank you.
Clearly it's been a long and arduous
process over the last couple days, and numbers have been
bounced around, lines have been switched, people's minds
have been changed, rechanged. And similar to what Mr. Hartdegen said: Again, Pinal County seems to be a sacrificial lamb in this process.

There's a lot of emphasis on keeping other counties together while lines have been drawn through Pinal County. Our interest is in, of course, keeping Casa Grande together.

Do not split that city as it was the last time.

I am also asking you to keep in mind majority-minority districts. There are ways to make that area a majority-minority district. If you want to include Tohono O'odham Reservation, for example, in that area, it does become a minority-majority district. That would be fine.

Maybe Mr. Hartdegen just said something to the contrary. Maybe some of eastern mining industries would be better represented by -- I believe Commissioner Minkoff made the suggestion earlier about the lower portion, combining the lower portion mining communities and putting those together.

If we're looking, based on retrogression, retrogression based statewide, not countywide, it seems as though the Congressional and Legislative plans thus far focused on Casa Grande's Hispanic population.
Clearly there is interest there, yes. But at the Congressional and Legislative level, it can't continue to be the only guiding force in Pinal County. There are other interests to be considered.

I just ask the Commission keep those in mind.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Gonzales.

This is the last slip I have. If others wish to speak, please fill out a slip, get it to me.

The last speaker slip is Frank Seanez from the Navajo Nation.

Mr. Seanez.

MR. SEANEZ: Thank you, Chairman Lynn, and Members of the Commission.

It's been really good to be with you the last couple days and nights, and I'm looking forward to a couple more here. And I would like to, in addition to thanking the Commission, I'd like to address a few matters now relative to the Legislative District proposed for inclusion in the Navajo Nation. I'd like to address provisions of the '93 plan, bench mark plan, last legally enforceable plan.

The numbers for the Native Americans within that district, as well as the voting age numbers.
within that district when in Phoenix with the 2000 Census numbers. As well, I'd like to address the numbers contained within the proposed Legislative C, taking both those matters. I'd like to address the EACO proposal, and I'd also like to address the Navajo-Hopi issue.

The Navajo Nation is concerned with the numbers contained within proposed Legislative District C as related to the numbers contained in current District Three when it feeds with 2000 Census numbers as indicated in your consultant, National Demographics Corporation's, report on page five. The Legislative District benchmark plan is the 1993 plan. That's the legally enforceable plan at this point. On page eight of the July 25th, 2001, report, National Demographics Corporation indicates that the only simple majority district, which is, affects Native Americans, is Legislative District Three. When it feeds with 2000 Census data, 75 percent, Census data, Native American data, of that 75 percent, 75 percent of that Native American population is voting age.

I'd like you to contrast that with the proposed District C which is on the draft map, which was first made public on the 9th. Legislative District C, as indicated by the numbers, which support that, there is
a Native American population of 63.41 percent. Of that, there is only a voting age population of Native Americans of 57 percent. That is a drop of roughly 12 percent in the net Native American population and a drop of 13.5 percent in voting age population.

I believe, and we certainly have counsel who advise in Executive Session, that may provide you with a difficulty both in terms of Section Five preclearance as well as a Section Two matter relating to Voting Rights Act.

I'm going to recommend that the Commission give that consideration in Executive Session.

As well, the proposal for the Legislative District C would include the City of Flagstaff. The City of Flagstaff is not currently contained within Legislative District Three and may be one of the reasons for the drop in the Native American population. The inclusion of Flagstaff is not supported by the Navajo Nation. And I believe if you refer to at least the documentation provided by the Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce, not the City of Flagstaff, but President of the Chamber of Commerce, Dave Marr, that the City of Flagstaff did not request alignment with the Navajo Nation but rather with communities which they felt have a common interest, Sedona, Williams, Verde Valley.
I don't believe that --

As well, the Navajo Nation is concerned with configuration of the proposed Legislative District C, because we believe that that configuration will pit Native American voting strength against Hispanic voting strength. I don't want to talk about incumbents or where it's from. We believe it will involve a net loss in minority representation at the state Legislative level.

With regards to the Eastern Arizona Counties Organization, we understand that it's been stated here that one of the driving forces in the development of the Legislative District proposal was the inclusion of all five counties in the Eastern Arizona Counties organization within a single Legislative District. We're not talking about a single county, not Apache County, not independent portions of Navajo or Apache, or rather non-Naño portions, because the recommendation would be to include both White Mountain and San Carlos Apache land bases within a single Legislative District as encompassed by the EACO proposal.

There may be a certain degree of inaccuracy with regards to the position of the White Mountain Apache tribe relative to this matter. I do
note that there is, I believe, within the record of the
Commission a July 5th letter from the White Mountain
Apache Chairman, Mr. Dallas Massey, which indicates
support for the EACO proposal. I believe that's true.
However, as indicated by the White Mountain Apache's
attorney, Mr. Baker Fosterfield (phonetic), at the
public hearing in Hon-Dah, and as reported in the NDC
report of July 25th, 2001, on page 25, there is also a
resolution of the White Mountain Apache Tribal Council,
the governing Council the White Mountain Apache Tribe,
which indicates the desire of the White Mountain Apache
Tribe to be aligned in a Legislative District with the
Navajo Nation as well as contained within the
supplemental materials provided by the Navajo Nation.

Commissioners, it is the wishes of the San
Carlos Apache Tribe, as expressed not by Tribal Council
resolution but by their Vice Chairman, it is also the
desire to be aligned in a Legislative District with the
Navajo Nation.

I understand that there are very strong
desires expressed by the Eastern Arizona Government's
Organization to have the alignment as it is set forth
exactly on the proposed Legislative District plan at
this time. However, I think that there needs to be an
understanding that when that is established as a driving
principle, that it leads to certain other consequences,
other things follow that might not be as advantageous to
other interest groups, including the Navajo Nation, as
well as perhaps the entire citizenry in the State of
Arizona; the point being if that was not made the first
and driving principle of the Legislative District map.

I would like to move now to the issue of
amalgamations of the district proposal. There have been
statements made that there are legal issues with regard
to the Navajo Nation's proposal with regards to packing.
We simply don't believe that that is true. However, you
can receive guidance in Executive Session.

As I said previously, the Legislative
District Three will reinforce numbers. In the 2000
Census data, it indicates Native American population of
75 percent. As indicated by supplemental information
provided by the Navajo Nation, Navajo Nation information
for that, supplemental districts include Native American
population of 77.7 percent, only 2.2 greater than
Legislative District Three now when infused with the
2000 Census information.

Finally, I would like to move to the
Navajo-Hopi issue.

As indicated by members of the Commission,
might as well be with the Legislative District. I think it's extremely important to address that matter. I've heard statements before that perhaps the first thing which was considered in the entire redistricting process was the necessity of separating the Navajo and Hopi.

There is no adjudicated requirement for the separation of Navajo and Hopi. That may come from a misreading of the Case Arizona for Fair Representation vs. Symington. However, I would like to point out, and a careful reading of that opinion will indicate that that was the result of a settlement between the parties, The Navajo Nation was not a party to that suit, and it's inclusion within the Court's Native American compromise was not determined to be necessary in any fashion. You can receive further advice about that.

It's not a requirement of the Voting Rights Act, not a requirement of Section Two of the Voting Rights Act. I would like to stress that.

With regards to dilution, there is no dilution or retrogression issue with regards to the Hopi Nation under all of the legal precedent which is set forward. There is not a possibility of retrogression as far as the Hopi Nation goes. As the Commission has heard, as early as the past couple minutes ago, there is not the possibility of the Hopi Nation being a voting
majority in either of the Congressional or a Legislative
District. That is not possible. And when the courts
look to retrogression issues, they look to retrogression
of Hispanic interests and Native American interests.

Both Navajos and Hopis are Native
Americans, and they certainly share a lot more common
interests on the basis of being Native Americans than
they are separated either by their past or their current
disputes in living so close together as two Native
American groups.

Further, there is no indication before
this Commission, nor is there any indicated within the
record of the Arizona for Fair Representation vs.
Symington case, which indicates that the Hopis as a
politically cohesive group vote differently than Navajos
do. There may be an assumption that is the case. There
may be claims that is the case. However, there is no
proof of that. There is indication, however, within the
amicus brief filed in that case, in fact, Navajos and
Hopis in significant occasions, they vote the same way.

Political cohesiveness is what you are
looking at. Unfortunately, with regard to those
matters, you don't have your necessary information to
look into that. Hopefully that information will be
provided soon by EDS, information, so you can have the
benefit of that.

Further, there is no information before
the Commission, significant information, on voting
registration between the Navajos and Hopis.

One thing I think would give relevancy is
review of maps. The only way to achieve contiguity for
Hopi in a district in Congressional or Legislative
separate from the Navajo Nation is by utterly abandoning
compactness. Either have the current trunk that goes up
to the Hopi or you have the much more attenuated
umbilical cord which is set forth in the Northern
Arizona Congressional District as we saw this afternoon.
And I would recommend against such an abandonment of
compactness. It is not necessary.

The Navajo Nation maintains it would not
be helpful either to the Commission's efforts or to the
long-term interests of the Navajo and Hopi people in
learning to live together more harmoniously in the
future.

As was indicated, there is no possibility
of geographic separation of the Navajo people and Hopi.
There's only the hope that Navajo and Hopi can learn to
live together more harmoniously. There's certainly no
legal requirement they be separated, but the Navajo
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Nation continues to seek reunification of both groups,
both Congressional and Legislative Districts.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Seanez.

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

If not, we'll close this portion of public comment.

At this time I think it would be appropriate, if it is the wish of the Commission, to move into a brief Executive Session pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.03(A)(3) to receive legal advice and consultation of our attorneys.

Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: So moved.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

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

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

Motion carries.

Ladies and gentlemen, if there is public session following Executive Session, it will be brief and, number two, quite uneventful.

I'd guess Executive Session will run anywhere from a halfPhourito hour.naIf we run public
session, we'll recess, or have a brief amount of recess.

It will be brief, and you won't miss much, and we'll go
over it again in the morning.

We'll ask you to leave us, if you will.

(Recess taken from 7:35 until
approximately 7:46 p.m.)

(Whereupon, the Commission adjourned to
Executive Session at approximately 7:47 p.m. until
approximately 9:37 p.m.)

(Whereupon, the Commission resumed Open
Public Session at approximately 9:39 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will stand
in regular session, and we'll recess until 8:30 tomorrow
morning; same time, same place.

(The following is a submission received
this date from the Town of Guadalupe, 9242 South Avenida
Del Yaqui, Guadalupe, Arizona 85283-2598,
hand-delivered.)

"Memorandum.


"To: Chairman, Redistricting Committee

"From: Town of Guadalupe

"We wish to reside in the South Phoenix
area in the new redistricting plan.
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"Sincerely, ix, Arizona
"Margarita Cota, Mayor, Town of Guadalupe."

(Whereupon, the hearing adjourned at approximately 9:41 p.m.)

* * * *
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