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PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd ask the Commissioners to take their seats, please, so we can get started.

I see Dr. Heslop from NDC.

If you'll kill the music, we'll reconvene the meeting of the Independent Redistricting Commission.

Let the record show all five members of the Commission as well as legal counsel and the consultants are present.

Ladies and gentlemen, I apologize for the lateness of the process. It's a fluid process, the fluidity, not the least of such is the consultants have been up two nights straight.

This is the time for public comment. This is the time for consideration and discussion of comments and complaints from the public. Those wishing to address the Commission shall request permission in advance by filling out a speaker slip. Action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter or rescheduling the matter for
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further consideration and decision at a later date. I have two speaker slips. Wink Wiess, President of the Arizona Phoenix South Mountain -- I'm giving it up. Resident, not president, speaking on behalf of Phoenix South Mountain, Arizona Republic Party. Mr. Wiess.

MR. WIESS: Thank you. I'm Wink Wiess, live at 1535 East Dobbins. COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Bring the microphone closer.

MR. WIESS: And the Diamondbacks win. COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes. MR. WIESS: I'm here to speak on behalf of the Central Phoenix South Mountain Community. I looked at three plan modifications, one to bring in the Garfield Community, a second, release Willow District, a third one being released the Guadalupe area. We feel these changes constitute better natural boundaries than being divided by a freeway or interstate system. It also preserves communities of interest, also makes compactness for the district that this would create. And we look forward to seeing you at more meetings.
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Thank you very much. I have information for the committee.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you very much.

If others filled out speaker forms, hold them up. We'll collect them.

Next speaker, Frank Seanez, representing the Navajo Nation.

Mr. Seanez.

MR. SEANAZ: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission.

I'd like to hold off making any comments or statements at this time until a second call for public input, Chairman Lynn.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Seanez.

Next speaker is Mel Hannah, Greater Phoenix Urban League.

Mr. Hannah.

MR. HANNAH: Mel Hannah. My address is 1402 South Seventh Avenue, Phoenix, 85007.

I'm kind of in concert with the individual that spoke earlier this morning. Our observations at this point our first to commend the outstanding job you've done. It isn't easy, won't be easy to balance everything.

We feel it's relatively of critical
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importance in terms of trying to respond to the natural
boundary, if you will, and/or man-made boundaries,
particularly stated in District R. We feel that by
doing that, it would retain Guadalupe east of the
freeway into the district that would come forth from
that area. It would also allow for District R, a
suggestion would be to put Willow and Garfield to R,
compact them, which would also be consistent with the
natural boundary, allow that boundary to be in fact I-10
to the folks west.

Those are our particular recommendations
to you at this point. We may have certain other ones as
the process moves forward.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. HANNAH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The next speaker is

Representative Richard Miranda.

Mr. Miranda.

REPRESENTATIVE MIRANDA: Thank you for
letting me have the opportunity to make comments.

I'm not sure, anyway, if we can get the
maps on the screen, or --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Not at the moment,

Mr. Miranda. The maps are fluid, in any case. We
certainly, if you direct comments either to specific
Representative Miranda: I'm referencing the Legislative District that starts at 51st Avenue, I believe goes all the way out to Cotton Lane. Basically, I'm sure you are all familiar with that area.

I want to give you some historical background of the community of interest, that would be West Phoenix, out in West Phoenix, and the communities of Tolleson and Cashion.


I've spoken to the school board members, and I've gotten out to school board meetings. I've spoke to them about the Commission and what their plans are with the historical communities of interest that they're looking for. And I also speak for the Mayors and City Council of Tolleson.

I have spoken with some of the members from the Avondale's City Council.

The Southwest and West Phoenix area has always been a historical community of interest. It's been that way for many years.
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One of the problems they had, when the
I-10 freeway was being built, they were going to split
up some of these school historical areas that has always
been out there.

When they had the other redistricting
process, they stressed they did not want that mandated
barrier to determine which side of the district they may
be on.

The other body that drew up lines
recognized that and said yes, there is a community of
interest out here and we are going to keep them
together.

Speaking to the school board members of
the five districts I'm speaking about, they are going to
be affected negatively by what has been proposed so far.
They do not want to be taken into, I believe, three
different Legislative Districts. They feel somehow
their whole collective area will be -- will not have the
effect on determining what is best for that community if
it's drawn up the way it is right now.

Murphy School District, which is basically
from 19th Avenue west of the freeway, and there actually
is one school east of the freeway right on the Durango
Curve, Hamilton School, said they want to be kept
together. They also feel they are part of West Phoenix.
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That is speaking to the school board members themselves.

Riverside was one of only two school districts in the entire Maricopa County, and has been, it was formed, Riverside School has been on 51st Avenue, has been part of Maricopa -- their own school district. It's a one school school district, but it's been in existence since 1850, I believe. They want to be kept with the rest of the school districts. Allgea King, one of the school board members, has expressed that to me. They feel they are part of that community. There is a community of interest there.

Isaac School District, which is being put in a Legislative district all the way up to Northern and some being put in with another -- two different districts, because Isaac School District goes beyond 51st that way and goes south of the freeway, they are being split into three different districts. They've expressly told me they do not want to be split up and feel they are part of West Phoenix.

Tolleson always had feeder students from West Phoenix, so they also are concerned about what -- where these lines are going to be drawn up.

The other, speaking now, going on to the other side, the west side of this proposed district, this historical community of interest has nothing in
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common if you are going to include Estrella Ranch. It has homes well into the three, four hundred thousand dollar home range. It has nothing in common with Litchfield Park and the northern part of 115th Avenue, Dysart, Litchfield Road, Estrella. There is no commonalty in that area, nor is there a sense of a historical community of interest. There is none, basically. That's something that cannot be done.

Again, I speak to you to try and keep this community of interest together. Splitting it up into three different areas is not what they want.

I've been out there, speaking to school board members, which are the grass roots of this school. They are the ones that live in it, are the ones that have the children going to school there. Historically some lived in there for longer than we've been alive. That's the bottom line. Regina Ameda Cruz lived off 35th and McDowell, is 85 years old, has lived in the same house for 47 years. If the map was to be drawn today, they would be in a district that has no community of interest with them. Again, they would like to see this area kept together.

Cutting it into three Legislative districts is just going to destroy this community.

I hope you take this into consideration.
I hope that as you work this out, Tolleson has expressly 
stressed already, in a prior meeting, they want to been 
with West Phoenix. They identify with West Phoenix. 
They have students from West Phoenix going to their 
schools. And they would like to stay as a community. 
They identify very much closely together.

And again, I want to thank you for your 
time for listening.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Representative 
Miranda.

The next speaker --

If you wish to speak in this session, 
please fill out a yellow speaker slip. We'll get to 
you.

The next speaker, Glenn Dennard 
representing the African American Christian Clergy 
Coalition.

Mr. Dennard.

PASTOR DENNARD: Thank you very much to 
the Commission, and thank you for your time and efforts 
thus far for all the people of Arizona.

I'm representing the African American 
Christian Clergy Coalition, Dr. Warren Stewart, and 
Pastor Alexis Thomas. And I have been summoned, so to 

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE 
Phoenix, Arizona
speak, to come and make sure our voice is heard and we
have a continuing role, I should say, and focus on what
you all are doing. And we commend what you've done thus
far.

Basically, what I've been told to express
to you is our concerns are probably a little less
political but very much we represent over 40 to 50
pastors who, if you take in the known members of the
parishioners, members of churches, probably 50,000 or
more, and that's probably very conservative, on purpose,
whose livelihood, whose -- we have -- their families
have been in the innercity area, predominantly the
district that is draft District R. Currently 23 is our
main focus, not solo, but that's our main focus.

And our concern initially, and you will be
hearing from us more, is just that the natural
boundaries that are currently existing, if they would
continue to take precedence. We're concerned about
that.

And what we're seeing, some natural
boundaries, some natural communities that should stay
together, the effort for that to occur we're hoping
would continue and increase, and that the lines that
currently, are being followed, will continue to empower
or greater empower the people who are in draft District
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R and serve not to lesson their ability to be in power.

Not to be wrong makers, a minister we can be wrong, we are looking with anticipation and great interest with what you are doing.

And like I said, if at future meetings, I think we're going to have greater participation. And we're looking real close to Central Phoenix South Mountain Community College's Plan at advising and that. We haven't totally supported that yet. We're leaning greatly toward it.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Pastor Dennard.

That was the last, will be next to last, next to last.

Rudolfo Perez, Jr., Director of MALDEF.

Mr. Perez.

MR. PEREZ: Good morning. Thank you.

I'm here to address the issue of competitiveness. I represent the Mexican American Legal Defense Educational Fund and remind the Commissioners that represent the Prop 106 it emphasizes competitiveness in drawing Legislative and Congressional maps.

I'm here to advise if maps are drawn to emphasize bipartisanship, competitiveness, if you prefer.
the term, at the expense of voting rights of the
minority community and communities of interest, it could
be a violation of Section Two of the Voting Rights Act.
That's why I'm here this morning.
Thank you.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Perez.
If you have a desire to speak, this is
call to the public.
I have one last speaker form. This is the
last one in my possession, Councilmember Cody Williams.
Mr. Williams.
COUCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: Good morning,
ladies and gentlemen.
I appreciate having this opportunity to
thank you for the hard work you've done. I know it's a
very exhaustive process. And it's very clear that a lot
of time and energy has been put into preparing these
maps. Certainly a lot of thought has been put into
establishing these various Legislative and Congressional
Districts.
I would like to comment on both of the
maps that you have before us. First I'd like to start,
however, with the Arizona Legislative District map.
I think you've heard a number of speakers.
In the short time that I've been here,
I've heard divisions reference the fact that natural boundaries are the things that may create consistency for those of us who look at the next 10 years from a politically and socially connected future. And one of the things that I and others have thought and discussed is the fact that the I-10 freeway creates one of those natural boundaries. It does so. However, I'd point out that as you look at the area that would be R on your Arizona Legislative District map, that there are communities that almost unnaturally exist on the other side. They create islands.

I must say I represent a community that is 55 square miles, has about 160,000 individuals in it. It runs from Thomas Road to north South Mountain to the south, approximately 19th Avenue to the west and 48th Street to the east. And there are so many pockets divided by the freeways that create narrow strips of community which logically should belong to possibly a neighboring district across a major intersection. For instance if we're at 24th Street, there's a community that has 24th Street to the east, the freeway, 51 to the west, it has McDowell to the south, and Thomas to the north. And there's a community that has McDowell to the north and another freeway to the south, and it represents a little square. And they often remind me
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that they feel like they are being left out.

So it is so much more difficult when you see the community north of I-10, which is more commonly referred to as the Willow neighborhood, sitting there by itself, just as you see Guadalupe sitting east of that freeway line.

Subsequently, the communities below that lie also logically below the confines and contrast of that district.

So I think that if you would just, if you were making a pie, as my mother would do, there's leftover dough she would trim around the edges. While we had the pie being ready to be filled, the dough still had value. We still wanted to eat the dough. I don't know if anybody here liked the dough of pie crust. It's not to say these communities are poor, but it is to say we do have these types of boundaries that have been established by either natural or man-made design. And we should adhere to them as best we can. And that would be the culmination about my conversation about the Legislative Districts.

I do believe that we should take those areas north and east of the I-10 out and add back in any of those that fit south and within the curve of the 10 as it moves south toward Tucson.
The only other comment that I can make about the Congressional Districts is Metropolitan Phoenix is clearly responsible for massive growth of the State of Arizona. And that growth has produced two new Congressional Districts. So I was personally surprised to see that the two new Congressional Districts happen to be rural districts and that those who will compete, most logically, for the newer districts, at least the way they were described in the newspaper, and I can certainly appreciate if that was not fairly or accurately conveyed in the description, were those left behind. But based on what I read, area C, if I'm not mistaken, and G, are the too new areas that have been established and referred to as new Congressional Districts. And neither of those two connect and/or split or go through any of the major Metropolitan urban areas within Metropolitan Phoenix.

Now certainly I think that for what it's worth, balance, numbers, population in each of these areas is certainly as close as you can get. But without being very specific and saying I have for you a better choice, a better plan, I certainly would have hoped that within this large cluster of things that we might have had an opportunity to see a new Congressional District within the urban confines of Metropolitan Phoenix, or at
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least access to a representative. While I believe that
the balance that was trying to be struck by having four
rural and four urban certainly may be a very noble
effort, the hub of the wheel of the State of Arizona
rests squarely in Metropolitan Phoenix.

And yes, I will continue to go hunting and
fishing in the rural communities. I will bet you by the
time we do this again 10 years from now, the urban
population of Metropolitan Phoenix will be twice as
large and make up three-quarters to four-fifths of the
population of the State of Arizona.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Williams.

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

If not, let us turn to the status report
and update from NDC.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, let me report
first on the Legislative plan.

We worked hard last evening, but I guess
it was one of those evenings. We didn't work very well,
or at least we did not produce what we hoped to produce.
Our problem is that we faced too many questions to which
we need Commission answers.

Now, you, yesterday, asked us to make
changes in every part of the map. There is a deal of
technical complexity in making changes in 30 districts
in all parts of the state. And we found ourselves in
the middle of the night needing instruction. And so
this morning our hope is that we can present to you some
of the problems that we discovered in the night and ask
you for instruction in resolving them.

So that is a rather negative report on our
night's report.

We do not have a plan or anything that
looks like a plan for you. We have incomplete portions
of a plan, several different alternatives.

We went up several blind allies last
night.

And that is our report on the Legislative
plan.

On the Congressional plan, it's much more
positive news. We have made the changes that the
Commissioners wanted. We think that they are good
changes, and we have a plan that the initials NDC have
fallen right off and I see glowing, perhaps not in gold
yet, "IRC."

Florence I called five minutes ago and
they should be coming in in about 10 minutes,
Mr. Chairman, to make a presentation on that plan. She
will lead you through each of the districts. And thereafter, Mr. Chairman, Doug Johnson will come; and he and I will together report on the Legislative plan and seek instruction from you.

So that's where we are.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Heslop, thank you.

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, prior to that report, I don't think we need to look at that plan to make an interim, take care some of Commission business. One of which is, I think, this Commission needs to give final direction to the consultants with respect to the Navajo-Hopi issue that we've been at. There may be a few other items that I think we can address in the interim prior to Dr. Adams being here.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: What is your pleasure?

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Are you talking -- Is this on?

Talking Congressional District, Legislative District, or both?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, I think we'd need to do it one at a time in light of the fact we'll see the report on Congressional first. I was recommending it prior to Doug coming so we maybe want to
address that rather than drink water or something.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Well, if that's your

pleasure, I'll be happy to discuss that issue or --

Ms. Leoni.

MS. LEONI: If I can make a comment, the

plan you saw yesterday about midday was a plan that did

not remove the Hopi Reservation from the Navajo

Reservation. This plan that you will see in about 10

minutes does that through a narrow corridor of Census

blocks which you saw on a slide yesterday that has got

about four people in it. I want to advise you that is

what you will see in 10 minutes. That is a reversible

change, is a reversal that affects only Districts A and

C. So we did it that way. But it's still completely

subject to reversal of plans.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Another point that needs

to be made, what we'll be approving and deciding today,

today or whenever that vote is taken on that particular

issue, is whichever representation we will be taking to

the public for the second round of hearings, it is not

and should not be construed as the final decision. I

think the question is whether we want the public to

react to a Congressional map with the separation or with

the inclusion, and that's really where we have to --

where we have to come down at this point.
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Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK:  Mr. Chairman, I agree with Mr. Hall. This is an issue we should consider now. For the sake of putting it on the table, I'm willing to make the motion that we present a plan that separates the Hopi from the Navajo.

CHAIRMAN LYNN:  Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF:  I second it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN:  Discussion?

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL:  It may well be redundant, Mr. Chairman, to highlight the complexity of this issue. But nevertheless, prior to doing that, I want to again reiterate what you said. I had a gentleman talk to me yesterday who said, "You can rest assured that whatever you guys do, there's going to be several changes;" to which I responded, "that is precisely the point."

That's why we're presenting a draft plan, to go and to submit that for public input in an effort to try and accommodate whatever changes may be appropriate or necessary that would best represent the wishes of the citizens of this state.

With respect to the Hopi and Native American issue, as I've said before, I have met with
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representatives of both tribes on several occasions. And it's easy to see the perspectives of both. For me, I guess, it becomes more of a practical issue than many -- than some of the legal considerations that may or may not come into play. And that is that it -- if there is a history or a -- a previous separation, and one can wonder and may believe that it would not be in the best interests at this time to try and go against the grain, as it were. And so in light of that, I guess I'm saying that I think that we should present to the public as a draft plan showing a continued separation pursuant to what NDC has -- we saw yesterday. And I think that then we can get whatever additional input, if there is any, regarding that through the coming weeks.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This whole activity that we've been involved in is all about trying to create districts that are going to work best for all of the people in Arizona. And to that extent we've been going out, listening to people, asking them to define for us what their AURs are.

I would like to be able to respond positively to every AUR that has been identified.
Unfortunately, that's not going to be possible because some are in direct conflict with one another. However, this is a unique AUR with defined borders that is easy to identify. And as long as accommodating their desires to be separate from the Navajo Nation does not negatively impact other goals that we are trying to achieve in terms of drawing districts that represent communities of interest that comply with the Voting Rights Act that allow people to have the kind of representation that they want, I think that we should try to accommodate them. That's why I would also support the motion and propose that the draft maps we send out do provide the separation.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I listened to the arguments made on both sides of this question through the Chair. And I believe that the arguments on all sides are sincere and heartfelt. My own perspective comes from, I think, maybe my profession, to some extent. I know that with the kinds of issues that exist today and will continue to exist for some time between the Navajos and the Hopis, that no single lawyer, no single arbitrator, could purport to represent both sides of those questions. There is, in effect, a conflict of interest. This is, essentially,
the argument made by the Hopis. I cannot see how a
single Congressional Representative could honestly and
effectively and fully represent all interests. And,
therefore, that is the reason why I feel that we need to
separate the two.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Call the question.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Well, before we do that,
let me also say this: This is -- this is a difficult
issue, as has been expressed. I would, frankly, be
inclined, because we're going to get reaction
regardless, pretty well know what reaction will be
depending on what choice we make. I think the safe
choice is to maintain separation, because it's been that
way for 10 years. It will look similar to maps that
they've seen before, because that's the current
circumstance. I might wish to go a different way and
show people a different map and get reaction to that,
just so that people can visualize what a unified
Northern Arizona District would look like and give
people an opportunity to react, and if they react
negatively, to do so. But as we said, it's fairly easy
to do inclusion or exclusion based on the work of the
consultants and the way things are going.

But I certainly get the sense that the
Commission wishes to maintain the separation in the
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Having said that, unless Mr. Elder wants to make a comment, we'll move to a vote. Let's do a roll call just for the sake of knowing where everybody is.

Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "no."

And the motion carries four to one.

Other matters I --

I see Dr. Adams. I don't want to rush her. As soon as she gets set up, we can look at the Congressional presentation.

Are there other issues we need to take care of that are of a business nature while she is setting up? If not --

Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I think we need to look at the plan. I don't know if you want
to do that at this point or defer that to another time.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's talk a little bit about the consultant's report a bit earlier, about the Legislative conundrum we face, and the fact we may need some additional time to work through the various circumstances that need to be adjusted on the Legislative map. And let me throw out a schedule, or makings of a schedule, to see how that sits with the Commission.

I would suggest we hear the Congressional presentation. To the extent presentation shows us a map very much closer to one that we could adopt, that we discuss that as fully as we need to. And at that point, as we all said, we're going to defer adoption until we're further along and have heard all public comment, and so on, to get to a point we feel fairly comfortable with the Congressional map, and so on. At that point we turn to the consultants and ask them what information would be useful to them, from the Commission, that would make their Legislative map advancement easier.

And if there are a series of questions or circumstances that need to be discussed and decided, we would discuss and decide those. At that point we would then recess, allow the consultants to move as far forward as they could, and essentially be available at
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the call of the consultants within, say, a half hour,
45-minute call, to come back into session either later
today or, if necessary, tomorrow, and return to the
discussion of the Legislative map.

How does that strike you? Reasonable?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let us proceed along those lines.

Again, members of the public, and press,
that are with us, we apologize for any inconvenience
that that schedule puts on you; however, I don't know
how else to do it and make progress. You'll just have
to bear with us. And it's just going to be a fluid
situation until we are completed this weekend.

With that, Dr. Adams, are you prepared to talk to us about the Congressional map?

(Dr. Florence Adams and Ian Rudge have joined the consultants.)

DR. ADAMS: Good morning, Chairman,

Members of the Commission.

We have a presentation for you this morning on the Congressional draft plan, still a work in progress, but we have addressed some of the concerns you addressed yesterday and followed some of the concepts
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presented yesterday and more fully presented them.

You now have a spread sheet of data in your hands from that work.

Let me go through this presentation for you.

Yesterday, August 10th, the Commission instructed NDC to continue modification of the Congressional draft map based on the approved reversal Ahwatukee move. Sounds like a lot of double talk. The move, you know, those moves moved Ahwatukee from District D, now moved Ahwatukee out of District D. You saw consequence of that in some form and then partial consequences.

Commissioners then asked NDC to modify Districts B, D, and E based on the recommended concept of a united Ahwatukee with Tempe and Scottsdale, moving District B north into the growth areas north of Phoenix.

As you recall, we explored problems with possibly moving east into Gilbert, Chandler, and decided to move forward with this particular approach even though it involved a narrow neck.

The major consequences of reversal and the subsequent modification: It reunites Hispanic communities defined by the IRC Hispanic AUR except the Glendale portion; keeps Glendale whole in District A;
keeps Ahwatukee united in District E; keeps Scottsdale united in District E.

We're going to see how it keeps Scottsdale united. That's something you may want to look at.

It moves Arcadia and Paradise Valley into District B and a few other blocks in that southeast Phoenix area, or south central, I should say. It moves District B north to share growth areas north of the Phoenix Metropolitan area with Districts A and E.

All three districts, A, B and E have some of that territory shared, some of that highly erratic, rapidly growing area.

Here we see, and I don't have my little pointer this time. I have this arrow. I think you can see it. This is the little Glendale portion we did not bring back in. And here is the area of B that wasn't moved into District B.

Here you saw Ahwatukee is once again united.

Now here is a little contrast for you to look at. This unites Scottsdale. So we have District B and District E. It united Scottsdale because of heavy population here to here.

To keep Scottsdale united, you need to make this little maneuver. However, you could put it
back and, in some fashion, have one small split in Scottsdale. You have to take a look at the actual number there. And we could do that by going through the town.

As you see, B does move all the way north.

E moves all the way north. A, as you already knew, moves all the way north.

The Commission asked also NDC remove the Hopi Reservation Moenkopi Village from District C and connect with District A based on District 10.

Major consequences of the Hopi reservation being connected to District A at the northeast corner by a narrow string of Census blocks: It's containing four persons and approximately 7,000 persons that will be moved from the Yavapai portion District A into District C.

So hear you see the neck, four persons in that neck moving up to the reservation connecting into the northeast corner of District A.

Here you can see the line of the map we presented yesterday, the black line. I'll use my pointer again. This black line is -- shows the territory that as a consequence of the move was moved from District A into C to equalize population, and that is in Yavapai County.

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
If you want to know the exact nature of that area, we can zoom in when we yet to the Yavapai map.

Commission members asked NDC to determine the influence of Tucson on District G. And I have some numbers for you on at.

We note that that area, you can see that Tucson is divided by the line between G and H. In the Tucson portion, there are 226,456 persons. 129,845 of those persons are Hispanic, or 57.3 percent Hispanic persons.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Could you repeat those, please.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: In G.

DR. ADAMS: G, the Tucson portion, 226,456 total persons. 129,845 persons of Hispanic origin, which accounts for 57.3 percent of that population.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Can I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Wait until the end.

DR. ADAMS: I left off a slide yesterday. Let me go one more time, make sure I haven't left anything else.

Here it is, next steps, final adjustment, fine-tuning.
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What I'd like to do is bring up the interactive map in order to answer questions.
So if we go ahead, if you have questions, specifically now.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes.

My question, the impact of Tucson District G, when you gave us figures, were those just City of Tucson or the entire Tucson urban area?

DR. ADAMS: That's City of Tucson. The Tucson urban area, Metro area, takes that number, adds about 60, not quite 60,000 more persons to that number. I didn't have to say it didn't add the Hispanic portion of that.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The Tucson Metropolitan area --

DR. ADAMS: 292,000 persons, 44 percent of the district. But the portion of Tucson that is in the district is heavily Hispanic.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Questions or comments for Dr. Adams?

Shall we go back now if you want bring up the interactive portion of the map? I'm sure there will be specific questions that relate to the nuances of the borders of those districts.

DR. ADAMS: Chairman Lynn, Members of the
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Commission, thank you for your indulgence. I had the map all up and for some reason managed to close it. I'm going to bring it up on the screen now.

And now we have the interactive.

If you have questions, I'll zoom in on any portion to assist you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's do it in the same fashion you presented it, if we can.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Before you start, can you show us the entire map, before we start focusing on specific areas?

Thank you.

DR. ADAMS: Okay. Almost all of it.

There you go. Almost all of it.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: That's fine. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right. I think the first part of your report dealt with Central Phoenix, or the Phoenix area.

DR. ADAMS: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Comments or questions on this portion of the map?

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Before we start, excuse me, could you put the Census place names, or

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
something, for reference up there, please?

DR. ADAMS: They are actually on there, if I zoom in closer. If you want them on there, if we change scale.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If you zoom in more, what we're looking at, corridor B, D, E, F, if we zoom in more.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: A question about the area between B and E, the two blocks of equal size in reverse.

DR. ADAMS: They're not necessarily equal when you take a look at those. I'll have Doug come up and take a quick look at those with you. Flash in. I want to zoom in on those.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Let me ask this question: Is the blue box an incorporated or unincorporated area?

DR. ADAMS: Unincorporated area.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: It may very well be annexed into Scottsdale sometime soon?

DR. ADAMS: It's heavily populated.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Heavily populated?

DR. ADAMS: Heavily populated. Exact numbers, I'd have to check.

Want me to check?
I have a technician. He can fly around the screen much faster than I can.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Can we get street names?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yeah. We have to have a reference.

DR. ADAMS: There you can see the population numbers there.

Let me zoom in closer, and you can see.

When I said "heavily populated," I'm trying to get absolute numbers. When trying to get to numbers like these, even though it doesn't seem like a lot, it will affect your numbers.

Zoom in closer there.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: How close in population are the two districts now?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: 48 or 38 a part?

DR. ADAMS: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: 200 a part?

DR. ADAMS: District E is 138 persons over at this point.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: If you switched them, they'd be almost exactly equal.

DR. ADAMS: Sorry?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: If you switched
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the two boxes, the districts would have almost exactly
equal population, roughly.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: That's correct.

Then we would be dividing a tiny portion of Scottsdale
as a consequence.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: My question is if
that area is likely to be annexed soon, anyway, then
that wouldn't make very much difference and, in the name
of compactness and achieving more to close equality, we
might want to reverse those two.

DR. ADAMS: We can certainly do that.

Possibly -- let me just show you a possible thing that
can be done there.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm not sure those
numbers are actually right, Dr. Adams. Looks like the
yellow area is very heavily populated. Two Census
blocks between them have almost 550 people. I think the
switch may put too many people into B and then have B
significantly overpopulated.

DR. ADAMS: Let's zoom in.

MR. JOHNSON: If I may, Commissioner, the
issue you are actually wrestling with, the issue you are
seeing numbers on is the City of Scottsdale. The desire
to avoid is by going there. We're actually looking,
where you want to switch this is up is in the north, or
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other area, also unincorporated areas, of equivalent population.

DR. ADAMS: Equivalent population.

Population there, a possible division of Scottsdale. A small division, some division. There is room, if I recall in the wee hours of the night when working on this, there is a possibility of taking a look, taking a further look down in this area and possibly bringing some of this territory into B from E, further adjustment there.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Arcadia south of the Paradise Valley area?

DR. ADAMS: Trying not to go too far down. It is possible to take in some area.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Phoenix? Scottsdale?

DR. ADAMS: It's Phoenix.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: It would make a lot of sense.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It does make some sense.

DR. ADAMS: We'd be happy to do that. We were trying not to go too far down with B.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Seems like it would make sense there just to square off the bottom.
DR. ADAMS: Yes. It certainly would make sense. We'd be happy to do that.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: North, the blue box.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: That is -- I want to be clear. It still keeps Scottsdale whole?

DR. ADAMS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Squares off the top by adding to the bottom of the district?

DR. ADAMS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments on -- Let's at this point be sure we're giving clear direction. Any objection to making that adjustment?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Go back to the northern end of the district. I want to see what it will do after we do that.

I think that makes sense.

DR. ADAMS: I do, too.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: So let's ask you to make that adjustment, and we'll take a look at that.

DR. ADAMS: Okay. We will indeed.

Let's move to the next area.

Now that pretty much takes care of B, D, and E.
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I believe the next thing we were discussing is restoration of the Hopi into District A.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let me ask one other question. If you move to the southern portion of that, I want to ask you a specific question about one other municipality all the other adjustments may have been affected I want to be sure I understand how.

Can you tell me in this configuration how many districts, for example, does the City of Chandler find itself in.

DR. ADAMS: Chandler is in two districts. The divider, as I recall, is Dobson Road.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Consistent with their testimony, and this configuration maintains that.

DR. ADAMS: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: What about Mesa?

Mesa? How many districts are contained in the parts of the City of Mesa?

DR. ADAMS: Let me move that over.

Mesa is in F. A small portion of Mesa right here is in E. There is one division.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Does that include all of Queen Creek and Gilbert?

DR. ADAMS: That's correct. They are.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay. Dr. Adams, before you moved in with your presentation, the Commission voted on the Congressional map to adopt the separation of Hopi and Navajo based on the representation that you have on this map. So unless there's something else you want to tell us about that, I think we've dealt with that issue.

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I would like to know the specific communities in Yavapai County you pulled in.

DR. ADAMS: Let me zoom in on that area. Hopefully I scaled it such that we'll be able to see. The blue line denotes the line that we had on the map yesterday. And so now you can see Eloy, Peeples Valley, Yarnell, Wilhoit, not too terribly populated. And I believe, if I can see where I am, Spring Valley. And I'm not reading this label very well.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Cordes Lakes. Can we zoom out, see something more on the labels, see something more in context of where these things are, please?

DR. ADAMS: On the place names, see where
they are on the map.

Want it further or I can show you both areas on there?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Can you go over to Mohave, please.

DR. ADAMS: I think I'll zoom out and zoom back in.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Zoom on the line --

DR. ADAMS: This line?

COMMISSIONER HALL: What is the population in Mohave valley and Arizona Village.

DR. ADAMS: Mohave Valley, Arizona Village. Let me ask Doug to come up, bring up those cities and show you. He'll do it much more quickly than I would.

Population of Mohave Valley and Arizona Village.

DR. ADAMS: Mohave Valley, 13,694.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Is there not enough population in the incorporated areas below Mohave Valley?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: 14,000 people in that area, Josh.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Above that.

Can you make that line straight above the

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
major communities, people in the major communities?

MR. JOHNSON: The line south?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Make it straight.

MR. JOHNSON: A couple hundred, probably in here, not a major population, the region west, east of Bullhead City.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Could we zoom back then to where we get the northwestern part of the state on the screen once?

I suppose what I'm looking at, I want to understand the trades that NDC was recommending in going south into Yavapai and going north into Mohave.

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Elder, there was no change in the line in Mohave County from the map you saw yesterday, no trades there. The only trade that was made was the Hopi Reservation was removed from District C and those two portions of Yavapai defined for you were moved into district C for trade. There was no effect on the line in Mohave County.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: That was one of the requests of this Commissioner that be looked at, the line be moved to the south to bring Mohave Valley and areas there with Bullhead City, almost one continuous
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urban area there.

DR. ADAMS: Mr. Elder, I did not have that on my list of instructions. If I missed that, I apologize. So we certainly would be happy to look at that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: How many people live in the remainder of Yavapai County that hasn't been --

DR. ADAMS: Sorry?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: How many reside in the remainder of Yavapai County that hasn't been incorporated?

DR. ADAMS: Hasn't been incorporated?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Which one?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Into C, I guess.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The southern part of Yavapai County.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Right.

MR. JOHNSON: It's pretty small.

DR. ADAMS: We can calculate the numbers exactly. It will take some churning of the computer. What we can do is show you the numbers on the map.

MR. JOHNSON: Numbers are too small. This
is an exception in almost 200. We're really very sparsely populated on the end.

COMMISSIONER HALL: The fact of the matter is it's probably not enough to trade some of Mohave for Southern Yavapai, is that correct?

DR. ADAMS: That was our conclusion. Maybe small areas. We'd be looking at some sort of division or moving around the heavily populated areas, because it is a fairly small count.

MR. JOHNSON: Just for Bullhead City, you'd have to find 33,000 people.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The only incorporated places in that southern part of Yavapai County now are Black Canyon City, Cordes Junction, which have a little over 4,000 people between the two of them.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Minkoff, what I was looking at is to see if we can find 4,350 in Mohave Valley to put in with the blue, I guess C, so that sort of, I guess mini-metropolitan area be made whole rather than have a line going through a community. We didn't hear that at the meeting in Bullhead. If there's -- I can't read from here, like that one over there, blue now, if that went over to Yavapai County to pick up Mohave County, just enough -- where is the shooter, in other words, if
we can take that part right there, have it be in C, I believe it is, and maybe take one of these pieces and put it back into A.

COMMISSIONER HALL: That's it,

Commissioner Elder, too much population.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Never mind.

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Elder,

Commissioner Hall, Members of the Commission, there are about 14,000 people, as we said, in Mohave Valley. Arizona Village does not have sufficient population in a trade to possibly take part of it. That one itself, Mohave Valley, is 13,194. So --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments or questions on this portion of the map?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I just want to comment that I think in terms of where they fit, that Yarnell and Peeples Valley probably fit better up in the Northern Arizona District, anyway. I think it's really too bad we can't put Congress up there, too. Well, population doesn't work.

Black Canyon City I think is a reasonable fit with the southern portion of state. Those two are better up. I suggest leaving them in the Northern District. I forget what the letter it is.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: C.
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Let's move forward then unless there's a specific comment on this portion.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: What is the population of Kingman?

DR. ADAMS: Population of Kingman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: You have it in your binder. I'd thought I'd remind you. It takes longer to pull it up than for you to look up.

DR. ADAMS: 20,069.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Thank you.

DR. ADAMS: There's a simple way. Talking unincorporated areas, that's where it's more difficult, we have to do computer magic.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right. Next section.

The next section I believe was the Tucson issue.

DR. ADAMS: I've given you numbers on that. Is there any, any other questions on that area?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Could you, Dr. Adams, since we didn't have a presentation on the interactive, bring up the Tucson area, give us a better look at the division of the Tucson unincorporated area between the two districts itself?

DR. ADAMS: There are a lot of blocks here
because of the other thing. I think probably you'd
rather have me turn off the Census blocks.

As I said, we're looking in the actual
Tucson city at 226,456 persons that are in G, and of
those persons, 129,849 are Hispanic, that's 57.53
percent. If you add in the rest of the incorporated
areas there, Tucson Estates, Drexel Heights, et cetera,
you add 60,000 more population to it, 282,491 persons,
or 44 percent of District G.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Adams, if you would
focus on the area of the split just below the name
Tucson and give me a square.

DR. ADAMS: Just about --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Even tighter.

That area is fine.

Go in to the point where I see major
streets.

DR. ADAMS: You want to see streets.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I do.

DR. ADAMS: Get those turned back on.

I have to zoom a little more.

Do you have a specific area?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Right below the Tucson
place designation.

DR. ADAMS: I'm still not getting streets.
COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Streets. Don't have street names.

DR. ADAMS: Is this the area you are interested in, Chairman Lynn?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Yes.

There are two parts of the University of Arizona campus. There's the Main Campus, and Arizona Health Sciences Center. The Arizona Health Science Center on Campbell Avenue north of Speedway, what this separation has done is divided the campus between two Congressional Districts, which is probably not a good idea.

What I would ask you to look for is an opportunity to move that portion that Mr. Elder is outlining with the pointer, that portion, to move that into the western district with the main campus with the University.

DR. ADAMS: Talking easily to Campbell.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Actually go a little beyond Elm. That particular area of the city, the University acquired a number buildings to use as ancillary buildings for the Health Sciences Center. The acquisition has gone north of Elm on Campbell. So you may, and again, I don't know what the density is of the population to make the district, but I can't imagine
it's huge, I think we're talking not more than a couple thousand people at the most. I would go all the way to Grant Road, just to be safe, which is just above Waiverly that you have there.

DR. ADAMS: I see Grant Road.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Grant and Campbell would be a reasonable place for that to be squared off to take in the entire University of Arizona.

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Lynn, take all that territory into District G?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Correct.

DR. ADAMS: See what the impact of that is on a minority-majority district?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If necessary, make adjustments at the bottom of that district to the east. I think to go the other way would create different havoc, if we go the other direction.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: The other direction, Commissioner?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Taking the entire University east instead of west.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Your concern is --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: By taking it east?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Leave it west?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It goes west.
COMMISSIONER ELDER: My only concern really is that we keep that University area whole. Now whether it moves east or west is -- does not make a whole lot of difference as long as it's not divided. That's my major concern. Now, if we could find some --

Do we know about what the population is in that area?

DR. HESLOP: Rather more than we speculate.

DR. ADAMS: If we put numbers on the map, we can see it's a rather densely populated area. Every one of those blocks with 25, 30, 52, 130, some have fairly dense blocks in there.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I guess what I'm looking for is some idea of the numbers we're looking at there, shifting one way or another, so when we move further south we can determine what would be a legitimate way or easy way of recovering that area.

DR. ADAMS: It will just take a few minutes. We can go in, select those blocks, tell you what population we're talking about.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I don't know that we have to do all of that here.

I guess the point I'm trying to make, my experience suggests that area around the University, and
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the west University neighborhood, which is, as the name suggests, west of the University, has more affinity with and relates more to downtown Tucson and the neighborhoods to the south and the west than the areas to the far east. And that was the point the other day.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, it looks like, going a little further south, I'm not as familiar with Tucson as you are, but there's a little finger bounded by the, looks like east of 22nd Street, Golf Links Road, Cray Croft, and if that might be a reasonable place to look to adding into the district we've taken population from.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Might very well. I'm suggesting you take a look at that.

DR. ADAMS: Okay. You don't want us to show numbers right now?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: You don't need to take time now. Refine the map further, take a look, and as Ms. Minkoff points out, the section goes relatively far east. I'm talking now about District G.

Around 22nd Street, it goes fairly far east and there may be some compensating values there.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I guess one of the things I'm concerned about is we've got that situation where we still are wanting to maintain the Hispanic
population in G. And by adding in that population around the University, because it does relate to the downtown, as Steve says, we are diluting or -- not diluting, we're adding in more of non-Hispanic population. And we've got to make sure we get the Hispanic population back then into the balance that we had prior to this request.

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Elder, Members of the Commission, the main concern would be the Hispanic community, as we have defined the AUR. We would want to make certain we are maintaining that community.

I may ask a question? I want to make absolutely certain. You indicated it wouldn't matter one way or the other. You just simply want the University whole within one district or the other?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: That's Mr. Elder's point of view.

DR. ADAMS: Okay. That's not a universal point of view.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd like to see how it works. If there is a way, without damaging the attributes of G we want to preserve, that the University and area just discussed could move west in that district, if it can't --

DR. ADAMS: Into G.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: If it can't, but I'd like to see if it could.

Mr. Elder's point, if it can't move west, that is say all into G District, then it should be made whole in another district. It needs to be made whole regardless.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'd agree with that. My preference would be to bring it into the west. But if it can't, then make it whole is the direction.

DR. ADAMS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

Do you have any other, on this one point, before we move on?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'd like to take a look at it again.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I wanted take a look far south, splitting sectors, the county, on this plan, as we look at it a last time.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I'd comment we let them make adjustments and as to specifics --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Are we finished? Is that the last one on your list?

DR. ADAMS: The last one on my list.
One other concern expressed by Commissioner Huntwork about moving the Glendale portion back into the Hispanic AUR, although I didn't get specific instruction about that, my understanding was there was concern that it would bring Maricopa County into District G as an adjustment.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I was really pointing out, I think -- not managing to do it right now, for example, your concern again expressed many times, concern, discussion we had about just how sensitive G is. Ultimately, it's simply an idea for a way to enrich the demographics of G, if we have to do it for any reason. I don't think you should -- I'm not asking you to go any further with it at this time.

DR. ADAMS: That's my understanding. I just wanted to make absolutely certain. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay.

At this point, without objection, we will ask the consultants to make the refinements to the Congressional map as we've outlined them.

Let's then take a 10-minute break and return to answer questions on the Legislative map as posed by the consultants.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, shortly
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before --

Jose and I want to just point out just one thing before you take your break.

We're not by any means suggesting you change your instructions to the consultants. We do need
to just express to you, just to make sure you know, in District G, the draft that we started with had a combined Hispanic and Native American voting age population of 50.36 percent. It has -- and that's running close. It had dropped to, in the plan that you were presented with this morning, dropped to 49.9. Some of the additional changes you are looking at are likely to drop it just slightly further. There's no problem with sending that plan out for comment, because you will get comment with respect to those percentages and also with respect to what you might reasonably do to correct that. But we did want to at least let you know that it -- it is an issue in that particular area and one that we will be watching on your behalf very closely, particularly as we get additional reports back from our experts with respect to the voting history data, racial block voting analysis. It's one we're still working on. At least we realize it will be an issue for you during the public comment period.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I don't mean to
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prolong the period before we take a break.

Wasn't the only switch we made was to

switch the University into G?

MR. RIVERA: On this map, yeah.

MR. HUNTWORK: Took the plan, and G, restored the whole integrity of the area?

MR. RIVERA: I didn't hear the second part of your comments.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Say it again.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Plan B united the University area. Moving back out of G, we would restore the original demographics.

MS. HAUSER: I think so.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Put back.

DR. ADAMS: That's correct.

MR. RIVERA: Correct.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Take a look at moving east so it's restored. I clearly understand the other issue. Keep it whole. Don't separate it. Put it where it belongs in terms of maintaining that -- the demographic in G, and we'll put it out for comment and -- that's fine.

Let's take a 10-minute break.

DR. ADAMS: May I ask one more question.

I want to make sure I absolutely understand.
basically takes it back to the map that we -- or
division that we had prior to the change Mr. Rivera
described. So is that how you want to take the map out
at this point or do you still want to explore moving
territory and seeing --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Explore moving it west,
keeping it whole. If it does damage, we'll know in the
process, as Ms. Hauser said, and we'll understand what
adjustment needs to be made at that point.

DR. ADAMS: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Whole.

(Recess taken from 10:33 until
approximately 11:04 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd ask the Commissioners
to take their seats.

I'd call the Commission back into session.

If we could at this time have the
consultants address us with respect to the issues on the
Legislative mapping that need to be the subject of
either further direction of the consultants or specific
decisions that need to be made with respect to making
progress along those lines.

Dr. Heslop.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
Commission, we're going to make a presentation on the
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problems we have identified. We're going to illustrate those problems. And then we're going to ask some questions which we hope you will answer for us. And then, if the Commissioners are agreeable, we would propose to take a number of hours, ideally five hours, to work through what we believe the solutions are to the problems in light of the responses that you give to our questions.

So in order to do this, we're going to be using two projectors, one for the purpose of the Power Point and the other to illustrate using maps the problems that we have.

Doug Johnson, who is our senior mapping analyst, has been concentrating on the Legislative plan. And I'm going to leave most of this presentation to him. But as we go along, I'm going to shift in with some commentary. So if we could move into the Power Point.

We need to talk about the map in terms of these areas.

Why don't you move through.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay. As you know, and as we discussed the other day, there's really the three areas in question that are driving this map, the north and west section, the Tucson area, and Maricopa. So let me switch over to the map.
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Actually northwest on the computer, as
it's pulled up. One second.

In an effort to get as much done as
possible, I was using both computers. I have part of
the map on one computer and part of the map on the other
computer. So let me bring this up.

This is where I was working on an answer
to our question on the north and the west side.

If you remember, the district in the
original proposal had the Hopi Nation out, and the
district that stretched from there down the Colorado
River through the river AUR to the Yuma County border.
And a corresponding district that was the in-land
portions of these two went over into Maricopa.

This is a sketch of one possible approach
that answers some of the instructions the Commission
gave.

Let me -- a couple questions I have to
pose, and hopefully this map will help illustrate them.

Some of the submitted maps that the
Commission received had this concept, and it's been
discussed in some of our hearings from an Arizona strip,
the area north of Grand Canyon.

The approach I've taken in this is to try
and have a similar community of interest of kind of the
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Grand Canyon tourist region with the river here but to make it much smaller than the previous approach. And that can be accomplished.

This is actually a fully populated Legislative District stretching from just south of the Navajo Reservation over and to the California border.

So one thing I want to check with the Commission is the Arizona strip does result in a couple of additional county splits. It results in a split of Mohave and as a result comes down here and also splits La Paz. And it splits Coconino so it gives a partial solution to our northern solution, shared interest up here, does result in county splits, and we welcome any feedback or direction from the Commission on that issue.

I don't know.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Why don't we take one at a time, go through them, so don't have to do it twice.

MR. JOHNSON: Let me ask related questions on the area so it makes sense and does tie together.

As discussed the other day, on Yavapai County, it really did pose concern to the district going around it. This is starting to illustrate what happens in the Legislative scenario, come through Yavapai with something like this.

We looked to three different approaches in
Yavapai, and end up with a different approach. Yavapai ends up in three pieces.

Come here, this district comes down, might end up in two. I haven't had the time to focus on this area yet to answer exactly what happens in here. I'm still trying to keep Sedona and Verde Valley together.

Really, Verde Valley is such a predominance of western population, it would probably have to be split if this is the approach we take.

The question I propose for the Commission is is the preference to accept a split of Yavapai County or is there a leaning toward the longer arm around Yavapai you saw in the original proposal?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Just a point of clarification, Mr. Johnson. Did you say you were going to split Prescott or split Yavapai?

MR. JOHNSON: Probably both. When you split Yavapai, it's really hard, maybe not the City of Prescott itself, but the Prescott area. We definitely will reach to preserve as many cities as possible, like preserve the entire Prescott area. I'm not sure we can.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: It's not like when you split Prescott you talk about splitting Yavapai, you're talking about Mingus Mountain, the natural
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boundary. For purposes of Proposition 106, reasonably well people in the region identified that with various testimony as a possible dividing line. There was no testimony that would have conceivably supported going in and splitting up the Prescott area one way or the other at all. And I think I would be very opposed to this.

There's another thing, as kind of a tour around the state that I've been thinking about that fits precisely with this issue. And it relates to a series of things and the way things fit together.

Again, it's very hard to master any one question itself. I think that's what got us into this predicament in the first place. So I want to try to do that.

I think maybe I should defer to the other Commissioners to comment on this specific question.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, if I might say, by the time we've gotten through this map, we'll have a number of questions and your more general questions. I would think it might make more sense, at that time, if I may say so.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: However, I think Mr. Huntwork makes a point. I want to also at least pose, I don't clearly want to do anything to prolong the process, extend discussion at this point in time. It
seems to me where we may have the most problem is not
any one individual point, because they're all
interdependent. Where we may have a problem is
methodology, where we start affecting and where we end
up.

I guess to that point, I think part of
what Mr. Huntwork is saying, if I understand him
correctly, is that we may want to have a more broad
discussion, either now or at some point, about whether
or not Legislative, Legislative mapping, is more easily
done, for lack of a better term, outside in, or inside
out, in terms of population centers, or whether it's
better done geographically in some form.

Again, broad conceptual rather than this
line or that line.

The difficulty here is that we've got 30
interdependent, interactive units that any specific
change made in one will ripple all the way around the
state. And whereas it's relatively controllable in the
Congressional map, it's four times as difficult in the
Legislative map.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, let me suggest
in light of those comments, of which I certainly agree,
we go through the whole map with all of the questions.
In the course of doing so, it will shed light on those.
COMMISSIONER ELDER: Let's not answer.

Find out what the questions are.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's go through the whole thing, try to deal with it either one at a time or in general terms so we at least give you some direction.

DR. HESLOP: Let's first go through so you see the questions.

MR. JOHNSON: The other remaining question in the northwest is the Flagstaff question. One thing, some of you may have noticed, if doing the math in the Northwestern region, it actually adds up fairly well to about three-and-a-third districts. The problem is the concentration of population around Flagstaff is so dense. So there was a lot of discussion about the priority of keeping Flagstaff with the Grand Canyon and/or with Sedona.

And one thing I should note, too, when talking about looking for direction, none of these are options we want to do. We understand these are not instructions from the Commission to split any of these things. We're asking, trying to figure out if it comes down to it, which are ways we want to go.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Where is Flag now?

Show me Flag.

MR. JOHNSON: Flag on this map is -- right
down in this area here.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: The white area, unassigned area.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay.

MR. JOHNSON: Let me go back to the slide show here.

There we go.

It allowed me get a lot more done last night.

COMMISSIONER HALL: You're doing great.

MR. JOHNSON: The Northwest questions, we'll walk through.

The next key area, northeast, and status of the Hopi. It was really discussed at length by the Commission, looking if there is a difference on the Commission Legislative front as expressed from the Congressional front.

Maricopa, there weren't, was not a lot of discussion about Maricopa yesterday. I'll wait -- no. I'm still on this computer. And I actually drew in the unification of Tempe that we discussed. So let me show what the result was.

Tempe, as you can see, we actually split it between a little piece of Scottsdale and small piece
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of Mesa over here. And that, there is flexibility there
to go further into Scottsdale, more into Mesa. Those
two changes don't have a lot of ripple effect. I was
focusing on ripples.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Two districts right
next to each other.

Do you have two districts the same color?

It's confusing.

MR. JOHNSON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: Oh, I have one more to do.

There we go.

What happens here is Tempe is unified, as
we discussed. Guadalupe is left out, as I was
instructed by the Commission. The ripples, as you know,
are both in the south and the north. And the one they
spent a lot of time determining how it would affect us
is in the south.

We can actually keep the population spread
within Maricopa fairly successfully. The side effect
the unification of Tempe triggers is an excessive
division of Chandler and of Gilbert in the east valley.
Before there was only a small arm cut off and the other
city was unified. Now they are both divided fairly
significantly.
So in the north, we also will have the ripple effect that will spill out to the northeast. That will come into play with all the Yavapai population coming down.

Again, I've not focused on that area at this time. If there is some direction from the Commission on what makes sense and what you prefer to do with this far east valley population, I welcome that. And in particular, I'd be interested in the Commission's view of whether unifying Tempe is a sufficient enough priority for the Commission to do it with Gilbert and Chandler facing more city divisions.

Let's go back to the slides here.

That, the other change we discussed was up in Peoria, a small shift of one neighborhood. That was easily accomplished, not a major impact. It's not something I'm looking for additional input on unless the Commission has additional input. I didn't spend a lot of time on Maricopa County.

If there are additional thoughts, I'd welcome input on that.

The key area number for east, southeast.

Let me run through the questions before I shift to the map, then I'll shift to the map for review again.

I've drawn a significant change in the
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Tempe area. You'll see it very easily, the significance of how the districts are reconfigured.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Tucson. Long night.

MR. JOHNSON: A step behind myself.

We're still testing alternatives of how to comply with the Hispanic AUR in that area and will get back to you with more information on that as soon as we can.

One question I have for the Commission. The river and freeway run very close to each other, as you know, in that area. I would welcome any direction from the Commission on which one is a better border between the two communities. You'll see how they place into order there.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Before you offer that communication, Mr. Elder, your comment about the river being a dividing line, not the Santa River, Rillito, north of the city, northwest to southeast?


The definition of the Tucson Metro area, we did discuss, to a limited extent, exactly how far out was considered the Tucson Metropolitan area, the goal being keeping the urban and rural areas separate. We'd welcome input from the Commission on what you term the...
metropolitan area being kept together in a rural area,  
perhaps being kept more isolated from the center of  
town.

The last point, within Tucson, as you know, the cities are interlinked and all but  
overlapping, in many cases. So this is a particularly difficult area to avoid city splits. Any specific cities that are high priority for unification in your view you may see having specific sections that would not be an excessively adverse effect if we had to split them.

Let me jump over to the map.

This, again, is a proposal under development. These districts are not yet even close to population equality. And the blue area up here is the kind of population we're working with to try to figure out where to put it. So what we have here is a reconfiguration along the freeway as was discussed.

There was discussion of the area in the intersection of freeways here. And we have moved that over more to the western community, as was discussed and directed by the Commission to look into that possibility.

If you remember, there were a number of more or less east-west running districts in this area.
In response to the feedback from the Commission, what we are investigating is if it's possible and advisable to draw more or less an inner Tucson district closely aligned with this dividing line and then more outer Tucson districts. Just to help orient you, this area right in here is the Air Force base as well.

So those are the main questions.

I would welcome the -- if you had thoughts on where you mentioned the river in the northern part of town, those things, like that, where you think those divisions should take place.

We'll walk back through each of these.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Good.

The questions I just listed were focused on within Tucson.

The big struggle we faced in designing a map for Tucson is it has some very clear areas that could be Legislative Districts; but whereas Maricopa comes up or is similar to Maricopa and comes up a little short, you ask where to get population, Tucson faces a similar question, comes up a little short. We're trying to prioritize different approaches.

Things have been discussed both at the Commission and brainstorming sessions. There is a narrow strip to the west that would attempt to go along
the border while still unifying Native American communities. The area of eastern Pinal County is a clear opportunity to pick up that population; however, when we got into details of it, there's not enough population there to fill this district.

As you saw in yesterday's proposal, to fill it in that way, we'd have to reach up through eastern Pinal to some other region as well.

Yesterday we went into Maricopa. It would be possible to go up into Yavapai, if that was a goal.

Thus the other question. And then, of course, we understand the priority of the Eastern Arizona Counties to the Commission and to the community, but we wanted to list that because we're trying to look at all the options and see what is the priority of the Commission and what causes the least ripple effects in other parts of the state.

All of these are available options in the area, and we welcome any direction from the Commission on that.

Those are kind of the big picture issues. Obviously, as we fine-tune the map, we'll get into smaller, more detailed questions, University location, things like that, and welcome any direction from the Commission on these issues.
Let me go back through them.

I'll bring up the maps as we go to them.

The northwest strip, three big questions:

Would the Arizona strip approach be acceptable? Split Yavapai or swing around it? And the Flagstaff situation.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: May I suggest that you show us the map and you keep the Power Point, if that's the way it's divided up for you.

But let me start with Mr. Huntwork and see if -- you want at this point to go in a different direction or take each of these in turn.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I want to talk about an alternative way of laying out the city to see if we can sidestep some of the questions and provide some different starting points.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Do you have some in mind?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes, I do. It would involve -- if you can put the Hispanic plan with Indian reservations up on the screen, I think I could adequately describe what I have in mind from that.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Huntwork, could you take your microphone out. I couldn't quite hear.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Methodology, this is starting from the outside working in. So how we
layout the rest of the state, then zero in on the
Metropolitan areas. And it may lead nowhere, but -- and
it certainly will involve goring a couple of sacred
cows, but it may not, you know, injury them to badly.

MR. JOHNSON: Commissioner, when you
mentioned Hispanic plan with the Native American, this
is their plan. It's a little confusing. Let me walk
through the lines there.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Does this have
your material or entirely theirs.

MR. JOHNSON: Colors in background are
mine.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Can you make that
clear? I want it to be completely theirs.

MR. JOHNSON: What we're are looking at
here, let me figure out here, one is turned around this
way --

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Just, just shade
the reservations. Put cross hatch or some shading.

Okay. Let me point out a couple things.

Number one, this thing is the last thing you had up on
the board.

Pinal County is pretty much intact but
goes way up here because Apache Junction is added to the
east valley. This area is a majority-minority district
and includes the entire Tohono O'odham Nation encompasses it, including west of this area, if necessary the western area of Tucson.

Now, suppose you also add some of the concepts from the Navajo plan. Suppose that because the Hopis were taken out you were to create a very thin strip down, add these two reservations into the Northern District. Presumably that would swing this line back this way to some extent. You would then have a land pocket here, but you also have this district down here which we previously identified as having lots of context with mining, and so on, with some of the other area and might add portions of that back into here to create contiguity and maybe a more complete community of interest along the non-Native American residents of that district.

This area, the Saddlebrooke area, my instinct is there is excess population here, because I think the more people that reside east of the Indian Reservation might supplement that area creating a district in north Tucson, which is one of the problem areas we've talked about.

These areas, these districts here do not appeal at all horizontally across county boundaries, and so on. We want to find a different solution. But in
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sum, you've created, you've created a basically Native American district here. You preserve at least what I perceive to be the essence of the EACO plan, you provide for Pinal County. You've created a river district over here. This is more compatible with the river AUR than the plan we have that comes east of the river plan. And then this area, this area could go, this area should work, could come up with a better solution.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let me understand, summarize, not to oversimplify what you are suggesting, is that in order to be able to ultimately draw the districts in the metropolitan areas which, from necessity, have to be more intimately drawn from population started outside of the city, you made decisions relative to those which, having made those decisions, gets you to population centers to finish the mapping process. Then at the same time, you, you have a couple principles you are working with, to the extent that we possibly can, we're not splitting reservations, trying to keep those whole. To the extent possible, we're trying to respect the AURs as we've defined them, at least the three major ones that we have adopted and moved forward with. And -- well, let me stop there, because that's all I'm actually sure of.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: And counties as
well to the extent -- most of the counties we're talking
about have been identified as AURs.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Well, let me get reaction
to that.

One -- the only thing I was a little
concerned about was the -- what would be left of the
EACO proposal may look as if you have a district
circling two districts, circling the San Carlos and
White Mountain Apache. That would be odd. I'm not
closing off thinking about that solution.

I think the real problem seems to be the
maps seen so far, a couple places, if you will, wound up
as remainders, there wasn't much to do about them. I
looked back at District L, it seems to be residue.
There is other hard work in other parts of the state.
It clearly didn't make any sense from any standpoints we
knew about. Probably left over territory didn't work
anywhere else. We need to avoid that anyplace we can.
Perhaps flexibility seems come from more populated areas
in terms of where you draw lines, very rapidly pick
population. You need one district or another in those
two areas.

The methodology is sound from a standpoint
of working outside in and creating districts that make
sense on the periphery of the state and making up
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population differences as you move into the urban core.

So let's discuss that possibility.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, if I may.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: One thing we definitely looked at when there were choices for the starting point were the goals of preserving the Native American Tribal Reservations, Hispanic communities, rural communities. Plans, choices you run into, the rural into urban approach, not that that is better than another way, I'm just giving a sense of where the plan is.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The difficulties you have with maps, have you seen the product of the very approach Mr. Huntwork is suggesting?

MR. JOHNSON: No.

I think when we tried to balance Three Points, we ended up at a very different starting point than the plan we had and the board did. But they are similar problems than any approach, as this approach ran into. It's in Yavapai.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: What is the pleasure of the Commission?

Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, a lot of what I just heard is, I don't know, has created about 10
more problems than answers.

    We have remainders. The Navajo plan
creates three remainders rather than one. On the face,
there are legal problems, anyway.

    In spite of that, I think it's important
for us to review where we've been and where we're
headed.

We have building blocks. And the
foundation of our house we started to build, if you
will, are AURs. With those, then, we are developing
walls and subsequent structure. For us to go back and
say we don't like the foundation even though we all
agreed months ago on the process this is what the
foundation is, we hired consultants, found out what the
foundation was, looked at the blocks, if anyone is naive
enough, found out after the finishing touches were on
the building blocks, I'm confused.

We have building blocks. EACO is one of
the building blocks, as all the documentation we have,
it is the most unified. We have other building blocks.

There may well have to be compromises. I
think we ought to consider reasonable and rational
compromises in an effort to try to solve problems. I
think the roads NDC is heading down are certainly
legitimate issues.
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With respect to the issue of dividing counties, we have to divide counties in rural Arizona to accommodate communities of interest and Native American. The problem, for example, with plan reflected on the board is splitting the two southern Native American Reservations that are combined presently under the current configuration. We have several desires from a variety of Reservations to be combined, and some may be realistic, some may not be realistic, or practical, or in line with the majority of some communities of interest that align around some of those areas.

So I would propose that we not stroll in reverse, we kind of build from where we were.

I think there are some legitimate examples in the southeast section of the state Mr. Elder had. I'm interested in exploring those.

The ideas on this particular plan, the southeastern portion of the state, are legitimate.

Also in respect to what you proposed in the northern portion of the state, I think that is a very -- an option certainly worth considering. I'm interested to see what numbers are with respect to that. And also determine where you -- if you put up what you were reflecting, Doug, it would certainly be more helpful.
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I had a couple questions with respect to this Yavapai County area.

MR. JOHNSON: Do you want to reference the coalition map or take that one out?

COMMISSIONER HALL: No. I want to reference our map.

MR. JOHNSON: You asked one question about our numbers.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Zoom out a bit.

MR. JOHNSON: This point, the western district is little.

At this point, this district is 17,000 overpopulated. So it can pull back somewhat from that point.

COMMISSIONER HALL: So with respect to the comment about the division of the Prescott area, I would concur with that. I think that we need to try and identify solutions. And while we, by reason, may need to divide counties, I hope the best intent possible is not to divide communities. Now realizing, however, that Prescott Valley extends all way from Chino Valley south, there may be some divergent areas there. I think we have to attempt to to the best extent possible.

Were you saying the northeast portion there, the white area, if you will, the northeast
portion of Yavapai, southeast of Coconino, that is short
population?

MR. JOHNSON: This is an unassigned area, the area I've not yet started drawing lines in.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Can you zoom out a little more, please.

COMMISSIONER HALL: There was discussion yesterday with respect to Pinal County. Did you discussion options what were findings, discussions of Pinal and Casa Grande?

MR. JOHNSON: The area with respect to interesting -- there's a lot of reason to unify that area as much as possible. We have been trying to find a way to do that. Down in Tucson, this alternative does present a little, a small additional Hispanic population that can be combined with this district. So one of the options, I would put it in the long-shot category, but given the importance and interest in Pinal, it's definitely worth pursuing, is possibly some way of strengthening this. I would be surprised if that gets us to unifying Pinal County, the Casa Grande proposal. It gets us closer to unifying more of it, hopefully getting a significant portion together.

That is definitely something that we are pursuing. I can't give you a promise how it will
result.

COMMISSIONER HALL: So, in short, maybe, maybe, Dr. Heslop, you could help us clarify, or Doug, what, specifically -- I know you guys are in the midst of work in progress versus us sitting here trying to move lines for you. What would you recommend are specific areas you would like direction in with respect to some of these changes?

MR. JOHNSON: Our interest would be in the key barriers we have run into or decision points we're running into, running past you, and getting direction from as decision points, taking endorsement, direction, on how you'd like us to pursue investigation at that point.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Go back to the Power Point series of questions and use that as a basis for the response you are requesting, other things we can add to that.

MR. JOHNSON: Sure.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: The north northwest.

MR. JOHNSON: Starting in the northwest, it may be helpful to leave the map up and read them or --

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Helpful to leave the map up.
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MR. JOHNSON: The first question was this Arizona strip. It makes a relatively compact, identifiable community of district at the cost, however, of perhaps an additional county split that might otherwise be avoided. We wanted to see. This is an option proposed by some of the community groups and is something the Commission would be interested in pursuing.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I'll jump in on that one first.

I think as far as Legislative Districts go, I know county records probably shoot us in the foot. I'm not sensitive to splitting of the counties to give us communities.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let me ask a historical question. In the current configuration, how many counties split the current Legislative configuration?

MR. JOHNSON: To be honest, I don't know, off the top of my head.

MR. JOHNSON: I did know it, until I started drawing this one.

We can look that up.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Two questions.

Number one, if you take Hopis out of that, what are the
demographics with respect to Native Americans? And
number two, what is happening over in Mohave County?
Can you zero in on that for us, see what is in and what
is out?

MR. JOHNSON: There are two splits in
Mohave that result. This is the northern split. Let me
focus. This somewhat unusual looking item on the map is
an extension of the tribal reservation. Let me put some
labels on the cities here.

Let me walk through the border here. You
have Peach Springs, a Census designated place, I
believe, with the Reservation. City of Kingman is north
of the line. And Bullhead City is south of the line.
Go down to the south, this stays out of
the reservation, on the south side here.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The Reservation
stays out of the district?

MR. JOHNSON: The Reservation is entirely
in the middle district here. We do have to split the
area here.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I was mostly
concerned about the Northern District.

Can you tell what the demographics are?

MR. JOHNSON: I have run the numbers,

having finished just minutes before coming over here,
this piece of it. I think around nine or ten percent.
That's a pretty speculative guess. I can look that up
and respond back to you later today.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think the whole
key in this area is to know exactly what the
demographics are going to be.

MR. JOHNSON: It is a unification of
virtually all the Tribal Reservations in the north end,
so it's fairly high. It won't be as high as the Navajo
Reservation.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Commissioner
Huntwork, could we try to address the county split issue
with NDC and then try to add in other ancillary issues,
keep it cleaner, so we get a response back to NDC?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Do we know the question on
current splits or an answer to current splits?

MR. JOHNSON: Do you have that?

Dr. Adams is looking that up.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay.

To Mr. Elder's point, I think what you are
asking us to determine is whether or not we want to
relax that standard in some fashion to allow for more
flexibility in splitting counties.

Is there further discussion on that notion
or would somebody like to make a motion to that effect?
Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Well, I don't think I'm prepared to make a motion, but in terms of what is more important, it seems to me that the most important thing that we can do is put people in districts where they are going to feel comfortable. And I think that county borders are probably less important than other considerations. And so, therefore, while I would like to keep counties together as much as possible, if there is a compelling interest to split a county in order to make districts seem to work for communities of interest, I think they could do it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I don't have anything.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: To move things along, I would move we allow to relax county integrity criteria to allow for maintaining communities of interest as a whole.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second by Mrs. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Proposition 106 says consider both communities of interest and counties, not both. It's a case-by-case decision and involves balancing all other criteria. I would be reluctant to pass a general resolution that says one has priority.
over the other in our deliberations. I'd like to ask
legal counsel whether it's appropriate to pass a
resolution of that kind.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: The question to NDC,
maybe to clarify that, is it was my understanding this
fell under the criteria of northwest and the question
specifically to that area, or general for the entire
state?

MR. JOHNSON: This question is
specifically to the northwest. I suspect we'll
encounter additional similar questions as we work our
way through the rest of the state or is it your
preference we come back to you with those as they occur?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion on the motion?

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The difficulty --
it is also difficult for me to decide how willing I am
to split counties when I am not very happy me with the
proposal that is on board in terms of configuration.

I am voting to give away a value expressed
in 106 over a piece of a plan that hasn't been fully
developed. The whole thing is difficult to me to get my
arms around at this point.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Well, what we may wish to
do, since we're clear that the two issues are of
relatively equal importance in terms of the standards we're trying to achieve, we see the work product where one has been used more than another.

If I take your point, the point would be you'd like to see a work product where the other might be in play more and determine whether or not that's a more acceptable solution than the one we have. That is to say the point of Mr. Elder's motion is to state it otherwise, to give consultants flexibility to look at communities of interest at least with equal weight to county boundaries in terms of Legislative districting and see if that doesn't relax, correct, not relax the standard, but change the emphasis in a way that would make the districting process easier. I mean that's, again, wording, specific wording aside, that's what I take the motion to mean and give the consultants that direction.

Mr. Elder, is that close?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: That's correct,

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Again, in this case, particularly Northern Arizona, we have Voting Rights Act issues very heavily in play which clearly express that priority over county boundaries under
Proposition 106. So --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We're not mandating anything else. All of those things are still in place.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: With that in mind, I think the motion with that in mind is fine, as long as we're talking about Northern Arizona and population of Native Americans.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other portions of the state as well.

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Correct me if I'm wrong, counsel, basically with the issue of representation of minorities, essentially the district is there is about what they have now. And to utilize the existing as a bench mark, it's difficult to go backwards, if you use the same, then the current configuration, if you utilize the current configuration as a bench mark.

MS. HAUSER: Yes, Commissioner Hall, the current bench mark is the last current plan infused with the 2000 Census data.

COMMISSIONER HALL: In light of the Census plan, we'll have to use Census data. I appreciate we're not there yet. This district is very similar to the bench mark. I guess is what I'm saying is I would doubt
Mr. Huntwork's fears run to the relative minority Indian issue.

Mr. Chairman, I think it's clear that NDC frankly needs more time. And Mr. -- Doug --

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Johnson.

COMMISSIONER HALL: If -- my preference was with respect to the county split, I'm not sure if we need it in the form of a motion, if that's the Commission's motion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: They clearly need time.

They are also asking for direction. This is one of the areas.

Further discussion on the motion?

All those in favor of the motion, say "aye."

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Opposed say "no."

Motion carries.

Again, the sense of the motion is, to the extent communities of interest and other interests are served by violating county boundaries in terms of mapping, we'd like to see the results of that so we might get a better view of how those two equal concepts wrestle with each other. I mean we've seen one. We'd lick to see the other.
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Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Now to take Mr. Johnson's lead, the next question is Flagstaff, whether it should be viewed as a link with the Kingman area or viewed as linkage with Sedona, Sedona or the Camp Verde area. Is that correct? That's the next area, is it not?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, if there is specific direction or if the Commission is comfortable with it going whichever way, going to either of the other two factors. We welcome either type of direction.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think my preference would be, if possible, to link Flagstaff with Sedona and Verde Valley. With my preference, all other things being equal, it makes sense, if it causes disruption with other things we're trying to achieve, I think there is flexibility.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Johnson, what are the relative numbers we're starting with in Flagstaff?

We're potentially looking at 6,769 Hopi probably being connected to that area. What is the population in the Canyon area?

Thirdly, what is the population in that Verde Valley area?
MR. JOHNSON: The population of Flagstaff, we'll focus, but 52,894. The other area, Williams is 2,800. Parks is 1,100. And Kachina Village is 1,000 --

COMMISSIONER ELDER: It may be a moot question. It appears they don't have population in all those put together to make a district.

MR. JOHNSON: That's correct. They definitely do not have enough to put a district together centered on here.

The question is the areas around here are essentially all but unpopulated. It's very, very sparse population. So really when we get into Coconino County, it's a problem to keep them together. I worked extensively drawing a region, trying to work around this issue, and felt it was a large enough concern to bring to the Commission to seek your guidance.

Is it a high priority to keep Flagstaff together with the Grand Canyon or together with Verde Valley or together with the Navajo Nation? Or is it more of a preference -- obviously we prefer to keep it with the appropriate community.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: You are asking what is that appropriate community.

MR. JOHNSON: What is that appropriate community and what is the priority on it.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I changed my mind.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right. Let me try this. I don't think it's fruitful at this point for us to be going into detailed discussion on any of this. I'd like to give you direction, give you the opportunity to work on an overall concept.

Ms. Minkoff gave direction it go South with Sedona, North Verde Valley. I don't know that I have a strong preference one way or other. I think we've heard testimony that links those communities together over the course of the hearing. We've also seen maps that include that area delivered from other parts of the state.

I think Flagstaff is enough of a population center that as a community, they probably could see themselves in a number of different scenarios, for example, the interstate, one terminates in Flagstaff, other runs through it east west. So there's ample reason to think there's an affinity to Williams, other communities to the west. There's reason to believe they clearly have some affinity down the mountain, if you will, to Sedona and Verde Valley. There's a significant amount of commerce that occurs up and down the highways, both state highways and
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interstate to the south. So, I, too, don't have a
problem with linkage Flagstaff to the south, if that
helps the circumstance.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, this
may be a comment that just doesn't make sense but I'm
going to make it anyway.

Through a lot of hearings we've heard "We
don't want to be a part of the State of Maricopa."
Flagstaff is a big doggone block. It might be
appropriate to bring in Prescott, Dewey, Chino, bring in
Cottonwood, Chino, and is the population of Flagstaff a
balancing condition to the Flagstaff Metropolitan area?

My hope is maybe look at bringing in the
area we've split now along that line in Prescott, try to
to get Prescott entirely in one area or another. If it
makes sense to bring it in with Flagstaff, do so.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Well, you don't have a
motion, but do you have a sense that --

MR. JOHNSON: Definitely.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next question.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'd just like to say
that I think, to Mr. Humphry's point, the Coalition
plan, there are interesting solutions to the southern
point of the state. I again urge, even in connection
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with the immigrants, alternative solutions.

I assume you guys haven't -- don't recall
with intimate detail the majority-minority issues there.
I direct we would be sensitive, continuously sensitive,
I know you are, to those issues in that. I think that
there are some possibilities for configuration in that
southern portion, and, if possible, still trying to
maintain for the two southern reservations to be
connected.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: What are you talking
about?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Southern Arizona.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: That's a little premature.

We just finished Flagstaff.

That additional direction is welcomed as
well.

MR. JOHNSON: The last question on the
northwest area is Yavapai County which is a question
which to some degree we addressed other day.

We wanted to clarify. We have seen plans
where instead of dividing it, if we zoom out a little
bit here, throw a long arm all the way around it,
similar to the plan that we had proposed the other day,
but these are more inland arms than we've seen in some
of the proposals, don't share much community around the
county border, similar to the L-shaped district here, serve the purpose of keeping Yavapai together. The question is to look to the Commission for direction or preference from the Commission on: Would you like to see some arm around Yavapai County, if that keeps it contiguous and together, or is it acceptable --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think our previous direction, and one we gave you about county contiguity, would apply to Yavapai as it would to others. That is to say we have other interests we're trying to satisfy as well. To the extent you show us communities of interest in other criteria we hope to accomplish that are kept together, we'd entertain some split, if it were appropriate. I think that's what we said.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Sorry, quickly, Mr. Huntwork, one thing I saw with the plan we had up Mr. Huntwork requested was there is whole series of bands that went horizontally across the state in this area. And one of my sort of pet peeves with redistricting as done in the past is you can't get there from here.

If you look at highways, linkages, valleys, all the things people use to move through their communities, they run north to south or west to
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southeast in this area. So would you please keep it in
the request and say maybe something C shaped through
there wrapping around -- if you can't get from one area
of the district to another effectively, it makes it hard
to represent people or people to get to you you're
supposed to be representing. That's my request, look at
linkages of people, representatives in the area.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I would also like
to take a step back to basic principles. We've
recognized a number of AURs. Aside from the major
communities of interest, Hispanic, Native American, and
rural urban, I don't believe we prioritized the other
AURs.

One of them was Yavapai County. We have
discussed the fact that there was testimony that
justified dividing Yavapai County basically at Mingus
Mountain. But we have not had any testimony to justify
dividing Yavapai County any other way. It's no more our
playground, province, than any other AUR, any other
county, the EACO plan, anywhere else. That's still part
of our bedrock, even though not an issue of a county
line.

We also have the river area AUR in play in
this region. Those are two things that, to the extent
we have foundation, as Joshua put it earlier, those are
two we need to try to start with, if we can.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm not --

MR. JOHNSON: I have a sense there.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: -- not sure we will get
through earlier.

MR. JOHNSON: Some may resolve on their
own as we work on the map. To the extent we get as much
direction as we can, it helps.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Where would you like to go
next?

MR. JOHNSON: Northeast.

Checking in, checking in with the
Commission, we checked in on the Hopi Legislative level.
I'll confirm, check in if there are differences when we
view the Hopi issue at a Legislative level.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd ask the Commission if
they've made an affirmative decision with respect to how
ey they wish to display the Navajo-Hopi Congressional map,
if looking for the same direction on the Legislative
map. I'll open that for discussion.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, we have
testimony and evidence from the Hopis that is clear and
it has been from the beginning that they considered it
equally important at the state level. I feel there's numerous documents to that effect publicly, private, and they've given us examples of why they feel that way.

The issue with the demographics in that Northern District is significant. 7,000 is much more significant in demographics of a Legislative District than with the Congressional Districts. Now, nevertheless, for the same reasons, when dealt with separately, we're making sure we consolidated as many Reservation areas as possible.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is that a motion?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: That we separate them, Navajo and Hopi.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Moved and seconded.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Hall,

Commissioner Hall will probably shoot me, but we had a speaker discuss the Native American minority positions. And I would like to support the Hopi removal from that area and link them outside the Navajo area. I would like to see, just an aside or slide to the aside, I don't know if you call it analysis or look at what are...
the ramifications or effect of taking a tongue, or
linkage down and picking up linkages down the White
Mountain and San Carlos, somewhat in A, and replace
population in A with additional Native American to
balance the Hopi relocation, removal. Let's see what it
does in that area.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: On the motion. Discussion
on the motion.

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, considering the
Hopis have made the preference that most of their issues
are federal, and when specifically asked if they had a
preference, if it was not possible to or practicable, or
whatever, to separate them, that they would prefer that
occur at a Congressional level, there's no question most
of those issues are federal and are not with respect to
the State Legislature; furthermore, as may have been
discussed, the Hopi Reservation, as it presently
resides, I think we did discuss this, there are portions
of the reservation to the south that are not -- that
would presently be included in what is the EACO plan.
I'm not sure representation on land issues would be
accommodated anyway. They'd still be in two, presently
in two separate districts. But in light of the fact
that there are, most of their issues are federal and
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also in light of the fact of the Native American concerns, I oppose the motion and desire they stay together on a state level.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I support the motion.

It's relatively small population, about 7,000 people. I do not see moving them out dramatically disrupts that district. I think we can easily move 7,000 people into another district. I don't think we can do it, as Mr. Elder suggested, from two reservations, Apache Reservations, the White Mountain and San Carlos, which between them have over 20,000 people. I'm not sure that's where we can find population. I think can find population.

Like with respect to EACO, what Mr. Huntwork said, they have made it very, very clear that they would find it devastating in terms of representation to be in a district with the Navajos. They have indicated their very, very strong desire to be pulled out of it even if it is in district with no other Native American population. I think that's something we need to listen to in trying to accommodate.

I would support the motion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Call the question.
All in favor of the motion signify by saying "aye."

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: All opposed say "no."

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "no."

(Motion carries three to two.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Direction is to separate the two for Legislative purposes for mapping again to explore whatever makes sense in terms of connection once it's separated.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: To clarify for NDC, I withdraw the request in connection with going to the San Carlos and White Mountain Apaches. It doesn't make sense statistically or from a representation standpoint.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It would also create a number of other problems to do it that other way as well.

DR. HESLOP: Current Legislative splits, except La Paz and Yuma, splits Mohave into four districts, Yavapai into four districts, Pinal into five districts, Santa Cruz into three, and most of the other counties are also split among two or three districts.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you for that bench mark.
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All right. Next question.

MR. JOHNSON: The next area to look at is on the other computer, involves Maricopa. Let me switch over here.

I should clarify, I failed to clarify, we also had a question on attempting to unify the Historical District. It's one I haven't had time to look at, just haven't had time to look at. My apologies for not looking at it before.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Doug, one other instruction I wanted to make sure you were aware of. In terms of districts, I think O and U, the suggestion of the vertical split for those districts rather than the horizontal split?

MR. JOHNSON: Right.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It's doable, two districts, dividing a different way.

MR. JOHNSON: Right. We looked into that extensively at a Congressional level, and it should make up the districts, be easier to do, and be at the Legislative level, although the districts would not be quite as high up.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Those two issues and the Historic Districts will be included on the revised maps?
MR. JOHNSON: As you might imagine, we tried to get as much information together, having gone through all the maps. It does include all the issues I've run into so far.

So the question that I definitely want to bring to the Commission is the issue of Tempe. And it is described for a run-through scenario, unifying for it; and I'm curious for feedback on the scenario.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Feedback, unifying Tempe to the detriment of what, and what is the detriment? You have a four-way split of Chandler as a result of unification of Tempe.

It seems to me under a doctrine we haven't adopted, we might want to consider, is do the least amount of harm. And that you, in my opinion, you need to rethink that unification if for no other reason than to reduce the harm that that unification has done to surrounding districts.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I want to commend you. You've taken on an important principle we haven't articulated.

I guess secondly, there was testimony from Chandler itself as to where, if they were to be split, they would like to prefer to have it happen. Also some
evidence from Tempe, I believe it was the Tempe Chamber submitted a proposal that was submitted if Tempe had to be split, where the logical point might be.

So as a compromise, we might want to use those two bench marks to work out something more fair to both.

MR. JOHNSON: If I may, in the Chandler case, I did look closely at that. If you'll look here, what they said was Dobson Road actually runs north south just east of the city line here.

I'm assuming they were referring primarily to Dobson Road, this area, not the narrow strip up and down. That was the first attempt in order to have a flow, Tempe up and down, it did have to flow. Should the instruction be to divide Tempe, we'll refer to the best way to do that.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'd also like to suggest you take a look at the Coalition for Fair Redistricting Plan and the Democratic Party Plan, both of which have a united Tempe and I think have maybe done a little bit less damage to some of the surrounding communities. You might look at those plans, see if they might help you reconfigure and keep Tempe united without chopping up other three pieces as much as you have right now.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: With all due respect, I'll say it, and I believe it, and I might get in deep trouble with my colleagues, but I think reference to other plans, in the narrowest sense, is not very helpful. The reason I say it is due to the interactive nature of the units on the plan. If you take away the way a plan treated one portion of the map, it's simply not useful.

With all due respect, unless you disagree, while I know my colleague, what you are trying to do is give direction, if you find in taking direction, ways of doing it, you already discovered one thing, I don't think we want to start a way of doing it wholly dependent on everything else around it.

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I want to be sure. There have been interesting thoughts in this morning's period public of comment, many of which surrounded District R. I know Dr. Heslop made those notes. I want to be sure those are also considered, what the ripple effect of those considerations is. They may well come into play in neighboring districts.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Particularly with respect to not only R and S as well, comments relative to what we've lovingly come to know as the Broadway curve and
separation by the interstate of communities along that axis.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, Lisa Nance provides a wonderful service. We get a diskette immediately after, and we'll look closely at those comments.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Comments had to do with Guadalupe. And I'm wondering if the evidence or testimony confirmed Guadalupe is unambiguous about how people there want to be treated, not how others want to treat them, how they themselves want to be treated.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We received yesterday a letter from Guadalupe indicating they wished to be considered with the Central Phoenix District.

But to your point about ambiguity, that's testimony in a long line of testimony.

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Let me clear that up. I've had a number of contacts with the community and people in it. There is confusion, I think, and it's very, very difficult for us to say it's an unambiguous position from the Community of Guadalupe.

Mr. Echeveste and I met quite some time ago with the then Mayor and City Councilperson who
explained to us that the interests of Guadalupe seemed
to align more with Tempe than with the South Phoenix
community, for a number of reasons, Justice Courts,
governmental agreements, et cetera. We then heard a
presentation by the Mayor of Guadalupe who was at that
meeting, at the South Mountain Community College public
hearing, supporting the presentation from the group that
was led by Supervisor Mary Rose Wilcox that they belong
to an AUR covering the South Phoenix area.

I contacted some people I met with later
on and said "I'm confused. I heard one thing when went
to Guadalupe, heard something else at South Mountain.
What exactly is the position of the community?" I was
told from their standpoint it made sense to put
Guadalupe in a Congressional District with the AUR
presented at the South Mountain Community College
meeting. For a Legislative District, they still felt
their interests lie more closely with Tempe.

Shortly after that point, there was,
apparently, a coup in the community of Guadalupe and the
Mayor was replaced. And there is a new group that is in
control of the Town Government at this point.

We received a letter from them saying that
they definitely want to be with the South Phoenix area
in both the Congressional and Legislative Districts.
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So in terms of what the people of Guadalupe want, I'd say your guess is as good as mine.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further comment?

What we have, Mr. Johnson, is what we have. Comment from elected officials has indicated they'd like to remain with Central Phoenix.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, the draft map, let's send it out. I'm sure, I'm confident somebody will tell us.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The other comment we got this morning was important, really had to do with over to the west. And I think it will impact from the other side. I can't quite tell which of the concerns came from the other direction. It's the area he was speaking about from the other side.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: V and R.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Commissioner Hall's point, in general terms, to consider what Representative Miranda said this morning, in public comment, to put it in context, at a public hearing, every hearing, we'll have public hearings all throughout and it will also be on the record today.

You might also check the transcript as you will with the Central Phoenix hearing this morning as
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Mr. Miranda spoke of Tolleson, in particular the Avondale, Tolleson issue, with respect to the Avondale Tolleson issue, with respect to that issue.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: New development areas with very expensive, high-end housing going in being combined with city areas with poverty and exactly opposite communities of interest being combined in that configuration.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Johnson or Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Couple questions, Doug.

Is this an attempt to connect rural and urban areas?

MR. JOHNSON: It's more an attempt to minimize the portion of Gilbert taken in by taking the entirety of Maricopa County portion of Queen Creek, minimize the Gilbert portion now, the southern portion now that's much less densely populated.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Likely a high growth area.

COMMISSIONER HALL: It is.

Where are the city boundaries of Chandler, approximately?

MR. JOHNSON: It's almost impossible to describe the city borders in this area.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right.

Mr. Johnson, the next area.

MR. JOHNSON: The only other question is in the Maricopa area, we arrived at this late in our discussions today. We did get the four discussions referenced before we added a couple comments today. I wanted to be sure there weren't any other priority concerns of the Commission or instructions of the Commission we didn't get to the other day.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think there may be one question as we see the direction we've already given you fleshed out in terms of change that might be rendered, some of the Central City District, Western Districts, and possible correction of the Tempe-Chandler-Gilbert Districts which will have a ripple effect throughout the valley anyway, look at those as they remain.

Mr. Huntwork.

MR. JOHNSON: Now we're moved down to the Tucson area.

This is an area of considerable focus right within Tucson and for the considerable effect they have on the surrounding areas, you go into Pinal, given all the input requests we've received from that area. This district obviously begins with understanding we have the state border on the sides, population coming in
from the south and the east that has to be kept in mind.

It also faces issues, as you know, of high growth, especially on the north side.

What we took from direction the other day is we had only captured the best community splits of Tucson. So what we've attempted to do is implement some suggestions on the other side, have not fully implemented all suggestions. Some are significantly underpopulated. I is overpopulated by 17,000. They are definitely works in progress. The impacts of changes made so far is over here a more hills oriented district and creation of this new area along the east side of the river, east side of the freeway district.

Before there were two really east-west running districts in this area.

District H, you see out here, is pushed out more into Tucson into small parts that are pushed out into suburbs. As noted before, if it helps reference, this area here is the Air Force Base.

Other changes we've made at this point are moving the district and freeway Y here over to link with the district in the east instead of the west in response to feedback direction and feedback in the community on the mapping.

Questions we're facing here, internally in
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Tucson, we have a couple. Number one, I should point out we're still testing alternatives for how to comply with the AUR, overall Hispanic AUR in the area. I'll label the AUR a joint Hispanic AUR. I'd seek guidance if the river is a good divider, how you might see that impacting where we're at in drafting the state right now, and of particular interest is the definition of the Tucson Metro area.

Let me bring up what I have in mind at this point is based on a comment. I don't think there's official direction from the Commission, but mention of the Coalition plan seemed to have a good border. Let me bring that border up. And I just wanted to follow up with you and see if that is -- was a specific direction you wanted to give us or if there has been other thoughts on that, including really all the way up to the county line is Tucson Metropolitan, or consider some of this more rural and attempt to stick more with a closer into Tucson basing of these districts.

So that would be one particular question I have. Would your preference be to see districts go out to the county line as much as possible, have the issue of population coming this way, down, or population coming up, or some mix if that is possible.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Could we zoom in and
see a few more roads.

MR. JOHNSON: Sure. Which?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: In the area you are referring to.

More.

MR. JOHNSON: Let me turn on the streets.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: The urban area of Tucson.

Okay. That's good.

What we've got there is the Tracy Roads that go out to the east. That's the Balinca Ranch, Catalinas, and Red Rocks, the only area would make sense bringing into urban areas, Steve.

Highlight the mountain, up in the area -- no. There you go. I don't know that it goes that far, but it maybe does. There's a town up at the top of the Catalinas that does have residents. And the only road that goes up there comes down into the urban area of Tucson, going to the east at all. It makes sense to incorporate that portion to the urban area as well as sort of the east west tan portion right above the green, right in there.

There's some areas that are within the urbanized area of Tucson that are very difficult, goes back to why you can't get there from here. There's the
possibility of including those in the area urban area of Tucson.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: But the point about the county line to the east, I mean the county line to the east evaporates into the eastern part of -- southeast portion of the state. To that extent, going out in that direction with a district, I don't think it's particularly critical.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I was going to say drag out that direction from northeast to the southwest.

Okay. Right there is good. See that line runs from where the hand is to the left and runs north. That's San Pedro from San Manuel to Pomerene and Benson. There is a valley there that runs there, and it makes sense keeping that with Cochise, or EACO, or something besides the urban area of Tucson. The roads may be good enough without chuckholes you could get the there from Tucson, but I don't think so.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: One area we're forgetting, and it is the area in the northern part of Tucson that goes into Pinal County, the communities of, I guess, now the Sun City Vistoso.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Saddlebrooke.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Saddlebrooke.
Currently the districts drawn, the one we had such
difficulty with last night, the one in Eastern Pinal and
into Maricopa County, a good portion of the district is
in Metropolitan Tucson. When dealing with what
Metropolitan Tucson would have to deal with, the issue
is what is going to happen with Pinal County.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Well, again, topography
here, the town is at the Catalina base, base of the
Santa Catalina Mountains. Growth along the corridor is
here. It does not affect here along this state highway.
It has gone over the county line into Pinal to the
extent that community is there. And Saddlebrooke and
Sun City Vistoso on opposite besides of the state
highway bisect the highway, try to keep it together.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Keep it in the
Tucson Metropolitan area?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Makes sense. It's all a
community of interest, if you will, arts, culture,
shopping, support systems, health care, and so on, go to
the south.

If, Doug, you can go to this portion of
the map, give me more emphasis on that.

I'd draw attention to portions of Central
Tucson, the district labeled J, and a portion of
district I, which is between the two interstates. That
should work very well.

This section of I is more closely aligned culturally and in terms of community of interest with this area of J than the downtown area of Tucson. And as a result, to the extent that this triangle could be reunified in this direction, it would make more sense than having it relate across the freeway and then over this portion of this district to the west of I.

MR. JOHNSON: I would add this region right here is the region we were last working on. Don't take these lines as anything significant.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand you were trying to give direction in that regard.

MR. JOHNSON: It's very useful.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I do think in terms of the district you've created, potentially, in terms of the green district, the one that is running sort of northwest to southeast along the base of the mountains, if you will, it's probably a fairly good representation of a community of interest that makes sense in Tucson. I mean it's going to be more homogeneous than not as a district.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I think I would agree with that. Although I think when we look at the impacts
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on Pinal County and we take the areas from Saddlebrooke
down and try and link them back into communities back
into south of Pima, we may very well have to come back
in and pick up portions of what is labeled as Flowing
Wells and shift things to the east a little bit.

I would also note that sort of brighter
green area without the roads is the river I was
referring to. And linkages across that are probably not
as strong as if you went east to west.

That area there, if there are ways of
either extending, picking up urban areas in the tan, get
out of rural District 2 southeast and then Cochise and
giving up areas to the south of the river for that area,
it would be preferable.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Also you see the influence
of the Catalina Mountains here.

MR. JOHNSON: Right.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: And this portion of the
green district at this point may fit as well this
direction as it does this direction because of the
influence of the mountains. You could be flexible there
in terms of where it goes. I know that is what you are
interested in, flexibility, not rigidity of the
direction.

Other comments on the Tucson area?
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Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Let me weigh one in.

Doug, if you'd put up the school districts, maybe not now them as doing adjustment of the lines, we did have fairly strong testimony in relation this morning about school districts in Phoenix, but also had, during community outreach, comments about districts, one at Amphitheatre and the County Foothills District being appropriate. Those might finalize exactly where you do shift some of the lines.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is this the last area of concern or are there others?

MR. JOHNSON: There are a last area, bigger picture Tucson questions.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We do need to take a break. I guess I want a sense from the Commission. Do you think we're close to finishing direction from the consultants so they can take their leave and begin work? If so, we could move ahead through comments. Or if there are substantially more comments, we should take a break.

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The only question, we've really not dealt with Pinal County at all. Obviously we have to deal with Pinal County.
Are other directions we're giving you
going to give you the flexibility that is going tocreate something new or do we need to discuss that?

MR. JOHNSON: Pinal County is, as youknow, very affected by this. And, more or less, everyline I draw in Tucson is trying to get visualflexibility in Pinal. I'm sure we'll return foradditional direction as we get specifically into Pinal.It may be more helpful and perhaps more focused use of
time to hold that until we get to that.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'm not quite surewhat is being said there. You have to take Pinal Countyas one of the prime directives today. You have to startwith that as much as anything else you've been told, asleast as far as I'm concerned. I think we've said thatbefore. That is equal, as far as I know, equal to anydirection you've been given.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I agree.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The starting place in thePinal County plan may have been, essentially keeps thecounty intact. The difficulty, as all of us have said,have heard in the testimony as late as yesterday, thedifficulty with that is the position of Casa Grande,particularly in relationship with Phoenix, Tucson, andin relationship to reservations, both north and south.
Then we have the issue of mining, the Indians on the far eastern side of that. All of that, all of that creates issues to deal with that.

Mr. Huntwork's point, to draw everything else, whatever happens is okay. We are saying try to take that into account as you draw, as you take all other things into account, to achieve as much of an accommodation to Pinal County as is feasible.

MR. JOHNSON: If I may, one common concern in our redistricting, once you draw an area and it's locked in, once you draw Tucson, it's not locked in at all. In many situations we'll have drawn all but the last district and then have had to redraw everything. We're not locking in everything just because it's not first.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Can we zoom out, go to Gila River to about the border so we can see the various linkages and -- okay.

MR. JOHNSON: This is actually the last question I had. It's similar to the Phoenix point, to the Commission's comment, or discussion we had the other day, Tucson comes up a little short in getting five full districts. Within this District G, obviously there were a lot of factors in play. The Commission has been clear
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in the interest's of Hispanic AURs, Pinal. I wanted to
check back if there was any additional direction at this
point.

COMMISSIONER HALL: My question is I
notice you've adjusted Santa Cruz County there,
incorporated it all with G. Is that population of G
correct with the way that sits?

MR. JOHNSON: I think it's still a little
short. Yes. It's at 156,000 and needs to reach a 171.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Because you moved H
out; is that correct?

MR. JOHNSON: H out and G moved east out
of here. I was attempting to see if I could swing it
around and what the effect of that would be.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Is that district, of
course you wanted to move -- is that a majority
minority?

MR. JOHNSON: G was not.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Close?

MR. JOHNSON: G is 117,000. Out of the
total of the district of 170, there are going to be --
and there -- I don't know off the top of my head the
Hispanic percent. It's not very high. That is one of
the thoughts in my mind, though, trying to a swing
little westward, see if that was something that came
into play. It still might.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Are you seeking additional
direction at this time or do you feel you have enough
direction?

I'll get to us. I'm asking the
consultants at this point whether you've asked all the
questions you need to ask of us.

MR. JOHNSON: We'd certainly welcome any
direction on the Hispanic community, Pinal County,
Eastern Pinal County. Our knowledge may not be as good
at that point. If you have any ideas, we'd welcome
that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Don't think anything we
said takes away from those principles we started with
which were, again, it's hard to achieve and still be
appropriate in terms of Legislative mapping, and those
principles, you know, you committed to in terms of
Reservation land, in terms of Hispanic AURs, and urban
rural in terms -- frankly, that's one of the problems
with the former district L was it combined a significant
amount of rural space between two urban centers of
population. And that was what made, in part, made it
problematic.

Mr. Huntwork.
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COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I have another issue, the purpose of which is to end up giving direction.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I propose something to resolve some of the things we're looking at in the Oro Valley, Saddlebrooke area, in there.

Take a look at the I area. One of things, if we take this population out, then this to T, whatever it is, it becomes underpopulated. It almost seems as though if shifted, so it took in part of a balloon to the south, whatever district that is, I can't see, and allowed this area to come around some, that would take and allow the expansion of Pinal County to go back over and pick up some of the areas to the east and incorporate that and lose some of the areas to the south that had been questioned as to whether the district should really go from the Maricopa Metro area all the way to the border.

I guess what I'm trying to do is still maintain the connection of the Santa Vera District to Tohono O'odham and Pasca Yaqui as well as the main Reservation area of Three Points south, the amalgamated southern districts, and allow Pinal County to made more whole. That would be helpful.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think you may run into a dilution of the majority-minority district in that area. We can at least look at it.

Okay.

COMMISSIONER HALL: You say "that area."

You mean I?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If you do exactly what Mr. Elder said, move some of that area in a counter-clockwise motion.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I may become, or E, depending on where it ripples, may become --

COMMISSIONER HALL: Is I majority minority?

MS. LEONI: I is majority-minority, yes.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: And E, should it work out.

MS. LEONI: I is overpopulated by 17,000.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I is.

MS. LEONI: I by adjustment will remain so.

COMMISSIONER HALL: There may be room for adjustment.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay.

Other direction at this point?
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Again, if lengthy, trying to be fair to Lisa as well as everybody else, if there is a lot more to say, let's take a break. If not much more to say, we could be finishing over the noon break, which is lengthy.

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: One quick thing, referring to the EACO area that is currently an entire Legislative District. That is an AUR this Commission felt extremely important, I still feel is extremely important; however, I don't believe that it has a position above and beyond any other AUR in the state. And so as you look at trying to deal with some of these very, very difficult issues, while it's the sense of the Commission, or at least my sense that we try to keep that AUR intact. If there are some minimal adjustments you need to make in order make other things work, I personally would not have a problem with that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Further along the same lines, just yesterday evening Mr. Seanez made a very important argument on behalf of the Navajo tribe. The gist of it was that, according to him, we would be diluting, in effect, the existing district if we failed to include the two Apache Reservations in the same
district with the Navajos. We've heard some arguments to the contrary.

One thing that is crystal clear is that by our own standards, the issue of Native Americans, Hispanics, and rural versus urban are three super priorities take priority over any AURs, including Yavapai versus Pinal or anything else. Had we not come to that conclusion explicitly, it would have been implicit anyway because of the fact that the Federal Constitution and Federal Voting Rights have priority.

Before we promulgated a plan for discussion, I would like to have the very best advice that our collective legal counsel can provide to us based on the information we have today, including information that was suggested to us by Mr. Seanez, as to whether, between that, whether we are required to do it or are prohibited from doing it. Might we be packing if we did it? Might we be creating nonminority districts under 106? Clearly that's one of the driving decisions and may affect a lot of things around it. I think we need to have the best wisdom and advice we can get before we -- in that regard, before we take our next step.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Does legal counsel understand the question?
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MR. RIVERA: Yes.

Want the answer now or for us to brief it?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I suspect -- I doubt it's an easy enough question to answer now. In any event, I think it appropriate to provide legal advice in Executive Session.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The next question, whether or not required at this point, the next question is if that advice impacts significantly the direction consultants go and to figure out where they go. We don't want to waste their work and hard effort if it would significantly impact their work and effort.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Precisely.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, the previous plan submitted, or I should say NDC's draft, that's why we have expert staff testing each of the proposals relative to those issues. I don't Ms. Leoni sitting on her hands with respect to those issues. She's considered those issues. It's a continuous issue in Mr. Huntwork's mind. He should sit down with counsel and satisfy the question to the best extent possible. I believe those issues have already been tested, especially in light of this proposal and the previous proposals.

Again, I reiterate, we don't have time to
throw the vehicle in reverse. That still will not
preclude whatever questions Mr. Huntwork will, have from
questions, many of which are contained in the three
binders we already have in our possession.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Does legal counsel wish to
respond?

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Jose and I are
not sure we have an answer any more conclusive than what
we had already indicated to the Commission in our last
Executive Session.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Then we turn to the
consultants.

To Mr. Hall's point, do you feel
sufficiently advised of this issue as to be able to
proceed at this point to be able to bring us back
another draft Legislative map?

MS. LEONI: I'd like to answer that we're
sufficiently aware of the issue. There is data that is
going to be brought to bear on it which may color the
advice we'll be giving one way or another. Data will
request possible adjustment. We're aware of the issue
and bear it in mind. We me we can proceed under the
circumstances understanding, though, this is an issue
that could cause adjustment in the second phase of
hearings.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

We are at a point a break would make sense, I believe. And the break that has been asked, for and the time consultants have asked for to do their work, and the schedule conferred with earlier, suggests a five-hour break at this point. That would bring us back slightly after 6:00 p.m.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: 6:30.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It would make sense to move it to 6:30. I'd expect people to have done whatever they wish to do in terms of food and water, and begin at 6:30 and continue until a reasonable breaking point this evening so we can reconvene.

I'll tell the public that we would this evening have another opportunity for people to make public comment. There would also be an opportunity tomorrow at the meeting noticed that will begin at approximately 11:00 a.m. on Sunday at the same place.

So that is our schedule.

Unless there is anything further from the Commission, the Commission will stand in recess until 6:30 this evening.

(REcess taken at 1:10 p.m. until approximately 6:34 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd call the Commission in
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session.
For the record, all five Commissioners are present in the room. And again, I will --
COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is this on?
CHAIRMAN LYNN: How about mine?
COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: We need to add --
Thank you. That's better.
I'll call the Commission in session.
For the record, all five Commissioners are in the room, although not all seated, but they are present.
For the benefit of those in attendance this evening, the schedule will be approximately as follows: We will have a presentation on the Congressional changes that were discussed earlier today. We will, at the end of the discussion on the Congressional map, probably have call to the public, and then end the session this evening. It is reasonable to expect that the changes that have to take place to the Legislative map will take a sufficient amount of time that it would be counterproductive to again discuss those before the consultants have had an ample opportunity to create a new draft for us to look at.
That would be the subject of tomorrow's meeting, which
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will begin at 11:00 a.m. and run no later than 3:00 p.m. tomorrow. Should we not be able to adopt both maps by tomorrow afternoon, which is certainly possible, we've made contingency plans for another meeting of the Commission later this week, time and place to be announced, to finalize the maps and preliminarily adopt them to be taken out for public comment.

So that's where we are in our process.

Dr. Adams.

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Lynn, Members of the Commission, good evening.

I'm here to present a report, it is a little report, on the two recommendations that were made this morning regarding the Congressional draft plan.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Dr. Adams, could you get a little bit closer to the microphone, please.

DR. ADAMS: Get a little closer. Okay.

Today, August 11th, the Commission instructed NDC to again make modification of the Congressional draft map by moving the unincorporated area east of North Scottsdale into District E. The Commission further instructed NDC to balance the population using Phoenix territory south of the Arcadia area. Here is the result of that revision.

As you can see, we have a considerably
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cleaner, straighter line between B and E. I'll show you a little bit, zoom in on that, see what we've done in both districts to go up to the county line.

And then to compensate for population taken in there, we went down in the Arcadia area below Paradise Valley, and I'll actually show you with the pointer. We actually straightened out this line a little bit all the way around here to equalize the population with the rest of this which is a city boundary. So the cities are unified.

In addition, the Commission instructed NDC to explore unifying the University of Arizona Campus in the Tucson area, and this is the area of concern. We did affect that unification. And the area in question, right here, that's the area that we moved, east Grant Avenue down Campbell. And that is the territory that was moved.

The change, actually, was affected up here, the trade in population. This line was straightened. Some of the territory up here was actually smoothed out a bit. And I'll show you the results of the change here.

On our August 4th draft we had a total Hispanic population of 51.27 percent. In the August 10 draft, with the change of a portion of the campus
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requested to be moved, the total Hispanic figure was 50.97. And then with this change that we effected today, the percentage went to 50.87. The overall minority population changed only slightly from the August 10 draft, 61.48, 61.4, and then the voting age Hispanic population went from the original August 4 draft, 45.36 percent to 44.9 to the August 10 draft to 44.8 in the current draft.

So those are the results of the work that you had us do on the Congressional map today. And I'd be happy to actually go to the map to answer any questions that you have.

MR. RIVERA: Mr. Chairman, Dr. Adams, could we go back and look at your figures again?

DR. ADAMS: Uh-huh. Did I do them wrong?

MR. RIVERA: No. I want to look at your VAP on that.

Do you have total minority VAP, Native American, Hispanic VAP on the district?

DR. ADAMS: Current district.

MR. RIVERA: August 4th, August 10th.

MS. LEONI: Total minority VAP.

MR. RIVERA: Hispanic, Native American.

DR. ADAMS: I have it on the spread sheet.

MR. RIVERA: I guess I should look at it.
DR. ADAMS: You should look at it.

54.8 -- no, wait a minute. Am I looking at the right number? Yes. No, I wasn't looking at the right number. Yes. 54.8. It's 61.4 total minority, and total minority VAP, 54.8. That's for the August 11 draft.

I think I have the other with me. And I can tell you what it was. 54.8.

So in the total minority VAP, there was no change.

MR. RIVERA: Thank you, Dr. Adams. And sorry for the interruption.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: As soon as you have that interactive --

You have it on the interactive map, Dr. Adams?

DR. ADAMS: I do have it.

Is this the area you would like to look at or go back to other --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: No. Total map.

DR. ADAMS: Oh, yeah.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: In using the impression issue analogy, using brush strokes, let's see the whole painting.

DR. ADAMS: I'll take the Census blocks
off. Bear with me in this drawing. I'll turn that
layer off and we'll go back.

Actually those are streets. You probably
want them on.

I'll turn them off. Right now I'll hide
those.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I just wanted to
take a look at the south end of B, with streets, to see
where they are.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Did you hear the question,
Dr. Adams?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I want to take a
look at the new south end of B.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: With streets.

COMMISSIONER HALL: And to that point,
Mr. Huntwork, it may be beneficial for the audience if
you show them the boundaries of all of those internal
districts. I know several of them out there would like
to know where east, west.

DR. ADAMS: It's drawing the streets.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is it possible,
Mr. Huntwork, if this doesn't do what you wanted done,
please correct me, to Mr. Hall's point, it might be
useful in the urban areas for us not to hit every jog,
every move along the city boundary, but generally give
parameters of the northernmost boundary, eastern,
westernmost, the most predominant boundary line.

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Lynn,
Commissioner Huntwork.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The urban districts, for a
number of people in the audience, not for their benefit,
per se, but there are a number of people concerned about
this, and we'd like to be as precise as we can about
this.

DR. ADAMS: Okay. You can actually see,
let me get my pointer here, you can see this fairly
well. But we are looking here at the east valley -- you
don't want the whole thing. We're looking at city
boundaries up here. So we have Paradise Valley up in
this valley. That's actually the city boundary. Get
down here, go around Arcadia, down here to Oak Street.
And we have 35th Street, and then along -- the gully
here is Thomas Road. I apologize. That is Thomas Road.
And then that street is not properly labeled, doesn't
look like it's properly labeled. I'll have to further
zoom in. That's not accurate.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Pasadena, one block north
of Camelback.
DR. ADAMS: Actually Bethany Home.

So let's continue. Hopefully we'll continue -- I apologize. It does take a while for streets to draw on here. See 46th Avenue, and if I zoom in here, it says 52nd Lane, Jomax Drive. If I zoom in a little closer, West Happy Valley on the top. We walked around this part before, 19th Avenue, Jomax, then once again you are looking at a city boundary, moving on up to Carefree Highway, the city boundary again, when you see awkward little juttings out. And then all the way up to the top, to the county line, Seven Springs Road, yeah, Seven Springs Road, Trail 247, and you are coming down, again, to the territory that we just took in, county territory on the eastern side of Scottsdale, Pima Road, North Pima Road. Again, we've got an odd little city boundary going on right here coming on around this way.

Very often when people get accused of gerrymandering it's because they're following a city boundary.

North Scottsdale Road.

Generally it goes along North Scottsdale Road back to the beginning point. And the boundary is Paradise Valley.

I can go over and take a look at D for
you. You see we followed Indian School, 99th Avenue,
and that's Camelback.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Camelback.

DR. ADAMS: 43rd Avenue, Palo Verde Drive.

You have to see that one down a little bit lower. Oh,
North 33rd Street, East Cambridge Avenue, 39th Place,
11th Street. I can zoom in and get these. If you want
a little more detail, I'd be happy to zoom in on those.
48th Street, and we are down to leave the boundary of
the Ahwatukee area. You see West Ray Road, and this is
the boundary of the rest of the region we're looking at
here. And then we're looking at the City of Avondale,
coming up along the border of Glendale, and Camelback
Road, and then back to where we begin.

Do you want to see the others? We could
see some others, but here again we're at Camelback,
going along the boundary of Glendale, I believe that is
43rd and 51st, that border of Glendale. And then you
see we have some little jogging up to Happy Valley Road,
then 19th up to Jomax, and then you see Carefree
Highway, 27th Street, I believe we have the Phoenix
border coming in there between them, and then Glendale,
Phoenix, and then this is that the very northern
territory going up to the county line. I'm trying to
get my hand back. Okay. We're getting into fairly
unincorporated area.

Want me to zoom out a bit?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think this is in the part in Yavapai County. I think you left Maricopa County behind.

DR. ADAMS: There you go. So we've just come to the finger that has come up to the Hopi Reservation and some of the Yavapai County territory.

I think I'll zoom out a little more again on this boundary as well. You can see a little letter where you are. I think you can generally see where you are. On this, rather than looking at streets away from the urban area, you're looking at counties now. And then back around to Avondale.

Looking at this area, I can generally describe to you we're taking in the cities of Mesa, Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, Gilbert, a portion of Chandler, the division of Chandler at Dobson Road, Queen Creek, and a bit more of Pinal County.

Are there others you wanted to see?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'd like you to zoom out, if you would, and just show us the state.

DR. ADAMS: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Dr. Adams, so I can
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understand what I'm seeing here, essentially the changes
from the previous draft are the inclusion of the
inclusion of Hopi Reservation in A and changes in
Metropolitan areas of Phoenix and Tucson. Essentially
that's it, correct?

DR. ADAMS: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments or
questions for Dr. Adams?

If you don't have questions, I'd like a
comment, a sense. Do you think this helps? Are we
close?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think we're
getting there.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Are we awake?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: That I'm not sure.
I think we're getting there. I think this is definitely
a move in the right direction. For now, I think it
would. There are obviously other things, other issues
we need to look at; but based on the information we have
now, I think it looks okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Again, I want to remind
everyone that when this map is adopted for public
review, it is adopted only for public review, public
review and subsequent testing. Other information that
may come to light between the time we put it out for
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review and the time of final adoption may have impacts on the map in a variety of ways, and we should all be prepared for that. This map, once approved for public review, will not be perfect and will not have been completed. I mean there are anomalies even in terms of population among the districts. And we know that. So this map will go out for review with a disclaimer to that effect. It is in fact a draft. It will have been an adopted draft when we get to that point.

Any further comment by the Commission on the map as it stands? If not, what I suggest is that we, as soon as possible, make the map in detail available both to the public and to the Commissioners. But I think it would be prudent for us to adopt both maps, Congressional and Legislative, after a period of review, that is our own review. I would like for the actual adoption of the Congressional map to wait until we've had a chance to look at Legislative maps and until we've had time to review this as well.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to request if NDC could put this on CD by tomorrow so we could load it onto our laptops and review it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: We might as well ask for floppies to be available in the event some in the
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audience members prefer to have a data copy available, also.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Anything else anyone would like to add at this point to the Congressional map issue? Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether it's Florence or Alan, but would you update your spread sheet for the Congressional map on the new numbers so spread sheet is reasonable to what the changes reflect?

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Elder, you do have an updated spread sheet. The one I handed out this evening is an updated spread sheet.

COMMISSIONER HALL: There is a reason both he has are one because I have two.


We thank you for that diligent work. And we will -- we will look forward to more detailed review individually as we get that material. We appreciate that very much.

I want to also maximize the amount of time you have to work this evening on the Legislative matters. But before we try to do that, we have a couple
of items on the agenda we might be able to take care of
before we allow the consultants to go back to their work
on the Legislative map.

If I can direct your attention to Item IX:
Presentation, discussion and possible decision
concerning the Commission's process during the 30-day
public comment period for items such as the release of
draft plans, mailing, citizen kits, and the procedure
for responding to submissions.

This was on the agenda to be discussed
today. I believe you received a packet and that was to
have been discussed today.

Dr. Heslop.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
Commission, as you approach the time for adoption of
these plans, it seems appropriate to begin considering
how they are best served in terms of release materials,
in terms of bringing their detail to the attention of
the public by the media, in bringing attention of
different groups whose interests are affected by these
plans, bringing them to the attention of those groups.

And also, since we have had a substantial round of
hearings, 24 hearings in different parts of the state,
it does seem appropriate to let all those who attended
those hearings have some information on the Commission's
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So the first items that I considered in this short memorandum have to do with the effort to bring the plans to the attention of those who might be interested, should be interested, and have in the past been interested.

On item four, it seems appropriate that as we enter the second round of hearings decisions should be made on the materials that go into citizens, what exactly should go in the kit or packet for citizens.

One very important element of such a kit is a statement from the Commission about its plans. And I have provided a draft of such a statement that the Commission may wish to consider for including in kits.

And then, as we approach the time for citizenry action, I think it would be well to consider the procedures that we need to have in place for responding to citizen reaction.

All of our experience over the last 28 years is that it is the second round when citizens see the lines, it is then that you will get an outpouring of questions, of comment, indeed, of suggestions for change and of sideline rounds of competition of your own and a large volume of citizen recommendations. It seems now is the time to think ahead of how these submissions
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should be completed and to what extent the Commission wants to formalize procedures for formalizing submissions and comparing them and how exactly we should respond.

It would, for example, be an idea, one we have in the past used, to develop an analytical table that would allow the comparison of many statewide plans, or indeed partial plans, on key facts.

So this is our effort, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, to look ahead to the period which will begin after adoption of your plans and to think through how the Commission might wish to respond.

The attachments to that short memorandum, the draft statement, seem to us appropriate to state very clearly the 106 criteria, the other guidelines that were used by the Commission, and then to make clear that the changes that the Commission is interested in considering would be changes that are in line with those criteria, with those consorts, and only changes in line with those criteria and principles.

The attached memorandum of July 18 is our effort to suggest a way of contacting all of those who attended the first round of hearings with a letter telling them what has happened and with a short summary statement of plans and some outline maps.
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Those are the ideas, Mr. Chairman. If they are approved, we'd be happy to work on these documents, refine them further, and work with Adolfo and other members of his staff in helping these become a reality.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Doctor, has legal counsel reviewed the recommendations contained in the memo?

DR. HESLOP: They have indeed.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: What is the pleasure of the Commission?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I've looked it over. In general, I think it's a good plan. My concern is as we go out for public comment and people tell us what they like or don't like --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Use the microphone.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I want to understand very, very clearly what changes they are suggesting. I wonder in a draft form if there's something that can be added to flesh out what we mean by detailed suggestions, something like "provide specific boundaries of districts, if you so choose," or -- not requiring them to do it, but just allowing them to be as specific as they want to be, as they can be, so we really understand.

DR. HESLOP: Yes, indeed. We will do
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments?

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I suppose the center of my question would be the timing. How soon would you anticipate trying to process these? Like if we're going to be meeting sometime this next week, would it be a matter of days or so after that?

DR. HESLOP: Yes, Commissioner. It seems to us we should be prepared for your adoption, and that, very quickly thereafter in the wake of the first news about this mail program that should begin. And we should have, in being there, some procedures for responding to criticism, suggestions, and all other comments we're going to get. I predict they'll begin perhaps sooner than you think.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: With respect to the area, I guess I would call it the survey portion, is that appropriate?

DR. HESLOP: Oh, yes.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Whatever you want to call that, where we ask for their input, do you approve or disapprove, in your experience, would it be better to maybe put that on a scale of one to five versus --
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DR. HESLOP: That's something to consider.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Would you please rate on a scale of one to five your opinion relative to those questions listed.

What is your opinion regarding that, Dr. Heslop?

DR. HESLOP: I have several opinions regarding that. Some people are unfamiliar with the idea of rank ordering, so it confuses some respondents, but it certainly gives you a more precise answer than merely to approve or disapprove. And if it's precision they are looking for, then that's a way to do it.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Maybe to that point, it would be better in line with the fact we can always go through school the A through F, if you will, grade --

DR. HESLOP: Grade, yes. I'm familiar with the principle.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I understand that, knew you would be, as we all are.

A possible suggestion, versus black or white, pass or fail, true or false, maybe give us a better sense.

DR. HESLOP: I think that's certainly true, Commissioner Hall.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any other comments?
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Dr. Heslop, do you have what you need?

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'm wondering if there's a way we can try to propose a different kind of input from ordinary citizens. We talked about this theoretically, talked about this theoretically from the beginning, but is there a way for a website, or some other way, would it be feasible to create a mechanism where ordinary citizens can test their ideas? We have seen amply demonstrated one little change here affects other places. We got, in the first round, we got input from people where they thought lines should be drawn and so on. The second round, in order to add a lot, it probably needs to have a more quantitative dimension to it. Is there a way we can help people to do that?

DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Huntwork, we have in some jurisdictions, including a statewide jurisdiction, say redistricting, we have made available to citizens a redistricting program so that they can go to a central site or take a diskette, disk, and work with it. That is something that the Commission certainly could do. It would involve expense, obviously, and it is something that would have to begin now, because it is not something that happens overnight. But, again, we would be happy to share our experience in
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that with Members of the Commission and see what we could develop.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'd appreciate what you'd do with that including how much it would cost, including how many such sites you'd have to provide in order to create meaningful coverage of the state.

DR. HESLOP: One of the things we experienced in many of the jurisdictions is that libraries, they are very keenly involved in things of this sort. The library is very often a community center. People can go to the library where they have some equipment that may be necessary, so that is something else that perhaps could be worked out in association with the libraries throughout the state.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any further comment?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: If at all possible, I know we've had our average people out there at many of the meeting locations that I was at. There were locations they said they would be more than willing and happy to post maps. I would like to see, if it's possible, and with the timing we have, identify the locations as we send out two different areas where they
can see a map, hard copy, note the library, if it is the
library, and have some eight-and-a-half by elevens of
their area that may be accessible so they can fill it
out and attach it to their response.

DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Elder, I think
that's a great idea, not only libraries but
jurisdictions, City Halls.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'm concerned about
the interactive, now that I've had my own experience
with Maptitude, to ramp-up a program for the public
here. To e-mail, send a map, hard line, copy line, copy
it and send it back, we'd probably get more response
than trying to commence a new digital type of data base.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: First of all, I'd
like to agree with Commissioner Elder. I think for most
people the computer program will be a little
intimidating. Some people would have the sophistication
to use it, and they'll make themselves available of it,
avail themselves of it. For the most, people do better
with paper, pen, pencil.

To clarify what was said earlier, in
devising the draft form, asking about specific boundary
lines: If you do have a suggestion, if you want to
indicate alternative boundaries, the request a citizen
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kit, maybe somebody, all they care about is looking at this district, we've drawn this line in the wrong place and instead of being along A Street it should be along B Street, and that is all they want to tell us. The don't want a citizen kit, don't want the rest. They live between A and B and want to be in a different district. The word draft form is easy for them to provide that information.

DR. HESLOP: Individual changes might be difficult to make in a map with 30 changes. I should warn and encourage the Commission about the sort of citizen response you have. Obviously, the people that will take the time to write, to develop maps, are those people who are unhappy with your adopted maps and want to make changes. I do believe you'll find very constructive, very interesting, often very useful recommendations, and the time we give to this process is well done.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The other thing I think might be useful for those who will not, cannot, may not avail themselves of an electronic methodology of looking at the maps, as you've done with us, certainly as these maps are finalized, if you would provide a general written description of the district, generally speaking it includes cities of, follows city boundaries of, has a
northern boundary of X, southern boundary of Y, so
people can, if they can't get it some other way, can
really fix in their minds in terms of neighborhood, in
terms of community, see how that fits; and if that will
accompany the map, that will make it that much easier.

DR. HESLOP: Something like that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: That's also much more
easily translated into Spanish as well as made available
to people that have an interest that prefer that in a
language other than English, as is part of our
obligation.

Mr. Hall, anything?

Anything else for the consultants this
evening on this issue?

We thank you very much for all of your
hard work and sleepless nights this week. It was a bit
of a marathon.

DR. HESLOP: We'll be glad to sleep some
this evening.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right.

We have four opportunities on the agenda,
one more piece of which is call to the public.
This would be the time for consideration
and discussion of comments and complaints from the
public. Those wishing to address the Commission shall
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request permission in advance by filling out a speaker
slip. If you would like one, staff will provide one for
you. 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.

I have two. The First is from Jose
Solarez from the Gila River Indian Community.

Mr. Solarez.

MR. SOLAREZ: Good evening, Mr. Chairman.

I'm here on behalf of the Gila River
Indian Community. I'm a third generation Guadalupano
from Guadalupe, authorized by the community, Gila River
Indian Community.

I'll stress the importance of some
information I think has been left out that needs to be
shared.

Number one, the community expressed the
fact they do not feel very comfortable with a district,
Legislative District, that goes into Tucson, even though
they do have a sister tribe down there, the Tohono
O'odham Nation, a culturally related tribe.

The Salt River Indian communities, as you
are probably aware or not aware, the Akimel O'otham, the
Pima, and Pee Posh, the Maricopas, the two nations, the
Salt River and Gila River, that is, the plan submitted is contrary to, we believe, the cultural linguistics and picture for these communities. The Metropolitan, urban tribes is very negative in the plans submitted, as has been shown on this, by the NDC draft.

Number two, the other issue is we believe a link has existed under the current District Seven bringing in the Salt River, Fort McDowell, possibly due to the fact many districts are utilized to hook up and not cause drastic change in population figures to the district south, below Casa Grande.

The fact Pinal County is now considered part of Phoenix' SMSA statistical metropolitan area, this is a big fact. The Casa Grande Metropolitan area is the biggest boom, housing area, to affect the Phoenix Metropolitan area, and will have a big impact on the work force. Due to this fact, it is an economic factor, stands out as a strong economic factor for the Ak-Chin, Fort McDowell, because of their economic dependence on the Phoenix area, not the Tucson area.

These areas have Casinos in the communities dependent on the Phoenix Metro area. Besides the Casino, which are very dependent on the Phoenix Metro area, that's a big community that exists in the Phoenix communities, doesn't exist with Tucson.
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And Casa Grande being a sister city south of us and the area south of us, we like to make it possible to keep it intact with Maricopa County.

We feel there's a strong possibility, basically District Seven, we've not seen major change in population in many of the districts we have seen. Sure, we did have some. Other than a few lizards and Gila monsters, South Mountain Park, Guadalupe, and question why there's Ahwatukee. Those are questions that haven't been addressed.

This economic community of interest Maricopa does not exist in any of the other areas with economic interests.

Those sister tribes are very dependent on Tucson population, and we're more dependent on the Phoenix area for economic activity and our school districts. And they're in Pinal and Maricopa County.

Those are issues that need to be addressed and have not been brought fourth and need to be considered when you make up the maps.

These pictures are very -- needs to be broken out in a way of showing us a way of going again around Apache Junction. Parts of Apache Junction can be included. The fact remains there is a way to connect Salt River, Fort McDowell, with Gila River. Fort
McDowell, as we now know, District Seven, we feel is not a major factor.

Casa Grande voices concern about keeping this. In fact, our community feels it's a community of interest. And part of Casa Grande doesn't have a large community of interest with our community.

The other part I'd like to bring up and address is the data being provided, present all the information. Mr. Rivera brought up, that's basically the first group DOJ will look at to make sure there's compliance, the American Indian, Native Americans. Somehow we see more Hispanics being reflected than Native Americans. We're interested in seeing data shown up every time data goes up. Hispanic voting age population, we believe that exists with Native Americans also, especially since there's a large impact on total majority-minority in districts. That's not reflected in data presented. We feel it needs to be made available when it comes out.

The other issue, too, that also should be addressed is an issue of availability. Our community possibly, I don't know the rights about software, but we, like you said, not all Indian communities have libraries. Our rural areas have resources to have a library, not Pima and Pinal, but resources are
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available. We hope, and it was mentioned, possibly
going back to local governments, making sure the City
Hall, sovereign nations have data available, also the
possibility of purchasing a license, if, you know, if
available, to have software available to us. We don't
have it that way. If cheaper, if it makes it available
to the public and the entities that are concerned and
involved in this process, I think that needs to be
brought up.

Those are my comments.

I'd like to come back after Mr. Seanez as
Mr. Joe Public here in regards to two things. I'll give
an opportunity for other people to come in. I might
come as an individual.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Solarez.

Don't go too far away. I only have one
other slip.

The other speaker slip is Larry Chesley
representing himself, a citizen.

Mr. Chesley.

MR. CHESLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I live in Gilbert, Arizona.

I'm somewhat familiar with drawing maps.

I've helped Maricopa County on three occasions draw
maps: In 1994, when I was a State Senator, I was on the
committee that drew the maps in Southern Arizona that
were required by Justice, so I'm reasonably familiar.

I live in District 30.

The map that you have presented to us
already from the Legislative Districts, if I were only
interested in my own district, I love what you've drawn
for 30. My problem is the rest of the east valley has
been, I think, shorted. Tempe, I believe, is divided
into four different communities: Scottsdale, Mesa, and
Chandler.

I have a map. And I'm sorry, I wasn't
even going to come. I decided this afternoon I would.
I have a map and electronic disk, if I can leave that
with you. But I have presented a map with what are
boundaries like US 60. We used as square as you can get
rather than zig-zagging, as the map that you had
presented originally. The only ugly part of this map
now is 30, the one I will end up in, in any case.

I have two options, one, go down to
Coolidge, the New Johnson Ranch between Gilbert and
Coolidge that is growing very rapidly, we'd pick that
up. The one we would refer to is B on our map, that
would be some of Apache Junction, to get us up to the
numbers that we would need in District 30.

The map that you presented, again, I
believe that most of us in the east valley actually could live with it except Tempe will not be happy with it. The rest of us could live with it with two exceptions. You put Queen Creek and part of East Mesa with Tucson. They have absolutely nothing in common, nothing.

And I know that you have to get numbers, and you have to draw population, but -- and I forgot what letter you put with that. I put a number on it of 12. But it goes all the way from McDowell Road all the way down to Casa Grande in Tucson. I know you don't gerrymander, because you said you wouldn't; but that looks like an ugly district.

I appreciate the opportunity of addressing you this evening. I know you don't have an easy job. But I hope that you would at least give some consideration to what I have presented.

If I may, I'd like to leave this with you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Chesley.

We'd take the map and disk.

The map you've seen has been altered.

MR. CHESLEY: I understand that sir.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The map you referred to was District L. Looked like L to me, too. That's why we made changes to it.
MR. CHESLEY: Thank you, sir.

Again, Mr. Solarez, now representing himself, a citizen of South Tucson -- South Phoenix, I'm sorry.

MR. SOLAREZ: Again, Jose Solarez.

I did talk, by coincidence, with the Mayor of Guadalupe. She asked I share her card.

The Elected Mayor and City Council, Elected City Council, sent her letter by the people of South Phoenix. I'll give that to Mrs. Minkoff. They asked me to go ahead. They were concerned about her voice.

Mrs. Minkoff, I'll share that information.

I'd also bring out another fact. As the former city manager, former magistrate, former Guadalupano, the way they live, the way it's been since long ago, Guadalupe is one of the smallest cities. One of the biggest problems they face is housing. Most of it is replacement housing. A lot of us had problems staying in housing. They don't have the luxury like in Tempe and Mesa.

Most grow up in the five miles of Guadalupe. Their cultural, families, educational, linguistic ties to the community, pardon me, I'm Hispanic as well. I live in the area of 48th Street and
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Southern, basically South Phoenix. One thing, if you go
over, every third, fourth house, you'll run into someone
from Guadalupe. I call it Guadalupe. We didn't have
anything in Guadalupe to buy. We moved into the
neighborhoods. There is a community of interest, and
that has never been addressed, and it ties with our
culture. Those Pasca Yaqui, the religious community,
many people are there on Sunday because of religious
ties. They are always there on the weekend because of
family ties.

We need to stress the issue real true
community of interest in Arizona, Guadalupe.

One of the things you bring out before
South Phoenix became part of Phoenix, a community, South
Latino, 32nd Street and Baseline, in that area, around
Highland Canal, a small Hispanic canal, President
Clinton, on his tour, chose to eat in south central at a
small restaurant. That family happens to be from that
community. That family has a lot of strong family from
Guadalupe. Families have been set up 20, 30 years in
the area. It was developed before Phoenix was ever in
the area. In fact, it's a stronger tie in Guadalupe
than the Pasca Yaqui Indian Community.

The other factor that failed to be brought
forth, the fact the urban Indian population exists in
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Phoenix. If you see that, the urban Indian population within Central Phoenix, we know here we're talking about what happens to be centered in that district. With Guadalupe's Indian population and that within Phoenix, it helps strengthen Indian population within the Central Phoenix corridor. And that exists and goes up through, like I said, within the northern boundaries, I think Camelback Road.

I don't have a map in front of me.

The fact remains, the Indian population needs to be addressed, so-called Indian population, Guadalupe, because it's Hispanic, South Phoenix, rather than Tempe. Tempe, used to be a part of Tempe. A lot of people in the community felt issues and concerns were not being addressed in the Legislature in the past. Those are one of the reasons, because of the community of interest, people did not understand the interests, education issues, social issues, were not being addressed.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Solarez.

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

Not --

MR. HARTDEGEN: I can make an annual appearance.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: We're always happy to see you, whether you speak or not. You are always with us in our thoughts.

The Commission will stand in recess until 11:00 o'clock tomorrow morning, same location.

(Whereupon, the Commission recessed at approximately 7:54 p.m.)

* * * *
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BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing hearing was
taken before me, LISA A. NANCE, RPR, CCR, Certified
Court Reporter in and for the State of Arizona,
Certificate Number 50349; that the proceedings were
taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to
typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing 168
pages constitute a true and accurate transcript of all
proceedings had upon the taking of said hearing, all
done to the best of my ability.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am in no way
related to any of the parties hereto, nor am I in any
way interested in the outcome hereof.

DATED at Phoenix, Arizona, this 29th day

LISA A. NANCE, RPR, CCR
Certified Court Reporter
Certificate Number 50349
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