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CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'll call everything to order. Everyone take their seats.

The Independent Redistricting Commission will come to order.

Let the record show all five Commissioners are present along with legal counsel, IRC staff, and consultants.

First order of business this morning, ladies and gentlemen, is public comment. Before we have public comment, I want to just briefly go over the agenda today so there's no misunderstanding how the flow will be this workday. We will have public comment as the first item this morning. When public comment is completed, but not before 11:00 a.m., there is a notice of and anticipation of an Executive Session of the Commission. That Executive Session will commence following comments from the public and will last no longer than 2:00 o'clock this afternoon. At 2:00 o'clock this afternoon, we'll reconvene in public
session, continue with the agenda, and close the day whenever the day is over with another public comment session.

So for those of you who are here to speak this morning and may wish to continue observing our process, we did this specifically so that you would know to come back at 2:00 o'clock. Nothing will happen before that time that you would be able to be a part of. And we did that primarily for your convenience. So that is the schedule for today.

Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Ladies and gentlemen, can I ask you to stand, in light of today is the Chairman's birthday, and let's sing happy birthday to him.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall, that will cost you later. Don't seek any recognition for the rest of the day.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I don't think it's recommended, no two Commissioners can have the same zodiac sign.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Quite possibly. I don't know. Quite possibly.

(Whereupon Happy Birthday was sung to Chairman Lynn.)
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank all of you. Thank you all of you. I really appreciate it. Thank you all of you very much.

Public comment. This is the time for consideration and discussion of comments and complaints from the public. Those wishing to address the Commission shall seek permission by filling out a speaker slip. Anyone that has not done so, please do so and submit one as quickly as you can, please. Action taken as a result public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter, rescheduling the matter for future consideration at a later date unless the subject is already on the agenda for this date.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is now time to hear from the public. I have several slips already. I would ask the following: If you are making a presentation this morning and the presentation is similar to or perhaps identical to presentations that you have made in the past, I can tell you that every Commissioner understands the issues that have been presented to the Commission to this point. We are always interested in new information. We are always interested in different information. To the extent your presentation reiterates something we already know and already have, if you wouldn't mind just incorporating
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that material by reference, to hear it one more time
does not make it any more glorious to us. We get it.
We've heard from various groups throughout the process
and understand the comments clearly. Also, to the
extent you can, limit your comments to three minutes.
We'll not put a stopwatch on you. If you can do that
and wish additional time at the end of the public
comment period when everyone has had a chance to be
heard, we'll return to you for additional comment.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Also, to that end, if
you have written material, if you submit that to the
court reporter so we get it as part of the record,
that's helpful.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: First slip for public
comment is from Jim Hartdegen, City Casa Grande, Casa
Grande Chamber of Commerce.

MR. HARTDEGEN: Thank you for coming to
Florence. I think it was very helpful for you and also
us.

Dittos on remarks I've made in the past.
I won't go through that again.

But the -- I want to say this now, because
I'm not quite sure what will happen later on in the day,
just so it's on the record and you know that the
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scenarios that the NDC had given you earlier on in the
month on your web page, we had a meeting early this
morning and we'd like to go on record saying that the
southern area A2, is good. That's our number one
choice, Ajo scenario on the deal. Whether those things
still stay or not, who knows. Just so you know, that A2
is our number one pick.

And our number two pick, we spent a long
time this morning talking about these two different
scenarios, was the southern area 4B. That was our
second choice.

But we spent a lot of time debating both
of those and looking at the information we had at hand.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hartdegen.

MR. HARTDEGEN: 4B as in boy.

First was 2A as in apple.

I can tell you that 5D was not only a no
but a "hell no."

So I was supposed to, since I was the
messenger, they thought you'd kill me not them. 3E also
was a very strong no.

We wanted you to know that early on.

They may be scenarios that are old by now.

That might give you an indication with what we have to
pick from.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Hartdegen.

Next speaker, Edward T. Begay, Speaker of the Navajo Council.

SPEAKER BEGAY: Thank you, Commissioners, staff, counsel, and guests. Thank you. It's my pleasure to appear before you again, because your meeting is also informational and sometimes it gets to be very exciting.

Based on the -- based on the last meeting in Show Low, we have suggested to the Navajo Nation we need to revisit a proposal that was worked up by your consultants that looked very decent and looked very favorable. So we brought that back to the Subcommittee of Intergovernmental Relations Committee of the Council and then the Intergovernmental Relations of the Council took our Subcommittee's Recommendation. And in doing so, the Navajo Nation's supports scenario D statewide, which our adopted resolution is Exhibit A. And then also, scenarios F as developed by your consultants, and we revisit that and ran the numbers among ourselves. And we are very supportive of that proposal as your consultants have worked up in your work session and also that you suggested for us to revisit.

So, in doing so, with that, if that's incorporated into your recommendations overall, as a
possible change that we're suggesting to the Commission
on the Congressional redistricting plan as — here as
Exhibit C, in the proposal.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to
present that as an update and a final position of the
Nation at this time.

And I yield to questions, if there are
any. Otherwise, thank you for your attention and the
documentations are handed out so -- for your review.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Speaker Begay.

Mr. Elder. Speaker Begay.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: One quick question.

Right after your Exhibit, part of Exhibit C, the blue
area, two five fourteen, is this because in the analysis
you were over and this would be an area you would
exclude to get population in balance?

SPEAKER BEGAY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

Next speaker, Mayor Neil Giuliano, City of

Tempe. Mayor Giuliano.

MAYOR GIULIANO: Thank you. Tonight I'll
be brief. Congress, districtwise, we're very
comfortable where it's at. The Legislative information,
some information comes to me, you may be aware, there
was an election in Tempe a couple Tuesdays ago. The interesting thing about the results of the election, not only did we have the highest percentage turnout, and the highest number of ballots ever cast in a city election, it went from 15,900 voters to 23,900 voters, which is a pretty big increase, 8,000 new voters participating on a local level, what was significant on the new numbers, all throughout the city, including the very southern part of the community, we actually had record turnouts of people from the southern part of Tempe participating in this recent election. I mention that because I want to go on record again stating the City of Tempe does not want to be split along the freeway for a Legislative District.

Our community may have a diversity of housing and diversity of people from north to south, but I think by evidence of the number of -- record number people participating in the local election held just a couple weeks ago, we all care about the community as a whole, and we want to remain a community of interest as a whole and participate as a community of interest and have our voice be heard as long as it can be by being as contained as possible and not split in half.

We understand the difficult job you have, and we understand our history is such that as a sliver
of our community, it has been in a different Legislative District.

We understand we may have to continue, slivering North Tempe in a different Legislative district, slivering it in a different Legislative District, we probably have to accept that. Splitting the community in half along the freeway corridor would not be a Legislative benefit for the state or Legislative. The people participating, we think it in the best interests to be as contained as possible.

We thank you very much for all the work and know you have a difficult job.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Questions, Mr. Mayor.

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: A question about the comments for the Congressional District, capping. Talking about the draft map or talking about -- have you looked at various alternatives on the website? Are all acceptable --

MAYOR GIULIANO: Draft map, all the same Congressional District.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: There are other drafts available. I'm not sure any --

MAYOR GIULIANO: All Congressional drafts that keep Tempe as one Tempe.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: One for central Congressional unites Tempe with the Town of Scottsdale and Downtown Phoenix. Specific comment?

MAYOR GIULIANO: I'm comfortable with that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mayor, other citizens from your fair city indicated they prefer a split for double representation at a state level. Do you have a comment at all due to that?

MAYOR GIULIANO: My understanding is a little different than perhaps some citizens. Doubling representation may be additional folks that have an obligation to interact with more citizens, but in terms of pure representation, the, you know, the R or D slash Tempe after the name may not take place depending on how many voters are in that district.

We think holding the city together as much as possible is more in our interests, keeping more people in the piece of the community within the district. No disrespect at all to our Legislative Representatives from District 26 who have a sliver of North Tempe in the rest of the district right now, but they clearly, the priority clearly is to represent the overwhelming majority of their district, which is not in
the City of Tempe, although they have participated and
come to events, been responsive. We clearly have not
been their number one priority, and they've said on
occasion, they are not, so to speak, speaking for Tempe,
because we're such a small part the of community that
was represented by them.

We fear if we're split in half at the
US-60 freeway, those folks that represent us may have
more of an interest in the part of the community in that
district that votes more or may be more one political
party or another rather than in allowing us to have a
solid voice as much as possible within our community.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

The next speakers, Nathan Sproul and Bob
Fannin representing the Republican party.

Mr. Fannin.

MR. FANNIN: Mr. Chairman, members of the
Commission, I'm Bob Fannin, Chairman of the Republican
Party, I share the situation you do, no compensation,
and it's sad -- with what you've done, to save time, I
want to make sure you have the comments. I will submit
them in writing. I would like to read from it. I think
you've done a tremendous job.

I appreciate very much the opportunity to
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submit testimony to the Independent Redistricting Commission.

As Chairman of the Arizona Republican Party, I understand that the people of Arizona voted for an Independent Redistricting Commission rather than allowing partisan incumbents to draw the lines. As a result, we as a political party, have refrained from submitting partisan plans.

To this point we have supported the Independent Redistricting Commission in its efforts, and the draft plan you submitted for public comment. In my opinion, in all but a few situations, like the Prescott/Prescott Valley/Chino Valley Legislative District situation, you have fairly reflected extensive public comment and recognized constitutional criteria required by Proposition 106 and federal law.

However, the Arizona Republican Party feels compelled to comment on plans that have been submitted that disregard the Constitutional criteria elevating artificial competitiveness and partisan incumbent protection above the Constitution.

As you well know, competitiveness is the last of the criteria in Proposition 106, and was worded in such a way that subordinates it to all other priorities. The priorities of the Constitution are
recognition of long-standing federal precedent on redistricting.

We simply ask you to do what you have been doing. Please meticulously follow the requirements of the Arizona Constitution and federal law. As the Commission has discovered, when this is done, it is virtually impossible to create artificially competitive districts by partisan gerrymandering.

I want to be very clear on this subject. We're not opposed to competitive districts as long as the Arizona Constitution and federal law are complied with, and a roughly proportional number of Democrat and Republican districts are made competitive. Currently many plans that have been submitted keep Democratic districts bulletproof, and reduce the advantage of Republicans in Republican districts to create artificial competitiveness by disregarding one or more of the priorities of Proposition 106.

It is rather obvious that the plans submitted by the Arizona Democratic Party are openly partisan plans designed to give their political party an advantage. However, there is one plan that is not openly partisan on the surface, but it has disregarded many of the requirements of Proposition 106 and federal law. As a result, I feel compelled to bring it to the
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attention of the Commission. One plan submitted on
September 12th at the meeting in Glendale has many
components that disregard the clear intention of
Proposition 106 and federal law. I have asked the
Executive Director of the Arizona Republican Party,
Nathan Sproul, to share those specific components with
you.

Again, I thank all of you for your
service.

This isn't in written the comments. I
share the same situation you do in terms of public
service, and thank you, thank you, thank you for all
you've done.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Fannin.

Mr. Sproul.

MR. SPROUL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
Members of the Commission.

Specifically the plan we're referring to
is the plan submitted September 12th at the Glendale
meeting. Democratic Supervisor Mary Rose Wilcox deals
with some issues before the Commission obviously in
trying to make some of those districts more competitive.

Our initial analysis in looking at the
plan seems to indicate two primary criteria utilized.
One criteria is not available to you, because you are
precluded from looking at incumbent addresses. We're not precluded from doing that. We feel an obligation in pointing out, the plan submitted by Supervisor Wilcox, out of 32 Democrats, based on our analysis of the plan, to be running again, Legislators, all 32 were protected. Out of 41 Republicans that seem to be running for reelection in the Legislature, only 14 are protected. Let me define protection, it's three basic criteria. First criteria, the district is basically the same as what the incumbent represents today, not dramatically displaced from the area. Second, the criteria, Democratic or Republican, stays the same, not multiple incumbents challenging each other in the election. Based on the three criteria, I emphasize of 41 Republicans we believe running again, only 14 are protected as opposed to 32 Democrats that seem to be running, all 32, based on our initial analysis, seem protected.

Based on the initial plan that has come out, some are a little obvious. In the area of Tucson, for example, I believe District DD, which is, I believe, lettering the same in your plan as Supervisor Wilcox' plan, wraps around Cochise County, Sierra Vista City Tucson, the northern part of Tucson along Saddlebrooke, Oracle Valley area, clearly in our opinion it's of
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detriment to the communities of interest and
compactness, took District Z, the northern Tucson
district, and reduced the percentage Republicans from 15
percent advantage to five percent advantage. To do
that, you had to take out Saddlebrooke as far south
below Rialta River. Overwhelming evidence suggests
that's a natural barrier, should be a respected
community of interest, as well as much of the river
serves as the Tucson city boundary.

In our opinion, the City of Tucson, for
numerous reasons, has significant detriment to the issue
of compactness, communities of interest, and honoring
city boundaries.

They, on district I believe W, which is
the international border of Mexico, wraps into Cochise
County, wraps into Buckeye, the area Maricopa County,
did not solve one of the most pressing problems you
have, which is how to do away with that district that
stretches to the southeastern border of Arizona all the
way into Maricopa County. What they did, the solution
is they made more compactness of a problem. If you were
to draw line around Buckeye, the northwest corner
district, all the way to the southeast corner of
Douglas, a 290-mile line, extended, as opposed to the
current 288-mile line, and made compactness more of a
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significant detriment.

The third issue I'd like bring out is the Prescott-Prescott Valley issue I know you all are dealing with. We did not solve the problem for you. It's a violation, in our opinion, a significant detriment to communities of interest.

North, the next area, I, Republican registration was lowered 11 points to seven points in order do this, an artificially competitive arm. I believe several drafters of Prop 106 wrote an editorial against doing this very concept. So they bring in two Democrat pockets in the area in an attempt to make it competitive and clearly violated the communities of interest along with the issue of compactness to instill competitiveness into the process.

Northwest valley pointed out a few issues. Instead of following, for example, the Commission drawing north-south boundaries, in essence, drew east-west alignments. Doing this, Glendale had seven Legislative Districts whereas currently Glendale has four Legislative Districts. Peoria has four Legislative Districts. Currently there are two Legislative Districts. Clearly it seems a significant detriment to the communities of interest, compactness, honoring city boundaries.
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M, Mary Rose Wilcox, your plan differed slightly in lettering. If I'm not mistaken your lettering, M, hers was L, but I think you know the district I'm referring to, one where the districts put out as truly competitive, a district with a two point registration difference as well as historical data, seemed a legitimate area as competitive, she changed to make an artificial bridge connected to Phoenix to El Mirage. In so doing, in that district, combined El Mirage, Phoenix, Surprise, Youngtown, Sun City, Peoria, and Glendale all into one district, clearly a significant detriment to the communities of interest, honoring town boundaries and compactness.

The last point I'd like bring out as a point demonstrating democracy protection, as such, in the Democratic plan, the letter Q, primarily the district of Tempe, what they did, in the lower southeast corner, if you notice the map, it changes ever so slightly the Commission's plan, changes it three-quarters of a percentage point. The northeast corner, drew three-quarter mile H, eliminated Senator Harry Michaels prime component. Clearly indicates modus operandi, Democratic. Although clearly enunciated, 14 of 41 Republicans are protected.

One point the Chairman alluded to I'd like
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allude to, most of the plans address issues of competitiveness. Almost in all cases it's Republican district lowering, Democrats gain advantage.

We're not opposed to competition. We're open and believe it's a fundamental responsibility of the Commission to consider natural competition where it exists in a community of interest, or priority.

To draw artificial arms, as supervisor Wilcox has in the North Phoenix District I think is clearly detrimental. The point I'm trying to make, one of the points I'm trying to make, when one looks at the competition, the proportional number of districts decrease with their advantage to be competitive, recognizing Republicans have the advantage. There's not one Republican, proportionality, which districts make competitive as opposed to automatically so many of the plans do reducing Republicans and giving Democrats advantage.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Sproul, do you have an analysis available in writing so we can put it in writing?

MR. SPROUL: I don't have it with me. We can submit it by the end of the day.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If you would.

Other questions for Mr. Sproul.

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
MR. SPROUL: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Joseph Donaldson representing City Flagstaff.

MAYOR DONALDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. Thank you for the opportunity to speak before you.

I'd like to read three letters into the record stating our Council's position on redistricting.

Mr. Lynn, On behalf of the Flagstaff Council, please accept our continued appreciation for the outreach efforts of the Independent Redistricting Commission. The opportunity for public review and comment is valued.

In its review of the initial grid, the Flagstaff City Council considered the process developed by the Independent Redistricting Commission and redistricting goals set forth in Proposition 106. The Council determined the district boundaries established by the community of interest criteria to be of the highest significant. The Council comment at that time was:

"We request Commission give strong consideration to maintaining the City of Flagstaff and its Regional Planned Use and Transportation Plan area in on Legislative District and one Congressional District.
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The area of the Regional Plan extends, generally, from Humprey's Peak on the north to Kachina/Mountaineaire on the south, Belmont on the west, and Winona on the east. This region includes 525 square miles of the Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning area.

In consideration of the August 17th draft maps, the scenarios presented at the September 6, Public Hearing in Flagstaff, and subsequent scenarios presented on the website, this early position is maintained and further specified as follows:

The Council emphasizes the imperative of maintaining the City of Flagstaff and its Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan Area in one Legislative District and one Congressional District. Furthermore, the Council requests the Legislative District boundaries be established in support of our regional area community of interest that includes economic, natural resource, cultural and local government considerations.

Accordingly, the Council supports the configuration of District C as described 17 August Draft Legislative Map, because it closely meets criteria set forth in Proposition 106 and respects our community of interest and municipal/regional boundaries. With respect to the community of interest criteria, Flagstaff and its Regional Plan area most closely identifies with
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the incorporated cities and towns in the Verde Valley.

I understand some of our Northern Arizona neighbors have requested inclusion in a Legislative District with Flagstaff. I ask that these requests be considered recognizing communities of interests we share; yet I understand the Commission's challenge in meeting Proposition 106 criteria and balancing the many requests it receives.

The Flagstaff Council also supports Congressional District C defined in the 17 August Draft Congressional Map.

Attached are two letters written in general support of the positions stated above. The first letter is from the Alliance for the Second Century and signed by the representatives of Coconino County, the City of Flagstaff, and the Flagstaff Unified School District. The second letter of support comes from Arizona Board of Regents member Kay McKay.

I thank your for this opportunity to comment, and request additional comments are considered should the Commission weigh other district configurations.

For the record,

The letter Alliance for Second Century in Flagstaff.
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Mr. Lynn,

The undersigned members of the Alliance for the Second Century support the positions of the City of Flagstaff and Coconino County as follows:

Number one, The Flagstaff Regional Plan area remains whole in one Legislative and one Congressional District.

Number two, Legislative District C, defined by 17 August 2001 Draft Map most closely meets the criteria of Proposition 106 and the greater Flagstaff area.

Therefore, we strongly support Congressional District C and Legislative District C defined by the 17 August 2001 draft maps.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Signed Paul J. Babbitt, Chairman, Larry Bramblett, Superintendent, and myself, Mayor of Flagstaff.

Also enclosed is a letter from Kay McKay, President of the Arizona Board of Regents and writes to me this letter.

"Dear Joe,

"I am writing as an individual board members and resident of Flagstaff.

"In regard to the Commission on
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Redistricting the State of Arizona, it is my position they should not divide our city between the University and other parts of the city. It is my opinion that Flagstaff, Williams and the Sedona area be kept together. It will certainly better serve the strength of the University from a Legislative standpoint. In turn, it will serve the areas I have listed in the strongest possible matter.

"Please consider this option when you advocate the commission. It is important to Flagstaff."

"With best personal regards, Kay J. McKay."

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Donaldson.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: One quick one.

Reviewing limits, Belmont on the west?

You said Winona on the east, I didn't catch the western boundary, the metropolitan transportation.

MAYOR DONALDSON: Humphrey's Peak north, Kachina/Mountainair and Belmont on west, and Winona on the east.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Does that metropolitan area encompass a school district from the gentleman that signed the letter as well as health care,
any other communities of interest, or just transportation only?

MAYOR DONALDSON: Entire area. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: One more question.

Doug?

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

One more question. When we were up in Flagstaff, there were a number of questions wanting Flagstaff in the same Legislative District with the Navajo Nation. Is this statement, you are disagreeing with that view?

MAYOR DONALDSON: No, I'm not. I'm only making comments I'm prepared to make with the Council. The Council met, prepared what was good for Flagstaff, came up and agreed to what was good for and agreed on what to present today. We want to keep Flagstaff whole. We work well as a community, as we stated before. There's another Maricopa here. If you split the community, the interest, travel, we don't get it as well represented as we could.

MR. JOHNSON: I understand you prefer to be with Sedona and Williams rather than the Navajo Nation.

MAYOR DONALDSON: You asked if Navajo Nation. If that is what Commission decides to do in keeping Flagstaff whole, that's the way it goes. But
our main interest here as representing the Council is to
speak before to you is keep Flagstaff as one entire
unit.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Jonathan Pearson,

administrator for the Town of Carefree.

MR. PERSON: Mr. Commissioner, members of
the Commission, Mayor Morrison was out of town. On
behalf of the Town of Carefree, I ask the draft
Legislative maps be revised. Carefree requests we be
moved Congressional E to B and Legislative F-2 District
to G. These two moves put Carefree in the same
districts with Scottsdale, Rio Verde, and Fountain
Hills, similar communities with similar interests, water
resources, desert preservation, and land use planning.
Congressional land use splits in the town, from B and E.
Thank you for considering our requests.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I didn't hear about
the Legislative District. You wanted to be moved from
and to?

SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: F-2 and G.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: D?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Same stuff.

SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: Any questions?
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think that is it,

Mr. Pearson. Thank you very much.

Paul Babbitt, Chairman of the Coconino

Board of supervisors.

Mr. Babbitt.

SUPERVISOR BABBITT: Thank you.

I'd remind you also, I greatly appreciate

presence. While Mr. Peru will discuss many of the

following concerns of the board further resulting from

the first round of public hearings, the board does not,

the board has not seen any subsequent maps or scenarios

resulting from the second round of public hearings. The

board is not in a position as a Flagstaff community of

interest, as defined by the Commission's guidelines,

having proposed Flagstaff, being split anyway, the

Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce, Northern Arizona

University, Coconino County, the Unified School

District, also support the position, as you heard in

prior testimony to keep Flagstaff who. As stated in the

letter to the Commission dated December 4th, the

Havasupai Tribe communicated the Board of Supervisor

their desire to be located in the same Legislative

District. At the September 6 public hearing, testimony

was given that raised questions about their position,

however, a letter will be forthcoming from the tribe
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confirming their desire to be as I stated in that
district with Williams and Flagstaff.

In our September 4th letter we pointed out
there is not a match in voting precincts of Grand Canyon
and Tusayan. Currently the board of supervisors
believes there is not. The communities of Tusayan and
Grand Canyon, even though they border one another, are
two very distinct communities with very different issues
and concerns. They currently are in two separate
Legislative and Congressional Districts, and the board
supports this continued separation. The disparities or
mismatched, as labeled on the attached match B, exist in
the Fernwood and the eastern boundary of the Leupp
precincts. The Fernwood precinct as shown on the
adopted map would take in a part of the reservation
precinct of Leupp.

The board of supervisors would like to
clarify their position on the Congressional adopted
maps.

At the September 6, 2000, public hearing,
the board was asked what type of district they would
rather have, a rural or compact district. At that time
the testimony supported rural. The board would like to
add to this statement. The boards supports a district
that is predominantly rural. Also, as stated above,
while they support the adopted Congressional map, the Board feels that they have greater shared interests with the eastern and southeastern portion of the state as opposed to the Kingman and river communities.

As stated in the Board's September 4 letter, the area surrounding the Moenkopi precinct has expanded to include areas within Coalmine North and South. This creates five voting precincts in an area that has a voter registration total of less than 250 people who reside in the same chapter of Coalmine.

Also, the path to reach the Moenkopi precinct has been changed from Highway 264 to the boundary between the Tuba City northeast and Coleman North precincts. This path of the Moenkopi precinct has the effect of pulling in members of the Navajo tribe that live along the pathway boundary.

Our suggestion is to keep the path as is, Highway 264.

The county board of supervisors recognizes and supports the separateness of the Hopi Tribe and acknowledges that a path has to be created to take in the Hopi community of Moenkopi, however, they support a path that is less intrusive through a whole of Coconino County and would like to work with the Independent Redistricting Commission's consultants in identifying a
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Thank you for allowing the Coconino County
the opportunity to comment on the proposed Congressional
and Legislative proposals.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: You get the award for
best tie.

SUPERVISOR BABBITT: Does that mean I
relieve the Chairman of his duties for the day?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Trying get rid of me?

SUPERVISOR BABBITT: No. Just no
objection to your taking the day off.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Can't think of a better
group of people to spend it with.

He must be running for something.

No, he's not.

Next speaker, Mr. Hercel Spears.

Mr. Spears.

MR. SPEARS: I appreciate the time and
effort you guys are putting into this.

I wish there was some way we could see you
compensated appropriately. I know it's a lot of hard
work.

I own property in both north and south
Tempe. Because I own property in both north and south
Tempe, have tenants in both north and south Tempe, it's
very, very apparent, there are two distinct communities

of interest in Tempe.

As the Mayor indicated, we are a very
diverse city. And that's true, we are very diverse
city.

You heard from the political Mayor, from
state representatives, from state senators, all of them
talking about how they wanted this, our city divided.

I'm coming to you as a citizen, someone that lives
there.

The reason I think it's important that we
acknowledge that it is a diverse, two diverse
communities, is that unlike city government, state
Legislative government, and federal government that
represents a different aspect of the people's needs and
desires, the city itself is governed in -- at the
benevolence of the state, can take care of issues not
convenient for the state to take care of.

Splitting the city into two different, as
I mentioned earlier in comments back and forth with the
Mayor, with two representatives and double the
representation, I would also go one step further and say
the city itself has hired a lobbyist, has had a lobbyist
to the state for a number of years. So the city as a
whole still will have representation from not only the
city, Mayor, and Council, but also from their lobbyist
they send up there. And this would just enhance the
representation the City of Tempe would have.

Here we're in favor of three splits of the
City of Tempe, or splits at the freeway.

Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Spears.

Next speaker Mark Thompson.

Mr. Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: Good morning, Mr. Chairman.

Happy birthday. Let me reiterate that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: I'd like to thank you and
the Commission for generating the alternative scenarios.
I previously testified in favor of representing to the
Commission, and subsequently they published different
scenarios. This morning I would like to reaffirm my
support for two representative districts in Tempe.

I've been a resident for 25 years and a
Tempe businessman for 11 years. I'd like to show my
support for Legislative a scenario for Maricopa 3E. As
a concrete demonstration, manifestestation, like the
public might, the Tempe phone book, let everybody and
the Commission take notice, it says "Tempe Ahwatukee" on
its front. When local consumers access business, this
what they use. "Tempe Ahwatukee," see this. The best is 3E.

The concern I have, or improvements or changes to the website, the difficulty or addressing or accessing graphic map data. Currently to view the Legislative, go to slides 18, 19, 20. The presentation in excess of 40 slides, and I had many friends, fellow businessmen, show support, businessmen show support through the website, look at that and change it, make it easier for individuals to access the website. So go ahead and see what scenarios are posted.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

If I remember the testimony, you appeared at the Mesa hearing. Your wife also spoke, if I remember correctly.

MS. THOMPSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Supporting separation at Highway 60.

MS. THOMPSON: At Highway 60. Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The next speaker is Peter Moraga.

Mr. Moraga.

MR. MORAGA: I'll be very brief.

I've spoken before the Commission before on behalf of the Central Phoenix Historic Districts.
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Again, I thank the Commission for coming together and working on this very important issue.

I won't reiterate the importance or the importance of our community of interest. You've done a great job doing that.

The Northern Historic District was taken out of one of the previous maps. I'm here just to recommend that the Historic District remain with the other Historic Districts in Central Phoenix. I brought copies and circled the areas for you. I'll hand those out to you.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Identify the area.

MR. MORAGA: Windsore Historic District, the northern part of District O, northeast corner of it, borders up to Missouri, east of --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is that immediately, the area north and to the east of Uptown Plaza?

MR. MORAGA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay.

MR. MORAGA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you very much. Thank you for the maps. They are always helpful.

Next speaker is Gary Richardson.

Mr. Richardson.
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MR. RICHARDSON:  Good morning,

Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. Thank you for the
opportunity to give you input on this very important
redistricting task before you.

I was involved in the last redistricting
of the State of Arizona that went before you. I was in
the State House of Representatives at the time. I know
the pressures brought to bear on the process.

I've lived in Tempe since I was five years
old, and that's almost 50 years. I've always
represented District 27, Tempe, and parts of Ahwatukee
while in the Legislature, four years in the House of
Representatives, and four years as a State Senator.

I would like to comment on something the
Mayor said earlier, the fact we had a record turnout in
our election recently I think argues to the fact you
should not split Tempe up at all more than it suggests
you should split Tempe one direction, street, or
highway. The fact of a record turnout shows a definite
community of interest and we would like to remain that
way. However, I know there are 30 districts, millions
of people to assign to their own district. I know that
may be an impossibility to keep Tempe in one Legislative
District. I think it would be the optimum.

I would like to encourage you for a second
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to keep communities of interest together. I'm speaking specifically of Kyrene School District.

If you adopt the plan, I don't know what number it is, the latest one, the one recently proposed, change the lines to Guadalupe and Elliott, you'll be splitting the school district right in half. You are going to be taking parts of it out of the Legislative District that should be been in, bringing it in the middle of one. Also, you are going to be putting people that live right across the street from neighbors in totally different Legislative Districts. I can't imagine a worse thing. You have to do it some areas. If you can avoid it, putting a line at Superstition Freeway, it would be far more advantageous.

Body language is very helpful, Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Everybody is a neighbor, wherever the line is.

MR. RICHARDSON: Everybody is a neighbor. Absolutely.

I think if you follow, not even the natural boundary, a man-made boundary, a freeway, follow the natural boundary the freeway has become, and do your best to avoid obvious political considerations in rewriting this district, I think you ought to not worry where incumbents reside, such as in 3E, where I urge you
to do through my presence today.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak. And I'd be happy to answer any questions you have.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Richardson, a couple questions.

Ms. Minkoff, Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Your remarks tended to be focused on the importance of school districts and not splitting, specifically, the Kyrene School District. If the dividing line of the Superstition Freeway unites the Kyrene School District, does that not then split the Tempe School District?

MR. RICHARDSON: Splits the Tempe School District. Either plan splits the Tempe Union School District. There are three districts in our city. We have tried for many years to try to get them to consolidate and unify. We've given incentives, if you will, some more overt than others. The last one practically said: Do this. Of course, we can't force people to do anything at the Legislature. We've not been able to unify and consolidate districts.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: What is the dividing line between Kyrene and Tempe Elementary?

MR. RICHARDSON: Guadalupe.
COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm learning all kinds of things that I did not know before about the State. Kyrene School District includes part of Ahwatukee, Chandler, and Guadalupe.

MR. RICHARDSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Guadalupe has been separated from the entire area in every plan.

Are you asking us in unifying Guadalupe School District to take the southern part of Guadalupe and put south Guadalupe School District or --

MR. RICHARDSON: My ideal scenario is to leave all Guadalupe and Tempe in the same district.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Including the part of Kyrene School District that services Guadalupe?

MR. RICHARDSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Several speakers mentioned the high turnout of the Tempe election. What was on the ballot that --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Maybe you heard about it, Mr. Elder.

MR. RICHARDSON: How long do we have room for?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Not a full analysis, just the issue.

MR. RICHARDSON: It was a recall election
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of the current City Mayor.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other questions for Mr. Richardson.

Thank you very much, sir.

Next speaker is Connie Thompson.

Mrs. Thompson.

MRS. THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners.

I wanted to bring up an issue before you. I wanted to bring it up the last couple times when you've been in Mesa. There has been hearings about dividing Tempe. I wanted to put it before you. I don't know how obvious it has been that people want to keep Tempe together that spoke at the last hearings, two citizens, six elected officials, five appointed board members, one elected, and the Democratic Chairman of the District 27. People would like to see Tempe have two strong voices in two separate districts that would like to have the division at US-60: Eight citizens and one elected official.

The Tempe Chamber of Commerce represents businesses. I think you can tell the citizens are not tied into the politics of Tempe, like Senator Mitchell, Councilman Mitchell, Representative Cahill, Councilman Cahill. People are more interested in what is going on
with Tempe, want two strong districts, want a voice, six
voices representing us, not just three. We don't want
to cut off a couple thousand people in South Tempe and
take away their voice. We don't want to cut off a
couple thousand people. Give us voice. Divide Tempe at
US-60. I still want to be in the south group. If you
do the boundary at Guadalupe, I'm stuck between the
group. Do it at US-60.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The next speaker is Hugh
Hallman.

Mr. Hallman.

COUNCILMAN HALLMAN: (Speaker says hello
in foreign language.) US-60, for the Council I won't --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: That's a joke. I hold the
record as the only person on the Commission that spoke
Russian, but that was some time ago, although some
colleagues say when I open my mouth it sounds like I'm
speaking Russian.

COUNCILMAN HALLMAN: I'm here today one
last time for combining what I believe is the strongest
community of interest in Tempe, Tempe itself. Tempe
demonstrated clear, while diverse, unifying focus for
our residents.

I understand that is going to be very,
very difficult to achieve. The concept of community of
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interest is rather murky. We can all perhaps talk about
where differences may be even within the City of Tempe.
If you are not able to accommodate that desire, I
understand regularly, recently, the life of it is very
small. I then ask you to look for secondary communities
of interest. Make a final determination of the boundary
between -- across Tempe. For me, the next best
indicator of a community of interest, if we ignore or
cannot combine the entire City of Tempe in one community
of interest, is Kyrene School District.

I recognize the question with Guadalupe.
Put Guadalupe, the most likely community of interest is
the north part of the City of Tempe. If the Kyrene
community has insufficient secondary, examining the
socioeconomic indicators, I believe the City of Tempe is
not exactly the right boundary. Baseline Road serves as
a better boundary line through Tempe. The reason for
that is twofold. The first kinds of homes, the kinds of
occupants in homes between the area of US and Baseline
to the areas north, immediately north of the boundary,
those two areas of the community were created and built
long before US-60 became the kind of dividing line that
might conveniently become a basis for dividing the map.
US-60 does not demonstrate a difference interest at the
north boundary and south boundary. It's just the
opposite. People south of the boundary have the identical kinds of problems faced by the people immediately north of the boundary. In fact, the neighborhood association that represents the people in and around that freeway called the Price Neighborhood Association, the largest single neighborhood association we have in Tempe, represents people from north and south of that boundary line, being US-60.

I implore you not to use US-60 as a convenient dividing line. The people's interests would be ill-served. It would include quadrants northeast, southeast, northwest, northeast of their interests. They've been fighting ADOT together with a unified voice, fighting aviation over flights. Instead of a convenient line, at least use Baseline.

Arguments would be the preference: Tempe and Guadalupe be together. If we can't satisfy that Kyrene boundary, the next best secondary indicator interest, splitting Guadalupe untoward no voice in that community more powerfully connected through a city or community interest. Secondly, if Kyrene doesn't work, Baseline as a boundary road. Baseline is a much better indicator based on socioeconomic indicators and specific problems that arise from that corridor.

I do speak from a basis of background and
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interest in this kind of problem, the current boundary line, the division of the City of Tempe. Six square miles, Tempeians more strongly identify with Tempeians than they do interests that might serve in the south.

I live in the area that for the last 20 years has been carved off into Legislative Districts with no voice as a fairly active member of the community, have served as a precinct committeeman. One decade they carved off one small section, carved off small portion with an East Mesa District and we had no voice at all. Currently the District is north and participates with Scottsdale, Paradise, Phoenix folks.

As a precinct committeeman with no voice in District 26, my concerns go unheeded in District 27 meetings. I'm also persona non grata, don't belong, in my district. They are not my representatives. I can't influence them in the way I would like to as an active member of the body politic.

Part of the concern is not to carve off such a small piece of Tempe as to assign them to no voice. A moderate dividing line, slight majority perhaps to the north that serves the city governments interests being represented providing folks south sufficiently that that group can, together, have a voice in the south district a semblance first to the other
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members, other interest groups.

Any questions such that I can answer them? Otherwise I'll allow you to get back to the birthday celebration.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Questions for Mr. Hallman? (The Chairman and Mr. Hallman exchange fairwells in a Russian dialect.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next speaker, Frank Seanez representing the Navajo Nation.

MR. SEANEZ: Thank you, Chairman Lynn and Commissioners.

On September 15th, the Commission asked the Navajo Nation to do two things, specifically. The first was to submit additional detailed written comments and the second was to review the Navajo Nation proposals in accord with the alternate NDC scenarios which had been provided to the Commission in Prescott and first announced to the Navajo Nation in Flagstaff, to provide the Commission additional options acceptable.

The Navajo Nation complied on September 19th. The Navajo Nation sent a supplemental packet of information to yourself and copies to the Commission's counsel and to NDC which covered additional comments by the office of the Speaker, Office of the President, Vice President, Navajo Transit, Transportation, Tourism, Four
Corners, Tuba City, Navajo Nation TANIFF Office, Division of Education, Tax Commission, and Navajo Hopi Land Commission. As well, the Navajo Nation provided detailed information to the Commission relative to support which Legislative Districts and Senators provided for Hopi bills in the 45th through 42nd Legislatures.

The Navajo Legislature through intergovernmental subdivision committee acted to pass resolution wherein the Navajo Nation looked at scenarios D and F of the Legislative District and approved and recommended to the full intergovernmental relations committee both those scenarios, D and F.

The Navajo Nation was a bit hampered because no detailed breakout of statistical information has been placed on the website for those scenarios.

However, the Navajo Nation is confident that the Commission's consultants, NDC, have done full analysis of that, made sure that that scenario is within the deviations required for Legislative Districts by the Voting Rights Act, and the Navajo Nation is in reliance upon the Commission and consultants on that area.

International area IGRS-253-01 the Navajo Nation provided to all the Commissioners and its consultants and legal counsel this morning at the same
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time as Speaker Begay's comments.

The Navajo Nation as well provided within that document as an alternative for a small change to the Congressional District approved conditionally by the Commission, and that change would just remove a small portion of Yavapai County and certain Census places from the Congressional District, Yarnell, Peeples Valley, Wilhoit, Mayer, Spring Valley, and Cordes Lakes to accommodate the inclusion of the Hopi Tribe and corridor area which is currently within Congressional District A as provided by the Commission.

The Navajo Nation would like to point out again the inclusion of the Hopi Tribe to parts of the state we believe is essential for Voting Rights Act Section Two surviving initial review under Section Five.

The Navajo Nation reminds the Commission both the Tribal Councils of the White Mountain Apache Tribe and San Carlos Apache Tribe unanimously supported those tribes being in the same district as the Navajo Nation.

The Commission was presented with the White Mountain Apache Tribal Council resolution at its first round hearing in Hon-Dah on June 18th of this year and the San Carlos Apache Tribal Council resolution again passed unanimously, 9-0-0, passed on September
11th of this year. That resolution, SP-2001-185, a copy of that was provided to the Commission previously as well.

I would direct the Commission to the transcript of the direct testimony San Carlos Apache Tribal Chairman Dallas Massey, page 67, at the Heard Museum in the second round of public testimony. Chairman Massey conclusively, in so many words, said, "The San Carlos Apache wants to be in the same Legislative District as the Navajo Nation."

(Whereupon, Mr. Seanez says thank you in Russian.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Seanez.

DR. ADAMS: Not a question, information. Data seeking. It's sent to be posted on the website. You should be able to see it by the end of today.

MR. SEANEZ: Thank you, Dr. Adams, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next speaker, Terri Leija representing the Minority Coalition for Fair Redistricting.

MS. LEIJA: Since day one, the primary concern have been Constitutional concerns of Prop 106. We went to work diligently and developed a community of interest, and that is the basis of our maps. But
because 106 includes the requirement of competitiveness, we went ahead and drew another concern that includes competitiveness.

At the meeting in Glendale, we submitted the criteria that we used for our map, and that did not include incumbents' addresses. We specifically spoke to various districts that we had developed, but I think you all have heard from our community, our Commission members from throughout the state, Tucson, Pinal, Guadalupe, or Surprise. And based on their concerns is what we used to draw our maps.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. LeiJa.

Next speaker, Patrice Kraus from City of Chandler.

MS. KRAUS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners.

I wasn't going to speak. You are quite familiar with the City of Chandler's position on the Legislative redistricting maps. However, because a number of speakers in Tempe talked about dividing Tempe at US-60, I thought it important I come up and say whatever you decide on the City of Tempe, it's hard to say what the majority wants not having access to all of the information that you are getting through the
website, through voters, and through, you know, speakers
elsewhere, speakers who see you on the street, et
cetera. But whatever you decide about Tempe, whatever,
however it will be divided, please leave us alone.
Please, please leave us alone. We like how we are.
Find a solution that keeps us happy, perhaps make some
people happy in Tempe, maybe not all. It looks pretty
impossible to do that. But I know a couple of people
have said that they support Maricopa 3E. We do not
support Maricopa 3E.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We appreciate your time as
always.

MS. KRAUS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The last speaker slip I
have, I say that, anyone otherwise that wishes to be
heard this session, there will be another session later
today, I can't tell you the time, at the end of the
meeting, the last speaker slip I have is from Jacob
Moore, Salt River Pima Indian Communities.

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

Coming together to face issues of the Salt
River Pima Indians and coming to trying to appease
everyone is not easy to do.
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I bring a letter signed by the President of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Ivan Makil, and also signed by the President of the Fort McDowell Indian Community, Clinton Pattea. We respectfully request the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and Fort McDowell Community be put in District E, on the Congressional side, and taken out of large the rural District C.

Before we go into that, I would like to also let you know that we also are content with being placed in District W, on the Legislative side, which does incorporate the metropolitan tribes, Salt River, Fort McDowell, Ak-Chin, and also the community of Guadalupe. We're very pleased to have that opportunity to stay together as rural metro tribes, which brings me to my next point.

In fact, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and Fort McDowell Indian Community are the only parts of Maricopa County included in District E, in terms of being out of District C, that's the only part of District C out of Maricopa County, Salt River and McDowell.

We acknowledge and applaud effort in terms creating a strong Native American District in District C. However, our concern is that our issues are
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primarily metropolitan in nature. In fact, a lot of the issues we deal with in C, flight patterns, air quality, freeway transportation, are like metropolitan, intergovernmental agreements with City of Scottsdale and City of Mesa. For those reasons we find it appropriate, for federal appropriation, or good regional planning, we participate with metropolitan areas versus some issues which may be more important to rural districts.

With that in mind, I want to try keep it short.

The other comment, I think, usually that has been posed by the Independent Redistricting Commission is how do we fix that?

Again, without trying to do your job, or our concerns about whether or not we have the technical skills or expertise you've developed over time in terms of hearing other concerns, one possible solution is the Arcadia District in District E, technically part of the City of Phoenix. That could be a possible solution, moving Arcadia over into -- into that district, District B, understanding there are some areas within district -- to give you an idea, this is a small number, require a small change.

The population of Salt River is approximately about 6,500. The population of Fort
McDowell is 800. So we're looking at in the range of 7,000 that would be moved out of District C into District E with the suggestion to compensate that would be moving some from District A to District C and some from B into A, which again would be -- allow for part of Arcadia out of A into E.

Beyond that I think the other question is, one other comment, also suggestion, might be possible that Salt River is considered to be moved into the Mesa District on the Congressional side.

Our concern is there is a physical geographic boundary in terms of the criteria, Proposition 106, which is the Salt River, the riverbed itself. In fact, a lot of the deployment and businesses that go on, the interaction of intercommerce, so to speak, Salt River is primarily done with Scottsdale, buying groceries or employment, not the Navajo boundary that takes place with the City of Mesa and Salt River.

There is commerce that takes place between the City of Scottsdale and Salt River Pima Indian River Community.

Thank you for your time. And I'd entertain any questions. Otherwise that concludes my presentation.

(The following is the written submittal of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and the
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Dear Commissioners:

As Presidents of the Salt River Prima-Maricopa Indian Community and the Fort McDowell Indian Community, we are writing to respectfully request that the Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC) place our reservations in congressional District E. As you know, we have already testified before the IRC in favor of being placed in District E, as opposed to our current placement in District C. This letter will provide further evidence and credence to our arguments.

"First, as was stated in the IRC hearing at the Heard Museum on August 30, 2001, District C is a rural district. Maricopa County, where our reservations lie, is urban and suburban in nature. In fact, the only parts of Maricopa County included in District C are the two Indian communities that we represent. While this would seem discriminatory in nature, it also serves to perpetuate a myth that Indian tribes are rural communities. Nothing could be further from the truth. We are diverse, growing communities that are integral parts of Maricopa County. Some of our tribal members
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live and work in the surrounding suburban areas of
Scottsdale, Tempe, Mesa, and Fountain Hills and have
important business and social ties to these surrounding
communities.

"Second, we believe that excluding our
suburban communities from Maricopa County will make it
more difficult to work with these communities that we
have successfully worked with in the past. Our tribes
have entered into many intergovernmental agreements with
these local cities and we have partnered with many
local, non-reservation communities to expand business
development in the region. Unfortunately, by taking our
tribes out of Maricopa County, the IRC may unwittingly
punish our reservation communities by forcing us to
fight with our surrounding local cities for federal
appropriation dollars. This could fracture
relationships with local communities at a time when our
Indian communities and local cities have been forging
positive, enduring relationships with one another.

"Finally, while we applaud the IRC's
support for creating a strong, Native American presence
in District C, the rural tribes concerns are far
different than those of Salt River and Fort McDowell.
We believe the rural tribes realized this when they
submitted their maps to the IRC. As you will recall,
the Navajo Nation submitted redistricting maps that excluded our tribes. We don't think this was merely an oversight. We are convinced, as they apparently were, that the varying interests of the rural and suburban tribes made it easier to keep the rural and suburban tribes in separate congressional districts. We also believe that our two communities, which total slightly more than 7,000 people, would minimally change the Native American population in District C and very small changes would be needed to the other districts.

"We understand that by adding 7,000 residents to District E, other congressional district will have to be slightly modified. We are prepared to help the Commission with this task. However, we aren't prepared to assume the expertise and knowledge that the Commission has developed of the affected communities whose districts might be altered. We think that the Commission may be better suited for this task. Nevertheless, we are prepared to be helpful in any way that the Commission sees fit.

"Thank you for your consideration of this request. If you need to contact us, we can be reached at (480) 850-8002 (President Makil) or (480) 837-5121 (President Pattea). In the meantime, please accept our best regards.
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"Sincerely, Ivan Makil, President, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community; Clinton Pattea, President, Fort McDowell Indian Community.")

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Moore, very much.

Other members of the public wishing to be heard at this time?

The Chair would entertain a motion as follows: Following a 10-minute recess, that the Commission reconvene in Executive Session pursuant to the agenda and pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.03(A)(4).

MS. HAUSER: Also, the two provisions.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Sorry, (A)(3) and (A)(4), both.

MS. HAUSER: Sorry. The motion.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: So moved.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

Those in favor say "Aye."

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Motion carries unanimously.

Ladies and gentlemen, we'll reconvene at or after 2:00 p.m.

Thank you.

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
(Whereupon, the Commission recessed to Executive Session from 11:54 a.m. until 2:46 p.m.)

(Recess was taken from 2:46 until approximately 2:56 p.m.)

(Whereupon, the Independent Redistricting Commission Resumed Public Session at 2:56 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'll reconvene the meeting of the Redistricting Commission at 2:56 p.m.

The record will show all Commissioners are present along with legal counsel, staff, and consultants.

The point is the Board a number of legal issues to discuss in Executive Session. No maps were discussed, no maps were present. No maps were discussed or recommended. You need to understand that the process we're going through publicly is that process. What we expect to discuss through the rest of the meeting is to take the options that have been either developed by the consultants, directed by Members of the Commission, or submitted by the public over the course of many weeks we have been reviewing the draft maps that we adopted last month and to begin to remove some of those options from consideration.

The reason we need to do that is twofold:

First, in order to fulfill our requirements under
Proposition 106. A significant amount of analysis and study needs to be conferred on those options that are under active consideration so that as a point when we decide to develop the final maps we have a full and complete understanding, statistically and otherwise, of the impacts of those decisions.

The second thing is that there are so many variations on specific themes that have been developed one way or another that it becomes very confusing, both to the public and to, quite frankly, all of us how many of those are under active consideration and how many are still possible in terms of a final map.

So the attempt, today, is to discuss, in an orderly fashion, if we can, the number of options that have been developed, one way or another, and for the most part to eliminate certain options as no longer being under consideration so as to get the number that will be fully analyzed down to a manageable number of options, including, of course, the draft maps that have been circulated. That's the attempt for the afternoon. And this is the first time today that we will be considering actual maps.

So with that said, without objection, what I'd like to do is begin with the Legislative map which presents us not only more options to be considered but
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has a number of areas of the state that are still under active consideration for potential change because of the amount of testimony that we have received, either at hearings or through other methodology.

So if you would turn your attention to the Legislative binder. And I think maybe the easiest way to do it is to follow the binder as it exists and talk about specific drafts, or tests, or options that have been submitted and decide whether or not we want them to be under -- continue under active consideration. And we haven't talked about the methodology that we'll use to do that.

I'm wondering what your pleasure is with respect to an option being presented and if there are not -- if there is not a consensus or not three votes -- how would you like to proceed in terms of options being eliminated? What is your pleasure?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Discussing them and -- are the mikes on?

Anything with three votes, go through and consider them for now.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Another point of view for now, another point of view, garner three votes, eliminate from consideration. All right.

Let's move to Legislative options. Dan,
COMMISSIONER ELDER: Before we do that, I would like to at least discuss whether two votes or three vote may be necessary to keep something on the table. If we have three votes, that's a majority of the quorum. I'd like to avoid that. Yes, voting on, yes, this point, looking like this one received three votes, a majority of the Commission. So if we make it a two vote, see how that runs?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: What is your pleasure?

Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I would be more comfortable with that, two votes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: So at least two votes keeps it in.

Again, the goal here is not to eliminate one or two of these options. I'll tell you the amount of work we have to do next week and beyond is going to be simplified greatly and made much more focused by the number of options that can be taken off the table if in fact we can do that. So I'm fine with two votes. I just ask you to give your votes very, very sparingly to -- anything other than that you want to actively consider next week.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Do possible two
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tiers, see what we end up with two-vote process, four, five left, get down, go through the balance left again rather than -- rather than at least go through all eight alternatives, nine alternatives, whatever it is now, then come back and revisit them once left rather than hitting one and two, oh, maybe was good one by the time get to seventh or eight.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: In fairness, we probably have eight or nine major alternatives. Each has permutations. We have a number of suboptions under some of the major tests.

At any rate, let's attempt to do that, go through, see which to eliminate. If too many, see if we can do a second round.

All right. I guess the easiest way to do this, Mr. Johnson, if you wouldn't mind, would you sort of take us through the book. I'll take over the discussion. You get us through the list, and we'll get them in order so you know what is in, what is out.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, pausing after each one to discuss them.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: One at a time, still in or whether we have a enough of consensus to remove it from consideration.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, as you may
recognize, we adopted the Legislative map. There are a
couple points as we begin I should clarify.

Number one, these are tests of concepts. When we get down to zooming in on streets and neighbors,
things like that, obviously we've not worked out every
last detail and matched every citizen request at this
point. That's our goal to do with the maps at this
point.

I should also note all maps are either on
the web already, which is true in most cases, or being
posted to the web, I believe, today. So they are
accessible to the public and they can go back to them
and add their comments.

A couple points I should also follow up
from the citizen or public hearings earlier this
morning. There were a couple of references to A2 and
4B, things like that. And those were references to the
Power Point presentation done in Prescott. Just for
your reference, A2 referred to by the representative of
Casa Grande, their favorite is very similar to what
Cochise presented as scenario 5 included in tests A and
G.

I'll try to note these as I get to the
maps, run through quickly, 5 wanted to mention, 4B,
representative Casa Grande okay with, wasn't his
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favorite, statewide test B and H. 5D, the, as he put
it, the "hell-no plan," is test D. And test F and F-2
are similar to it. 3E he mentioned was a strong no is
test E.

The number of Tempe speakers referred to
Maricopa plan 3E. That is the plan that includes Apache
Junction, Gold Canyon, in with urban districts included
with tests E and B. I'll try to refer to that as we get
to specific maps.

Jumping in with the first scenario here is
test A. This is the one first shown, I believe, last
week and posted to the web last week. Its primary focus
in developing this was to draw the border district that
we see down here, District Y, and to incorporate that
with unifying the Prescott Tri-Cities.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Doug, rather than go into
detail, we know what each is. Go in order. And let's
get them up on the board and see if we have concerns.
What I would hope to do is ask the Commission to engage
in conversation about each of the options. And if you
have a reason to want to keep it, fine. If you have a
reason to reject it, let's talk in some detail about
what that reasoning is so it's very clear if a test is
not left in for consideration next week, why it's
eliminated.
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Let's start with test A.

Is there conversation, comment, on test A?

Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, there's another alternative very similar to this, does a better job, does not split Flagstaff as this one does, and it handles Yavapai County better. I think given all the variables, other tests forthcoming, it's probably better. I don't think this needs to remain in consideration.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'd weigh in in favor of keeping this in the mix until we get further on down the line. Things are happening in both central cities in Phoenix, Tucson. I'd like to take a further look when we get to that stage.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any other comments on A?

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I also have a problem with the Northern Arizona portion of this district in terms of splitting Flagstaff, in terms of splits occurs in Yavapai County. I'd not be in favor of continuing to consider this one.

And I'd also, the way the La Paz County is split, I understand La Paz County has to be split, but
there are better ways of splitting it, better ways than going right through the middle of Quartzsite.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Which map, Joshua, is similar but preferable?

COMMISSIONER HALL: I believe test G.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Test G is a lot worse for Yavapai County.

I understand the preference. I'd like to keep this one in play for a while longer, too, if only for the reason we eliminated it is in comparison with G.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, let me ask a question on procedure here.

I think in reviewing the eight or nine maps that we've asked the consultant to give to us, there's probably a problem or three on every single map we have. And to go ahead and say we want to go forth with it as is, you know, maybe -- we may not reach any of our goals.

So how do we integrate, say this map may not be to good, or carry through the first round, see how many maps we end up with that are reasonably palatable? Here's what I see with each one of the maps, go through there?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Great question.

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
I think the way you began answering it is probably the perhaps easiest way we do it. Let's take a fairly quick run through the maps, see if there are any we agree with out on the face of it.

Go back, take a look at what is left, see if with the modification we like to keep them in or if at present there's a sufficient problem or similarities we might combine a couple, are some similarities with other maps, and decide on one, two options, preferable options, thereby changes, thereby eliminating another one from changes, perhaps a quick run-through.

What I'm hearing, A is still in play.

Without objection, move to test B.

Comments on B?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, B does a lot of good things. I think it divides Flagstaff. I think it breaks up EACO, which we have identified as an important AUR. And I am pointing out a very good reason for doing that, which is not necessarily apparent on the face of this. It also puts Apache Junction back into the Phoenix Metropolitan area and requires us to redraw all the districts in the East Valley, which is one area where we received almost unanimous approval for what we had done.
We may end up doing that, and some of these alternatives don't look too bad in the East Valley, but I hesitate.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I have problems with B as well in terms of the southern part of the state, some options it presents, as well as supporting comments made earlier.

With this one, I don't have any great need to keep it in play.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I agree.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, we'll take B out at this point.

What we'll try to do is go through the entire scenario and ratify what we can. I want to be sure if we're clear on it, if there are any other deficiencies that need to be pointed out, be sure we do that, to the extent you want them on the record.

I think we have better options to choose from for the reasons stated.

At this point, B is out.

Move on to option C.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, option CC fails to get the option for equality.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: C is out by definition.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Go straight to D.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Option D.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It's pretty much a minus. I don't like the fact Flagstaff is divided. We haven't unified the Tri-Cities. Flagstaff is divided, haven't unified the Tri-Cities. The way the Apache Reservations are connected, are less than wonderful. There just isn't a lot I like in this one.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any sentiment for keeping D?

Without objection, D is out.

Test E.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Whatever advantages this district has in the northern part of state in terms of unifying some communities, and perhaps not dividing others, it loses appeal in the southern part of the state with some of the interesting configurations along the border. I find this one problematic. I'm not -- I'm certainly not in favor of keeping it in the mix the way configured.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It's kind of ugly in the Phoenix Metropolitan area.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: On a rating system, community interests for communities, two pluses, 13 minuses. No opinion to keep it forward.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, E is
Test F.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, test F, in addition I gave you test 2. The two are closely related. Primarily differences in F is closely divided and then in F2 it's united with an impact that kind of goes through the state, eastern portion of the state. If you like, I can walk through the maps.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Is F2 here?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

MR. JOHNSON: F2 unites -- will take 30 seconds to run through it -- unites Flagstaff, ends up including Williams and Parks in there. A makes up for lost population picking up areas north of Holbrook, and I believe it takes in Winslow as well, and -- yes, by taking in Winslow. And then District E needs to pick up population, so it takes a portion of eastern Pinal. And then it includes -- let me put the label on there so you can see the label on there -- so it includes San Manuel, but goes right up to but does not include Mammoth or Oracle. Then DD had Sierra Vista already, also picks up a portion of northern Santa Cruz and the Green Valley area, one of the goals. That's a nice side effect of the split there. It make up for that. W goes up north, goes into eastern Pinal, takes in Mammoth and
Dudleyville. Y goes north a bit giving up eastern Pinal and picks up -- here you see Fountain Hills is in both F and F2 and picks up more of Scottsdale as we try to ripple population through.

It appears there are good goals.

Flagstaff, Williams, Parks are together. Impacts on Y, picks up a portion of Scottsdale and the districts on the east.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes, Doug. Does C drop all the way -- seems like it goes below G there into the urban area of Maricopa even further down.

MR. JOHNSON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Orange below and orange above are not connected.

MR. JOHNSON: Separate districts.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: K and G are separate?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Does the population end up having a Maricopa majority?

MR. JOHNSON: In this case, Flagstaff is united, is not a majority district. The odds are not long before it will become a majority. In regular F, I believe it works out close to 50-50. Because if -- you have 40,000 people from Flagstaff instead of 50 and
don't have Williams and Parker.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Same question on D, Yavapai plus Western Maricopa, Western Maricopa and Yavapai.

MR. JOHNSON: Roughly 50-50. I can get the specific numbers, if you like.

It's probably a little more population in the Yavapai portion, but --

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I think it will be an urban influenced district within the next election or two.

Scroll further so we see the bottom part of the state. Sierra Vista comes in even -- yes.

Mr. Chairman, based on the new F2, I don't see much there I'd like to have to continue on.

Flagstaff continuing on appears the only benefit.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: F or F2?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I agree.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any sentiment for keeping F or F2?

Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I want to make sure I understand something.
One thing, I think F2 keeps open the possibility that I have not eliminated in my own mind which is that we might choose to unite the Apache Reservations with the Navajo Reservation in a single district. Of the options for doing that, it's the one that looked the best to me. I don't think we have another option which provides a credible way of doing that. This one does break up EACO, but if we decided to do that, it would be for a reason that might be worth doing. It does leave the non-Reservation portions of Apache and Navajo Counties together with other rural counties, including Graham and Greenlee, and the rural areas in Cochise County.

I'm not sure that the only way to deal with that District C is bring to it all the way down to Maricopa County. It seems to me that C and Y, parts of C and Y could be combined to make a rural district, that the metropolitan area portions where Y comes into Scottsdale could be minimized. That's not the only way to deal with those issues right there. As a starting point, this one does a fairly good job uniting the Tri-Cities, unites Flagstaff. And if we -- we're going to consider an option for uniting the Apache and Navajo areas, this seems to be, to me, to be the best alternative.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: But F doesn't --

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: F2.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: F doesn't have the
characteristics as well as F2.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Right.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Consensus on F to leave it
out?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Right.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Talk about F2.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: F2. Concern is the
solution may be worse than problems. Cochise will not
be a happy district. It's what Graham, Greenlee wanted
all along. Graham, Greenlee don't want to be with
Cochise.

However unhappy if we've taken out Sierra
Vista, which they see as the heart of the county,
Cochise will not be happy with this.

Flagstaff will be happy united, unhappy in
a district such as this or soon, as it will be,
dominated by Maricopa County. Same thing with the
Tri-City areas. They very much want to be united. I
don't think they'll be thrilled at the price of unity by
being dominated by Maricopa County and losing their
voice.

You've got Fountain Hills, Rio Verde with
no connection to Scottsdale. They see that as a problem. That's their connection rather than a large
district primarily rural in character.

Other than it gives an option of connecting the Apache Reservation to the Northern District, I don't see much in the rest of District F2 to recommend it.

I would be in favor if we want to do that in looking at some modification of other scenarios.

Rest of this district has too many problems in it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let me ask them.

Mr. Huntwork, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The problem is other scenarios didn't have that connection with the Apache and Navajo Reservation. And the question was if we were to consider that at all, what approach would do the least, the least damage elsewhere. We can't -- you can't modify one of the other approaches to do that without encountering all the other problems. And this match suggests a starting point to dealing with it.

Two points. Number one, test the point in Yavapai that did recognize the central connection with the western Maricopa County and even West Valley. There was a good deal express testimony to that effect. The Yavapai, Tri-City area is growing fast enough, they were
not concerned, or many people were not concerned about being overwhelmed by growth in other areas.

Finally, I do think it's important, would be important, if we were dealing with this, to combine the rural parts of C and Y in order to keep a district there as out of Maricopa County to the extent possible and still be in there, that district be configured so overwhelmingly non-Maricopa, at least to start with.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: For the moment, let's leave it in. For the moment, take those where there's pretty good consensus, see where we are when finished.

Move to G and G4.

Doug, highlight the differences on G and G4.

Starting plan G, quick overview, somewhat of a combination of the two, very early draft presented long ago before we adopted the current adopted draft plan. The northern piece of that draft, you first saw combined with a southern piece similar to test A with the border district, similar to Cochise scenario five, Sierra district included in the border district.

Flagstaff is in fact and is unified with the Navajo and Hopi reservations and the Grand Canyon area, including Grand Canyon Village.

The difference with G4 is two-part. And
the two, two tests involved in G4 are independent, so accept one and reject the other, if you like.

The first piece is down in the south. There was a concern of eastern Pinal, southeastern Pinal being grouped with Saddlebrooke. So that area has been grouped, put into District W in order to make up for that. District DD presses in and takes northern Santa Cruz County, more of northern Santa Cruz County, Sierra Vista, creating almost exactly in that county Cochise District Y.

Cochise comes up, District Y already includes Tohono O'odham, picks up Gila River and Ak-Chin Reservations, does not pick up Gila River, stays with the rest of Pinal.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Zoom in on Pinal south of Gila.

See that around --

MR. JOHNSON: Sure.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Pinal County, part of District Y, only two Indian Reservations or three Indian, Gila River, Ak-Chin, and a finger of the Tohono O'odham.

MR. JOHNSON: Three Indian, and the population of the town of Maricopa, Ak-Chin, and Gila River Indian Reservation.
Three, zoom in quick so you see where, the rest of the line here, the south edge of the Gila River Reservation down here, the Ak-Chin Reservation down here --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: That's the only part.

MR. JOHNSON: Only part.

MR. JOHNSON: If you compare to G, G has the Tri-Cities unified, but the dividing line, let me show that.

But the border of District G, C, is the southern edge of those two cities. So what the request was was to see if we rotate this, can we unify all of the Prescott region. We can. It does have the side effect of both instead of D being a West Valley district that picks up portions of southern Yavapai, both C and D becomes slight majority Yavapai, significant portions of Maricopa in both. Each one has a tradeoff. Again, neither one of the options, neither south or Yavapai can be traded with G independently.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Where is Flag?

MR. JOHNSON: Flag is unified with the Navajo reservation.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: So C district, can you briefly describe what is included there, in G4?
MR. JOHNSON: In G4, it starts, in the northwest, essentially along the freeway with, let me zoom in, read those a little better, includes Ash Fork, Seligman and Ash Fork. Comes down and picks up Williams and Parks, goes south of Flagstaff, and you can see it goes right along the south border of Flagstaff, and then it comes down and picks up Sedona, the Verde Valley. And in G4, it continues down into Peoria, Cave Creek, and New River areas.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Tri-Cities C or D.

MR. JOHNSON: G4, Tri-Cities all in D.

The advantage, it unifies all of Yavapai, not just the Tri-Cities above Dewey-Humboldt.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: How far west of the interchange, the junction of Humboldt this morning, we heard testimony like to go to Belmont, I believe, on the west, probably accomplishes most of it, maybe not far enough on the south, somewhere between Munds Park you have there and the other.

MR. JOHNSON: This really is almost exactly around the entire city border of Flagstaff. A couple places where the city border comes in for compactness, scared it, essentially follows exactly the city line.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Planning district, maybe
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larger than the city border.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, it is.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Therefore the question relates to that entire designation, just to note where it is, how much is in, how much out.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I think it pertains to what was there with the original, in that we came right to the southern border of Prescott, and a tremendous amount of -- urbanized amount of southern Prescott. Same thing occurred in Flagstaff, the urban area extends out to the Museum of Northern Arizona, Snow Bowl, all the tourism type facilities we heard about in the meetings. A lot occurs in the area.

I'd like to see the ramifications of incorporating more of the Flagstaff area if we had to give up --

MR. JOHNSON: The challenge with this district is really -- it is a lot of area, population very focused, 53,000, I believe, in Flagstaff, a hundred some thousand in the Navajo Nation, and 7,000 in the Hopi Reservation. Right there you are at 175,000 plus. Then we have two western reservations and the Grand Canyon Village, really the only areas that drop off this district, trade off with something, the Grand Canyon Village area, which is a possibility, or pieces of
Flagstaff.

The other significant comment on this district is District A does not include the City of Page, which is about 6,000 people, when we looked at ways to incorporate it, really, without taking on Hopi or some other -- 6,000 people from Flagstaff.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Based on the conversation, I get the impression either G and/or G4 are worth some more discussion and consideration. The question is can you make a distinction between G and G4? Which would you like in or both?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Probably both. I like G for Northern Arizona, and -- G is a better District. G and G4, pull the south, Cochise, like that. Keep improvements in G4.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Were those separate changes, northern and southern changes --

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mix and match?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Northern part of G4, and southern part of G looked pretty good.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Southern part G I saw problem. Southern part of Z I saw a nightmare. That has been improved, incorporating into W. Price of
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doing that was pulling Sierra Vista out of the border
district.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's do this for the
moment, leave both in for further discussion.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Leave both in for further
discussion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's move to H.

MR. JOHNSON: H is the last test. The
other map we might want to look at is the Coalition 2
map. This is the last of them all.

District H is another attempt at combining
with the Navajo reservation.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Steve?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: This was done at
my request. And I think it does some good things. But
I also think when you compare this with F, which we've
already discussed, that the relationships make more
sense, to me, in F, so -- once I've seen this, it's
interesting --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Probably not worth further
consideration.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Right.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, H is
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The next map you have is Coalition 2. This is the map presented at Glendale, I believe.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes. This map in many ways on a state wide level is very similar to the adopted map with two changes. Hopi is connected to C, not in District A, and down in the south it's redrawn to -- color mix -- redrawn to include a border district.

Within Tucson, the Maricopa areas, however, it's been more significant. I can zoom in, if you like.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Before you zoom in, are the Tri-Cities and Yavapai County are all united in that district or are they split?

MR. JOHNSON: In this map, it's unchanged from the adopted map in the Yavapai, Prescott in one district, Prescott Valley in another, and Dewey-Humboldt in a third, not unified yet.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Prescott --

MR. JOHNSON: Prescott, Paulden, and Williamson are together.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: What's your pleasure?

Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, in light of the fact I think there are some districts in the
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metropolitan areas that merit consideration, at least temporarily, this ought to stay on the table.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I would agree.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, we'll keep it in for this round.

Mr. Johnson, are there other permutations you and Dr. Adams would like consideration of in or out before we go back and revisit some we've included or are these the major divisions along with adopted drafts --

We also have a Coalition 1 map presented prior to the time that our draft came out, Coalition 2, and then we have other drafts submitted through other parts of the process. Are there other decisions you need from other --

MR. JOHNSON: I don't believe so,

Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Adams.

DR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, I think if there are any of the other drafts that the Commission has seen to this point, they would like to review at this time, we would be happy to bring them up and have you take a look at them. If there are any that stand out in your minds, we would be happy to bring them up.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.
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COMMISSIONER ELDER: Doug, could we bring up the adopted draft Legislative map, please.

Mr. Chairman, down to the south, southeast part of the state, northern and central does not appear to be as too much of a problem. You run into problems as with District W and District DD, as I remember.

If we can make a modification there, the balance of the plan was not all that bad. I'd like to carry through until we look at the other four, five.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think the drafts are a given.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's not move away from the drafts, analyze those as a bench mark. We'll know when we deviate, what we'll be deviating from and why.

Any other maps you'd like to be seen, to have been brought up at this time?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Could I ask for a recap of what is in so far?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I wonder if someone is keeping score.

Dr. Adams, have you been keeping score?

DR. ADAMS: Yes.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Refresh for us.

DR. ADAMS: Chairman Lynn, you voted, agreed to keep test A in. You kept test F2 in. You kept both G and G4 in, and you kept Coalition 2 in.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: And the draft maps.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: So that gives us six, six options with obviously some variations on a couple of the six.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Five.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Including our draft.

Our draft A, F2, G, G4, and Coalition 2.

Any further discussion on perhaps reducing that number further?

Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Again, Mr. Chairman, tests A, F2, G, G4 I think are similar, while a continuing concern -- the Commission address concerns alluded to earlier in southeast Pinal and in Yavapai in light of the fact that -- in test A. Flagstaff is light, and while still working with Yavapai in F and F4, and in light of the fact southeast Pinal in test A is still a work in progress, there's still sufficient flexibility with the maps on the table to eliminate test A.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion on the
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possibility of eliminating test A.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I don't have a problem with that.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Main difference between A and G, I think, the A alternative, that leaves Flagstaff out of District A.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Part is divided.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Part is divided.

I understand.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: As an approach, if we work with A, we might be able to create a district where Flagstaff is out of District A, unite District A. Part of the process shown changes made in District F, between F and F-4. I think it may be possible to do that by working with the population around in that same general manner. But the -- I would just like to keep A alive for that reason. It's really the only difference between the two. I'm not quite ready to -- I think A is the only alternative that does not unite the Apaches with the Navajos and still keeps Flagstaff out of District A which we still have on the table, if I'm not mistaken. Well, the Coalition plan, obviously.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.
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COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Doug, can you tell us on test A how much of Flagstaff is in the Northern District and how much is in District C, approximately?

MR. JOHNSON: Most tests, numbers are 10,000 people.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: 10,000 in the Northern District.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Most in Flagstaff in District C?

MR. JOHNSON: This one is higher than others, maybe 12,000 or so.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: While looking for a second vote on keeping A in, Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Let me ask Commissioner Huntwork, isn't G a work around with A to solve the problems with A?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Commissioner Elder, G basically puts Flagstaff all into District A. What I was wondering was whether there was a A so Flagstaff is not in District A.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I guess is the community interested in trying to get there? It almost seems there is testimony Flagstaff, like the northern area, tourism, like the relationship with Hopi, Page, houseboats, whatever it might be up there, included with
Grand Canyon City. Seems like it does put those all together where they're asking to be. I was trying to make sure I wasn't missing something in the analysis other than I would like to see a more urbanized area included in A, but I'm not so sure I know how to get it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'm trying about two things. Number one, I attended the first Flagstaff hearing and read the transcript of the second one. There was a good deal of testimony about connections to Sedona and the Verde Valley, as well. The second thing is that I am -- continue to be concerned about the demographics in A and would still like to continue to explore possible ways of keeping the Native American population in A as high as possible without the necessarily of combining it with the Apache Reservation. I suspect, at this point, I don't know enough to be sure, I suspect including that much of Flagstaff in A changes the percentage of Native American maybe by a couple percent, reduces it by a couple percent.

Doug, can you shed any light on that?

MR. JOHNSON: I don't have the specific numbers. I know there's a notable Native American population in that portion of Flagstaff. Taking that out would need to be offset somewhere. As you noted,
the Winslow area is probably the most likely. And
Winslow is going to be essentially, I think, a Native
American percentage. I can take a few minutes and
figure that out if it would be helpful. I think it's
roughly an even trade.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I looked at test A
and G. There's one percentage point difference of
Native American population.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: With respect to testimony
from Flagstaff, I don't think it was unusual, heard from
several parts of the state, on the order of magnitude.
Most communities are saying, number one, keep us
together; number two, if you need to move us some
direction, stated a preference. As is often the case,
there are preferences on both sides. Some preferred
north, some south. In other parts of the state, there
are very similar patterns. Other stated other
communities of interest. Clearly number one, most
communities not having to be divided by numbers was to
keep them whole or as whole as possible.

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I think that we're all
concerned about are the concerns you've alluded to,
Mr. Huntwork. And I -- you can rest assured I'm
intimately familiar with this area. We've spent a lot
of time trying to figure out what is the best way to
keep intact the communities of interest, simultaneously
maximize the voting opportunity of the Native American
population. We looked at everything, the population
center along the southern boundary new lands, Holbrook,
Winslow, and Flag.

I guess what I'm trying to say, and maybe
I didn't make myself clear, I don't see other options
that preclude us from still looking at those
opportunities or alternatives, but that this option
wherein Flag is split, I heard unequivocal testimony in
Flagstaff and today they do not want to be split.
Therefore, that is why I said in an effort to try to
minimize the number of targets we're trying to shoot at,
I'm suggesting we take this one off the table since the
majority of components are similar to those on the
table, with the exception of those noted, and still not
preclude us from making additional in the components
southern line of A or northern line of A, whatever,
maximize the best opportunities for all parties
interested.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORTH: Also be clear I
oppose A because Flagstaff would be split as well. I
want Flagstaff to be united. The point, though, would
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be that having Flagstaff united in A and then trying to
figure out how to take it all out of A is a much bigger
job than starting. District A, it's a much bigger job
starting a plan A, trying figure out how to keep
Flagstaff united outside District A. I'd like to keep
it on the table. I had my weigh.

Does anyone agree with me?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think that's the
question. I believe you stated that very well.

I think you have your answer.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Okay.

Well, then, I would suggest, then, we, for
the time being, take test A off the table leaving us
with five choices.

Any further discussion on F2, G, G4,
Coalition 2?

Again I ask the question if there's a
distinction to be made between G and G4. Do we want
them both to be considered in terms of further testing?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Coalition 1 and 2
in my mind are different animals than these other plans.
In my mind they both have ideas in them that are worth
considering and we should look at as we adjust some of
the districts, particularly, I think in the metropolitan

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
areas. But I don't view either Coalition 1 or Coalition 2 as an alternative plan for us to be considering. Is that -- am I on a completely different page here?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Well, it's in because it was analyzed to the point other plans were analyzed for us to review. Obviously it was formally submitted. Much of what was in, some aspects of Coalition 1, because it was submitted so early, are incorporated in draft mapping. Obviously not, not to the last line; but certainly a lot of the elements that were submitted in 1 are included. Coalition 2 is a modification of that to achieve a different purpose, modification purpose in the presentation.

Did you want to consider that in the modification, or analysis of draft maps, or consider in reference in analysis of the maps? That's in fact the question on the table.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, I think they are two different things. I would not -- I don't think Coalition Map 2 is in front of us, as a map, that is considered by the Commission. It has ideas in it we'll want to make sure are considered and ask the consultants look at and ask the consultants to look at as far as to elect collateral changes. The whole range -- there are quite different districts in the urban areas I would
need to have a lot better chance to look at closely and
have a better understanding of before I could consider
any of those changes on an individual basis. I think
that's a reference map, if you will, not a map we're
considering at this time.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments on that
issue?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The importance of
keeping the Coalition 2 map on the table is not that
this is the map that we will adopt. Obviously we're
going to draw our own maps, our own districts. That's
what we've been charged to do by the people of
Arizona. I believe there's a lot in there I'd want to
keep on the table. First of all, it's the most
competitive of all draft maps we've had so far. I want
to keep it in there, see how they did it. I'd not be in
favor of removing it, although obviously the lines we
draw would be lines we draw.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Perhaps one of the options
is to turn that map into a test and ask that it be
incorporated and analyzed. The question is -- a test
off which variation. I suspect the variation would be
the draft, our draft map, and Coalition 2 variation to
it.

Mr. Elder.

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
COMMISSIONER ELDER: Suggesting leave Coalition 2 alone and let stand as is, make adjustments we perceive as necessary with other maps as go forward.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Taking Mr. Huntwork’s point on all other tests, tests were directed by the Commission based on input, that is to say we either heard testimony or received information and asked consultants to specifically test certain options. What you see in the book are apples and oranges comparison. The Coalition was submitted and analyzed. The question is to put it on, I think is Mr. Huntwork’s point, more equal footing. What need to happen is we'd need to turn Coalition 2 into a test with parameters we'd ask the consultants to look at. Then it would have more of a relationship to the others tests we're dealing with.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: To be specific, some of the things about the Coalition plan I'd reject immediately. It doesn't do a thing for basically uniting Mohave County. It doesn't do a thing for the Tri-City area. It creates some districts down around Tucson that just run roughshod around some other ideas we've already discussed and rejected. On the other hand, I like the fact it combines -- takes the Hopi Reservation out of District A. I'm one of the
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Commissioners that voted in favor of that.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I did, too.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: What?

Oh.

As a whole, it's not a test I'd be interested in pursuing. There are, I'm sure, some individual aspects I'm interested in and are worth seeing. I think it is worth remaining so we can put our finger on those things and ask our consultants to test those changes. And a lot will be specific changes within the metropolitan area. But, again, as a whole, this map does not appeal to me at all.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: If you look at that map, and if you take, in 106, sixth line, seventh line, that says competitiveness, where it does no harm or detriment to the preceding. There are very few communities of interest in the rural areas of this map that hold together based on what we heard in the first and second round testimony and submitted to earlier, the Commission, whatever. Maybe in the Phoenix urban area it may work. I haven't really looked at that one area T. Tucson, it's not a lot better than the rural part of the state, though we consider Tucson rural. I don't
know what the fix would be on this one other than you say using as a baseline for competitiveness. It really doesn't do anything for the rest of the state.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, the use I see of making of the Coalition 2 map is when we get to the issue of competitiveness. I'll have something to say later today after we deal with the Congressional maps. What we want to be able to do is look at our drafts and to look at this, which has been presented to us both by the Coalition and by our analysis of competitiveness. So I'd like to be able to look at districts and say well, okay, we have these districts. Can we make them more competitive, and look at this map as a guide to making them more competitive? Whether that means it stays on the table or whether it means it's a resource, I don't know. I just want to be sure that this map still stays with us so we can use it to assist us in adjusting the maps we're ultimately going to approve.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I agree there are significant, few redeeming values to external areas of the map.

Without objection, I'd simply instruct the
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consultants as they're in the process of testing competitiveness, my perspective of the Metropolitan Phoenix area, utilize the suggestions and ideas that have been proposed in this map as part of the consideration process, and as far as a general map, I'd be in favor of removing this as a "quote, unquote" test map.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'd agree with that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Sounds like a plan.

We want to retain those aspects, particularly in urban areas, address the competitive nature of the districts, analyze that as we go forward with respect to it being a draft, or a test that we would continue to analyze. We will take it off the table at this point, which leads us, ladies and gentlemen, to the draft, our draft, F2, G, G4.

I ask again, maybe the answer is you want both. Is there a significant difference in G and G4? Keep both as tests or do you have a preference?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: The real differences between G, G4, the two of them, you can choose to accept the two
independently or the southern change or northern change.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: G4?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'd like to
continue to look at both. There are things I like and
things I don't like about both of them.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I think
that G4, in light of the fact Sierra Vista is segregated
from Cochise County, in my opinion whatever fixes there
are in Yavapai, the cure is worse than the ailment.

Since now both districts in Yavapai are metropolitan
dominated districts, certainly as we try to tweak some
concerns we have, still have flexibility, again take G,
say we want to try to see what alternatives there are, I
suggest we work from G and still try situations more
with specific feedback as we prepare to do so.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Up in the northern
part of the state, there's not much problem with that.

I'm not sure G4, C, D have much improvement, or plain G,
C, D. My concern, the southern part of the state when I
looked at G, the main problem I had with District Z, it
included the north Tucson retirement community of
Saddlebrooke and eastern Pinal County, which I think is
a very dysfunctional district. G4 incorporates a change
and removes that. I would not want to lose that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Tradeoff for Sierra Vista?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Possibly another.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Between the two.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: District Z in G4.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Andi, Commissioner Minkoff?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: You can call me Andi.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Part of Eastern Yavapai, Mammoth, San Manuel.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Pinal.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Pinal, both where the mine is shut down and started selling company housing to retirement, recreational, that kind of aspect, Country Club membership, redoing the town, redoing the street, selling off properties to develop a retirement community. Oro Valley, Oracle, Saddlebrooke, you don't see the dysfunctionality until closer to Kearny.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay. There it starts.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Again, some tweaking there, whether you trade areas north of Winslow to get the population you need to expand Flagstaff, I think G is something, not too bad a plan.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: There was some testimony in Yavapai County, also in Coconino County, that split Yavapai basically along, now the revised Tri-City area in terms of the Tri-City area. Testimony was very mixed, but to the extent there was any testimony in favor of splitting Yavapai County anywhere, that was the spot. G4 comes closer to doing that than G. G divided Yavapai in a completely different spot. Also there was testimony Yavapai south, a different spot was the logical connection. I'd be reluctant to take G, the northern part of G off the table, G4 off the table.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Johnson, Dr. Adams, let me ask a question. Are there sufficient differences between the two, a number optimal, lowest number possible without redistricting choices beyond which we'd consider, enough differences or similarities of G and G4 it's not burdensome to keep both on the table at this point or are they sufficiently different you would like us to make a choice?

DR. ADAMS: I think, Commissioner Lynn, Members of the Commission, Mr. Johnson was about to speak to that issue before you got into conversation. I'll let him finish that.
MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, it would not
be overly burdensome to consider both, given the --
really the two changes are really on or off without a
lot of modification. We would start running into time
issues if we started playing around both with the urban
tests we've already discussed and a lot of tests in
these areas. If you want to keep either options as an
on off, no problem.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Just recap where we are:
Our draft, F2, G, G4, and elements of the Coalition 2
map deals specifically with competitiveness in urban
areas we want a further look at.
Is there any further reduction or, dare I
ask, are there other additions?

Well, in full consideration of everything
we've gotten, are you comfortable that further testing
on these options will be sufficient to give you what you
need to begin work next week, I guess is the way to ask
that question?

Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman I'm not
sure we removed the number of targets. I think we need
to get the type of analysis we discussed in effort to
try to come back and make hard decisions.

To that point, I, personally, do not see
any redeeming value to the test F2. In light of the fact we're wanting specific data, specific analysis, and specific feedback in an effort to try and come up with a finalized map, my count is F2 has I think three districts completely out of metropolitan areas, only three districts. I've -- tell me I'm wrong. Does not X not go into Maricopa County?

MR. JOHNSON: X does go into Gila Bend, not cities of the West Valley. Borders the Gila River Reservation.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. Two colors mixed there. Okay. So four? Four districts, one influenced by metropolitan area?

MR. JOHNSON: A, B, X, and E?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Correct.

MR. JOHNSON: Correct. Y goes into Apache Junction and Scottsdale influenced.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Does not represent rural Arizona to the best extent possible. In addition, it's difficult count how many AURs are destroyed in that effort. I just don't think that's something fruitful for us to pursue.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Joshua, maybe create another rural district, primarily rural district, combining C and Y, and putting the more urban areas in
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another District to the south. So that is another easy way to create another rural district. D, I think, depending on your definition, may or may not be rural, but a lot of people in Yavapai County were -- thought it was fairly ridiculous to consider them to be a rural district anyway. And there was a lot of testimony about combining with the Phoenix area.

But aside from that, I don't think we do ourselves a service at this point by deleting the only map that would allow us to combine the Apache and Navajo tribe. We may come to the conclusion we can do that or may not. At this point, I, at least, have not come to that conclusion or heard any dispositive evidence as to what we need to do in that regard. I think it's important to keep the best option on the table until we have definitive information that allows us to make a full and informed decision. So really my answer would be unless you have a better way of combining Navajo and Apache tribes, I would like to keep this one on the table.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments on F2?

So far one in favor of keeping it, one in favor of eliminating it.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Doug, a question.
The difference between F and G in District A, what does it do to the majority minority and influence on the Native American?

MS. LEONI: Commissioner Elder, I have the numbers on G, not G4. I'll give you the G and -- a G and F2. And A and F2 has a Hispanic population of about three percent. This is voting age. It has a Native American voting age population of about 74 percent and a total minority voting age population of 74 percent.

District G has Hispanic age population, Hispanic voting age of 61 percent and voting age of 69 percent, that's VAP.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: What is the pleasure on F2.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'd say, Mr. Chairman, F is an ugly map, no doubt about it. I agree with Mr. Huntwork in considering benchmark information. Leave this on the table until we have further analysis we've taken a look at, maybe work arounds we can do in other areas of the state. Right now it's the lowest one on the list. Not very compact, barely contiguous, four districts considered rural. An awful lot of AURs don't fly with this. Same class with Coalition 2, baseline informational piece but not really considered as a map.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right. For the moment, then, we are at our published draft, F2, G, and G4 with elements of other maps being looked at specifically.

I think, I think, at this point, that may be the best we can do on the Legislative options, in terms of additional work that needs to be done.

Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I would just like to ask a question. In my own mind, with regard to G and G4, I mean, I would have a fairly clear preference for G4 in the northern part of the state, and even southern part of the state. I don't know if we have any sense of that or not. I'd suggest --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Try to combine the two and deal with one?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Deal with one on that basis.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I thought I heard Ms. Minkoff express an opposite view earlier. I wanted to double-check that against my memory. It's possible I might have misunderstood that.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm sorry?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I guess my point --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Was there a
question there?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Yes. Mr. Huntwork asked on the northern part G or southern part G4, or reverse.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Reverse.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Northern part G4 and G be combined, G as an alternative, rather than looking at two separate maps.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: My only concern, I would echo an issue with District Z and in the southern portion of Z mixed in with G4.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand. As an option, not a map to be adopted, understand a draft to be further considered and modified, which comes closer?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If I had to pick between the two of them, G4 comes closer to me. It comes closer. It's problems as to which comes closer.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, the Mingus Mountain split is easy, not a problem. D may well consider themselves metropolitan or more urban. Folks in Verde Valley do not nor do any other cities up there, Williams, Ash Fork, et cetera. And my big concern with that split is, again, that that is, in my opinion, and Doug clarify the numbers for me, has that not had a significant influence from northern Maricopa County?
MR. JOHNSON: I don't know the
significance number. It is definitely significant. It
has to be over 30, 40,000, in my opinion.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Which is also a high
growth area in that area. So I don't concur that that
necessarily is a better situation. I guess the
fundamental testimony is G does do, keeps the Tri-Cities
together. I agree it's not an ideal split in that
neighborhood. My sense is, I could be wrong, those
folks would rather have a rural district rather than to
have -- Humboldt would rather be rural than be combined
with Prescott Valley.

With respect to the southern portion, I'm
not sure that eastern Pinal is the situation, as
outlined in G, not this map, G, is as problematic as
taking the heart of Cochise out of it, being Sierra
Vista. Those of us there at that lynching -- I mean
meeting, we heard vehemently, and with volume,
emphasized by bumper stickers, they do not want Sierra
Vista outside Cochise County. I --

Everybody wants everything. One has to
consider what is the lesser of two evils.

In my opinion, having been to all those
town meetings, that that was certainly one of my most
memorable experiences in Sierra Vista.
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I suggest the southern portion here is a best case scenario, at least at this point, to move forward here, utilizing G to make adjustments, amendments, make ways to fix it. This isn't it. I'm saying in order to try to minimize the number of targets, I suggest we remove G4 and keep just G on the table.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Doug, in this one, straight G, is Page in B or Page in A?

MR. JOHNSON: Page is in B in both B, in G and G4.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: The southern part of the state, if we add the draft map and went out with Flagstaff split, went out, bumper stickers to?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Flagstaff isn't split.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: City boundary, Flagstaff to the west, we're not picking up to the west. I'm not positive, one from Flagstaff tell me, the east-west road to miles west of the highway that runs along the city park, I think that city park on the north side of that, about the city limits of Flagstaff, and that --

COMMISSIONER HALL: I don't think there are any differences between G and G4 in that area.
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COMMISSIONER ELDER: Never mind. We'll work out the northern areas and try to work out twice --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Do we have a sentiment to work out G4?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I heard both.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Let's put it this way. I won't go back Sierra Vista if we have G4.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand that.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Talking the northern part of the state more. We can fix things in the southern part of state different ways. Urban encroachment, we can fix that, separate that.

Verde Valley, Sedona, et cetera, separates it from the Tri-City area, they asked for that pretty strongly.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think at this point, it is reasonable to keep them both?

Ms. Hauser.

Don't raise your hand. You don't need to do that.

MR. RIVERA: Only has so many fingers.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I grant you that.

I was looking at one of them I thought
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wanted recognition.

What I'm hearing then, if at this is the list: Our draft, F2, G, G4, other maps to be analyzed as directed, four, three, three and a permutation of a third that we are looking at to move forward in terms of a Legislative map.

Again I ask a question: Anything else want to add to the list at this point?

Paragraph then my suggestion is we take a break. And when we return, we do the same thing for the Congressional map. And then once we are finished with the picture in total, we'll ask for a motion to move that forward.

Let us take a 10-minute break at this point.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken from 4:32 p.m. until approximately 5:06 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Commission will come to order.

The next order of business is the Congressional options and instructions to consultants.

And I think here we have, Doug, correct me if I'm wrong, I think we essentially have three options to consider. Maybe there's actually a fourth, FF. Is that accurate? Maybe it's more than one.
I lied. It's a bunch of options.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Gave us three or four new ones today.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Why don't we do this. On the options that were delivered today, do your want to just recap those for us so we know what we're dealing with? Clearly we understand we have our draft; we have a downtown district that we're -- that has been presented. Why don't you go through the options for us.

MR. JOHNSON: One other one I cited, too, as the Commission stated earlier, the goals go to which maps we'll do a lot of competitiveness analysis on. Some plans are competitiveness alterations to plans on. You don't have to rule in or out competitiveness plans on this point. We're looking to rule out or in some other configurations.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Point that out so we don't miss that nuance.

Quickly running through the tests here.

Test AA, triggered by the request of the Salt River Tribal Reservation and Fort McDowell Reservation be included with Congressional District E with Scottsdale, a relatively minor change with the adopted draft map, those two reservations, small population, small area, area into District E, rotates through, and small changes...
in Yavapai with the addition of the Mojave River Reservation.

BB, CC are closely related. They are attempts to unify Mohave County. A, unify Mohave County in C, in this case.

CC, this is closely related in this plan.

La Paz County goes with the border district. The main change in this is that Pinal, the majority Pinal County, including Casa Grande county, changes from D, BB, CC, C goes and picks up population, La Paz in or out, Avondale, Goodyear, Litchfield Park, Tolleson area. In a very quick summary, that's BB and CC.

DD, if I could jump around a bit, another proposal in your pack, downtown C, D, Downtown Competitive Hearing District, that drawing is based on an adopted redistricting map. Request DD is a request to draw a similar Downtown Congressional District that would be a -- fit a more current definition of competitive, but to make it fit in with CC. That really doesn't change.

So DD is Pinal County with District C and changes what's submitted with D and changes around it.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Zoom in on that area.

MR. JOHNSON: Essentially we have the La Paz border District G in this case. C comes around,
picks up Casa Grande, Ak-Chin, and the Gila River Reservation.

District G comes around picks up a portion of Buckeye, Goodyear, Avondale, Litchfield Park, Tolleson area, and a little of Southwest Phoenix. And we can go into detail on this as you walk through different discussions. As a result of that, those areas are picked up from District D.

District D pushes into Glendale, South Glendale, South Peoria, Luke Air Force Base area to bring up El Mirage.

District B goes from Tempe down in the southeast, comes up through Phoenix and ends up in a portion of Central Glendale.

I can go into more detail if you wish.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Backing up a bit, trying to figure it up for myself, when La Paz County was switched into District G, I'm talking about test BB, CC, BB, AA, CC has in G, I'm trying to figure out what other changes were made. Where did you put 20,000 people in A you took out of La Paz County? I looked and can't find it.

MR. JOHNSON: Look at Phoenix. Zoom in the detail map.
COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I did.

MR. JOHNSON: It's not a big area.

Litchfield is in the center of it.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: That's what I thought. Litchfield Park, G in both scenarios. I thought I had it. It is less of Litchfield Park.

Doug, test CC, let me see if I can highlight, test CC, Litchfield Park is in A.

Here we go.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: And Tolleson. Part of Tolleson is in G.

MR. JOHNSON: G, right.

In BB, where La Paz is still District A, Litchfield Park, Avondale, Tolleson area, what citizens commented on keeping together is kept together. Once you put La Paz into --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: CC is kept together.

MR. JOHNSON: CC is separate.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Looked like CC is separate. Looks like identical.

MR. JOHNSON: Looks like is right on -- should be right on the border.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I see.

MR. JOHNSON: A little piece of Litchfield
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Park. A number of city lines, slight splits, BB looking closely like Litchfield Park is divided. Those are just because these are concept maps.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Thank you.

MR. JOHNSON: Quickly summarizing the other two, FF is a twist on what was CC. In CC, put all of Yavapai into District A. Test FF is a test to see if Verde Valley, the Sedona areas, some comments have a more rural flavor than the Prescott Valley Tri-City areas did. See what happens if put those back into C. As you see there, we split off Mohave.

Test GG is essentially our adopted plan. You'll only see, from the Tucson map in your binders, the only changes in test GG were in Tucson.

Essentially District H comes over, picks up Green Valley, Sahuarita, the surrounding population, and more of Santa Cruz population in exchange for District G, and picks up more of the University neighborhoods.

So that's -- GG is fairly basic. GG is also the only test that changed that anything in the Tucson area.

Changes in Tucson, done in GG, can be done in any of the other maps.

Other tests. There should be the test
that excludes Yavapai.

Oh. I skipped over that. Let me add that back in.

One moment while I get this on the screen.

This test, EE, is a twist on CC. Instead of uniting Yavapai County in District A, it unites Mohave County in District A. Let me fill in the districts.

I'll bring it up on the screens. You have in your binders test EE. I'll try to go through this.

The main difference in Yavapai County is back into the rural district. And all Mohave County is into District A and then the Hopi connection. Because Yavapai is no longer there, the Hopi connection goes west through Moenkopi, through the north rim of the Grand Canyon, to connect to Mohave County.

That, in a quick summary, is the various alternatives. I can go into more detail if the Commission has questions.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay. Let's go back through the first option, which would be AA.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, before we go through these I have a request. We received a number of requests just today, also received a few Legislative tests just today, earlier once,
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received a very short one-page sheet, just one, bullet points, changes to each one. If you could get those to us on tests you got to us today, I think that would be very helpful.

MR. JOHNSON: We intended to do it but ran out of time.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I understand. We've been pushing you pretty hard.

When you could, if you get them to us tonight.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: The AA test, is that incorporated with all the remaining tests or no?

MR. JOHNSON: I believe it is, yes.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Basically AA is redundant.

MR. JOHNSON: It could be done on its own.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any objection to removing AA?

AA is out.

Mr. Huntwork. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I want to catch up. AA is our plan by bringing in the Salt River and Fort McDowell Reservations.

MR. JOHNSON: Right. It's also done in
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every other alternative.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Nothing unique about AA.

Elements are reflected elsewhere.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: If you didn't want
to make any other changes, AA shows us other minor
changes you have to make in order just to do that.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Personally, that's
exactly what I would want to do, so I don't want to
eliminate AA. All others are interesting that we will
discuss later. This is the only one I really was in
favor of. So --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Well, BB does the same
thing.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: All do the same
thing.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Huntwork's point
he's saying, AA only moves the tribe, leaves the adopted
draft in place, correct? BB does the same thing,
provides other alternatives.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Does a lot of
other things.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Which you may or may not
like.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Right.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Then I’m wondering if --

maybe considering AA as a separate draft, that may be

one thing. It perhaps should be an alternative to our

adopted draft with one change in place, the adopted
draft and version A, or double A, because it’s that a

singular change that is affected. I understand your

point in preserving discussion on that change.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It seems to me

saying, then, the original draft should probably not

still be on the table, replace this with the original
draft.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Maybe.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I don’t have a

problem with that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Maybe.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I don’t have a problem

with that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Call it draft AA. That

way we’ll consider it as an alternative to the draft

map.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Fine.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay. BB.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff, BB and CC are

both attempts to achieve the same result, which is to
unify Yavapai County, take it out of the rural district,
put in a unified rural district.

CC does a better job, unites La Paz with
Yavapai County, which they asked for recently in a lot
of different testimony. And that seems to be the major
difference between the two. In looking at the two of
them, I favor keeping CC on the table rather than BB.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other discussion?

Mr. Paul.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I agree with that.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I agree. CC I
think CC has real problems with it. I do not like the
fact that it is basically makes both District A and, I
believe, District C less competitive than they are now.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, let's go one at
a time.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Are you objecting to --
the point I think has been made, as between BB and CC, I
think the point was made that we would like to continue
to consider CC for analysis purposes, at for the moment,
eliminating BB. That's the point.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Fine. Two
Commissioners both wish to do that, that's what we'll
do.

CHAIRMAN LYNN:  All right.  BB is eliminated at this point.

By elimination, process of elimination, CC is in at this point.

Let's go to DD.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF:  Right.

CHAIRMAN LYNN:  Actually the next one in your booklet is the downtown CD.

COMMISSIONER HALL:  DD just incorporates that into CC.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF:  DD takes the concept of the Downtown Competitive District and superimposes it on that.

COMMISSIONER HALL:  Our map or CC?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF:  CC is our map, one of the maps we generated.

COMMISSIONER HALL:  "We" being --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF:  The Commission.

CHAIRMAN LYNN:  Not Commission.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF:  It's not our map.

COMMISSIONER ELDER:  DD is a combination of CC and the Downtown Competitive District.  Is that clear?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF:  CC remains the same
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in the rural areas. And what option DD changes is in
the Phoenix Metropolitan area, it changes, I guess,
probably, E, F, D and V.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's ask Mr. Johnson to
weigh in on that.

MR. JOHNSON: The concept is correct.

Both are correct. The concept configuration, both are
significantly different in DD because of bringing in
District C.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Configuration of
district -- configuration of which district?

MR. JOHNSON: The Downtown Competitive
District as referred to.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Correct me if wrong,
the external District DD, G, H, C and A are essentially
the same. Is that correct?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Minimal change in
A?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: The one district runs
around?

MR. JOHNSON: You are talking about the
change in District A between the two plans? G gets
Avondale.
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COMMISSIONER HALL: The point, if we keep DD on the table and CC, is that redundant?

MR. JOHNSON: A good example, what we're referring to earlier, DD competitiveness is an example to CC, what we want to test over the next week.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Why didn't do that on the draft map? Why combine with CC?

They are alternatives. It's not a serial thing. We don't have to do --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I made the request that this alternative be tested. And in looking at it, had the options been presented to us up to that point, the one that seemed to me to have the most positives was option CC. So I asked them to see if they could superimpose a competitive district in Maricopa County on option CC. However, it could obviously be picked up and put on any of them. It doesn't make a lot of changes on the donut, if you will.

This is the whole, and the rural districts are the donut. It doesn't make a lot of changes. It has minor changes in District A, as it goes through Maricopa County. So the reason I asked it not be superimposed on our draft map is because I liked some of the things done in adjustment C better than the draft.
This might come closer to something I would like to see as a finished product.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I don't like CC. And I also don't like the central district. I dislike them for different reasons. It would certainly be more informative to me if I could see them separated rather than together.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner, similar to the Legislative with Coalition 2, the Commission is welcome to consider the downtown CD term on the computers as another alternative, turn it into a test, if you like.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Downtown district or test DD?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork is talking about something a little different than a comparison of the two.

Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Right. You know, the idea of the Downtown Competitive District was a separate idea proposed by a separate group of people. It stands on its own, has its own arguments for it and against it. Those arguments have nothing whatever to do with the argument of changing A or not changing A as had

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
been proposed. It seems as if we're going to go forward
with the map that considers a downtown district, it
ought to be variation on our proposal, not a variation
of some other proposal we haven't reviewed, considered,
or acted upon.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I guess what we're looking
for, or I'm looking for, because we just got these test
results today, and because we just looked at the maps
today, what I'm trying to do is get down to the lowest
common denominator without losing the concepts involved,
by that I mean what is the fewest number of tests moving
forward we can keep in play without losing the concept,
some of which is redundant in the tests as we go
forward.

One of the redundant tests is the downtown
district different from the way Phoenix was drawn in
draft map I which ripples through a couple of these
tests. I don't want to lose the concept of a downtown
district. Concept and execution, per se, are different
to me.

We need to deal with the concept before in
light of some execution sent to Judge It. But I don't
want to lose that concept as we move forward.

I don't want it permeating three, four
different maps unless the solution is significantly
different and we need to look at them separately for that issue alone. It changes too many things, too many variables in the test, to give it you clear and directly, I guess is what I'm saying.

Mr. Minkoff, then Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Could we test DD, the downtown area, the Maricopa area can really stand on its own, superimposed on CC, just because that's the way I asked for it? It could really be included in any of the rural configurations, with some minor adjustments.

So maybe when we talk about DD, what we ought to talk about is letting it stay on the table in the greater Phoenix area configuration and eliminate the rest of it, because that's just picking up from one of the other alternatives.

Want to do that?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's get Mr. Hall's comment and ask you to respond.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Where this conversation started was in light of the fact that DD is essentially a Downtown Competitive District put into CC. Why don't we say we'll leave DD on the table which addresses both, make their life easier, and eliminate CC, and try to minimize the number of maps under consideration. And the same principles and issues are
being considered. And, therefore, we can reject or
accept any of those items or considerations yet be
minimizing the choices. We'd eliminate the downtown and
eliminate CC, keep DD, which has both, look at it.
Whether we agree or disagree I don't think is the
subject at this particular time.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I just want to ask
the question of whether in creating CC it made
significant changes in the portion of the Phoenix
districts not affected by this proposal? Did any of
those lines change?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes. District D, test CC,
changed. It gave up it's western extremes, the
Tolleson, Avondale area instead moved up and picked up
South Glendale into CC, shifted even into there. Is
that -- does that answer your question?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, it does. It
raises another question.

That was not -- that was just an
incidental part of the change. It wasn't necessary to
make that change in order to -- the basic change. It
was -- was it?

MR. JOHNSON: Right. That wasn't one
of -- the focus of the test. But it was, essentially,
the inevitable ripple.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: You needed to add population to District G, once you took out all of Pinal County or most of Pinal County. Wasn't that what caused the change, you had to go in Maricopa County and pick up population from District G?

MR. JOHNSON: Correct.

This wasn't what we went in aiming to do but was the obvious result or forced result.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Right. So it's needed.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I would suggest, really, over the course of the next week I have to do a lot of thinking about CC. I have also got to do a lot of thinking about that central district. To my mind they are two completely different issues. And to the extent that they've been combined in a map, it concerns me we're more or less uniting them.

COMMISSIONER HALL: What, keep both on the table, eliminate DD?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: It's more appropriate to eliminate DD. Create a map that shows a central district on our draft.

COMMISSIONER HALL: On our draft. CC on
its on own?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: CC on its own.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: How does that sit?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Are we talking about something similar to a central configuration on test DD?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: That could be the test.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Applied to the draft map, as I understand the compromise.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: So we'd take the metropolitan area of test DD, or superimpose it, both on CC as it is already and draft map? I'm confused.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: CC, as I understand the compromised proposal, CC looked at on its own, attributes looked at on its own. Then ask that that downtown district shown in District B in test DD, that that map be applied to the draft and looked at separate.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay. It could also be applied to CC, which it's already been done.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: CC has other changes already in there.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm saying I don't want to lose the option of a downtown district being superimposed on CC. In other words, it seems to me you
are saying downtown district goes into a final map, that
it's going to be on our draft map rather than CC. And I
happen to think that CC has a lot of good things in the
rural areas. And I don't want to lose the opportunity
for the downtown district by supporting a lot of options
of CC. It seems to me it's creating a situation I have
to choose between the two of them. I'm not sure I want
to do that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: What I was
concerned about, the situation I have to take both or
neither. I'm not sure I have to do that. Let's get an
extra test of the downtown district its on own. We
don't have to throw away the work already done,
officially or unofficially. I would like to know what
kind of district you get on its own.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: On the draft.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We're adding a test.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Not eliminating CC or DD,
adding a test.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: We have our new
draft, draft AA and CC. Maybe what we're saying, both
of those should have a downtown district option.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Johnson.
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MR. JOHNSON: Just to clarify one point, the group submitted a downtown CD, did draw that map onto our draft. So it's not really -- it's already drawn, and it's in the back of your binder. That's maybe not the best place to put it, the back of the binder. So that's drawn.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: You are absolutely right.

MR. JOHNSON: Very similar to the Coalition approach.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Given that's the case, is it the sense of the Commission we want to include CC and DD?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Maybe it would be fruitful for all of us to have a sense of history.

Tests are run to make District C more compacted. Started with CC and DD, and agreed CC looks better than BB. Following that, those that liked CC and wanted to test Downtown Competitive and wanted to incorporate that into CC. Fact of matter, it really is, if you look at DD, it is simply a continuation, an evolution of the very same test we started with.

E is -- EE is a continuation of the very same test, if I understand correctly, basically inspired by the previous alternatives placed out on there where
attention again was to increase compactness of C. And
Mohave was taken out of C instead of Yavapai.

So they are all, essentially, mutations, if you will, of the same alternative, as is FF, where
Yavapai is included with A. But northeastern Yavapai, Mingus Mountain, if you will, Verde Valley, is put back
into C.

To that point, then, in light of the fact that basically all these alternatives start with the
same basic premise, what I was saying was I don't think we're precluding from adding or subtracting any of the
alternatives proposed. That's why I thought it simpler to just look at DD which incorporates the two of those
and minimize the number of maps our consultants will provide us feedback on as they already have the downtown
district separate with the adopted draft and go through the remaining options here and say what other of these
other options that are essentially -- come out of the previous options we'd like to continue to consider.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion?

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, that's fine.

It doesn't reduce the number of issues, reduces the
number of maps.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Doesn't reduce the number
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of issues. We're not dealing with issues directly. It limits discussion of issues around the fewest number of maps possible, whatever that number is, just so we can concentrate on those issues more fully in maps depicted.

So to that end, what is your pleasure?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Be comfortable keeping the draft AA and DD, so far.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Meaning eliminating CC.

COMMISSIONER HALL: And BB.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: And BB.

All right.

Speak up. There's a proposal to keep AA and DD and eliminate BB and CC.

You know, for anybody that comes in late, they are going to think we are absolutely beyond redemption.

Hearing no objection?

I do think that covers our options. I think it reserves the options.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: BB and CC are out.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: So far, our draft, DD and AA.

We haven't finished.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: DD is the only one
that leaves the river area in two districts. All the
others are splitting the river in three.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No. EE has it in
one. No, two. DD only has two river districts.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I support EE and FF --
some concerned about the future, I. Don't want to pull
the trigger on the present because concerned about the
future.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'll go back through the
list. Find out if something is missing. The list
through once, we can add it. Let's, for the sake of
argument, consider we've eliminated BB, CC. DD and AA
is in, and we're up to EE as the next option.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I think this district
ought to say in.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Double E.

Not what you have up there?

Doug is not following us. Although if --
for the public it might be interesting concept, since
you don't have a binder.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I think Mr. Huntwork
could explain EE.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: It's appropriate
as I suggested we look at EE.

After the hearing in Bullhead City, there
was a lot of testimony about keeping the river districts together. EE is one of the plans that leaves the river in two districts. There was a lot of discussion about the cities, particularly the cities in Mohave County, not feeling that they were part of a rural district. Testimony was they considered themselves urban because they had industry located there. They were a major transportation corridor of various kinds, warehousing, fabrication, a lot of industry, very rapid growth, and truly identified and requested if they had to be combined with something, it would be with the rural area. So this accomplishes some of that. It also accomplishes, perhaps, still a major line to connect with the Hopi Reservation which is no longer than it was before. That was the thinking.

The other point about this was I was concerned about CC. Frankly, I'm also concerned about EE, making both districts less competitive. And I don't see any reason for, this is pointing out a way to create two districts less competitive than the ones we have now. But I must say this one does it less than CC. So I suppose you'd say it does some of that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The suggestion is EE be left in. I would like to keep it in if for no other reason, whatever other attributes it has, it is the only
alternative we've looked at that actually reduces the size of the rural district to any great degree. The connection between Hopi and the River District A in this example, I mean artificial regardless to separate Hopi and Navajo, artificial, wherever the connection is, I understand that. If kept separate, it doesn't matter whether it goes west or south. If it goes southwest, it's to the next available district.

We also understand from the Hopi, in fact, they're somewhat less concerned where separated. It's if separated than where separated. If separated, or an urban district as opposed to rural district, Maricopa County, West Valley on A?

MR. JOHNSON: Commissioner, predominantly an urban district, 155,000 from Mohave, I have, I believe, 19,000 from La Paz, so 175, and about 7,000 from Hopi, so still over 400,000 from Maricopa.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Jim, the only thing about this one, we did go to Yuma, found out all around the state, thou coven they neighbor's property type thing, varies distinctly. Mohave wanted to be with Yuma, Bullhead City really want to be with Mohave. The river district water issues, the same. This one, wow, you know, being the urban district makes it difficult to support.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: A, always on the river district, some portion of the river community, on the draft maps, La Paz, and the southern portion of Mohave, is predominantly the river district. Based on the population of the state, we'd figured we'd create not quite two rural districts.

Did that. C is essentially a rural district. And C is still predominantly a rural district. A is always a rural district, putting different population in it. My only issue, it puts Yavapai in and Mohave out.

I'd note we heard from Yavapai they are not rural, urban. Their issues are attracting industry much more strongly than Mohave and the river communities.

The only thing is looking at this, Mohave and Yavapai, which ones are pulling in Mohave.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I misspoke. La Paz, not Mohave.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Look at the transcript, Bullhead City and Kingman, see a lot of testimony. Mohave, not Eloy, are ones that fit the rural district. A small sense of that, Mohave County.
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Mr. Chairman, what I was going to say, the only plan I looked at makes a connection to the reservation, Hopi Reservation.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Does that too, but I'm trying to look at the bright side.

Are we in agreement it's in for the moment?

Move on to FF.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Doug, refresh my memory.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Moves Verde Valley out.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: FF is CC minus Verde Valley.

Enough change to keep in or take out?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think putting Verde Valley the Northern District is commendable.

We've done serious damage to Mohave County.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm hearing it out to be excluded.

FF is out.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: GG.

COMMISSIONER HALL: GG affects the Tucson area. Real positive changes in this district. I, similar to what we did in AA, I'd like to see this as part of draft of AA, if you will, if that's possible, to
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try to minimize the number maps. I'm only looking for simplicity. This affects one single area. If we take that, draft AA, make the change to both draft AA, that would be easier for us to analyze.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm not really happy with test GG. And the reason I'm not, one of the things we have yet to do and really need to do is make districts more competitive. This change actually makes both G and H slightly less competitive. I don't think we should be looking for adjustments to do that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The University in H, less competitive --

COMMISSIONER HALL: I thought made it more competitive.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I think the University is in G. I get -- even though living there, I don't know where it is.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I can't tell.

Essentially what it does, because the University properly is in G, what it does, essentially it adds the adjoining neighborhood east, Sam Hughes, to G. The University neighborhood extends eastward in terms of location and proximity to University.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The statistic --

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
CHAIRMAN LYNN: And what it trades for that, Sahuarita and Green Valley, consistent with testimony we heard in Southern Arizona.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Statistics consultants gave us is the change were more competitive, slightly more competitive.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Which one?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: H.

G goes from a 52 percent Democratic registration, 28 and a half percent Republican, to 55, almost 66, and 26. And H goes from 38 and 42 and three-quarters to 11 and little over 43. The change made it less than competitive.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The first set of figures don't square with mine. Tell me where you are getting the first set.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Demographics on the various tests.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: On the adopted draft?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Not the adopted draft, the Tucson area. Actually I don't have a problem witness.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We could reject it, but I'd like to look at it as one of the options. We don't have a problem. One of the small things, it's an
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adjunct adopted draft with a variation as we did with
AA.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: One or other two
options, interchangeable, either option --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: In this instance, it's a
straight trade for population, doesn't affect anything
else.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: We can change. We
can insert GG into it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any other map you want and
it works out.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Probably take a look
at --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Irrespective of
competitiveness and other issues.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: In terms of population
effect on other districts, no impact on any other
district.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Okay. I almost defy
anybody to figure out where it is. Probably the poorest
map we've had. I really --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Not a poor map. The scale
is wrong to figure out where it is.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: If you didn't know
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where Vail was and Tucson --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We could zoom in, if you want to see --

I'm fine with it just being an adjunct to AA and looking at a variation.

The last test, our draft, two variations, two variations incorporating changes AA, GG, then DD and EE.

Are there any additions or deletions that we can continue to make today?

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I've been just trying to think about what we've done. And I'm concerned that somebody might get the wrong idea from looking at this map DD. I really think there are arguments related to CC, arguments relating to the central district, completely separate from each other.

People reading the tea leaves, if you will, could get the wrong idea from the fact we've combined them on the same map. They are really separate adaptations. I would like to suggest we do either CC and a separate one provided by the central district coalition, as separate maps, rather than combining it into a single map in order to avoid confusion about that issue.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Asking to add a map back in, as I understand.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: EE out, CC in, and the central district --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Central district test becomes a replacement for DD.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The advantage of DD, it superimposes the downtown district with our drafts. The downtown district submission we received at the Glendale public hearing doesn't fit our maps. It fits the draft map. It doesn't fit CC.

Here's another way to draw the downtown district that fits into District CC. And I would like to keep it on the table.

If we decide we want to go with a downtown district and decide we want to go with version CC, they've got to mesh with one another. I have a lot of faith in people who look at our draft maps.

When they comment on them, they generally comment on the areas of their concern. I don't recall receiving an awful lot of comments when people began at the top, went through the bottom, commented on every area of the map.

I was in Yavapai County, the Tri-City area, you satisfied my community, please fix it. I live
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in Tempe, don't divide my Community. I live in Sierra
Vista, put me back with Cochise County. Those are the
kind of comments we get.

Look at DD, people commenting on the rural
aspects of DD. People commenting on the way a
competitive district changes a competitive district.
We'll get kind of feedback we want without confusing
people. I think having too many maps is confusing to
people, because it's rather difficult to get through all
of them on our website and see the differences between
them.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Seems to me the
fact we get comments from rural areas and urban areas,
they're separate maps. One comment I don't want to be
receiving is in favor of an urban area, but not an urban
area, not a rural area. Those are separate in mind. No
reason we should invite that comment or leave ourselves
open to receiving it. They are really completely
separate issues.

The fact is we're going to consider them
on separate maps whether on separate maps or not. They
really should be on separate maps.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd like to ask --

Let me take Mr. Elder's comment. I wanted
to ask the consultants, maybe think about it while
Mr. Elder makes his comment. I wanted to get a sense of
the workload and ability to test the variables on these
maps.

Many of the attributes of the maps are
similar. There are, however, some differences test to
test. What I want to be sure we try to do, as said in
Legislative, is preserve the differences in testing, not
overload the work in the next few weeks, so we have good
data on each of the attributes we're looking at very
closely. That's the goal.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: One of the things I
wanted -- one of the four maps look like a carry
through, does not give us an alternative to bring Hopi
into the Navajo. Is that something we can take a look
at and have the numbers where it would, say, combine the
Hopi and Navajo so we still can?

MR. JOHNSON: Commissioner, that could
definitely be a test you could instruct us to do,
involves 7,000 people. We could run it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm wondering,
trying to avoid confusion about the maps. We want to
have as few as possible to test and work with, and so
When we post them on the website, post some kind of statement explaining that many of these maps incorporate different changes in different areas of the state and that you may like the urban areas as one map, rural areas as another map. That's okay. Just tell us what you think, phrasing it better. Only I am -- right now, put it as something like that. And somebody looking at it would understand, they like the rural part of it, can't stand Maricopa County, or vice versa, phrase comments that way.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other aspect, Congressional maps, unlike Legislative, there are options here. Because the districts are much larger in population, and fewer of them in the state, that they may be, in many cases, more easily combined, features of one map and features of another, with the idea you get one area of population, those lines get quite different as a combination of various ideas. At least you are capable of doing it without the entire ripple effect for the entire state.

I agree with you in concept we want the fewest number of options available, so comments directed to those features tested, someone could make the distinction between what they really like and don't.
Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes. Exactly.

My concern is somebody looking at the central district, I look at the central district, talk about whether I'm in favor or not, I want to be able to identify exactly what the central district does. If that combined several changes, it's difficult to isolate here is what the central district did, as opposed to here is what Yavapai County District did.

What we should present should make it possible for us to send it out and anybody who wants to comment on our proposal to see what the proposed things do in and of itself.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Also a situation, the proposal is made, however it is made through the process. Our obligation, it seems to me, is to take the essence of the proposal, attempt to perfect it, perhaps beyond what the proposer is able to do, has resources to do, or whatever, consider the essence of the concept being proposed, preserve that, make it work in terms of those ideas we think have real possibilities. It's with that in mind we're trying to make this happen in a way that we can keep track of it.

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Hall, I propose
you add CC back to the equation, delete DD from
consideration, add the central metropolitan
configuration as it currently exists in DD as a separate
map alone considering the metropolitan changes with map
HH. I don't know if anybody heard that, especially you
and the consultants. I think that solves all the
problems.

Marguerite, did you hear that?

MS. LEONI: I heard that. I'm one always
listening.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Delete DD, add CC
back, take Metropolitan Phoenix configuration in DD,
make a separate map only considering the metropolitan
lines, name that map HH, since I like the letter H,
whatever, since about down there.

Everyone in agreement with that?

Mr. Huntwork, Ms. Minkoff?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Sure.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Great.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Have AA, right?

What I propose, make a change in the
Northern Native American District, and change located in
GG, put on one map. I propose take DD off the table,
and therefore you have EE, and CC back on the table, and
add another map called HH, which, in essence, takes the
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current lines as drawn in Metropolitan Phoenix on the
map DD and only considers the metropolitan ramifications
of those lines.

I'd like you have a map GG in Tucson, a
map HH, Central Competitive District as it's configured
in DD in only Phoenix.

MR. JOHNSON: Commissioner, the only
concern I have, the reason it worked in Tucson GG, a
straight --

COMMISSIONER HALL: All you are doing is
zooming in on DD. Zoom in on DD and print it.

MR. JOHNSON: But anything you change with
DD impacts District G.

COMMISSIONER HALL: We understand that.
We're just saying we want that map considered. What
other changes we make is another issue.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Let me ask a
question and clarify the point Doug is trying to make.
It's possible something HH, you are calling it, the
metropolitan area, might say G, that looks good to me,
not realizing it, does have implications on rural areas
of the state, which the switch between G and H does not.
You might say they like the downtown area, looks good to
them, and write positive comments, and find out what
you've inadvertently done has also supported changes to
rural portions of the state.

MR. JOHNSON: Right.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is that the concern you have?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Maybe what you do, don't use HH at all, just put DD on there. Explain DD is essentially CC in rural areas, changes in the urban area.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, this now, as I understand it, has not accomplished what I hoped to do, which is to isolate the changes from our proposal, from the current draft proposal, that would result from the central district, not from another test that we've done, but from our current proposal. That's the purest way to understand the kinds of changes of that test and that test alone causes to the overall map. In order to do that you have to base it on the existing proposal, not on some variation of the proposal. Sure, it's compatible with CC. It's compatible with EE. You could do both. But in order to understand what impact that has, or what impact it alone has on the draft, you have to compare it to the same baseline as all other tests that have been compared, our current draft.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The only problem, then, it is done in a map District G, coming into G into
Maricopa County. Our current draft doesn't have District G coming into Maricopa County. Changes G quite a bit, District A quite a bit.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I realize it does that. Of course it does. The idea is for us to understand, and the public to understand, so they can comment on it, exactly what the central district, by itself, does. Those are things the central district causes. And I think we need, owe it to ourselves and the public, to identify exactly what the consequences are of this district all by itself, just like we've done with other changes we were considering.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Those are two separate issues, Mr. Huntwork.

I understand what you are saying and agree with it. That's a test you want accomplished. DD is a test someone else wanted to accomplish. As I understand Ms. Minkoff's position, they're two totally and completely different tests. And given -- what I hear you saying is you want a different test, different downtown competitive test, different configuration. I understand you folks have already done that or the presentation itself did that. We have that on the plate, I think.
All we're trying to do at this point is keep things on or off the table. DD combines CC and an alternative for a downtown district. And I think the map itself does that and allows for a response as appropriate.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The other issue, I think, we need to bring up is regardless of how many maps or permutations we come up with when we're finished, there's a certain amount of time required to finalize each one of them. And the concern is that if, if the number of alternatives still under consideration are significantly different, one from another, that the amount of time necessary to do the full analysis is going to, I think, jeopardize our schedule for next week. Not that that is the worst thing in the world. We need to be aware of that. We may need, it will push the schedule back. We need to be aware of that. Each of the maps will require multiple days of analysis to get us the analysis we're looking for. And that is the purpose of the process, to try to get down to most manageable number we can with the fewest number of gross changes so that, to your point, Mr. Huntwork, each individual change on a map gets it's due and is analyzed appropriately but that we really need to, in my opinion, consider only those alternatives for further analysis we
actually think we might vote for and, by doing that, get
the number down to a reasonable, as small a number as is
feasible.

I don't know whether the consultants want
to comment on what I just said.

DR. ADAMS: Chairman Lynn, Members of the
Commission, there are significant differences to the
alternatives that you have on the table. We will
require sufficient -- we will require sufficient time to
analyze all these. I think our hope coming in that we
would get down to possibly two. We already have more on
the Legislative side than we had anticipated. I can
tell you it will add to the time we will need to give
you a full analysis. If we could get this down a bit
further, it would be very helpful. If some, you know,
would not have sufficient votes to continue, that would
be helpful.

If we need to take more time, we'll take
more time and just push the start date back a little
later.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman and the
consultants, I ask, AA is an adjustment of the Northern
Native American and adjustment of GG. That's really
minimal. Am I safe in saying that? Correct me if I'm
wrong. We still have DD and EE technically on the
table.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: And CC as well.

DR. ADAMS: Possibly CC.

COMMISSIONER HALL: DD. CC isn't. As a
working premise, DD. CC, have all information on the
adopted draft, correct?

Any additional information?

MR. JOHNSON: Commissioner, we've not yet
addressed the adopted map, how to make the districts
competitive or implement suggestions from the community.
We really are looking at three fairly significantly
different base maps to work off of, adopted map CC, with
or without DD, and EE. If narrow down from those three,
it's a great benefit. You can kind of set aside the
question of the downtown district, north-south district
in that approach. But really looking at those -- it's
not radically significantly different in the base maps.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'd like to suggest
if trying to narrow it down that, at the very minimum,
we include what we're now calling draft AA with GG, and
DD, and then if time allows us that you had a EE.
However, if that is going to push us beyond the October
1st starting date, then I suggest we just go AA and EE.
I guess what I'm asking, can we begin on October 1st with three Congressional options, and we have three-and-a-half Legislative options? Because one of them is just a variation.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let me get an answer to that, Mr. Huntwork.

DR. ADAMS: If I could, Members of the Commission, confer with Ms. Leoni and Ms. Hauser for a moment.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Then we'll take Mr. Huntwork's comments.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think my comments were addressed to my fellow Commissioners more. We're talking about making two very major changes to our proposed map. One is the Central Phoenix District. The other is the, if you will, shift of Yavapai or Mohave, consolidation of the river, on the river district. Each one of those changes, separately, has major implications for our process. That and I think we need to know what the separate implications are. The combination of, essentially, we already have. But in order to really debate and a couple, two plans, I think, have integrity. We need to -- we really need to take each of those separately, because they are entirely separate.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.
COMMISSIONER HALL: I agree with that.
But DD is already a map that is drawn. And what I'm hearing you say, Jim, is zoom in on DD.
COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: DD combines the two, but --
COMMISSIONER HALL: Addresses both of them.
COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Not both.
COMMISSIONER HALL: Sequentially.
COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Not sequentially.
COMMISSIONER HALL: Combines them.
COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: No.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Variables. Isolate variables, isolate variables. If we add two variables, the same map has multiple effects. One variable isolate it's effect.
COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: May be something I want to do, or that is something I don't want to do, or may be one thing you can do with a combination. Say you want to do something like it or not?
COMMISSIONER HALL: Luxury of 15 variables. Luxury, no luxury. Five maps. Three is pushing it. I'm hearing you say going to four.
COMMISSIONER HALL: We don't have the luxury.
COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: There may be pieces of that I'm interested in, but the combination is something, personally, I'm not interested in it. I might be persuaded differently, but certainly that's my thinking.

The meeting today was supposed to be simplifying things. The meeting today, why, those things, supposedly we're not talking about today. I don't want to on subroads. We're supposed to be making a decision, or suggest to the public we're making decisions about those issues.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me one reason we scheduled so many days for the meetings next week is the maps we're keeping on the table today will undergo further changes and modifications as we discuss some of the issues we have before us. I really believe that DD works because although there are slight changes in the urban districts that are created in what has been done in outlying areas, it's the concept we're talking about, not specific lines, half mile this way or quarter mile this way, or unite this neighborhoods taking this small area. Those are all changes we can make.

We are nearing the end of the process. We
need to start next Monday and finish rapidly or we won't
finish the maps until November, because there will be a
three-week break, assuming I can get back at the end of
it.

We need to simplify it. That's why DD, it
includes two important changes, both of which may be
considered independently. Just like any other map we
are looking at, we may look at it and say: Well, I
really like most of this map; however, I want to put the
Hopis in with Navajos, take Hopis out of the Navajos, do
a switch in GG, undo a switch GG. We will be doing a
switch. We need as few maps as possible.

I recommend there's not a single map here
I like every single thing on. Some are closer than
others. I'm willing to go with just really AA and DD.
I'm willing to eliminate EE. The reason is you can't
put both Mohave and Yavapai County in District A.
Yavapai is a better fit than Mohave. One needs to be
there. That's why I feel comfortable going with two
maps that cover most of the issues we'll be dealing
with. If the consultants can handle EE as well without
delaying the calendar, I'm willing to leave it on the
table.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Recommending double A and
double D.
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1       COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes.
2       CHAIRMAN LYNN: With permutations we're
3   talking about. If time, EE.
4       COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Double E has
5   already been done. Double C has already been done.
6       Central Phoenix --
7       COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No.
8       COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Central Phoenix
9   has apparently already been done, based on our maps. So
10   you're talking about creating additional work for the
11   consultants must be about something else, because it's
12   not about that.
13       CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's not the mapping, it's
14   the analysis: competitive analysis, racial block
15   voting, all the other things to be done in order to make
16   a judgment on alternatives at the final hour.
17       COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: In that case,
18       Mr. Chairman, I cannot tell you how important I think it
19   is to have a separate competitive analysis of that
20   Central Phoenix District all by itself.
21       COMMISSIONER HALL: I agree. Every
22   district, every map, in fact combined, does not preclude
23   separateness of analysis or ability to extract the
24   separateness of analysis.
25       COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: You know, we all
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know, as we take a step back, the analysis of a single
district is meaningless in the overall scheme of things.
I'm talking about the effect of that central district,
not the competitiveness of the entire map. In order to
understand that fact you have to look at an analysis of
just the change resulting from that district. That's
the only way to know the effect of the change resulting.
Also, the way to know the result of the change is do a
separate analysis of the change. But the one that I'm
mostly concerned about is, in my own mind, that central
district.

I would like a sophisticated
competitiveness analysis done that shows not only
whether that district is competitive, how it affects all
other districts.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Several. Mr. Elder,
Mr. Hall, then Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I don't
want to take an alternative off the table, one the
Commissioners believes wholeheartedly we should take a
look at. I'd like to see if we revise the schedule,
Andi has time constraints the following week, a week
away, we have the week away, start Wednesday morning,
running Wednesday through Saturday, coming back, going
Monday to through Wednesday of the following week, A
gives the effect of three, four more days to do
analysis, allows us to have the range of alternatives
Mr. Huntwork is looking for and still fits the schedule.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I think we can
cooprocess, Mr. Elder.

Even if additional alternatives, we can
start work on the Legislative, work in the earlier
morning while members of the staff are still doing
analysis on certain parts of the Congressional. It's
probably be later in the week before we get to
Congressional, anyway. I think there's an opportunity
to still make all the considerations versus discussing
forever a motion on the DD alternative for the
consultants to consider it.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I second it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Moved and seconded
consultants consider it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Comments not
necessarily on the motion. First of all, analysis of
the downtown area of Maricopa County area of DD has
minimal impact on the rest of it, certainly on the
competitiveness of the rest of the map. It does fit in,
dovetails what was done with CC, doesn't really change
Changes in the downtown district are to B, to E, to F, and some to D. Those are areas we're looking at. Not a lot of impact on A, C, G, H, on competitiveness, virtually none. I'm not concerned about that, even though part of total map.

It really needs to be, to be given the credibility, needs to be part of overall map, that that analysis proceed. If we decide want it as part of the overall map, it's not part of a major problem. I'm concerned about delaying the start. As long as draft districts, for heaven's sake, we voted for District W. If a final decision, we'd be thinking. Drop dead date is October 12. If not dead done October 12, we recess until the middle of November. We may very well be done long before that, hopefully I have time to get a few things done before I leave. If we are not, then we have pushed the entire process past the first of the year in terms of Justice Department approval. I don't think that that is a risk we want to take.

I suggest we go with what we have, AA, DD, and possibly EE, depending on what the consultants have, and move ahead.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: There's a motion on the floor to add EE to the test. Let's stick with the
motion, notwithstanding comments relevant otherwise.

I'd like to dispose of the motion first.

Mr. Huntwork on the motion.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, the central competitive district is being proposed solely for one purpose, and that is a purpose to create a competitive district. Yet we're considering a motion that fails to test that separately and independently for its effect on competitiveness. I just consider that to be ridiculous. And I would suggest if the sense of the motion is to present a separate test of competitiveness of that district, it should be defeated. If there is room for an additional test, then, you know, fine. But if this is to the exclusion of that test, this needs to be defeated because the sole purpose and sole justification of that district is to conclude competitiveness of that district.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Can the consultants can assure us the maps and plans will have all the data detail we've requested on Monday if we add in additional tests?

DR. ADAMS: Chairman Lynn, Members of the Commission, it isn't totally depending on NDC. You need to understand that. We do have some competitiveness
testing coming from another source. Therefore, we are
trying to contact that person to see what he would
be able to accomplish.

As far as NDC is concerned, it depends on
what the Commission wants us to do with each of these
maps. If you want us to take each one of these maps,
provide you the information as you have seen to date but
also offer suggestions for changes to them, based on the
analysis, also to take a look at, if you noticed in your
binder, we have been developing a list, based on
testimony, at the hearings, we took excerpts of specific
changes citizens wanted, one example I can tell you at
Phoenix Union High School we heard testimony about the
exchange of a piece of Isaac School District for
Westwood Village, would this be possible. There are
many little tests like that. Are these all things you
are expecting to see in each of these tests? And
that's -- that's the kind of thing we are hoping
ultimately to do with whatever plan or plans are adopted
by the Commission.

If you had a couple plans, we could
probably test some of these things, tell you about it:
This doesn't affect it a bit. This little citizen
request we can take care of.

There is a lot of work in it, a lot of
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citizen suggestions we need to take into account as we take a look at these final maps.

So it is -- two things, not only dependent on us, how much of that kind of testing you want involved in each one of these maps.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: There's a statistical data base we're working with for racial voting block regression, competitiveness, then a graphical, I pass out the letters, standards. The next round we need to be there or cannot make reasonable decisions and cannot debate the issues. So if we can't have those, there's no reason to meet or we need to reduce the number of plans, if you can meet that.

DR. ADAMS: Mr. Elder, Members of the Commission, the kind of detail that we provide in the adopted plans where we had a zoom-in map of each of districts for the adopted maps that went out in the citizen kit is the expectation we have, one of those zoom-in maps for every single one of these tests. Those are very time consuming to create. If that's what you want, yes, we'll need significant additional time.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: We're raising a lot of important issues; but with regard to what we have
here in test EE, there are only two things I'm am
personally concerned about on the issue on the table.

Number one, I want to know what the effect is on
competitiveness of A and C by virtue of the changes
we're making there, and I -- my understanding, I guess
this surmises we'll have made both those districts less
competitive. And I want to know what the effect is of
creating that central, on competitiveness, of creating a
central district. My suspicion is we'll be creating a
district there that is competitive at the expense of,
number one, impinging on the Hispanic community of that
is interest currently well-recognized in D and, number
two, making other districts, and particularly District
E, less competitive by simply packing more Republicans
into it and, thereby, creating an even more
noncompetitive district, which I think is exactly the
opposite of what we should be doing.

I feel that is extremely important, to
have those two steps, to have them done in a way so we
understand the effect of each one of those decisions and
understand it clearly.

Ms. Minkoff has made the argument that
even in test DD there's minimal overlap between the two.
I don't know if that is true or not. If it is true, it
seems to me we serve our purpose by doing them
separately. Ms. Minkoff will know, essentially, the
results of test DD, by her hypothesis of minimal
overlapping. I'm not smart enough to look at the map
and tell you if it's a great disservice to it by not
running the test separately.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall, on the motion.

COMMISSIONER HALL: The motion itself
provides for us an opportunity to have our consultants
do tests on every single district, as you just outlined.
They'll do a detailed analysis on the competitiveness of
C, and A, and the downtown district, and tell us if it
makes others less competitive. And I might suggest the
idea of making the alternative map, Mr. Huntwork, if
we're going to then put that out there for about a week,
I'm going to guess, going out a limp, I'm guessing,
folks in this room that will provide additional
information, negative or positive, depending on one's
perspective relative to that map.

All I'm suggesting by this motion, this is
an alternative we want additional analysis on in
intimate detail of ones we want to do that, make a
decision on every one of our fears or suspicions. It
may well be confirmed, and then we have that
information. That's all I'm suggesting. Make it an
alternative for additional consideration. Doing two
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maps is more time than one is my perception.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: One, doing one wrong takes more time than two right.

The logic here is it affects no difference two separate or one together, but the answer is until we know that, the only safe way to proceed is do two separate.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Additional discussion on the motion.

I'm concerned about the motion, not because of the motion itself, I'm concerned about how we're getting to where we're getting. And my concern is this: If I can oversimplify the response on the Congressional draft map through the process, it was as follows: Not withstanding one person's small concern about this line or that line, the overriding concerns on the Congressional draft map were as follows: First, the rural district is too large; two, that the river district goes too far into Phoenix; three, that the map is not as competitive as it could be. Beyond that, there were very small, in my opinion, changes that were asked for, generally, in the Congressional area. There were in fact lots of other things that were said. But I know that's an oversimplification. And my concern is
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that given we have the downtown district as a potential option in terms of competitiveness, it and its ramifications need to be looked at. I think we agree on that conceptually. What we disagree on is how to get that done. That to me is one difference from the draft map that needs to absolutely be looked at. The other things we've been talking about, essentially, in many cases, are simply a line here and a line there, other than the draft that we started with. And to that extent, with the exception of I think double E, affords us a different look at the rural district and different configuration along the river. That's a significant difference.

I tell you if there aren't at least three of us to vote for that map in total, I'm not sure we ought to have it analyzed, because it goes far beyond the map in terms of the changes would be made, and it may well get to that point.

I am concerned about the way we're getting to what is in and what is out. I'm not sure I'll vote in favor of the motion just because I'm not sure it's the right way to get there, not because I don't support the motion and concept.

I do think what we need to get to is a complete analysis, number one, of the draft. Number
two, significant alterations of the draft either improve it, improving overall competitiveness of the draft or in some other way having a significant positive effect on the draft we drew. I don't -- I'm not sure I know how to get there. I know we have more work in this list than we'll be able to accomplish this week.

On the motion, further discussion.

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to suggest three major issues you just suggested: The river district coming into Maricopa County, the size of the rural district, and competitiveness of the downtown district are all addressed in DD.

MS. HAUSER: Sorry?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: They're all addressed in D.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: How so?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No river district in Maricopa County. All Mohave, La Paz, and Yuma County, none of those three come in, significantly -- actually, La Paz and Yuma are in district G.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Dominated by Maricopa and Pima.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Rural district, some Maricopa and Pima in it. Primarily a rural district. Configuration of the rural district has changed, and there's exclusion of Yavapai County and La Paz County, I believe. Those are the three things done in DD. So in effective it includes all three tests and changes from the original draft district.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: On the motion, roll call.

Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "No."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Yes."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Yes."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: "No."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "no."

Motion fails two to three.

Let's take a ten-minute break.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken from 6:50 until approximately 7:23 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The record will show all five Commissioners are present along with staff.

The issue under discussion is essentially an issue of scheduling and workload.
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Currently the four Legislative options we've agreed to preliminarily, on the Legislative side, AA with a couple modifications. And still on the table, the rest of DD and EE. Not off the table, incorporated by motion. Still under consideration to be included.

My point is that that, essentially, is for and eight maps, at a minimum. And there are permutations beyond the eight. If we expect full analysis of those eight maps, we are not going to begin our final mapping process a week from tonight. I can guarantee that, based on conversations with the consultants who are going to be doing the work. If we are unable to reduce the list significantly, we will simply have to delay the start of the process. So those are the options.

Now what I'd like to do is continue with the Congressional discussion, to get that list to whatever we think we can deal with, and then perhaps go back and revisit Legislative.

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, maybe take a piece at a time. I'd like to instruct consultants to create a Downtown Competitive District without significant detriment to the other goals.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Can you change that
from Downtown?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Phoenix Metropolitan Congressional District, Competitive Phoenix Downtown Competitive District without significant detriment to other goals for analysis purposes only.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is that a motion?

COMMISSIONER HALL: That's a motion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think I can readily agree with this approach.

I do want to say that think it minimizes damage to goals that can't be prevented. I personally think some damage can't be prevented. We should minimize damage, and then have analysis of the concept.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Full analysis.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Test analysis of the Downtown Congressional analysis as it relates to an improvement of the competitiveness of the districts in the draft. Otherwise there's not much reason to do it, in my opinion. That's the point.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: In lieu of one of the motions, AA, BB, or EE?
COMMISSIONER HALL: That's my intention.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: My hope.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I presume if it's something the Commission wants to proceed with, it will be superimposed on whatever map you lean toward for the rest of the state. Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Right, which is phase two.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Since we'll already have an analysis of our draft, superimpose on that, isolate the variable.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Unless you decided to go with another map rather than our draft, then superimposed on that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Correct.

Discussion on the motion.

Roll call.

Mr. Elder?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "Aye."

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chair, eliminate DD and EE from consideration.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I presume CC is on the table.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: CC has already been removed.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I was going to add it in.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm telling you at the present time.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I withdraw my second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: You can add it back in.

It's currently not on the table.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Let me amend my motion.

I make a motion we delete DD and EE from consideration and add CC.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll second that one.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Already did.

We have an amended motion on the floor.

Discussion.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I agree this is
what we should do except the elimination from
consideration is so final. I don't think we should
analyze them, don't think we should test them, but there
are -- it's very possible we may come back with them as
compromises for other reasons. With that clarification.

COMMISSIONER HALL: From consideration and
full analysis by the consultants at this time.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Right.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the
motion.

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have a
discussion. Is our draft AA, also, approved or -- I'm
suggesting --

COMMISSIONER HALL: I think that is still
on the table.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Maybe add that to
the motion.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Fine. Leave AA on,
remove DD, EE, add CC.
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COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second to add that.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Adding AA in lieu of the current draft plan?

COMMISSIONER HALL: No.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: No.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Adding with GG.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Correct.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Self-contained. Either buy it or you don't?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Haven't analyzed it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I need to ask the consultants, how much work is there in testing AA separately from another plan?

MR. JOHNSON: Not very much. The speaker this morning gave population totals. It's like 6,000 people.

DR. ADAMS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Roll call.

Mr. Elder?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?
COMMISSIONER HALL: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "Aye."

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'd move we eliminate G4 from the list for analysis on the Legislative plan.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall, I'd ask you hold that motion. I like that a lot. Hold it. Let's just finish up the Congressional before we jump back to Legislative.

Is there anything else we either wish to eliminate, combine, or dare I say add to the Congressional list for testing? And again, let's be very clear to the public. None of the options you see in the book tonight are totally off the table. What we are doing is asking for additional analysis on specific options so that we have a full understanding of the impact of those options on the changes to the draft that has been circulated.

Anything else Congressionally you'd like to do?
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COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make sure the consultant assures me we take a look at Hopi in or out on any of these plans. Is that what I heard last time I asked that question, Mr. Johnson?

MR. JOHNSON: The response last time, if that's the instruction, we can certainly do that, if you want to give us that instruction. Or it doesn't have to be a motion.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'd make a motion, then.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The motion is to make sure we have sufficient analysis to consider the Hopi either in or out of any of the Congressional options we're analyzing so we understand the impact of that decision on any of the decisions.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, the only concern I have of this motion is I think the impact on the overall map, demographics, competitiveness, and so on, it's already pretty well-understood, at a minimum. The impact of the change is not something that is really only reflected by numbers on the page. So, in my mind, I would -- you could either -- I neither oppose
nor approve this motion. I just -- I just think that
the demographics are not going to be the issue with the
Hopi.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I was just --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I would withdraw my
motion as long as by your previous statement we have the
ability to modify, or as the term twink was, knowing
what demographics most likely are.

I'm concerned we won't have a reasonable
analysis to be able to do that from either
regression, retrogression.

I see Ms. Hauser saying yes, we will, or
no, we won't.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser, want to
clarify your body language?

MS. HAUSER: I was talking to the other
end of the table.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Oh.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, I was talking.

The concern Jose and I have at this point is that there
are so features in play that we are not going to be able
to give you a legal opinion, a legal opinion with
respect to is this plan good or bad until you are
finished adopting it, at which point you are going to need to have a break for us to be able to do that and come back and us tell you there's a problem. There's an infinite number of things you might end up doing in the final meeting. That's our concern.

As far as competitiveness and other analyses done, as you know we're waiting for some word on a time estimate, depending on the number of alternatives you have going. So we will get that information to you as soon as you get it.

If you want from us a legal opinion that says this is good to go, it's going to be awfully hard to get that to you based on the fact you want to have everything in play up to the very end. It's a concern.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser, that was even more responsive to the question than the question, but that aside, Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I just wanted to restate the question. I think the question was: In your opinion, do we need to have a separate analysis on each of these tests of the effect of including or excluding Hopi at this time?

MR. RIVERA: Here's -- if you want have it before this plan comes up, we can't even look at it
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until NDC and the other consultants have come up with a
draft plan. So if it takes them two, three days to do
it, we can't look at it until that point in time. If
you look at a time line right now, the time line of
October 1st, we're not going to get it until right
around October 1st.

If you want preanalysis before you look at
every one of these, you are not going to get it, to be
blunt with you, from legal analysis.

Whether it would be better for you to have
it, of course it would be better for you to have it to
make a determination, something you want to discuss or
you don't want to discuss based on what some of the
legal ramifications are.

If you insist on going, you'll get it at
the tail end rather than prior. Is that simple enough?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, one
more time?

MR. RIVERA: I guess it wasn't.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: How likely is it
the demographics of 7,000 Native Americans on the Hopi
Reservation are going to affect our analysis of
different plans in different ways? In other words, is
it likely at this time this test is going to be of
significance benefit to us?
MR. RIVERA: You are isolating one incident.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Right.

MR. RIVERA: Isolating one incident, not how you take into effect, how you take into effect each plan, just Hopi, Navajo, yeah, isolate that alone, overlay the Navajo Hopi on every draft coming through?

MS. LEONI: Jose.

MR. RIVERA: There's more than just that issue to look at. I think it's the second we had of the table from the right-wing party.

MS. LEONI: For clarification, we're speaking only of the Congressional plan. The motion goes only to the Congressional plan.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

MS. LEONI: I would like to ask Doug how big a demographic difference, how big a demographic difference 600,000 --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: 600,000, 40,000 --

MS. LEONI: How big a swing?

MR. JOHNSON: One percent. Depends what you switch with.

If I may, if there is a potential change the Commission is seriously interested in, I'd ask you mention it. Is it something your interested with,
please mention -- I'd much rather have it at least in
the computer, if not fully tested, this week. As hectic
as this week will be, next week will be worse. I'd
rather have us forewarned.

COMMISSIONER HALL: You are forewarned.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The point of Mr. Elder's
comment, as I understood it, was to be as clear as we
can be, as we review the options still on the table for
us, as to what the impact is of separation or inclusion
of the Hopi in the Northern District for removing it
from another district on either the Congressional -- I
took it to mean Legislative as well. Maybe his intent
was just Congressional at this point, Congressional
options. Currently they are out on the options still on
the table. They are separate. And the issue was what
is the impact of inclusion on each of the options.

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: To Mr. Huntwork's
point, give them the maps identified. Do a full-blown
analysis when we whittle to one map, say at one map
phase, show us in or out.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Makes sense to me,
try to isolate.

Do any learned counsel see a problem with
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that methodology was really the question? We're only
talking about one, very few -- I keep getting the
feeling we're answering questions about all myriad
variables, and we're not.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: And the ripple effect is
minimal, an exchange between two districts.

Get an answer on that.

MR. RIVERA: I'm sorry. You know, I guess
in an absolute world without taking any other factors
into consideration, that alone would not take very much
time, that alone, that real world without any other
considerations.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The substance of
Mr. Huntwork's comment that alone.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Say that. If we
wanted to run a test, see what the variable is, run AA,
the easiest one to isolate it, and we go from there.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is the consensus from the
consulting group that's reasonable and can be done?

DR. ADAMS: Yes, Chairman Lynn, Members of
the Commission, amending this to ask us to run this test
on AA, with the changes. And I think that is
reasonable.

I think it does make sense to go ahead and
at least test that option in one plan, because it will
be somewhat time consuming.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay. Without objection,

let's order that, direct the consultants to do that test

in AA.

Are there any other suggestions,

reductions, comments on the Congressional list?

So what we have at this time is we have

our draft, AA, and CC. And there were some small

variations --

COMMISSIONER HALL: Maricopa.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: And downtown Maricopa,

Central Maricopa District for competitiveness purposes.

DR. ADAMS: Right, right.

MS. LEONI: And the Hopi test on AA

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Both in and out.

MS. LEONI: Right.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Anything else that we can

do on Congressional?

Any other instruction on Congressional

mapping?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have instruction

on both.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's finish the list of

Legislative and go for general instructions on both.

Return, then, without objection, to the
Legislative list.

We currently have our draft, F2, G, and G4, and then the aspects of competitiveness in the urban areas from the Coalition 2 map as submitted.

Are there any changes wish to make to that.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I renew my motion to remove G4.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I would second that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Moved and seconded to remove G4 from the list.

Discussion?

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, G4 is one that deals with Yavapai County and is the one I think in a much more preferable way to G. I think it's important for us to leave that on the table. I'm perfectly -- I actually prefer G in Southern Arizona, and I would love to combine G and G4 by taking the Northern Arizona and Yavapai portion of G4 and southern Cochise County of G. But I don't want to remove G4 because it's the only thing we have on the table that even comes close to taking care of Yavapai County.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm wondering if there
isn't a consensus or at least the makings on part of the Commission for, essentially, combining aspects of the two maps, as Mr. Huntwork suggested, of a single test on the whole map rather than testing both for components we have in each.

If there isn't, there isn't. But the motion currently is to remove G4 from the list.

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: My only concern about the Southern Arizona situation with G, we have that one district --

(An odd noise is heard from the convention facility background.)

MR. RIVERA: One of the consultants.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: -- with Z, replacing that. We replaced another district that doesn't work, which is DD. So while I'm certainly not advocating for the Southern Arizona configuration in G4, I would like to make sure that there is still room to adjust and do something about District Z, at least the northern portion of it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'm sorry. We've been through this. I don't see Z as a problem, and rest
of southern area is far Superior than G4.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think you would

if you lived in Kearney or Hayden.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: How many people are

there? We can still twink that area.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm asking that.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Four, five hundred,

shift it one way or another.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No, a few thousand.

If you take all the mining communities in that area

adjacent to Gila County, talking about several thousand

people. And maybe that's not as many as in Phoenix, but

to those few thousand people, that's an important

district, like splitting Quartzsite.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: The alternative, G4,

is ridiculous.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm not suggesting

G4. Make sure the options for dealing with that portion

of Pinal County in District G.

I'm asking the consultants, without

accepting the configuration on G4, if we're talking

about -- I don't really know what the population is of

the small mining communities in eastern Pinal County,

but is there flexibility and are there options for

putting them in different district than north Tucson?
COMMISSIONER ELDER: Does that include all mining communities?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Active mining communities, not once selling off to developers.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Okay. Two.

MR. JOHNSON: We definitely are aware concerns exist in each of the alternatives and will be looking for other approaches.

What you are seeing in the test is what we've come up with to this point. Should we find a better approach we can make people with happier, we'll be including that in our proposals to you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: On the motion to remove G4.

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: My concern with G4, looking now at the Yavapai split, while some of those lines up in the northern portion may be more favorable, there's now Verde Valley, Peoria, and Cave Creek and the Tri-Cities, et cetera, with west -- the western valley, if you will. While the left district, whatever letter that is -- I'm concerned that basically both of those now are metro districts and the expansiveness of those districts. So while the dividing line up there, I agree, Mr. Huntwork, it's more ideal. I'm not sure that
the cost of that line is worth the benefit. Therefore, I think that the division, as specified in G, is probably better, at least keeping a portion of that area in a rural district.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm wondering if we can't -- I take it from the last comment we certainly could ask the consultants to address the issue of a dividing line in Yavapai, for example, on a map that still does not satisfy that particular feature as far as we're concerned and explore other options. So, in other words, if we eliminate G4 from consideration but make a specific instruction on map G, that feature of G, along with perhaps some others, needs to be refined and options presented. I know that that creates more problems in terms of ultimate review, but I guess the sense here is we still have to solve some of the problems that have been identified through public testimony and our own discussion.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, we passed over the issue of Yavapai County last time. But I don't think we can do it again today. If we are going to do anything, I think we need to give a clear signal as to where we're headed with this. And I don't think that B, as it stands, is a satisfactory map. So -- and
B4 is really a pretty good map.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: G and G4.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I apologize, G and G4. By making that change, I think we're again sending the wrong signal. I think that the rural urban distinction is important. I certainly supported it as much as possible.

There are, in this map, there are a number of good rural districts. But the people in Yavapai County made one thing very clear: They wanted to be together. If the way to do that is to bring them down into Western Maricopa County, they would prefer that to being split at all or split in the wrong spot. I think it's important for us to move in that direction at this time. And G4, the northern part of G4 does that.

The number of people -- I might also point out, I think C in G4 ends up being a pretty strongly Metro dominated district. What are the demographics? How many people in C, in G4, are outside the Phoenix Metropolitan or inside?

MR. JOHNSON: I haven't run the exact numbers. I think it's somewhere between 30 and 50 thousand are in the metropolitan area. So we're looking at 120 to 140 outside of it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.
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COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: My problem with the split, G4, Sedona and Verde Valley made it clear they'd prefer to be in a district that severed them from Prescott, Prescott Valley, and Chino Valley. They said they'd prefer to be in a district with Flagstaff, not prefer to be with G4.

It's another one that puts Sedona with Flagstaff, a small incursion into Maricopa, separates Prescott, et cetera. If trying to meet the express concerns of that part of the state, G doesn't do it at all and have to go back to F2. That's why I think we take G4 off the table. I'm not sure it's any better for that area. It doesn't put them where they want to be.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think F2 is a very important map. It does something else far different than this. That is the map that unites the Navajo and Apache Tribes. It also breaks up EACO. And EACO on this map, G, any variation of G there is still a very strong rural district, and it has been well-protected. Now, I think that, you know, if we just count -- what we need here is an alternative that doesn't put the Navajo and Apaches together and still protects the interests of Yavapai County, which were not only strongly expressed, not only strong feelings, but
there were very strong persuasive reasons for respecting that community of interest that I just -- I think we have to give that equal weight to.

The combinations that are left in C do work, communities of interest we want to have combined, and it sounds as if that's primarily, at this time, a rural district. Maybe when we look at how it comes down into Maricopa County, we can put some portions of Maricopa County into the tail end of that district so it will remain rural longer. Maybe that's the way we can try to address some of those concerns. But overall, the northern part of G4 seems to be what comes closest to what we need to do.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Would it contemplate the consultants having a full-blown analysis on test G and in addition to that give an analysis on certain components of G4, specifically the components in Yavapai County that Mr. Huntwork has alluded to and/or referenced? And I understand that will ripple down into Maricopa County.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Two districts.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm trying to take something off the plate for you. Is it possible, Mr. Chairman, to ask your consultants, have them give us an analysis on the key components of G4 that seem to be
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still an important consideration for some while
providing a full blown analysis on all of G?

Does that make your life any easier, Doug,
or have I made it worse?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF:  Let me add two
which may clarify some.

COMMISSIONER HALL:  Let me ask my
question.

MR. RIVERA:  Doug, you need a lawyer
standing next to you.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF:  Related to the
question.

CHAIRMAN LYNN:  Gives you more time to
think about the answer.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF:  The difference
between, dealing with the D and C2 maps, the external
boundaries of the two districts are identical.  All
we're talking about is the dividing line between D and C
that changes on the two maps.  So does that simplify the
analysis between dealing with the two, in two districts.

COMMISSIONER HALL:  I don't think they are
in Maricopa.

MR. JOHNSON:  They are.  That's why G, G
more to C.

COMMISSIONER HALL:  Then that doesn't make
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life any easier.

MR. JOHNSON: Not much. Maybe a little.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: No. To the extent --

if -- we're trying to deal with Mr. Huntwork's concern about Yavapai County, not just Mr. Huntwork's concern, one he raised. If we're saying that the solution to that problem is wholly contained, could be wholly contained in the reconfiguration of DC, this map, analysis, analysis configuration, specific reconfiguration issue, this one whole map has to be analyzed. The only variable is the way DC is reconfigured. Sounds like progress to me. I could be wrong.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Four columns, D, D1, C, C1, whatever, instead of -- instead of having to do the other 20 columns on a separate map, right?

Doug, your lacking enthusiasm is disconcerting.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The difference is the change in Southern Arizona. G, H is swapping population, a small amount of population. Still the same concept.

MR. JOHNSON: Correct. Straight trade between the two. Could look at G, swap them out, redo it later.
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COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Would you amend the motion to that? I'll lend it support.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. K

CHAIRMAN LYNN: District K we're not dealing with.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I would move that we would remove the total G4 map from consideration with the exception of the Yavapai County component of C and D to provide full analysis on those districts in addition to complete analysis of G.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Who seconded the original motion?

Mr. Elder, is that acceptable?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We have an amended motion on the floor.

Amended motion.

Mr. Elder?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?
COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "Aye."

(Motion carries.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We've taken G4 off. We've added the District C and D analysis variable to test G.

Any further items for Legislative mapping?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Doing F2, G with variables C plus D, and we're using C2 as an evaluation background basis, but we're not doing a full-blown test on it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Essentially our draft, F2, G with two changes -- or one change we asked to be looked at in Yavapai, and the competitive elements of the Coalition 2 submission, the Legislative package as it currently exists. Any further reductions.

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm not so sure that I'm convinced that given all of the flat spots of the total configuration of the map, F2, that it is prudent for us to have our consultants to do analysis of the map. I guess there are interesting features there. I'm just concerned about the level of work that we're loading upon them that may not bear fruition.
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I'm wondering, is it possible in, simply, with respect to that map, maybe identify specific components or is that an unrealistic expectation?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Seems to me it is. F2 is a significantly different map, significant ripple effects because of a couple key components. G and G4 are essentially the same with the exception of the treatment of -- isolating the treatment of Yavapai. In this instance, because we have Apache in with Northern District A, that ripples significantly through the rest of the map. It's not a minor change. It's a significant change.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Then I'd ask, is it still the desire of the Commission, pleasure of the Commission of maintaining this alternative for full consideration?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Couple ways to find out. One is a motion to remove it.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I was just curious, were Commissioners feeling it, go down emotion road.

Interested for input.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Three maps, legislatively, asking to be tested, with two small -- one small variation in one map, issue of competitiveness in the metropolitan area relative to the Coalition 2
We have now narrowed down the tests on the Legislative side as well.

I need to double-check with the consultants and legal counsel on workload vis-a-vis where we are at the moment versus fewer options.

Mrs. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Seems to me, the reason F is still on the table, there is still separation, inclusion of Apache Reservations in the Northern District. As I look through it, while it does achieve that, there is so much in this map I think problematic, District D, pulls Sierra Vista out of Cochise, C, D go into Maricopa County, problems all over this map. I can't see any way I would support any kind of configuration of this as the final map. So if the only purpose is to allow for the inclusion of the Apache Reservations in the Northern District, I think what this map shows creates so many problems elsewhere in the state it really doesn't work.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: And that would be discussion on the motion no one made.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Well, I think it might be a motion then to take it off, which I'll be happy to do.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Motion to remove F2 from consideration.

Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion.

Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, you know, the Navajo Nation has made its legal position and its preference very clear to us. The Navajo Nation is unquestionably protected by the Voting Rights Act. And the Native American communities are unquestionably a community of interest that we must honor and reflect under the terms of Proposition 106.

The inconvenience, and some of the concerns that have been expressed about issues in other parts of the map certainly don't take priority over the Voting Rights Act issues we've recognized from the very beginning, which we recognized are the highest priority we have to deal with. So we can't really remove from consideration the only option that the Navajos are willing to condone at this point and the only option that comes close to the benchmark they've told us is the appropriate level, at least, unless, and until we have some factual basis for doing so. At this point we don't have, in the record, such a basis. And I do not
know and have no reason to believe that we ever will.

But unless and until we do, I don't believe we can
remove this map from consideration unless we replace it
with another map that accomplishes the objective.

Perhaps a compromise would be to say that
there are clearly a number of changes that -- appear to
be a number of changes that appear to be made with this
map, take into consideration some other improvements
that have been made in some other maps, detail in
Tucson, Cochise County consolidation, for example, the
history that goes on north a little further. All those
things seem to be not inconsistent with this map.

Maybe instead of authorizing a full-blown
map, what we've been asking to do would be to review
this map, see if there are ways to incorporate some
other refinements that we have been able to make in some
of the other maps we've looked at and then perhaps do
the competitive analysis after we've made some of those
fine-tuning improvements.

MR. RIVERA: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Rivera.

MR. RIVERA: Just to add on to what
Commissioner Huntwork said, you don't have to look at
this map, a map somewhat similar to this, until you make
a determination of the bench mark and Navajo and Native
American district out there. If you take off and make a
determination later, you need a certain benchmark to
meet the determination. I think -- you may not have to
keep this map in mind, but you want to have an option at
some point in time when you get to that point in time.

The other thing, if I can go on,

Mr. Huntwork, I think you have to do the whole map.
There are so many ripple effects, you can't isolate just
the Apache aspect of it. You have to look at the whole
map because of the ripple effects that go all the way
through.

MR. HUNTWORK: I agree.

MR. RIVERA: I thought maybe you could
isolate.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I said perhaps
because of the problems in other portions of the map you
shouldn't do a full-blown competitive analysis that are
mainly going to affect other portions of the map but
rather instruct the consultants to start with this and
come back to us see what of the other refinements that
we have made could be incorporated so we then have an
improved version of this map and then do a competitive
analysis.

MR. RIVERA: Ask her what is in front of
the Senate Subcommittee right now, Mr. Johnson. It may
be more difficult to do that aspect than to do the full-blown.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: One concern is competitive, a full-blown competitive analysis on this map could be a wasted effort. We'll soon start looking in detail saying change this, or we want Cochise County united just the way it is on test G, and so on.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Adams.

DR. ADAMS: Chairman Lynn, Members of the Commission, it would make sense to analyze that entire map rather than incorporate it into another map. We would be basically drawing another map and then it would have other consequences. You've already seen this one. I think it just makes sense to go ahead and do an analysis of this map.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll withdraw my motion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Does the second withdraw?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any more Legislative changes?

If not, other instructions to the consultants in preparation for our deliberations, whenever they begin?

Ms. Minkoff?
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COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: This has already been discussed extensively tonight. I want to make sure we get it on the record. I'd like to instruct the consultants as they are doing analysis of all of the maps that we have forwarded on to them tonight that an analysis be made to see how the districts, some of the districts in each one of those maps, could be made more competitive without undermining any of the other criteria mentioned in Proposition 106.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: All motions or --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think they better be at this point. What we are doing is creating workload.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: To the extent any of these create additional workload, it impacts the schedule. We better have a clear majority in favor of each of the motions.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I make it in the form of a motion.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mind restating?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I make a motion to instruct the consultants in doing analysis and testing of each of these maps to determine if there are ways that additional competitive districts can be created or
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districts can be made more competitive, according to the 
requirements of Proposition 106.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I guess my concern is 
the word "determine."

Lisa?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Want a different 
word? I'm happy.

MS. HAUSER: Well, Mr. Chairman and 
Commissioners, the fact of the matter is that the 
consultants, who you are drawing the maps, do not do the 
competitiveness analysis. We have moved beyond into an 
area using a more sophisticated analysis that has to be run, and there is some information you've been presented 
in connection with that and some of the challenges that 
would be faced in trying to do what you are suggesting. 
But suffice it to say that it would really have to be a plan run under the competitiveness test that we have been using.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I understand that. 
But the people who are doing the competitive testing are 
not charged with the task of modifying the districts. 
That's our task with the assistance of our consultants.

I'm trying to find out then how we get to that point. It almost seems like a catch .22 you are describing to me. And, you know, I -- I don't find that
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acceptable. There has to be a way.

   Tell me who analyzes districts for

competitiveness and who will make recommendations to us
for adjustments in the districts that might make them
more competitive.

   MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman and Commissioner
Minkoff, our expert would be able to analyze in terms of
competitiveness and make recommendations along those
lines, if the Commission chooses to have the expert make
those kind of recommendations. But if what you are
talking about is not substantially redrawing districts
for districts but making changes around the edges, then
it seems like it doesn't get you there.

   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Maybe I
misunderstood. When I met individually with the
consultants last week, and as we all did, I was told
they were prepared to do that, if they were given
instructions by the Commission. I'm just trying to --

   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Adams, Ms. Leoni.

   DR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
Commission, it is indeed around the edges. And once we
have the competitiveness analysis of the expert, I --
you have to understand, it's a very complicated issue
and not simply a matter of the Quick and Dirty we've
been using. A lot of issues affect competitiveness.
Once we have that analysis, then we can make some recommendations for changes, but they would be around the edges. It would not be a dramatic change. You already have districts fairly competitive, according to the analysis. And to increase that competitiveness would be simply working at the margins.

So, yes, indeed, we would be prepared to do that, prepared to make recommendations; but after we get report from consultant working on this specifically, not a wholesale change of districts, not a dramatic change of districts.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Except with the one you've been instructed to do in the greater Phoenix Metropolitan area.

DR. ADAMS: We have indeed been instructed on the coalition plan in terms of the Downtown Metro area, been instructed to look at the Competitive Metro District in the Congressional. And we certainly will do that. And those will be tested for competitiveness by the expert as well. So we will be looking at those.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, that was my point. I think we're already there, Ms. Minkoff.

I think they are already doing that with respect to the metropolitan areas on the Legislative
level and Congressional level.

As a practical matter, from a Legislative standpoint, whatever we come up with in outlying areas, to address a multiplicity of issues, it is what it is. Try to solve as many problems as we can try to solve, that's where it's going to be what it is.

Competitiveness, there may be opportunities downtown. We instructed them to do that for Legislative, competitive, and we're okay in that department.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Additional instructions to the consultants?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Now that we've, I think, finalized the fabric we're going to try to work with over the next week, are we comfortable, I don't know whether Lisa had a response back from the outside consultant that we're going to have credible, both graphical as well as data information to actually proceed on Monday?

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Elder, Members of the Commission, under the circumstances, I do want to hear back from the additional consultant. I think it would be possible to start with the Congressional
Districts on Monday. But that is based on hearing back from the consultant. We do have time to post. But -- so that might be a possibility. I won't know until we hear back how much time it will require. We need to let the IRC attorneys weigh in on this. They may also need to weigh in on these, may not feel they're sufficiently prepared.

MR. RIVERA: Depends on when we get the maps from NDC before we can do an analysis. Depending on the date and time we get it from NDC, and from the other experts, we start doing our analysis at that point in time. It's kind of like, get it quickly, we get it quickly. Don't get it in to Saturday or Sunday, it's almost impossible.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Since we don't have a response from the competitive consultant, that's a piece we can't fill in tonight.

MS. HAUSER: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand we're trying real time to get a response. We're not able to get that response.

The question, then, and again, it relates not to this item, per se, but the next item on the agenda which is scheduling.

I guess what I'd like to do is complete
this item by indicating any other changes we have to
consultants before we move to scheduling. In other
words, is there anything else we're asking of the
consultants before we begin the next phase of the
process? Any other instruction to them at this point?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I have to say the,
NDC, balance of the consulting team, attorneys, experts,
whatever, we really, this time, coming up, is when
making final decisions, have to have the information.
So please do not hesitate, coming up Wednesday, we don't
have the window, or daylight. We need to know so we
renotice the meetings and get on. I don't want to come
in here and find we're sort of going through the motions
for a couple days because we don't have the information
to deal with it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any other instructions to
consultants?
If not, is the record clear --
Let me ask the -- let me ask the
attorneys. We have created a workload out of the
Legislative and Congressional maps and permutations. Do
you have a clear enough record or would you prefer
summarizing the motion in terms of the alternatives?

MS. HAUSER: I think we would like a
summarizing motion and then one of our famous 10-minute
breaks so we can confer about what time we think we'll need.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: On schedule.

MS. HAUSER: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's do this, then, the Chair would entertain a motion that reflects our workload to the consultants as follows: On the Legislative maps, analysis should go forward on our draft, on F2, on test G, with the Legislative Districts C and D reflecting the change in Yavapai County analyzed both ways, as existing G and the alternatives, and the competitive aspects of the interior metropolitan districts of the Coalition 2 map, that the Congressional workload be our draft, test double A including our incorporation of the alternative in AA, and GG, and test CC. That's my list. And I think --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: And the competitive --

DR. ADAMS: Downtown.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm sorry, and the metropolitan district for Maricopa County on competitiveness. And included in this is the alternative on Congressional that, on those tests, we would like to know the impact of inclusion or exclusion of the Hopi in the Northern District.
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COMMISSIONER ELDER: Correction,

Mr. Chairman, AA only.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Sorry. We agreed to test
that AA only. Thank you. That is the workload, a
motion that effect.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: So moved.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, a question.

When you stated that, you said "our draft."

Congressional, our -- test AA, including our
alternative in AA and GG, the Hopi issue you mentioned?

It's a different thing.

See, different, Jose.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Hopi testing on AA only.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Three issues on AA,
Right?

MS. HAUSER: I think so.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Inclusion of northern
tribes into the metropolitan areas, the GG new division
of GG, and the exclusion or inclusion of Hopis.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion on the motion.

Roll call.

Mr. Hall?
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COMMISSIONER HALL: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "Aye."

(Motion carries.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Two more items agenda, one which is call to the public. We'll take a 10-minute break for purposes of discussing the item on the agenda, scheduling. I hope to have that completed shortly. After the break, if you have not filled out a speaker form and wish to be heard later this evening, we'll take that later.

Please try keep this to a 10-minute break. We'll reconvene at 25 minutes of.

(Whereupon, a recess was taken at approximately 8:25 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will come to order.

On the issue of scheduling, I'll be happy to here from any of the consultants or counsel on the scheduling issue.

Who wishes to be the barrier of news, whatever it is.
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MR. RIVERA: Whoever is closest to the exit.

MS. HAUSER: Just remember, don't kill the messenger.

The expert will be working through Friday to complete the balance of racial block voting, then we can start doing the tests for competitiveness of the other plans, all the tests we're sending. And based on our calculation of how many hours it will take to do those tests, which is about 50, 50 hours of work, and he can't -- yeah, and he can't work Monday, that's the one day that he is unavailable, so he said he can start on them this weekend as soon as he finishes the racial block voting. So that takes us through the end of next week. At that rate, then, we get those reports and, Jose --

I like to share with co-counsel.

MR. RIVERA: We get the reports and review them, obviously we review them, depending on how much work is involved and stuff, will take us some time.

Any estimate, Lisa?

Two can play this game.

MS. HAUSER: I don't want to work with Jose, anymore. I don't want to.

I take that back.
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The worst part, if in meetings and getting reports at the same time, it's just an unworkable situation to do that.

MR. RIVERA: Two, three days.

MS. HAUSER: I'd say we're talking.

MR. RIVERA: You are talking about possibly Friday by the time he gets these things done, Lisa and I looking at them over the weekend.

MS. HAUSER: We can start that following Monday, I would think.

MS. HAUSER: NDC is very quiet. Let's hear from them.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The date of that following Monday is --

MS. HAUSER: The 8th, a state holiday.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Does that mean we're precluded from meeting?

MR. RIVERA: No. Staff may be.

MS. HAUSER: Sunday is state holiday also. I think we can swing that.

DR. ADAMS: Chairman Lynn, Members of the Commission, we can get materials very quickly to the consultant. The problem, as Ms. Hauser stated, the consultant will need time to go through these materials. Therefore, I must defer to the attorneys' schedule on
this. And they will need to see these reports before we
can come back and meet again, is my understanding.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Did I understand you
correctly, by the end of week we'd have a written report
for items they've already have worked on?

MS. HAUSER: At the end of the week, the
written report items he's about to start to work on.

COMMISSIONER HALL: The question is items
he's already worked on and completed.

MS. HAUSER: No.

MR. RIVERA: The items.

COMMISSIONER HALL: What do you mean "no."

MS. HAUSER: I mean "no."

MS. HAUSER: Items he's going to report to
you on at the end of week, racial block voting with
respect to local election issues which are critical in
certain parts of the state and ballot propositions.

What you, what you've got -- what you have seen from
Dr. Handley is with respect to the statewide races, so
this is something that comes back to data problems, data
received now on local races, and he's committed to turn
that around for us.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I thought analysis had
already been completed.
MS. HAUSER: Not on local races and not on ballot measures.

COMMISSIONER HALL: The earliest we can get any report is Friday.

MR. RIVERA: Not in any districts you've drawn up. Only --

COMMISSIONER HALL: In general.

MS. HAUSER: Keep in mind racial block voting analysis is not district -- not draft dependent. Existing patterns around the states.

COMMISSIONER HALL: In your opinion, with that report, in writing, would we not, on Monday, the --

MR. RIVERA: The first.

COMMISSIONER HALL: -- be able to analyze certain aspects, probably reduce some options.

MS. HAUSER: You'll not have competitiveness, not one bit more information about competitiveness than you do today.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Certain questions on the table are more contingent. There are some issues I see coming in the report you are alluding to on Friday. Correct me if I'm wrong.

MS. HAUSER: I think that is theoretically true. I'm not optimistic.

MR. RIVERA: I'd be surprised if the
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information you have on Friday changes.

COMMISSIONER HALL: What?

MR. RIVERA: After we run the ballot propositions, that local election changes anything from your knowledge you have now, or if it changes anything, it would be minimal.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I understand. Written documentation what we perceive to be preliminary analysis.

MR. RIVERA: Preliminary analysis, racial block analysis. Written report, addresses additional decisions, can we not?

MS. HAUSER: If the Commission is willing to do that, it's hard to predict. The expectation is what's coming today, more stuff is coming off the table today than can easily handle, in all candor. It's hard to say what will happen next week. Keep in mind, also you'll want to take information back to Dr. Handley with respect to percentages in certain districts and get information from --

COMMISSIONER HALL: I understand that. We could take back, basically, two instead of four, is what I'm saying, Lisa.

With that report, it appears to me, it's my sense, we can go, for example, Legislatively from
four alternatives to thereby expedite what they'll analyze in intimate detail some information forthcoming at the end of this week which would be critical to some decisions pending.

MS. HAUSER: Again, it's entirely possible. I can't predict how the Commissioners vote. If you want to proceed, your premise is logical.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Worthy of exploration?

MS. HAUSER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Go back to something Mr. Elder said several hours ago. I'm surprised I remember it.

Mr. Elder said earlier, a reasonable point, that it would be ill-advised to get together unless we could make real progress with whatever information is available. So the issue becomes what we think we can accomplish with material available to us by the end of the week and the on basis of what we think we could accomplish, whether we're reducing the number of options from four to two, or some other reasonable expectation. If, however, it's the sense of the Commission there would be no appreciable progress that could be made until more information is forthcoming and more analysis is done, I don't think it would be prudent for us to try to get together and simply be frustrated
not having the information we think we need to make
decisions, and clearly neither counsel nor consultants
can get what we might have in our heads in terms of what
we're willing to do or might do or what decisions we
might make with that information.

Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Sounded as though the
schedule went we'd get some Friday, then competitiveness
would take the majority of the week. If we met on
Monday, the 1st, and if we could reduce two to four,
four to two in each category, how that would affect 50
hours identified, what it would take to do the analysis
from competitiveness and block voting by Dr. whatever it
was, Handley.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Handley and McDonald.

MS. HAUSER: Total number plans of to be
examined and competitiveness.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Linear 50 hours
whether we do one or four, or is it something sequential
whether he does analysis, get down to only 25 hours
instead of 50 hours?

MS. HAUSER: Takes approximately five
hours per test.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Thank you.

MS. HAUSER: And based on the list we
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have, add this up, various configurations, 10 tests to run.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: To Mr. Elder's point, reduce the number of tests by some percentage.

MS. HAUSER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: One would expect the analysis to take that much less time.

MS. HAUSER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I can't think of any decision on the Congressional maps that would be made solely on the basis of racial block voting. I can only think of one that might be made on that basis, on the Legislative maps. And I think having all us get together for a meeting just for that is probably not worth it. But we could just leave the day noticed and -- leave it noticed, get together. It seems pretty bleak to me.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Currently scheduled to meet Monday at some point. Haven't decided on a time. We have still two days plus to notice that meeting and have it be official.

What seems clear, if we schedule for Monday, we shouldn't schedule Monday through Friday at this point next week, but rather schedule Monday sometime for the purpose of at least reviewing where we
are if there's the opportunity to reduce the workload.

To Mr. Huntwork's point, if others on the Commission are simply are inclined to not think we're able to reduce the workload based on analysis done by the end of week, it would not make sense to get together until we have the data to pass on that analysis, competitive analysis and other material. That is sort of where we are.

I'll take any suggestions anyone has.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Bottom line is we need to meet on the 8th. Is that what we're saying? Start meeting on the 8th, meet that week, and hopefully do it in one week? Right?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Or --

COMMISSIONER HALL: -- go to four Members of the Commission?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Oh, no we don't. We can meet in Beijing.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm not so sure it's a good time to fly, Andi.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: May not be.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I don't think we have any real options. We have to get prepared for the 8th. We have to get -- urge the consultants to make sure that they are ready. We need to get -- clear our
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I don't think we have other options.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I wonder if the only other
option we may have, to Dan's point about linear or
sequential, I'm wondering if some of this could not be
completed in a fashion if it isn't Monday or a week from
Monday. I'm wondering if there are items that could be
produced we could get started on as other work is being
done outside the Commission meeting itself and have it
if we catch up to us as we go through it.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: It leads to a comment
if four, five hours, 20 hours, might be able to meet
starting Wednesday or Friday or Thursday, something like
that, and follow in on Monday the 8th with the next set,
Congressional or Legislative.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'm concerned
counsel can't analyze the reports and sit here and
participate in hearings at the same time.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand that part.

But it may very well be, again, it may very well be that
what we might have to do, and the tradeoff is -- look,
in my mind we start on the 8th. The likelihood that
we'll finish by that Friday is an interesting bet. I
have no idea what the odds are. If we can by some extra
time, even if it means beginning at some point in the
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week earlier, and if by that I mean let's say we start
on Thursday or Friday, or someday earlier, the week
earlier, and even if it means meeting for several hours
and then not meeting for several hours while the
attorneys catch up, some modification of the schedule
whereby we are doing both, meeting and review work but
not at the same time, obviously, it's still better than,
perhaps, than waiting until we have everything on Monday
the 8th and than hoping that we complete the work.
I'm only exploring options. I don't know
it works.

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I concur with that.
Be realistic. We spent two, three hours
tonight on District DD.

I think that, from a practical standpoint,
there is going to be significant discussion relative to
a downtown competitive district long before we need to
analyze the intimate details of how competitive that
district is.

I think that if our consultants come back
with some alternatives or proposals relative to that
particular district that the configuration of which,
trying to address the other goals, there's going to be a
significant amount of time invested long before anyone
on this Commission is going to be prepared to analyze
the data table and detailed analysis.

I would agree that would be, for example,
one area where we could make some progress in the
preceding week and try to possibly give more focus to
all parties involved.

I think additionally legislatively there's
some other areas with possibly some initial information
and with some initial consideration of alternatives that
we can make some progress on and try and fine-tune, if
you will, and reduce the number of targets prior to the
8th.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The example there
is exactly what concerns me. I know I'm not going to be
able to talk about the central competitive district
without competitive analysis. The whole point of it is
competitive analysis. So that's one that just -- it's
on hold until we have that information.

I think -- Mr. Chairman, I guess I
encourage us to hold the door open to a more accelerated
process, encourage our consultants to try to think of a
way to do it, by either Congressional or Legislative
separately first, isolating those tasks with a couple
days in between from additionally work being done in
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background, or the weekend, or something. The lawyers
do those, and Monday be ready to do the other one we
didn't do the end of last week. Maybe there's a way --
we need to -- the need to push it is clear. And
possibly we can meet Wednesday --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think most of us cleared
our schedule at the beginning for the first two weeks.
There may be some exceptions to that for blocks of time
here and there. By and large, all of us thought at
least for that first week and probably into the second
week there would be considerable amounts of time that
would be Commission time.

What if in working with the consultants
and counsel you allow me to try to work out a schedule
that makes sense based on the work that is being done,
needs to be done. I draft a schedule and circulate it
to you for some period during that two weeks with the
idea that we will begin at the earliest possible date
where we have meaningful data and can make progress. It
may mean some of those days working portions of days so
that continued analysis can also occur at a time at
least contemporaneous with our meeting.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: When you do that,
suggest to us what the schedule would be for that day,
when we meet a day.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: When I can, I will. What it's predicated on -- the fall-back position is the start date. If we start earlier, the 7th, Sunday, 6th, Saturday, any day prior to the 8th, count them yourselves, try to do so given what we expect to be an end date that we have to try to meet. And I would -- I would want to have the flexibility to try to put a schedule together that makes the most sense in terms of accomplishing the task.

Without objection.

All right.

Is there anything more on scheduling?

Item VI, public comment.

If anyone wishes to speak to the Commission this evening that has not filled out a yellow speaker slip.

MR. RIVERA: Too late.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I invite to you do so.

This is the time for consideration and discussion of comments and complaints from the public. Those wishing to address the Commission shall seek permission by filling out a speaker slip. Anyone that has not done so, please do so and submit one as quickly as you can, please. Action taken as a result public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the
matter, rescheduling the matter for future consideration
at a later date unless the subject is already on the
agenda for this date.

First speaker, Joseph Donaldson, Mayor,
City of Flagstaff, representing the City Flagstaff.

Mr. Donaldson.

MAYOR DONALDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
Commissioners. Thank you for sticking in there. This
is quite a job.

There may be a misunderstanding of the
official position of the City of Flagstaff and its
communities of interest. I hope by the following to
provide additional clarity to our official position and
suggest there is opportunity for some configuration,
refinement, by holding our communities of interest
together and maintaining Flagstaff and its defined
region whole.

Its important to state Flagstaff continues
to stand on the importance of remaining whole and
combining its communities of interest. Flagstaff is in
the Northern Arizona Regional the hub. Flagstaff is the
city with the greatest population. Flagstaff is the
northern education center made up Northern Arizona
University, Coconino Community College, Lowell
Observatory, United States Geological Survey Institute,
the Internationally Renowned Museum of Northern Arizona.

I don't tell you this as a tourism commercial, but to point out and emphasize the importance of Flagstaff to the region as an economic center, a rural economic area, the center of major natural resources, and home of cultural and local government considerations.

When applying the rule of communities of interest in rural areas, not only must communities of interest be taken into consideration, but also the strength of a community when seen as the center of rural activity and unity.

We respectfully request the Navajo Nation remain whole in and their request of Indian Nations to remain whole and united.

The City of Flagstaff in applying the rule of communities of interest respectfully does not include the Navajo Nation as community of interest. The Navajo Nation respectfully does not include Flagstaff as a community of interest.

Flagstaff considers communities of interest to include those communities that do not have a designation of a sovereign nation.

Adopted District C continues to be the best configuration that might be able withstand some modification to meet other rules of Proposition 106 and

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
is certainly a configuration Flagstaff supports. I think one of the overriding perspectives necessary for the Commissioners to apply is a view as a member of that configured group. When asked am I joined with communities of interest, if I am a small community of interest, does the configured group I'm joined with have political power to accomplish my communities needs?

On behalf of my City of Flagstaff, and as a representative of the citizens and Council of my community, and acting as a official voice of governmental leadership for our community of Flagstaff, I wish to reenter into the record my previously entered statements as a further clarification.

The Council supports the configuration figure of C from the 17 August map which closely meets the criteria of Proposition 106 which respects communities of interest in municipal regional boundaries.

One of the communities of interest the Flagstaff plan areas most closely identify with are the cities and towns of Verde Valley.

I thank you for the opportunity to comment and request additional comments are considered should the Commission weigh other district configurations. If the Commission should wish any clarification beyond
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today, please call me.

Thank you. Have a nice evening.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mayor Donaldson.

Next speaker is Mark Fleisher. Mark Fleisher.

MR. FLEISHER: I want to speak on three, four issues in particular.

I requested at South Mountain, submitted a map, made comments.

The existing grid, first map put out, would make things more competitive, keep things bulletproof. One more competitive district.

I submitted a map on the 15th. On that map, there are three competitive districts, A, C, and H. Now, we also have three Republican districts, A, E, F, two Democratic districts, D, G, and E. When I submitted the map, all the districts, with footnote make changes with G and F, would continue to be -- G and F, would continue to be less than 50 percent if you took a majority party for every district. That meant minority parties, and the independent party, would equal 50 percent or greater. That was one criteria for keeping them from being bulletproof. The cover letter had more fine-tuning, kept it under 55 percent. Fine-tuning kept
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Map I submitted, all districts were less than 50 percent majority party. Two majority districts, D and G. And as I said, they became more competitive, 70 percent. Some say not competitive. Some say it is.

At a Congressional level, the problem I had in creating a new district, it's clear from the discussion today, personal agendas and some concepts have not been brought to this issue so far. And the fact there have been lots of criticisms in the way districts have been drawn, criticisms from the Commission, nobody said the Commission had one agenda from one party or another, or candidate, maps from one predetermined criteria set in place, not what results would be. People appreciated that and press appreciated it.

To create that, people wonder what is the reason to change the district drastically, like the downtown district.

I also think if want to try get this process done much quicker, I think it would be better if you guys talk, even in front of us, tell the consultants not what you're looking for, feel like you describe you want a cat. Like tell them to put Yavapai together.

What everybody here is saying, not do a map with Yavapai
together, do an analysis. It takes so long, you probably would not support or want to have that discussion now. What you're leaning towards, you still have two, three alternatives, if that's what you need.

Downtown interest, from somebody, see what effect that has. It makes sense to have that. Do analysis. There are a lot of things not to give consideration to.

Really want them to spend 20 hours on competitiveness, 10, 20 hours considering something not appropriate?

I was a little surprised, talked before, when talked before about competitiveness after the next round of discussions.

Today the discussion, the only time here talking about competitiveness, talking about the downtown district and also coalition maps. There doesn't seem to be discussion on trying to make the districts competitive. Issues last on the map should have been cleaned up before, put out. I'd like to know when you'll actually be talking competitiveness. When looking at the final map a week from next Friday?

It takes so long to do an analysis. I spent a number of hours. I sat down for probably 10 hours total in front of maps, drew maps I haven't given
to you, maps on criteria I think answer problems. They're not perfect, could be changed, existing maps you supplied, moved boundaries, particularly using I-17 and 10, reasonable boundaries to make decisions. Got all of 500 votes, 500 registered, 500 population being within fine-tuning, maybe more than that, 500 population. Fit other criteria gave you. I think it can be done. Say design a horse, committee comes out with a camel. Perhaps that's true. Come out and give instruction openly. What it accomplishes, maps might give better -- fewer maps to look at and have analyzed. Final comment. I'm curious why the maps you determined today, looked at, mine was not one of them. I asked during break. It was one given. She said it was distributed to members. I'm concerned it was not one being considered. I'm not saying it was one that should be passed, should be considered, voted up or down. Nothing up there is one I submitted. I was discouraged by that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Fleisher.

Last speaker, Judy Dworkin representing the Navajo Nation.

Ms. Dworkin.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners.
There are a number of points regarding the process which the Navajo Nation wishes to bring to the Commissions' attention this evening. The first point is that the maps that have been placed on the website, particularly most recently, scenario D, are not clear enough for members of the public to be able to make a determination whether certain particular communities are within or without districts.

For example, in scenario D, it's not clear to the Navajos whether Flagstaff was in or out of the northern A districts. That's point one.

Second point is that the Navajo Nation is very concerned about the consideration of the Navajo Hopi issues. This is, of course, not something that you haven't heard from the Navajo Nation before, but we are concerned, the Navajo Nation is concerned with comments, for example, of the artificial corridor, or that the Hopi does not care where they are placed. Navajo wants to be sure the Commissioners all understand that the Navajo Nation does care about the plans and does care about where it is placed and where other Native Americans are placed. The Navajo Nation feels that this is an opportunity to provide a strong Native American voting influence on their district and is concerned about efforts by the Commission not to support that.
proposition.

In particular, as a previous speaker has noted, the Navajo Nation very early on in this process provided to the Commission maps on both Congressional and Legislative Districts, and to be honest, is very disappointed its maps were not selected, at least to be tested on these various alternatives, so that the Commission would have, as a whole, an opportunity to consider the Navajo Nation's proposals with all the testing that would be done for these other proposals.

The Navajo Nation is very respectful of the Commission and its tests, but it believes this should have been done with respect to the proposed map for each of the Legislative and Congressional Districts you have from almost day one.

The Navajo Nation is also disappointed the meeting that had been canceled because of the very tragic events of September 11th scheduled in Tuba City could not have been rescheduled. The opportunity for you to be able to hear what the Navajo people have to say about the redistricting effort is something that the Navajo Nation would have hoped the Commissioners would have reached out to do, particularly given the Navajo Nation and the members' difficulty of them to come to a location. That Tuba City meeting should have been
The Navajo Nation believes that the Commission has paid more attention to efforts or statements made by individuals and groups including some other Native Americans to remove Native Americans from the Northern District; for example, it seems to have paid more attention to Hopi, Salt River, and Fort McDowell being taken out of a district than it is with interests of Navajo to keep them in a district.

In the situation of the efforts to remove Native American tribes, the removal of Salt River, Fort McDowell, and Hopi is removal of 10,694 Native Americans. Replacement was Fort Mojave Tribe, replacement of 360 Native Americans, a big tradeoff in Native American population by that movement. Navajo is interested in improving Native American influence.

We believe only, on the Legislative front only, Legislative front attempts to do that, keeping Apache in, as Commissioners pointed out, F2, we certainly are glad that did not come out tonight and look forward to analysis that will be done on that.

Thank you all for listening to my comments.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you very much.

Any other member of the public wishing to

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
be heard at this time?

Any other Members of the Commission?

Consultants?

Legal counsel?

Commission is adjourned at 9:29 p.m.

(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at

approximately 9:29 p.m.)

* * * *
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