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

First order of business is public comment.

This is the time for consideration and discussion of comments and complaints from the public.

Those wishing to address the Commission shall request permission in advance by filling out a speaker slip.

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

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

Please, if you would --

Thank you very much.

Ms. Andrea Gonzales.

MR. GONZALES: I have a couple quick comments. I'm representing the City of Casa Grande.
We turned in a proposal. There are a couple things I wanted to clear up for the Commission this morning. It's come to my mind there are questions why we kept Apache and Casa Grande together in same the county. The reason we did that in our plan, Apache Junction and Casa Grande are the two major communities in Pinal County that show growth, both in farming and agriculture, and are interested in having someone in the Legislature. We simply cut out the eastern area in Pinal, the mining area, and felt they would be represented better by someone from the northern area.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

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

If not, let me make sure it's clear to the public, the meeting this week is scheduled for today, tomorrow, and Saturday. It was done in this way because we have no idea how long the discussion, decision-making will take in this part of process. It's quite conceivable the agenda which you have on the table outside, and you are certainly free to look at, may be completed today, may run into tomorrow, may run into Saturday. But at this point, based on sort of agenda management, I'm not sure we will use all of the time allotted. Therefore, I just want everyone to
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understand, we will go through the agenda as expeditiously as we can and finish at whatever point we come to the end of the agenda. If today, tomorrow, Saturday's meeting will not occur. If we go into tomorrow, move to the end of the agenda, we'll complete when we can.

With that admonition, if we move to tomorrow, we'll have yet another public comment period when we start the meeting. If we're close to finishing the meeting, we'll reserve another public comment period at the end as is custom.

Is there anyone else wishing to address the Commission at this time? If not, there will be another opportunity for comment.

We'll close item number II.

Item III, discussion and possible approval of the minutes of the July 6, 2001, public meeting.

Have you had an opportunity, members of Commission, to review the July 6 minutes?

Is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I move we accept the minutes from July 6.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion. All in favor,
Chairman Lynn: Chair votes "aye."

(Motion carries.)

Chairman Lynn: Item IV: Report by Executive Director regarding administrative matters, including an update on Commission staff.

Mr. Echeveste.

Mr. Echeveste: Commission members, you have in your packet a one-page update on staffing to date, which includes transition of a number of staff. Unless you have any questions, it's a one-pager. It's an update from the last time around. About the only change has been the one staffer went to work at the data center at the request of the Governor's Office and I replaced that individual with Susan Svitak.

Chairman Lynn: Any questions from the Commission?

Commissioner Minkoff: There are several new people. Can you introduce them, if any are here?

Mr. Echeveste: Actually, they are all working, doing outreach.

Chairman Lynn: As opposed to what we're doing.

Mr. Echeveste: As opposed to do what
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we're doing, they're doing outreach. I asked them to stay at their posts.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Anything else?

MR. ECHEVESTE: The other item that you have is the second round of public hearings agenda. But I would like to pass to you individually identified agendas that I would like to have back whenever you have a chance, hopefully by the end of this meeting, not necessarily by today, but by Saturday, of this --

What I would like for you to do is identify which hearings you would be able to attend so we can then be able to undertake the logistical planning for transportation, and so forth.

With that, we have here Huntwork, and Lynn --

Let me just hand them to you. It has the names on there.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: You forgot me.

MR. ECHEVESTE: No. It is in the file.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Lisa, Jose.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff will be attending all of them.

MR. ECHEVESTE: No, you are in the file.

Mr. Chairman, I have no other matters to bring up today.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Echeveste.

Any other questions or comments for the Executive Director?

If not, you have this in front of you.

Revisions, discussion, possible revision for the schedule of the second round of meetings. Any comments, questions for the Commissioners with respect to the schedule, locations, or the timing, so on, and so forth?

I think it pretty well conforms to the discussion we had last time.

A come things of note. We added a September 2nd meeting in Tuba City.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: 11th.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: 7th, I think.

No, 11th, pardon me.

I believe that's the only substantive change.

If not --

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Have we gotten agreement for transporting from Yuma to Tuba City?

MR. ECHEVESTE: Yuma.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Normal way to get to rural areas, Navajo Air.
MR. ECHEVESTE: Normal ways to get you there and back.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: My car is getting so its wheels are falling off. It would never make it that fast.

MR. ECHEVESTE: We don't want you to drive there.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Some have small wheels.

MR. RIVERA: Is there any reason why not to go to Tuba City after Flagstaff?

MR. ECHEVESTE: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, we left September 11th vacant because throughout Arizona, the cities, it's election day for the cities. The only time available was the 11th. And the Navajos, the tribes up there do not have elections on that day. And --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand your point, Mr. Rivera. I think, again, we have it set for the 11th. If -- again, I open that to the Commission to discuss the choices. It seems to me Mr. Rivera's point of going from Flagstaff to Tuba City logistically is much easier and simply have the weekend before we begin the next week's meetings on Monday the 10th in Yuma. That way we would actually not need the Navajo Air
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arrangement, because we would be fairly close from Flagstaff and could drive.

Without objection, we could ask Mr. Echeveste to investigate moving that meeting up to the 7th with the idea it's logistically easier to accommodate.

MR. ECHEVESTE: That would be a Friday.

We didn't utilize that. It was your directive you didn't want that, keep Friday for formal public hearings.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: In this instance it might make sense.

MR. ECHEVESTE: At your directive, we'll work on that.

MR. RIVERA: Sorry about that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right.

Item VI: Discussion and possible direction or decision with respect to the process for timely payment for professional services and to critical vendors.

Is that an issue?

MR. ECHEVESTE: You'll find that issue is resolved. I have not had time to discuss it with any of the vendors, to any length. I can assure you that the process has been worked out and we will not see or they
will not have the kind of problems that held up payments
up to that point.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

Any further comments or questions?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Since this does
seem to be resolved, it's been quite awhile since we've
seen a financial statement. I would request that at the
earliest possible time, that one be prepared so we know
where we are in terms of expenditures.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner

Minkoff, we're in the process of reformatting that
budget. And now that we have processed some backlog of
payments, we anticipate that at the next Commission
meeting we will submit a revised budget for your review
and approval.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Also expenditures
to date?

MR. ECHEVESTE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other questions and

comments?

Okay. Item VII: Executive Session for
discussion or consultation with the Commission's
attorney's pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.03(A)(3).

Ms. Hauser, counsel requests Executive

Session?
MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, yes.

The Commissioners received some written legal opinions from Jose and I. We have only a couple of additions or clarifications to that and just some further instructions concerning today's meeting.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Would you anticipate that that session, I'm doing this for the public, to be relatively short, to last perhaps less that a half hour?

MS. HAUSER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a motion to go into Executive Session?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: So moved.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

All in favor, signify "aye."

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

Motion carries.

Ladies and gentlemen, we expect this will take less than a half hour.

(Whereupon, the Commission recessed Open Public Session at approximately 9:10 a.m. to go into Executive Session.)

(Recess taken.)
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(Whereupon, the Commission concluded
Executive Session at approximately 9:52 a.m. and
reconvened Open Public Session at approximately
10:02 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I had an indication from
a member of the Commission he would like to reopen Item
V, second round of public meetings of the Independent
Redistricting Commission.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes. I'd like to
discuss the meetings. It no makes no sense, the Tuba
City shift. That makes nine straight days, or at least
eight straight days away. I'd like to return calls to
clients. I know I made a commitment, but --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I would agree.
I think staff makes the call. I think
staff needs a break. I would like to give staff a
chance to do other things.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I think we move to the
7th. If there are those that can't attend, they can't
attend. Make it more convenient for those that can
attend.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'll take those comments
for what they are worth.

You'd like some direction.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Yes.

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
CHAIRMAN LYNN: I sense that.

I'll entertain a motion either to move to
the 7th or keep it to the 11th, either one. I'll be
there either way. I have no life. It matters not.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I make a motion then
to leave the published agenda as published.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

Hearing no discussion, all in favor of
leaving the agenda the way it is with the meeting in
Tuba City on the 11th, signify by saying "aye."

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

(Motion carries.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Leave it the way it is.

Anything else?

Item VIII: Possible presentation,
discussion and possible decision with respect to the
adoption of any additional AURs.

We'll turn to Dr. Heslop.

I suspect the Commissioners may wish
reposition themselves.

This will be partially a Power Point
presentation, correct?
DR. HESLOP: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That is
our hope.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission,
the first thing you need to address, is additional AURs.
There are three. We can display them, if you wish.
You know the source of these AURs. They
are from the, let me say, abundant flow of CIFs from the
residents of Scottsdale which I have been reading over
the last two weeks. The Commissioners have seen a
summary of these CIFs. And so in recognition of the
volume of this testimony, our recommendation would be to
recommend Scottsdale be undivided as an AUR.

The second source of proposed AURs are the
hearings that came to us late from the Tucson area.
These are the Green Valley and I-19 areas. There was
substantial testimony at those Tucson hearings and
supported also by CIFs that these areas constitute
genuine communities.

It would be our suggestion, Mr. Chairman,
that we add them. If you instruct us to do so, we will,
we'll e-mail all commissioners with full detail on these
AURs.

Mr. Chairman, that would be our proposal
to the Commission.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is that all you are going
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to do with the Power Point, Dr. Heslop?

DR. HESLOP: Can I ask a question on this, Mr. Chairman?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Don't take it off. I want to refer to that.

MR. HUTCHISON: I want to not blind you.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: What I want to refer to in the last two AURs is ask whether those are two distinct AURs, two representations of the same AUR, whether distinct, how they differ?

DR. HESLOP: Two distinct AURs. The area is one we could consider as an AUR itself, but they are reflective of testimony that came from two different perspectives, one with regard to the I-19 corridor. It's important, particularly with regard to transportation and trade, the other with regard to the Green Valley area, more specifically regarding it's particular character and the sense of people in the Green Valley, that they had a community. So, Commissioner Minkoff, we present them as two separate AURs.

It's clear we are dealing with some of the same general area. And there they are.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Dr. Heslop, I guess I
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come from this area.

DR. HESLOP: You do indeed.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: This area, the San Xavier District, I've never heard of Summit. Is this a Census designation?

DR. HESLOP: I shouldn't refer to Summit in that designation. It is a Census designation. It's quite possible you haven't been there. The Census knows it to exist.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: My question then is, my comment is on the maps we present for the public, we really need to have references the public knows, that this is the San Xavier Mission, or something, so they know that's what Summit is --

DR. HESLOP: Excellent point.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Get rid of acronyms nobody knows, or get back to acronyms the public knows.

DR. HESLOP: We'll at the get back to what the public knows.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I don't see the point of making a city like Scottsdale, or a City like Tempe, which also appeared and argued strenuously in favor of keeping of keeping their city together, an AUR. Cities have their own status under Prop 106 and keeping AURs together for mapping and other
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groupings of significance so we give them weight in this
cconsideration. The City of Scottsdale, aside from the
fact it has political boundaries surrounding it, is not
different from other affluent areas immediately
adjacent.

I'd defy anyone to explain to me what is
different from land on one side of a Scottsdale area,
residential areas of Scottsdale and another side in
terms of being anything other than a political
subdivision.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Heslop.

DR. HESLOP: I need to tread carefully. I
read all the CIFs. There is no doubt in my mind
Scottsdale thinks of itself in very different terms from
communities around it. Some make that point very
bluntly. "We in Scottsdale are different." Sometimes
they refer to themselves as the Beverly Hills of
Phoenix. They make clear, detailed distinctions between
their city and neighboring cities. So that's one thing
to say.

The second thing to say is we have been,
in the citizen process, responding to citizen testimony
and comment, CIF communication in development of these
AURs.

Given the simple volume and intensity of
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Scottsdale CIFs, it seemed to us in line with other
precedence, for example, Yuma.

Yuma is also a jurisdiction, but as
Commissioner Minkoff and I heard it, Yuma thinks of
themselves as a very special jurisdiction. They have a
sense of county community.

I think it's true that in many rural areas
of the state, cities and counties have this sense of
community defined by jurisdictional lines. And that
appears even here in Scottsdale.

People think of Scottsdale as particularly peculiar.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Are you saying then there are some communities that are not as cohesive with their boundary as Scottsdale in this instance is special or unique in the way they have presented themselves?

DR. HESLOP: Well, I should say that, reflecting on the CIFs, that there is near unanimity, or unanimity, that Scottsdale is peculiar, that it is a particular community that has a strong sense of its own community. There is something less than unanimity about whether it should remain whole.

There are some suggestions for lines, divisions. Some people say it's less than large enough,
perhaps it's appropriate to be divided.

The point I was trying to make to Commissioner Huntwork, I think all members of the Commission will recognize this. When you went to large communities, the sense of community does diminish. The sense of importance of jurisdictional lines, of city lines, diminishes. But here in the case of Scottsdale there is an undiminished sense of city community.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: My concern, I agree with Commissioner Huntwork, I categorize under 106 or even voter rights, have a category to keep city counties whole where practicable. There was a different sense when we went out to the public and asked what makes your community cohesive? What makes your community whole? What is the glue that holds it together?

I guess I didn't hear that much saying the glue that holds me together is the bonds of Scottsdale. My neighbor across the street, Paradise Valley, Carefree, also is affluent, also has the general same socioeconomic based conditions. It doesn't seem -- I think in cross-categorizing, we're maybe doing it twice.

DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Elder, we're obviously here to take instruction.

I would say when you look at all the cities and counties in Arizona, which are, you are quite
right, protected by Proposition 106, there are few where citizens have taken the trouble to say this city requires attention by the Commission because we are a special community. So Scottsdale, in that sense, in terms of the public process through which we've gone, distinguished itself, in my view, from these other cities and counties that are protected by Proposition 106.

That is true for some members, Yavapai County or Yuma County, they are protected by their citizens in significant numbers, and some intensity of testimony commented on the fact that they felt themselves to be communities as well as counties.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall and --

COMMISSIONER HALL: What is the population of the city.

MR. HUTCHISON: 60,260.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Larger than a Legislative District, so it would not remain intact.

Our discussion is somewhat moot. We've in the past said we'd designate an AUR by whatever an individual constituency perceives them to be. Then what we do with an AUR, obviously, is something subsequent to that designation. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I'd move we accept Scottsdale as an AUR and move on.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I was about to say at worst this is a redundancy; therefore, it doesn't matter. Because the City of Scottsdale, like other communities throughout our state, already has significance we are required to take into consideration. AURs are essentially maps we are using to supplement that, and that we also will take into consideration. But I find myself disagreeing quite strenuously with the comment there is something unique and special about Scottsdale. I really disagree with that.

Testimony I heard throughout the state consistently raised the point: This is my city, my county, in more rural areas of the state, and it is important to me.

I think every meeting that I went to had a good number of people who stood up and made that precise comment.

So if the sense of this is that we're going to give some greater weight to Scottsdale because -- as a unit, because we created an AUR for it, than we are to other units throughout state, I'd oppose the motion. If the sense is just a redundancy get on.
with it, I'd be in favor of motion.

So what is the sense of the motion?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Well, it seems to me, there is an issue to deal with here. We're looking at Scottsdale saying Scottsdale, like here, the land isn't the difference. It depends -- parts of Scottsdale are nothing are like Greyhawk, nothing affluent, south Scottsdale, in terms of socioeconomics, northern parts of Scottsdale, and yet they're still saying we're a community of interest.

One was to add to Tempe to make numbers work. People were saying don't do that, don't separate us. We're a community, we belong together.

I think that is important at least to recognize.

Obviously when we draw Legislative Districts, Scottsdale will not be one Legislative District. It can't be. There are too many people. We need to recognize what they're telling us and what the concerns are did.

We not not hear similar intensity from other communities, you know, that are too large for one Legislative District. We did hear this from some districts. Chandler said please keep us together. We
may be too large to keep us together. If we are, here's
where we suggest you divide it.

We should recognize that. We need to
recognize what Scottsdale is telling us.

Certainly it's a Legislative area
regardless of what they are telling us about not being
able to comply because there are too many.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork, get your
comment, then I'd like to add to the discussion.

My perspective, what is important here, is
the integrity of the process. The process, we asked
people to identify, self-identify communities of
interest. It appears to have been a groundswell of
community, to be a community of interest, and,
therefore, would translate into an AUR.

On that basis, that basis alone, not
necessarily my perceiving significantly different areas
around it, on that integrity, I'm prepared to vote for
the motion.

Mr. Huntwork.

MR. HUNTWORK: I can't recall, is Tempe a
community of interest?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Already designated
Tempe.
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Throughout the state, people have made the comment that keep us together despite the differences in the area, keep my political subdivision together. That's a common theme throughout the state. It's the recognition of it in some places and nonrecognition of it in others that is concerning me. I'm, too, concerned about the integrity of it in the process. If we've made Tempe an AUR already, we've made Yuma an AUR already, there's no inconsistency in making Scottsdale an AUR and we should simply have to weigh it appropriately as we work with these and draw our maps.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the motion? If not, all those in favor of the motion signify by saying "aye."

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

(Vote taken)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Motion carries four to one.

Further comment on Dr. Heslop's presentation?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, do either of you southern residents have comments on those?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's consistent with what we heard on the motions.
Is there a motion to accept those two?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll move.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

Hearing none, those in favor say "aye."

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

Motion carries unanimously.

Does that conclude the presentation?

All right.

Other discussion on AURs adopted or presented at this point before we move on.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Just a question.

Since those are new, do we have them on our software?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We will.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It needs to be updated?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Yes. It needs to be updated, since not official until this morning. We'll get those.

All right. Let's move on to the main event, the presentation by NDC, discussion and possible decisions concerning instructions to NDC on modifications of the grids for development of draft.
Congressional and Legislative maps.

I'd ask the Commission to get to a vantage point where they can see it.

Dr. Heslop.

DR. HESLOP: Commissioners, thank you. I apologize for the disturbance. Chairman Lynn asked me, to in the interests of informing the public, to, in short, cover some of the features of the agenda, what is the Commission's schedule. And here it is.

As we understand it, August the 1st through October the 1st, here is the schedule of the Commission.

On August the 1st, we received the last of the citizen input forms, the last of the written communications, last of the citizen input from this stage of the public input process.

I have completed reading many of the CIFs from the last week. I got some new ones today, Mr. Chairman, and some additional letters and maps, and we will summarize them over the weekend.

By August 4 we will have completed what the Commission has been calling the rough map stage.

Between August the 4th and the 8th, the Commission moves into district development.

On August the 8th, with a map to adjust,
maps to adjust, for Congress and the Legislature, the
Commission goes into the adjustment stage.

And then between the 11th of August and
the 15th of September, you have further opportunity for
citizen comment and the second round of public hearings.

September 15th through 26 is the time when
the plans are fine tuned, when we go down to that one
person deviation, if that's what it is going to be. And
then between September 26 and October 1st, there's a
final report. And I do not have, on this schedule, of
course, an item that concerns the attorneys, the
submission for preclearance. So, Mr. Chairman, that's
the schedule. And I know that the Commission has
published it, but in the interests of information here
to the public, I have gone through it for them.

If you could now move into --

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I
think there is something missing from that, as I
understood the process. At the end when we issue what
we believe is a final report, it's my understanding we
keep the record open for a week to 10 days to receive
additional public input on the final product.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I don't know about the
specific timing on openness, but I think that point was
agreed upon by the Commission. Once we had adopted
final maps, there would be a period for final comment
before we sent it to the Department of Justice, if you
would.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Dr. Heslop, the only
central concern I had is if NDC would be able to produce the
maps in relation to the first two or three meeting days
in enough lead time, that Mr. Johnson will be able to
print and be able to Fed Ex to various locations. Last
time as we went out there one of the comments we
received consistently was get us the maps so we can
review them and be able to comment on them at an
informed or educated level at the hearing rather than
seeing them at the hearing for the first time. We'll be
getting real close, at the 11th to 15th --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: That's a month --

COMMISSIONER ELDER: The eighth and
eleventh, start the hearing.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: August 25th is the first
hearing. That's a two-week period.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Citizen comment is
the 15th --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Of September.


DR. HESLOP: There's a lot of time.
I have distinct recollection the
Commission did commit to a period when the public would
review. That should be added to the schedule.

Let's go to the Power Point presentation.

The purpose of this presentation is to
assist the Commission in making decisions on grid
adjustment. I'm going to say some things the Commission
perfectly well understands and has in mind. I say them
because there is a public audience.

The heart of the Commission's process was
the equal population grid. The Commission took it to 24
different hearings in all parts of the state seeking the
reactions of the public. The Commission got reactions,
not only reaction not only in the way of hearings but
also in the way of a large flow of citizen input flows,
in terms of written comments from which we derived AURs.
There were also citizen plans and plans for use by
different organizations.

So the Commission is how in possession of
a very substantial body of citizen input and
information.

Let's go on.

We are ending what we referred to as the
rough planning stage of the redistricting process. And
I hope is isn't redundant just quickly to remind
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ourselves of what that rough planning stage has been composed of.

It began on July 17th with very specific discussions by the Commission, discussion on the principles that should form the redistricting process.

At that meeting the Commission did adopt principles for it's conduct and for the development of maps. Also at that meeting the Commission asked NDC to proceed with the identification of three major communities. We'll be saying a lot about them.

Just a quick reminder. We're talking about the Native American community, the Hispanic community, and the rural and urban communities of the state.

On the 20th of July, NDC presented a report to the Commission. Our effort in that report was to provide basic planning information. We made some recommendations for our grid adjustment. We discussed controversies, grid-wide controversies, and others. We developed a checklist, because we felt there were controversies we felt Commissioners would want to think through how they should be resolved.

We provided analysis of the maps that we had received, basic information, because we had not at that point received the political information. Indeed,
we still have not received full political information.

And we provided an update to July 17 of the citizen input.

As of Monday of next week, you'll receive a further input of citizen input.

So those were the first steps taken in rough planning.

Let's go on.

These are, I suppose, self-evident points.

But I wish to make them anyway.

The Commission is responsible for decisions. Perhaps this sounds a little bit defensive. Maybe I wrote it after reading one of the CIFs from Scottsdale that said "Don't let the consultants anywhere near the maps." So I say this because NDC is not the map maker, map drawer here, the Commission is. I should comment, also, that the maps that you will receive from others are not your maps, either. The Commission is its own map maker.

The second obvious point, the decisions that you make here today, and I hope you make decisions today, are not final decisions. They are preliminary. They can be undone. They will in many cases be undone. I would be unhappy if you thought they were in any sense other than a preliminary sense lines. Because we can,
we can make changes.

And the final bullet there, and it's a point that the Commission understands very well, there are principles that guide the Commission.

Proposition 106 provides those principles, but -- and you have principles, also, that you, yourselves, have developed and principles, too, that come out of the public process to the Commission.

Let's go on.

So I would refer to this as a principle redistricting. And without belaboring the point, most of the redistrictings taken on in the country are not principled, they are guided by partied interested, they are guided by self-interests. And members of the NDC team and I like to be involved in a process that is guided by such principles.

The principles you adopt are two key principles in redistricting. The principles are the community of interest principle. And, you found, as you went around the state, that citizens are capable of identifying their own communities, that they do perceive, as Commissioner Huntwork was saying, the place where they live is special, they don't have to be in Scottsdale to have that sense.

Proposition 106 says to the extent
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practicable you should be respecting communities of
interest. That's what comes from 106.

   Much the same is true from respecting
jurisdictions. You see the close overlap between to
those two principles.

   I make the point also that the citizen
testimony and comment is, itself, a principle.

   The Commission time and time again, it's
obvious in the discussion just had on AURs, was guided
by citizen testimony and comment.

   So forgive me for rehearsing these
matters, but I think they are important.

   Now, what I'm seeking to do in this Power
Point, what I'll ask Doug Johnson, our senior mapping
analyst, who has in front of him a little paper packet
on the Power Point to provide them to the Commission.
And you don't have to follow this Power Point to see, I
think, where I'm headed.

   I would like to go through the items that
NDC is suggesting for your decision, requests for
instruction, our recommendations. I would like to go
through them and then, if it is your wish, I would like
to come back and look at them one at a time and suggest
to you, that, as a Commission, you may want to
deliberate and decide these maps --
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Heslop, for edification, go through all of them, give us a sense of what the task is under the item, reconvene on Friday, hit them one at a time and give us a sense.

DR. HESLOP: That's the wish.

Here are the principles. No news here.

These are principles already adopted.

We will recommend, later, that you give us an instruction to adjust the grid to respect Native American Tribal Reservations. You have a map of those you know that the grid offends. We believe that the grid should be adjusted.

We think that there should be an adjustment of the grid to respect the Hispanic AUR that we have developed with you. We think that the grid should be adjusted to respect that rural urban community line to the extent we can. And we think that the grid should be adjusted to minimize those city, county divisions. We think that's especially important in the rural areas of the state. So here are some issues in terms of general principle for grid adjustment.

Let's go on.

This slide was intruded in my Power Point last evening by Marguerite Leoni.

MR. RIVERA: Troublemaker.
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DR. HESLOP: I'm not sure what her motives were, maybe trying to make me remember she's not imperfect or maybe trying to remind me I'm not perfect, it's an imperfect world, we're all going to develop a not perfect map, a sure-fire map, but keeping that in mind as we develop requests for the map and ask for instruction.

Go on.

We think you should instruct us to develop a Northern Arizona Congressional and Legislative District.

You know the situation here. It is the problem of the Hopi-Navajo separation. We have some thoughts on that.

My suggestion is that on this issue and all the other issues that we make some preliminary comment, comment that refers back to the testimony, to remind you have some of the issues, and that you then discuss it and, if you can, or will, give us an instruction on how you wish to proceed.

So that's one tough item.

Next, please.

We think that you should instruct us to develop two CDs in that Hispanic community area and that you should tell us to enhance influence in other
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Congressional areas to the extent practical.

We think, too, you should tell us to develop Legislative Districts in that same area.

And we think that you should tell us while we're about it to respect other communities of interest, these other minority communities of interest throughout the state.

I'll ask Marguerite Leoni when we come to that issue to suggest some of the basic issues you may wish to address in your discussion.

Let's go on.

You'll recognize, perhaps, a pattern here which requests for instruction relate in each case back to the principles that you have determined should guide the redistricting, one of them, of course, is the development of rural districts.

We think you should instruct us to develop one entirely rural Congressional District and another that comes into the urban area but does so as unintrusively as possible linking, perhaps, with those exurbs that still have a strong rural feel or sentiment as expressed in citizen testimony.

We think that you should tell us to do much the same with regard to the development of rural Legislative Districts.
Let's go on.

I know that Adams is an expert on the east valley. It's a big, troubling area. Some things came out very clearly from it. We think a Congressional District can come out from it that gives voice to their sense of community, that respects their boundaries. And these are, of course, city boundaries, and you should instruct us to develop such a district.

We believe that east valley districts for the Legislature can be developed in much the same way.

Let's go on.

We heard a lot of testimony, and we will be fair to the different aspects of that testimony when we come to this issue, but we are hoping that you will instruct us to develop an Eastern Arizona Legislative District that includes the Navajo and Apache Counties, Gila, Graham, and Greenlee, and uniting tribal reservations, and you'll tell us to do that and adjust the grid.

Here's Yuma, and we think that Yuma deserves a legislative district in terms of the testimony that we heard. And we hope that you would instruct us to develop such a legislative district.

Go on.

Yavapai is the same kind of issue.
Again, there is a volume of testimony to
which this request can be related.

Go on.

We think a West Valley Legislative
District is also supported by testimony and that that it
can be drawn in such a way as to respect local
communities of interest.

And we think that a Legislative District
can be centered on the River Communities AUR we
developed. We know there's controversy, but we think
such a district can be developed, and we hope you'll
give us instruction in that respect.

So, Mr. Chairman, members of the
Commission, we pause there.

The second part of the Power Point can be
done on paper rather than on Power Point. We can go
through each of the issues one by one.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission,
if it's your will, we'll treat them in the order we
presented them here, because that is an order that seems
to us to reflect the hierarchy of principles that you
have adopted. And we will be responsive, of course, to
any questions you have.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: To the extent, Dr. Heslop,
visuals might be useful in the discussion. I wonder if
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might reposition screen that direction so we might see
it in that direction, so we can see it as we discuss
them.

DR. HESLOP: Certainly.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any general questions for
Dr. Heslop or other consultants before we go through the
list as presented and deal with each of these items?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I did have one
question.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Where you talked
about an East Valley District, Congressional District, I
wanted to make sure of the population. A Congressional
District is 641,000. Six Legislative Districts, that's
a large area, six Legislative Districts.

DR. HESLOP: There is population -- the
population is indeed there.

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

CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right. Let's get down
to business.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, you'll see in
the second half of our presentation. We bring up these
individual matters.

As a way of assisting the public, we are
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going to show some maps as well. And these maps have, of course, already appeared in your binder. And you can, of course, check them on your Maptitude.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think I need to say very much about general principles.
We had considerable discussion of them.
It would be my hope the Commission would instruct us to make all of these changes to the grid.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Should there not be additional an item five on here for other AURs to the extent they're not redundant with the first four? When were we going to consider the other AURs? Or are they at a later step, stage?

DR. HESLOP: I thought, to this point, being that we would use those AURs in the district development process in these other areas. But we would not at all be opposed to the adjustment of the grid, bring it into line with all the AURs.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: In the process, as we look at various issues, like the very first one, adjust the grid with respect to the Native American Tribal Reservations, can we overlay the grid as we have it now on the process of the screen so we see what adjustments
on the grid would be?

DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Elder, that is available in your binder.

Can you do that?

MR. HUTCHISON: I can do that.

What is the item in the binder for that overlay.

DR. ADAMS: Number six.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Number six.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No. Maps and statistics for AURs.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: One other question while he's finding that.

The checklist in your report to us, questions you posed, some of which are addressed by the Power Point but some are not.

DR. HESLOP: Right.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Are we also going to have an opportunity to go through those, give you answers to those not addressed in the Power Point.

DR. HESLOP: I hope you'll do that. I'd be very interested in that.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Original grids we approved.

MR. HUTCHISON: Which grid?
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COMMISSIONER ELDER: Congressional, now,
so we can see when we're looking at approving what the
ramifications are. These, Dr. Heslop, we have the grid,
like isolated areas. I want to see the gestalt, what is
it doing to the whole thing.

DR. HESLOP: Like I commented in my
report, this is not the grid's strongest suit.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I've been through
that.

DR. HESLOP: With regard to the Tohono
O'odham Nation in particular, the grid did not do well.
So there is the --

MR. HUTCHISON: Would you like me to go
in?

The Tohono O'odham Nation was split into
three districts, Southern District, Pima County, this
border, extends into Maricopa County, split this
district, a noncontiguous portion in southeastern; San
Carlos was split into three districts, northwest, not
one -- southeastern, and the southern district. Gila
River --

Want me go through every Indian
Reservation?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: No. Going through
discussions, the grid, for areas, where it's split,
jurisdictional, where it split the Native American
Reservations, where it split AURs. I wanted it in
background. Include the grid. Where adjusting things,
if so, why so; if add to, take away, so we know what
we're causing.

MR. HUTCHISON: See major revisions, the
Navajo division, Fort Apache, Gila River split into two,
and I believe Walapai split into two districts.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Havasupai --

MR. HUTCHISON: Kaibab is split.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Kaibab.

MR. HUTCHISON: They are --

MR. HUTCHISON: Just to highlight, you

have a Maptitude report in your binders that highlights
divisions of tribal reservations by grid, which are
split, what divisions, how many times.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right. I'll try to
keep on track so we know when we're finished with an
item and ready to move on.

The question was raised by the initial
restatement of the general principles we already
especially agreed to.

Any more comment on the question on that
particular issue?

Mr. Huntwork.
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COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: My question about
the other AURs really is when will we consider maps?
I don't know, one of the points we
discussed to some extent overlap and contradict each
other. I don't know how you can really take it into
consideration thoroughly without further input on how we
want you to do that. When will we do that? Obviously
it is our intention to take it into consideration.

DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Huntwork, my
recommendation would be, if you let us, in the period
between now and the eighth, to report to you on those
AURs and on the impact of the development of different
district configurations of AURs. Our intention would be
to bring you a map on the 8th with a substantial set of
notes on the implications of that map for AURs and
alternative configurations of AURs that we must have in
our mind for a map. And a rough general principle I've
been thinking about as a map is developed and we seek
those districts that respect best those AURs. But you
will have not only a map but notations on alternatives
that would respect AURs in different way or perhaps some
cases better ways.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think that's a
good suggestion and how we ought to proceed.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, then,
can we reconfirm these, as a minimum, are directions to consultants to proceed in adjusting the grid using principles reflected in one through four?

Then let's move on.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, we will move on.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: No, Chris, let's move on.

MR. HUTCHISON: I'm moving as fast as the Power Point will allow.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Kidding. A little grief.

DR. HESLOP: If there is more troubling controversy in your binder, I don't know it if there is, partly pause it speaks directly to the Commission's major principle of community, partly also because it addresses a crucial voting rights concern.

We believe that the Commission should instruct us with regard to the development of the Northern California District -- Northern Arizona.

MR. RIVERA: We can give instructions on that, also.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: We can get them more messed up than they already are.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Just sink it.

DR. HESLOP: I got it. It won't happen again, if I can help it.
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DR. HESLOP: -- Northern Arizona District

and the issue of the Hopi and Navajo.

Maybe we could look at that in graphic
terms.

In order to give our perspective on this
issue, let me just say that we have carefully read the
testimony and the written comments. There aren't a
great many CIFs on this issue, but there are important
written comments. And it is clear there are both pros
and cons on this issue of separation.

Paragraph to us it seems that the pros for
separation involve first and primarily the fact that
this community perceives itself to be very different
from the surrounding community, and they are able to
define themselves very precisely as a community in
cultural, social, economic, and spiritual terms. They
think of themselves as a particular and different
community. And I begin there with the pros.

There are also clear interest differences.

Why are we interested, why is the Commission using
community? The issue of representation has to do with
the issues represented and whether or not the
representative will speak with a clear voice to the
concerns of the community. And here, too, the Hopi,
Navajo have their differences.
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At a Federal level, issue differences seem to be different.

The third point for difference, Congress themselves and federal courts have given recognition for recognition of a separate identity. Indeed, speaking of courts, the Hopi have made claim with regard to retrogression.

In all of these ways, a case has been made by the Hopi for separation. But there is a case against separation, too.

The Navajo is the larger community. The Hopi is a very small community. The map design, if the Commission wishes, and indeed has the instruction from 106 to develop compact districts, this is not a compact district. This map that would separate the Hopi.

There is a Native American voice in Arizona. And the Native American voice has spoken in your testimony and in written comments about the importance of uniting Arizona Native American tribes.

And then, finally, there is a voting rights case on the other side that to create a Hopi District could have negative effects on the Native American population in the Navajo prescribed districts.

So here's an issue where there are real questions on both sides.
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It also has to be said that there is both
a Legislative question and a Congressional question.
Indeed, the Native American testimony is
somewhat divided on the Legislative issue, as it is also
on the Congressional issue.
So, Mr. Chairman, I recognize the
troubling character of this issue. But the
Commissioners should also recognize that this is a very
important starting point for any plan and that these are
very different approaches that could have ramifying
effects throughout the plan.
So we would hope, Mr. Chairman, to receive
instruction on it.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think before we enter
into that discussion, any instruction given to the
consultants today is instruction up to a point. We
should be clear instruction given today is, too, in
effect, test the ramifications of that instruction when
you return to us with maps having followed instructions
given today. Those maps may have created problems
greater than those following instruction given to you.
We'd have the opportunity to change instructions.
DR. HESLØP: You stated that exactly as I
commented to Commissioner Huntwork.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: What I'd like to do on
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each of these, so as to control debate, what I'd like to do is entertain an affirmative motion on each of these, entertain discussion on each of the motions.

If someone is prepared, I'd entertain a motion for instruction with respect to Northern Arizona Congressional and Legislative Districts. I'd like to hear it.

DR. HESLOP: If I could have the indulgence of the Chair just a moment, the map we put up is, of course, not the only way of dividing the Hopi from the Navajo. We used it only to indicate the sort of separation that could occur.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: That's an excellent point. We're not at this moment giving you instruction either way to suggest we favor one of the two representations we've seen.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I have a suggestion. I think we're dealing with to separate issues here. We're dealing with Congressional Districts and we're dealing with Legislative Districts. I think rather than one motion, we should deal with them separately.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm happy to take them separately.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I have spent, had three separate meetings with the Navajo Nation, three separate meetings with Hopi representatives, and certainly Mr. Heslop has not understated the unreconcilable differences, if you will. And so there's no question that this is a very challenging issue.

Therefore, it is my opinion at this point that we attempt to try and maintain on a Congressional level the separateness of these two entities.

Therefore, I make a motion we instruct our consultants to draw a northeastern rural Congressional District with an attempt -- with an effort to separate the Hopis from the Navajos.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If I might, Mr. Hall, I take it your motion has -- actually deals with more than one of the recommendations the consultants are asking for. If we might just deal with a Congressional District with respect to the Hopi and Navajo, specifically. In terms of the rural characteristic, that's another issue we'll get to in a moment.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Northeast or --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Norhest or somewhere else?

Ask you take "rural" out of there. That's
a different factor. We'd like to deal with rural versus
urban separately. That's a separate issue to be dealt
with differently in terms of -- there's some
overlapping.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm just saying, to go
back to the previous screen, the three major areas,
adjusting the screen, rural Native American, rural
versus urban, utilize the three, in that respect they
do. There's Native Americans there. That's why I
included the word rural in there.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If you want to keep it in
there.

Is there a second to the motion?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's been moved and
seconded.

Discussion on the motion?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: At the
Congressional level, I'm in favor of the motion. I
think there are solid reasons for putting the two
populations in separate districts. I would like to
suggest, however, removing that "rural" characteristic.
I think it might add an additional layer which might be
limiting to the consultants when they are trying to do
what we've asked them to do. Later we'll tell them to
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recognize rural interests, ask them to recognize rural interests. I wouldn't want them to mix up that up. Therefore, I'd ask, propose amending the motion to remove the section referencing rural sections.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: There is an amendment to the motion. Is there a second to the amendment?

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'll agree to accept the amendment, pull that out, if that's okay, instructing the consultants to create a northeastern district that would keep the Hopis separate, Navajos separate from the Hopis.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Hopis are unique and vulnerable and that we should make every effort, to the extent that we can, to provide them with the tools they feel they need. They made it very clear what they feel they need to insure their continued survival. That's really the way in which the Hopis have expressed this issue. I am concerned, however, about making this decision in a vacuum.

The -- I don't know that there is any single issue in this state that in and of itself drives
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the entire layout of how these Congressional Districts
get laid out. I think this is a critically important
issue. I want to say, therefore, I think the separation
of Northern Arizona between an Eastern District and
Western District makes sense for other reasons as well.
And I, just in supporting the motion, I want to make it
clear that we have other important factors involved,
too, in dividing in this manner.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Huntwork.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

One of the things that concerns me, I want to make sure
we keep categories separate if all possible. This will
have effect on four, five, six other decisions along the
line, if combining issues, rural to urban, whether it be
social, economic, or something else, whatever.

I'd like to keep issues, categories, as
clean as possible, so we don't set a precedence in
effect here in the way we do it, then come down the line
and do something totally different and there's not a
really traceable process we went through to arrive at
the process.

I agree with the removal of the rural
aspect to keep it as clean as possible, do it from
there.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

Other comments on the motion?

I'd like to weigh in on this one.

I think Dr. Heslop characterizes this one correctly when he says this is probably the most difficult, at least the most overtly difficult decision we need to make in a preliminary instruction to the consultants.

There are two principles that weigh very heavily on me in making this decision. Again, it's not irrevocable to the extent we need to proceed down one of these paths.

It's clear to me if you vote in favor of separating the two tribes that you run the risk of violating the compact and contiguous nature of the kind of redistricting that we are trying to achieve. And that's troublesome. But on this issue, it's less troublesome than what appears to be a clear separation of communities of interest between these two tribes, particularly. And I don't believe it exists, at least to this degree, and it may not exist to much of a degree in any other part of the state. Here it is very clear those two communities do not share the same interests from the same point of view. To have them Congressionally represent by the same individual would
make it virtually impossible to have those two interests represented fairly, in my opinion.

I'm in favor of the motion. I'll support the motion, again, with the reservation I'd like to see what it does to the rest of the grid adjustment as we move forward.

In principle, I'm in favor of keeping the two tribes separate in grid support.

Any further discussion?

If not, all in favor, signify by saying "aye."

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

Motion carries.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Another motion, and I may need help from my esteemed legal colleague in terms of Legislative Districts.

In terms of a Congressional District, it was important to do what we did. For a Legislative District, the Hopis and Navajos see themselves as separate communities of interest. To the extent possible, I would like to accommodate them. However, I do not believe that the issues are as critical at the Legislative level as they are at the Congressional level. Most of the differences that they have are
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issues that their representatives in Congress deal with
rather than the Legislature.

The major differences in representing in
the Legislature, Indian gaming, these two communities
are in agreement.

I need help designing a motion that
basically says: Do it if you can, but don't -- you
know, don't have it create a noncontiguous, noncompact
mess up in Northern Arizona.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If you'll define it, we're
pretty close.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Separate Hopi and
Navajos.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Respect Legislative
Districts -- you are making motion that the attempt
should be made to keep them separate Legislatively
unless doing so would create a problem with other
mapping in that area?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Exactly.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second to that
motion?

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'll second it for
purposes of discussion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

It's been moved and seconded.
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Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you. An attorney in Northeastern Arizona submitted an interesting proposal. Here's a proposal to the solution of Ms. Minkoff's motion. Again, I'm not sure any of us had a chance to analyze it or what the ramifications are.

If you notice, the Hopis are there to the north. Legislatively, the corridor comes due south and connects it, among other issues, connects it with another district.

Having some level of familiarity with this area of the state, there are some strengths and weaknesses with this proposal. It merits some consideration.

Some strengths are in addition to Hopi lands, and Moencopi off to the west, looks like the little head on the bird, also the Hopis have made subsequent acquisitions, my understanding is at least five additional ranches. Most all of those ranches are located to the south within the brown portion indicated on this map. Four of those are around Winslow, Flagstaff, and one is located in Eager, the 26 Bar John Wayne Ranch, up in my stomping grounds.

One of the things this proposal is...
Legislatively, it includes all lands owned by the Hopis.

Now, my understanding is four of the five ranches are in the application process, four further to the north; it's my understanding they've not submitted the 26 Bar further to the north.

The Hopis made it clear to me as I met with the Chairman that on occasion there have been some divergent issues on a state level. One of the very critical issues affecting the Native Americans now, and Mr. Rivera could enlighten us, is health care. And because of those health care issues, there is, I guess, in some of the proposals made for support from the State Legislature, that there has been some efforts, inclusions / exclusions, depending on one's perspective. Therefore, gaming is not the only issue. There are other issues with respect to infrastructure, et cetera.

So I think that that is an idea for the Commission to consider. And this is an idea for maybe NDC to pursue if it's the wishes for this Commission to vote in favor of the motion as indicated by Ms. Minkoff.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Hall.

Other comments on the motion?

Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Because of the just the shape of the Hopi area, it is -- and the fact
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that it is substantially surrounded by Navajo
Reservation, creating the separation by definition will
deviate from the compactness and contiguity standards.
And it's that which concerns by about the motion. It's
inherently what concerns me.

If it's that we'll tolerate that but not
have it if it doesn't create good districts throughout
the rest of Northern Arizona, the instruction should
explicitly recognize we intend to do that, that we're
going to authorize that in this case.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I take it it's a sense of
Ms. Minkoff's motion we'll do that so long as it does
not impair the ability to draw other districts in the
rest of the state, that that was the spirit of the
motion that was made.

Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Something else I
thought of, Mr. Chairman, look at the map, other flat
spots with respect to it, that's a whole other issue,
but -- another idea of the strength of this particular
idea, Hopis would also be included with the San Carlos
and White Mountain Apache Tribe for an increased level
of Native American influence in that southern looking
district.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments?

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I had the impression the Hopi felt comfortable looking west instead of south. In this motion, I don't want to include a decision about which direction --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It doesn't. This map is not included in that part of the motion. It's simply one of the ways it might be accomplished.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Exactly.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Heslop included a western approach --

COMMISSIONER HALL: The Hopi said they like it identical to the way it is. Probably not have.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Except the current district, the entire reservation isn't in one district, just a small portion of it.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I understand.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the motion?

If not, the motion, again, is to, for the purposes of the legislative districting in Northeastern Arizona, that to the extent practicable, without negative impact on other legislative districting efforts, the Navajo and Hopi should be separated.

All those in favor of the motion signify
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by saying "aye."

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

Motion carries five to zero.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, the next request for instruction relates to the Hispanic AUR.

I'd ask Marguerite Leoni who is a post student of this issue to comment on it.

While she's coming to the podium, let me say one of the very few advantages of the issue you were just discussing is that the numbers involved are very low.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Unlike the issue we're about to discuss.

MS. LEONI: Good morning, Commissions.

Dr. Heslop has asked me to address the issue of the development of the Hispanic community districts. And there are two significant bits of evidence that recommend this approach to your rough draft of a plan. The first of significance has nothing to do with your testimony but has a legal status. And it has to do simply with geographic residential patterns.

And could you bring that up, Chris.

MR. HUTCHISON: Could we dim.
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MS. LEONI: Could we dim the lights just a bit.

This is not a situation in Arizona where we have to guess where there are high concentrations. We do not need tentacles or leaps and bounds to find minorities. By shading the Census map according to densities, you'll find they are located primarily in South Phoenix, Tolleson, the Avondale area.

Help this along by simply placing the Census AUR over it, Chris.

Warm colors, high density, pink, yellow, and green.

Without an iota of testimony, this residential pattern can have significance from a legal point view under Section Two analysis. Now, it's not the only factor, but it is one of much significant.

Now, obviously, this area doesn't represent a Legislative or Congressional District. And there are little pieces that the Commission is going to want to address, maybe large pieces.

For example, we have the Guadalupe appendage off to the east which appears to have at least a natural color affinity with geographic patterns here. But the nice thing about this approach is that your decisions in this respect are supported not only by
geographic residential patterns but by testimony. You had a cohesive group of minority representatives. Some at a community level tell you in explicit terms about why this group deserves recognition on a basis of then where they simply live, testimony having to do with culture, language issues, socioeconomic status, educational, concerns of unique concern to people of this residence.

On that testimony we developed, in your binder, uncanny but natural reflections how that testimony coincides with geographic patterns.

Our request, our recommendation, our request for instruction from you is this be one of the prime areas of the state where you consider creation of minority opportunity and minority influence districts.

There are going to be adjustments to be made. We don't have perfect population here. There are other areas of population that are not adjacent but are close. And decisions are going to be made, need to be made by you. But we would like the general instruction to proceed, instruction to create general Congressional and Legislative Districts. There will be the need for obvious finetuning further on in the process, but the general location of districts isn't going to change.

There is another sensitive area of state.
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Chris, if we can look at that.

This one is a little more difficult to see because of the combined minority character of the southern part of the state. We do have warm areas, Hispanic areas highlighted. Those, Chris, residential AURs. This, again, is in your book, the South Phoenix, Tolleson, Avondale, Guadalupe area, to see the relationship.

We also gathered in this general AUR other rich concentrations of Hispanic community. And these are -- these concentrations are aided by the significance of -- by the presence of significance Native American concentrations which we believe, and we're studying this now, will reflect a strong community of interest on many issues with the Hispanic community. And these are, of course, the Tohono O'odhom Reservation --

Chris, do you have that? -- Pascua Yaqui.

One option in this particular AUR, extension of this AUR into other tribal lands that are to the north between Phoenix and perhaps even in the Maricopa area, and bring them down into here.

Once again, we believe this is an area where a Congressional District is appropriate.
We think creation of that Congressional District naturally locates for you the minority concentration on the legislative side.

The number of districts, I think it is, from looking at numbers, you have numbers in the binder, we're looking at two, I believe, substantial total minority Hispanic Congressional Districts.

The number of Legislative, at this point, I think is somewhat fluid, but we're certainly in the number of eight, at a minimum. And the actual number will depend on a number of other considerations that the Commission has to make.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Leoni.

May we then have affirmative motion with respect to this instruction on this portion of grid development?

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I so move.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: May I take it from the motion we're talking both for the entire block, that is to say --

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I move all of the words on the screen.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Both Congressional and Legislative.
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Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Question. When you talk about the two Congressional Districts, is it understood by this motion we are really talking about one centered in Maricopa County and one centered in the center part of the state?

MS. LEONI: Well, that's for you to tell me, Commissioner Minkoff. I'll tell you that's what I'm understanding. That's what I'm understanding from the residential patterns.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Right.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think that's what the testimony and Census data suggests that's the location, in general terms.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If we do it, we'll not find enough people anyplace else.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Anyway, Chris, put up again the original grid on each one of those options as well as maybe a couple of towns so we see the context of these, especially the southern areas, the Arizona grid, where the Southern Arizona AUR is.

MR. HUTCHISON: Grid, AUR, red is the AUR,
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and cities over it?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes. As well as Indian, Native American, Tohono O'odhom?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: We've seen three AURs, four AURs, not one geographical reference. Unless you have some good idea what the pattern of roadways are, you're lost. I have no idea what the pattern of roadways in Phoenix are.

COMMISSIONER HALL: What do you call --

MR. HUTCHISON: Hispanic AURs.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: South Mountain in there, a geologic form, river, anything that tells us where those are.

MR. HUTCHISON: A lot of other AURs relate to South Mountain. Isaac School District is an AUR, is included in a general area, all wholly included.

MS. LEONI: If you'd pull up, it's easy to develop the geographic features.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: While Chris is doing that, Mr. Huntwork, do you have a question?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'd like to ask what is the percentage of Hispanic population in those two AURs, the wording we're about to approve, the reference to maximizing the effective remaining population in the other districts, how many people are
we talking about?

MS. LEONI: Could you give me a moment,

Mr. Huntwork, give me a moment to calculate that for

you?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: While they're doing

that, what I'd like to see, when we end up doing these,

adjust the grid, we've not seen grid, I'd like to see

the grid every time we have an AUR.

The red line is the proposed Hispanic AUR.

And the X lines --

MR. HUTCHISON: Hatched lines are Indian

Reservation.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: The grid is the

colored in area underneath everything, I see.

DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Elder, those

grid AURs are covered in the binder.

MS. LEONI: Commissioner Huntwork, I'll

use numbers to keep it simpler. There are 1,295,000

persons of Hispanic origin in the state. These two AURs

include 716,000, so close to 55 percent.

What we're looking at maximizing are other

majorities, not -- other than American Indian, Native

American, not large populations of other minorities,
either Asian or African American. However, in

combination, often communities have similar interests.
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So we're looking not only at Hispanic, also combined minority concentrations.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Could you just also tell me how many Hispanic voters are in each of the two, separately as well.

MS. LEONI: Voters -- voting age or voters?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: No. Residents, total population. Total Hispanic population in each.

MS. LEONI: What page -- Doug, give us those numbers.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's in the binder.

DR. ADAMS: Red numbered six, in the binder, very first of the two AURs have the statistics right behind.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Thank you. The numbers down here in red.

MR. HUTCHISON: Hispanic persons in each of the enclosed areas.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Can't see it.


COMMISSIONER ELDER: AURs agreed to earlier on, the Summit, and the Green Valley, and the Sahuarita, those get taken into account in how this balances, works as we do the process, that would work,
trying to get reference. The highway that runs from Yuma, red dots, is that Gila Bend, and where that freeway runs?

MR. HUTCHISON: I can throw in interstates.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Okay. That works.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Additional questions on the motion or additional comments on the motion? If not, all those in favor of the motion, essentially everything in the block that the consultants are asking for direction on, signify by saying "aye."

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Opposed say "no."

It's accepted unanimously and that direction is given.

Dr. Heslop.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, rural Arizona, urban Arizona, I believe if one counted the number of references in CIFs to the importance of distinguishing rural Arizona from urban Arizona, they would probably exceed in numbers references to any other single subject.

Earlier I made the mistake to referring to Northern California. I know a lot about Northern
California, and I know you would not get that kind of response from California. I was surprised by it when we went through the evidence for Arizona.

It is testimony that comes not only from the rural area but also from the urban area, much more of it from the urban area than rural area. But urban residents, too, want separate representation.

Underlying this drive for separate representation is an understanding, a common sense understanding, that rural areas of the state have different needs from those of the urban areas of the state.

The emphasis that we've seen throughout the community suggests that rural communities have their own special needs and require their own special representation, to a degree, not the same degree, but to a degree you find rural residents expressing that same position.

Now, the Commission is already committed to the principle of exploration of rural and urban division.

We now recommend and request instruction to develop two primarily rural Congressional Districts. One we believe can be kept out of the rural areas.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Urban.
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DR. HESLOP: Excuse me, out of urban areas. The other cannot. This brings us into touch with one of the gray areas of this rural, the other areas, places beyond the suburban belt, places that integrate out of the urban belt that go to the rural belt, see themselves as rural, where people go to escape to the rural and all too quickly find others following them down the freeway with this intrusion. The second rural CD you should make, in our opinion, would be to embrace such communities to the extent possible. We don't know to what extent it is possible, but we would certainly explore it. That, it seems to us, to be a general principle you could admonish us to adhere.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there an affirmative motion with respect to this recommendation?

COMMISSIONER HALL: So moved.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion.

Ms. Minkoff?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have a concern about the rural district that is going to have some intrusion into urban areas, because I'm concerned about what those urban areas might be. Our grid used Bell Road as the dividing line. We've seen a lot of draft
plans using Bell Road as a dividing line.

If we truly want to keep a district that has significant rural influence, I'm concerned about that, because that is the fastest growing part of the greater Phoenix urban area. And if that is put in a district that is to be primarily rural in character, it won't stay that way for long. Far before the 2010 Census, that will be an urban area. That's exploding.

It doesn't have to be part of the motion. If you are going to do this, I'd encourage you look for another part of a rural urban area.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We also had discussion of one AUR, one rural urban, in Southwestern Tucson. Instead of one intruding on Northern Phoenix, there may be some support for what we had previously done.

Any further discussion on the motion?

Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, especially with the initial decision which creates districts in Northern Arizona that divides east and west, that we may not -- this may be inconsistent in several ways. The idea of having one rural district that is purely rural and the other that can intrude, I'm not sure why we want to adopt that principle in such a pure way. Why not have two that are allowed to intrude
both to the minimum extent possible balanced that way
with the result being two districts more rural than one
purely rural and one purely urban? It gives
flexibility, also gives flexibility, giving some exurbs
in the west as well as exurbs in the east as well as
creates districts. Thought this may be overly
inflexible as currently stated.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?
COMMISSIONER HALL: As indicated in
abundant testimony referenced by Dr. Heslop, that's not
what the rural community wants. Currently the
population stage justifies almost completely rural
districts.

I think in light of the wishes of every
single city I attended in rural Arizona, from Flag to
Prescott to wherever, to Safford, Thatcher, they all
said: We want to be separate from the great state of
Maricopa, if you will.

So in an effort to -- my opinion is in an
effort to comply with and grant the wishes of what the
public very clearly, most clearly, said, this is the
issue that was most abundantly clear, what I read, of
any issue we have, therefore, I think that we have a
mandate, if you will, from the public with respect to
this issue.

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I don't think there's disagreement or inconsistency with these two opinions.

Basically, what I think we're directing you to do is to concentrate rural populations into Congressional Districts. Since there isn't enough rural population in the state to create two full Congressional Districts, you'll have to put some urban areas into it.

I agree with Commissioner Huntwork. I think what we're saying is yes, there will have to be an urban component to the two rural districts. There aren't enough people to do it otherwise. We don't want to tie your hands in terms of how you distribute this urban or suburban component, whether you put it all in one Congressional District or whether you distribute it evenly or unevenly between the two. I think you may need that flexibility. And that's why I would support Mr. Huntwork's proposal.

We are still going to end up with two rural congressional districts. Somewhere there will have to be an urban component. I'd like to allow you to remain flexible where you put that urban component.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I just wanted to
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assure Commissioner Hall and everyone else I heard that same testimony. I understand this -- I feel we have a mandate to create essentially two rural districts.

If I'm not mistaken, something like 20 percent of the population was in -- is outside the Phoenix and Tucson metropolitan areas. That's certainly one complete district and the majority of another.

Strategically, how do we best implement the mandate we received? I did not hear any one person testify I want one entirely rural district and then you can sacrifice the other district. I heard people say we want to separate rural from urban as much as possible. I think the more flexibility to consultants gives the more opportunity to do exactly that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the motion?

For my part, I think the way this is worded to me reflects not only what we heard in testimony but the reality of the circumstances you are talking about. What I mean by that, there isn't sufficient population for two purely rural districts; but there is clear sentiment around the state for one that is purely rural. And to that extent, and to the extent we've heard that testimony, I think for me the way this particular instruction is worded seems to be
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appropriate. I would support it the way it is.

Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I am -- I have tried to be -- to read the testimony and understand what it said. I don't remember a single comment that was that specific.

I do not remember any person standing up and saying: I want one entirely rural district. If you are aware of any such testimony, I would stand corrected.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I am aware of such testimony. In fact, we have map submitted by Mr. Platt. He submits two entirely rural districts, not one, two completely outside rural districts, not only testimony, maps generated by that testimony. So that's one of several. It can't be --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Not completely rural.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: What we did --

COMMISSIONER HALL: He did.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: What we did hear in a variety of locations: When you district this part of the state, please do not include us with Maricopa county. That we heard over and over again. And it is clear that if we're talking about the northern half of
the state, if there's to be a rural district, really
rural, and we comply with that kind of input, it would
not include Maricopa County in it. This instruction is
based on what we've done to date, cumulative
instructions we've given. I'm comfortable with and I
see great congruity between an encroachment district, if
I can use that term, being in the southern part of the
state, which allows the other part of the district to be
more pure. I'm comfortable with that.

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: One of the things
I've learned since I've gotten involved with this
districting that absolutely astounded me is that Arizona
is one of most urban states in the country. Having
driven through Northern Arizona, it doesn't look very
urban. Population tends to be concentrated in Phoenix
Tucson areas. Statistics I saw, it's not 80 percent of
Arizona, more like five-sixths of the population is
either very, very close to Phoenix or the Tucson
metropolitan area. If that's correct, we have something
less than a million people living in rural areas, around
other communities, or around the state.

My concern with that proposal, what we'll
end up with is one rural Congressional District and one
temporarily rural Congressional District that will soon
become an urban Congressional District dominated by urban areas.

I'm not sure that's what we were hearing.

I think that's a misinterpretation of the testimony. I think there's enough testimony out there to say we want more than one rural district. I don't think this will achieve it, at least in the long term.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion?

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I think 70 percent of my hearings, they were in rural areas. And there wasn't equivocation on the feeling and the statements and the presentations in those hearings that said anything except rural. We did get the exact quote, "the state of Maricopa." Many times they did include Maricopa and Pima County.

We did get extremely strong bias out of Maricopa county. "We do not want to be attached to them in any shape or form," that adamant, that type of feel, pervasive over meetings, river communities, southeastern to central.

We did not hear -- I believe we did not hear anybody come up and say: Gosh, it would be nice to be part of Maricopa County.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.
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COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I heard a few negatives about Pima County, too. I heard the same thing. I'm not at all disputing the arguments about rural versus urban. Again, the question is how to best implement that. Pure and simply, how do we best implement?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: The map best states that. People in audience probably want to make the 1:00 o'clock Diamondbacks Game, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I say call the question.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I gave up my tickets for the Diamondbacks this afternoon.

MR. RIVERA: Me, too.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Jose, we don't need to hear about your cross. It's not relevant. The question has been called. All those in favor of the motion, signify by saying aye.

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

Opposed "no"?

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Motion carries four to one.
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It would be appropriate at this point, we're coming up on the noon hour, to take the noon break.

What is the pleasure of the Commission.

With the agenda, with this speed, we're proceeding through the agenda, take a full hour for lunch and come back at 1:00 o'clock and continue with the agenda?

Without objection, we'll recess until 1:00 o'clock and resume then.

(Recess taken at 11:48 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will stand in session.

Dr. Heslop, would you talk about the next set of recommendations for the East Valley, please.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, as you know, there was a huge volume of testimony from the various East Valley communities. For the sake of convenience, I'd suggest you think about it in two categories.

First of all, from the very big communities of Scottsdale and Tempe and Mesa, there was a volume of evidence that they did not wish to be divided. We've referenced this subject earlier. And then another even greater volume of evidence from citizens had to do with linkages.
Some citizens, let's take a look at the map, some citizens want to be linked to Ahwatukee and Fountain Hills, take a look at Ahwatukee, others to Gilbert, Chandler, Queen Creek to the south, and others, still, to Fountain Hills, and Carefree, and Cave Creek to the north.

So there are two problems that the citizens brought the Commission. One problem, division of communities. Second question of linkage of communities.

I'm sorry Florence isn't here. She's been working 48 hours flat. She's very much expert on the East Valley area having redistricted a number of the communities.

Mesa, for example, is a community with which she's very familiar. It's current population is 300 -- is it 396,000, 400,000 people. That community will by 2010 have 550,000 persons in it, according to Mesa's own projections. These communities are very rapidly growing communities. They have an opinion about themselves, an opinion about their community that isn't always fully shared.

There are some people in Mesa, particularly in East Mesa, who think primarily linkage to more rural areas, yet others in Mesa think of linkage
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to Tempe. All these problems of linkage.

So, in any event, sitting with Florence
and Chris, we took another look at the citizen
testimony. And we believe that the citizen testimony is
such that if you follow it, if you follow the citizen
testimony, it should be possible to create, let's go
back to the recommendation, it should be possible to
create one East Valley Congressional District which
respects these local self-identifying communities. And
it should also be possible, we believe, to develop six
Legislative Districts which have the same effect of
respecting community.

Obviously, some decisions are going to be
involved in developing these districts. And our
thought, ladies and gentlemen, is there is a basis in
the testimony itself for most of those decisions.

As with all of these other requests for
recommendation, our thought is if you give us this
instruction, we'll away and do our very best with it.
We'll also give you full notation, full detail on the
choices that develop as the lines are drawn so you will
know the alternatives.

So, Mr. Chairman, Commissions, one East
Valley Congressional District and six East Valley
Legislative Districts.
We'd be happy for your instruction.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Can you put that --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd rather do it that way.

If you have questions, let's answer those.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay. I'm looking at the population figures you've got there. It appears to me that what you are really talking about is almost two Congressional Districts in this part of the valley. And so I'm wondering, when you are requesting a recommendation just for one, what happens with the rest of it?

DR. HESLOP: Well, the recommendation would be one, that would be very clearly most of the east valley. When people look at the map, people would say: Ah, there is the East Valley Congressional District.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: have you considered separating the Southeast Valley from --

DR. HESLOP: No, we didn't.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: -- from the northern portion? That might be a way to go about doing it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other questions -- I prefer to have a motion, if you want to clarify anything first.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: We heard public comment this morning from representatives of Casa Grande. They have proposed a Legislative District combining Apache Junction, Gold Camp, following the county line with Casa Grande. Can you -- do you have a comment, any comment on that, Dr. Heslop?

DR. HESLOP: We’re extremely interested in Casa Grande. There was volume of testimony. We had a citizen petition with regard to it. And we believe that it may be possible to accommodate all of the interests there.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a motion?

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I would like to move the adoption of the recommendations set forth on the screen.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think along the lines Andi was saying, I don't know how we could do anything other than at least one Congressional District and at least six Legislative Districts in the East.
Valley, doesn't come out even close to even. And it's what we do with the remainder that is the difficult question here.

I will say that particularly with respect to Congressional Districts and the sentiments expressed this morning about the Phoenix metropolitan area, in effect, I don't think those people weren't mad at the rural residents of Maricopa County, just the urban residents, probably.

The Phoenix metropolitan area contains very close to five-eighths of the population of the state. I don't know how statistics are put together, whether or not they included Apache Junction and Gold Camp. But if they did, you do have a very neat, clean allocation of five Congressional Districts, two Phoenix Congressional Districts.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Mr. Chairman, could you hold until tape is -- change in tape right now.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Chris, the hatching.

MR. HUTCHISON: Distinguish city from unincorporated islands in the city.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Incorporated -- unincorporated or nondesignated places.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Suggests the start of an extremity of an unincorporated area and start of
an incorporated area, end up with the most compact and
contiguous districts that include that area and, in
effect, free up the rest of the state from those -- from
the crossover.

Now, I would also would like to say I
attended hearing in Apache Junction, and there was quite
a bit of testimony at that hearing to link Apache
Junction and Gold Camp with the Phoenix metropolitan
area, not the rest of Pinal County. We have some very
strongly conflicting testimony in that area.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder, Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'd say in support of
that, also, both at the Safford and Thatcher meetings,
both Globe meetings, and representative of that
discussed at the San Manuel and Pinal County issues,
they were pretty uniform in saying, yeah, keep Apache
Junction, Gold Camp, keep it with the metropolitan area.
It's not rural. If used rural, it doesn't have
commonalty from a standpoint of mining, agriculture.

Two things were brought out, Gila Valley,
mixing along the San Pedro, San Manuel, San Pedro,
urban, more resort, health care systems, gravitate
toward the metropolitan area. I see that.

The problem I have here, to some extent,
is that Apache Junction, Gold Camp, are in different
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counties, different areas. If we respect those
proposals from Chandler -- not Chandler, Casa Grande
takes on more weight. I'd say no, give them guidance on
the east valley, east Casa Grande option or tie in Casa
Grande, not from a county sense but it's more
appropriate.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The issue of the
Apache Junction and Gold Camp request remained so
united, and there are so many people in Apache Junction,
Gold Camp, if we pull so many people out of Pinal
County, we don't have enough people for a district.

It's an interesting juggling act.

Following up, as a place to start on the
southeast, there is much more synergy between Mesa,
Chandler, Gilbert, Apache Junction, possibly Tempe, than
there is between those communities and Paradise Valley,
Scottsdale, Fountain Hills.

I think probably that is your initial
Congressional District, the southeast portion of the
valley. Then as you move north and west, Scottsdale,
Paradise Valley, Fountain Hills may very well fall into
Congressional Districts, a Northeast District where they
seem to fit a little bit better.

The other thing I suggest, when you have
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to divide communities rather than unite them when you
deal with Legislative Districts, we heard very, very
strong testimony from Mesa, a number people suggesting
the dividing line, I forget whether they wanted
Ellsworth or didn't want Ellsworth. The grid had a
dividing line. They suggested it be moved further east.
Listen to that.

The other thing I think you need to listen
to, in dividing Chandler, there are too many people for
one Legislative District. We had virtually unanimous
testimony Dobson Road is the appropriate dividing line,
the appropriate line in Chandler. Listen to that. I
don't know what the implications are for the rest of the
map. Where possible public testimony seems to be so
uniform, you really need to try, as far as we can, to
accommodate that testimony.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, if I can, this
comment is very useful. We'll take very careful note of
it and we'll develop districts, again, reporting back to
you on alternatives, noting in each case what
adjustments are being made for this plan and what other
adjustments have to be made following alternatives.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Can you overlay school
districts?
MR. HUTCHISON: I can.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Correct me if I'm wrong, in Pinal County, do not school district boundaries respect county boundaries?

DR. HESLOP: A couple don't.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I guess my -- our direction, one principle, respect geographic boundaries, county boundaries. I guess -- I run numbers, everything on the map, Southeast Mesa, Gilbert, Chandler, Queen Creek, Gold Camp, approximately 730,000 people. There's too many people there anyway, correct?

DR. HESLOP: Right.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm wondering, is it not a win-win to make -- keep Pinal together and still have 640,000, approximately? I'm asking. I don't know.

DR. HESLOP: Do it either way.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Queen Creek there, where is the school districts, county line?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Shut down elementary schools.

MR. HUTCHISON: Elementary, secondary overlie.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Queen Creek western boundary is coming on --

MR. HUTCHISON: They do follow county
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think that there are connections, important connections, between Apache Junction, and Gold Camp, and Pinal County, also important connections with Maricopa County. I'd want to see the alternatives to judge between them. I don't disagree with the point being made. I'm saying there are other factors, and you have to see them all before we can really make that decision. If they are necessary -- if they have to be included in the Phoenix Metropolitan area in order to preserve the rural district, I'm sure that's something we'd all want to take into consideration. This is where additional population to create a rural district, consider a very rapidly growing area quickly, to change the character of rural district -- there many things we have to consider. And I believe the comment we'll see will have both approaches and appropriate notations is about all we can say at this moment.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the motion?

If not, all in favor, signify by saying "aye."

(Vote taken.)
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

Opposed, "no."

Motion carries unanimously.

Dr. Heslop.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, perhaps the single most impressively documented and important submission was that by the Eastern Arizona Counties Organization. Their proposal for the development of an Eastern Arizona Legislative District that would include the southern portions of Navajo and Apache along with the counties of Gila, Graham, and Greenlee. It would be wrong to suggest that this submission was supported by all citizen comment. There were some citizens who raised questions about the separation of Navajo and Apache Counties. There were others who suggested that there was a better grouping of counties. But when you look at the submission itself, the number of resolutions, not only from counties and cities, and the quantity of citizen support, it is hard not to be persuaded that this seems to be the will of the clear majority of people in the area who perceive this to be a community, although multicounty community. So in those terms, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, we recommend and would request your instruction to create such a legislative district.

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a motion to that effect?

COMMISSIONER HALL: So moved.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I was troubled by the words "Uniting all included Tribal Reservations."

One of the effects of this, it seems to me, would be to separate some tribal areas from others. It divides the Navajo to the north, primarily. And that's -- that phrase gives me some concern. Or the problem behind it gives me some concern.

COMMISSIONER HALL: What I think the intent was, correct me if I'm wrong, Dr. Heslop, all tribal areas within the area are -- they are not dividing within the designated AUR. The two reservations, being the White Mountain Apache Tribe and San Carlos Apache Tribal note little finger there in Pinal County is only there because of the reservation boundary.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I think that's the intent of the wording, was it not?
DR. HESLOP: I believe it was.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORk: What is the percentage of Native American in this district?

COMMISSIONER HALL: And also, I believe Chairman Massie supported this proposal, did he not?

DR. HESLOP: That's true. We have a letter in the binder from him supporting the proposal, Chairman Massie from White Mountain Apache tribe.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: 36 percent.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORk: What effect does that have on the Native American population to the putative Native American District to the north of that?

DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Huntwork, the question is could we increase the Native American population of the district to the north as a result of not creating this Eastern Arizona County District?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORk: Essentially, yes.

DR. HESLOP: What, Chris, is native -- I can't see.

MR. HUTCHISON: Okay. Just to clarify, Commissioner Huntwork, are you clarifying this to the Navajo proposed plan which unite --

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORk: Not comparing, no.

DR. HESLOP: Let's find -- Does that screen show what the native
population is in the Eastern Arizona counties?

MR. HUTCHISON: Non-Hispanic percentage, 16.22 percent population, in that district.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: In that district.

MS. LEONI: Combined Hispanic population, it's a 34 percent plus minority district.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: In combination.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork's concern, as I understand it, is as we have the northeastern part of the state with significant Native American population above the Eastern Arizona proposal. Taking this proposal into account will have an impact above it in a significant way. The Question was to be sure to analyze that in a way so we have the same kinds of choices here as we would in the other opportunity.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: However, the Navajo Reservation is a population in excess of 100,000 people. We have already made a decision that we're not going to be dividing any Reservations. Therefore, we are going to have a Reservation with a majority Native American population up north. There's no way not to do it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the motion?

If not, all those in favor, signify by saying "aye."
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."
Opposed say "no."
Motion carries unanimously.
Dr. Heslop.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, this was the first of the hearings, in fact, Commissioner Minkoff and I attended it, not a very numerous audience, no doubt of its single-mindedness. They wanted to know the division of their county, and the county is, in fact, let's take a look at it, how many people are in the county.

MR. HUTCHISON: About 165,000.

DR. HESLOP: In other words, about a pretty good Legislative District. They have a case. Given the weight of the district, given the county integrity, we recommend a Legislative District based on Yuma County, an undivided Yuma County, and would be greatful for your instruction.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a motion to that effect?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: So moved.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?
Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Once again, I believe this plays into the question of retrogression and balancing the various communities of interest in our state.

I recall from the standing AUR there is a significant Hispanic population that is not evenly distributed in Yuma County. Again, the question, or comment, really, relates to the interconnectedness of all these things. I have some concern if we do that, we might jeopardize our ability to create other districts that reflect the -- should reflect the voting strength of the Hispanic population. So I do this with just a certain amount of reservation, particularly because we have similar requests from Pinal County which also has somewhat the same situation, a couple counties that want to be kept together, continue to do this, Tempe that has some -- if we continue to do this, we lose track of other extremely important considerations and not -- so I really, I have strong reservation before we proceed.

I'd be interested in seeing this comparison for everything else.

Pinal County, I don't know if they pop up on this later or not. As we went through the first
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time, is there a separate resolution to create a
district that consist of Pinal County?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Not on the list. We can
add that.

COMMISSIONER HALL: See that 50 percent
minority alone. I doubt that concerns --

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Also, we have to remember
that the concern of retrogression is statewide, not
district by district.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: That's what I'm
saying, we need flexibility.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The other thing,
Yuma County population tends to be somewhat
concentrated. Over half the county is right within city
Yuma, then Summerton is right near there, and some of
the other communities along Interstate 8 fairly close to
Yuma County. The rest is a gunnery range; and there are
not too many people that live there, for good reason.

I don't think there's going to be an issue
if we keep Yuma County intact that is going to
negatively impact on our ability to create a
majority-minority district, only because of where the
population is located.
I have a concern we're trying to keep counties intact, trying to respect integrity county boundaries.

Yuma has a population of 160,000 people, a little too few. Mohave County also wants to stay intact, has population of 155,000. And right in between is La Paz with 25,000 for the entire county. They're in the uncomfortable situation of being between two areas where if they join either one, it's too many. Then we have the issue of what to do with La Paz 25,000 in the entire county. When keeping counties whole, we're creating other problems.

DR. HESLOP: I think Commissioner Minkoff doesn't want a response from me. It's a predicament.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think it brings up the interactive nature of each of these decisions. That's the point of giving instructions, to see how the interplay. We'll make additional decisions next week as to whether or not we've created something we're happy with or something that has yet work to be done in terms of making us happy.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Dr. Heslop, aren't we going to have a River Communities AUR, I think, that will resolve some of that, what do we do with La Paz, in
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between La Paz and Yuma, that strength is there between
Yuma, we have, how we divide between that, too? Both
come down as -- who knows what numbers?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I thought the river

community AUR --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'll get there. It's

still to be talked about.

Further discussion on this one? If not,

all those in favor of the motion, signify by saying

"aye."

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

Opposed "no."

Motion carries unanimously.

Dr. Heslop.

DR. HESLOP: You'll have sweet relief.

Florence was going to alternate with me in this
presentation. I thought it might be interesting to the
Commission if I called on Doug Johnson, our senior
mapping analyst who will be working with the Commission
to make a very brief presentation to you on Yavapai.

Doug is someone who started in the
redistricting business 10 years ago doing exactly the
sort of thing Chris Hutchison is today.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners,
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good afternoon.

Yavapai is another one of those things with almost perfect population as Yuma talked about. In my briefcase I almost kept together a process that went through a lot of input, particularly with respect to Sedona. You see the northeast corner of the district, city, a letter from Mayor Everett who said he'd like to see Sedona unified. We also had a lot of input as well from the cities of Verde Valley, which Chris is indicating there. They all wanted to be unified. Mayor Everett expressed being unified with those cities as well. Others handed in input. Three county supervisors said they actually were interested in splitting the county so they'd have input with various representatives at different levels.

So that's why it's on this list for instruction from you today, this division of opinion, supervisors interested in division, a lot of citizen input, guidelines in Prop 106 to some degree recommending unifying counties.

The only AURs involved in this question, we've established so far, Verde Valley, Sedona ones.

The recommendation we're putting forward for your instruction is to create a unified district with Yavapai County, add in part Sedona, unify Sedona as
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that mayor requested, keep the population intact. The
population as a whole might be slightly below the
population, add in slightly above the Legislative size.
That's our recommendation for an instruction.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there an affirmative
motion on the recommendation.

COMMISSIONER HALL: So moved.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have a question.

It seems to make sense to unify Sedona. I

seem to recall testimony from Sedona they link up with
Flagstaff and the Northern part of the state.

Do you recall whether there was an
overwhelming amount of testimony one way or the other?

MR. JOHNSON: The thought occurred, they
did have that request at the Legislative level to be
merged with Flagstaff. Mayor Everett of Sedona, at the
Legislative level, requested to be with Flagstaff, if
you want to divide communities one way at a Legislative
level, another way at the Congressional level.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall then

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I was at both
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meetings, Flag and Prescott. Flag, some said send us north, some said send us south. Some said make Mingus Mountain the dividing line.

With respect to Prescott, on the whole, there seemed to be general consensus, from many, you know, just utilize Yavapai County. Of course, the Democratic party was rather unhappy with that proposal in light of the party registration of that particular county. So -- and wanted -- they had an alternative idea in an effort to make district more competitive, maybe down the road wanted to take a hard look at the competitiveness of this district.

From a practical standpoint, ignoring that issue, it certainly makes sense, I think, as far as combining, generally, communities of similar interest.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, once again, I was at the hearing in Flagstaff.

The Sedona and Verde Valley contingent came and testified. I don't know if they came to Prescott or not. That could be some indication of where they relate to. But the point overriding is I don't know how to make this decision without looking at how these relate to other areas.

Once again, we have this -- reasons to go
one way and good reasons to go the other way as well.

The physical boundary with Mingus Mountain
is another factor to consider, same basis as uniting
political subdivisions.

And so we have -- we have our criteria not
leading to any definite conclusion in this area.

In my mind it's certainly premature to
handicap one outcome or another without seeing how they
relate.

I think I'm going to support the motion in
the sense I've supported a number of the others, too. I
want to see this, need to develop, need specifics next
time we meet. We need to see alternatives as well.

In voting for the motion, I don't mean to
suggest that there's more than a 50 percent chance that
this is going to be the outcome. We just don't know.
At least I don't know.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I don't know we can make
that statement on any of the recommendations we've made.
We need to look at them, analyze them, see what they've
done.

Further discussion on the motion?

COMMISSIONER HALL: I agree with
Mr. Huntwork, in many of the areas. Take some of the
southern cities, relate more with metropolitan Phoenix.
Black Canyon, or something, seems to me your point is well-taken, Mr. Huntwork. It seems to be -- the southern portion seems to be more a community of interest to the metropolitan area, and the northern seems to have more of a community of interest with the northern.

I agree they seem to look at it, see how it measures with other recommendations, and look at it there.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Consultants, notwithstanding the vote we'll follow, what you are hearing from the Commission, this is an area, as with other areas of the state, that really do play differently depending on a number of variables. Even though we are giving you preliminary instructions to attempt to keep Yavapai County whole, Yavapai County presents a number of interesting options in terms of how it might be districted that impact on that which is around it. I know you take that, but understand that these areas where we'll be making specific comments, the number of choices we'll be looking for are more numerous than simply: Here's Yavapai County.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Before we vote on this motion and move on, Chris, could you just put the communities to cities up there?
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MR. HUTCHISON: Those are the communities and cities.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: White areas are incorporated areas.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: You don't have names up.

MR. RIVERA: He's all over it.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Need to see better.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: For the benefit of everyone, Chris Hutchison, who is working the computer today, he's a student, going to be a senior. I wish all of our children were as facile and bright as Chris is in terms of doing thing. He'll not be with us in terms of the entire process as he'll be going back to school. We'll have some of his time but not nearly as much as over the summer. He's really terrific at what he does.

MR. RIVERA: And he's all over it.

MR. JOHNSON: One city is split at the bottom there, not labeled, that's actually Peoria, down on the screen. It's a piece in the Yavapai population.

MR. HUTCHISON: Just annexed.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Peoria annexed?

MR. HUTCHISON: Actually a park.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the motion?
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If not, all those in favor of the motion, signify by saying "aye."

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

Motion carries unanimously.

Dr. Heslop.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, we have a proposal from communities. It's not as well-supported as the Eastern Area Counties proposal, but it is a proposal that has the support of many communities within it. And that speaks also, so it seems to us, to some or all of the testimony that we had on that area.

And so we request instruction to develop a West Valley Legislative District.

Chris can bring up the area of interest here and perhaps put some city names on it.

While he's doing so, I should say Doug Johnson, 10 years ago, was just as quick as Chris Hutchison was, just as quick with a much slower program. Chris will be just as old 10 years from now.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Wait until the city names come up so we know exactly what we're proposing here.

MR. HUTCHISON: I can zoom in.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Wickenburg to the north
and a significant portion to the middle and south.

MR. HUTCHISON: It follows out back along
the boundary. Peoria now annexed this area here, by the
way.

Nobody lives up there, either. It follows
the Surprise boundary, excluding Sun City West, El
Mirage, and continues down, takes in Luke Air Force
Base, a western piece of Glendale, strip annexation, and
goes around. Don't have any area here.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chris, it includes
Surprise but excludes El Mirage?

MR. HUTCHISON: Excludes the Sun Cities,
not Sun City Grand.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Where is Surprise?

MR. HUTCHISON: I can highlight it.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Do we know what Sun
City Grand is?

MR. HUTCHISON: I actually got on Dell
Webb's website to figure it out.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It abuts Sun City
West.

MR. HUTCHISON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The issue is do you
divide a city or retirement community with common
interests.
DR. HESLOP: As you know, there was a huge volume of testimony with regard to the retirement communities, a large volume of testimony that made a distinction between Sun City Grand and the other Sun Cities. Since they are wholly included within the city boundary, that would be testimony for it not being a problem.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: What would this do for El Mirage and -- I think they called it the original mile for Surprise inside or --

MR. HUTCHISON: Since all Surprise is included, it's not a problem.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: El Mirage --

MR. HUTCHISON: El Mirage is not included.

COMMISSIONER HALL: What is that line, that line, a road?

MR. RIVERA: Grand Avenue.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Grand Avenue.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: This is one of the more problematic areas for me. I'm not sure -- if someone wants to make a motion on this particular recommendation, I'll take it and discuss it, but I'm -- let me just pause and say:

Is there an affirmative motion on this one?
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COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm still trying to understand the motion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand the difficulty here is that this West Valley proposal is not as well-supported as some of the other proposals by public comment as we've had. It's problematic as far as I'm concerned. Let me share what those are.

We heard a significant amount of testimony about differences among communities. To the extent Sun City West, Sun City Grand, and Sun City are quite similar, regardless of whether they fall in incorporated areas, clearly they have some affinity. We also heard El Mirage and Surprise, at one and the same time, are older communities, vacant land has grown up around them in a way not very consistent with their communities of interest, those two communities in particular.

And it's difficult for me to support this particular recommendation insofar as one of those communities is in boundary, one outside boundary, and it also splits Sun City Sun City Grand. In that respect, I find this one difficult to support. That may be the reason we don't have an affirmative motion.

That's my two cents.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I agree.

MR. HUTCHISON: Further down it takes in
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1 Tolleson and Avondale.

2 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think the issue here, what we've approved up until now, in terms of
5 guiding you to develop districts, while there wasn't
6 unanimous testimony, the preponderance of testimony was
7 really in favor of what we have authorized you to do. I
8 don't think that is the case here. This was a proposal.
9 I remember the Estrella meeting, that it was presented
10 by officials from some of these communities, but it
11 doesn't have the same level of support that the others
12 do.
13
14 I agree with Chairman Lynn, putting this
15 aside for now, work with districts, see where they lie.
16 I did get a pretty overwhelming sense
17 Avondale, Tolleson, Goodyear, Litchfield Park, those
18 communities, smaller communities, very, very close
19 together, they want to remain together. They're going
20 to be a small portion of whatever district they end up
21 in. None are large communities. That makes some sense.
22 To extend across all other communities I'm not sure
23 makes sense because they're conflicting communities.
24
25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: With respect to the
26 communities of Surprise, El Mirage, even though not
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contiguous, they're similar communities of interest. They are communities probably closer in character to a community like Glendale than they are to the immediately surrounding communities.

Take a look at ways in which they might be linked because of that commonalty.

That's a suggestion, not direction.

COMMISSIONER HALL: We have to give some direction for the whole west valley.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: They'll do the whole state. We're picking specific things.

COMMISSIONER HALL: We made motions thus far, have given specific direction regarding --

What I heard you folks saying, you don't want to follow this motion. What is the motion?

MR. RIVERA: There is no motion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: No motion.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Leave it blank?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Leave it blank for the moment. Discussion is taking place.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: There are a lot of areas in the state. They'll be dividing the City of Phoenix. City of Phoenix is enormous. Tucson they'll be dividing. We haven't told them where to divide Tucson. A lot of that we're not doing. I suggest --
I'd be prepared, if you want a motion, to make a motion to keep the smaller communities together. Beyond that, I don't think that this is something we want to do at this point in time.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Chris, I'd like you to put up the original grid here.

I think where I'm coming down from, this doesn't appear, though it's an overriding AUR, to adjust the grid. Wherever the grid falls, leave grid be until there's another reason to adjust the grid at that point. Right now there doesn't appear there's a enough strength in terms of continuity, cohesiveness, whatever, to justify adjusting the grid in this instance.

I'd like to see where that grid falls.

MR. HUTCHISON: Straight down. If you remember, the meridian line cuts straight through the City of Peoria, went all along here this way.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: To the extent we have other direction about keeping communities intact, and so on, adjustments might be made to that line. Mr. Elder's line, the grid there doesn't have an impact on that area at the moment.

Again, I don't want to characterize the fact you don't have specific direction in this area as
not taking these comments into account. Our comments
are along a different line than the specific direction
you've said.

DR. HESLOP: I hear the Commission saying
NDC is to develop an alternative.

COMMISSIONER HALL: What it is we don't
know but do it.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: One thing I'd like
to suggest, and maybe not put it in the form of a
motion, because I don't know what to do with Sun City
Grand, it is part of another community you'd have to
divide, but I think it makes a great deal of sense to
unite the retirement communities.

Once again, public testimony we heard,
while not unanimous, seemed to be overwhelmingly in
favor of keeping Sun City, Sun City West, and Sun City
Grand together. It may be that concern overrides the
concern to keep communities undivided. That might be a
reason to divide that portion of Surprise, put Sun City
Grand with Sun City West and Sun City.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: At one meeting I
attended there was actually some testimony in favor of
dividing Tolleson from Avondale. I believe the Agua
Fria river runs right between and is a natural dividing line. Tolleson, I believe, is in old District 22, is very logically sized. I believe 22 was a very logically sized district with very excellent demographics. Even that general of a suggestion may not be -- may be premature in this area.

Also, the other thing I wanted to add was I don't remember overwhelming testimony of keeping the Sun Cities together.

I'd respectfully suggest there was at least as much testimony in favor of dividing them up, from the people in Sun City.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It was mixed, and at the Glendale hearing in particular.

The testimony as I recall it, Ms. Minkoff, I think you were in attendance.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Was Sun City, Sun City West, be kept together. Sun City Grand was the one shifting.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Maybe a dozen people attended that meeting and spoke about Sun City. We subsequently received some written communication from a representative group that purports to represent the Sun Cities, an umbrella organization elected and highly
representative of all the citizens in Sun City who said
exactly the opposite, said we are currently divided up
into three different areas, are just as happy with that
arrangement as anything else, leave us that way.

In my mind, that was, if anything was
overwhelming as to the sentiments of the people in Sun
City, it was that rather than the relatively small
number of people who provided conflicting testimony, as
it were.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If I recall
correctly, there was a resolution from an association
out in that area in support of keeping them together.
Then there was another group that said we disagree with
them. So it wasn't just individual testimony talking
about the Sun Cities. There were homeowner association
resolutions, I don't remember the exact name, I'm sure
we could go back and find out, that basically said the
three Sun Cities belonging to, another group said we
disagree with that group. We maybe need to do research
to find out the validity of various groups that have
conflicting resolutions.

MR. HUNTWORK: I may have overstated it if
I suggested overwhelming testimony either way, just
trying to rebut.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's conflicting, no
question.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.

I guess now is my time. I need to talk a
little bit on frustration over philosophy. Because one
of the things I've looked at in the redistricting
process is giving opportunity and access to the general
public and population and citizens of the state.

With that said, and starting to realize
after we went through the communities of interest and we
went through a lot of things, instead of bringing a
bunch of people together, it seems like we're getting
direction that says rancher wants ranchers, farmers want
farmers, Hispanics want Hispanics. We're building
barriers, edges. This area is an area that doesn't have
declared edges. I don't think we should put edges in if
they don't have overriding conditions.

With that -- you know, if Sun City West
and that, yes, retirement to retirement. If there are
reasons why they want to stay separate, or other
considerations there -- I would like to see diversity.
I would like to see a lot of things going on, a lot more
discourse between all entities.
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I have no objection to splitting up some
of the areas, and it would seem to be valuable.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It may be another one of
the areas, as we discussed with Yavapai County, where,
because the testimony and public input has been varied
in terms of how they see that community of interest,
that it may be one of those areas where we use other
criteria that we've either already established or need
to establish throughout the process to help us determine
which of these decisions we make. It doesn't seem clear
it should be one or the other at this point.

So we choose not to give you a West Valley
AUR recommendation at this point.

DR. HESLOP: I know we've listened very
carefully, Mr. Chairman, and taken notes. We'll follow
them.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Heslop.

DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, members of the
Commission, our final request for instruction involves
the river. I think we all know there was strong
testimony on the importance of the border, border
issues, trade, and strong testimony about the river,
special problems, sewage among them, many others related
to the river communities. This substantial testimony
with regard to the river was described by one person as
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great again for western Arizona development and led us
to the development of a river communities AUR.

Review of the map suggests that it is
possible to create a River Communities Legislative
District. And so it is our recommendation that you
instruct us so to do.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there an affirmative
motion?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I would make that
motion, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: From the map you
have up there, it appears there's Indian Reservation
that is divided.

MR. HUTCHISON: You are correct. This is
the current district. There's the River AUR I can draw
on top of it.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The River AUR all
the way down is in conflict with the proposal just
approved a short while ago to create a unified Yuma
County. So if we approve both of them, you'll have a
lot of fun.

DR. HESLOP: Interestingly enough, this is
the grid district on the northwest portion. And I may be -- I may be incorrect, I believe of all the areas where we visited in the state, there was more support for this grid piece than in most other portions of the state.

This portion of the state was quite pleased with that Legislative District, felt it captured their concept of community of interest, and they were more than happy to let it be that portion of the map and let it go forward.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Be lucky.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: You would be with random.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I didn't attend the hearing. From reading the transcripts, it appears there's more than enough people for one district, not enough for two complete districts along the river.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Including Yuma.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Including Yuma.

Need two and combine one with something else. Seemed the middle piece wanted to be more the north than the south.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No, not necessarily true.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Middle piece fought over
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north and south.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Middle didn't want them. Mohave didn't want them.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I stand corrected.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It was interesting.

Almost had an auction.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: La Paz County. The issue there, three counties, La Paz, Mohave, Yuma, almost the size for two Legislative Districts. Poor little La Paz County, they're in the middle. That's where they'd have to be split.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The other issue with the Yuma AUR, it's border concerns as not opposed to, in addition to, or apart from river concerns. Two concerns are quite clear. One related to water and sewer issues, the other related to along the river; similarly have issues Congressionally and Legislatively. Yuma is in a unique position, not only occupies the river to the extreme southwest, also occupies that portion of the border that begins the border issues beginning at Yuma all the way over to Douglas, although there are some differences among the major major communities along the border, Yuma, Nogales, and Douglas. There are many similarities as well.

We find ourselves, at least from my
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perspective, I think this is supportable. I think it's supportable from the standpoint this particular instruction meets with the sense that I think I got from attending those hearings and the feedback on the grid itself.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: What is the population of those two counties combined?


COMMISSIONER ELDER: Ms. Smith from La Paz.

COMMISSIONER HALL: You have to cut it up.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Either have to separate Mohave, La Paz, cut-off --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have it, 134,747.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Is what?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: La Paz, Mohave together.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: So we're -- the river connection between -- it's sounding like we're almost inevitably going to find a logical point to divide La Paz County.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm wondering if we pull out the Indian Reservation and put it with the Walapai, Havasupai, Coconino County, if that takes
enough population out.

MR. HUTCHISON: Walapai --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Kaibab.

MR. HUTCHISON: Walapai are split.

Two persons live in this tract.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Put them with them.

MR. HUTCHISON: Query this.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Are we also, by
doing this, splitting the Arizona strip, the area north
of the grand canyon.

MR. HUTCHISON: The strip all over to
Page?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Consider it to go
to the area impossible to get to from anyplace else,
accessible from Yuma but anyplace else. Two people
representing that area, both have to get in there, they
never see anybody.

MR. HUTCHISON: There is the Grand Canyon.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yeah. We have

pretty well split that.

Where is Fredonia?

MR. HUTCHISON: Here.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Coconino or Mohave?

MR. RIVERA: Coconino.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Joseph City,
MR. RIVERA: Colorado City.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I've never been up there either.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Aren't we shorting Yuma?

MR. HUTCHISON: 1,000.

COMMISSIONER HALL: High on this one, shorting Yuma.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Almost 1,000.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Cutting Yuma if you want to cut an entity that small in half.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Well, they cut Yuma County in half first. They made La Paz.

I know, I'm sorry. I meant that to be a flip comment.

There is a way to do it. Parker, in the north part of the county, and Quartzsite, the only other concentration with any kind of population in the southern part county. That's a way to do it, if we want to.

What you are hearing, see alternatives as well.

The La Paz County area population are in play in those options, because it's clear we have the
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dilemma of having too much population in both
configurations without some tradeoff and don't have
anywhere else to go, so to speak, no other
concentrations along this strip other than ones we'd
have to go into the state a fair distance in order to
pick up any meaningful population.

DR. HESLOP: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: An alternative
addressed, looked at, Yuma, maybe pick up to the east
population there, which might be going into the Gila
Bend area. I guess that's Maricopa County. I guess on
the northern reaches, the Colorado tribe, you have the
strip across the north, pull that out so then you go
from, whatever, Colorado City, or Bullhead south, and
pickup all of La Paz, and the Bullhead --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Might work.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: -- take Yuma further
to the east, and put the northern part together with
whatever happens in that central northern area.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Put the Arizona
strip with Coconino.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: The Arizona strip
with Coconino, or Native American tribal areas, and
this.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chris, say something?

MR. HUTCHISON: Say something. I was also going along with the Commissioner, the idea of uniting the Walapai, Havasupai, they identify themselves as a community together.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The $64,000 question: How many live there, two, three thousand people?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Is this a demonstration where you go click, click, click?

MR. HUTCHISON: Label the population. 6,221. Tract comes down. And this tracks. 4,450.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Getting close.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Take out the reservation at the top, the Arizona strip, and the reservation down there, how much all together, the three areas.

MR. HUTCHISON: 13,000, 12,000.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Too many.

MR. HUTCHISON: The other option, whole Census tracts. Proposition 106, you could use the Indian Reservation boundary and take blocks out, make it more.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: You're getting a sense of what you might look at there to solve this problem.
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DR. HESLOP: We have that sense,
Mr. Chairman, indeed.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Without reinventing a
gerrymander.
With that discussion, background,
explanatory notes, is there further discussion on the
motion?

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

(Vote taken.)
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."
Motion carries unanimously.

DR. HESLOP: That's the end of the
presentation.
I thank the Commission.
We'll take careful note of the
reservations expressed on each.
As I noted at the beginning, we'll prepare
the map with substantial documentation allowing you to
see the alternatives and consequences in considerable
detail.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Before you leave the
podium, Dr. Heslop, I have a feeling there will be other
instructions that may be coming from Commission.
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DR. HESLOP: We'd be very grateful.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments as well?

I think everybody wanted to get in. Let me start with Mr. Huntwork who I believe I heard first.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'd like to make a motion to instruct the consultants to make a Legislative District centered on Pinal County based on the plan presented at the Casa Grande hearing, one which includes Apache Junction and Gold Camp and another which excludes them, and finds ways to add population to Pinal County that is more of the rural agricultural community of interest that was expressed at that hearing.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion.

Mr. Elder?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: To that one, we had in two different meetings discussion on Pinal County, that Saddlebrooke related more to the, what is it --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Sun City.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Sun City Vistoso area, V I S T O S O, area, that again, health care, medical, shopping, social relationships, all of that, so close together, across the border, this might be an area
that would break away from county line designations as having priority.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: They are more like Pima County, Gold Camp, Pima County, Maricopa County.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Were you saying all Pinal County, Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: No.

COMMISSIONER HALL: The Casa Grande proposal.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Excluded some portions of Pinal County,

COMMISSIONER HALL: Superior, Signal Mountain.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Asking for a proposal.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Direction, alternative.

Further discussion?

All those in favor, signify by saying "aye."

(Vote taken.)

Motion carries.

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Dr. Heslop, in the report sent to us earlier, there were a number of
questions, many of which we've already addressed. I'd
like to make sure you don't need answers on any others.

Native American we've addressed. Native
American was addressed; Western Valley we addressed;
East Valley. Could you go through them, see if you need
answers on any of those others?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The other way to put it is
do you have sufficient instruction on the others to
proceed?

DR. HESLOP: That was our judgment, these
tenets then allow us to develop a map which would
highlight the difficulties facing the Commission, and
the map would bring to focus some of these other areas.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Do you have enough
information on where we stand?

DR. HESLOP: I think we do indeed.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I want to, not cutting you
off, get to Mr. Elder and Mr. Hall, to the extent he
wants to be heard, also.

I want to caution everyone here, what this
is is a process. A process has a number of facets to
it, each building on the next.

Any of the directions that we've given the
consultants today are a part of the process but not to
be taken as a final adoption of any of these AURs in the
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form of a map which we will see later on next week. And
all of them are subject to further discussion, further
interpretation, further review and analysis before such
adoption takes place. This is in fact a process.

We've given consultants direction so they
can move forward in map preparation. We'll not approve
maps until the end of next week at which time all these
issues will have been revisited, all possibilities will
have been reviewed, and all ramifications will have been
identified prior to ramifications analyzed. I want to
make that clear to all present so there is no confusion.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Dr. Heslop, take a
look at, where I'm having trouble, I don't know the
Phoenix area that well, there were several proposals
that came in as proposed AURs. The north boundary here,
north boundary there, one central city, historic,
somewhat overlaid with the southwestern, you know, how
to resolve those. I should know where my mother grew
up, the Willow District, designated a Historic District.
I'm kind of at a loss where the central part of the
district fits in, east, west, Hispanic.

I'd like a little more look at where the
edge is geographically, the limits of the proposal made,
and citizens' comment.
DR. HESLOP: Perhaps the easiest way to do that, Commissioner Elder, is show the historic preservation AUR and then to overlay the proposal, perhaps, the South Mountain proposal that we had. Both proposals had substantial testimony in support. There is very significant overlap.

Obviously with regard to the Hispanic community proposal, there is voting rights concern. I think we need to take that concern perhaps more seriously than the issue of Historic concern. We need to gratify both groups. One of the concerns, in our concern, one of the questions we proposed to the Commissioners, we believe as we develop this map we'll explore the implications of both approaches in that division of the area.

Our machine has gone cold and we may have to warm it up.

That would be our approach, Commissioner, in this mapping process, to not only relate districts as they relate to the grid and tell you what adjustments are being made as they relate also to AURs advanced and tell you in each case what the impact on AURs is.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'd appreciate that.

In one of the proposals, there's an increase of four, five percent Hispanics from where we
are now. That may be where you get flexibility to make
sure we hit retrogression. Is there any other issues
there the when data base comes there, how it fits others
together so we have continuity of community there?

DR. HESLOP: Believe me, there is no
subject we'll approach with greater care than the voting
rights issue.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: For my clarification,
and maybe the benefit of everyone here, can we look at
the time line so you'll make recommendations to us for
adjustment of the grid in the metropolitan areas when?

DR. HESLOP: How do you mean "metropolitan
areas"?

COMMISSIONER HALL: We haven't talked
about Phoenix, per se, and Tucson.

DR. HESLOP: They'll be part of the plans
we bring forward to you.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

DR. HESLOP: Districts in metropolitan
areas have to be justified to you both in terms of the
original grid and the impact on principles the
Commission has endorsed.

We believe that the outlines of the map as
you have instructed us today will give us a basic start
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on those metropolitan areas.

COMMISSIONER HALL: The second question then is have you had an opportunity to analyze the variety of proposals in identifying areas of similarity?

DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Hall, one of Doug Johnson's primary task this weekend is to do exactly that. He will be looking at all proposals brought before us, comparing them with the grid, comparing them with the instructions given by the Commission, and comparing them among themselves. We'll have a dossier of information on those plans and citizen proposals.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I was afraid we were going to run out of reading material.

DR. HESLOP: Kill another tree; need another binder.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Looking at the overlay, see the areas of overlap? If there's an attempt made to satisfy both requests, I don't think it's too difficult to do. The areas contiguous to the South Mountain plan both to the east and west are very similar in makeup to the district they have. So if we're, for instance, to go with a historic district, and it pulled population out of that plan, as requested, I think it would be very easy to pick it up on either side.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Rather than discuss plans submitted, not appropriateness, let's talk about communities of interest submitted.

In that particular instance, we do have an ability to take into account both communities of interest in an appropriate way.

Other comments or direction to the consultants at this time?

I think we're all just sort of anticipating next week's reading material and choices that will be ultimately ours to make next week.

I think it's clear we're off to a good start. Hopefully you feel you are off to a good start in terms of direction given to you.

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have a procedural question about what happens now.

You'll present a report present next Wednesday which we'll read, digest, and memorize before we come on Thursday. That, I presume, will not be one Congressional plan, one Legislative plan, but a series of options.

DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Minkoff, it's our intention to have two plans.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: One of each.

DR. HESLOP: You'll like some, not like others. Part we'll detach. Parts will be exchanged. We'll do everything we can to give you prior to Wednesday parts.

I think Doug Johnson can produce analysis of some citizen plans prior to Wednesday, and we'll provide them prior to you.

The question is when we reconvene prior to Wednesday with a Congressional and Legislative plan before us, and we look at them.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: And we want to suggest modifications, don't like the line drawn here, believe does this to this community, that to that community, let's see if we can move it here, we will do that as group on Thursday at the meeting?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thursday, Friday, and Saturday.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: And we will be able to do this in steps? Once you change a line, it has a domino effect on 29 Legislative Districts and seven Congressional Districts. We may feel real comfortable moving this line here, adjust this district, then adjust this district, and we may not be able to do it all at once, have time to have all that done. Somebody else
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will have another suggestion, do all over again. We'll
do that --

    CHAIRMAN LYNN: We will.

    COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: We'll be able to
conclude that by Saturday --

    DR. HESLOP: Today's work will look very
easy compared to then.

    COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: We've told the
public, it's been in the newspaper, we're going to
finish by the 11th, a week from Saturday. I want to
make sure the meetings Thursday, Friday, Saturday,
you've done it before, we haven't.

    DR. HESLOP: We will, God willing, the
chair remaining strong, the sun high.

    CHAIRMAN LYNN: Someone can step in my
stead next week.

    DR. HESLOP: Talk about ramifying effects,
you'll see things you don't like in the plan and what
happens when you do something else, we'll show you. In
some cases, you'll see something happening you like even
less you don't like.

    Yes, that's exactly what we anticipate.

    CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right. Other comments
for Dr. Heslop and NDC?

    Thank all of you for all your hard work.
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It's a very ambitious time schedule.

We appreciate what you have done and will do.

Paragraph item X: Return to 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.

I have one speaker request. Are there others in the audience that wish to be heard?

If not, let me call on Sherry Smith, private citizen from Yuma County.

MS. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I didn't realize I was the only one. I'll keep it short.

Thank you very much for the time today.

All these issues are very important to all of us. And whatever happens is going to be with us quite a while.

We're really trying to, in Yuma County, where I'm from, we're trying to work together to do the best thing we can. We'd really like to have some
concerns -- I would. I'm speaking as a private citizen. I have in the past -- I would like to apologize for that outburst. I was following along and forgot what I was doing a minute.  

First of all, the main premise in Yuma County is the Congressional District should not be divided.

As the Commission had discussed, it is a unique county in Arizona. It has a numerous amount of issues that are compounded even though is has a smaller population, 165, 166 thousand. You have the river issue. You have the water issue with California. You have all the close proximity of Indian tribes. And you also have a large Hispanic population.

You are looking at some of the many principles Proposition 106 has laid out that you have as a community of interest.

And I believe, I've been involved with politics since I was in sixth frayed. Nobody likes to listen to that. I won't go into it. All of us know these Congressional Districts will have a huge impact on the welfare and well-being of the people Arizona.

When you look at water issues, the big fight we're having along the river to hold onto that water, all the Indian tribes involved, Fort Mohave,
Coshawn (phonetic), Pago (phonetic), Tohono O'odhom, and you go on down -- there's one down there I forgot.

Anyway, I understand now Hopi is needing to be in a district, I think that would be great. But the amount of population for Mohave, La Paz, and Yuma is 334,000. When you have half a district in three large counties, or two large, one small county, I still think of La Paz as Yuma County, really, looking at something, we do have a large land mass, but it doesn't really affect the issues so much, because it is a similarity of issues.

When you speak of rural issues, it is very important to the people who live in those areas. The distance between services, looking at health issues, looking at the kind of thing where you have road maintenance and less taxes to maintain longer expanses of road, I could go on and on, and different issues of schools, schools of various cultural backgrounds that have to -- you have special needs or programs, you have to address those needs and programs.

Basically, to end, I don't want to sit and talk -- don't want to -- okay, that's it. But I think if we -- you know, I think -- I'm really impressed with the Commission. I think you are very astute. You've studied the issues. And you are well-aware of the impact of these districts and what it will do to the
state. And it is a hard job. It really is. You have
my -- I'd like to say vote of confidence.

I know we're looking, like I say, there
may be some things we don't like.

Primarily I think Yuma County should not
be divided and it should be primarily in a rural
district.

Thank you very much.

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

MS. SMITH: You are welcome.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next person to speak is

Mark Fleisher.

MR. FLEISHER: I have a couple comments

I'd like to make.

First of all, I'd like to talk about the
fact most people in the community are very impressed
with what you people are doing. As the Former Chairman
of the State Democratic Party, deal with political
activists, most people feel you've worked in a
nonpartisan, sincere manner. I'm real pleased with the
progression, a neutral grid. You didn't have
preconceived grids laid out.

It looks today like most of what I've
seen, the criteria setting will not come up with any
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predetermined results. You're letting it fall wherever
the lines fall. There are certain criteria, which I
think are certainly relevant to the Justice Department
and voters of Arizona. I'm real pleased with the way
the Commissioners are handling that, not figuring where
people live.

One thing I'd like to discuss, see if
there is any feedback, the criteria in Prop 106,
competitiveness, I missed a little bit here after lunch,
and I apologize for that. Was there any discussion
about making districts competitive? Did I miss some of
that?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: There's been discussion
all along.

I can't engage in dialogue with you during
public comment. The only thing I can tell you is
competitiveness has always been one of the criteria
we'll be using to judge the efficacy of the maps we put
together. And it will be used along with other criteria
when judging whether or not maps are acceptable to us
and ultimately acceptable to us for submission.

MR. FLEISHER: I don't see any relevance
to Democrat, Republican registration. I'm not sure if
you'll have that by next Thursday, Friday, Saturday. If
don't have it by then, it's already in soft cement, so
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's be clear as to what level of cement it's in by the end of next week. That's an important issue. I want to be clear to everyone, the maps that are produced at the end of next week's meeting are draft maps which will be the subject of a series of public meetings for the next month. There is nothing in those maps that wouldn't be subject to additional change or additional modification during that period of time based on input from the public on those drafts. To suggest those drafts are in any kind of cement is simply not correct.

What we will be doing, as those maps are being reviewed, are all of the kinds of continuing analysis that need to be done with respect to all of the criteria that we wish to accomplish.

Understand something, just as an example, the districts you'll see drawn by the end of next week won't be exactly even population. They'll be close, not exactly even. We're hopeful by the time the process is completed we'll be exact or as nearly close as we can, clearly close on Congressional, as close to exact as we can in terms of Legislative. That kind of adjustment will still be going to be done during the period public of comment and at the time the Commission will take the
final look at all districts before we ultimately give
final approval to the plans which will be in October.

MR. FLEISHER: My issue of concern was
that the criteria in 106, some of the issues being
looked at now, certainly communities of interest, and
some other criteria there, not criteria on
competitiveness, I know you're discussing the issue of
contiguosity, the Hopi, how you look at those things,
no issue of how to make competitiveness. When is the
appropriate time? After the maps come out on the 11th?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Because Prop 106 is clear
about the competitive portion of criteria,
competitiveness is to be done at the expense of none of
the other criteria. Therefore, analysis of
competitiveness, necessarily, needs to occur once other
criteria is attended to.

MR. FLEISHER: After the 11th might be the
appropriate time, not before.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'll discuss
competitiveness soon as we have maps. We don't have
maps. We can't look at a district and make a judgment
whether or not it's competitive at this point.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think -- I just
wanted to raise a question. Maybe counsel should, or
whatever. We're really engaging in dialogue here. I
don't believe it's something we should be doing.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think you are right.

MR. FLEISHER: I apologize. I didn't mean
to. I didn't realize. To the extent it's public
comment, my comment on when competitiveness would be
done, if I was missing the opportunity to do that, I
didn't want to do that. I was thinking August 11th
would do it. If it was too late to do it, if you
already would have maps, I wanted to make sure the time
frame was still open.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We're thinking we do want
to engage in dialogue.

It's not too late for any issues until the
final end of the maps at the end of the process.

MR. FLEISHER: What --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Fleisher, I will not
answer any more questions. If you would like to make a
comment, I'm happy to listen. I'll be happy to talk
after the meeting. We have had enough talking back and
forth.

MR. FLEISHER: Thank you for talking,

Steve.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: My pleasure.

MR. FLEISHER: Like, you think on the
11th, very shortly, we'll get copies, like you think working maps, some adjustments made while you're doing it, so we see the adjustments, while you're moving it, what the result is, all the different districts? I think Ms. Minkoff, when you move one, all 29 other Legislative Districts will change. It would be a nice public meeting, get feedback. What I was thinking is when we see lines move, see what the effect would have and see the maps actually be drawn and have the public here at the public meeting. Rather than them moving, have the maps be interactive while we're here and see the work while here, displayed and discussed.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Fleisher.

Next, Andrea Gonzales.

Ms. Gonzales.

MR. GONZALES: Good afternoon.

I just wanted to reiterate a couple points I made earlier, especially after hearing the comments and discussing the Casa Grande plan, the first of which is it was mentioned Apache Junction has more in common with the metropolitan area than it does with the rural community.

Maybe I didn't make myself clear when I said the reason we included Apache Junction is because
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of the similarities it shared with Casa Grande in that
they both are the two major metropolitan areas of Pinal
County that do share interests in growth, also share
interests in protecting the agricultural and farming
industries and mining in Pinal County.

If Apache Junction is picked up by a major
metropolitan area, such as Mesa, it will have been
sacrificed by being represented in the Legislature.
They'll only be numbers in the Legislature.

The second point, if the plan did not
include Apache Junction, maybe go west, we don't think
there's any way to make up for the loss in numbers. If
we lose Apache Junction, we lose the Pinal County plan.
There's no way to make up for the numbers going west.
That's all.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

The next speaker is David Gass.

Is that a G, sir?

MR. GASS: Gass, yes, G A S S.

I'll just take a moment of your time.

There's something, I've been to a number
of your hearings, and it struck me personally. I live
at 17415 North 6th Avenue, just North of Bell Road.

Five years ago you might have called it
rural. It isn't anymore. Bell Road wouldn't be an
appropriate dividing line for dividing rural and urban
sections.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: You are saying "wouldn't."

MR. GASS: Would not be appropriate.

We've grown significantly since then.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Gass.

Paul Eckstein representing the State Democratic Party.

Mr. Eckstein.

MR. ECKSTEIN: Mr. Chairman, members of
the Commission, I'm Paul Eckstein, a lawyer in Phoenix
and long-time representative together with John Frank at
Lewis & Roca.

I'm counsel for the Democratic Party on
redistricting matters.

We have submitted a Congressional packet
and a Legislative packet with maps and explanations.

I hope all of you have had an opportunity
to look at our maps, our numbers, and the rationale that
is set forth therein.

But I do want to take a moment to
summarize the major points we hoped those maps
accomplished, to talk about a second thought we have
with respect to two Legislative Districts, Legislative
Districts on our maps, 15 and 17 in Southwest Phoenix
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and Maricopa County.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Eckstein, I don't mean
to interrupt. What I'd like to have happen, do you have
a written submission you wish to add to that we've
received or are we just receiving oral testimony today
on those two thoughts?

MR. ECKSTEIN: Oral testimony. I have a
map that constitutes our written submission.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Can you leave that?

MR. ECKSTEIN: Yes. I have numbers to
submit with that. I don't know that it's complete. I
was just given it about an hour ago.

I think it useful, though, to talk at the
outset that when coming up with what we used in coming
up with this, we, the lawyers, members of the Democratic
Party, Legislators, and others who had an interest in
making comments to us, we met a number of times, at
least a half dozen, maybe a dozen times, to come up with
the maps we came up with.

We started meeting, I think, sometime in
May, had meetings in June, and they accelerated in July.
So it was a process that involved hearing from a lot of
people in our meetings as well as attending your
meetings.

I think representatives from the
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Democratic Party attended, if not every single
Commission meeting, most of them, and started to report
back to us as to what citizens around the state thought
was important to them. And we did our best to
incorporate these disparate views into our
presentations.

This is the ultimate zero zone game. You
can't take something from someone else without giving it
to someone else. And we understand that. And we
understand that the lines that we have suggested are
susceptible of different interpretation and can be
moved, and we think slightly, to achieve similar
results. But we think what we have done is in faith
with Proposition 106, in faith with the Constitution of
the United States, with the Voting Rights Act. And we
think we've done that with, maybe, and some Democrats
aren't particularly happy with this, maybe to the
detriment of the Democratic Party in trying to make more
competitive districts.

We understand that the notion expressed in
Proposition 106 that there be competitive districts is
at the end of the list. And it says "without
significantly impairing the others interests." But it
is a significant point. And I think when the people
voted on Proposition 106, one of the things that really
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motivated them was the fact that they could have competitive districts.

At most, in the current system, we have four, maybe five Legislative Districts that are competitive and maybe one of the Congressional Districts that were created in 1991, '92, and, as I say, four or five of the Legislative Districts. We've done a lot better job.

Let me go through the points very briefly.

We started with the grid that the Commission came up with, and that was our starting point, because we wanted to deal with the lines and numbers that you were most familiar with. We tried to, as I said earlier, adhere to the Constitution, to both the Constitutional provisions in the Arizona Constitution, Proposition 106, Article One Six Oh Two, and the 14th Amendment to the Constitution.

We have improved majority-minority districts. And we believe that we have fully satisfied the requirements of the land grants of 1965. And we have protected communities of interest, broadly defined.

I understand you had some votes earlier today. I think our communities of interest are aligned fairly well with the communities of interest that you expressed in your votes.
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Indian Reservations have been in one Legislative and one Congressional District since redistricting, since 1972. Our firm was actually involved in litigation that established that principle. And I think -- I know we, in these maps, recognize the integrity of Indian Reservations. But now with Proposition 106, the kind of recognition of Native American communities of interest have been extended to others. We realize those in our presentations.

On the Congressional side, we've included detailed justifications for what we have done. And I just want to make five points.

Number one, the number of majority-minority Democratic Congressional Districts is increased from one to two. Currently District 2 is the only majority-minority district. Under our numbering system, Districts 2 and 4 are majority-minority districts with more than 50 percent minorities in the majority. And we have two districts that are minority influence districts, districts 6 and 8, which include between 40 and 50 percent minorities. If one assumes that the minority population is growing quickly, then -- indeed, more quickly than other parts of the population, it is not unreasonable to expect that at the end of the period, that if they will not be majority-minority
districts, they will be greater majority-minority
districts.

It's like Wayne Gretzky's comment about
his success. He says he skates the way the puck is
going to be, not to where it is. The Supreme Court
ought to adopt that as a principle. Unfortunately, they
say look at the numbers where they are today. And I
think that as a matter of law you are obligated to do
that. But you have to recognize that the population is
growing.

When you have a state like Arizona, when
it is growing by as much as 40 percent in a 10-year
period, you have to not, if not skate to where the puck
is going to be, where the numbers are going to be, you
have to understand where the numbers are going to be.
We've done that as well.

The second point on the Congressional map
is that we have only split Mohave and Pinal Counties,
other than Maricopa and Pima, and the remaining 11
Counties fall within one Congressional District, except
where they might cross a Reservation.

You can see our proposed District 8 starts
in the Northwestern part of the state and comes down,
picks up Walapai, Havasupai, Navajo. In our map the
Hopi Reservation is excluded. I understand one of the
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principles you've adopted is to separate the Navajos and Hopis. One can debate that until the cows come home. But to accept that, for the cows to come home is less important to the Legislative map. We have them together there. Hopis could be easily removed with, I think, 10,000, 9,000 population. Accommodations can be made.

Mohave, Pinal Counties, are the only counties we've split.

I think we've done the best we can given the fact that we have one of the most urban states in the United States with 76 percent of the people living in Maricopa and Pima Counties. That's just another reality we have to live with.

The third point is in an effort to provide the most competitive map, we've created two districts we believe are Democratic Districts, 2 and 4, three Districts that are Republican Districts, 1, 5, 7, three districts we believe are very competitive, 3, 6, and 8.

When one tries to label a district, saying Democrat, Republican, you know, you look at the Legislative history for the last 30 years, the last years' election. They demonstrate things that are true. Sometimes it's demonstrated not to be true.

Based on numbers, we think we've created three very competitive districts. And that's three more
than -- at least two more than -- probably two-and-a-half more than we have today.

The fourth point on Congressional, Congressional lines, are that four of our districts have a significant rural population influence, 1, 2, 3 and 8. The two that are greatest are one on the west side of the state, and it does pick up population in Maricopa County, and 8, which is the district I just described, which picks up population on the east side of Maricopa County, but I believe no more than 150,000 in each of those out of 641,000.

I understand that at least one of those, Maricopa County Northwest, is fast growing. But I still think that the rural component of one will have the majority vote and have the most significant vote in that district. So we've recognized that community of interest.

And finally, number five, with respect to the Congressional lines, in line with population growth of the state, we've created a new district, really two of them are new, 8 is kind of a new district, 6 is one on our map really new. It is one that picks up the central parts of Tempe, Phoenix, and I believe goes over to Glendale, to recognize the communities of interest that exist in central cities that we think are more
alike than they are different. And that is a very
competitive district, as we have drawn the lines.

With respect to the Legislative maps, we've also included justifications in -- they are
detailed. You can read them at your leisure, if you
haven't. These are key points.

Number one, increased the number of
majority-minority Legislative Districts from seven to
nine.

Just to recapitulate, with respect to
Congressional Districts, increased from one to two;
Legislative Districts, from seven to nine. That more
than satisfies the Voting Rights Act requirement without
violating those provisions in packing minorities into
districts to dilute the overall influence in the state.

We think we've made the proper
accommodation required by law and certainly in terms of
public policy.

We think our lines and our numbers achieve
all of what Proposition 106 is designed to achieve.

The second point on the legislative map is
that in an attempt to maintain urban and rural
integrities, our proposal has 17 districts in the
Phoenix area, four in Tucson, and the remaining nine are
rural-based districts.
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We think that given the numbers in the state, that pays pretty significant attention to rural districts. If you say 76 percent of the population is in Maricopa and Pima Counties, and you have nine of the districts as rural districts, it's almost 30 percent, 38 percent. So we think we pay more than significant attention to the rural interests.

Finally, with respect to the Legislative map, we think we have created a very competitive situation going from four, or at most five, to eight competitive districts. Nine would be districts that we identify as likely Democratic Districts, and 13 would be districts we identify as likely Republican Districts.

We understand there may be issues with our map. Since we had our meetings and submitted our proposals, we've heard from people in the northern part of our state. Coconino on our Legislative map is divided into three districts. Certainly that bears a lot of additional thought. We couldn't think of any other way to do it to achieve all the goals of 106.

I mentioned with respect to Prop -- Districts 15 and 17, what I have here is a map -- and I will leave it with you -- that shows the original lines, this line here being 17, the pink, 15 being the pink. A map here we believe is a better recognition of
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Communities of interest.

When you look at the maps, you'll see what's being seen as initially proposed, it being moved into 15, essentially the Laveen area and a little west. We now recognize and believe that this, 15, represents, in a better way, a community of interest, that South Phoenix and South Mountain Village concept and, at least, up to around here, is closer to the current existing District 23.

We think this substitute map, I'll leave the numbers with you, is a better rendition and better achieves the purposes of Proposition 106.

Those are my comments. I apologize for being late and taking as long as I have.

We think our proposals reflect an awful lot of thought.

I'd be happy to meet with any of the Commissioners individually to further explain what we did and why we did them.

Chairman Lynn: Thank you, Mr. Eckstein, very much.

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

If not, we'll close the public comment period.
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The next item on the agenda is future meetings.

As all of you know, we have the rest of the meetings outlined for the schedule as we've now adopted it. The next formal meeting will be next week, beginning Thursday. And we are again scheduled for potential meetings Thursday, Friday, and Saturday.

Whereas this week's meetings went very smoothly and fairly rapidly, my guess is next week will be a different matter. We'll use all of the two-and-a-half day schedule.

Any other issues?

Next week's meeting, Mr. Echeveste, in this room, in this configuration, slightly different head table, which we'll talk about later.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next week. It seems to work out well. We appreciate all your efforts.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: We're going to give Mr. Echeveste here recognition. It was well-organized, everything worked, we had water, and everything was wonderful.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Are you suggesting we start the meeting Thursday morning?
CHAIRMAN LYNN: We are.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Is there any way to delay that?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: No, unless you want to meet Sunday.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I just have an unavoidable conflict down here Thursday morning at 9:00 a.m.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We can talk about the starting time on Thursday.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I can't start until noon.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Noon is tough.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is there something we can do on the agenda that doesn't relate to drawing districts?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: There will be, but it won't take a lot of time. The primary matter on the agenda will be the presentation.

MR. RIVERA: Mr. Chairman, heaven forbid I support Mr. Hall, but one of the things we wanted to talk about is if we get the report from NDC, the next project from NDC Wednesday, there might be some needed legal review on this. It might be nice to start at noon to give some leeway to do legal review on Thursday.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: My only concern, and let's be very clear, everyone, if we start at noon Thursday, my best guess is we'll be at this Saturday evening. I want to be clear about that.

COMMISSIONER HALL: No problem.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If that's not a problem, it's not a problem with me, there's no problem.

MR. RIVERA: My only fear, and it's Ms. Hauser's fear, we'd not get through the legal analysis to give you a good legal analysis.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand your point.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, at this stage, we're going into now the most critical stage. We need to have everything here. If one of our colleagues is unable to attend, if something were to come up that I couldn't be here for an hour, I think we need to extend the courtesy to each other. If that means meet Sunday, Saturday evening or Sunday, I say we extend the courtesy.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I appreciate that. I cannot think of any meeting I would rather reschedule.

This is a judge-set meeting, and he won't listen to me.

MR. RIVERA: Do I have a retainer on that
one?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, we'll begin our Thursday meeting at noon. We'll be prepared --

Do we have a facility conflict on Saturday? We do next week as well. We have to vacate the room Saturday afternoon.

What we may need to do is prevail upon the hotel to change their accommodations or we may need to meet elsewhere. Certainly we'd prefer to try to change the hotel, change their mind rather than change --

MS. HAUSER: Like this week, it's probably a wedding.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: What is more important, as long as it's not my --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is there no other facility that can accommodate us?

MR. ECHEVESTE: As soon as we adjourn, I'll talk to management, see what we can do.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Tuesday. We have to post Tuesday to have a sufficient amount of time to do our work.

The next meeting is the most important meeting in the series. We should not give it anything but our full attention for as long as it takes to do our
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work. Make whatever accommodations in that regard.

MR. ECHEVESTE: If I cannot get this room past 3:00 o'clock, we'll look for another facility like this that can accommodate us through the evening near the freeway.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: This session of the Independent Redistricting Commission is adjourned until next Thursday at noon to a location, either this one or one to be determined.

The Commission will stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at approximately 3:16 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 166
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 7th day of

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