

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF ARIZONA
ARIZONA INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

PUBLIC SESSION

Phoenix, Arizona
August 12, 2001
11:00 a.m.

ARIZONA INDEPENDENT
REDISTRICTING
COMMISSION

LISA A. NANCE, RPR, CCR
Certified Court Reporter
Certificate No. 50349

1 THE STATE OF ARIZONA INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING
2 COMMISSION convened in Public Session on August 12,
3 2001, at 11:00 o'clock a.m., at the Pointe South
4 Mountain Resort, Conference Rooms Estrella and
5 Flagstaff, 7777 South Pointe Parkway, Phoenix, Arizona,
6 85044, in the presence of:

7

8 APPEARANCES:

9

- 10 CHAIRMAN STEVEN W. LYNN
- 11 COMMISSIONER JAMES R. HUNTWORK
- 12 COMMISSIONER JOSHUA M. HALL
- 13 COMMISSIONER ANDI E. MINKOFF
- 14 COMMISSIONER DANIEL R. ELDER

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

- ADOLFO ECHEVESTES, Executive Director
- AMY REZZONICO, Press Information Officer
- LISA T. HAUSER, Commission Counsel
- JOSE de JESUS RIVERA, Commission Counsel
- DR. ALAN HESLOP, NDC, Consultant
- DOUG JOHNSON, NDC, Consultant
- MARION PORCH, NDC, Support Staff
- TIM JOHNSON, MC, Computer Consultant
- LISA A. NANCE, RPR, CCR, Court Reporter

SPEAKERS FROM CALL TO THE PUBLIC:

- PATRICE KRAUS
- JIM HARTDEGEN
- ALBERTO GUTIER

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Public Hearing
Phoenix, Arizona
August 12, 2001
11:00 o'clock a.m.

P R O C E E D I N G S

COMMISSIONER LYNN: I'll call the
Commission to order.

The record will show all five
Commissioners are present as well as legal counsel and
the consultants.

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 filing out a
speaker slip. Action taken as a result of public
comment will be limited to directing staff to study the
matter or rescheduling the matter for further
consideration and decision at a later date.

I have two speaker slips.

Mr. Echeveste, do you have additional
slips?

The first I have is Mr. Hartdegen.

MR. HARTDEGEN: Chairman Lynn, Commission
members, I've done my share of scolding and doom and

1 gloom. From the information I've been able to glean
2 yesterday about the reconfiguration about that district,
3 unless there were major changes overnight, I think it's
4 pretty decent. I think the people in Casa Grande will
5 probably go along with you on it. If that were the
6 final product and you're ready to nail it down, I feel
7 very good about it.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Hartdegen,
9 very much.

10 Next is Jose Solarez, planner for Gila
11 River Indian Community.

12 I saw Mr. Solarez earlier. We'll try
13 again in a moment.

14 Next is Alberto Gutier.

15 MR. GUTIER: Good morning.

16 I'm representing myself. I'm a party
17 activist for the last 30 years in Arizona.

18 You guys have a tough job no matter what
19 happens.

20 I'm a professional mapper. I know what a
21 tough job it is. I know no matter what happens, the
22 funny line with the Hopis, it's a tough call, this tough
23 job. The Legislative maps, I get nervous. I went to
24 see the maps maybe two, three times ago. I always make
25 a point that freeways constitute a big, big demarcation

1 of lines. A lot of people live along the demarcation
2 lines. They don't shop and things across the
3 demarcation lines. A lot of people don't consider the
4 demarcation lines. They don't try to go beyond their
5 own community of interest. Being in 30 years in the
6 same district, I get concerned when I see lines that
7 don't go inside the west side of so-called freeways of
8 Central Phoenix, especially I-17 to 51, special
9 interests, demographics, special lines across either
10 way.

11 It's a tough job. I don't envy you.

12 I hope you consider those communities of
13 interest, especially communities of interest, the area
14 of Moon Valley, the area like we know, where one of the
15 Commissioners, like myself, live, and has taken care of
16 areas of all income levels, like Sunnyslope, being in
17 the same district as our district, and is always
18 attentive to the east communities, happens to be in the
19 middle of the Moon Valley area and Phoenix area.

20 I'd comment along the lines drawn, finally
21 that you consider the kind of things and split two
22 months ago, two, three months ago. I wanted to point
23 that out.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, sir.

25 Again, let me ask if Mr. Solarez is in the

1 vicinity.

2 If not, we'll have to defer his comments
3 until later this afternoon when we again have public
4 comment which we will have at the end of the day.

5 For everyone's scheduling purposes, we'll
6 conclude the meeting today at 3:00 o'clock regardless of
7 where we are in the process since the room is needed for
8 other events. And for your information, the tentative
9 schedule, although it's not been officially noticed, if
10 we do not finish the legislative process today, the next
11 meeting will be Thursday of this coming week. It will
12 be held in Tucson. It will be at the Double Tree Hotel
13 South of Broadway on Alvernon and will start at 9:30 in
14 the morning on Thursday. It's also noticed, or will be
15 notices for us to continue that meeting until Friday in
16 case we do not finish on Thursday. That meeting on
17 Friday will start at 8:00 o'clock at the same location.

18 MR. ECHEVESTE: 8:30.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd like to, before we ask
20 for a report from the consultants on the progress of
21 Legislative mapping, I'd like to revisit an item for
22 briefly, entertain a motion regarding the Commission
23 budget.

24 Mr. Hall.

25 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I make a

1 motion we accept the budget.

2 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

4 Mr. Hall I ask you, this is the revised
5 budget, updated budget?

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I wanted to include that
8 in your motion so we understand that.

9 Discussion?

10 We've all had copies.

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

13 (Vote taken.)

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye. "

15 Motion carries unanimously.

16 Thank you, Mr. Hall.

17 Dr. Heslop and Mr. Johnson, the floor is
18 yours.

19 DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
20 Commission. We're here to report on progress. I have
21 to tell you that it is clear that we will not, as I
22 think it is almost certain, complete the Legislative
23 plan today. There are many important remaining problems
24 we hope for your instruction on them.

25 We do have a substantially redrawn map.

1 As the Commission knows, changes, many of
2 them substantial, have been made in every area of the
3 map. As we have proceeded, we have continued to note
4 adjustments to the grid.

5 Here you see the current map as we have it
6 drawn now with the grid overlaid.

7 What I'm going to ask Doug Johnson to do
8 is take us on a tour of this current map and ask, as we
9 go district by district around it, that you give your
10 reactions. We will take careful note of those
11 reactions. Then we have a series of slides for the
12 screen which pose questions and identify problems.

13 Again, I will take you through those
14 problems. And at the conclusion, we will ask for
15 specific recommendations, or specific answers to
16 questions that we will pose.

17 So that's, Mr. Chairman, members of the
18 Commission, that's our intention.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let me ask one question so
20 I'm clear what we're looking at. I perceive that to be
21 a map which includes county boundaries, grid lines, and
22 the State of the Legislative Districts as they are at
23 the moment.

24 DR. HESLOP: That is correct, sir.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: And I mean the developing

1 districts --

2 DR. HESLOP: Developing districts.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: As they are at the moment.

4 DR. HESLOP: To which we'll seek reaction
5 as we go on the tour at the moment.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, please
7 proceed.

8 DR. HESLOP: Let's start.

9 MR. JOHNSON: We go through each part of
10 the state. In some cases where districts are very
11 large, district by district, others they are more
12 general in terms the area. I should put one note of
13 caution at the very beginning, in particular, for the
14 public folks, areas have more area. Certain pieces are
15 areas of development. We're well aware, this area,
16 Pinal, the portion of Yavapai District, those are not
17 definitive lines. Particular areas, things are in flex
18 a lot.

19 As you go through it, I'll say this is a
20 district almost drawn. This is a district we still have
21 a lot of work to do in.

22 So starting in the north, this is still a
23 map under development, the Hopi Reservation.
24 Incidentally, this piece is left out of it. It's not
25 yet assigned to a district. Given the instructions

1 received yesterday, the next attempt will be to attach
2 it to an area not part of the Navajo Nation.

3 But this Northern District, this stretches
4 across the northern part of the state and takes in the
5 Navajo Nation.

6 Zoom in on this corner here, and most of
7 the Grand Canyon area, and then over to the river.

8 I don't have the labels on the cities.
9 Let me put the labels on the cities so you have a sense.

10 This district is essentially at population
11 numbers we're seeking to reach. The only caution on
12 that front, as we add details, the Yavapai District down
13 here is fairly significantly overpopulated at this
14 point, so there may be some adjustments to this
15 district. One thing in particular that we're looking at
16 is possibly adjusting it so that it may come down a
17 little further to Coconino County to reduce the split of
18 Mohave County.

19 Two pieces under consideration here,
20 there's one specific option I'll present today. One, a
21 part of general adjustment later. In the end, we go
22 down and reduce the county splits, city splits, without
23 significantly changing anything else.

24 That covers the basis of the Northern
25 District. Again, it unites a number of nations. As

1 drawn now, it's 64 percent Native American, and it's one
2 of the options we'll mention to you today. Actually
3 you'll deal with that question as well.

4 The second piece, this has taken
5 considerably more shape since we last had a map to show
6 you, is this river and rural area district.

7 It is at essentially population equality
8 at this point, I believe.

9 Let me show you the population of the city
10 right now. I'm sorry, it's about 20,000 short. We do
11 have the proposal about Mohave up north. We'll deal
12 with that today.

13 We, at this point, one of reasons it's
14 short is I've attempted to take Prescott Valley out and
15 keep Prescott Valley together. We've been working to
16 get similar community areas, to keep communities
17 together.

18 You can see we went down into the far
19 western part of Maricopa County to pick up population
20 and keep it together.

21 This dividing line is in flux. It wasn't
22 set for any specific reason other than I was doing work
23 at the time.

24 This an area in work, and we're doing good
25 work on the river and rural district.

1 Another district we had work and good
2 input from the specific rural district, Yavapai and most
3 of the southern Coconino County.

4 This district now, we're happy the
5 communities were able to unite. They are relatively
6 compact. The only concern is it's still about 20 or 25
7 thousand people over. So we're looking at the different
8 options to address that. I suspect that portion of
9 Prescott Valley may have to be divided in some way.
10 We're working to find other options for that.

11 If that were to happen, if there were a
12 way to do it that made sense, we'd like you not have a
13 random map like you saw the other day.

14 Over to the east is an area you are
15 familiar with. It's -- this remains the Eastern Arizona
16 Counties District as proposed by community groups.
17 We've not made changes in that area since you last saw
18 the map.

19 Down in the Yuma area, per the discussion
20 and instructions talked about the other day, we did
21 succeed in creating a river Yuma district that takes in
22 all of Yuma County and then a portion of La Paz which it
23 was able to take in. It does have all the tribal
24 reservation along the river here.

25 This area is not part of it. This area is

1 another, again, under development area. They were
2 trying to figure out what to do and decided a large part
3 of what it is based on the Phoenix area here.

4 The Phoenix map, Maricopa area map, I
5 should say, has not changed since you last saw it.

6 We did discuss Tempe, changing of these
7 districts North-South and concerns about the historical
8 district in here. Those are still on menu to be
9 addressed. We just have not in the last two days
10 focused on the rural areas, not those two areas. They
11 are still in the instructions you gave us. We're still
12 acting to implement those.

13 This area in here, we're -- and this
14 eastern part of Pinal County, is the kind of influx
15 areas we discussed the other day. Actually we've taken
16 feedback from the last meeting to come up with three
17 alternatives. One is still a general state, two
18 specific alternatives for you to look at today and
19 hopefully give us instruction on which is the best
20 approach to take.

21 That would cover this whole area, the
22 valley region we discussed the other day of east Pinal
23 County.

24 The Tucson map also has not changed since
25 we last met with you. We definitely still plan to

1 implement discussions we had about where the best
2 dividing line is, to hear what makes sense in terms of
3 the outlying areas, where to divide those, and the map
4 you see later. This is equal as to implement all of
5 those instructions.

6 Again, we have 23 to 25 districts that are
7 pretty much at the right population number, at
8 essentially the configuration we anticipate them ending
9 up in. With all the issues, a change anywhere can
10 trigger a change everywhere. This is all very
11 tentative. Mainly it's an update of where we're at in
12 the work in progress to get specific direction from you
13 on one specific area that may change significantly
14 before you see it again.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: To that point, Dr. Heslop,
16 Mr. Johnson, it seems to me, please correct me if this
17 is misstated, it seems to me in terms of instructions we
18 make to you today, it would be more helpful if we gave
19 you, for lack of a better term, a goal rather than a
20 goal and specific methodology for reaching a goal, that
21 is to say let's take, for example, the Phoenix area,
22 Chandler, if Chandler is still divided in four sections,
23 if our goal were to be that Chandler not be divided in
24 more than two districts, we'd leave it to you to give
25 options on how to make it happen; because once we give

1 you that and something to go with it, we may preclude
2 the goal by the direction in terms of moving other
3 districts around to make it fit.

4 And again, I'm asking that because I think
5 what I'd like to do today, this is a personal
6 preference, I would like to give you as much direction,
7 that is goal-oriented direction as we can, and give you,
8 instead of hours, days to work on that, and perhaps not
9 come back with a single map in a certain area, but
10 perhaps even two, three options as you see them to solve
11 the problem as we direct it.

12 DR. HESLOP: That's exactly it. We hoped
13 for goal-oriented direction. It also helped for you to
14 help us choose strategies to answer a particular series
15 of problems. We'll be stating these on the screen very
16 soon.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay.

18 DR. HESLOP: In response to the second
19 part of your statement, it would be our intention to
20 develop a map as best we can but to have alternatives
21 well in mind.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd like to at least get a
23 sense from the Commissioners as to whether that
24 methodology works for them. And I think it does.

25 Okay.

1 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It's certainly
2 easier on our part.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think it makes it easier
4 on both our parts get to the conclusion.

5 If you would, Mr. Johnson, revisit the
6 state area by area and we'll try to give you the benefit
7 at least of, by your questions, the goals and ideas you
8 might want to pursue.

9 DR. HESLOP: Perhaps it's a good idea for
10 Doug to just show the screens without discussion on the
11 rest of the slide show and then to come back to the map
12 so the Commissioners know what is in the second half of
13 the Power Point.

14 MR. JOHNSON: I'll quickly run through the
15 slide so you have a sense of what the issue is so you
16 know what we're asking for specific direction on then
17 come back to the map on what we just discussed.

18 I want to focus on Yavapai.

19 What we're talking about, as you see from
20 that, as you'll see as we discuss the state in more
21 detail, there are two keystones the state is turning on
22 at this point. Yavapai is one. Tucson and Pinal County
23 is the other one. And we're going to be, somewhat of
24 the goal from the last meeting, there are three specific
25 options in this area. And that's what we'll be

1 presenting.

2 One is -- they are all aimed at Eastern
3 Pinal County and population issues in Tucson and needing
4 additional population. Three, one attempt is to move
5 westward, one shifting around, preserving the Eastern
6 Arizona Counties AUR. Another has a minor adjustment to
7 the Eastern Arizona Counties.

8 I'll run through these so you have them in
9 mind as you look to statewide.

10 The western move states a lot of analysis
11 to develop because of the all AURs that surround the
12 area, the Hispanic area, I-19 AUR, Yuma AUR, Pinal
13 County AUR.

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm not sure what
15 you mean by the western move. Are lines moving west, in
16 the eastern area of the state, or are the western
17 districts expanding?

18 MR. JOHNSON: Sure.

19 The next slide I'll show a little map of
20 the area.

21 Essentially what we're looking at, all
22 three districts relate to need and questions of
23 appropriate linkage for population.

24 The western move, there's an option, a
25 swing for part of Tucson population this way in some

1 approach and allowing this to kind of consolidate. A
2 lot of AURs come into play on all besides of this. So
3 we don't have a specific proposal for you on that front,
4 but it is an option to go that direction in some way.
5 And it will make more sense relative to other options
6 we'll be presenting on the same topic.

7 The second option is to link this somewhat
8 rural Cochise County Legislative District up into that
9 portion of Pinal County to pick up additional population
10 to complete districts down here, a little bit of a
11 change. This arm does respect the Eastern Counties
12 border. It looks a little funny, as you know. It does
13 follow, as discussed at the last meeting, connect the
14 valley areas, connects the mining valleys. It's one
15 option that would work pretty well, unite communities,
16 has the population we need, would bring the district
17 essentially into population equality. It does have the
18 compactness issues.

19 The third one, it has strong community
20 support, has interest in preserving Eastern Arizona
21 Counties AUR, but, of course, in presenting all options,
22 we need to take all into consideration when we made this
23 consideration, there's a shift of some portion of
24 Eastern Pinal County.

25 We focused for this proposal on this area

1 primarily because the exact edge of the Maricopa
2 Districts and exact edge of Tucson Districts is still
3 very much in flux. It could be, we'd actually prefer to
4 take more of this community in here. At this point it's
5 too much in flux to give specific a definition on it.

6 It would it make sense for this portion of
7 Pinal County, more if we can go into the Eastern Arizona
8 Counties AUR.

9 They do have, as you discussed, some
10 similarities of community.

11 This, as you can imagine, would trigger a
12 change all the way around the Eastern Arizona Counties
13 AUR and actually has some beneficial impact way up in
14 the northwest.

15 Let me walk through with how we'd propose
16 to handle that shift.

17 The areas of Winslow and Holbrook are near
18 the Navajo District. And we'd propose if the option
19 adopted by the Commission, those two areas, and probably
20 some region in between, we to be made compact, there
21 would be very little in between the move into the Navajo
22 AUR. Also change the Native American percentage of the
23 Northern Arizona Navajo District from 64 percent to 68
24 percent, and it would still leave the Hopi Reservation
25 outside of that district.

1 Again, just running through pluses and
2 minuses, and we're not specifically recommending that
3 with this discussion, I don't mean to give that
4 impression.

5 The third piece of this move, because we
6 picked up additional population in the Navajo Apache
7 area, the City of Kingman, if we could work it out with
8 population numbers, New Kingman would shift down into
9 the New River AUR, uniting Kingman with Bullhead City
10 and more of the river community.

11 So that's where we'll be asking for
12 instructions.

13 Let me now with that in mind take us back
14 to the map and walk through, if we could, Mr. Chairman,
15 I'd like, kind of leave those options in the background
16 and discuss those specifically if we could for this
17 part, get other thoughts unrelated to the three options,
18 although we welcome any thoughts.

19 The first area would be the northern
20 region of the state, the Arizona strip, Navajo, Grand
21 Canyon District, and the river and rural district.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let me start.

23 If I understood your analysis of the
24 changes to the, for lack of a better term, the district
25 which includes the EACO AUR, and the proposal to include

1 Winslow and Holbrook in the Northern District, which
2 will allow you to unify Kingman and perhaps New Kingman
3 with the rest of the river AUR, would that include all
4 that development or would Kingman and New Kingman have
5 to be split, in your opinion? I know you don't have
6 final numbers. Is it close enough that's a possibility?

7 MR. JOHNSON: City of Kingman could be
8 moved in its entirety is the anticipation. All this is
9 couched, in our opinion --

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Of course.

11 MR. JOHNSON: New Kingman, actually,
12 looking in effect at New Kingman and whether that can
13 come in as part of the Grand Canyon area as well, I
14 can't give you a definitive answer. It may require
15 dividing Kingman, New Kingman, from each other. New
16 Kingman is a Census designated place, not an
17 incorporated town.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Not being totally familiar
19 with what is going on in that specific area, I certainly
20 defer to the testimony and other things we've had from
21 the river communities as well as Kingman about how that
22 should work. It just seems to me it either ought to be
23 all in or all out.

24 Ms. Minkoff.

25 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Zoom out and show

1 us the whole state.

2 Something -- let me talk -- this would
3 involve dividing up the Eastern Counties AUR, which up
4 until this time we've been reluctant to do.

5 I'm wondering if it may solve some other
6 problems.

7 If in addition to just the Winslow and
8 Holbrook area you went down to Navajo County and picked
9 up those two Apache Reservations, you know, they
10 connect, there's a pretty broad area to go down, put
11 them in the Northern District, you'd then have to shift
12 a fair amount of population from the Kingman area and
13 could easily do it and might even take in more of
14 northern Mohave County into that district. Put the rest
15 of Apache County, Graham, and Greenlee County with
16 Cochise County as part of an Eastern County Northern
17 District, which allows you to take in the western
18 portion of Gila County which really has a lot of
19 commonalty with the Pinal County mining communities,
20 rural communities, et cetera, and might make a district
21 in eastern Pinal County where it's a little better and
22 also allow you to remove the northern portion of Pima
23 Counties, which includes the northern metropolitan of
24 Tucson as well as Saddlebrooke from going into Pinal
25 County and them get out of that district and then

1 possibly shift Santa Cruz County into that western Pima
2 County District. And obviously you have to do more
3 shifting population. I haven't equalized everything.

4 I'm wondering if that might still respect
5 the rural communities' interest, Native American
6 communities of interest.

7 I realize I think it chops up the EACO AUR
8 pretty significantly. I still think it keeps some of
9 the communities of interest in that area together in
10 terms of like concerns and might address some concerns
11 of Native Americans and concerns of Pinal County and
12 might allow us to get something that addresses a lot of
13 concerns we've heard around the state.

14 I'm just asking you to consider that.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: While we're on that
16 subject, are there other comments regarding either that
17 scenario or that portion of the -- I know we started
18 with the Northern District. Obviously Ms. Minkoff's
19 comments were affecting that district as well as others.
20 It's a more general comment.

21 Mr. Huntwork.

22 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Based on the
23 information that we have received from our consultants
24 and attorneys, it appears that the Northern District as
25 it is laid out there has excellent demographics to

1 assure that Native Americans would be able to elect
2 entities, candidates of choice in that district pretty
3 much as it stands. However, the alternative discussed
4 does achieve some benefits, not only to that district
5 but also, I think, to the mining areas and eastern Pinal
6 County and Mohave County as well. So all three areas
7 may be benefiting in terms of communities of interest by
8 making that slight adjustment.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

10 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, if I may
11 kind of summarize what I perceive to be the pros and
12 cons of some of the options that we've heard.

13 Some of this I've thrown out there simply
14 because we're all looking for solutions. I think again,
15 not to be redundant, we make sure that we understand
16 that the goal, as much as possible, is to respect
17 communities of interest. Cochise is a community of
18 interest. The question I have with respect to Eastern
19 Pinal is would they feel more comfortable with an option
20 being with the San Pedro Valley?

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: San Pedro Valley,
22 Kearny.

23 COMMISSIONER HALL: Would they feel more
24 comfortable with that valley or the east. Therefore,
25 two options I think asks a question, if you will. So in

1 the event they feel more comfortable with the east and
2 move them as part of the EACO AUR and trend, if you
3 will, those two northern communities, and some
4 additional unincorporated areas, that could both be
5 beneficial to Eastern Pinal. The challenge, however,
6 with that, there's pros and cons to that. The pros to
7 the two northern communities, both Winslow and Holbrook,
8 both have 25 percent a piece Native American population.
9 The concern, however, is both are on I-40 and Holbrook
10 is the County Seat of Apache County. The Court systems
11 are there and the Southern Apache County is, you know,
12 is Navajo County. All Navajo County is under that
13 jurisdiction. The primary jurisdiction of the courts,
14 as you know, relates to Southern Navajo County. That's
15 the only concern I have with respect to that issue.

16 But if it proves to be a solution, I
17 would, you know, I would suggest that maybe it's
18 something we'd consider.

19 The negative ripple effect in Mohave
20 County, while it combines part of Pima, the splitting of
21 the city, I'm wondering if that is more concerning than
22 the splitting of two cities within a similar community.
23 In my mind that may well be the case.

24 I'd really like, if I may speak on the
25 positive, what I perceive some of these changes, I think

1 they do solve problems. I indicated the comment period,
2 I think that that gray district is looking a lot better.
3 And I think that pursuant to what we heard from
4 representatives over in southwestern Arizona, that
5 district looks pretty good. And some things, while we
6 have some population in Southern Mohave and Yavapai that
7 need to be resolved, I like the fact we now combine all
8 Prescott with those relating neighbors versus the
9 initial proposal of splitting those.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

11 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I'd
12 like to take a look at the four or five AURS that are to
13 the southeast and pose some conceptual shifts or trends
14 that might very well provide some solutions or provide
15 solutions to two Commissioners or comments.

16 One, look at San Pedro Valley. The
17 Mammoth and San Manuel and that area there, look to the
18 east, the mining there, mining in Clifton, and that, may
19 look at rotating this around. Cochise, go to the north,
20 pick up the southern part of the EACO plan, Mammoth, San
21 Manuel. Going down to the east of Tucson, San Manuel,
22 what that would then do is allow this area here to be
23 included with the gray area which also then allows this
24 area which problematically has Casas Dobes all the way
25 to Superior, all the way around, the gray area,

1 Hispanic, or I've been looking at that, where we could
2 find the Hispanic numbers to keep Saddlebrooke, Oro
3 Valley, Casas Dobes together. Go to the west and you
4 start losing the Hispanic AUR there. You start picking
5 up maybe just a portion of the Santa Cruz Valley to the
6 south. It does have the appropriate numbers and you
7 trade for the encroachment. It might be here the
8 Hispanic numbers would possibly work out. That would
9 make a more contiguous, compact area here with Cochise.
10 It would take an area here, allowing the Native American
11 native communities to stay with the northern piece. And
12 it may not affect the north as much as other options
13 did. I would like to at least look at that analysis.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

15 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: From a population
16 standpoint, and I can't do the sophisticated analysis
17 you can, it looks to me if you put the northern part of
18 Navajo County, Winslow, Holbrook, Show Low, Snowflake,
19 Heber, Snowflake, et cetera, shifting 50,000 people, the
20 reservations themselves, close to 22, and all the other
21 towns, there's probably another close to 20, 30 thousand
22 people there.

23 In terms of what happened to Mohave
24 County, it wouldn't be a problem splitting Kingman and
25 New Kingman. They are far less than that. That's a big

1 population shift and would take a lot of the western
2 portion of that Northern District and you could put it
3 someplace else.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: The fundamental
6 concern with respect to the Navajo -- what you did by
7 reason of that shift is you completely removed the
8 opportunity for the Native Americans to have a voice,
9 completely. So I think we need to understand that by
10 shifting all of Northern Navajo County to the Native
11 Americans, we diluted the percentage to -- well, it
12 would simply be almost uneventful, if you will.

13 So clearly from a legal standpoint that is
14 not a possible option.

15 Again, as a reminder folks, the reason we
16 went, we did AURs. People have communities of interest.

17 Speaking to Mr. Elder's suggestion, the
18 Eastern Arizona organization, all the communities stated
19 conclusively their interests are agriculture. The
20 Native American water adjudication, not to mention land
21 and economic issues, and in addition with respect to the
22 Safford Thatcher issue, with as much closure indicated,
23 with the closer cultural and religious issues, many of
24 the folks up north attend college in Thatcher.

25 So it's clear their community of interest

1 relates as indicated and their interest in south
2 Cochise. And the border issues is, in my mind, not even
3 in the same or in the ballpark.

4 While it may look prettier, we may need to
5 remind ourselves the building block is communities of
6 interest and building blocks as established.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

8 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I'd
9 like to ditto what Joshua just said. We were looking at
10 an idea made that possible it to keep, essentially, keep
11 the Eastern Counties proposal in place with some minor
12 tweaking that achieved ripple benefits, not -- I don't
13 see anything that would suggest it was necessarily to
14 wholesale dismantle the area completely. Certainly we
15 ought to work as hard as we can with that idea before we
16 consider this -- running roughshod over this AUR as we
17 would any other in the state.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I wonder, does someone
19 have, it's in the binder, does someone know what the
20 EACO AUR population is?

21 MR. JOHNSON: It matches more or less
22 exactly the districts of -- district lines in
23 Legislative District R.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Essentially the
25 Legislative District population is very close.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Therefore, in business, if
3 we do anything with the district, it's pretty much
4 trading like for like: 20,000 go in; 20,000 come out,
5 more or less. Is that --

6 MR. JOHNSON: Right. That's the reason
7 for, in option two I mentioned discussing, just pick up
8 this arm population, Eastern Pinal. Tucson needs
9 population. Option three, have to swap it. EACO is at
10 population.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand it.

12 The thing that continues to occur to me,
13 looking at the map, what I perceive to be, I don't know
14 this, I hope the public hearings give us much more
15 information on this point, I continue to see an affinity
16 in terms of interest between the communities that are to
17 the east in Pinal County and those to the west of the
18 EACO district, that is to say that they share a number
19 of things in common, from my perception. But I'd like
20 to know this:

21 I guess in all of this discussion back and
22 forth, and this may be one where we present it one way
23 and take testimony to see if it should be a different
24 way, obviously, but that the line of Superior, Kearny,
25 Dudleyville, Mammoth, San Manuel, and/or those in total,

1 may have more in common with Globe, Superior, and so on,
2 than they do any other direction you can take them.

3 So if you attempt a solution that kind of
4 keeps those grouped together, and move them as a group.
5 I understand it invades the EACO AUR to some extent. We
6 may be on to something. I don't know. I'm suggesting
7 it.

8 Ms. Minkoff.

9 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I don't know if the
10 population works out. One possible way to do it, we've
11 heard testimony the San Carlos and White Mountain Apache
12 tribes, there's some conflicting testimony, the majority
13 of the testimony is they'd rather be with the Native
14 American groups in Northern Arizona.

15 I hate to make the map uglier than it is.

16 I wonder if there is a way of just
17 creating a corridor to connect them north, if you do
18 that population by Eastern Pinal County. It might work
19 to move that into the EACO area. A minor adjustment in
20 the EACO area doesn't disrupt the heart of the EACO area
21 to get the eastern Pinal County into the district which
22 fits them better for them.

23 MR. JOHNSON: That's similar to what the
24 Navajo proposal did. It's something we're looking at.
25 The complexity you're looking at, there's almost two

1 necks, one running north to connect the reservations,
2 one south for the south.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Use eastern Pinal
4 County.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: Eastern Pinal, 15,000
6 people, and the reservation is 25, 30 thousand?

7 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No, the two
8 reservations are between 21 and 22 thousand.

9 COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Area the Eastern Pinal I
11 showed, outlined in our slides is exactly 15,000. The
12 green area is exactly 15,000. The entire east Pinal
13 green area is probably around 18 or 19, not counting the
14 Oro Valley portion.

15 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: What about not
16 counting Saddlebrooke?

17 MR. JOHNSON: Not counting Saddlebrooke.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Again, I fear we're
19 getting into too specific a solution. We could debate
20 all day. I fear we not get into any specifics. I think
21 we could give direction. I caution the Commissioners
22 we're not to be trading boxes and streets.

23 Mr. Huntwork.

24 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'd like to give
25 direction to keep EACO, as much as possible, and change,

1 make sure we keep the essence, what all people there
2 have asked us to do.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The best way to do that
4 would be in the form of motion.

5 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I so move.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'll second that.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there discussion?

9 Ms. Minkoff.

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yeah. In general,
11 I support the motion, in concept. Because I want to do
12 that for every AUR that has been presented to us. But
13 I'm a little bit uncomfortable singling out one AUR over
14 all the others.

15 Yes, I want to do that for the EACO
16 proposal, because it makes a lot of sense for them and
17 it's a district that works very, very well for them.

18 There are other AURs, however, that aren't
19 getting the same attention. So I'm going to vote
20 against the motion not because I oppose the concept that
21 it represents but because I feel that it's inappropriate
22 to have such a motion for one AUR when we're really, of
23 necessity, ignoring other AURs that have been presented
24 to us.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let me ask for a

1 clarification, and I'll ask, if I may, Mr. Huntwork.
2 Let me attempt to give you my understanding of the
3 motion and then you can correct me if I've misconstrued
4 it. Because in the discussion on this particular issue
5 we've had conflicting recommendations from the
6 Commission, different recommendations how we might treat
7 that area of the state. The reason I asked for the
8 motion is to try to get some direction, that is a sense
9 of the Commission as opposed to conflicting information.
10 And I take your motion to not hold EACO inviolate but
11 rather to say as a principle we should keep it together,
12 as we do all AURs, except to the extent you need to make
13 suggestions to create the district we're talking about
14 maintaining other communities of interest we think are
15 like communities of interest?

16 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: That is correct.
17 And I would emphasize that there is no intent in the
18 motion to place it over any other AUR but only to
19 recognize that it is one and to respect it as much as
20 possible.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion?

22 Roll call.

23 Mr. Huntwork?

24 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

1 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Aye."

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

3 COMMISSIONER HALL: "Aye."

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?

5 COMMISSIONER ELDER: "No."

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

7 Motion passes three to two.

8 Again, it's direction. If it doesn't
9 work, give us an alternative we can go with with further
10 work.

11 Are there other general comments we might
12 fashion into direction for the consultants?

13 Mr. Hall.

14 COMMISSIONER HALL: With respect to
15 Yavapai and Coconino County, did you need ideas there?
16 What were the wishes?

17 Correct me. With the orange, is that
18 overpopulated or under? Orange, rust, over, under --

19 MR. JOHNSON: Orange is underpopulated at
20 this point, somewhat intentionally, awaiting a decision
21 on the shift of Holbrook and Wilcox, because that would
22 solve the problem. Otherwise we'd look into the Yavapai
23 area for that population. It is underpopulated, not
24 something we're specifically seeking instruction on that
25 problem.

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Holbrook, Winslow?

2 MR. JOHNSON: Sorry?

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I wanted to keep the
4 record clear.

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: There's also
6 approximately 7,000 people in the Hopi area, and you
7 have to put them somewhere. It's a pretty short
8 corridor. That's population into that district.

9 In terms of the gray district, Yavapai,
10 Coconino District, you said overpopulated. In pulling
11 population out of there, you might look at the southern
12 portion of that district and move portions of that part
13 into Maricopa County. Part of that Black Canyon City,
14 and so on, are really fairly easy connected with
15 northern Maricopa County, if you have to take population
16 away.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

18 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Doug, would you take
19 a look at the west valley, Wickenburg down, yellow,
20 east, whatever? It does not show up in the earlier west
21 wing plan. I wanted to know how the line on the north,
22 northwest evolved.

23 MR. JOHNSON: Certainly.

24 It's at this, a fairly in-flux line. What
25 this is, it used to be the district that went all the

1 way out to the river. Obviously, we wanted to not have
2 the river be so closely connected to the dense Sun
3 Cities area. So the creation of the line where it is
4 right now largely is drawn in an attempt to get
5 population equality in districts up here. We've not
6 looked at this point from defining communities other
7 than the point of staying far away from Buckeye,
8 Surprise, Buckeye in Maricopa. That's a line I know is
9 in flux and certainly expect to move around. If there's
10 specific guidance, thoughts on the best place for it, I
11 welcome it. It's not set by any community we've looked
12 at.

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I suppose the other
14 end of that, then, I would like to see, as a concept, if
15 we can adjust either through the Coconino population
16 shifts Ms. Minkoff is referring to, if we end up with
17 excess, I would almost like to take a look at that more
18 than the district sliding to the west from the river
19 communities, the very edge of Hualapai on down. I
20 believe right now we have three districts that
21 incorporate the river. So if there's a way of including
22 Kingman and areas to the west of the Hualapai in as sort
23 of a brown district, then it would only be two districts
24 along the rivers as opposed to three.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff and then

1 Mr. Huntwork.

2 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It looks to me like
3 the yellow district, Buckeye, and Sun City, et cetera,
4 you've taken population away from it.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Right.

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: And haven't put any
7 back in. So it's probably a little underpopulated. I
8 suggest to put population back in, look to the adjacent
9 district, blue district. We heard testimony yesterday
10 that district really moved too far to the west, split up
11 a number of communities, school districts, et cetera,
12 maybe takes up the west portion of that district, and
13 shift that district back to try to pick up and unify
14 some of those communities. It will obviously create
15 problems with other adjacent districts. We'll let you
16 deal with those details.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The reference she's
18 talking about was in Representative Miranda's testimony
19 yesterday. That's on the record. You have a copy of
20 it. Take a look at it for guidance from those
21 communities that tend to share a larger community of
22 interest around school districts and other issues.

23 Mr. Huntwork.

24 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: In looking for a
25 possible point to break off the southern end, you might

1 look at a topographic map. There's elevation changes in
2 the way people move around communities dictated by.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Get close to that mike.
4 We just can't hear.

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Make that a motion
6 next week.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: Can we zoom back out.

8 With respect, I believe, to the current
9 Commission instructions to separate the Hopis, I believe
10 that's correct, for your information --

11 Is that correct, we gave direction for
12 both?

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Congressionally, I
14 believe.

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: We said
16 Legislatively, also.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay. Did we? It has
18 been a long weekend.

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: Anyway, as far as
20 linkage, Ms. Minkoff, they prefer to be linked to
21 Flagstaff, predraft, in light of the fact it's the
22 nearest community; they have a shopping center in
23 Flagstaff; that's where their head offices are, et
24 cetera.

25 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Hopi?

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Yeah.

2 Other general consultants at this time?

3 Mr. Elder?

4 COMMISSIONER ELDER: In the Pinal area,
5 I'd like to take a look, reiterate comments from
6 yesterday, take a look at the bright green area. I want
7 to say splitting it so where we go from Hayden, or
8 Dudleyville, somewhere in that area. To the eastern
9 part, Top of the World, Superior ties in with the Casa
10 Grande, Coolidge area, and southern part ties in more
11 with whatever happens, Cochise, EACO, whatever. I have
12 a problem to some extent withi Catalina, Oro Valley,
13 Saddlebrooke, and the interstates between them, mining,
14 and up north to the east valley condition, and within
15 North Maricopa County.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other general discussion?

17 I want to be clear that Mr. Johnson has
18 identified a number of areas sort of in flux in addition
19 to the two metropolitan areas totally in play in terms
20 of reconfiguration, sort of on the principle of working
21 outside in, so the population adjustments are more
22 easily done in population centers rather than having to
23 create bizarre-looking corridors to pick up additional
24 population.

25 Those areas in flux have been clearly

1 identified by you this morning, Mr. Johnson.

2 I think what the Commission is saying to
3 you, there is flexibility in terms of the ways in which
4 you might look at that. There are certain things that
5 we'd like you to just keep clear. Obviously you know
6 what those are, AURs to start with, and other principles
7 we've established through the process.

8 I don't know if it would be -- let me ask
9 the Commission.

10 Do you have any specific direction, again,
11 not too specific, in general terms, is there anything
12 you want to say about the Metropolitan Phoenix area or
13 Metropolitan Phoenix area before we leave the map?
14 Because I'm sensing that, you know, we're moving around
15 and I certainly don't want to let the consultants leave
16 without hearing specifically about those two areas.

17 Ms. Minkoff.

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: There were a number
19 of instructions we gave earlier you indicated you still
20 have and just have not had a chance to work on. I want
21 to make sure you have a chance to do that. One other
22 that has had a chance that came up, the West Phoenix
23 Tolleson Avondale District, see if you can unify some of
24 those communities, not quite as far to the west, maybe
25 shift that district a little to the east, may have to

1 shift a little to the north. I'm not sure. The other
2 thing I'd ask when you come back to us on Thursday with
3 whatever you come back with, you have demographic
4 statistics to look at. It's easier for me if you have a
5 piece of paper I can look at, understanding there may be
6 options, but obviously, that is something that we're
7 going to want to know about in terms of the district
8 that you are designing.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

10 COMMISSIONER HALL: Can you zoom into
11 western Tucson?

12 Zoom out a little more, please.

13 Thank you.

14 Did I hear you say that you are lacking
15 population in Tucson? Is that what I heard you say?
16 You are a little short on those now?

17 MR. JOHNSON: Tucson has, similar to
18 discussing Maricopa, Maricopa has 4.8 districts. Tucson
19 has the same issue, dominates four five, not quite
20 enough to hold four five.

21 COMMISSIONER HALL: What I'm wondering,
22 thinking out loud, I'd welcome input, shift less
23 population -- first of all, is this district -- two
24 districts, two different colored on the west there? Is
25 that the same district?

1 MR. JOHNSON: All one district.

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: Reservation.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Right.

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: If we shift some
5 population out of the western district, some of Tucson
6 urban population out, what is wrong pulling eastern
7 Pinal back into that up above? With it --

8 MR. JOHNSON: It is definitely a topic
9 we're looking for -- this is Drexel Heights we're
10 looking for here. That's definitely an area down to the
11 Reservation, defined communities, one place. It is
12 fairly dense, so it's tough to trade off space for space
13 until we get the exact numbers. That's definitely
14 something we're interested to do.

15 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm not sure
16 Eastern Pinal with Eastern Pima is a good fit with you
17 looking at the characteristics. Eastern Pinal is
18 totally different than what you have in Western Pima
19 County. I'm not sure that's a good fit. If Eastern
20 Pinal is not with western Pinal, it's probably the best
21 thing to have it with western Pinal, to do -- share a
22 lot of things, economy and community.

23 COMMISSIONER HALL: Here's where I'm
24 bringing it in. One of the fundamental principles is
25 rural and urban. Eastern Pinal is based in pretty heavy

1 urban. Western Pinal based in pretty heavy urban. If
2 you brought in Pinal, one is combining counties to the
3 extent possible, and increased the compliance with that
4 principle: Two is added population, minimized
5 compliance in Tucson with that principle allowing Casa
6 Grande and other communities to have a greater voice in
7 that particular district.

8 I'd certainly welcome input on that.

9 I'm brainstorming. And maybe my two
10 Tucson colleagues could comment on that. It may have
11 been what Mr. Elder was alluding to, and I didn't fully
12 understand what he was saying.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Josh, are you
15 suggesting uniting Pinal, putting the eastern part with
16 the western part and southern part?

17 COMMISSIONER HALL: Not the whole Pinal
18 County, Gold Canyon and Apache Junction.

19 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The green area,
20 excluding Saddlebrooke, the green part and exclude Pima?

21 COMMISSIONER HALL: Minimize Tucson.

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: And put together
23 Western Pinal. That makes sense. I misunderstood you.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

25 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Doug, could you

1 guesstimate how many are in the Tucson Metropolitan area
2 in E, or the gray area?

3 MR. JOHNSON: Talking about the Tohono
4 O'odham District?

5 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Pinal County
6 District.

7 MR. JOHNSON: I don't know. I ran the
8 check with the last set of maps. With the area in such
9 flux, it's a figure I'll have at the next meeting.

10 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: On the order of
11 magnitude of 15,000 or --

12 MR. JOHNSON: It's not dominated by
13 Tucson, so it's less than half the district.

14 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Let me ask this:
15 Is it at least 15,000?

16 MR. JOHNSON: I'd guess somewhere -- if we
17 take a break, I'll run the numbers.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm sure it is. 171, not
19 a lot of population outside the area, through those
20 parts of the state.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Right. That's true. I do
22 know about 70,000 in this part of Pinal, maybe a
23 thousand or so, a couple thousand in the farther western
24 Pima, Tohono O'odham, 12,000 or so, around a hundred
25 thousand or so, about 70,000 for the others.

1 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Demographics.

2 MR. JOHNSON: At least a majority-minority
3 district, with both Hispanic presence and Native
4 American. We'll have to get that for you.

5 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Do you know the
6 demographics for the cities in eastern Pinal County?

7 MR. JOHNSON: No. They were not in our
8 Hispanic community AUR, so if that gives some
9 indication.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: What is it in the southern
11 part of the strip, San Manuel, Oracle?

12 MR. JOHNSON: We'll have all the details
13 with the maps we present.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Why don't we take a
15 10-minute break, and we'll continue in -- let's try to
16 have 10 minutes, have it not be half an hour.

17 (Recess taken from 12:30 until
18 approximately 1:11 p.m.)

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will return
20 to session.

21 All five Commissioners are present.

22 Are there additional instructions to the
23 consultants on any part of the Legislative map?

24 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

1 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I just wanted to
2 reemphasize what we talked about yesterday dealing with
3 the Phoenix Metropolitan area to give us an option that
4 unifies Tempe in one Legislative District.

5 MR. JOHNSON: We can certainly do that.

6 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Where possible.

7 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It's an option.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I want to make sure I
9 understood that in terms of unifying Tempe. Restate
10 what you think we said.

11 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The current plan
12 that I have, on my laptop, has Tempe divided in, I think
13 it's at US 60. I'm not sure where the dividing line is,
14 two separate Legislative Districts. There was a great
15 deal of testimony, including a letter from the Mayor,
16 all members of of the Tempe City Council, asking that
17 Tempe not be split up, that it only be one Legislative
18 District. It's too small for a Legislative District.
19 I'm suggesting when they come back with the divisions
20 they're making, they present us something that unifies
21 Tempe in one Legislative District as an option to be
22 considered.

23 MR. JOHNSON: We can certainly do that.
24 From the discussion the other day with Tempe, we have
25 the makings of an option already.

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Hopefully that option will
2 correct some problems with Chandler.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Right. That's a problem,
4 too. We took clear instruction the other day you did
5 want to resolve divisions of Chandler and Gilbert as
6 well.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Correct.

8 Mr. Hall.

9 COMMISSIONER HALL: In addition to
10 metropolitan areas, essentially we had, we're still
11 struggling with what I understand is our Yavapai-Mohave
12 issue and our Eastern Pinal issue.

13 Is that a safe synopsis?

14 MR. JOHNSON: Definitely. Actually we
15 will run through a little detail --

16 COMMISSIONER HALL: Pardon?

17 MR. JOHNSON: Actually we're hoping to run
18 through more detail on the Pinal issue.

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: Want more detail?

20 DR. HESLOP: More instruction,
21 Commissioner Hall.

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: I guess what I'd like
23 to see, you indicated one option of combining it with
24 the Southwest portion of the EACO AUR. Let's look at
25 the ramifications of that. I'd like ramifications of

1 Casa Grande, the bulk of Casa Grande, Pinal, leaving
2 that district as you have, adding that, subtracting the
3 population out of the influence of Tucson, in an effort
4 to not affect the majority-minority influence of that,
5 minimize that to whatever extent that might be, again
6 realizing I think portions, by far, portions of
7 Saddlebrooke going in, I think still come south,
8 whatever the details are there.

9 So that's two, I guess.

10 Mr. Elder proposed a third idea bringing
11 eastern Pinal south. Most, I understand most of the
12 people that live there work -- is that right -- work in
13 Tucson. So bringing those south I think is a third
14 option.

15 I think if you look all three of those,
16 consider the ramifications, pros and cons, Thursday we
17 can look at that, propose something most beneficial for
18 all.

19 COMMISSIONER ELDER: And to make a
20 correction for that, most people that work in Mammoth,
21 San Manuel, work in the urban Tucson area, they are
22 linked culturally, socioeconomically. You might want to
23 maintain that issue in divergence from the Casa Grande
24 or Pinal County plan, AUR plan showed.

25 Is there still trouble or a need, I look

1 for NDC for guidance on what the population trades are
2 in and around Tucson? I sense if we take out the
3 Hispanic population there at Mammoth, we have to make it
4 up someplace else. Where we'll get it, I don't see a
5 good solution without a big jump where we move the line
6 in Santa Cruz. And then that makes another issue of
7 breaking that Santa Cruz Valley in two pieces, which we
8 don't want to do. It takes the whole of Santa Cruz or
9 none of it. We don't want to run down the valley, east
10 valley, west valley, make sure they maintain Santa Cruz
11 Valley as a whole, if looking at that as a way to
12 balance population, and make sure you do the same thing
13 at the north end. We want to make that sort of economic
14 community whole and not keep it separate.

15 MR. JOHNSON: If I may, Mr. Chairman, I
16 actually have that number Commissioner Huntwork asked
17 for earlier as well, on Tucson influence in the western
18 Tohono O'odham District there.

19 I've highlighted the section in there,
20 rough guesstimating to be considered Tucson Metro, and
21 that population comes out to 45,000 people within this
22 shaded area here. That does include about 5,000 people
23 in the tribal reservation lands here, 5,000 there, 4,000
24 of the rest, traded Tucson there. All the rest is in
25 this district.

1 So as we look at the proposal you are
2 describing, shifting this district so it has a little
3 less connection into Tucson, more of a rural character,
4 that's what we are looking at in terms of numbers.

5 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Were you are saying
6 you would take and separate Santaveer (phonetic), add it
7 to Tohono O'odham? The rectangle in the middle is
8 Santaveer. Add it. That I think we have to keep as a
9 contiguous part of that gray area. That's what makes it
10 difficult to go trying to unite any part of the area
11 back into the whole area.

12 COMMISSIONER HALL: What is the population
13 of Pinal, excluding Saddlebrooke, excluding Eastern
14 Pinal, and Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, and
15 Saddlebrooke?

16 MR. JOHNSON: Exact numbers, I think it's
17 20,000.

18 Okay, that's that district.

19 Even though showing crossing over white
20 areas, you wanted to exclude Saddlebrooke?

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes. You bet.

22 MR. JOHNSON: 20,609. I missed a small
23 sliver there. About 20,000 people.

24 Let me just confirm one thing. About
25 27,000 people.

1 COMMISSIONER HALL: 27.

2 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: What were the
3 demographics? Can you put it back up? Sorry for that.

4 MR. JOHNSON: An extra 7,000 may not have
5 been in this district.

6 I guess it is.

7 Oh, yeah. The extra 7,000 is not in this
8 district. It's 20,600 people, 9,700 of Hispanic origin,
9 and 262 of Native American.

10 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: 47 percent
11 Hispanic.

12 COMMISSIONER HALL: How much?

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: 47.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Another directions?

15 COMMISSIONER HALL: Need direction on
16 Yavapai?

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think so.

18 Another part of the direction, population
19 is key in driving this. We have a good sense of what
20 communities.

21 Let me ask the same option of other areas
22 of the state. Are there other areas of the state where
23 you feel you've not been given sufficient direction or
24 feel you cannot be the most productive you can be?

25 DR. HESLOP: We have further questions.

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Please.

2 MR. JOHNSON: If I might, I understand the
3 Commission's motion on this area, but I just want to run
4 through details, make sure I have a proper understanding
5 where the Commission wishes us to go on this.

6 Let me -- in this region, we obviously
7 have direction to look at the option of perhaps
8 increasing the rural nature of this district, reducing
9 the Tucson population, swinging a little more east into
10 Pinal County, possibly all the way east into Pinal
11 County. My understanding of the Commission's
12 instructions is that's something you are definitely
13 interested in.

14 Is that a correct understanding?

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think you are hearing
16 we're interested in looking at it.

17 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. The other two options
18 we have a little more detail on because they didn't
19 involve quite as many communities and AURs, so we could
20 get more a specific proposal. An option is to keep the
21 Eastern Arizona Counties AUR intact, bring the Eastern
22 Arizona Counties, and bring these intact. This is an
23 area where we request additional instruction.

24 Is this something the Commission is
25 interested in or you mentioned preferring a split, more

1 coming down from Dudleyville to the west?

2 Does the Commission have a preference if
3 there's a preference we go up the edge or split off, a
4 move to the west?

5 Mr. Elder.

6 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I want
7 to make that comment about splitting the west. It
8 wasn't in relation to option two. The more I like
9 option two going around EACO, that just doesn't look
10 like an option I would really like to investigate a lot
11 further.

12 Background, further, a long neck going up
13 there from, gosh, really Maricopa County to the
14 Southwest corner of the state, even though mentioned
15 before, linkage around the river, it's a railroad.
16 Mining community, no more a mining community than to a
17 great extent to the southeast. They don't shop, the
18 socioeconomic between the northern leg and southeast
19 don't match. They go back to the west or southwest.
20 I'm not so sure we can justify that shift based on any
21 AUR we have, any other rationale we have, other than
22 trying to gain population. I don't believe that's a
23 direction we want to go.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: So the Chairman responds,
25 I don't think it does anything for us in this, and it

1 does some odd things to the -- does odd things to Pinal
2 County and also violates things we're trying to keep in
3 place.

4 I don't think it's worth pursuing either.
5 Ms. Minkoff.

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: My preference, if
7 it can be done, is unite as much of Pinal County as
8 possible. That's what they asked for. They presented a
9 plan that showed us how to do that. They presented a
10 plan, said it was wonderful if there were 29 more like
11 it, all meshed. Unfortunately we didn't and they don't.

12 I'd like you to take a look at that plan
13 again and see how much of it you can accommodate in a
14 single Legislative District.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

16 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I want to add,
17 although we have been looking at approaches that start
18 from the outside and work into metropolitan areas, we
19 need to be careful not to home in on the metropolitan
20 area so no other option makes sense. This is getting
21 very close to Tucson. If a long blockade like that
22 clearly limits options to the north and east, I think --
23 for geometric reasons, it doesn't seem very promising.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think you are getting a
25 sense from the Commission not to pursue option two.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Sounds good. I appreciate
2 the direction.

3 COMMISSIONER ELDER: One last assist.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other questions you may
5 have?

6 MR. JOHNSON: The last piece, my
7 understanding, and I'd like to clarify this and make
8 sure I have the proper understanding of the Commission's
9 instructions, is it seems to be a preference for moving
10 the Pinal County region of this district east. But if
11 that isn't possible because of other AURs and other
12 issues in play, is this AN acceptable option for the
13 Commission?

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: There are a couple of
15 things that are problematic on each of the options. I
16 think it's fair that if we're going to look at shifting
17 population, let's say block wise from the bottom of that
18 district around the top and moving Pinal County east,
19 that we also ought to look at the other option just for
20 comparative purposes and see what happens if you take
21 some of that county which does have some affinity in
22 terms of community of interest issues, some communities
23 in lower Gila County. I know that's problematic on
24 other points. I think just for comparison purposes, I
25 think I'd at least like to see it to be compared, given

1 there are pros and cons to each.

2 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, those are all
3 the questions I had.

4 DR. HESLOP: That's all the questions I
5 had.

6 We'd like to move ahead to development of
7 the map. There's no way we'd complete today. We'd like
8 to return to the Commission Thursday, at the meeting
9 Thursday, with a fully developed map. We've had
10 Thursday the opportunity of the Commission to explore
11 options at that time.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd like to reiterate,
13 though there's not a need for it to be reiterated,
14 something Mr. Huntwork said. We've obviously taken, by
15 virtue of items taken, an inside-out approach on
16 Legislative mapping. Clearly at this point, I want to
17 echo it, not suggest we came in the, or it's contained
18 in some way, necessarily, the urban areas, rather
19 because we have more flexibility in areas, use
20 flexibility, again recognizing and respecting AURs and
21 other principles we've tried to move through the process
22 with, use flexibility to come to an ultimate resolution
23 of all 30 districts. In a fashion that makes sense. I
24 think that's a good point.

25 Are there comments from the Commission at

1 this time before we move on in the agenda?

2 If not, I'd thank the consultants not only
3 for their hard work, the number of hours on task over
4 this three-day period, it's been -- it's been an
5 interesting three days, no question I think they've made
6 significant progress, four days now, who is counting.
7 Obviously they are all sort of running together, over
8 this four-day period. We certainly made significant
9 progress to our goal. We're very hopeful that we can
10 conclude our deliberations on both maps on Thursday.
11 That would be our hope.

12 DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, thank you very
13 much. We've enjoyed this interesting process, learned a
14 great deal from it, and our drafts will significantly
15 improve. Thank you.

16 Let me take a couple items on the agenda
17 just so we may conclude with our final call to the
18 public at this session.

19 I want to remind everybody about future
20 meetings. Again, Thursday, in Tucson, beginning at 9:30
21 morning, the Doubletree Hotel between Broadway and 22nd
22 Street adjacent to Reid Park.

23 Let me then ask, is there anything from
24 counsel?

25 MS. HAUSER: Not at the moment, other than

1 I think we do have a couple of remaining items on the
2 agenda that you are aware of.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: You may want to remind me.
4 I don't see any.

5 MS. HAUSER: Did you want to revisit -- I
6 apologize. I misplaced my agenda, but the -- the
7 budget.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: That's been done.

9 MS. HAUSER: You did that.

10 Also the report, or -- not necessarily,
11 report --

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Recommendations from
13 consultants.

14 On the second round of public hearings.
15 Did that as well. I think that may have happened while
16 you were in conference yesterday.

17 With that said, anything further from
18 counsel?

19 MS. HAUSER: No.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Echeveste, anything
21 from the Executive Director?

22 MR. ECHEVESTE: No, none.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: In that case, we will
24 return to call to the public.

25 Again, this is a reminder that this is the

1 time for consideration and discussion of comments and
2 complaints from the public.

3 Those wishing to address the Commission
4 shall request permission in advance by filling out a
5 speaker slip. Action taken as a result of public
6 comment will be limited to directing staff to study the
7 matter or rescheduling the matter for further
8 consideration and decision at a later date.

9 First is Patrice Kraus, Intergovernmental
10 Affairs, City of Chandler.

11 MS. KRAUS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 I understand how difficult your task is,
13 considering the matter several meetings ago. I envy you
14 less after the last several days.

15 Today you talked about one of the
16 instructions you gave to the consultants, an attempt to
17 unify Tempe. I understand the desire to unify Tempe
18 when Chandler's preference was to be in one district
19 also. However, we understood how difficult that would
20 be because of the proximity to Ahwatukee and concerns of
21 that area. We decided to provide options to the
22 Commission that they might consider. We hope you'll
23 keep those options in mind as you work this week.

24 We hope you don't unify one community at
25 the expense of another.

1 I have another serious concern I would
2 like to raise in watching some of the options that have
3 been set forth over the last few days and some things
4 that were discussed. I'm concerned that there won't end
5 up being any predominantly Chandler District, that it is
6 a numbers game and that our population will be used to
7 shift into an Ahwatukee District with some Chandler
8 people in it or into a Gilbert, Mesa, and an Eastern
9 Metropolitan Valley District with some Chandler people
10 in it and that there won't be a predominantly Chandler
11 District or majority of a district that are residents of
12 Chandler.

13 As you work next week, as the consultants
14 work next week, I hope you take it into mind; and I'll
15 see you on Thursday.

16 Thank you very much.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

18 Next is Frank Seanez, an attorney
19 representing the Navajo Nation.

20 Mr. Seanez.

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

23 It has been a pleasure being here with the
24 Commission this last four days, and I'm looking forward
25 to Tucson on Thursday, Friday.

1 The Navajo Nation will remain engaged with
2 the Commission throughout the whole process. The Navajo
3 Nation is very appreciative of the Commission, of the
4 consideration of the Navajo Nation's concerns.

5 Changes which have occurred to the
6 Congressional and developing Legislative map are of
7 great interest to the Navajo Nation. I will be advising
8 members of the IGR subcommittee of developments on my
9 return. It's still a matter the Navajo Nation
10 understands is in flux.

11 The Navajo Nation has not dug in its heels
12 on this matter and understands that it may be in the
13 best interests of the Navajo Nation to keep its position
14 fluid both in relation to the Congressional District and
15 Legislative District to take into account political
16 realities, taking into account working with other
17 minority groups to address issues that are going to be
18 in the best interests as perceived by the Navajo Nation.

19 I do have a couple comments with regards
20 to the Legislative District as currently proposed. The
21 best information available to the Commission as of this
22 date from the consultants were that the Northeastern
23 Legislative District would contain a Native American
24 population of approximately 64 percent. That 64
25 percent, of course, is still a drop of 10 plus percent

1 in Native American population from the current
2 Legislative District Three as infused with 2000 Census
3 data. That is of concern to the Navajo Nation. As
4 well, that's a drop of probably 13 plus percent in
5 Native American voting age population. Those
6 percentages are bound to be of serious concern to the IGR
7 subcommittee on redistricting.

8 I'd like to underscore the desire of the
9 ability of drawing in further Native American population
10 within the Native American District or decreasing
11 non-Native American population. I see three manners
12 discussed by the consultant with the Commission before
13 it's addressed in that manner. Although the vote was
14 three to two, if I understood it correctly, for
15 exclusion of the Hopi Nation from the Legislative
16 District and Congressional District, well specifically,
17 I guess, the Congressional District, including the
18 Navajo Nation, the Navajo Nation would like to point out
19 as far as the Legislative District goes, the Hopi, with
20 approximately 7,000 membership and population that
21 equals three plus percent of the Legislative District.
22 That's almost exclusively Native American population, so
23 you are talking about an infusion of American Native
24 population within the Legislative District. That 7,000
25 people goes a long way to increasing the Native American

1 population.

2 We'd still like the Commission to be open
3 to that possibility as the situation changes. And the
4 Commission intends to balance the various interests
5 which are represented across the state.

6 As well, another option which has been
7 mentioned, if the Hopi inclusion cannot be managed for
8 whatever reason, and it has received some discussion
9 here today, there is inclusion of the San Carlos White
10 Mountain Apache within the Legislative District. The
11 Navajo Nation understands the strong feelings expressed
12 by EACO and the desirability of the maintenance of AURs
13 other than those represented by the Native American
14 community. However, that is another option which the
15 Commission should not foreclose, should the Hopi
16 inclusion not be a viable one.

17 As well, with regards to the reduction of
18 non-Native American population, there was discussed the
19 exclusion of Kingman and New Kingman from the
20 Legislative District. That would be another option
21 which the Commission might want to look at in terms of
22 increasing Native American pop -- percentage by a
23 decrease in population within the deviations permitted
24 by the law in the Legislative District, approximately
25 five percent, or actually up to 10 percent, as far as

1 the case law goes.

2 The Navajo Nation is very hopeful the
3 Commission will be able to take advantage of increased
4 demographic voting registration and voter history
5 information from EDS, or such other consultant as the
6 Commission may obtain for obtaining that information.

7 The Navajo Nation believes it will be
8 extremely important for the Commission to have that
9 information prior to making it's final determination on
10 this map.

11 Again, thank you very much for the time
12 that has been made available to the Nation. It's a
13 tremendous experiment that you've undertaken.

14 I understand we're not to Disneyland yet,
15 but maybe by the end of the week.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Seanez,
17 very much. We're certainly not there yet.

18 If there are other speakers, the last to
19 be heard, I have the last speaker slip in my possession.
20 Are there others?

21 If not, Jose Solarez, planner for the Gila
22 River Indian Community.

23 Mr. Solarez.

24 MR. PEREZ: Did you a favor, sent him out
25 to get something to eat.

1 A VOICE: He's not here. He'll have to
2 wait.

3 MR. PEREZ: He's coming back at 2:15.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: He'll find himself lonely.

5 Is there anyone else that wishes to be
6 heard during call to the public?

7 We'll close that.

8 Anything further from any member of the
9 Commission?

10 I want to personally thank all of the
11 staff of the Commission who have spent many long hours
12 here either in assisting us while we were in session or,
13 just as importantly, providing security in the room
14 while we were absent so we didn't have to tear down and
15 bring back all the material we have to look at.

16 I also want to thank the Commissioners for
17 their attention during the past four days. It clearly
18 is a work in progress, but it is becoming clearer all
19 the time.

20 As long as we continue to make this kind
21 of progress, we certainly will complete our task in due
22 fashion.

23 Is there anything further?

24 If not, we are adjourned until Thursday
25 next.

1 (Whereupon, the Commission adjourned at
2 approximately 1:45 p.m. until Thursday, August 16, 2001,
3 at 9:30 a.m.)

4

5

* * * *

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF ARIZONA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF MARICOPA)

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 68 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 5th day of September, 2001.

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

