MR. LYNN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. If I could ask you to take a seat, we'll get started.

I want to be very respectful of your time because you have given of it so freely this evening to be with us, and we want to be sure to have enough time to hear from everyone who wishes to address the Commission. So I have asked you to take a seat at this time and we will get started. Thank you very much.

Let me say good evening again. My name is Steve Lynn. I chair the Independent Redistricting Commission for the State of Arizona. I would also like to introduce Dan Elder, a member of the committee, who is here with us this evening.

To Dan's right is Dr. Allen Hessleff**. He is with the National Demographics Corporation, our primary consultant in the redistricting process.

And to Allen's right is Jose Jesus Rivera, one of our two legal counsel. It became very clear when hiring counsel that most lawyers who know anything about election law have either gravitated toward one major party or another. So we hired two counsel just to be fair. Mr. Rivera happened to be Democratic counsel, and Lisa Hauser is our Republican counsel, but they're both acting in a very nonpartisan way and
giving us terrific advice, and we appreciate that.

What we're going to do this evening is start with a presentation, and I know some of you may have seen the presentation before, but what we're trying to do is keep this presentation constant throughout our public hearing process so that all of the citizens who join us get the same information in the same way.

And we'll go through that presentation first, and then the most important part of the evening is to hear from you. We have speaker request forms. They're in the back on the table, and if you wish to talk to us, we would appreciate it if you would fill one of these out. We will take these in order, and we will stay until everyone who wishes to be heard has been heard.

So we appreciate your being here this evening, and let's begin with the slide presentation. Is there anyone present who would be more comfortable with a Spanish language translation? If not, then we will --

(speaking in Spanish.)

MR. LYNN: Now, if we may have the lights, we will do the presentation. Can everybody see the
We are going to be talking about redistricting, and redistricting is the process of redrawing lines after a decennial census is released. We are drawing new lines for both legislative and congressional districts in the State of Arizona under the provisions of Proposition 106. And this is the first time that's ever been down. Proposition 106, as you may know, was passed the last general election. This is the first time a redistricting has occurred under that legislation.

It's very important that there are some differences between the way Arizona has redistricted it in the past and the way we will be doing it this time. This time citizens play a very different role. In fact, the five citizens who make up the Commission, we aren't elected by anyone, and I will talk about this election process later. We actually take the place of the legislature in terms of the role of drawing districts. We also want to involve citizens, all citizens of the state, in a very crucial way in the development of these political boundaries.

These public hearings that we're having are partly to educate, but more importantly they're to
24     hear from you and educate us as to how you would like
25     these boundaries drawn.

We will be using these hearing to bring
the process all over the state. There are 23 hearings
which began on Monday, will continue this week, next
week, and into a third week. And after that 3-week
period of time, we will have listened hopefully to
thousands of Arizonans at these meetings. We
appreciate your turnout tonight. And we need to share
with you our plans for the new district after we've
heard what you think those districts ought to look
like.

Once you tell us what you believe the
district should look like, we will create some
districts for you to take a look at. We will have
another round of hearings, and you can tell us how well
we heard what you said you wanted to have happen.

We are determined to make this a fair
process and achieve districts that honestly represent
the people of Arizona.

Now, in the past states all over the
country have done redistricting in a way that was a
very divisive process, in a way that raised charges of
dirty politics, partisan power plays, all sorts of political intrigue of one kind or another.

Discrimination in one way or another has been at the heart of much of that criticism and it all

boils down to a very abusive term called "Gerrymandering" or correctly "Gerrymandering." It's actually Gerry.

In the 1800s the federalist governor of Massachusetts, Eldridge Gerry, had some very interesting districts that he was a part of drawing. And the Boston Globe memorialized his work in a cartoon which pictured his district as a salamander. So it was Governor Gerry Salamander or Gerry Mander. And from that point forward the drawing of political boundaries in a way that only can be described politically has been Gerrymandering.

There are a number of things that Gerrymandering could do, and here are some examples of how you can use Gerrymandering for political redistricting abuse. Let's say that you have a block of minority party voters. That block as you see on the left can be divided a number of ways to decrease the influence of that block in the four districts represented.
Similarly, you could also take those minority voters and pack them into one district, giving them perhaps one seat or the opportunity for one seat in the group of four but saving the other three districts for a majority party.

The same process can also work when you have ethnic minorities involved. And certainly in the State of Arizona we have a significant ethnic minority population throughout the state concentrated not only in urban areas but also around Indian lands, Native-American territories throughout the state.

Here’s how that works. You create an ethnic district to help usually the opposition party and often times the ethnic minorities by voting history vote with the democrat. So you can see how that works in this situation. You isolate this group and make the safe districts around them.

You also can preserve a democratic incumbent by making sure that a district excludes those parties where that democratic incumbent might not do so well.

None of these things are particularly acceptable. And the voters, by passing 106, wanted
this process cleaned up and done differently. And so you have the Commission. They created this entity out of Proposition 106, and we are responsible for this new kind of redistricting.

Now, let me talk just a minute about how these five individuals came to be on the Commission so that everyone understands the process.

First of all, there's an affirmative application process. Any citizen of Arizona who wished to serve needed to fill out a fairly lengthy, detailed application and submit it to the Commission on Appellate Court Appointment. That commission headed by the Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court reduced the 311, that's how many people applied, 311 applications, reduced them down to 25. And they did that through whatever process they used. I have no idea what methodology they used to do it. But they sat for a day or two and went over, had read all the applications, and went through a process of putting together a list of 25. Ten Democrats, ten Republicans, and five Independents.

That list then was circulated to the political leadership in the Arizona Legislature, and each of the leaders in turn, and there was an order of
selection, made the selection from the list. Now, they
were not obligated to select people from their own
party, but as you might imagine, the first four
selections were two Republicans and two Democrats.

Let me just give you an idea of how that
happened. The first person selected was Jim Huntwork.
Jim is an attorney from Phoenix, and he was selected by
a Speaker of the House Jim Wires.

The second person chosen was the person
who became Vice Chair of the Commission, Andrea,
sometimes called Andy Minkoff, and when you see Andy,
just remember it is a woman. Absolutely Andrea is a
woman and doesn't let us forget it because she is the
only woman on the Commission. And she's from Phoenix.
She is a community activist and she was selected by Ken
Chevron, who is the minority leader in the House.

The third selection overall was done by
Senate President Randall Gnatt of Scottsdale. And
Senator Gnatt chose Dan Elder, who was a landscape
architect and consultant from Pima County, from Tucson.

Once the first two picks were made,
Maricopa County was frozen out of the first -- the rest
of the two picks. In other words, no county can have more than two representatives out of the first four. However, the fifth representative could have been from anywhere. So it's conceivable that one county could have had a three-person majority on the Commission if it had worked out that way.

Mr. Elder was chosen by Mr. Gnatt, and the fourth pick from Jack Brown, who is -- I can't call him the minority leader because the Senate is 15-15. So he's the democratic leader in the Senate. He chose

Joshua Hall, who is in the land title business in northeastern Arizona. He's from Apache County, lives in St. Johns and has offices in Show Low and a number of other places in the White Mountain area.

Those four individuals were sworn in, and they in their first public act interviewed publically the independent candidates who would become Chair of the Commission. Now, by the time the interviews were set, there were only four candidates for Chair. One had dropped out. Apparently somebody tipped that guy off as to how much time this was going to take and how long the pay was.

At any rate for whatever reason, one person had withdrawn their name and there were four of
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us. We were interviewed publically, which if you've never gone through that process, I highly recommend that you skip it next time you have the opportunity.

And after deliberation by the Commissioners, there was a vote taken as to who should chair the commission. The vote was 4-0 first ballot for that guy from Tucson, that registered Independent, the one speaking to you now to become Chair of the Commission.

So the makeup of the Commission is two members from Maricopa County, two members from Pima County, and one member from Apache County. You will note, however, that all five of us do not reflect ethnic minorities of the State of Arizona. We all happen to be Anglo.

When I explain the process to you, you need to understand that nowhere in the process was there any sort of requirement for diversity, and the selections of the leadership were on whatever basis they wished to make them. This has been a bone of contention since the beginning of the deliberations of the Commission, and the only thing we have been able to say is that we are the end of the process, not the process itself. If you have a problem you may need to
take it up with those who made selection.

We have been selected and we're going to do our level best to represent all citizens in the State of Arizona regardless of how they view themselves in terms of political group, ethnic group, geographic group. Our job is to do the best we can for all 5.1 million Arizonans.

Proposition 106 states that the Commission shall establish both congressional and legislative district and that the commencement of the process, the beginning of the process shall first be the creation of districts of equal population in a grid-like pattern across the state.

Now, there are other goals that we need to achieve. In order for us to be successful, all of the constitutional voting rights law that has come before us is in play. We have to be sure that any map that we ultimately draw will pass review by the Department of Justice against a number of criteria.

Now, let me just quickly go over those. In addition to meeting the one person/one vote rule that is in the Constitution and the Voting Rights Act provisions, we need to have congressional districts that have equal population to the extent practicable.
and state legislative districts that are equal in population to the extent practicable.

In the case of congressional districts, the population of Arizona is, in fact, divisible by eight. Therefore, as close to dead even as we can get them is what we're shooting for. That means down to the last person.

With respect to legislative districts, we are trying to get those as close as possible as well. We do have a little bit of leeway if history is any judge, and where we have leeway in legislative districts is to be able to take in let's say the last couple of hundred people within a city or within a census tract or in some other way if we can make a case for it. There can be a small disparity in population based on achieving some other goal.

The districts shall be geographically compact and contiguous again to the extent practicable. If you look at the current map of state legislative district, you will find some interesting shapes. Some perhaps worthy of being cartoons. The fact of the matter is that Proposition 106 was put into place so that the districts would look more like districts and
less like free-flowing art.

And so the district hopefully will be more regular in shape. Will they all be squares? Probably not because that's just not the way patterns develop in the state in terms of population. But will they be more regular in shape? We hope so.

District boundaries shall respect communities of interest to the extent practicable.

What is a community of interest? Justice Sandra Day O'Connor in a previous Supreme Court case said that those communities of interest need to be respected. Unfortunately she didn't define the term.

So we have two choices. We can either define the term and move forward or we can do what we've chosen to do which is to ask you to define it for us. We will be asking you some questions tonight and throughout this process about community of interest, and it's your job to tell us how Cochise County and this part of the state feels in terms of its community, its sense of community. We've already heard from other parts of the state earlier in the week where the see the affinity that they would like to maintain between themselves and other parts of the state, and we hope to get that same information from you.
Again to the extent practicable, district lines will use visible geographic features, city, town, and county boundaries, and undivided census tracts as best we can. Understand that to get eight congressional districts down to the last person, we will probably have to crack a census tract or two just to make that happen.

And then finally on this list to the extent practicable, the competitive district should be drawn. That means that no one party will dominate all the districts drawn to the extent that there isn't an opportunity for minority parties and others to one per office and perhaps be successful.

Here's what else Proposition 106 does, which is quite unique. There are other states, by the way, who have gone away from legislative redistricting to a commissioned system but none of them has done this in exactly this way. We are not able to use the party registration and voting history data in the first phase of the process. We can only use that later to test whether or not there has been any erosion of influence by groups that have established influence in the past, and we can use voting history data and party
registration to assist that later in the process after
we have draft maps drawn.

But notice the last part of this
statement. "Places of residence of incumbents or
candidates shall not be identified or considered." Now
what that means, and I'm a big one for managing
people's expectations. I want you to understand when
we have finished with this process and we have drawn 8
congressional and 30 legislative districts I guarantee
you that somewhere in the state two incumbents who
currently serve in the legislature from different
districts will find themselves in the same district.

How can I guarantee that? I can guarantee it because
we won't know where any of them live; and therefore,
the lines will not respect their current districts.

That means that it is likely, it is
possible, it could happen. So please be aware that
that's something that might an outcome of what we're
doing here.

---------------------------------------------------------------------
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counted in the census. Please understand that while we sympathize with that point of view, we are bound to use official census data and that's the only information we can use in the redistricting process.

So any difficulty that communities have with an undercount needs to be taken up with the Bureau of the Census, and we will get official data from the Bureau.

Here's a snapshot of what's happened in the state in the last 10 years. You will notice that in 1990 3.66 million people lived in the State of Arizona. The 2000 census puts that number at 5.13 million people. Now, I want you to keep your eye on this figure just to give you an idea of proportionality. Keep your eye on this figure as I show you the next slide.

Here's some counties that have grown significantly in the last year. Take a look at Maricopa County's current population. It's almost as much as the entire state 10 years ago. Maricopa County comprises about 53 percent of the state's total population. And so any thought that Maricopa County would not dominate in terms of either legislative or
congressional redistricting should be dispelled at this time. Because of one person/one vote, they are entitled to the amount of representative that that population gives them.

But they're not the champs. They only grew at 44.8 percent. Take a look at some of the river communities. La Paz County grew at 42 percent, but Mohave County grew a whopping 65 percent in the process.

So we've got a lot of work to do because of all the congressional and legislative and districts that are out there, they're all unbalanced currently in terms of population. Some have not enough. Some have more than they need.

Here's what we have to do in this process. 106 says that the first thing we have to do is to draw equal population districts in a grid-like pattern. We did that last week using as random a process as we could divide. Now, we could have started anywhere but we chose to start with a random representation, and there are a series of rules that we went through that I'm not going to necessarily take the time to go over this evening unless you want to hear them, but let me assure you of this. The grid that was published in the
paper and the grid that's on the wall for you to take a
look at, I think it's back there, is random. And
here's how random it was.

We picked a place on the map to start, and
the place we chose to start with is a place where all
townships start in the state of Arizona. And I will
talk about townships a little more in a minute. But
notice the definition of grid. No matter which
dictionary you use to define it, what you're going to
see is that this is a regularly-shaped kind of
district, a regularly-shaped pattern. Lines crossing
one another at right angles, making squares or
rectangles, those kinds of subjects.

I'm going to go through these very
quickly. The Arizona Republic listed a number of kinds
of grids that could be drawn. None of these would pass
Department of Justice. They're just the newspaper's
idea of what might work. So there's an equal
horizontal grid. The 5-2-1 grid which some people
might think is an interesting idea. The urban power
grid, which if you live in an urban area, you might
think is a good idea. The minority power grid which if
you think you belong to that group you might think is a
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good idea. The fact of the matter is none of those
grids have the kinds of attributes that the Department
of Justice would pass. They have flaws, significant
flaws.

And so we've decided to do instead of
drawing before we listen is to listen before we draw.
The grid was just that. It was something we needed to
start with. But now we wanted here what you think
about those communities of interest before we actually
draw maps.

Now, when we get maps drawn, and believe
me what was printed in the paper is grid, not a map. I
want to say that at least six times so that we all are
clear. And we ultimately draw maps. Those maps will
be reviewed over at least a 30-day period by not only
the citizens of the state in the same manner that we're
doing now but by the state legislature. They have 30
days to look at it as well. But they have the same
standing as you do. We expect to hear from them. We
expect to hear from you. We expect that they will
submit maps to us. We will provide you the opportunity
to do the same.

And based on all of that input we will
draw final maps, and we will submit those to the
Department of Justice. Assuming that those maps are
approved, precleared by the Department of Justice, they
go directly to the Secretary of State's Office, are
certified and are put into force. So that's the end of
the process.

Tonight, we would like to give you the
opportunity not only to speak to us if you would like
to but to give us information on a citizen input form
That form is available at several places. We have them
here this evening both in English and Spanish. We are
making them available through our website:
www.azredistricting.org. And you can download. In
fact, one gentleman came this evening with a downloaded
copy which he had filled out and is handing it in. But
you don't have to come to the meeting to do that. You
can fill it out on line and ship it back to us on line.
You can fax it to us. We will take it any way we get
it. We are interested in your input.

We ask a series of questions. We would
like you to identify yourself. We would like you to
state your major concern. Let us know in as few words
as possible the thing that you most want us to know
about the redistricting process from your point of
view. We want you to tell us what boundary lines you
would like to see used in your area.

For example, I have heard a couple tell me
informally tonight that they actually like the grid because the grid sort of kept Cochise County whole and didn't divide it up among legislative district. Well, I've got good news and bad news. The good news is that you're right. The bad news is it's going to change maybe depending on how the maps work. And so what you need to tell us tonight is that very kind of thing that as you draw maps, because that was a random process, as you draw maps consider keeping Cochise County in one legislative district. That's the kind of input we need to hear.

What areas or groups or neighborhoods do you think should absolutely not be divided, like the City of Sierra Vista or Douglas or should Douglas with Bisbee or should Bisbee and Douglas be with Tombstone or should all three of them be with Sierra Vista. You tell us. We are not going to make those judgments without your input.

And then what information would you like us to take into account when we draw lines in your area. Do you want us, for example, to try to maintain the integrity of school districts or precincts or county boundaries. Let us know what you think is important. Those are the things we are interested in knowing.
If you would like to get a little more involved than just the citizen input form, you can request a citizen kit. A citizen’s kit not only has that input form but it also has a smaller version of the citizen kit map which reflects in more detail the census block groups and the photography of Cochise County. And you can actually get into that map and kind of draw some lines if you want to and show us how you think the legislative areas should look.

You can request that at the website. You can request it here tonight. You can do any or all of those things, and we would be happy help.

Well, when we're finished with the maps, you're going to have several criteria that will be used to judge whether or not they're acceptable. The federal mandates of one person/one vote equal population or as near as possible, and the Voting Rights Act rules will be reviewed by the Department of Justice.

Proposition 106 also places requirements on us, and some of them we've talked about already this evening, the grid being one of those. We have to use the grid.

We have taken steps to move forward by using, as I said before, a random process. Now, let me
talk a little bit about how the grid came to be. We picked a point on the map with which to start, and we started at the place where all property begins to be cataloged in the State of Arizona. Properties cataloged by township. And the point on the map where the townships begin is the Gila Salt Baseline & Meridian. It's at 107th Avenue and Baseline in Phoenix. I'm sure you've all driven by and waved. It's a terrific tourist attraction. At any rate, that's the geographical center of the state from which all townships emanate. So we have a point on the map to start.

We also decided that if we're -- if our charge is to draw grid-like patterns that the township would be a fine building block to use in building grids because a township is a 6-mile square. Now, you can imagine in a city you can accumulate a large amount of population in one township. In the middle of Phoenix, townships could be fairly densely populated. But as you move out from urban areas, you need more townships to aggregate the population. And remember our first obligation on the grid is population only. So what we're trying to do is aggregate population up to the numbers necessary to make either a legislative or a congressional district. So we aggregate in this
We aggregate groups of townships into larger blocks, and ultimately we have the super township which is a group of 16 smaller blocks of four townships. That's what we would use in a very rural area to accumulate population.

Townships provide exactly the grid-like pattern we were looking for, and then when you overlay census tract information on them you can begin to count the individuals in each of those areas and work through the equal population grid.

Now, we talked about how this would work in a random fashion, and before I go through the schedule, let me just tell you we have this point, and then we had to figure out whether or not we needed to start in one or the other of the quadrants. Well, in order to figure out which quadrant to start in, we drew lots. We put the four quadrants in a hat and picked one and northwest won. So those of you holding the northwest card, you can see the cashier at the end of the evening. There's no prize.

Northwest one so we started in the northwest randomly, and we started aggregating townships with population attached until we made
As soon as we were finished aggregating the entire northwest quadrant, then it was a problem of which way do you move. Do you move clockwise or counterclockwise to the next quadrant. Well, in order to get that solved, we flipped a coin. Counterclockwise won.

So we went northwest and then went southwest, southeast, and then northeast. And that's how that grid came to be. The day that grid was released was the first time we had seen that grid because the only thing we did is adopt the rules for random grid making, and whatever happened, happened. That's the only way we could assure that the starting point was truly random and had no political bias to it.

Now, understand that that grid is going to change. It's going to change based on the input from citizens like yourselves telling us from all over the state how that grid either does or doesn't serve their purpose or meet their need. There are certainly aspects of that grid that people have told us they like. And that's fine. We will take that into account and attempt to preserve the things that people like. But understand that when you start making a change in
that grid, you immediately affect all of the other districts that are continuous because changing a line

means you've changed population and other demographics in the surrounding area. So we will have to balance all of that.

We're going to have two rounds of public hearings. This round to get community of interest information. The second round on draft maps. We're going to develop plans, submit final plans to the Department of Justice for their review, and we're going to attempt to have that completed, the submission of plans, completed by early September. That means that if the Department of Justice takes the 2 months that they have to review the plans, it is conceivable that we could have preclearance by the end of the year. I'm not saying it will happen, and there's certainly the possibility, as history will tell you, of a number of lawsuits being filed that could delay the process. We hope that doesn't happen, but we are prepared that anything in that area could happen.

My computer is applauding so I must be finished. Let me just tell you that at this point what is critical is your input. We have a process and we
think the process serves both the federal law and Proposition 106.

Now I would like to ask Commissioner Elder to highlight a couple of point that we think are extremely important for this evening.

MR. ELDER: Well, you can see my technical ability does not match, you know, whatever because I was trying to get back to that slide where there is those I think it was E or F that identified specific areas that we need to have information from you back. When you give the information that says we'd really like to move the line over here, we need to know why you want to move the line over here. Is it based on a community of interest. It's a school district. We vote together for propositions. We are agriculture. A community of interest is not necessarily an ethnic or racial or a language minority. It could be agriculture. It could be mines. It could be school districts. It could be just about anything. But we need that definition.

So when you propose a modification or you propose we would like to keep this area together, give us the because. Is it based on the community of interest. Is it based on social economic that we do
business together.

Last night I was up in Bullhead City, and they said we really work together because we've got a problem of sewage along the Colorado River, and all of the counties along the Colorado River have that same problem. It's part of the major problem in their community. So that was something that linked them together. They said we would like to be together because we need strong representative to solve those problems.

So if there's things in your area or things in your communities that you want us to address as far as, well, if you could move this line to here and give us the reason why in these forms when you turn in your form, we would appreciate it because that gives us the rationale that when we move the line it's defensible. The Department of Justice can take a look at it and say they used Rule B, D, and F or whatever it might be to make that adjustment and that's reasonable and that's fair. That was unbiased.

So that's what we're looking for and if you could when you ask your questions or you make your comments, if you can give us a sense of basis should we
use to make adjustments to a line when it becomes apparent we need to, it would be very helpful. So with that, let's open it up to questions. And we have the counselors around here somewhere. Here we go. In order received. Oh, boy. Tricia Gerrodette?

MR. LYNN: We would ask if you come forward, this will amplify, and if you would spell your name for the court recorder, that would be most appreciated.

MS. GERRODETTE: Yes, it's Tricia Gerrodette. And it's spelled G-E-R-R-O-D-E-T-T-E. I guess would think that it would be really important, I'm looking forward to having Sierra Vista be all in one district instead of split. I think our community of interest certainly lies to the north and to the south. There is -- we refer to it as Hereford in which we could see sort of ** Pedro Valley. And just I think -- my personal feeling is that we might have a little more in common with people over in Santa Cruz County on the west side of the Huachucas. They might not agree. I would be interested in hearing what they have to say. But I kind of think I have more in common with them than I do...
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with people in Willcox, a long way away where I -- they
have more in common with ** keep counties together.
That might be something to look at. Thank you.

MR. ELDER: Jim Hortoan.

MR. HORTOAN: My name is Jim Hortoan, H-O-
R-T-O-A-N.
I live in Sierra Vista. I've lived here
12 years. My community of interest -- I really thought

about this. I thought about your awesome
responsibility and our responsibilities as citizens to
give you input. And I tried to think who do I -- who
do I identify with. And in Sierra Vista if you live on
the west side or the San Pedro I should say, my
economic association outside of this city is with
Tucson. My cultural association outside of this city
is with Tucson. If you ask me the name for
acquaintances or friends outside of this immediate
community, I couldn't name a sole other than political
figures. In Safford or Greenlee County or San Simone.
I know one or two in Douglas. I know one in Willcox.
I know a lot in Tucson.
I think if you ask my friends and my
neighbors where their economic and their cultural ties
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were, they would be in the direction of Tucson. I certainly hope that our City of Sierra Vista has a -- is in a single district, that it's not split yet. If you get down to having to split some of these blocks, we've paid our dues. Go somewhere else. Thank you.


MS. GRUGZINSKI: Hi, my name is Beverly Grugzinski, and it's G-R-U-G-Z-I-N-S-K-I. I came here just to see what you all had to say and get information on what's going on because I know everybody is interested. And glancing through your book here with your grids and your different maps that you had, I noticed that on all of them the main problem was districting with your minority vote, whether it be too many or too few. And I'm assuming that you're assuming that the minorities vote the minority party.

In my opinion, people vote for the person that identifies most with his problems and his issues. To be safe streets for the schools, please go in and save lives for everybody. I think problems for voting should be left up to your parties. If they find themselves good candidates, it doesn't make any
difference if you're a Democrat, Republican, Independent. You're going to vote for whoever you think best identifies with you.

As far as an unbiased way of dividing, I think a good way to do this, and I'm going to sound like Bush here, is to get everybody together whether they're Independent, Republican, or Democrat. If you could get your people within your districts to talk with their parties in between your visits, get your parties to get input from their people, then the party leaders get together, your Democrat, your Republican,

your Independent. Let them tell you united what their people need and what they want. What more unbiased opinion can you get than all your parties agreeing on what everybody needs.

MR. ELDER: Marsha Arzberger.

MS. ARZBERGER: Good evening. I am the State Senator representing District 8 Southeast Arizona.

MR. ELDER: Spell your name.

current legislative district in southeast Arizona is quite large encompassing most of four counties, and I travel a little bit. And believe it or not, there are a lot of people out there who have opinions on how their district is drawn. I would just like to pass onto you what I'm hearing.

The first thing I hear is that we want to maintain our rural identity. We do not want to be combined with urban centers. People tell me that rural issues are different. One size does not suit all, and they want to have people representing them who understand and they want their district to be mostly rural.

Secondly, I hear that there are many things that they have in common. The border communities currently are included in one district, and they have common problems, so those borders communities they would like to keep those together.

I also hear from Cochise, Graham, Greenlee, and part of Santa Cruz County. What I hear that they have common economic levels, that they trade together. There is a Southeast Arizona Government Association that handles many of the distribution of programs through this area, and they have a lot of
commonality.

So I'm just passing onto you that that's what I'm hearing. The smaller school districts have different problems than larger school districts. They feel better combined in a district where there is more of the same problems.

Another thing is that we have common industry in the southeast corner of the state, and it will be easier not to Gerrymander us. We are bordered on two sides by New Mexico and Mexico, so being in a corner should help a little bit with that district in whatever district you decide to put a number on it.

But the common industries in this area are agriculture, mining, border trade, and tourism. And I think you will hear from other folks that that's important also. Thank you.

MR. ELDER: Leslie Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, and I would like to welcome you to Sierra Vista and Cochise County.

My comments today are please remove the split that's in Cochise county. I serve on the Board of Supervisors, and my district is the largest in Cochise County. And I have District 8, very large
portion, and a very large portion of District 9 runs through it. So it's very, very difficult to be able to serve my constituents on specific issues and represent them in either the House or the Senate.

So as you're looking at these, please unify Cochise County, and I too would like to see it kept as rural as we can possibly do it. The maps as you have them today are tremendous. I would like to see it kept as that as close as possible. Whether we moved a little bit of it from Pima County down and incorporate it some of Santa Cruz, that wouldn't create as much of a heartburn or me much of a heartburn, but because they're terrific people, and we're all representing the rural areas that are there.

I do again want to thank you for coming down here because it's important for us to be able to come and stand here and look at you folks. So thank you.

MR. ELDER: We're coming back.

MR. THOMPSON: Oh, we'll be here.

MR. ELDER: Jay Raschje.

MR. RASCHJE: My name is Jay Raschje, R-A-S-C-H-J-E. And did you want any other data?

MR. ELDER: We will take anything you have.
in a written form

MR. RASCHJE: Okay. I do have a written document that I intend to give to you.

MR. ELDER: That would be great.

MR. RASCHJE: That will follow. And I want you to know that I am a member of the Cochise County Democrat party group and that a number of us have gotten together and gave serious evaluation to what is going on, and I think what you're going to hear from me is going to parrot a lot of what you have just heard from others that I haven't worked with, except Ms. Arzberger. We did get together, but other than that, none of the other speakers have spoke together previous.

Cochise County, all of it would be in a legislative district. Graham County would include the City of Safford and all portions east and south as well of the county, south of the Graham Mountains, all of the Town of Thatcher and north and west of that town including the San Carlos Apache Indian Reservation would be made currently with Legislative District 4. A clause I think coming down from probably the Senators states, well, you're going to need population as well.
And what we have described here, by the way, does come up with about 173,000 people.

All of Greenlee County, Santa Cruz County, we would propose just taking in the southeast corner of the county, and most of the City of Nogales presently is in 8, and that would stay the same and we would add a couple of other precincts to try and get the population numbers up. So we would end up with about 173,000 people by our scheme.

One of the things that this does is it maintains a legislative district of the southeast corner of the whole state. The current district has a Hispanic population of about 44 percent. Our proposal reduces that a bit but it keeps it pretty close at about 39 point something percent of Hispanics.

As everyone stated, border communities with similar interests are kept together. I think you will hear when you get to Nogales based on conversations that have been had with people down there that they want to be split, that some of them want to be in District 8, some of them want to be in the other district. I believe you're going to hear that down there. And of course what we're saying here reenforces that. That helps make the population of people with
similar disposition.

It was mentioned that we want to maintain our rural ambience, if you will, and this does that. And you have communities along the border that are kept together. Obvious interests to anybody who reads the news.

What we have also done is outline in a map form what that district would look like. It is contiguous, and as I indicated, it takes across the border, southeast corner of the state.

The big job you gentlemen have, I admire your ambition to do a job of that, and I know you're going to do the right thing. Thanks a lot.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. Other people that have come in that haven't filled out a form please do so. I have those on at the end, but I'm also going to open it up for questions as long as you tell the reporter what your name is. You don't have to fill out a form per se. But we would like to have it. This way it gets us on the mailing list. It gives us a contact list where we can give you more information and help you provide us information.

Ben Anderson.
MR. ANDERSON: My name is Ben Anderson, A-
N-D-E-R-S-O-N, Junior.
I represent myself, but I also represent
as the chairman of Cochise County's Republican
committee, that party, and also I'm the chairman of
Legislative District 8.
So I went to your meeting on Saturday in
Tucson, and I thought it was very outstanding. We paid
attention to that and then got together and did a lot
of work since then to comment on what we saw. We
downloaded all of your information from the website.
We think that however you came up with what you came up
with is relatively excellent. We're just very happy.
Whether people are not, we are relatively happy.
What we do stress as a major concern is
that we would like, as others have mentioned, to
maintain our rural character, rural values, and our
rural economy. We want absolutely no Gerrymandering
whatsoever into this.
You know, we like the boundaries that are
portrayed. We know that you have to make some
adjustments. We realize that these adjustments will be

based on a community of interest.
The one that we point out is the one in
northern Graham County where the computer, not knowing, has included the southern half of the San Carlos Indian Reservation. That probably is not wise and wouldn't pass justice in review. So we believe that the northern boundary should come to the southern boundary of the San Carlos Indian Reservation, and it should be where it is now in another legislative district to keep the Indian tribe and nation together. That is their community of interest.

Likewise, as you travel to the east you will find that come to Greenlee County. In order to maintain a compact and contiguous package of the southern portion of the southern border of the Apache National Forest would be appropriate, the northern portion, the reservation or the forest goes north and the population that they currently have basically stays south.

Your western and eastern boundary is the State of New Mexico. Your southern boundary is that of the country of Mexico on the other side. We of course want Cochise County to stay one county. We've been proud of Cochise county.

We wouldn't want any of our...
municipalities, to wit, St. David, Benson, or Sierra Vista, to be split off or Gerrymandered to some other district. So if you follow a line straight down from Graham County all the way down to the border where it intersects right through to the Cochise County, that is good. We know you have to go off to round out the 171, 021.

We have done reviews of your census data, and we think that Cochise County, Graham County as mentioned, Greenlee County as mentioned, and that a part of Pima County that represents a rural economy just like ours, not necessarily Tucson, but contiguous and compact with us is appropriate.

Now, what falls out of that is what's not in your portrayal. Your portrayal right now is very good. We feel, for instance, that border communities is a good term however, it flies in our district to two areas: the Bisbee/Douglas area. We do not feel that Nogales necessarily fits into that, and the reason is they have a very, very unique community of interest, and that is, it's not often discusses, is the cammex* border package. The cammex* border goes from the border with Mexico in Nogales literally all the way up to Canada, but the package runs up I-19 to Tucson to Phoenix, 93 up to Nevada and on through. That is a
very important train route, and everything along that
corridor really needs to be soled and together in the
best interest of that particular district.

Now, Nogales in that part of Santa Cruz way down there is a long distance from here by terrain, by intervening mountains. Another thing that they have that we don't have, it makes a major difference, is that we do not have the real network for the trade package. That what they have there does not apply here in Douglas, and Maco is the area.

So I've pretty much outlined the area. The key fact I want to stress again is we do not want to be Gerrymandered in any way, shape, or form. We want to keep the contiguous, compact package that you have now with that adjustment necessary from Pima County. And I will provide you all this information. I've already sent it in, but I will do it again.

And I thank you very much for your attention, for coming, and I think that your process is outstanding. I did not vote for 106, but I'll tell you what, I was wrong. You're doing a very fine job, and I thank you.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. Bobby Lugo.

MR. LUGO: Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity. I did vote for 106 because I
thought 106 was something from the future and the way
that it had been in the past that all this
Gerrymandering that went on and I think that with a
commission, a neutral commission that we could come up
with neutral boundaries in our districts would be
adequate for everybody to be represented in the State
of Arizona.

We're talking about what our districts
should look like. Our districts should look like
Arizona. Our districts should look like the United
States of America. Right now our district does look
pretty much like it. It's got a woman, it's got a
Hispanic, and it's got a white male, which right now
the 40 percent of Hispanics are being represented in
that area. The women population we have, and then we
have a white male that represents like the face of
Arizona.

If we were to say that we weren't going to
Gerrymander anymore and we were going to have Cochise
County to stay as one county, then let's keep this
rural. Let's not go into Pima County. Pima -- when
these counties were formed, Pima was then separated
from Cochise County and Santa Cruz. Santa Cruz and
Cochise County have more in common than we do have into
Pima County.
Maricopa and Pima County are your heavily populated areas. We need representation in Santa Cruz, Cochise County, Greenlee, and Graham. And those four counties, if you could get some other area that is in the rural area of the state, then I think we would have more in common, and we could get representation like we should get as the face of Arizona. Thank you very much.

MR. ELDER: Tom Nessler.

MR. HESSLER: One of these days I'm going to have to learn how to write very well. Tom Hessler, H-E-S-S-L-E-R.

And I would like to thank you. I'm the mayor of Sierra Vista. And first off, I want to thank you on behalf of the citizens of Sierra Vista for coming down here. You are very welcome. And, Mr. Chair, I thank you for bringing everybody down here. I don't think you introduced your able assistant over there, Theresa Pulido, which I had the opportunity of meeting her earlier today.

I would mention one thing that there is a monthly meeting of the mayors and managers of the Cochise County, and we include the county supervisors. And we meet monthly, go around to different towns. We will be meeting next week, and I will take it upon
myself to encourage all of the mayors and managers to
...
retrogression. Retrogression deals with reducing the
number of majority/minority districts and also the
demographic makeup of legislative District 8. I cite
in there specific section of Voting Rights Act and ask
that you look at it and answer to me in writing how the
Commission is going to treat retrogression.

My second questions speaks to communities
of interest, drawing districts which both contact and
contiguous and also again in compliance with the third
section of the Voting Rights Acts.

My other question deals with racially
polarized voting patterns. I ask the Commission to
give me in the future which perpetual -- which specific
races that you looked at to identify racial polarized
voting patterns, again, mentioned in the Voting Rights
Act.

And lastly I ask that the Commission
submit to me which cases you are going to cite and
which you are going to defend this plan. In the end
it's not going to be the Commission that draws its
line. In the end it's going to be the Commission with
approval of the U.S. Department of Justice and
ultimately victory with these United States District
Courts' system that's going to draw these lines.
I wish you luck. I was in the legislature 8 years ago when we went through this bloody battle. I'm glad it's away from the legislature because it's much less polarized. But keep in mind all the Supreme Court cases, all the Federal Court cases have never nullified any provision of the Federal Voting Rights Act. They have only said you must pay more attention or less attention to them.

I hope to hear from you before the next round of meetings, and I'm sure we'll visit with you again. Thank you.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. Any other people who would like to speak?

MS. EDWARDS: My name is Carolyn Edwards. I'm president of Legal Women Voters of Cochise County. I have a question for you.

I read in the paper that Dr. Ostulov, who was one of the sponsors of the amendment of the initiative, whichever, suggested that you submit the maps you -- the lines you've currently drawn to see if they satisfy the Department of Justice. Have you given any consideration to doing that?

MR. ELDER: First of all, we shouldn't be asking questions in a public meeting, but would you...
like to be done with the public meeting? Is there anyone else who wishes to give

formal testimony. We would be happy to stay and answer questions such as this, but is there anyone who would like to be heard on formal testimony?

If not, let's close the public hearing portion. Then we will just have an informal discussion.