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CHAIRMAN LYNN: If I could ask the
Commissioners to take their seats, we'll start the
meeting.
I'd like to call the meeting of the
Independent Redistricting Commission to order.
Mr. Turney, are you able to hear me well
in back? I'm not, we'll be able to tell.
Let the record reflect all five members of
the Commission are present.
Let the record reflect that Tucson has
shown a great deal of interest in our process. We have
a terrific gathering this morning.
We're very appreciative all of you have
come out. As is our custom, we'll have public comment
at the beginning and end of our meeting.
If you do wish to speak and have not yet
filled out a yellow speaker slip, I'll ask you to do so.
If you've not yet filled out that slip,
staff will pass them out.
Let me make a couple comments before we begin public comment. I'd like to, for all your information and the record, let everyone know where we are in the process.

Today it is our hope, whether this meeting ends sometime today or tomorrow, we will have adopted draft maps, one Congressional and one Legislative. I want to emphasize these drafts are drafts. They are not perfect. They will not pass all the tests they need to. That's not the intent at this stage in the process. The purpose at this stage in the process is so the public will have another opportunity to comment at this stage in the process.

At the end of the process, the Commission will again meet at the end in very lengthy session to take all comment into consideration and take into account all comment into account.

To that end, all those seeking to comment this afternoon and at the end, because of the number of people speaking, I'd ask you to try to limit your comments to three minutes each. We'll not be strict about that, but we have a lot of work today and we want to balance public input at this juncture with the amount of work we have to do with the Congressional and Legislative mapping.
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The second thing I have is if you have specific comments about very small pieces of the maps, that is this particular boundary should be one street over or this particular line should go one other place, that comment is perfectly fine; but understand those kind of adjustments may not be made at this point in the process. They will be taken into account to fine-tune all of the districts we've drawn.

At the point we are satisfied as a Commission we have taken all that comment into account, we will then adopt final maps than then will be submitted into the Department of Justice for review. That is about a month away.

That being said, 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 further consideration and decision at a later date unless it is the subject of an item already on the agenda.

MR. ECHEVESTE: I have a handout submitted to me, submitted by Ken Bennett, State Senator. I'd
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like to include this for the record.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Echeveste.

It will be made a part of the record and made available
to each Commissioner.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The first person wishing

then to, the person speaking first, is Representative
Marion Pickens, State Representative, and representing
herself.

Ms. Pickens.

REPRESENTATIVE PICKENS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Would each speaker, for

the purpose of the public hearing, if you would, state,

and if it's not absolutely obvious, spell your name.

REPRESENTATIVE PICKENS: Representative
Marion Pickens, P I C K E N S.

I'm representing myself.

This is the first opportunity I've had to

be at a Commission meeting. I appreciate you all coming
down to Tucson so I can participate.

I'm really speaking for myself because I

have lived in Tucson now for 40 years. I feel I'm very

much a part of this community and have looked at and

been a part of the whole political process that has

taken place for a number of years, even having run for
office myself.

There is something very different about Tucson and Pima County. We haven't gone through the Baja Arizona revolt for nothing. Other than the fact we view issues very seriously down here, we want people to view the City Council, Board of Supervisors, and represent the views we have here in this community.

Community is very important to us, to be sure we have people elected that can represent our issues, not necessarily parties, issues important here in this community.

I believe you have done, as I have been getting information from my staff as to how you are dividing the Legislative Districts, you are certainly taking into consideration Hispanic minority interests, making sure that they have some geographical compactness. I don't believe you really addressed the whole issue on competitive districts.

It is the competitive issues down here that allow us to elect people on issues.

I guess the old, now, District 13 is a perfect example on that. That has not been particularly Republican or Democrat. It's represented by people that feel very strongly on issues in the community and feel strongly on issues.
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As you are looking now, as you are going
to fine-tune Legislative Districts, particularly here in
Pima County, please look at how we make sure the issues
of the community can be represented in the Legislature
through those competitive districts, which is how I hope
the district is now going to be drawn.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Representative
Pickens.

The next person I have wishing to speak,
Salomon Balde negro, Chair of the Chicano Consortium for
Public Issues.

MR. BALDE NEGRO: Mr. Chairman,
Commissioners, I want to address a couple things.
Congressional issues.

District G, on behalf of the Chicano
Consortium for Public Issues, I submitted a map that
argued the case that District G should be, what you call
District G, we call District Two, that the whole border
constitutes a community of interest. And the map we
submitted, substantively what is District G, your
District G covers now, except your District G does not
include the lower part of Cochise County, the Douglas
County, ours does. We argued, we'll argue, the entire
border from Douglas constitutes a viable community.
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The Douglas border issues are extremely important, a viable issue. To divide, somehow magically say the Douglas border issues are separate from these issues, or should have a different voice represent been them, simply from our standpoint is not a viable thing to do.

We continue to argue the case the entire border should continue to be included in District G.

I think the statistical manipulations that have to be done would be minor enough to not cause -- not be disastrous to the rest of the districts.

On the Legislative side of it, looking at the Legislative side of it, what we call District 10, I couldn't make out what you call them over here, we have letters for them, I think District U, what we call District U, I think you know what it is over here, the south side of Tucson, south central part of Tucson. Historically it has been, historically it's been a very cohesive part of Tucson. That south central part of Tucson should remain in what was District 10, what we call District 10, you call whatever you call it.

And the west side of Tucson is also a traditional part, viable community part of interest that should also be kept together.

The way it looks now, you've taken part
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central part of Tucson and stuck it into the western
part Tucson. While there are some commonalities between
the two areas, historically, traditionally, it's a much
stronger part of the sense of the south central part of
Tucson and it makes much more sense to be in part,
District 10, than District 11. The south central part
of 10 has been small very cohesive community
historically, has been in District 10, an agrarian District
10, for that matter.

I see south Tucson, south central 10 in
11, and I think you should reconsider that.

Look at the south side of Tucson, south
central side of Tucson as a viable historically cohesive
part of Tucson. Look at those sides.

That would make better sense for
candidates running for office, people developing
historical voting patterns, voting patterns, race
issues.

If you do that kind of tweaking, again, it
would not be disastrous, not entail monumental changes
that have far-reaching ramifications. Tweaking can be
done and should be done.

Speaking from a community of interchange
point, I want to reiterate, the border should be one
continuous border of interest. It is that in reality.
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Chopping it off Sierra Vista, or whatever the line is, is an artificial boundary.

I think the border, which has been done way before we have, obviously, the reality is those issues are there. And to chop it off arbitrarily is artificial manipulation and doesn't make sense.

To reiterate, go back and maintain the south side of Tucson, south side the Tucson, what we call District 10. Maintain the south central side as a viable community of interest.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Baldenegro

Next speaker, Mr. Seanez, representing the Navajo Nation.

Mr. Seanez.

MR. SEANEZ: Good morning, Chairman Lynn, Members of the Commission.

The Navajo Nation is here again to speak to the Congressional District and Legislative District. The Navajo Nation is viewing the Congressional District as an improvement over the original, the original grid, as well as the first draft which was released on August the 9th. However, the gerrymander which is indicated on the draft map for the exclusion of Hopi from the same Congressional District from the Navajo Nation has merely changed shape. Now we have the flying giraffe there.
And the Navajo Nation is here to recommend the beheading
of the flying giraffe.

We don't believe the Navajo Nation should
be separated from Hopi Nation. It's diluted the Native
Americans from the voting population. It's innumerical,
and we're here to advocate with the Commission to make
that additional change before adoption of the
Congressional map.

The Navajo Nation as well is here to
address concerns with the Congressional District even as
it has been modified.

For discussion purposes, at the Phoenix
meetings, the percentages of 64 percent and considerably
less, and that assumes 12 percent Native American voting
ages is still a percent less than the bench mark of
Native Americans, less than the Native Americans in
District Three voting age.

We believe the Commission can address the
Americans voting age.

First, which Legislative District the Hopi
town, 7,000 individuals, or approximately three
percent of voting district, we understand that there are
intersections of other communities of interest,
especially the southeastern part of the state; however,
the adjustment of what we refer to as the EACO district
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may be required in order to increase the native population, Native American voting Americans through the White Mountain Apache Tribe and San Carlos Apache Tribe, especially if the Commission is not to see clear to have the Hopi Tribe to see clear into the Navajo Tribe, especially for voting preclearance. Navajo sees other alternatives available to address the percentage number, one being possible exclusion of New Kingman Butler and Kingman from the proposed Legislative District, high, relatively high numbers of voters and very low numbers of Native Americans. We don't believe exclusion of Kingman by itself will be sufficient. We believe it will also have to be addressed primarily through the addition of the Hopi tribe to the Legislative District. But also we encourage the Commission to look at other options involving San Carlos and White Mountain Apache Tribes, if that becomes necessary, and the Commission does not see it possible to redraft in the way we're suggesting.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Seanez.

I ask, because the room is so small, if you have a cellphone, turn it off or put it on stun, one of the two.

The second thing, if anyone is standing in the seats to the far side of the room, that would be
Next speaker, Dora Vasquez, representing the Pinal Hispanic Forum and Pinal NAACP.

MS. VASQUEZ: I'm here on behalf of the Pinal Hispanic Forum and Pinal NAACP. I'm here for the Pinal Coalition on Redistricting.

The Pinal Redistricting maps best represents, in addition, the Pinal Legislative District not only interests the Hispanic community, it also interests the native communities. The City of Casa Grande wishes to be kept in a district without being divided into two districts. The coalition map does just this. The Hispanic Coalition plan as submitted keeps the City of Casa Grande within one Legislative District.

Even more important, it keeps the American Indian Hispanic population within city in the district. It reflects a community of interest, reflects the American and Hispanic in the district, and reflects other districts.

As you drive down Interstate 10, you'll see the Casa Grande area is rapidly changing traditionally. It's an agricultural community changing to a bedroom community, new homes being built daily.

The Pinal Hispanic Community Forum and Pinal NAACP want to assure this rapid development does
not infringe on the needs and developments of the
long-term residents that need to assure transportation
and social services are readily available to the elderly
and need to assure education needs of the children are
addressed at the Legislature.

We strongly support the Gila River Indian
requests that the district be drawn as it joins the
rural communities of Gila, the Fort McDowell
communities, Ak-Chin Indians, and also request Ak-Chin
not be divided at State Route 77, and the mining
communities be included.

The Arizona Independent Redistricting
Community plan increases retrogression for a planned
Commission to represent the concerns and not compliance
of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The Voting Rights Act
prohibits can't sell out and minimize the voting rights
acts which are minimized, specifically, to dilute the
voting rights of the American Indian Hispanic community
which historically existed and provided sufficient
registration to elect a party, the voting priority
Legislative district as submitted by the Hispanic
Coalition.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If you have those comments
in writing, we'd be happy to take a copy, if you'd like
to submit them.
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Thank you very much.

Next speaker, Mark Clark, representing himself.

Representative Clark.

REPRESENTATIVE CLARK: Mark Clark, representing himself.

To let you know, and the audience as well, as well as you know, this is one of the first opportunities we've had to make and have an opportunity to make our districts competitive. I think that through that, it is a unique opportunity.

In the past, we basically have had to basically draw the lines, which I think has been okay. But for this committee, one of the best opportunities that we do have is to do just what I said, be able to let more people have an impact as to which district, instead of before, through what I've been able to see, in my own campaign, I've had to basically go and ask for votes. People generally tell me, you are Democrat, a Republican will win. You are in District Seven. I'm Republican. It's a Republican district. I'll win.

Redistricting this way, it's a better opportunity to assure the best candidate will win. Through my eyes, as a freshman in the Legislature this session, with an opportunity to see a unique situation the Senate had, a
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15-15 split, I think, you know, through that, we had
some good legislation passed. It was where not only a
certain group, the majority of the Senate was there, or
whatever, it wasn't a specific group of people making
legislation, all people. All senators were able to come
to the table and had a voice. That produced a lot of
good legislation.

If you take, for example, the House of
Representatives, we have a 37-23 split. In that, I
think that there was only certain people making and
passing legislation. I think it was one-sided at some
times. If we, through redistricting this way, we'll be
able to make our districts competitive, actually be able
to bring more people of either an equal amount of
Democrats or equal amount of Republicans on either side
of the table, give us an even balance, a better balance.

The main issue I have is basically
reassuring. Hopefully you reassure districts are
competitive, not lopsided. That's the major purpose,
hopefully the issue of redistricting this way. When on
the floor, it makes a huge difference, because we do
have an opportunity to come to the table and give our
input and feel like people are listening to you, how
laws are made in the State of Arizona.

Everybody, the team you have, everybody

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
has input. You have input on either side.

Hopefully the redistricting, we can have

that.

I think another issue that I see, through

my district, is we have a unique district, a lot of

small towns. And small towns generally have been

grouped together.

I think than during the map I saw, it had

my district as District Seven B, basically, in between

Phoenix and Tucson. Now my district would go into

Tucson taking Oro Valley, Catalina, and Saddlebrooke,
going back toward Manuel, Oro Valley, and going back to

Casa Grande, Apache Junction. If a person has part of

the rural area, it would be hard for them to legislate

because of factors. You would be passing legislation

trying to add road improvements, pulling money from one

side to the other. For people, and actually in the

interests of the people, it would be better served if

they had a representative basically representing a group

of people that had a set of interests. Shifting from

having two representing Tucson, representing a town like

San Manuel would be extremely hard. Not only the

people's interests, from the standpoint of interests,

that would be a consideration I hope you take into

consideration. I don't know what else I could tell you.
I don't know what else I could tell you, how policy is set and policy is made. It will be interesting.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Representative Clark.

Again, if you filled out a slip and want to speak at the morning session, there will be another session this afternoon. Please fill out a slip and hold it up. If at all possible, limit your comments to roughly a three-minute period.

Carol Shearer, League of Women Voters, representing the Greater Metropolitan Tucson.

Ms. Shearer.

MS. SHEARER: Good morning.

My name is Carol Shearer, S H A E R E R. I'm President of the League of Women Voters of Greater Tucson.

I'd like to thank all the Commissioners for doing a very difficult job. The League of Women Voters was very involved in collecting signatures for Prop 106. In collecting signatures, one of the most appealing points was the competitive part of the districts. I'd like to remind you, that was what the citizens felt. I think that's what many other leagers feel.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Shearer.
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Next speaker, Mr. Walker Smith, principal planner for the City of South Tucson.

Mr. Smith.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners.

At your hearing at Desert Vista Campus and the Pima Community Campus, we asked you to consider the community of interest for Tucson. I want to say a few more words about that, considering a few more remarks about Mr. Baldenegro.

The community of interests of South Tucson go basically north and east. The current map for South Tucson goes east in Tucson on an east line to 12th Avenue and the Freeway. And historically south of downtown it's the west side of the river. The east side of the river tends to be a community of interest. It would be more natural to go east, perhaps toward the mainland of the railroad.

The railroad is the east boundary of the Tucson, is a single track. Many years ago the railroad families settled on both sides of that single line railroad track and there continue to be families on both sides.

South Tucson's relationship marks the family, the urban league. This is more than just a
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single ethnic consideration. And we would ask you to consider those kind of factors in the community of interest for South Tucson on the south side of Tucson issue as you move forward in your deliberations.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The next speaker is Richard E. Green, representative of EAHEA.

Mr. Green.

MR. GREEN: Yes, I'm Richard Green. I live in Superior, Arizona. I'd like to speak on behalf of myself.

I'm a member of the KARA Board which represents low income people from Pinal County. I'd like to see the community of interest from Pinal County be kept as whole as possible. The way they have it on the latest map I see cuts Pinal County into four districts. We've been cut up into districts before. I don't think this serves the people of Pinal people very well.

Mr. Kingsbury will have a map to present to you. I support the map he presents.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Green.

The next speaker is Richard Salaz representing himself.

Mr. Salaz.
MR. SALAZ: Thank you. Good morning.

S A L A Z.

I've been a resident of the City of Tucson since my birth. I'd like to reiterate what Mr. Baldenegro, Walker, and Green said, Pueblo Hills, South Central, South Tucson, and the southern part of Tucson are more a community of interest with us than the west Tucson mountains. And I think, if I read your map correctly, there is a little dog leg that goes all the way up to Marana. I assure you there is not a whole lot of community of interest with the Town of Marana, even though we have a lot of good friends up there.

I would like to keep as much of District 10 that we have now. It encompasses all of District 10, goes eastward and southbound. It has been there 30 some odd years, I believe. I've been involved a little bit in politics, am not a politician by nature. I follow whatever concerns I have directly.

Consider keeping District 10 as much intact as possible. Like in a walker, keeping it right now, it's not a single ethnic group we're talking about, it's a multi-ethnic community, South Tucson, the south Air Park Council, South Air Park Gardens. We'd like you to keep it as impact as possible.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next speaker, Mr. Ron
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Kingsbury, Chairman of the Pinal County Democrats.

MR. KING: I guess I'm down low again.

I'm Ron Kingsbury, K I N G S B U R Y.

I'm representing the Pinal County Democrats, representing the Pinal County people, not just Democrats.

One of the things that very much concerns me, Pinal County has been a splinter of the State of Arizona. We're the one being squeezed between Maricopa and Pima County. What has happened through the history of Arizona, Pinal County has been, if we need votes, we'll grab part of Pinal County. We've really not had fair representation through Pinal County.

Redistricting, I thought had been a goal of bringing ahead, bringing the county together, so we'd have voice in the legislature and everything. As we had, we had six splits during the redistricting. When I look at maps, it's down to three.

My question to the Commission is why are we being split all together? We have 179,000 population in Pinal County. We are diversified, all walks of life, Native Americans, all walks of life, working together as whole. Our County Commissioners sent letters to the Commissioners explaining why the Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, should be part of our Legislature instead of
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being City of Mesa, or that end. We have always been
tagged what is left or taken from us. And I think it’s
time that Pinal County be recognized as a legitimate
entity to the State of Arizona instead of being a step
child of everybody that grabs us.

I have a map here that I would like to
present to you as to what I feel and we have been
talking about for the -- during the last part of
redistricting. I have a map I'll give you.

Nothing like getting them all mixed up.

On the map you will see, if I can point
out some of the things on the map, that what we have
done is included all minorities, the Indian nation.

I was talking to, just before I got a
chance and the meeting started, looking at our map, the
Hispanic and -- they are very agreeable with our map.
The only question they asked, what they add to the map,
if we could go above Apache Junction and take in the
Gila River Reservation, Fort McDowell and that, as part
of that. They would like to be part of that.

If you look at our map, we have the whole
Pinal County as a district. We have dropped out Oracle
on that map because of the figure of the -- the
population figure. But if you look at it, the Oracle
area is more or less part of the Tucson area and that
If you look, we are including San Manuel, everything. We are making our county a district or everything, whatever it is, whether Democrat, Republican, whatever Democrat, creed, whatever, so we have a speaking in the Legislature. My district, District Four, takes Gold Canyon, not Supreme Valley, as put in the -- during the report, all the way up to Utah, St. Johns, and everything. Our representation has always been from that area. District Seven comes into our area, but more or less the southeastern part of Pinal valley. What we'd like to do, our plans, and what we were asking the Commission, please consider, we would like to be whole instead of split so we have a voice in the Legislature and state government. Tucson, I came to Tucson in 1946. My dad was stationed at Mammoth Air Base. Tucson was a resort town, a mission, and growing in its right to ask for representation. Pinal has the right to ask for representation. Thank you for listening. CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Kingsbury.
We will take that map and make it part of the record.

The next speaker is Mr. Bob Mitchell, a speaker for the City of Casa Grande.

Mr. Mitchell.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Excuse me, sir. Can we have that?

A VOICE: Ron wants this one back.

COUNCILMEMBER MITCHELL: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman,

Commissioners, it's a pleasure to address you. I had an opportunity to address you when you were in Casa Grande earlier in the process. While I'd like to support the earlier map when you were in Casa Grande, and looking at this map when I just saw of Pinal map I don't know if it would be a bad map either. I don't know if it would be bad to have the worst of all world's in the map you now created, which includes the cities of Florence, Coolidge, Eloy, Casa Grande, Coolidge, Tohono O'odham, Eloy, Ak-Chin, those put together, many communities of interest we originally talked about, 80 percent of dairies in state one area, most feed lots in one area. It does create an agricultural area of interest in one area, Gila Bend as well as Western Pinal County. It does in fact keep all school districts in Western Pinal County in one school area, and does keep
most Hispanics and Native Americans into a district, which is a part of our minority-majority district at that time. It also creates an industrial corridor for the western part of Pinal County going down to the south. So the areas of interest that have been put together by this map that have been submitted, while certainly not my first choice, is certainly a map of merit keeping the western Pinal areas, communities of interest, and as a cohesive map or Legislative District that would represent Casa Grande.

As I indicated before, we've before been split several different directions. I applaud the Commission keeping these areas of interest together. This is an improvement we never -- we haven't had and certainly appreciate.

Again, I want to thank you for the job you are doing and the opportunity to speak before you.

If there is some area of interest I've not mentioned, I apologize. I think overall, the concerns we have have been met by this map that was submitted.

Again, my first interest is to keep Pinal County whole. Second, look at the map we submitted originally in Casa Grande; and, thirdly, the map submitted.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you Councilmember
Mitchell. Appreciate you being here today.

The next speaker is Mr. Pederson. I take it from your slip you are representing yourself.

MR. PEDERSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: You are representing yourself.

MR. PEDERSON: Yes. I represent myself also. I represent Mr. Pederson and am Chairman of the Fair Redistricting Campaign.

Those people came together for one purpose, that's to insure every vote counts in Arizona.

We came out with a number of criteria for drawing a number of legislative redistricting lines.

I want to compliment the Commission. If this initiative would not have been passed, our legislature would be doing this in the basement of the Capitol, not in the open, in public, not subject to open scrutiny. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, thank you members of Commission.

Involving the criteria as to how we arrived at Congressional and Legislative Districts, there were a total of five criteria. Certainly compliance with the Voting Rights Act, certainly that's number one. The Arizona history with regard to Voting
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Rights Act, there have been many, many infringements of the Voting Rights Act. Arizona is on the Department of Justice Watch List, one of the few states on the watch list at the US Department of Justice. Other criteria are geographical compactness to respect communities of interest. We have to take all of those into account and come up with that definition, respect for natural boundaries. You've heard testimony as to how counties have been split up.

I went to my high school reunion. I was born and raised in the city of Casa Grande. That city was split three years ago into three Legislative Districts, Jim, I live on one side of the street. My neighbor on the other side of the street. And that legislative line goes right down the middle of our street. If you take into account respect for natural boundaries, communities of interest, we all know that's direct violation.

I'd also like to spotlight another criteria we debated at some length when coming up with specific language in 106, and that's competitiveness. We've all heard the stories of people frustrated their vote doesn't count living in lopsided district. I live in a lopsided district. I'm sure most people in this room live in lopsided districts. Either Republicans or
Democrats dominate that room. Most districts congressional or legislative, are lopsided. Our basic conclusion was as long as the other criteria were satisfied, the main ones here, Voting Rights Act, compactness, competitiveness, to raise that to the same priority, as long as it has no detrimental effect to that of the other criteria -- now there are a number of ways, a number of opportunities throughout the state where competitive districts could be formulated.

Naturally, we're not going to make North Scottsdale safe for Democrats and we'll not make South Tucson safe for Republicans. There are many parts of the state where drawing of lines -- through drawing of lines they can be made competitive.

What is competitive statewide?

Five percent differential through Democrats and Republicans giving Republicans, current Congressional, is favoring Republicans, Legislative Districts has 19 percent difference. Now, in our campaign, we emphasized everyone's right to vote. We said when you go into a voting booth, you should have more than one person to vote for.

We have a history of voting being decided in primaries, voting being the coronation of the election of the primary. We do not have to sacrifice
elections. Our party suggested how this can be done with respect to rural interests, with respect to urban interests, and at the same time have a minority map. They are not mutually exclusive. It can be done. You do not have to sacrifice the voting franchise of one part of the community to achieve the voting franchise of another person in another part of the community.

Our efforts during the year passing Proposition 106 created promises. We feel the most basic part of the proposition is to achieve each proposition so we craft it such that it keeps the promise we craft that when we make a promise, the biggest promise is competitive campaigns, strong discussion of issues.

Chairman Lynn mentioned, this is a draft. We consider it only halfway through process. When the Commission draft plan's complete, I expect we'll have districts fair with one another. One without the other is another broken promise without the other.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Pederson. I have two more slips available. If others wish to speak, get those to staff. We'll accommodate you.

Next is Steve Gallardo representing the Coalition for Fair Redistricting.
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Mr. Gallardo.

MR. GALLARDO: Good morning, Chairman,
Members of the Commission.

First of all, the Coalition would commend
the Commission and the Commission's work they've done so
far, during the weekend's marathon, and commend you for
the work you've done so far.

The Coalition would like to request the
Commission refer back to the Coalition's map submitted
on July 16th. This map was based on 13 different
illustrations of communities of interest. These
illustrations were presented to you at the South Phoenix
public hearing, and we'd request the Commission look at
the Maricopa County districts, refer back to our map
when creating the Maricopa County districts.

We'd request the Maricopa County area be
created for a minority-majority district. This allows
us to maximize minority voting strength. There are some
concerns with Legislative District P, I believe, on the
proposed map. There are a couple areas that when
looking at the maps, or the illustrations of community
of interest, they do not fall on our maps as communities
of interest. And there are areas which are considered
communities of interest that do not fall on any of the
proposed communities of interest. We'd ask that
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interest be looked at and be drawn up where it need full phases on communities of interest.

Also, with respect to come District D, I believe, the South Phoenix community of interest, looking at communities of interest presented, the area I believe of 24th Street and Camelback area, that does not meet any of the 13 communities of interest. And we would ask that changes be made to this congressional area. There's a southern part of Glendale that does meet communities of interest and ask you take a look at that, and again, maximizing the strength of the minority vote in the minority county.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Gallardo.

The last speaker slip I have, Carlos Salaz, vice president of an organization, SOAR.

Mr. Salaz.

MR. SALAZ: My name is Carlos Salaz.

I was born in South Tucson. As has been mentioned a lot here, and my opinion is try to leave District 10, District 11, as much as possible, the way it is now. I believe with the comments of my brother Baldenegro, and Walker, and Green, we're retired brothers, steel workers, Hispanic retirees.

We're barely getting in the picture here on redistricting. I have no idea what you are talking
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about on redistricting. I'd like to get information, maps, so I can make a good decision if you guys are doing a good job or not. I believe you are doing a good job, but I hear there's areas where they could be left alone, maybe jump into another area. I don't know. But as a citizen I'm asking information so I can make a wise decision, so not just going on information, wise man, like to have a fax machine, fax whatever you can. This is my first meeting with the Commission. It's my fault. I didn't know where your meetings were being held and where. But I believe that the person that has spoken on the area of District 10 and District 11, I believe they should be -- if you could leave it as it is, I would appreciate it, if you could have that into consideration.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Salaz. Are there any other members of the public wishing to be heard at this time? If not, we'll close public comment for the early session. We'll again have public comment for later in the meeting or again if public comment will go to a later session.

Thank you again for the public comment at a later time.

Item three. Item three is presentation by
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NDC, discussion and possible decision concerning
development and adoption of draft Congressional and
Legislative maps.

I believe this presentation refers to
legislative mapping.

Is there any comment from the Commission
with respect to the Congressional maps.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I would
like to make a motion we accept the maps on the
Congressional maps as they presently exist.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, in
passing this motion, are we saying this is only the
draft maps we'll send out for public comment?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Correct. I understand the
motion to mean every map we approve up to and during the
approval is a draft. This is the draft we'll use for
the purpose of securing the public comment period.

I might also point out under Proposition
106, there is a 30-day fixed public comment period when
the draft maps have been developed. Public comment
period will begin as soon as draft maps have been
developed and are made available to the public. The
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public hearing schedule consists of 30 days. Public
comment period will be 30 days.

This motion, as I understand it, refers
only to the period the drafts will be made available to
the public for 30 days.

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: No question,
Mr. Chairman. There is no question we have work to do.
We welcome the opportunity for the public to react to
these drafts. I think we need to move to the phase of
the Commission accepting these as drafts, the Commission
accepting these as phase two.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion?
I don't know at what point he left the
motion on the floor except to accept the Congressional
maps as drafts for public comment.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: One point I'd like
to bring up is the -- I would like to address
specifically the one line we have drawn connecting the
Hopi Reservation to the rest of that district. I noted
myself and heard numerous comments from myself and
outside that creates a somewhat comical appearance to
the district. And, in fact, we have done this for very
important reasons which are entirely serious and
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sober-minded. But I've asked the question a couple
times and would like to ask it again whether it is
necessary for us to have a physical connection. It
seems to me to be an unnecessary embellishment if we are
not legally required to have it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'll ask whether or not
legal counsel wants to respond at that point.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I'd
like to ask a question of Mr. Huntwork.

Is it because of visual appearance? I
believe that linkage only has population of four people.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Four people. The
comment from Mr. Seanez about the flying giraffe, the
comment in the Arizona Republic, the Arizona dinosaur
fossiles, all of those are unnecessary comments for
something done for entirely appropriate reasons. I
prefer not to if we have that option.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman and Commissioner
Huntwork, the criteria includes a goal of making
districts that are compact and contiguous. There does
not appear to be a -- an exclusion of the possibility of
having a district that is noncontiguous; however, the
draft includes a string of zero population string census
blocks that although a little funny looking at least
makes it contiguous, in fact, even though they are
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman,
aesthetics notwithstanding, I thought Mr. Seanez'
characterization was rather creative. I prefer to have
the Hopi Reservation physically connected with the
remainder connected. I think it does look strange. I
think it would also look strange as an unconnected
island. No matter what we approve, having it connected
or not will be a little aesthetically jarring. However
we achieve having it connected will be a little jarring.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Reminds me of the
discussion of the motion, again, this is for draft
purposes, jarring, because the connection is relatively
sparse population, could we at a later date decide to
make a change on this issue.

Further discussion.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I concur. At a later
date we could determine we could move it. Should it be
determined it can stay, we can have the opportunity.

I emphasize with you this is a draft.

I'm not sure by removing the small neck,
I'm not so sure the comical metaphors would stop.
They'd simply change to an additional metaphor to
represent a different type animal. I, therefore, call
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the question.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The question has been called.

Additional discussion?

Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I agree with my fellow Commissioners and encourage everyone to focus on the substance of this.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Huntwork.

Are you ready for the question?

On the motion to accept the draft Congressional map for the purposes of public comment, roll call.

Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Chair votes "aye."

It might be appropriate, because we do need public breaks so the public stenographer can stay with us for the long hours we'll be needing her with us,
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to take a brief break, to go through some history. Our
history has been for brief breaks to tend to take longer
than they should. I'd like to, in the interest of the
amount of work we have to do, the Legislative work we
have to do, take as close to a 10-minute break as we
can, reconvene as close to 11:00 o'clock as possible.

Thank you.

(Recess taken from 10:45 until
approximately 11:00 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will be in
session.

The next presentation will be a
presentation by consultants.

I should point out between the last
meeting in Phoenix and -- since the last meeting, the
individual Commissioners have had a chance to provide
individual input from the Commissioners. And hopefully
the consultants have incorporated that individual input
from the individual Commissioners and the public, and
we'll see how rapidly we can make that progress.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
Commission, we have a short Power Point presentation to
explain the Power Point changes we've made and to bring
before the Commission some decisions.

I'd like to bring before the Commission a
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small housekeeping matter. There's a small sort of
c confusion, and I'd like to bring it up.

As you know, the current Congressional and
Legislative maps before Arizona use a numbering system.
Many citizens refer to those numbers. But the districts
we are drawing are very different from the current
Legislative Districts. So to signal that difference, we
have used the alphabet. We have lettered the districts.
So the original map we brought you on August 9th was
appropriately lettered from the north to the south.
However, as a result of the changes made, we are engaged
in a kind of -- maybe alphabet soup because these
districts are moving around and getting out of alphabet
order. It would be my hope, Mr. Chairman, we continue
to use letters we have on the maps even though we know
their logic has become a little confused. And it would
be our intention when you instruct us to reletter the
map when changes have been made after this meeting of
the Commission to bring new logic to them. I apologize,
Mr. Chairman. That's where we are.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I don't think anyone on
the Commission will be inextricably tied to a letter
versus some other designation as long as some confusion
with the districts we're dealing with today and changes,
that won't be substantive. I don't think anyone would
object to relettering once we have all 30 in position
where we think it will be made available to the public
later in a way for the public to comment and subsequent
changes can be made in the most expeditious way
possible.

    Dr. Heslop.

    DR. HESLOP: To assist in the Power Point
presentation, I'm asking if Marguerite Leoni would
comment on some screens involving voting rights and Doug
Johnson to comment on detail of the maps for which he is
predominantly responsible.

    You will remember, Mr. Chairman, Members
of the Commission, it was August 9 we brought the first
draft Legislative map to you.

    As a result of the hearings on August 9
through 11, that draft map, which you see an outline of
on the screen, was subjected to a number of instructions
for change and instructions to test alternatives. So in
the interest of reminding everyone and informing the
public here about those instructions, I'm going to
quickly rehearse them. You asked us to unite south
Yavapai, west Yavapai with river communities; south
Yavapai with topographical lines; linkage of Hopi with
Flagstaff; you asked us to look at the historic district
in Phoenix; moving District S southward; told us to
align Tucson districts closely with community borders;
did not keep the tourist districts, despite they
represented real community interests, asked us to
eliminate it; to unify Tempe; asked us to experiment
with EACO adjustments although seeking to preserve EACO
to the extent possible; create a
Glendale-Litchfield-Tolleson district; in Tucson told us
to move the university from the Foothills District; and
also in Tucson to put Flowing Wells in the Lower
Foothills District; also in Tucson, separate East Tucson
from mining communities; wanted improvement in the river
AUR unity. The district under most fire was Tucson
district L. Asked for elimination, perhaps
extermination; asked to turn the Central Phoenix
District from east-west to perhaps north-south and to
unify Westbrook Village.

Well, now, what have we done. There is a
lot of work, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission,
that has gone on on this plan since we left you on
Sunday. And we believe that we have followed your
instructions and that in doing so we have created a
significantly better plan. You can see the items that
we've done.

We united South Yavapai with Maricopa.

United West Yavapai with the river
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Yavapais, South Yavapai divisions.
Hopi with Flagstaff.
Casa Grande and Southeastern Pinal.

We have spent, we calculated rather about
11 hours, dealing with the problem with the historic
district. We have tested, retested, and tested again,
and you'll hear more from us on that in a moment.

We have worked to align the Tucson
districts with community borders, made major changes
according to instruction. The Tucson border is gone.

We have worked to align the Tucson

We've looked at EACO adjustments. We've
worked very hard on that.

We have tested the creation of a
Glendale-Litchfield Tolleson district.

We have moved the University.

We have put Flowing Wells in the Foothills
District.

We have experimented with the East Pinal
mining communities.

We have changed the river AUR community,
the west unified district is gone.

And we unified the Westbrook Village, it
is unified.
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The result is it respects Native American communities, respects communities of interest of Hispanic AURs, respects rural urban divisions, there are few city and county splits, improves compactness, respects AURs and other communities of interest. So those are our claims about the maps.

Mr. Chairman, what I'd like to do is ask Doug to take you on a tour of the map quickly going through these districts referencing the changes. What we would then do is look at some of the remaining problems. And we believe there are some problems that the Commission would want to look at. And we'd bring forward these problems but also suggest some ways of improving them. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I'd ask Doug to come to the podium.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: Good morning.

We started looking in the north region.

This region we looked at is the tourist district and other concerns in here. We have the spotter here so I can point to specific areas.

You can see we've made the northern Native American majority district much more compact, a much more unified community, reaching from the reservations in the west, the Navajo reservation in the east. It
also includes the Grand Canyon area and Grand Canyon
village in that district.

We are pleased with the compactness of
this district. It is much more focused in one
geographic area than the previous district was, and we
believe it complies with instructions of the Commission
as laid out.

We also should note as you clearly can see
we have retained the separation of the Hopi and Navajo
separation in this map as was the Commission's desire.

One other thing to point out, the very
deedge, you can't really see it on this screen, we did
improve the unification of the river communities.
There's not a lot of population in this area added on
the north edge here, but it does, it does extent the
river communities along the river while leaving the
reservation areas in the east here with the Navajo
reservation.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Would you answer a
question regarding Kingman in this regard?

MR. JOHNSON: Sure. Kingman in this map
remains in the Navajo to Havasupai tribal reservation
district.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: Flipping to the other side
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of the state, the border area, in this map we have, as
was discussed today in the public comment period, Casa
Grande, southeast Pinal, and unifying it together with
the tribal reservations, the urban tribal reservations
up here. The only change from some of the comments made
is in this area with the Tohono O'odham, we essentially
looked back at the community information we received,
and the Tohono O'odham received, the Ak-Chin requested
they be placed with them, the Gila River requested
Ak-Chin placed with them. Either can be done fairly
easily.

Yuma County is intact, unified. It takes
in a small, about half of La Paz County including about
half the river county here. Unites the southern river
into one district.

Over on the southeast county, it's again
intact.

The Nogales portion, Nogales county along
the west is divided along the areas here. It takes in
Tanque Verde and Vail, goes over to, I believe, Green
Valley and over to the edge of the Saddlebrooke areas,
not including Saddlebrooke to the west. A more detailed
map of Tucson will take that in.

A Tucson map will take in, more detailed
communities will take in, detailed communities
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stretching down I-10, separated that in, a grid line
clearly between them, an airline base grid as we refer
to it, stretching along the northeast and south of the
base. Then the Saddlebrooke to Catalina Foothills base,
newer suburb regions north of Tucson.

And H, the district labeled H here is
south of the river district. It's very homogeneous with
communities south of the river between them and the
foothills areas.

One significant change to note is in the
previous map where concern was we did not match up with
communities of Tucson as well. An additional area of
Tucson, that's around areas here and wraps around Casa
Grande. It did result in removing a district from the
Tucson area.

Moving to the other heavily urban part of
the state, Maricopa County, when we met with you last
and reviewed in progress work, we did the change in
District CC, the dark orangeish valley district. We
looked at attempting to unify it, showed you in the work
in progress meeting, we were able to unify it, the split
of Chandler, the significant split of Chandler in the
area Chandler objected to, and the split of Gilbert as
well.

And following the directions of the
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Commission at that time, we put District CC back in its original configuration. It divides Tempe but divides it along the city. It numbered a number of CIFs, and that may be a logical place to divide it.

Other things, the District of Phoenix previously went E to the west, reoriented west to south, S, as you'll see in the historical district, did not reorient a AUR, historical district, and Hispanic contradict in that AUR. The other thing, the Willowbrook District is unified.

Further, northern areas AUR, mainly the Scottsdale district and mainly the north Scottsdale district, and part of it is taken over into the western district as well. One district isn't solely impacted by growth, as we discussed in last meetings.

Those are the primary changes in Maricopa County.

This is a better use of the river AUR. W1 District, previously the north edge of the reservation of Kingman, the Kingman area, extended up the river to unify the river community. There's very little population in that area, not a significant population change in the river area. New Kingman is still in the reservation district.

Eastern Arizona Counties remains
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essentially intact, did not make any significant -- I don't think we made any changes from the Eastern Arizona Counties' map.

Yavapai is an extensive change from the previous map. My apologies for not having the cities on here, but I can show you where each one is.

Essentially the key instruction that made all the instructions possible was the Commission's decision to decide what happens if we don't keep it intact, don't make it intact, let other communities around it affect Yavapai. The result around it is Sedona remains united across the county line, Verde Valley remains united around it, and Camp Verde remains united around it, remained intact around it, intact. Sedona remained intact with Flagstaff. The interest in that area, same with Prescott, more or less needs to be one or the other.

In this place, because of the interplays with other communities around it, we reunited the place with it.

Prescott is clearly impacted heavily by the change. The communities on this map in the yellow district coming over in the southeastern over is the City of Prescott. And remaining within the yellow area are other cities and towns north of Prescott.
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The small blue arm that comes west
underneath the arm of the yellow district is the city of
Prescott Valley. Because of population numbers in the
same district as Verde Valley, the Sedona Valley area,
the pink district, western Maricopa, Sun City district,
where it comes along the city borders Prescott Valley,
city and towns of Prescott Valley, all in pink. This
was a source in a straight deal of efforts to unify the
valley as much as possible. When we did have to divide
it, the lines made some sense. The Commission had to
discuss, if had to divide some portions of the state,
some of the southern Prescott area does have a
connection with interaction with Maricopa Valley, a
logical place to group them, if we had to divide them.
Prescott Valley was one we weren't able to
keep with the rest of Verde Valley or with Maricopa.
That, the result of it is, primarily, is
an attempt to keep the Native American region AUR
together.
Also, the size of Flagstaff drives a lot
of this, and the AURs of the river and eastern AURs
impact this decision with this.
We are fairly comfortable with this.
Should the county have to be divided, we'd prefer to
minimize the division of Prescott Valley, any divisions

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
of Prescott as much as possible. Every city is minimized. None of the cities within is minimized. Cities as a whole is divided, it's as logical and in compliance with Prop 106 as possible.

I'll step aside for this portion.

DR. HESLOP: On August 9th through 11th, we identified several problems. Maybe we've created some more as a result of solving them. It's been our experience the last problems are always the hardest problems. We bring you some problems we think require very careful attention. Many of these problems involve voting rights issues. I was very impressed very late during the night to see Margaret Leoni, an attorney, busy at work with the computer developing a historic district. And so since it is her work, I'll turn to her to explicate it.

MS. LEONI: Thank you.

He thought I was a computer dummy.

One of the instructions we received at the last meeting was an attempt to respect, to a greater degree, the historic district.

And as you know, there is flexibility within Phoenix and in that portion of Maricopa County for handling these sorts of problems. One of the alternatives would have been to bring the historic
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district south into the Hispanic AUR, South Mountain
AUR. The second alternative would have been taking the
historic district into the current district lettered S.
I think in looking at this current problem
there's an additional issue that needs to be looked at
in this area, and that is also the consideration for
Hispanic representation presented for you. We've had a
map out there for consideration of the Commission and
the public assigning five districts to portions of that
AUR. And I think it is very important that you be
paying attention to the testimony you are getting to
that AUR while you are considering realignment of the
historic district. I will remind you we had specific
input today, perhaps five districts, that realignment in
that district is not an appropriate one. I think we
should listen carefully to what we're going to hear from
here on out to this issue.

I will mention this is a Maricopa South
Phoenix Hispanic limited AUR problem and the flexibility
we have there does not need to affect other parts of the
state.

I think we have a map here, Doug.

This is an initial proposal focused on the
historic District AUR. And, as you can see, the gray
area up here -- let me get a pointer -- unites that AUR
by pulling it south into the area we have labeled as R.
This area is a central part of the Hispanic AUR. This
configuration of the representational interests of that
AUR. But it is at least one option for addressing the
historic district unification that you have instructed
us to proceed with. But once again, I would ask that
this be an area that is looked at as a whole and as a
result of interest you've received today and in the
future.

Do you have anything to add to that in
light of the demographics?

DR. HESLOP: Tempe. We've gone back and
forth on Tempe for good reason. The Commission was
interested to explore what the results would be of
Tempe's unification. We saw the effects on Gilbert and
Chandler. The Commission requests us to explore further
division.

This is not, in our view, a major problem.
The alternatives listed here, we, on the whole, having
read the testimony, think that the Highway 60 division
makes rather more sense. And it certainly coincides
with some recent community input. But the alternative
split is available for the Commission's review.

Here's our Tempe map. We can explore it
in more detail, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission,
after the presentation.

Doug has done a pretty good job, I think, on the Prescott Valley splits as he went through the map. One of the facts to note here is that the Commission established no AUR in this area. We have very little testimony.

In the map as presented, each city is unified.

We do have Prescott Valley with the Verde Valley district, Prescott Valley with the Mohave District, and Sun City with the Verde Valley District. That's what one can say on its behalf.

We believe there's community justification for a split which is, of course, an awkward one. There are alternatives.

I think a line from Shakespeare: Nothing is good or bad save the alternatives. Make it so.

Here are some pretty bad alternatives, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. We could divide Flagstaff. We have worked on that. We have divided Flagstaff in different ways. That can be done. You can certainly split up EACO. It would not require -- it's not a small adjustment of EACO. It's multiple splits.

In Tucson, the map responds to community
testimony and the Commission's instruction, and we are convinced it does improve the Commission's instructions. It's a good community-based map, and the Commission will recognize it's handiwork here. But we have to underline that there are some issues with this configuration. It does reduce the number of Tucson districts. And it redistributes Hispanic voting strengths.

There is Hispanic voting rights strength here and we have to address it.

We have a proposal. It is a modification of the original plan which addresses those two difficulties and reserves, we believe, the best of the two community lines that the Commission instructed us to follow.

And leaving, in a sense, the most difficult for last, we have the Northern Arizona District. On its behalf it needs to be emphasized truly it is a compact district. It united many tribal districts, does what the district instructed us to do with regard to the Hopi. Doug has brought you through the map. I won't bring you through it any further.

Again, I'll ask Marguerite to take you through it further.

MS. LEONI: Aesthetics is first. Though artificially contiguous, does comply with 106. The
issue needs to be considered seriously as to redistribution of Native American voting strength by this configuration. Numbers up there tell you that without much more.

That area currently enjoys a 75 percent Native American total majority of citizens. Now that district is underpopulated by a significant amount. That number is subject to change. It is a flexible number. The proposed district brings it into closer compliance, not perfect compliance, the one person one vote issue, recognizes significant redistribution, the Native American voting strength. Highlighting that again to the Commission, it requires careful attention.

One of the shall obligations of the district, the Commission, under Proposition 106, the Voting Rights Act, shall bring attention to this issue while considering obligations of the Commission to that. We'll have information of the voting rights pattern which will be very important to the Commission in making decisions to the Commission in considering these issues.

We have a proposed alternative to Northern Arizona which addresses the numbers we need to be looking at with regard to the numbers we'll be taking in, if this is the alternative. I'll have Doug describe it to you, let you know what it does in regards to
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MR. JOHNSON: Just look at the geography.

Voting strength, unite the Hopi, Navajo, number two, take Winslow, not so small, out of EACO, and merge with the Navajo reservation area with the district. As a result of the to changes, over on the west side, put together more of our river AUR. Reunited Golden Valley, Dolan Springs, and part of Kingman and New Kingman. Those two are not enough to put together with New River, but a portion of it.

This is focused. See the small change here? This little arm reaching down does have significant population, however. And then the connecting arm, however you care to term it, is gone because the Hopi are now included within the district here.

MS. LEONI: I would mention we don't have a slide on this. This modification is one the Commission might consider changes to. The numbers are about a 67 percent total Native American district.

Now, as we have discussed here, voting rights is not a numbers game. It's a totality of circumstances investigation. But this is, and so you are going to need more input.

In so far as this is all we have before
us, it's a redistribution based on numbers.

The solution here, or alternative numbers here, it raises the northern district from 62 percent Native American to 67 percent.

DR. HESLOP: So, Mr. Chairman, we hope for some instructions on these issues. We would recommend, if we may, that they be discussed in terms of the Maricopa problems first, because that can be confined, the Tucson problems, and then the northern district. That would be advantageous to us.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, if we can use that order, unless the Commission like to start elsewhere.

DR. HESLOP: Finishing with Northern Arizona.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's then concentrate on Maricopa County Arizona issues, specifically with Maricopa county issues.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I like the motivation issues. I'm very concerned with another piece of the puzzle. District P, I think it was, the western district, connected up with R. That was a district that seemed to me, on the face of it, to run the risk of being a short term, of being a short-term
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Hispanic district. I thought short term, if we did a little rotation in that district, we could solidify the areas on the outskirts of that. It was the testimony of Richard Miranda last week there are three, four hundred thousand dollar homes going in on the outskirts of that district. So I'm wondering if -- how you have, whether you have considered that as part of the area and whether you would deal with that problem.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Commissioner, we have looked at that issue and looked at some concepts for how we can address that. Most of the efforts we have looked at, how we look at that, it's definitely something we will need to take into consideration, but --

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Let me ask it a different way. Is this compatible with that, does it move in that direction or move the other direction?

MS. LEONI: My preliminary -- first of all, I agree with you. District P is a sensitive district. We can work in a rotational way. This is a rotational configuration. And there is work improvement of this whole area here.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Seems to me my concern, I have the same concerns for it.
It might be possible to look at that district along with district V and the district that includes the southern portion of Glendale, et cetera. That may be where the rotation and change take place with district rather than involving districts R and S. We may be able to isolate this particular issue, the Historic Districts, from our concerns with District P, and maybe deal with that later on. I do have a concern with the shift that you've made which I think looks good. It certainly does what we asked you to do in trying to unify the historic district. I'd like to know if there are any voting rights implications in terms of changes you made.

MS. LEONI: Yes. I'll give you the facts. Voting rights implications. Redistributions, voting rights, between the area R and area S, the northern part of -- area R as it stood in the plan from this morning was quite a strong district. This reconfiguration redistributes some toward S. The counterbalance from area S is somewhat counterstrengthened. We need to look at that in terms of testimony in terms of ability to elect. We should have testimony on that. There are impacts on this move.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Do you believe those impacts are going to threaten the ability of
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communities to elect abilities of their choice? Do we not have enough information? What we had, I thought, originally, was a very strong minority-majority district in R and sort of a marginal one in S. Do we now end up with two districts that are comfortably majority-minority districts or two marginal districts?

What do we end up with?

MS. LEONI: At this point, S is improved. I don't believe it's improved to total voting age, Hispanic voting age improvement. I think voting age improvement. I think it's a movement. Initial reaction is movement in the right direction, but there's more to be done.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: When I had the opportunity to meet with you one-on-one, the suggestion I made was to move back that district back south, to lop off I suppose the central corridor portion of S, bring S southward, accommodate that by bringing the other end of R southward. Can you do that and achieve four solidly minority-majority districts southward?

MR. JOHNSON: We did and looked at it. We did not do it in the context of looking at four districts. When we do E, we'll look at it looking at four, four districts. In the of context at context four
districts, essentially we could not go far enough south to make it worth it. We moved S south, and the repercussions changed the configuration and nature of all the districts.

Marguerite's brainstorm, the point, going west was the work you see here. Again, that's the piece of the puzzle we'll look at when we have more a in-depth analysis here.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Would you take it as a fairly high priority instruction to look at that as soon as possible? I would regard that as a couple reasons. Number one, you know, as we did with the rural district in Northern Arizona, the intent was to create districts that would be representative for over the next 10 years, as least as far as we could predict, not that would pass today or change tomorrow, or not necessarily so.

The four districts is more consistent with the original minority plan, which I'm sure motivated that same consideration. I'm sure we're talking about, I'm sure parts of it are even reflected in that plan. In any event, would you take that as a high priority plan before we escape from today, if possible.

DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Huntwork, we've
taken the historic district as a priority, as a
considerable high priority. We've taken 11 hours in an
effort to try that solution. This is a sensitive issue.
The movement of territory among them is not something
that can be done in a short recess. It's also our
general opinion that we can expect valuable testimony on
this arrangement and on alternatives from the members of
the affected community. And I think it may be better,
Commissioner Huntwork, if I may suggest it, to look at
that testimony in the second round of hearings.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes. I guess I'll
beat a dead horse here.

Can you show me where cities, towns, and
street edges are, Tolleson, Sun City?

MR. JOHNSON: Tolleson is here. Good,
here it is off.

This is almost entirely Phoenix, Guadalupe
is unusually shaped. This, the city line of Phoenix,
and Tempe is on the other side of it. Up here we get
other cities. This is the Glendale, Peoria area up in
this space here. These are all in Phoenix. We do have
the freeways coming around and the freeway square,
whatever you choose to call the square.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Do you have that
alternative map?
MR. JOHNSON: We don't.

In order to get all the different things, we brought the desktop computer, an interactive map on the desk top. We tried to get it on this in time for the presentation, but we didn't have a chance.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I wanted to comment, we had a giraffe. Now we have a bear district or scottie district.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Looks like a place mat at McDonald's. How many animals can you find.

Let's not go through that.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, I wanted to address the point Dr. Heslop was making in context. I know it creates a lot of work to create one of these maps. I know how hard our consultants have been working to carry out our instructions one at a time. At the same time I have been trying to express this configuration does not reflect, and the revised configuration, does not reflect my understanding of the way those central neighborhoods logically lay out. I'd be reluctant to go out to the public, personally, with a map knowing that. And I would certainly, before we do, I would like to see -- personally I would like to see that alternative.
COMMISSIONER HALL: Let me see the alternative.

Are you saying, Mr. Huntwork, are you saying there were some concerns with respect to some of the designated AUR representations? Did I hear that or --

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: No. I think my concern is this pattern does not reflect the AUR as well as an AUR would, several AURs would, a Hispanic AUR and Hispanic Historic District AUR.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Historic District AUR, I'm looking at a map they have, looks like District 15 on their map, it does include those new areas that have been moved from S into R. And while it's certainly not exactly the same, it does appear to cover a lot of the same area and not to be terribly different. As I recall the Hispanic AUR presented to us was a large AUR I'm not sure it would fit into one Legislative District. I think here there was some overlap between the Hispanic AUR and Hispanic District. I don't think this deviates too far from the proposal presented to us. And it seems to solve one problem without negatively impacting another AUR.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I would
recommend my colleagues make a motion to the effect of
what they are referencing so we give clear instructions
to our consultants with respect to the alternatives we
are considering.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'll attempt to do
that.

I'd like to make a motion we instruct the
consultants to show us what we could achieve if we
attempted to unite the historic district, or the essence
of the historic district, with a nonminority-majority
district, probably to the north, and consolidate the
Hispanic AUR in the South Phoenix AUR into four
majority-minority districts, period.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is that a motion, Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Hall.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Now let's clarify.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Exactly what we're talking
about.

In this part of the process, we cannot

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
have anyone misconstrue or be less than completely understanding of a motion that is made since we expect this change or any other change to result in something we'll be able to vote on later today. Let's be clear.

Mr. Huntwork, explain that or ask the consultants if they fully understand what the motion goes to.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'm having to explain my thinking. My thinking is, number one, the historic district, in large part, is not minority-majority. It dilutes the minority strength in the surrounding districts no matter where you put it, unless you put it in a district that is not -- which we're not trying to create a minority-majority district. Secondly, I'm concerned as the Hispanic Coalition has expressed about the fact that we have attempted to create five minority-majority districts here; but at the expense of assuring that we successfully achieve four, so I would like to see how that option would lay out best in the opinion of our consultants.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: My question: In the opinion of our consultants, Doug, maybe you can respond to that. We did hear from representatives from the Coalition for Fair Redistricting. Mr. Huntwork is
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correct, are they correct, does that strengthen four
minority-majority districts and strengthen them?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner Hall, we've looked at this. One thing to keep in mind,
always we've looked at this, the move, we welcome, very
helpful, but such a move is not confined just to these
districts. In every scenario we've looked at in an
try to, up to this point, every district on the west
side of the district all the way up to North Phoenix is
affected by this change. It is an extensive analysis
and very hard to give a gut reaction to this until we've
done all the analysis.

While we certainly welcome the input, this
morning we certainly expect additional input on exactly
where the lines should be put.

The Coalition plan mentioned before is a
useful guide and actually was used as a definition
extensively in drawing lines. In one way, as it was
considered extensively from their plan city splits to
reduce the number of city splits is part of the reason
it's difficult to analyze all the changes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the
motion?

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Commissioner
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Huntwork, could you explain the areas of the map your
motion deals with?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: This map clearly
does not depict everything that would be depicted by
this motion. I need a map of the Hispanic AUR.

Zoom out a little bit.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I'm
sorry. I really need to get some context, something,
another computer, hookup, anything, roads, towns,
something on there.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Until we make a map
interactive, we don't have that capability on the nap
that is up there.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: And the question was
can we get to that place in a fairly quick manner so we
can deal with that.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, we definitely
share the interest in making these maps more
descriptive. Given the time frame, the number of
instructions, focusing on the maps, or the focus as
complete, the priority of completes and getting
interactive on the computer for the presentation, we
have not been able to do so at this time.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm just concerned if we
take these in isolation, we're not going to be able to
see it in a manner that would be useful. And I'm
worried about not only from a time standpoint,
understanding standpoint, the issue of going back and
forth. I want to minimize the back and forth in terms
of making adjustments, being able to see adjustments as
we wish to make them, and the impacts of each.

Is there a configuration we can look for
how long to get there? I sense on both Mr. Huntwork's
part in understanding changes in the motion, do we have
something that will affect it beyond the area itself,
Mr. Elder's comments, his frustrations I share.

We need that position to understand the
totality of the change before we can really decide
whether it's a good thing or not.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, may
we table the motion until we do that this afternoon?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is that acceptable?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Do you have additional
staff in the back rooms working?

DR. HESLOP: No.

COMMISSIONER HALL: If was the consensus
of the Commission, if people were working simultaneously
while working on this mission, if that's not possible,
I'd certainly table it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: To that point, Dr. Heslop,
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from that point of view, how did you expect this interaction to proceed with respect to making Legislative changes to this point? I want to understand what your expectations were to find out?

DR. HESLOP: I did not understand the desire for the Commission for further map detail. I thought we outlined the detail previously and the concepts alone would be a basis alone to proceed.

If further detail is needed, I'd request a recess in order to access the detail and bring it to you.

I wonder whether that necessity for detail is required for all the problems brought to you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I assure you it will apply to many, if not all.

What we may do, if in it's in the opinion of the Commission some changes for the Commission don't require the detail, we might move to those. I think specifically with respect to both Maricopa and Pima Counties, the interactive nature of those districts, that it is going to make a big difference.

Ms. Minkoff and then Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, it seems that the reworking of Districts R and S, in terms of unifying the historic neighborhood worked when you
just took those two districts in isolation, you told me
you thought I would like it, and I do. I think the
issue has been brought to the table, which is an
important one. It primarily involves five districts, R
and S, as well as P, which is that western district
referred to earlier, where Representative Miranda had
some testimony at our last meeting. And of necessity
doing anything with District P would have to do with
District P and District T. We're really talking about
five adjacent districts. And there may even be others
that are brought into the mix. If we're looking at the
Hispanic AUR, certainly District P is certainly very
much involved, the eastern part is very much part of the
Hispanic AUR and is not reflected in the current
configuration of District P. I think that really that
entire area needs to be dealt with, unifying the
historic district, respecting the Hispanic AURs, looking
at Goodyear, Litchfield Park, whether to keep them there
or out or in another district.

DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Minkoff, I
understand everything you said. You are describing not
work for a recess. You are describing days, days of
redistricting work.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It may be something
that will have to respond to public comment. If it's
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possible to look at it in any way to look at it today.

DR. HESLOP: Take 90 minutes,

Mr. Chairman, get detail on the map. It may be --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: For all options?

DR. HESLOP: Yes, all options, so you can interact with the map, yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Is the map that you have up there a layer that we can give to Mr. Johnson and plot as an overlay or transparency we have? We've gone through this in two, three meetings, having a reference or something people can reference on the map. I'm having a hard time in all the areas we discussed, from Kingman, the Prescott Valleys, Navajo, going on down into this area, the Tucson area. Understanding, I can't, I've been doing my homework, the isn't no way the public can have comment, or be able to evaluate and see what they are doing. I have to have this reference.

DR. HESLOP: As you know, Mr. Elder, we've developed an interactive map. I can add a zoom capability, do that, if you wish. I'm prepared to do that, if you wish. I'm also able to provide to Tim Johnson, materials to Tim Johnson, materials so we can provide plots. We'd be very happen to do it. It will
take 90 minutes. We may be looking at problems in
detail. It isn't required if we're not prepared to move
forward.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm not sure the
Commission has a position on all five of the areas you
raised.

I think it's very important to Mr. Elder's
comment to see the interactively, see however the work,
whichever changes are working, the 90-minute opportunity
to work at.

Are there areas this morning that
capability is less important for that we can move
forward with on any of those?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm thinking
through the issues Dr. Heslop raised to see if we can
deal with them. Some, I think we can deal with those
now. After we've done that, take the break.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Sound reasonable?

COMMISSIONER HALL: I concur.

I guess as we do that, I want to
reemphasize the point, maybe I'm missing that, we're in
the draft phase. Are these concerns or issues so
significant, we're unwilling to stamp draft on it and
say to the public now we have concerns; we want to hear
your concerns, allowing all the feedback to be
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incorporated in order to accommodate all the concerns?
I think regardless of whatever we try to do in our
efforts to perfect our draft, if you will, that we're
still going to get into significant comment on every
facet. I don't know where the line is on the continuum.
I'm not sure whether I fully comprehend all the
interaction on the concerns with respect to Central
Phoenix. I'm wondering, would it be prudent to list
what we have as concerns and add to whatever the public
has and come back with a more cohesive solution.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Hopefully we get whatever
the cohesive solution is before we go out. It's an
interactive look within a 90-minute time frame.
If you would, look at the five issues you
raised. Let's see if any of those, that interactive
look is not necessarily needed for us to give you
instruction. If there are some that we can deal with in
the absence of that action, we should make progress at
that point.
The first I take it you have up there is
Tempe.

DR. HESLOP: Yes, sir. And alternatives
we have considered, in light of your instructions, are
listed on the screen.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: To that point, do you have
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the representative map of that change?

How many districts does Chandler find itself in as a result of that change and the same question as to the City of Gilbert?

MR. JOHNSON: Changes, to give you a sense, the city border between City of Mesa, Gilbert, this side of this district, go into the Mesa District. Look here, the Mesa District.

Tempe, District CC, come below the city line. We don't have the exact distance it would go to, nothing all the way to unify the city, a significant distance to the south.

The effect on Chandler, Chandler is split slightly to the arm that reaches westward to the city. There would remain some split. The split line would remain west of Dobson Road. The key dividing line, the representatives of that city indicated is their preference. So Gilbert would remain unified.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Without locating precisely where Tempe would be split, can you give us some idea where -- more of Tempe in the northern district than the southern district. Approximately what is the split?

MR. JOHNSON: A small sliver of Tempe is
left in the southern district, 10, 20 percent of Tempe.
That's in the real ballpark.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I would like to see how that looks.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Interactively?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes. I think something is to be gained from moving Mesa. There's one less community in that particular district, perhaps one less split of Mesa. It obviously has to be split many times.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's hold some comments until we look at it.

Look at the second area, see if we have some agreement.

DR. HESLOP: Here is the issue of Prescott Valley. Here is our Prescott Valley map, and here are the alternatives, the only ones we can see to the Prescott Valley split.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any reason to believe we don't need to see it interactively?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I do.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think we need to see that one.

Go to number three. Keep going. That one we need to see.
DR. HESLOP: Northern Arizona District, Mr. Chairman. Here is our map, and here are the issues with it.

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It seemed to me the solution Doug was proposing was not only incorporating the Hopi Reservation but incorporating Winslow and removing portions of Kingman that involved population with it. One has to come out somewhere else. It takes out population Y, AV1, a lot of changes. We need to see that interactively.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Fifth and last --

DR. HESLOP: That is the last, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, the changes to the northern district may have some ripple effect. I think we will analyze the ripple effect. I think the specific issues in the northern district and those in and of themselves are pretty self-explanatory. In effect we take some issues, those are ones that can be addressed prior to a break.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think one issue we perhaps can address is the concern about whether we should revisit the issue about the Hopi Reservation.
being inside or outside of that district. Obviously if we change our earlier position, that does have a ripple effect. If we keep the issues separated, there's not many changes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd remind everyone of Ms. Leoni's comments on changes. It seems clear we need to make some changes about the district. The only questions are changes that are recommended are once without a further interactive look.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Excuse me. A couple questions. I know in my mind why I separated the Hopi from Navajo on a Congressional level. I don't know as well the issues on a Legislative level from the standpoint of how the Hopi and Navajo stand on Legislative state issues. The Hopi Legislative may not have a great effect on the Hopi. I'd like to take a look at the percentages. I think on percentages, with that inclusion, it brought percentages to where DOJ, we're at least in the ballpark; correct?

MS. LEONI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: And then that gerrymander, if you will, or tongue, coming down to Winslow, coming down to get Winslow?

MR. JOHNSON: That area is all of Winslow.
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COMMISSIONER ELDER: Are there tracts around that? I have problems in four of the five areas. We have an urbanized area that doesn't reflect that city boundary. This is taking in enough of the Winslow urbanized functional area, the city limits, the periphery around the city limits which is disenfranchised.

MR. JOHNSON: I wouldn't say disenfranchised, the area around the freeway, some around Winslow, some around here.

The reason we did not include it, make it probably better looking, a little more compact, is because of expressions from that area, that community, to not be included with the Navajo reservation.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I don't know how big the tracts are. Something that only expands four, five miles outside Winslow, so long as the area remains contiguous, remains contiguous, whether they live in a truck stop along the freeway, whatever, along the outskirts, if you keep it whole, not necessarily go into the Navajo, Apache counties, take enough, four, five people, that group, the metropolitan area, if you will, of metropolitan Winslow.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The other question, the metropolitan side of the map, splitting areas around
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Kingman from Kingman itself, the area sees itself as a community. To the extent there's population along the southern boundary, any of this district might be picked up to unify Kingman. That's of interest to me as well.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm not sure why Winslow was proposed to be brought into the Northern Arizona District. It seems to me if you put the Hopi Reservation into this district, you are adding about 7,000 people. Without splitting Kingman, the New Kingman, Butler area, going into Dolan Valley, Dolan Springs, splitting those areas, putting them with the river district, you might accomplish what you need to do without going into the river district, leaving Navajo County, if Hopi is brought into Navajo.

MS. LEONI: Commissioner Minkoff, the test is with regard to voting strength. Winslow has Native American population and we test for voting population.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm not sure Winslow does.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: 10,000.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: As I look at it, 10,000 does. Winslow has 9,520, 25,004 white, 4,003 black, 2,234 are Native American.

MS. LEONI: Commissioner Minkoff, I'm
pleased to test it for you. Winslow is about a third
Native American.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No, less than a
quarter.

MS. LEONI: When that area is traded to
the area to the west, in the Kingman exchange, the net
result is an increase in voting strength for the
American Indian. But what we can do is give you the
exact difference that it makes.

I do agree with you, it's not a majority
American Indian area. But the trade is what boosts that
district somewhat more. We can bring that back. It's
not a difficult thing to bring back to you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: While looking at
that, I just have to mention you could take out, add
especially all Mohave County south of the Mohave --
Colorado Mohave River in exchange for the reservation.
I think obviously that would vastly enhance the Native
American concentration in that district, not make it
necessary to combine the Hopi Navajo. The testimony
from the Hopi is clear and consistent, absolutely
unequivocal, they do not wish to be combined at either a
state or federal level. The reasons for that are less
clear to me as well as other Commissioners. But the
expression of desire, interest, and concern was absolutely clear and unequivocal. I think that is an issue or alternative that we also need to take a look at.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: There's no question that their testimony is clear and unequivocal. And we've heard testimony as clear and unequivocal on a variety of other issues of separation. There's also testimony on the challenge to the federal issue. That's also clear my mind.

I make motion make for adjustment of the inclusion of Hopis within the northern district and excluding Golden Valley and Dolan Springs.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I second that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion on the motion.

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I strongly supported separating the Hopi from the Navajo. Conceptually I still do. I don't know how to make this district work otherwise. I'm not sure there's a way that we can come down, pick up the White Mountain San Carlos Reservations and make it work. I would like to make this change, send it out for public comment. I
have a lot of confidence in the people of Arizona and see if maybe they can find a solution we have not found.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: To understand the motion, just so I'm clear, Mr. Hall, the intent of your motion is to include the City of Winslow as well as include the Hopi or not?


CHAIRMAN LYNN: Inclusion of Hopi, exclusion those two communities.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: In other ways, mean changing of the EACO District.

I personally feel before we send out a map we need to look at options.

I think we need to look at keeping together Yavapai County or most of the Yavapai County and solving some of the other difficult problems that we are facing. Obviously because of the highly interactive nature every change we make, it is impossible to say, without having it studied, but if that were the case, I certainly might be persuaded that the best solution is to solve problems in three or four other places in the state and find a solution in the EACO area that allows...
it to remain rural, relatively compact, and with the communities of interest that are not defined by the county boundary but by other factors to remain intact. In fact, most of the other county boundaries could remain intact. I don't see any reason why Graham and Greenlee Valley couldn't remain intact. I don't see why Graham and Greenlee Valley couldn't remain intact with the exception of rural valleys. Those could remain intact in parts of Cochise Valleys. Make a rural district. The essence is trade-offs in parts of the state. I.

Want to make a point, was going to make a statement before we talked interactively. I didn't say we should solve problems by carving up by carving up Yavapai elsewhere. I said keep EACO together if you could. Consider it either way, if you had to. It is an AUR no more important than anything else. Don't consider ranking it above Yavapai County or keeping Yavapai County together. You said no there was Yavapai County AUR. I do recall -- I seem to recall we did have a Yavapai AUR. Even if we didn't, I remind you counties have express priority under Prop 106. AURs, in our way of defining 106, we don't create license to break up one county to break up other counties.
It's a long speech. I think we should consider what happens if you made adjustments to that Eastern Arizona District in order to solve some of these other problems.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Heslop.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, we were picking up on a comment that you made about Yavapai County, that counties have no special status as AURs.

We do have an AUR for Yavapai County. I agree it has no less a status than other AURs that the Commission has adopted.

But if I may speak to the issue of dividing EACO, we have looked at that. We have looked at the idea of bringing the line south. We know perfectly well that you would produce not an adjustment to this map but a new map, an entirely new map of the State of Arizona. And I have to tell you that it was the impression I had, and I think the other members of the NDC team had, as a result of the hearings on August 9 through 11, that it was the Commission's sense that the map with the changes you wished would bear good witness to the principles the Commission adopted that the map with the adjustment would be the map the Commission would consider for adoption. Now if we are...
to look at the EACO splits, this will develop design of
a new Legislative District map. As you well said, sir,
there are 30 districts on this map. The change to some
involves change too many, indeed to all. Just this
morning, Doug and I looked at an EACO split alternative.
I said how many work. He said several days, because
we'd be designing 30 new districts. I did wish to say,
we felt we're following transcript testimony from you
with regard to Yavapai. Secondly, on the EACO split we
felt it anathema to the district which involves such
wholesale change.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'd like to remind
my fellow Commissioners, public hearings begin in nine
days. We have to have a map to the people of Arizona
long before that time. We cannot expect the people to
come to a public hearing tell us what they think unless
we look at them, let them review it with them, consider
it with them. If what Dr. Heslop is telling us is
correct, I think the best we can do at this point is
make modifications to the maps presented to us rather
than wholesale changes that involve wholesale changes.
There is time enough after the public comment for the
wholesale changes that need to be made. At that point,
there's time enough if they need to be made,
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instructions need to be made, if wholesale changes need
to be made.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: As additional changes,
we'll be addressing Yavapai and EACO. The Motion is
very specific, speaks to specific issues. In order to
move forward, eat the sandwich a bite at a time, I call
the question.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The question is called
for.

Further discussion?

If not, roll call.

Roll call.

Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: No.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Elder?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye"

Motion carries.

At this point we'll take a break, a

90-minute break, to allow the consultants to take
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an interactive look the state.

The Commission will stand in recess until that time.

(Recess taken from 12:33 until approximately 2:10 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will go back into session.

Let the record show all five Commissioners are present as well as counsel and consultants.

We all have the capability to see interactively the maps interactively. However, to do that we'll have to see the screen behind us. We tried to turn it around, but it's not big enough, so we'll have to turn our attention around to the interactive map.

Based on the conversation this morning, we probably ought to turn our attention to the Phoenix area and look at the area we started talking about this morning.

MR. JOHNSON: We want to focus on the larger area or four, five areas.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Have you done anything on the larger area?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's talk about the historic area.
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COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Yes, Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Could we have NDC describe changes peripheral to this, looking at the two, three other districts peripheral? I wanted to know about the two, three areas peripheral.

MS. LEONI: Could I make two, three comments?

In this area, the only change made is the change we were instructed to make to the historic district.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: In this instance, the unification of the last better term in the historic term only occurred between Districts S and R.

MS. LEONI: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Could you describe for us the demographic impact had on those districts, where they were before where they are as drawn.

MR. JOHNSON: The map we're looking at here with the botched district lines are the previous district lines. Look at District S. It is -- before we made the change, it was 51 percent Hispanic origin and 44 percent Hispanic voting age. When we make the change, the district is now 54 percent Hispanic
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population and 47.2 percent voting age.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: What was the other voting age, approximately?

Lisa, can you read it back to us?

(Read back.)

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: So both have gone up about three percent.

MR. JOHNSON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: District R.

MR. JOHNSON: District R, we have done an equivalent amount. However, it started, 62 -- it started at 59 percent Hispanic,

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: 59? I have 62.

MR. JOHNSON: 62.

MS. LEONI: 62.

MR. JOHNSON: And 53 -- about 53 percent voting age. So it still remains.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: From 62. And what voting age?

MR. JOHNSON: I think about 53 percent.

It may have a couple blocks in it. That's why it altered a bit from earlier numbers. It was the most heavily -- the strongest Hispanic percentage.

MS. LEONI: Commissioner Minkoff, if I may intervene, it originally started from 62.63 percent
Hispanic. Hispanic, 63.1, 63.17 Hispanic, let me correct that. I need to correct that. Voting age was 56.15, almost 57.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I want to make a motion we adopt changes reflected.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll second that motion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: In and of itself, as an isolated change, I think it's desirable. I'd support the motion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other discussion?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Question, call the question.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The question has been called for.

Roll call. Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

Let's move to the next problem area identified.

MR. JOHNSON: Does the Chair have a preference?

Tempe is probably the most convenient to go over to.

In this case, let's see if we have this drawn.

I believe in both cases it's showing the split of Tempe. I can zoom in and give more detail if you like.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Please.

MR. JOHNSON: Okay. Currently, if you see, you have the north part of the district is Scottsdale.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Uh-huh.

MR. JOHNSON: Then we have Tempe following the city lines on the west edge down to the 60 Highway. The only place where it comes down a little bit from the 60 Highway was -- there we go. This will help. This is to balance population equality right there. It essentially still the highway. Over in Mesa, this
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district currently encompasses this district in Mesa.
Currently zooming in, to give you a little detail on it,
I drew the street, 18th and I think Second Avenue. Let
me scroll over. Yes, it's Second Avenue in there.
The change that we were making, it has
been suggested, would be to trade off the Mesa portion
of this district. So that is the City of Mesa
highlighted there. So take this portion that we saw
before out of the district. It would join up with the
blue district. The blue district border would now come
up along the Mesa city line. What that would enable us
to have the pink District CC and pick up additional
population to the south.
When we looked at it, it is not sufficient
population to reach all the way to the city line, but it
would be all but the city line down there.
The swap that would then take place,
because this district, the Ahwatukee district here would
then be short on population, we'd pick up additional
pieces of Chandler.
When we looked at it, we determined we
could stay west of Dobson Road, which was Chandler's
concern. Great.
The circle, here, going in four districts,
chandler going north, and then pick up the Dobson Ranch
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portion of Mesa right here.

Somebody is trying to help me. Additional computer power.

Four districts are affected.

Primarily Mesa is the primary city affected. We'd unify the northern portion affected and divide the southern portion of Mesa affected.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion we adopt that change and include as much of Tempe in one district as possible.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd like to ask one question, if I may, Ms. Minkoff. I want to be clear. An area of one concern last week, which was answered this morning, though I want to be clear, ask a couple things:

Number one, this is unifying more of Mesa by this move?

MR. JOHNSON: Actually the population is divided, would stay the same. It's an even trade of two sections of Mesa.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mesa stays the same in terms of division.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: There's more of Tempe in terms of the district?

MR. JOHNSON: It's significantly closer.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's reducing the number of districts in which Chandler is divided, two, except for a very small bit of population to the extreme south.

MR. JOHNSON: Right. The split of Chandler would remain at the far western arm of Chandler. The portion of Chandler they testified is very important for them, the eastern portion of Chandler remains together.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The impact other than those three communities is zero?

MR. JOHNSON: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think this makes some sense. I think that the portion of Mesa that is put back into Mesa really fits much better there than with the district that has so much of Tempe in it. I think the Dobson Ranch area of Mesa is a very good fit with Chandler. It's not that much different, a newer portion of Mesa, seems to fit with a community like Chandler. I also think that the benefit of unifying most if not all of Tempe is very, very positive. I think that we're trying to split communities as little
as possible. And Tempe is unique among communities among our state. Demographically it's a very, very diverse community that has requested to be together.

Some individuals obviously disagreed, and we've received a fair amount of input. The majority of input at public outreach meetings, Maricopa and City of Tempe, is to keep us together. Even though we haven't been able to accomplish all of it, I think this is a positive change.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the motion? If not, roll call.

Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Aye.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

Motion carries five-zero.

Next area of concern.

Doug?

MR. JOHNSON: The Commission voted on the Northern District. Is there interest in looking at it interactive?
CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think the sense is we looked at it earlier this morning, or this afternoon, by the time we voted on it.

MR. JOHNSON: There was discussion earlier about the area of Winslow involved. I can pull that up here. I already changed it here.

Census blocks here are what you see, and the reservation line here is in red. The numbers that are showing is population lines of each census block. To the level of information this provides we can roughly estimate the area of Winslow.

Let me darken the city lines so you can see that a little better.

This is the incorporated City of Winslow. As you can see when I zoom in, there are census blocks nearby that have census blocks in them.

What we were attempting to do by making it contiguous along here, and the question we faced, are these areas people that live near Winslow, when we consider that portion, the 160 people in this block or that happen to be geographically close to that, really the only way is to get somebody close to the community to know where that line should be drawn.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: As I recall, the instruction I gave before the break did not involve
Winslow, the Hopi Reservation into the northern, and
taking out --

COMMISSIONER HALL: Dolan Springs and
Golden Valley.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Something like
that. If Winslow were to stay or go, that might have to
wait until public comment during the hearings.

Can we see the changes that putting Hopi
Reservation in and taking out those two Mohave County
communities have may?

MR. JOHNSON: My apologies for any
confusion, the questions about that at the time.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Did that keep the
district in balance or come up more less somewhere to
keep it conceptually somewhere to keep it in the right
number?

MS. LEONI: Commissioner Elder, the
numbers we're looking at this morning included the
Winslow switch. We now eliminated that which was done
on the lunch break. We're about to see the numbers now.

MR. JOHNSON: The details, when I zoom in,
are on the other side. The details, as Marguerite said,
are just about there. The details, we're about 1,300
people short. A little of the blue area here will need
to return, also. But you can see the area of Dolan
Springs, Golden Valley, and then down here, this is
actually, we're still working on getting that part out,
is unified in the river district.

You can see how this follows the city
border around, around the edge of Kingman, and around
the edge of New Kingman here. When we complete the move
we'll follow the edge of New Kingman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If I understand, all
incorporated Kingman and all New Kingman will be in a
new district. The two communities are in the western
district.

MR. JOHNSON: That's correct. The 1,300
people we need to still move for population equality we
have actually looked for in the blue unincorporated
area.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: You think that can
be easily done without impacting on the two communities
we just moved out?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Fine.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Let's look at the
numbers.

MR. JOHNSON: These are the numbers for
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the northern district. Let's go down to the percentages here.

The Native American percentage is now 66.03, and the Native American voting age percentage is now 61.027.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Say that again?

Voting age percentage.

MS. LEONI: Voting age percentage is 61.027. So this is now an improvement over the district which you saw this morning.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Believe you started 62 percent.

MS. LEONI: This is an improvement of four points. The Winslow margin left 62.087. We rounded it up to 267. This is 66.03 total without the Winslow switch.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Ms. Leoni and counsel, do you have recommendations or would you like to maybe --

MS. LEONI: Can you give me a moment to talk with your counsel?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Please. While doing that, would you minding go over by Flag?

MR. JOHNSON: Sure.

COMMISSIONER HALL: The Census tract,
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there seems to be a Census tract to the east of Flag not part of Flag. My understanding is there's a thousand Native Americans that live there.

MR. JOHNSON: This one? That's correct, 1,052.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Is that my understanding, that would affect the City of Flagstaff?

MR. JOHNSON: It just barely touches the northern pieces here, working on the block level, and would affect all --

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion we add that northern portion to the block line.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I second that but ask it be identified.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's moved and seconded we add that Census tract.

Is there any other way to identify the area?

MR. JOHNSON: I can give you the tract number.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I make the motion simply for the point of discussion, Mr. Chairman. I realize the ramifications. I feel it's the most expeditious manner to move through this. I would like to, quite frankly, adopt the motion of the Northern
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Arizona District and receive feedback from all neighboring communities relative for that.

Here is another example of a potential adjustment area.

I think, you know, if you do this adjustment, for example, somehow find another alternative way to reduce population another way, I think there are other opportunities for the potential Native American voice to be properly heard. I simply site one example. There are probably others, several others.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Well, I would suggest, again, this level of change at this point may not be the appropriate time to make it. But the motion has been made and seconded, so we are in discussion on the motion. Frankly, I would prefer to just note that this is not a unique situation but rather a situation that we will find ourselves in throughout the map where minor adjustments of this kind can create effects that we are trying to achieve whether it's in voting strength, competitiveness, or whatever the issues are, the kind of changes that can allow us to give impact on the map as it can.

COMMISSIONER HALL: With that, with Ms. Minkoff's permission, I'll withdraw the motion.
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COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll withdraw the second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Leoni, now you've had a chance to consult with counsel.

MS. LEONI: We agree this is a configuration that can go out for public comment recognizing public input will be crucial to finetuning final changes made. We are also anticipating in the near future additional voting pattern information to help make that information.

Have I misstated that, Ms. Hauser?

MS. HAUSER: Pardon me?

MS. LEONI: Have I misstated that?

MS. HAUSER: No.

COMMISSIONER HALL: To that, from Flagstaff, Tuba City, we'll hear ample information regarding that subject wherein we'll have ample opportunity to make an intelligent decision.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right. We've already voted on the northern district as modified.

MR. JOHNSON: The next area to look at would be Yavapai, a similar area, actually. There is some interconnection between these issues.

The particular area we're focusing on here is the Prescott Valley portion.
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COMMISSIONER HALL: Doug, zoom out so I get a little perspective and zoom back in one or two more clicks.

MR. JOHNSON: If I highlight the county line, it might help here, too.

There's a lot of information on this map, obviously. The Yavapai, Maricopa line is right along the south here, and Yavapai County comes up. Sedona is right here, southwest of Flagstaff. The county line comes up. The county line continues up into the reservation, slow growth of the county map.

The districts we're looking at are here. The blue is the river district coming over a little bit. One thing I should note, this blue piece coming in shrinks as we pick more of Kingman up into the new district. There's a tradeoff as it comes around.

What we're looking at here is actually a more recent version as we work on the map.

Let me go back. It's a little clearer.

Nope. That's too old.

The slide I showed you this morning, Paulden, Chino Valley, these all trigger around. That was under the scenario where Winslow was included in the northern district, blue district. Winslow would have to come around and take part of one of these.
We are, as we mentioned this morning, working hard to not split any one of any individual cities.

Taking Hopi into one, and Kingman, get out one of these two, one remains. I'll read the names. Williamson is in blue. Prescott in the blue. Prescott Valley in the green and Dewey Humboldt in the pink.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I ask again, ladies and gentlemen, turn your cellphones off.

MR. JOHNSON: This is a key area of influx for a lot of reasons. Actually changes to be discussed in Tucson may impact the Maricopa district to some degree as well. So I think, in fact, correct me if I'm wrong on this, I think we wanted to be sure to inform you on this, there's a lot of impact on this area, and get direction from you if this was acceptable or one of the alternatives proposed more acceptable such as dividing Flagstaff.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: I like all of this, whenever central areas seem to be divided, and referring to some of the comments that have been made previously, I think, however, there are a couple perspectives one must take on the subject. One must be, certainly I would be interested to hear, effectively this area would
have tripled it's representation. In light of the massive amount of representation, per se, relative to a rural area, that certainly may be a situation that would give increased clout to this particular area.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: For clarity, would you again go over the alternatives you are again asking us to consider, one of which you alluded to in terms of dividing Flagstaff?

MR. JOHNSON: The Flagstaff question: What are the driving complications, other population we have to work with outside Yavapai, to make that a complete district, which is overwhelmingly centered in the City of Flagstaff?

As you know, the city is very large and areas around it are almost uninhabited except for smaller towns along the road. There is not a lot of room to work to try keep different communities separate and unified, unified within themselves, separate from each other, which means to try to get to the right population number.

Looking at this, one option would be to divide Flagstaff, get flexibility on population, move around these districts, perhaps the river district, come up to the north. We haven't developed exactly how that would work. Perhaps the Native American majority
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district up north would come up allowing us to pick up
Flagstaff, allowing us to pick up Kingman. I guess that
was one alternative.

Oh, that's right.
The other alternative, and one the
Commission had asked us to look at when we ran into this
Yavapai problem back with the tourist problem back with
EACO, we did look at problems there. Because EACO
counties are smaller, did divide multiple counties of
EACO. Obviously there are options there.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Just for perspective's
sake, what is the current situation with respect to
Legislative Districts in Yavapai County?

MR. JOHNSON: Actually, I can pull this
up.

I think I have the maps and data here.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Currently districts
one, two, and five.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: In this district,
would it do things terrible? If we do things we should
do, it's all been a good education, we can't achieve
perfection everywhere. This area has been sliced and
diced into three pieces to solve problems that arise in
other areas. This is intimately connected to the
situation in Kingman. As we've talked about, that's an
area added that's onto the extreme western end of that
northern district. Demographics are different.
Demographically it's far removed from the political
center of that district where it's going to be, and I
think that's part and parcel of this same problem. I
don't think either of those are acceptable situations.

Now, as a quote from Shakespeare was
indicated, it does depend on what the alternative was,
as indicated.

Before I could vote conscientiously in
favor of this, which, by the way, so we understand each
other, I don't criticize the consultants for putting
this on the screen. This is a logical outcome of some
of the other decisions we have made. And we have
painted ourselves into a corner. This graphically
illustrates how this appears on the map. I would like
to see the alternative.

You say it would involve some splitting of
EACO. But I would like to know exactly -- I would like
to know what that entails.

We've discussed several alternatives that
would involve, have some effect on EACO. But I think we
have the obligation to look at that. I want to clarify
just one point. I think there was a misunderstanding.

And I want to say again to the consultants again what my
understanding is regarding counties and AURs.

I think I said this correctly before. I may have misspoken so I'll say it again. Counties are already given priority by proposition by 106. It is therefore a redundancy to call them a community of interest. Community of interest is a redundancy of 106.

There's a political entity calling themself a community of interest under 106. No way did I mean a system, nor did I think political entities unimportant or shouldn't keep them in mind, as well. I think this configuration appears to me to reflect a misunderstanding on that point.

We have divided this political subdivision into three pieces in order to keep a political subdivision, AUR, intact. That priority does not arise from Proposition 106, certainly does not arise from any decision I intended to take. I personally feel before I could vote for this, if we compromised a bit over on the other end to solve some problems on the other end over here.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Almost surprise

surprise.

Could you zoom out and pick up the
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southern part, also. Now maybe zoom in. What is it further south.

I'm sorry, actually picking up like the Maricopa County edge. I want to see what is at the bottom of this.

MR. JOHNSON: Coming up here, this is Peoria, New River, the Sun City area.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Could you drag into that Sun City area. I want to zoom in to that area.

MR. JOHNSON: Sun City, Sun City West, Peoria, Surprise, Buckeye, following around. This point up here is the Phoenix line, coming over to the edge of Cave Creek.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I guess my comments, some in held pieces, some pieces, some pieces we could manage or micromanage, don't affect micromanagement. If you took Sun City and dropped it down into the T2, take it out there, add Prescott Valley, and make more it contiguous with Yavapai, the T2 compensate, or reverse that, in any case, I think quite a few edges needs to be taken a look at.

I'm in agreement with Mr. Hall, we probably ought to go ahead in this instance and go out and find out. We did hear correctly, Mingus Mountain, the original, unifying the community, hearing other
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things, look at the public, get more information, go
ahead with it as it is there.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is that a motion?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Do we need a motion
to leave it as it is?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We're dealing with each
with motions as it is. As the consultants raised, they
need direction as to each of the areas. Maybe if not
making changes, we can move on, deal with it all at
once. That would probably work just as well.

If there isn't a motion for any change at
this time, let's move on to the next district.

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: We need to summarize a
point. The consultants said two options. One is a
division in Flagstaff. The other is annihilation of
EACO. The consultants have looked at that. I can say
personally, I've had personal sessions and on my own
looked at it, what is driving the cart, looking at it,
what is driving the cart is strict compliance with the
Voting Rights Act. That's what is driving Northeast
Arizona. We are able to accommodate communities of
interest to the best extent possible.

There are a variety of options, if we look
at them. The ramifications, if you look at the other
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options, most especially the division, the ripple effect, as stated earlier by the consultants, is a completely new map which I think does not represent any communities of interest. So in light of that, I would, I feel like we do need to have a motion.

I want to make a motion, present this portion of the plan as it is shown as part of our draft map.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: It's very important to me, if there is something that shows what the ripple effects are, that I have the opportunity to see it. What I am hearing is a contradiction. I'm hearing we don't have anything and it would take a long time to create it. But what I thought Mr. Hall said is we do have something and we've seen it. Could someone tell me if we do have something? If so, I'd like to look at it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Heslop.

DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Huntwork, we have at a conceptual level, not once, but at a conceptual level looked at ways to adjust EACO, replace
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EACO. We've never drawn a complete map to reflect either the adjustment or dismemberment of EACO.

We could share with you, with a little preparation, at a conceptual level, what we see as the major change.

We could perhaps in a little longer show you some of the results of detailed adjustments to EACO.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, if this --

Number one, I think it's important to say that the obligation is on us as Commissioners to see this information and understand it. It's not the consultants as the gatekeeper and we are to take their word for this. I need to see that information at least before I can vote on this motion.

Secondly, the implication is at the conceptual level you must have seen something so devastating I will be able to see it, too, and, therefore, we will not need to go to the more detailed level. I will be interested in seeing the presentation up to that point and then presumably we would all reasonably agree that is as bad as you seem to be implying and adopt this with a clear conscience. I can't delegate the responsibility for making that with a clear conscience. I need to see it for myself.
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MS. LEONI: Commissioner Huntwork, I need to make it clear, we've never been instructed to break up EACO. And we have not done so for that reason. This testing that occurs is in response to other changes that are made. We look at a variety of options to accomplish the directives of the Commission. Many have led to EACO. We've not brought them back here because we've not been instructed in that direction.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Heslop.

DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Huntwork, I should also say that really, to understand, at the level that I think you are asking for understanding, the consequences of a major change to EACO, we would have to draw a completely new map. It would be a very different map from the one that you now have.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I understand that. I believe that is the correct answer. I also believe it is inaccurate to say, and we should correct the record to make it clear, no one has checked what would happen if we did go into EACO. And no one has verified that would indeed not result in an overall satisfactory map for the State of Arizona. We haven't done it. The consultant has not done it because they've felt they've not been instructed not to do it.
haven't done it.

Is that not correct?

DR. HESLOP: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion on the motion.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I think we have the capability to play whatever "what if" questions with our computer.

I call the question.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The question has been called for.

Mr. Huntwork?

MR. HUNTWORK: I want to respect it's called.

I think there's a broader question here. In my mind, has to do with the schedule, the immediate schedule and long-term schedule. If there is a significant possibility that we're going to change our own minds and make substantial changes to the maps, big, substantial changes, not fine-tuning, changes that affect the overall scope of the map in broad detail, then we might have to schedule another whole round of hearings in order to obtain public input on changes in addition to the round we have coming up at this time.

As long as there is such a possibility, I
would personally prefer to delay the upcoming hearings by a week, if that's what it takes, in order to flush out the alternatives so that we can really choose between them and make our own best decision as to what we think we're going to do.

I don't want to send out a map for that much public comment at this point that has a substantial likelihood of being radically changed.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Whatever map we send out has the likelihood of being dramatically changed. Whatever likelihood it has has the likelihood of being changed. With the amount of publicity the next round of hearings has received, it's a serious mistake to the public if we change them. We have to be committed to going ahead with them. We have to understand, bite bullet, and understand at the end of the public hearings we'll be making significant changes.

If we go out to a third or fourth round of public hearings, unless we're unwilling to listen to people, it always changes at public hearings. It's a more open process than ever before. Ultimately the decision is ours.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: On the motion, the question has been called.
Roll call. Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "No."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Yes."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Yes."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Yes."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "yes."

Motion carries four-one.

Next area, please.

MR. JOHNSON: The next and final area does end up affecting Pinal County.

Let me focus first on Pinal County.

We described issues and concerns this morning. Really there are two approaches to take to addressing these concerns. I'll open it up to the Chair, if the Commission prefers, or whatever the Commission prefers.

There are two sets of concerns in this map, the previous districts and the ones we came back with from the latest set of instructions with. And we could attempt to alter this area. And working from either one as a starting point, I think what we're specifically looking at, from the Commission on, and
looking for any direction they have, is on this
direction of moving the district back into Tucson.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Which district?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Leoni.

MS. LEONI: I want to remind the
Commission on two points made on this morning's Power
Point. This modification did result in loss of the
Tucson district, number one. Number two, we highlighted
for your attention a rearrangement of the minority
districting and asked you to consider that in future
decisions you made in regard to decisions here. This
arrangement includes two districts.

Can I see numbers? Is it I and H, Doug?

Yeah, right, they are approximately 50 Hispanic
minority.

The other alternative we brought back to
you this morning rearranged that voting strength so one
voting district is at around 50 percent and one is
around 30. In a moment I can give you precise numbers.

Can you give me the numbers on the voting
district? Is it H and I?

The rearrangement of voting strength is in
TT and in J. And TT is now significantly higher. And
obviously this is not the only issue in Tucson. We want
to continue to note for your consideration the loss of a
Tucson district.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: When talking about a district moving from Tucson, it's obviously a place where a district went to, or the flip side of that, to illustrate from two sides of the maps, one for the Tucson area maps, or three in and one up to Saddlebrooke. Where the other went is Casa Grande, Pinal County, up to the -- up into the Fort McDowell and Salt River Reservations.

In the other approach, this is a little older than the most recent version other I showed you at the last presentation, the green comes over and takes in Gila Bend and Ajo as well.

This is an area we received considerable public comment on, including some very helpful comment today to help guide us in this.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: This, we have a macro issue, a configuration in the southern part of state.

Tucson has predominantly three, four core issues, core issues of interest. The other is where lines are drawn, communities of interest, as defined in earlier testimony today, or previous testimony before the Commission in one form or another.
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The difficulty I'm having, and I live here, so I can imagine how others are feeling, is that for the first time I feel we have far too many maps and far too many changes to contemplate without being able to see in detail what we're talking about in order to give you appropriate instruction. It's very clear to me that District L in the previous map are unacceptable districts for a number of reasons. Changes made in support of the motion resulted, in part, in the map shown earlier today. You refer to it as a map that had the District E, or whatever it would be, in that map, the green district to the west, configured slightly different from this one, insofar as it would take -- that's a more correct representation.

MR. JOHNSON: Kind of puts it in here.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Can we get to something in between? I'll tell if I like it or not. Show me something in between. I can't tell if I like it or not.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, we're currently developing a plan that put out addressing a fifth district into Tucson and accommodating the concerns in the macro area, as you put it.

I think what we're looking for is confirmation of the Commission's desire to return that district to Tucson, not forgetting the concerns with the
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earlier version, and trying to find a way to bridge the
two, a direction to bridge that approach and develop the
map in detail.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: So for my edification,
I'm wondering if we can kind of summarize, if you will,
in just a tad bit more detail, when you say the previous
conscerns, middle concerns, the last concerns, what we're
saying.

MR. JOHNSON: Let me start with the first
map. This is the dreaded L.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

MR. JOHNSON: I don't think anyone
foresees returning. The Casa Grande community also
expressed concerns about this map, not only the Maricopa
portion, how their concern was divided, how their
community was divided.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay.

MR. JOHNSON: The second map was similar
to this except E, the green district, had less of a
piece of Tucson. It was still taking in the Tohono
O'odham, and a little bit of southern Tucson, but it
dropped some of that reservation and picked up the Ajo
southern Maricopa sections, which is what we had as an
in-progress map last time we presented this to you.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

MR. JOHNSON: On the L side, we've taken this out of Maricopa. Part of the reason for this being in progress, we had not determined where it would go in there. The latest version --

COMMISSIONER HALL: Hold it. I'm interested in the reaction regarding E, where we configured at as regards this one. Is there some feedback or --

Mr. Chairman, did you have feedback on that, not this version of E, later feedback of E?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Not specifically until I determine how it interacts with everything else.

Interaction of everything, one part of E, absent one portion of E with everything else. I can't do that.

Again, to put a point on it, if you are developing, along the lines of everything you've already been given, the direction you've already been given the Commission and from testimony, when might we see that alternative?

And let me help your discussions.

My intent, because of some specific needs of members of the Commission, is to call a dinner recess at about 5:00 p.m. and to reconvene at about 7:00 p.m.

Or let me it this way, if I were to do that, how would
that help?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I believe we could get it done following a dinner break, along those lines.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If we extended that dinner break sooner, would that accommodate it sooner? I'm trying for a lot of reasons to get as much done today as soon as possible, not the least of which are the public hearings we've committed to. The sooner we have the map drawn, the sooner people can analyze it and give us the benefit of information on it.

I think it's difficult, speaking only of myself, it's difficult to give more direction than you have, without seeing a map in progress that might resolve more of the issues important in this part of the state.

MR. JOHNSON: I think we could get you something with four, five issues.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: You need four, five hours to create that alternative for us, to create that alternative?

MR. JOHNSON: We should be able to do it in four.

This will actually, the northern issues of this, impacts into the northern Yavapai area. We
anticipate minimal impact. Yes, we should be able to do it in four hours.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm not sure we have four hours at this stage of the process. That's your good faith estimate of what it would take, so that's fine. I don't know what discussion we can give you on Tucson without looking at that alternative.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: One thing I've been relatively silent on, deferring to people from Tucson, the University of Tucson issue.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think the revised map, some of those changes are in progress.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I've been told we need to make those requests in the public form. I'd like to at least take a look at, and I pose this question primarily to Marguerite and our attorneys. It almost makes a lot of sense whatever it turns out to be, trade with the Casa Grande area, where you end up with the area horizontally, end up going around before, green, going around. The problem is not going to end up matching with the Hispanic numbers and the Native American numbers.

I'd like at least to take a look at it.
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It does have Hispanic in it, whether close to balancing -- not Yavapai, yeah. Pinal County, including Casa Grande County, plus areas up in here. I think that is one area that we should look at. I don't know whether we can make the Voter's Rights Act and all that work, look at it and say here's why it won't or will work.

And I think after that, Doug, if we zoom in, give more, or my perceptions and more of the Tucson area, zoom in from about there to about there. We had -- Tucson is considerably different than the Phoenix area in that I want to say we have more geographical boundaries that somewhat match district populations than Phoenix does, it seems like. We heard testimony this morning that the area from, you know, I-10 and the railroad, in there, that this part is a fairly strong community of interest. So that's from I-10 north and the railroad south. I'd like to take a look at, I don't know which way it makes sense with the voting numbers, or whatever, see what happens with that central district.

Right now we have an area, just like Phoenix, the historic area from the Presidio, almost I-10, Baronito, fairly old communities, to the University, a designated historic community, south,
Broadway, my mother-in-law was born in, from 1912, 1913, I'm not quite sure what her birthday was. That area runs south, that area, keep the historic area, various boroughs and that together would be helpful. Outside of that, the other thing I have, areas of the river that we have two miles, a mile and a half, two miles, no crossing, as the corridors would have it, one to one can't climb up it or down it, no social communication from one side of the river to another.

If we look at areas south of the river and bring them into the mid part of town and areas north of the river that, you know, stay north of the river, it seems like that would probably be good from the numbers situation.

Outside of that, the only other thing in the newer plan is a very long, cigar-shaped area. The freeway does link, but the freeways do function.

If the rivers give us edges that would be helpful, also. Those are comments on Tucson.

Last one, the mountain range, Catalina, the area in held here, forest land, Saguaro National Monument, Tanque Verde Monument, Sabano Canyon, that Tanque Verde area is almost a contiguous piece of Tucson.

We heard many times from Cochise, the
outlying areas did not want to be with Tucson. We
figured we were rural. They were rural, not urban, that
we would remove them from rural-urban issues of Cochise,
take them out of social economic issues of Cochise.
Those are areas I'd like to take a look at with NDC with
NDC on revisions with NDC and why on that issue.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Does that square in the
main on areas you were intending to look at anyway in
terms of alternative anyway for Tucson?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes. Appreciate the
information.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there further input on
this particular issue, Tucson issue? Are there other
areas of the state that we have not yet addressed, or is
this the last one?

MR. JOHNSON: This is the last of the five
we presented this morning. Then let me make a
suggestion. It's 3:30 this morning. If we were to give
you until 7:30 to finish the Tucson portion, and please
correct me, members of the Commission, if I'm wrong, but
I believe once having dealt with this part of the state;
we'll have dealt with five problem areas that were dealt
with by the five consultants that might be prepared to
prepared to talk about adoption of draft legislative
districts. There might be other things to talk about,
given that's generally the case.

Would it be appropriate to ask the
consultants to discuss their work, for us to take care
of any other business that does not involve the
consultants, to complete our work for the afternoon,
break, and reconvene at 7:30?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Excellent idea.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right.
MS. LEONI: Commissioner, it will take a
few moments to mobilize upstairs.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's time to take a
10-minute break anyway. We can do that while you do
that and then proceed.

Let's stand in recess.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Did you not say we
were going to stand in recess?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's take a 10-minute
break and we'll be back.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken from
3:30 p.m. until approximately 3:45 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will come
to order.

Let the record show all five members of
the Commission are present along with legal staff along
with Commission staff.
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I'd like to take other items.
I'd like to take other items, and the
public comment period, a third public comment period.
If there are no other items, we'll break
until 7:30, reconvening, and then take up the five other
areas we're dealing with.
Let's take item V.

COMMISSIONER HALL: The Commission is
aware there's been an issue with Mr. Echeveste.
Therefore, we had some additional personnel issues to
work out with respect to his personnel matters in that
regard. Therefore, to date he had not received a pay
adjustment under his new responsibilities as the
Executive Director of our Commission.

Therefore, I would like to make a motion
that as those other issues have now been addressed and
taken care of, we would adjust Mr. Echeveste's salary to
$95,000 a year annualized.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Would you clarify the
effective date of that motion?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Effective date of that
motion would be, I think that's today, is it not,
Adolfo?

MR. ECHEVESTE: Whatever the whole pay
COMMISSIONER ELDOR: Retroactive to the current pay period.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Retroactive to August 1st.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Next pay period.

COMMISSIONER HALL: This is the first of the pay period.

MS. HAUSER: The next first pay period.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Annualized first full pay period. It's moved and seconded.

Any discussion?

It's moved seconded. Any discussion?

All in favor, say "aye."

(Vote taken.)

(Motion carried.)

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'd move that legal counsel is instructed there be additional compensation for additional expenses he's incurred by reason of the rapid pace and extreme distances that his job requires.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, before there's a second on that motion, I think there needs to be some clarification that we're talking about a manner of reimbursement rather than compensation.

COMMISSIONER HALL: That's correct. I
apologize, Ms. Hauser.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: An expense reimbursement mechanism.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: All commensurate with the appropriate governing laws and regulations.

Discussion on the motion?

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

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Motion carries unanimously.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Still under item III, I guess, of the agenda, I'm wondering what we expect to come out of tonight. Are we going to have a presentation by the consultants, I guess, a conceptual plan by the five districts centering on Tucson, but will they have an opportunity, tonight, to actually draw those districts, or are we merely going to see this concept in more detail and have a map developed to the same degree as the rest of our map, adoption at a later time.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: My understanding, with the
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break, we're going to take the map we will see tonight which will have sufficient detail to compare with the rest of the map we've looked at. That's my understanding of what we're going to see tonight.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Let me ask. I tabled the issue for minority-majority districts in Phoenix. In my mind, that was as important, it is a comparable issue and comparable decision to the one we are thinking about making with respect to Tucson. And I would like to see that issue explored before we put out a map for public discussion. I'm not quite sure why, but the consultant indicated it would take days to produce that map yet only hours to produce a new map with comparable detail focusing on Tucson. I'm not quite sure why that was, in any event. The issues in my mind are very comparable. I don't want to -- I really don't want to put out a map that fails to give our best analysis to central regions of Phoenix.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: And, therefore?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think I'm just discussing what we're about here right now. What is the timing?

Are we really -- are we really looking at putting -- at adopting a map tonight for presentation to the citizens of the State of Arizona?
CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think we're looking at adopting a map either tonight or tomorrow, either of which, if the information from consultants, as you describe it, would allow for a complete remapping of the districts in Phoenix for discussion purposes prior to that time.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: There really, there's another area of the state, as indicated earlier, where I also have grave doubts about whether we have fully considered all of the options. And that also would take some time to really evaluate. I have looked at options to that on my computer as best I can. But as the consultants have pointed out very emphatically, it takes even them days to flesh out that plan, and it's not something that it's feasible for us to do.

My feeling is it's very important for us to do it. So I would like to, personally, delay things, be given the opportunity to really prepare the plan for Tucson in detail, be given the opportunity to develop the alternative plan for Central Phoenix in detail, and be given the opportunity to explore alternatives that might solve the problems in Kingman and in Prescott Valley, at least to the point of seeing what other problems that might lead to before we put a plan out for consideration by the citizens of Arizona.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is that a motion?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes. I'll make it a motion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

Hearing no second.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I was going to respond to it. If there's no motion on the floor, I don't need to.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there any other matter we need to discuss before call to the public?

This is the time for consideration and discussion of comments and complaints from the public. Those wishing to address the commission shall request permission in advance by filling out a speaker slip. Action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter or rescheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date unless it is the subject of an item already on the agenda.

First is Mr. Hartdegen.

MR. HARTDEGEN: I know you are probably getting tired of me for public speaking.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: You should get college credit.

MR. HARTDEGEN: It would look good on my

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
I feel like an inch worm across the road.

In Pinal, the Pinal County plan, Mr. Kingsbury, I'm glad you asked for public comment, I'm afraid if later it would be too late. The little piece between south, western Pinal County south in Gila Indian River Communities north of Tohono O'odham, the little piece of the pie that touches the western south of the pie that touches south.

In some way, I know you have to deal, if you haven't already, with the Ak-Chin community. If you put that slice back in Pinal County to the Maricopa County line to the west. I think most of us would be very happy. Not unless the consultants come back with another rendering of what they are doing. We'd be very happy. That little slice taken out on the map earlier today, you cut the Casa Grande elementary school district, and cut the Santa Cruz, and Casa Grande union high school district, and people in Maricopa, Stan Fielding High School, those people in the part of the county do have a lot common with Casa Grande, go to hospitals there. If unlucky enough to die, they go to the mortuary, if unlucky enough to get pregnant, they are lucky enough to go to the hospital, not in the city limits. Have tremendous Tucson ties, have more ties.
than the citizens on the east side of Scottsdale than
consultants asked to be put in the districts, cousins,
and whatnot. If you think about that when the
information comes back, I'd appreciate it.

               CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hartdegen put it,
define the slice.

               MR. HARTDEGEN: If I looked at the map,
right south of the Gila River Indian Community north of
Tohono O'odham, north of Borrow Road, Casa Grande city
limits, the Ak-Chin Reservation, an odd pie-shaped.

               CHAIRMAN LYNN: The next speaker, Anne
Murray, vice president of the Broadmoor Broadway
Village.

               A VOICE: She thought you would not have
testimony until tonight.

               COMMISSIONER ELDER: I did tell her that.

               CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'll save her and she'll
have an opportunity later.

               Any other business until what will turn
out to be a lengthy dinner break?

               CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Kingsbury, if that's
your wish.

               MR. KINGSBURY: I'd like to thank the
board for the consideration -- excuse me. My voice, for
the consideration, you've done an excellent job, and

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
it's a fair job. One of the things you and I just
mentioned, bringing the communities together.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Kingsbury.

MR. KINGSBURY: We'll always have time for
comments like that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will stand
in recess until 7:30 this evening.

(Recess taken at 4:14 p.m. until
approximately 7:57 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will come
to order. Let the record show we finally have five
Commissioners present.

May we have a report from the consultants,
please.

Dr. Heslop, please.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, members of the
Commission, as we promised, we have worked on the Tucson
problem since you recessed. We have failed to produce a
complete map. We're sorry for this. But the problem is
complex. And as we have all been learning, the
problems, the big problems, affect all parts of the map.

So we come before you with the Tucson districts in
outline form. We cannot produce a complete map this
evening. We are confident if we work through the night,
we will have a map for you tomorrow morning at 8:00 a.m.
I realize that this imposes a great strain on the Commission, and it is a matter of our sincere regret. There is nothing that we can do about it.

Our suggestion, Mr. Chairman, is that you let us show to you the outlines of the Tucson districts so that we can be sure that we are on the right track, and if we are, we then go away and work that plan up and go into final form.

We are confident we can not only do that but that at around 7:30 we can have a diskette for our associate, Tim Johnson, who can run the data for you so that you will have a map and the data almost simultaneously.

So, Mr. Chairman, what we'd like to do with your permission is show you the outline of our Tucson configuration, get that from you. If you may, we'll get your reactions to that, and then also present to you findings that we have in response to other questions that were posted to us with regard to district P and Districts E and L.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection?

Proceed, Dr. Heslop.

DR. HESLOP: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: As we discussed earlier
today, micro macro issues on Tucson, micro macro
dependent, haven't spent on macro in Tucson. Roughly,
very roughly, working on rough issues of Tucson, clearly
staying out of urban areas and working to keep the Casa
Grande at least with Gila Bend, we were unable to keep
it with eastern Pinal. Let me keep it with where the
main focus of work where was this evening. You can see
similar to the original map. Zoom in on the downtown
map, where we discussed a number of features.

You can see a number of streets and things
here. This is the University area, we've been unified
with the district coming in from the west, have the
freeway coming in here. We discussed with the
University District and railroad tracks and University
area.

This is the ugly inlet still being worked
on. The main goal was to get the railroad track
identified. Up to the north, this the area that has
been significantly revised. Let me zoom a little bit so
you have a bit of a sense where we are here. You have
the foothills district, foothills area which is back
especially to Casas Adobas and Catalina Foothills,
coming to where Catalina Foothills comes together.

And District H, the green district, comes
together only where the City of Tucson comes across the
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river. It comes together where the river comes across
the river.

One thing we're trying, we're not sure how
it will balance, where numbers balance, we talked about
Tanque Verde, how it balances, those things, Cochise.
Those things, Tanque Verde belongs more with Cochise.
It's difficult to balance. While we can't put in
Catalina Foothills without splitting, we're trying to
put it in with Saddlebrooke Foothills. It fails the can
you drive from here to there. We can't promise it will
remain once we're equalizing population on the map.

To give you a sense of the current
challenges we've been wrestling with, a majority of the
population, voting strength we discussed earlier, we're
well on the way to being addressed with.

This district has been strengthened,
currently 20, 25 thousand people overpopulated. Those
will come off the western parts. And those will be more
populated into the Tucson city area which will improve
cohesiveness and community flavor well, communicating
well in almost suburbs up here, and the agricultural
town, from the town here.

Otherwise in the town, population needs to
move, space is the east end of what is District H.

This is -- we worked so hard to focus on
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getting H to have cohesiveness around communities around
the river, this part we need to address because now it's
significantly overpopulated as well. Trade-offs around
this, the district is coming around Saddlebrooke, or the
Air Force District still needs to be done. This gives a
sense of where the areas need to end up.

This area will be south of the river. The
Air Force Base will be south of here. The Air Force
Base as we discussed as well has moved over to 12, in
this area. This actually worked out fairly well. The
tradeoff portion below the freeway here, in exchange for
the University and Historic Districts over here, moving
in with the district from the west. So that is working
towards the goals that have been described, gives you a
sense of the progress we've been able to make so far.
We're fairly pleased with it. This path will get us
toward communities in Tucson and voting rights
questions. Obviously those two are clearly related.

The larger question of Casa Grande, again,
we're attempting to go to the proposal that was fairly
warmly received by just about all parties, keeping Casa
Grande with Ajo, Tohono O'odham, if not possible to keep
with Pinal; also the question before the urban
reservations, and whether they and the group were
separated. That will be very difficult to tell before
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we get more population balancing in districts.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: This looks like the return of District L now labeled E and the problem before if coming back is still the problem.

MR. JOHNSON: Definitely a concern. No plan can take any metropolitan problem before we keep out of Maricopa keep out of Apache Junction and --

DR. HESLOP: Gold Canyon.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Then you have an issue if trying to unite for urban reservations.

MR. JOHNSON: Right.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The way you have to do it is through Apache Junction.

MR. JOHNSON: Right.

If we -- this is all very theoretical at this point.

If we do unite them, my suspicion is it will be through the Tohono O'odham District coming around, and somehow the Pinal District will spin down and pick them up. It's all very theoretical.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: How do you connect them to reservations east of Scottsdale, which is what they were asking for.

The Gila River Indian Community is asking.
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to be with the Salt River Pima River Reservation, not
down towards the Tohono O'odham, but east of Scottsdale.

MR. JOHNSON: Again, it's very theoretical
at this point, if that were the scenario to happen.
This district is more or less, have the Tohono O'odham
piece in Tucson. Virtually nothing else in Tucson, that
conceptually allows us to swing around Apache Junction.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Apache Junction can
entirely be within Maricopa County.

MR. JOHNSON: Right.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Within Maricopa
County District.

MR. JOHNSON: That's the goal. It has its
own complications.

MR. JOHNSON: That's where we're aiming to
be with this area. It's completely dependent, the end
result of balancing out populations. It can't go south.
Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Let's take a look back at Tucson a little
bit, from about that size and perspective.

I think we're probably moving the right
direction from this morning's map. I think there's a
couple things we look at like the Casas Adobas. With
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the exception of people that passed petitions for
incorporation, I wager not five percent of the
population can describe where Casas Adobas, where that
is. It's not incorporated and is almost homogeneous. I
guess I'd like to take a look at it. I don't know the
population of Tanque Verde is, the whole area slid east,
Tanque Verde slid up, put Tanque Verde, slide it up,
have it more contiguous, more uniform. That would be
one thing to look at. I asked before the break to look
at the area coming around, pick up the eastern area.
And I believe Marguerite Leoni did that. Or do we have
any numbers or does it work is the question.

MS. LEONI: Commission Elder, we have that
on a separate one.

Commissioner Elder, we've taken a look at
it.

Chris, can you put it up on here?
If you can wait until we finish, we've
tested it, have comments. We have a picture of it.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: And I think probably,
zoom in a little further in through here. Do we know
what the cross streets are. 22nd Street, Broadway --
now we know about where we are.

I think you are on the right track there.

I think the only piece, like you mentioned, and it's a
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work in progress, is that area. If you look at the
areas immediately south of that area, immediately south
of Broadway, not as heavy a line, I don't know which
district, the purple district here, 25,000 over on, so
adding in population there, where would we take it out.
I don't know. Maybe this northern area,
Flowing Wells, matches the demographics pretty well,
strong in H, green, also for population?
Good luck.

A couple comments, couple edges. The
numbers, getting better, Presidio, Baronito, Boroughs,
the area on west of town, Main and Broadway, down over
to, oh, Pueblo, the neighborhood center, some
neighborhood centers west of town into those areas, this
does, west of the freeway, talking about edges and
railroads, I think there's enough crossings in this area
of the freeway, very similar freeways of Phoenix,
crossculture. The eastern portion in through here, a
lot of forties, fifties, maybe even thirties
neighborhoods that if they're not Historic Districts,
they have very strong homeowner's associations, very
strong cohesiveness, seem to stick together, community,
 glue, libraries, that sort of thing.
In general, in some way take a portion
here, take that off, move it down, put the Tanque Verde
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population over, get the numbers on this purple. I think that works fairly well.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Thank you for the analysis.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Can you move back up to the Pinal County portion of the map?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Assuming you tried to unite the four communities you tried to unite, how many districts would we have in Pinal County?

MR. JOHNSON: It's very difficult to say. Probably, the assumption is in that case Saddlebrooke would come up into east Pinal. We wouldn't have that come up into Pinal. The question is is Apache Junction split off. Probably Apache Junction would go one way. Apache Junction, eastern mining, number three, is very hard to predict.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I understand E is a work in progress. Show me the demographics as it currently exists. I can't see the population.

MR. JOHNSON: Population as drawn is 185,000, 14,000 over.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Right.

MR. JOHNSON: 28,260 of Hispanic origin and 5,500 of Native American origin, so maybe one-sixth,
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math in my head is done poorly, 33, 34,000 combined Hispanic population out of 180. That district would need to change.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I understand from people who know Tucson more than I do this is an improvement in Tucson, which is a good thing.

We need to be very, very careful we don't create problems in other areas by solving problems in Tucson, Phoenix, or anyplace else. We need to be very, very careful about making sure that it's not at the expense of Pinal County, that we create a better situation in Tucson.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: As I understand it, you have -- you have District I almost out of the Tucson, almost out of the Tucson metropolitan area.

MR. JOHNSON: As it's currently configured, it still has some numbers down here in the -- this would be to the east of the edge of the reservation. Let me zoom in a little with it.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Sahuarita.

MR. JOHNSON: This edge is to the edge of the Tohono O'odham Reservation.

I don't have it highlighted. This is the edge of the reservation. We have some highlighted,
Sahuarita and East Sahuarita.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is that the airport at the top, the white?

MR. JOHNSON: The reference coming completely out, the reference, if we try to unite the four Maricopa reservations, this would be an area we'd drop off, the non-Reservation portions.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: What I'm wondering, I can't see how many Tucson districts there are, with the colors being so similar. It's hard to tell. Are there five Tucson districts there or only four?

MR. JOHNSON: There are four centered entirely in Tucson from the foothills, below the foothills. The Air Force base, and west side, then the Saddlebrooke, Oro Valley District, and then the District I. Five definitely dominated by Tucson, possibly six with influence, depending on influence.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Saddlebrooke is one that goes all the way up.

MR. JOHNSON: Right.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: If you consolidate more in Tucson, you wouldn't have to go all the way up.

MR. JOHNSON: Right. Definitely looking at how to do that. It's preferable to stay in the area.
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COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Where is South Tucson, in the light blue area now?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Yes.

MR. JOHNSON: It is just -- let me highlight the line so you can see a little better. It is just in the purple here.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It is not what we heard in public comment earlier today where they said there interests lie to the southeast rather than to the west.

MR. JOHNSON: Right, focused down by 12th and to the 12th. There was testimony related to the historic areas, and rather to the railroad, the trying to get to where they were speaking to this morning.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: What would happen if you just set out to create the five districts in Tucson without regard to what was around, made that as logical as possible, then you would have -- simply have to look around for additional population to complete one district, something like you did with the Congressional Districts in Phoenix? That would seem to be the way that would make the most sense out of the Tucson metropolitan area?
MR. JOHNSON: In general, that is somewhat the approach we're taking on internal Tucson districts. The two factors that kind of affect our ability to do that, one, the Tohono O'odham Reservation to the west is a very large geographic feature affects Tucson regardless of how we draw the districts there and, two, the Hispanic community AUR that includes Tohono O'odham and actually goes up along Casa Grande. So we're somewhat coming out of Tucson two ways, one, through Saddlebrooke --

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Right.

MR. JOHNSON: One through Tohono O'odham. The two sides directly affect how we draw these.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I see that. One is if you combine some reservations really up in Maricopa County, you could get the area south of Tucson out of that district all together, leave you back in the position that was no longer a factor in the Tucson metropolitan area, and then you could set about to do five Tucson districts without that influence.

MR. JOHNSON: Right. The complication we wrestle with in that case is population numbers kind of in that circle. Once you've enclosed it from the north and the west and somewhat to the east, Cochise is very solid population. That is a significant factor in its
district, and we're trying to avoid affecting it's percentage as well. So that's -- we really can't encircle ourselves completely, as you know, or we'd start combining Saddlebrooke with Eastern Arizona County areas which is tough to justify as well. So there's no easy out.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Can we zoom out a bit? Both blue and purple are overpopulated now?

MR. JOHNSON: The green and purple are.

The blue Air Force district is underpopulated by about 4,000.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's difficult to know how much progress we're making, in my mind. If you go out at least one more generation, and maybe -- let's start with that, and then I'll go further.

There's no question that this area, Mr. Elder is quite correct that this area, as well as into Oro Valley, and in fact, even up as far as Saddlebrooke, it could be dealt with in almost any manner, because it would be hard to make many separations in that whole area in terms of community of interest. The only difference would be that the further north you get in Pima county, and then the southern end of Pinal County, the only real difference is one of age, because there are significant retirement communities,
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such as Sun City, Sun City West.

In the north end of Oro Valley, Sun City Vistoso, and Saddlebrooke.

Now, as you move further north into Pinal County, the differences become distinctly clearer. If you curve around the Catalina Mountains, we've already heard the cities of Oracle and San Manuel tend to think of themselves as associated more with Tucson than with the northern end of -- either the northern end of eastern Pinal County or certainly Maricopa.

As you move north through Pinal, that changes dramatically.

The further up you go, the worse it gets, from my perspective, in terms of affinities.

I think in terms of the interior districts, in Tucson, I've already talked about this one. This district, which comprises much of central Tucson and eastern Tucson down curving around to the bottom of -- or side of the Air Force Base. Again, there, it's relatively the same. And I think -- I think that works.

We have had, continued to have testimony about the dividing line. And there's an argument to be made either way between the interstate creating a dividing line between neighbors or, as Mr. Elder said,
there are some historical ties that obviously predate
the freeway that connect neighborhoods on the east and
the west side of the freeway.

I think -- I think I'm comfortable enough
with this general direction to allow it to go out for
public comment, because what I think we'll hear much
more refining comment about how these lines individually
should be drawn.

As you come across the southern part of
Tucson, say even with the air base, and come across what
at that point is, I-19, again, you have some natural
barriers that you are dealing with. But I understand
that some of the distinction there is going to be on the
basis of not only even population but percentages of
subpopulations within the district that we need to keep
balanced as well. I understand that distinction.

I think the biggest difficulty you've got
at this point is solving the north end of this problem.
The south end of the problem, I think through public
testimony and revisions that we will subsequently make
will resolve itself. And I'm relatively comfortable to
let that go. But I certainly am not comfortable unless
there's a better solution of what is now called District
E, which is L revisited, until we get that resolved. It
really does not -- it does not solve the problem that
we've been talking about. So clearly concentrate on that area. And to the extent that either some arrangement, such as suggested by Commissioner Minkoff earlier, or there's some other logical solution, we've certainly had enough testimony from enough people in Pinal County how that area of the state relates to one another. We ought to be able to figure out how to make that thing work.

The thing I don't like about this configuration, we have this meandering wraparound district that goes around the edge of Tucson.

One of the districts that the current districts in Tucson is reminiscent of, this is the big semicircle around the city. It's something that we had hoped to correct through this process. And I certainly don't want this result to revisit that, if we can avoid that.

I do think there's some natural divisions that we've already addressed that are layered as you come down from the foothills area to the center part of Tucson and into the west and south portions of Tucson that do make natural divisions that make sense. I would certainly respect those, if you could.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I make one comment.
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We heard testimony at the Amphitheatre that the superintendent indicated he would like to have that district whole. That might give us a line. I cannot tell you, I think probably the Amphitheatre goes through B on Adobas, Casas Adobas north to south. I can't tell you. If something comes up, we need a line, that may work for you. Other than that, I don't know of any lines of demarcation for you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's talk about that a moment. The southern boundary is the principle road in Tucson. The northern boundary is, I believe, north of Marana. So it is a significant district in terms of geography. And -- I heard the same point. But it is enormous.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Looking east-west, vertical, that's the only line that makes any sense there.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Matter of fact, the northern boundary is all the way up in the City of Catalina. There is a middle school in Golder Ranch, GOLD E R.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Unless there is something else on this map, some questions may be
answered in the answer done on the request I made of

let's look at trying to rotate Pinal County

horizontally. The northern part represented what one of

the plans was, and the southern part then wrapped

around, made an ugly looking district but it seemed as

though we might look at some of the issues.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: There may be one more

comment before we move on.

Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I certainly

wouldn't, don't mean to presume to know as much about

Tucson as you gentlemen do. I do want to say the

problem we're grappling with is there are too many

pieces of Tucson broken off, the south is probably going

into somewhere else. That's why the northern district

has to break off so far.

In a nutshell, the only way to solve that

is to bring all the pieces of Tucson into the

metropolitan area back in and try to keep them as close

to the center as possible. That would bring the Pinal

County back down into, probably, to work the numbers,

probably back into the Saddlebrooke area. But you have

to keep Tucson together, start keeping the pieces

together. That goes off to the north because there's

nowhere else to go.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm curious, what is
the total population? Short? Long?

MR. JOHNSON: Total population, Pima,
Cochise, Pinal, 30,000. Full set of districts, set
districts.

COMMISSIONER HALL: 50,000 short?

MR. JOHNSON: 30 to 50,000 short.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Plus or minus 20.

That's why you figure in an effort to kill
two birds with one stone, as it were, the desire is to
combine the reservations, pursuant to their wishes, in
an effort to garner more population.

MR. JOHNSON: Not necessarily our desire.

There's so many factors in here, we're running through a
whole bunch of scenarios that could work. That's one
we've had, community testimony, interest in that, and
we're considering that.

COMMISSIONER HALL: The other alternative
is Western Maricopa, or is that not going there. I
can't tell if that's a line there or not.

MR. JOHNSON: Right now we're looking at,
seem to have had fairly favorable testimony from the
community on including Southwestern Maricopa, an
extremely rural portion of the county. That is a fairly
homogeneous community with the Pinal, Pima area, makes
us get some of the 30,000 there, or however many we
need, regretfully not enough to get all of them there.
So that is a start.

COMMISSIONER HALL: And in your opinion a
combination of two of those areas, is that sufficient
population?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes. The scenario we drew
yesterday, or when I wrote the proposal we had this
morning, we did take exactly that approach, taking in
roughly the line you see here in Maricopa, the west, and
then it took a different approach than what I described,
came up through the Indian Reservations, and the
extremely far Eastern Maricopa as well. Got us to the
set of population we needed to complete districts.

We know it can be done in essentially the
approach. Now we're wrestling with the configuration of
the districts in that area.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the
Tucson map, per se, before we look at the alternative
analysis?

All right.

If you proceed with the analysis of the
alternative in the Pinal area.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
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Commission, we'll move machines. Margaret Leoni has worked with the analysis and Chris Hutchison will assist her in explaining what our findings are.

MS. LEONI: At this afternoon's session, Commissioner Huntwork asked us to look at District E. This is rough. Work with District E, and then draw District L, over into the Gila River Reservation, taking in the Ak-Chin and leaving Casa Grande in the Pinal District but uniting the Tohono O'odham with the Saddlebrooke area.

I want to advise you, we did this on the map, not the current map Doug is working on. To transfer from one to another takes 90 minutes or more. That was not time we had. We have numbers on it and can tell you in a nutshell with this configuration we lost a minority district in E with the loss of population in the Casa Grande area and Gila River.

Chris, can we put some numbers up there? District E is lacking slightly, 18,000 people.

Hispanic origin population dropped to 33 percent and slightly more. So we've gone, total minority population is now about 44.23.

When we looked at this on August 4th, and we did this on the August 4th draft, the ugly L
District, we were approaching 64 percent minority. So this is something that needs development. It needs population. And I'm going to ask Chris to speak to this. We would naturally on this one move further east into the San Manuel area. That would take in a Census tract, rush up into eastern Pinal County, only gather about 8,000 people, bringing in population we have available to us, or so, into the district, is not such that it would recover the minority percentage.

As you can see, we have the San Manuel area, the one highlighted, 8,000 people, which brings us far north. With San Manuel, about four, bringing in change, about 13,000, but not enough to put our numbers up, changes to 34.3. Makes movement. Then have to move over to west to the Census tract. Has about 13,000 people there. We're going to have to split that.

Can we get the number on that, Chris, for the Hispanic percentage.

We're just not going to be able to get enough minority to establish an AUR that the original District E was built on.

Commissioner Elder, did you have any further question on this experiment?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes, Ms. Leoni and Mr. Chairman. I wanted to take a look at that as a
concept or idea to see what we'd pick up, the southern
half of what was the old L district. It's becoming
quickly obvious to me we can't get back enough of the
population distribution we're looking for to maintain a
majority-minority district on the west side there of E.
I guess -- my frustration is I like the east-west
orientation. We can't achieve our goals doing that. I
appreciate the efforts for getting me the numbers so we
can make the evaluation, and that, but I think it's not
working.

    CHAIRMAN LYNN: I don't think there's any
reason to pursue that.

    COMMISSIONER ELDER: No.

    CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next point.

    COMMISSIONER ELDER: I agree. Yes, there
is no reason.

    MS. LEONI: We have a number of tests on
the machine, not that particular test.

    CHAIRMAN LYNN: Go ahead.

    MS. LEONI: Once again, the test does not
include the plan. We worked on side-by-side plans.

    This experiment, test we're about to
describe to you now, does not include the
reconfiguration of S and R to include the historic
district, the historic -- Phoenix historic AUR, pulling
it south and west into R. But the test we did does not affect that. I ask you to ignore that. That has been approved by the Commission on motion. It will appear on the map that goes out for public comment.

We were asked to experiment with reconfigurations of P and T.

As you can see, P has become quite compact. T remains an elongated district that includes Goodyear and Litchfield.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Before you go on, is the district next to it the same color?

MS. LEONI: I'm looking at it on the screen. It's more distinct, Commissioner Minkoff.

Excuse me.

Has that helped at all?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes. Thank you.

MS. LEONI: Is that helpful? On the screen I'm looking at it is yellow.

T, it's light green on that. Yellow is what I'm looking at. P is light blue. I apologize. The colors don't appear true.

Does that -- I apologize.

There it is. That's T.

We don't consider this a finished product.

We're able to report to you, we believe
this rebalancing of the population has distinct
possibilities in observing more closely the
five-district configuration of the AUR that had been
adopted by the Commission. If we get some numbers up
there for T.

T has now become a district with a total
Hispanic origin population of close to 39 percent. This
is a change from the 44 percent that was literally
neither here nor there under the five-district option.
By making these changes, as I said, they are not
completed, but populations are close.

District P -- Chris -- has been
significantly strengthened. When we started this test,
P was 50 and a half percent, 50 and a half total
Hispanic population. We now have P at 55 and a half
percent total Hispanic population, that's Hispanic total
population, Hispanic voting population of 50.5 percent.
We achieved Hispanic majority voting age population with
this. We're not satisfied with all the lines. We think
the extension of what is now T over the top of that
bears a closer look. We were forced to take Avondale
into the west side for population purposes. By the time
when we left Avondale on the side with P, the west side,
we were overpopulated 50,000.

We want to look more closely at
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arrangement of districts move in this direction. We believe working between P, V, and T, we can achieve a better configuration.

So our report to you is we think this is a positive move, but our report is not finished. Our report is this test is not completed. We'd like to bring this back first thing in the morning with a completed proposal.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It's a step in the right direction. The thing I suggest you look at between now and tomorrow morning, P and V, divide them horizontally, not vertically. That would address some issues, school district boundaries and communities of interest that seem east-west rather than north-south.

MS. LEONI: We think that's very perceptive and a good approach to this.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

MR. HUNTWORK: I agree. And this was one of my major concerns I expressing earlier today. I think if there's a good test of this by tomorrow morning, it would help make me a lot more comfortable, probably help make me more comfortable with the map.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, then, if you finish that overnight and give us the benefit of

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
that analysis in the morning.

MS. LEONI: We'd be pleased to do so.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm beginning to feel much more comfortable with the way the northern part of the state and Phoenix are developing. I still have real, real concerns with the southern part of the state. I don't suppose to know what works best with Tucson. I suppose I know less about it than other parts of the state. I ask other Commissioners, you expressed comments to my mind, comments which created real problems Pinal County and Metropolitan Phoenix. Are the improvements in Tucson sufficient enough and important enough to do that? And I'm not proposing to say they are or aren't, whether they are worth, in a sense, the collateral damage that has occurred to some of the other districts. If they are I'm prepared to support them. I don't know.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm not prepared to answer. We don't know the collateral damage on the damage to Pinal County. It's our hope and direction to the consultants to minimize that damage, to the extent either through Mr. Huntwork's observation to draw districts back into Tucson and begin anew, put all the
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pieces together so you have a full complement to draw
from, or whether you continue on the basis that the
layout in Tucson, in general terms, is reasonable to
begin with. But to the extent you still have to make
adjustments in Pinal County, to pick up that last 30 to
50,000 population to make a district, that you do that
in the most benign way possible, consistent with either
AUR, testimony, or something else that we can hang our
hat on, it's something that makes sense. I'm not sure
we can give a definitive answer on that until we see it.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think you
minimalize collateral damage in other areas but also
Tucson, start with Tucson, putting those districts in
order.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Fanning out.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Fanning out with a
small piece has to be put somewhere else rather than a
big piece.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Again, the issue this
evening is is there sufficient direction to make
substantial progress overnight. That is the key. If
you feel you are lacking in any way in that direction,
now is the time to get it. There will only be one
overnight.
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DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, we feel we have indeed the direction and will work the next 10 hours to produce a better map.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Are there other areas you'll report on tonight we need to address?

DR. HESLOP: No, sir.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Are there further directions to consultants?

Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Dr. Heslop, we are grateful to you and your staff for their efforts, grateful you hired staff that have no need for sleep whatsoever, and we want to express our confidence and appreciation for efforts you guys are doing, your diligence and hard work.

DR. HESLOP: We reciprocate our gratitude to the Commission for their understanding.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd only say, Dr. Heslop, when you next report to us, if you say "we have failed," I think you should change it to "we have not yet succeeded." We will succeed.

DR. HESLOP: In our lexicon, "fail" is a temporary word.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Very well.

Any further direction to the consultants?
If not, I think, if you'd like to get a
head start, I don't know if it will help you, we'll will
entertain one more round of call to the public.

You may want to continue to have a
consultant, some member of the team to be here to hear
the call to the public as well.

Those who wish to be heard would need to,
as usual, fill out a yellow speaker form and we'll be
happy to entertain call to the public as our last item
this evening.

(Discussion off the record.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ladies and gentlemen, this
is the last item this evening.

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

Being as we've been at it about 12 hours,
let's try to keep it to a three-minute time period, if
we can. We don't have a watch on it. If you'd do your
best.
The first speaker is Anne Murray, vice president of the Broadmoor Broadway Village Neighborhood Association, I assume.

Ms. Murray.

MS. MURRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Commissioners. I appreciate the chance to speak.

The issue I wanted to speak to is a macro type issue, that is the use of Broadway Boulevard as a boundary dividing north-south districts. And as I understood the most recent map, District H, and the southern boundary, it would be the boundary for what they are calling the Air Force District. Northern boundary would be the boundary, do I have that correctly, with the use of Broadway as an east-west boundary between the districts. Broadway functioning as a corridor is a significant corridor impacting neighborhoods adjacent both north and southwest of University. Broadway goes into downtown with a different kind of population business mix. East of University, going east, probably as far as Wilmot, certainly as far as Swan, we have a network of very cohesive, strong neighborhood associations with a long history of working together on issues which we share on both sides of Broadway. Broadway functions to us as an organizing factor. For example, currently
transportation on Broadway is being considered.

Broadway carries a great deal of transportation.

Consider the amount of transportation on Broadway. My transportation is on Broadway. My neighborhood is anchored by the Broadway Village Shopping Center, the first shopping center designed by Jose O. Johnson.

That's also an identity point for all four neighborhoods north, south, east, and west of Country Club.

Another feature of this is that Broadway runs kind of in between Speedway and 22nd Street. When you go from the University east to Wilmot, the schools all inter-relate. So the middle schools and the high schools in that swath of neighborhoods all receive feeders from the elementary schools all between 22nd and Speedway.

So to divide this very cohesive community that has worked together over a long period of time and put some of it south of Broadway in one district and another part of it north of Broadway in another district really divides what is a very close community of interest.

So that basically is the point I wanted to make. Please do not see Broadway as a boundary. But actually 22nd Street would be a better boundary.

Thank you very much.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Murray.

Next speaker is Mr. Bohnee, public relations speaker for the Gila River Community.

MR. BOHNEE: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, thank you for the opportunity to say a few brief words.

I wanted to reiterate a few words made by the Lieutenant Governor of the community and echoed by Ms. Minkoff, and really that is, if at all possible, to look and consider combining the four metro area tribes, which would be Fort McDowell, the Navajo Nation, Salt River Indian Community, Pima River Indian Community, and Ak-Chin Indian Community into what would be the same district. One of the iterations I guess I see to my left over here I guess accomplishes that goal.

The iteration that was addressed last week by the Lieutenant Governor had the Tohono O'odham Nation, Ak-Chin Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation in one district. Cultural relations, there are many distinctions the bind the metro area tribes together, both culturally, but also a number of issues that the communities address as -- both as Indian communities, the four metro tribes, and economic development issues.

In that context I just wanted to reiterate that that would be a strong recommendation from the
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community.

With respect to the compactness issue, this may have already been provided to the Commission. The reiteration we have over here, pretty much most of Pinal County in one district, which also includes the four metro tribes, I think gets to that particular issue in terms of having compact districts, also looking at the communities of interest.

I hope as the map drawers and Commission consider viewpoints, that would be one strong consideration you take into consideration.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Bohnee.

The next speaker, Ms. Cecilia Cruz, Latino Self-Help Network.

MS. CRUZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Commissioners.

I know it's a difficult task tonight. I did appreciate that.

There are two points I'd like to have you consider, to be very brief. I know you received a map considered by the Chicano Consortium Border Map, I believe, that takes into consideration strong considerations and all considerations shared by the issues in that map.

Second, issues looking at Legislative
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issues what is identified by TT and J in Tucson,
primarily, areas in West Tucson and South Tucson, I
would like you to consider natural boundaries that
occurred along the interstate and including South Tucson
into what is identified on the map as J, that has been
historically South Tucson, which has been, the dividing
area has been the interstate, where it does merge into
I-19 and I-10 going south. It does address the issue
25,000 in population, gives District J added population,
and keeps historically what has been represented before.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Cruz.

Salomon Baldenegro, Chicano Consortium for
Public Issues.

MR. BALDENEGRO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
Members of Commission.

This morning I talked, fixated on some
issues on South Tucson, the same issues she talked about
and border issues I talked about, and forgot some things
I think are important to mention. One is what the
previous speaker referred to: I want to thank you for
your work. You are doing a lot of work, hard work, and
a great service for our state. I know how hard work is.
I want to make sure you are aware we appreciate the
work. Some may not agree with it. We appreciate the
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effort. You are doing good work.

The second thing it's important for you to know, from the standpoint of citizen involvement, it's political important from a democracy point to know the border map I submitted for Chicanos Consortium for Public Issues was looked at, reviewed by about 400 people. I distributed it to 258 people in Tucson and 68 people in Phoenix. I got feedback from people I did not distribute it to, people got it passed to. It was passed on to other folks. From that I calculate about 400 people looked at the map we submitted and many commented, either called me or sought me out personally and talked to me. I mention that to impress upon you that the map we submitted and the border district we argue was not created in a vacuum.

The third thing I forgot to talk about this morning was to make sure you understand that those of us in Tucson working here on issues, Chicano Consortium for Public Issues that supports issues for fair redistricting are very active, appeared before you many times, and will again want to reiterate their plans and their comments. Be aware we do support and conceptually endorse their comments and their plans.

And fourthly, I forgot this morning to talk about, after I spoke, a lot of speakers talked
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about the competitive aspect of redistricting. I know that Prop 106 was devised and passed and has as -- at its heart the notion of competitive districts. And that's important. When you juxtapose the competitive aspect with Section Five Voting Rights, and things, sometimes those things have a way of getting in the way of each other when you wind up with the final product. I know you will, and you'll make sure it's in the record, juxtapose it, based on the fact with voting rights and other things driving this.

Thank you for your time, patience, and work.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

Frank Seanez, attorney with the Navajo Nation.

Mr. Seanez.

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

I wanted to, on behalf of the Navajo Nation, thank the Commission for its diligent work, especially today in considering some of the very difficult issues involved in redistricting.

All the Commissioners at one point or another have led to discussions within the public hearing of some of the very real concerns which affect
not only other communities of interest but the Navajo Nation as well.

In particular, the Navajo Nation is appreciative of the fact the Commission is willing to revisit again its support in separation of -- separation of the Navajo Nation and Hopi Tribe. We believe it's much more defensible, much more reasonable, and much better Legislative, better than one, than the prior iteration, NE1.

There are changes in support for various ideas, as the discussion winds up. The Nation as well wants to express its appreciation for some of the discussions and initiatives which did not go forward, particularly Commissioner Huntwork's keeping in play the idea of the combination of the White Mountain Apache Tribe and the San Carlos Tribe in the same Legislative District as the Navajo Nation.

One thing the Navajo Nation reminds very concerned about is the drop of Native American population between the bench mark plan and even that which is now before the Commission in M1.

We're still talking about a Native American population which is topping out at somewhere near 66 percent. And we can't let the Commission forget what we're looking at from the bench mark plan is 77
percent.

The Navajo Nation still very much concerned about that drop.

Some of the discussions did not come all the way through fruition or passage of fruition of the motion.

There are Census tracts out there which would not involve splitting census places or municipalities which would increase Native American population. They surround municipalities, like Flagstaff, and are contiguous with other portions of the Legislative District which is now under consideration in the Legislative District map.

As well, the Navajo Nation would encourage the Commission to still keep under consideration other Census places and municipalities that have large Native American populations, specifically Winslow and Holbrook.

The Navajo Nation does not give up its position that a Legislative District with a Native American population of 77 percent can be obtained by the unification of Apache County and the unification of the White Mountain Tribe and San Carlos Tribe in accord with the Navajo Nation's Plan first set before this Commission on June 25th of this year.

Thank you.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Seanez.

Next speaker, Mr. DuPont.

Mr. DuPont.

MR. DUPONT: I'm here as regards the dividing line on Broadway. As Anne Murray stated, Broadway and its cohesiveness is a community of interest. We've studied using the Broadway corridor. Most of us share the Broadway line. There's a balance in the neighborhood plan. I sit in a building on Alvernon, a plan that is inclusive on this side of Broadway and the other side of Broadway which is inclusive of businesses on Broadway, which I've done for four years.

I'm one of the organizers of the Central League of Businesses which is inclusive of both sides of Broadway.

We'd ask you to reconsider moving that to the 22nd corridor so it keeps us together. It is a major part of Tucson, that being considered, Broadway.

There are several historic buildings on Broadway that need to be together on Broadway.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. DuPont.

Next is Mr. Smith.

Mr. Smith.
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MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This day has given me my first real window to what you all have been going through. I want to say I appreciate it. I'm reminded of an analogy to making sausage. I won't go any further than that.

I hadn't intended to speak tonight.

I particularly appreciated the comments and questions by Mr. Elder, Ms. Minkoff, and the Chairman.

I associate myself with your comment of the progress made, probably talking about some small lines in Tucson, South Tucson, which I was talking to. However, as I looked at the map, it appeared to me the consultants were perhaps trying to be responsive to the testimony of several of us from South Tucson, Mr. Elder's comments, but maybe they didn't quite understand what we were saying.

I'd like to take a quick crack at it. We said we have communities of interest, in particular south and east. I think I may have confused them when I said east to the railroad, because there was an area associated with South Tucson with this new map north between the freeway and the railroad which is a different area. I'm trying to be helpful to the consultants, and they are looking at this.
I would mention a comment Mrs. Cruz made, I also noticed that.
Without the maps, I'm not sure. There was a purple district in which South Tucson appeared on tonight's map. And that district wound up west. And what we had been asking is that portion of the district on the southeast part of that district that was on the east side of the freeway be associated with the pale blue. We also noticed that you commented that the purple was overpopulated and -- in a very heavy majority-minority district. It sounds like, as you indicated, Mr. Chairman, there may be kinds of things can be worked out, perhaps in public comment after you do the map.

I thank you for the opportunity to restate what I was saying, and thank you again for all your work.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Smith.
The next speaker is Paul Mackey.

Mr. Mackey.

MR. MACKEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. I intended to talk on another comment. As I sat during the day, certain things developed, particularly the last item dealing with the Tucson area.
I was concerned initially when I came in this morning hearing talk of only four districts in Tucson. The phraseology of the consultants, I was concerned Tucson was totally screwed in terms of districts. Seems now there's consideration of five districts.

Talking of population of 583,000 in Tucson, Tucson and Eastern Pima County, 171,000 in each district, it would work out, roughly, using one man one vote thinking, to roughly five districts for Eastern Pima County, or Pima County as a whole, with the intended focus on that.

After watching the map and the work done during the recess, I guess, let me speak to one of the concerns, and that had to do with the green area in Tucson, or what I'm referring to as District H. I wish we still had the maps. I could suggest adjustments.

Some of the previous speakers, Bill and Anne Murray, some involved the central part of Tucson, central Tucson leadership. It's 30 associations, covers an area roughly on the East of Wilmot Road and extending roughly to Stone Avenue, east of I-10, and extends north to Grant roughly to 22nd.

Now this is a relatively cohesive area of the Tucson central area. I say that, having been in
this community a long time working a lot of data in the
area. I also chair a group that is neighbors the
University of Arizona and 10 neighborhoods there. We
don't think in terms of us being in the purple area. If
anything, I would suggest this area, area H, or the
green area, that be shifted eastward.

I know a couple members of the Commission
from the Tucson area said it seemed to make some sense
to you. I differ in the sense the central part of the
city doesn't begin to associate itself, think of itself
with the Wilmot area, part of the southern part of
Sahuarita. We're talking a totally different part,
orientation, voting patterns. And you begin to see real
cohesiveness in that part of the city.

I suggest the area perhaps be dropped to
the south, south of Broadway, perhaps down around 22nd.
You'd have to play with it somewhat. I think the
consultants said the blue area, airport district, excess
population, something be done with it there.

The main concern is it be shifted somewhat
eastward, part is the airport district, and that it be
shifted.

What is the organization for the
districts? There is different criteria. The Foothills
District extend in Oro Valley, a relatively homogeneous
area. This not a competitive area. It's a safe
district. It's like what are we using here as an
organizing base in the Tucson area, criteria? We're
beginning to get very questionable about it.

So, in the absence then of defining better
the criteria, I'm going to suggest then if nothing else
we have a strong central district, a cohesive district.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Mackey.

If others wish to speak, I'd ask you get
speaker slips filled out. Raise your hand.

The last slip I have of those wishing to
speak this evening is from Steve Gallardo for the
Coalition for Fair Redistricting.

Mr. Gallardo.

MR. GALLARDO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm with the Coalition for Fair
Redistricting. I'm Steve Gallardo.

I know it's been a long day.

I want to reiterate the points by
Mrs. Cruz and Mr. Baldenegro, support the changes in I
and U. We feel it would maximize the minority voting
strength in those two districts, and we support that
wholeheartedly.

We have made a change and plan on
submitting a proposal to the Commission in regard to our
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suggestion regarding Tucson as well.

Also, in regards to Pinal County, we also
support Mr. Bohnee with the Gila River Indian Community
with regard to the Pinal County Legislative lines. We
feel this is minority-majority district and feel the
Indian Reservations should be put together.

Also, the Coalition also would ask the
Commission please look at the Yuma County District. I'm
not too sure what number or letter that is. That's
currently a minority-majority district. Although we're
a little hesitant to call it a strong majority-minority
district, we'd ask the Commission, as far as minority
voting right interests, look at it to make it a stronger
minority-majority district.

Finally, as regards Maricopa County and
district P, the West Phoenix District, I did see the
draft the consultants have created with some
corrections. We again have submitted a map I'd like to
submit to the Commission for their consideration.

One thing I want to point out for your
collection. I understand the population problem. I
feel if we could add Avondale, maybe have the district
go as far west as Litchfield Road and I-10, I-10 being
the northern boundary, going eastward to 83rd Avenue,
83rd Avenue north to Glendale, Glendale east to 51st
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Avenue, 51st Avenue down south to Buckeye Road. And if you look at that particular district, again, if it's overpopulated, have the northern boundary currently cut off at Glendale Road, have it keep continuing down until the population is where it needs to be at, I believe 171 plus, I feel that would be a strong minority-majority district.

We've also outlined three other districts. I know there were concerns early on in the hearings in regard for minority-majority districts. We outlined them. And we hope the Commission takes them into consideration.

With that, good night.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Are there other members of the public that wish to be heard this evening?

Any final comments from the Commission?

I'd simply ask the consultants as they are doing their work this evening, the public comments this evening are very apropos, and they continue to define things, particularly in the Tucson area.

It seems to be problematic as we move forward. There are natural divisions that have been suggested. I'd suggest you take those strongly into account as you move forward as you are trying to solve the greater macro issue of Southern Arizona.
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As we move through the southern area, the comments made this evening and earlier in the day have been very instructive and I think can be very helpful in making some choices easier for the consultants to select where lines go, so I'd actually take those into account. Further comments from anybody on the Commission? If not, we'll stand in recess until 8:00 o'clock in the morning.

(The following is a letter for submission to be included the record:

Arizona State Senate
August 15, 2001

Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission
1400 West Washington, Suite B-10
Phoenix, Arizona 85007.

Dear Commission Members:

I'm writing to encourage the Commission to preserve Yavapai County intact as a Legislative District.

Our population is within 3% of the required number.
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Including all of Sedona brings us precisely to the ideal population and meets the City boundary goal. The County is clearly a community of interest and is geographically compact. We obviously fulfill the Proposition's stated intent to use county boundaries to the extent practicable.

These are the very criteria identified in Proposition 106. We are the perfect example of what the law asks you to carry out. Thank you for preserving Yavapai County intact.

Sincerely,

(Signature in original on file with the Commission)

KEN BENNETT
State Senator

KB/jy.

(Whereupon, the Commission adjourned for the evening at approximately 9:29 p.m.)

* * * *
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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 192
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

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