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MR. HALL: Ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to be with you here this evening. Again, we would like to ask those who are just coming in, we welcome you to come in and sit with us. I assume there is sufficient seating.

I would like to welcome you to the Independent Redistricting Commission meeting here in Hon Dah, Arizona. We appreciate your patience and we appreciate the opportunity to be with you.

It would be impossible for me to recognize all of the important people here, but your presence is noted and we are grateful for it.

We are here to discuss a very important matter. Before though, we need to do just a little bit of housekeeping, if we can.

Adolfo, can you make a statement, please?
(Adolfo Echeveste spoke to the audience in Spanish at this point.)

MR. HALL: Thank you. Is there anyone in the audience that did not understand what either he or I have said? How would they know?

Therefore, what we would like to do is those of you that have a copy of the agenda in front...
of you, basically, we will proceed and I will make
the introduction and Power Point Presentation and
discuss the importance of redistricting which we
then will allow public comment and we welcome your
comments.

I think it is important to note this is
a public meeting. Therefore, we, as you can see to
my right we have a stenographer taking down all of
your input and the proceedings of this meeting.
Therefore, after we proceed with the presentation
and receive public comment, we can respond to some
general questions relative to this process.

And so without further ado, we will
proceed.

As we have indicated, we are here today
with respect to this Independent Redistricting
Commission for drawing State Legislative and
Congressional district lines, pursuant to the
provisions of Proposition 106, which you know was
passed in November of last year.

The difference is that the citizens are
now asked to provide more input. We are not only
here in a short version to educate you, but our
desire is for each of you to educate us with respect
to your knowledge about your community.
Some of my fellow commissioners are in Pima County. We have been far and wide. To disclose my roots a little bit, our horses have been saddled and we have been riding hard and we have made an effort to reach the far corners of this state.

Tomorrow we will be in Flagstaff. Wednesday we will be in Apache Junction. Thursday I'll be in Prescott and there is another team simultaneously working in another area of the state as we try to reach out to each of the citizens to receive their input.

Our desire is to make this process as fair as possible in an effort to achieve results as anonymously and impatiently and as fairly as we can.

In the past some have said that redistricting has raised some confusion and even some divisiveness because there are those that have felt there are power partisan, power employment, incumbent protection and racial discrimination. This term that has been coined has been gerrymandering, depending on your particular preferential phraseology or statement with respect to this.

In 1811 there was a gentleman who was the Federalist governor of Massachusetts by the name of...
Elbridge Gerry who was accused of drawing district lines in an effort to protect his own interests. The Boston Globe in 1811 drew the district in the shape of a salamander, and thrust the term was born, gerrymander, named after him.

I hope you will forgive me for referring to it as gerrymander. Is that all right with you?

Here are some of the examples of how this works. There is a dispersal of minority power voters called dilution and is in violation of federal law.

There is an example on the right. They have a concentration of minorities which is a term called packing which is also not allowed.

Here are a couple of more examples of an effort to gerrymander to obtain a political result. On the left-hand side they have created an ethic district to help republicans, and on the right-hand side they are preserving a white democratic incumbent by diluting the Hispanic population.

In this example, the voters want to clean up the State's redistricting process and thus we have proposition 106. We are the ones that are responsible for the process. This is subsequent to the census of the year 2000.

There are five members of this
commission. The Chairman of our commission is a registered independent by the name of Steven Lynn. The Vice Chairman is Andrea Minkoff, a business woman in Maricopa County. She lives in Phoenix. She is a registered Democrat.

Daniel Elder is an architectural designer in Pima County. He is a registered Republican. I am Joshua Hall. I live in St. Johns. My office here is Premier Title in Pinetop, Show Low and Snowflake. James R. Huntwork is an attorney and he is a registered Republican. I am a Democrat.

Pursuant to the proposition and to Democrats and Republicans, the chair is a registered Independent in an effort to obtain independence. I might also add that to even qualify to apply for this process, that none of us could have been political candidates or lobbyists or held political office for a period of time, and in addition, not to hold political office three years subsequent to our resignation or our termination as a member of this commission.

I think it is also important to note that the commissioners are receiving zero pay for this opportunity and maybe more than one has suffered buyers remorse on more than one occasion. In reality, in sincerity, I can assure you after having met each of these commissioners,
each desires, each of us, to obtain fairness, independence and impartiality.

Proposition 106 states, and we realize that now we must comply with that law, and any challenge, not only challenges from the federal but for the first time in the history of the state, we also could receive a challenge by reason of violation of state law.

Therefore, it is imperative we follow strictly the language, and our counsel is ensuring that we do so, but it says that we shall establish congressional and legislative districts. The commencement of the mapping process for both the congressional and legislative districts shall be the creation of districts of equal population in a grid-like pattern across the state.

Subsequent to that initial phase then, the following considerations must be made to respect to the redistricting process.

The districts shall comply with the United States Voting Rights Act.

Congressional districts shall have equal population to the extent practicable, and state legislative districts shall have equal population to the extent practicable.

Districts shall be geographically compact
and contiguous to the extent practicable.

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

To the extent practicable, district lines shall use visible geographic features, city, town and county boundaries, and undivided census tracts.

To the extent practicable, competitive districts should be favored where to do so would create no significant detriment of the other goals.

It is important also to note pursuant to the language of proposition 106, the party registration and voting history data shall be excluded from the initial phase of the mapping process, but may be used to test maps for compliance with the above goals.

The places of residence, and I would like to emphasize this phase as we invite you to have an opportunity to provide public comment to each of us is that the places of residence of incumbents or candidates shall not be identified or considered.

We ask in your comments that you not make any attempt to identify as part of this record where any incumbent or incoming candidate is located or where they reside.

We have had that try to occur, and our
attorney promptly stopped it.

The census indicates changing population based upon the census of 2000. There are some that are of the opinion that census does not accurately reflect the community of interest. We don't have any say with respect to those matters or numbers. All we can do is simply utilize the numbers provided to us by the census process.

If you'll notice, our state has grown 40 percent over the last ten years. Maricopa County right now is approximately three million, which notice the state in 1990 was only two point six. Significant growth, and we can see primarily where that growth occurred.

There are five point one million people in the state. I think Phoenix now is the sixth largest city in the nation.

Here is a sample of county growth. If you notice, Yavapai grew 65.5 percent. Mohave had 65.8.

As I have indicated, in Maricopa County there are now over three million people. Our task, therefore, is to develop the district in a grid-like pattern, which this district has already committed, based solely on the consideration of equal population.

Here are a couple of example grids.
Since we have done the grid, I'm going to move these examples rather rapidly since the relevance is minimal.

As you recall the Arizona Republic cited some examples of possible equal population grids. Here is one that was cited that was proposed by a gentleman by the name of Mark Asterlof who was one of the original drafters and provided language for this process.

The Republic cited a 5-2-1 and then cited significant problems with or disadvantages with that particular plan.

There was the Urban Power Plan that was provided. Major drawbacks were also cited, specifically that it suppressed minority representation.

There was the Minority Power Plan and there were others that cited disadvantages with respect to that plan.

Again, we have already developed an equal population grid, which I think all of you have before you, and I think it is important to note that this grid is merely a starting point so that we properly comply with the terms of this proposition.

The second step then is to hold public hearings, which we are here today for. The Independent Redistricting Commission shall advertise
draft map comments to these hearings of congressional and the legislative districts to the public for comment, which comment shall be taken for at least 30 days. Either or both bodies may act within this period to make recommendations to the Independent Redistricting Commission by memorial or by minority report which recommendation shall be considered by the Redistricting Commission.

The Independent Redistricting Commission shall then establish final district boundaries. So in essence, the process is like this. We have created an equal population grid as a starting point. We are holding public hearings, meetings, so we can receive your input via this form that we will discuss in more detail in just a minute, and then we are going to prepare draft maps based upon input from all representatives of the state.

Those draft maps then will be placed again for review as stated in the proposition for at least 30 days. Subsequent, to the addition in that process, we'll also have a second round of public hearings, receive additional input, and then we then will do a final map which we will prepare then to submit to the Department of Justice.

This citizen input form you should have
before you, and it is imperative and critical that
you provide information to us so that we know what
your desires are with respect to the community of
interest we are now in.

The first line asks for specific
information about you. Then your major concerns
that you may have with respect to this process.
What boundary lines you would like to see used in
your area. What areas, groups, or neighborhoods do
you think should absolutely not be divided by new
district boundaries. What information would you
like us to take into account in drawing boundary
lines. Please rank order all that you think apply,
one being the most important, and etc.

For example, keeping the community intact
or bringing particular groups together, using a
manmade or natural boundary, drawing congressional
and legislative districts that include whole cities
or as much of a city as equal population permits,
using local government boundaries when drawing
congressional and legislative district lines,
keeping census tracts from being split, using
freeways and major transportation routes for
district boundaries wherever possible, drawing
compact and contiguous shapes for districts.

If you could please complete these, in
addition to whatever comment you may have, and
provide those to us, I might also add, you can mail input to us, and we have a web site at WWWAZREDISTRICTING.ORG.

The maps that you have are provided on the Web site. In addition, there is frequently asked questions there and you can also learn about each of the commissioners and you can provide input via this form over the Web site. We welcome you and invite you to do that.

These kits that you have, if you need any additional ones, our consultant or staff would be happy to help you.

In review, the criteria for the maps we must comply with are mandated by the federal Constitution and the Voting Rights Act and we must ensure that they are equal in population of the one and five million. For the Legislature, the magic number is approximately 171,000. From a congressional standpoint, that number is 641,329.

For rural Arizona, their initial challenge is to have sufficient population to ensure that we have a legislative or congressional district.

For proposition 106, the requirements, then, as stated earlier, also must be complied with. One is considering communities of interest, and there are several represented here today.
As I have indicated, we have already done the grid and I would like to talk a little bit about the development of that grid, which essentially is the starting point for this process.

The commission's desire and felt that the best intent was to do so in a most arbitrary and impartial fashion. Therefore, we wanted to utilize a basic building block.

For those of us that deal with legal descriptions relatively regularly, the township is a fundamental building block throughout the state of Arizona. All of the townships start at the point of the Gila-Salt River Basin Meridian and that point then is the place for the geographical survey for the whole state has occurred.

Our desire then was to utilize these townships as building blocks in an effort to create an equal population grid that could do nothing but consider population.

Therefore, we aggregated townships and one township, as you know, is how many sections? Thirty-six sections. Six square miles, isn't it? And there we aggregate townships in a township grid, and from there we aggregate them into super township grids.

I think it is important to note that in connection with the grid, though, you must consider...
population which is represented by census tracts, and census tracts are not square like township grids. Therefore, the question could be asked, looking at the map before me, how in the world did you ever use square boxes and come up with these shapes, because you have to take into account the census tracts which is the basis for accounting for population and then develop rules in an effort to be fair in the aggregation process.

The commission wanted to be as fair and arbitrary as possible. Of the four quadrants which are indicated by a vertical line and horizontal line through that point, we then drew out of a hat which quadrant would be the best place, and we started in the northwest quadrant by simply the draw.

And then we also decided or wanted to make a decision whether we wanted to be clockwise or counter-clockwise and we flipped a coin and the determination was made that we should start in the counter-clockwise pattern in the northwest as represented by the starting point of the townships.

The consultant then, via software and developing rules as they have encountered problems, aggregated the townships, utilizing the overlay of the census geography in an effort to create equal population, legislature and congressional grid.
That is the map that you have had an opportunity to see.

In review, then, our schedule is public hearings, develop a plan, more public hearings, do a final plan, and submit that final plan to the department of Justice.

I think it is important to note, folks, that one of the key factors and one of the reasons that we are required to have pre-clearance by the Department of Justice is because we are a section five State, meaning that specifically, minority interests and specifically reference Hispanic and Native American interests, have not been diluted nor have they been disenfranchised by whatever plan is proposed.

It is critical that we do all that we can via this process and whatever means necessary to ensure that the minority interests of our great state are fairly represented.

That is in case you missed the cue, I would like now, then, if I can, to turn the meeting over for public comment.

I have before me a number of speaker slips, and for those of you who may want to be provided a speaker slip, Amy Rezzonico will provide that to you. We would like to have that before us. Amy, if you could come up for just a minute and
Marion, could you come up? Before I turn the meeting over to public comments, I would like to introduce you to the representatives of our staff who are here.

Marion who is walking is with National Demographics who is our hired consultant working with Dr. Heslop.

Dr. Heslop is our consultant in helping to develop and design these maps.

Amy Rezzonico is our Public Information Officer, and Adolfo Echeveste is our Public Outreach Coordinator in an effort to do so.

And certainly last, but not least, is Jose Rivera is our legal counsel, former U.S. Attorney, and we are grateful to have you here.

If there is anyone else here who wishes to speak, you need to fill out a speaker slip. I'm going to call them out arbitrarily.

We welcome your input, but in the interest of time, we ask that you limit your time to two or three minutes, and then we'll take time to hopefully answer any questions that you have.

I'm going to place this microphone at the podium here.

ADOLFO: If anybody else has a form just hold your hand up with it and I'll pick it up.
MR. HALL: David Osterfeld. When you come up, Mr. Osterfeld, if you could please spell your last name and who you represent for the benefit of the reporter.

MR. OSTERFELD: Good evening. My name is David M. last name O-s-t-e-r-f-e-l-d. I'm Assistant Tribal attorney for the White Mountain Apache Tribe, and I'm appearing on behalf of Chairman Dallas Massey, Sr., White Mountain Apache Tribe, to provide comments to the commission, and basically express his gratitude for coming and hearing comments of the community.

Honorable Commissioner Hall and members of the Arizona Redistricting Commission. Thank you for providing my nation the opportunity to comment at one of your many public hearings for discussion of the vitally important work you are doing on behalf of every Arizona citizen to fairly draw the legislative districts across Arizona.

As you know, our current congressional representative has consistently advocated for our interests, providing us a voice we feel comfortable with at this time. This point brings to light a central and valid reason for our concern about the redistricting efforts, the fact that our representatives may change, and that they may focus their efforts on non-Indian communities which may
I, along with the Tribal Council, the Tribe's Legal Department and my advisors have reviewed some of the proposed redistricting proposal maps which are identical to those presented to all in attendance tonight, and we have great concerns with them.

For example, in all of the proposed maps made available to the public to this date, the Fort Apache Indian Reservation is cut into separate districts, which will fail to unify our voice as a people to the United States Congress and will split our efforts in the Arizona House and Senate.

We believe that we should be kept in one voting district for both federal and state legislative districts to ensure our unified voice is heard and acknowledged.

Perhaps more important, though, is that if the Fort Apache Indian Reservation is split into two or more legislative districts, the cultural impact of legislation on our people and our voice will be stifled by the concerns of non-Indian communities, creating a situation where our interests may be placed at a lower priority than other communities which do not suffer the same economic and social problems as we.
These timely conditions include our 60 percent unemployment rate, our 1,000 plus waiting list for housing, our great need for increased infrastructure, our vital need for continued funding of Human Resource and Social Service provisions to our people, and our many other needs essential to meet the vital building blocks of any community.

If our Reservation is split into more than one legislative district, our legislators will not receive an accurate picture of the conditions on the Reservation. Our average income, our high unemployment rates and many other important facts which help sustain federal and state funding resources for improving the Reservation will be skewed in a way which likely will harm our future success in improving the lives of our tribal members.

We are not alone in our request that you compose new districts which fully contain the exterior boundaries of Indian communities. All of Arizona’s Indian communities want to ensure a strong Indian voice and representation in our federal and state legislative bodies.

We believe that uniting the voice of as
many Indian nations across Arizona through their elected representatives will help protect the core values and culture unique to our communities and our people.

It is without question that Indian culture and tradition is uniquely different from non-Indian culture, and sometimes our interests compete with those of non-Indians simply because of our cultural differences.

While we have and always will seek to form friendships and lasting bonds with neighbors in non-Indian communities, our cultural and traditional beliefs often transform what may seem like normal, universal issues for all communities into special needs for our people in ways for which non-Indian cultures perhaps would not advocate or do not understand.

It is for this reason that we advocate for legislative districts for both federal and state representation to include, as exclusively as possible, as many Indian nations as reasonable in this and surrounding areas.

As an example, we advocate for a legislative district that include the Navajo Nation, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the White Mountain
Apache Tribe and the Gila River Indian Reservation, if possible.

That concludes the remarks of Chairman Dallas Massey.

I would like to read a resolution of the Tribal Council, White Mountain Apache Tribe. This is resolution number 06-2001-167 and it reads:

"Resolution of the White Mountain Apache Tribe of the Fort Apache Indian Reservation.

WHEREAS, the State of Arizona is gaining two congressional districts, due to population growth within the State, and for that reason, the congressional district boundaries are being redrawn; and

WHEREAS, the Fort Apache Indian Reservation is within the Sixth Congressional District and represented by the Honorable J.D. Hayworth; and

WHEREAS, it is anticipated that the areas of northern and eastern Arizona will be incorporated into a new district, composed primarily of rural areas and Native American lands; and

WHEREAS, the White Mountain Apache Tribe, through its elected Council, expects to see that the new district will fully comport with federal
election law standards and will effectively represent the rural and particularly Native American interests in the region; and

WHEREAS, the Tribal Council expects that the new districts will unify rather than divide Native American interests, as district boundaries have done in the past; and

WHEREAS, the Tribal Council is advised that the preliminary proposals for the new congressional districts in northern and eastern Arizona will divide the Tribe's lands into two separate voting districts, and similarly sever the lands of other Indian tribes; and

WHEREAS, these proposed boundaries would perpetuate division among and within Indian tribes and seriously compromise the White Mountain Apache Tribe's ability to secure necessary federal representation and support for its Tribal members and governmental programs; and

WHEREAS, the many decades of underfunded and inadequate federal programs for tribal communities should be addressed through more responsive congressional districts which respect and are responsive to the geographic integrity of tribal governments.

BE IT RESOLVED by the Tribal Council of
the White Mountain Apache Tribe that it hereby
supports the development of congressional districts
in Arizona which will represent the character and
needs of Arizona's rural areas, and in particular,
the needs of the Indian tribes in eastern and
northern Arizona, so that tribal concerns and voting
power are unified rather than fragmented, for the
purpose of assuring better representation and
effective legislation in congressional matters.

BE IF FURTHER RESOLVED by the Tribal
Council of the White Mountain Apache Tribe that for
the reasons set forth above, it hereby opposes in
the strongest terms the creation of congressional
boundaries which would divide or sever any portion
of the lands of the Fort Apache Indian Reservation
of the White Mountain Apache Tribe, for that reason,
the preliminary congressional district boundaries be
modified to respect and uphold the geographic
integrity of tribal governments."

This resolution was passed on June 12,
2001 by a vote of five for and zero against.

Thank you.

MR. HALL: Thank you. Chuck Haynie. Did
I pronounce that correctly?
here and for hearing our comments here this evening.

It is my opinion that this district should be left intact with the following exceptions: that we pick up all of Gila County. This would pick up Pine, Strawberry and Gila County. We need to pick up all of Pinal County. This would pick up Safford and part of Thatcher, all of Greenlee County, which would involve areas such as Morenci and Clifton and Greenlee County.

We would give up Pinal County which probably has enough population to be its own district. I feel that this comes close, within 700, probably, of the 191,000, whatever it is, and the population requirement for this district.

It is also my concern that the voice of rural and northeast Arizona not be diluted. I am very comfortable with our representation of this meeting and that is my comment. Thank you.

MR. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Haynie. I appreciate that. David Brown.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Good evening, and

I appreciate the members of the commission for holding these hearings throughout the state and staff for coming and participating.

My name is David Brown, spelling is
regular. I am chairman of Apache County Board of
Supervisors. I am also a local attorney. I
practice law with two brothers, a cousin and another
associate here in the White Mountains. I have
offices in Pinetop, St. Johns, Eager and Snowflake.
I'm married, have six children and I have lived in
St. Johns all of my life.

My district is one of the largest
supervisory districts in the state of Arizona. I
represent Window Rock, St. Michaels and everything
to the south clear to Alpine.

We have some other Apache County folks
here this evening, including one elected official,
Sue Hall, and several employees of Apache County.
We appreciate being here and sharing our concerns.

Let me just also say that in my practice,
I represent folks in water areas and water
litigation, and I have represented the farmers in
the Duncan, Safford, Thatcher and Fort Thomas area,
and I also have represented the towns and cities of
Winslow, Holbrook, Snowflake, Taylor,
Pinetop-Lakeside, Show Low, Eager and Springerville,
so I have a pretty good idea of what the north
eastern quadrant of the state of Arizona is about
and what the citizens are interested in, so I come
with that background and that information.

Let me speak to the legislative district
first. We have been -- we, Apache County has been a
member of Eastern Arizona County, EACO, it is fondly
referred to, and we were formed -- that organization
was formed many years ago to address issues of jobs
and industry which included farming, mining, what
there was of the timber industry and many other
concerns that affect today those five counties
equally and did not concern most other areas of the
state.

It has been a strong organization that
has worked well for many, many years. We have
looked at the -- I don't speak for all of the
members of EACO. I speak only for my district and
Apache County, but I think that you'll hear
throughout the evening and as you go to other
hearings in other counties, you'll hear somewhat the
same theme is that we desire a legislative district
that keeps us intact and keeps us whole, which is
not too far from what the previous gentleman
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splitting of the San Carlos Apache Tribe because they would be included in this district. And we have for many years found many issues of mutual concern before the legislature with both the White Mountain Apache Tribe and the San Carlos Apache Tribe.

The community of interest, I mentioned a few of them, but as they come together, we are one of the few areas of the state that is not worried about too much growth. We are in need of economic development. That is one of the keys that draws us together is all of the circumstances that we talked about usually comes down to the fact we don't have enough jobs and so we are looking at timber, mining, farming, ranching, our forest's health -- we don't want to burn it all down -- recreation and water is one of the greatest challenges right now to eastern Arizona because of the various adjudications and litigation going on.

We have cultural similarities. We have a pioneer heritage. We have an interest in how open spaces are maintained. We have transportation issues that don't effect anywhere else in the state. We have narrow, curving Salt River Canyon type roads. We are interested in houses being developed and maintained.

So, as far as the legislative district
goes, if you take that area of southern Apache County, southern Navajo County and the other three counties in the Eastern Arizona County Organization, then you hit the target of 171,000 or close there to.

As a supervisor from Apache County, we enjoy the relationship that we have with two senators representing Apache County, one from the north half and one from the south half. It has been a very healthy relationship. We appreciate that opportunity and would like to continue that relationship as it addresses the legislative and congressional districts.

If you take the rural population in the state which is approaches almost 1.3 million and divide that into the number, the 641,000, that is required for a congressional district, you then have two districts, two rural districts.

So our proposal is that the state be carved, if you will, into two rural districts, and then work the urban interests from there. But the eastern half of the state, with some adjustment, could have rural congressional districts and so could essentially the western half of the state, and still keep Indian tribes intact. Not split up the San Carlos Apaches and not split up the White
Mr. Hall: Thank you, Mr. Brown. Pursuant to recommendation of my counsel, we need to remind you that current reference to current representation is another caution in that area.

Frank Thorwald. How did I do?

Mr. Thorwald: You did pretty good. Frank Thorwald, T-h-o-r-w-a-l-d. I'm the President of GAFRA which is a Governmental Alliance For Rural Arizona, and we represent about -- between half and three quarters of the rural areas of the state. And I have been there. We go there, yes. And we have represented about three quarters, half to three
quarters of rural Arizona.

In the last five years we have known that there is a great deal of difference between the needs of rural Arizona and the major metropolitan areas, and I must say I agree strongly with the last two speakers.

The way the district needs to be drawn is in a way that rural Arizona will get the kind of representation it needs, because it is so different than the needs of metropolitan areas, and I think that needs to be a primary consideration that you need to look at, because it is very difficult when you have two masters, one a metropolitan area and one a rural area and you have to represent them adequately. That is all that I have to say. Thank you.

MR. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Thorwald. Mr. Flake.

MR. FLAKE: Thanks for the opportunity of expressing some feelings that I have on redistricting, and I want to commend the Redistricting Commission and recognize a little bit of the great job that you have to do.

My biggest concern is that an endangered species be respected and that endangered species is the citizens of rural Arizona. That is the basis of
the thought that I want to say.

We are fast becoming a minority group in
this state, along with other minority groups is the
people from rural Arizona. And as you stated at the
conclusion of this presentation, some thoughts need
to be put into not diluting minority groups. Rural
Arizona is a minority group and I hope that is taken
into strong consideration and it is getting more and
more as time goes on.

Five years ago Maricopa County was just
a little over 56 percent of the state of Arizona.
When we redistrict it -- when we did the census a
year ago, Maricopa County constituted almost 60
percent of the state. Almost every area of the
state is growing, but Maricopa County and Pima
County are growing faster than the others, and so if
we are not careful, all representation is going to
come from that area too.

So my concern is that you give a voice
to an endangered species and minority group and that
is the people in rural Arizona. Thank you.

MR. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Flake. Marker
Platt.

MR. PLATT: I'm Marker Platt, P-l-a-t-t. I
am a resident of Apache County. I was born and
raised in St. Johns. Been there all of my life with
the exception of time away for school, military
service and employment.

I would like to just say that I concur with what has been said by the previous three speakers in congratulating you on your efforts thus far, but more specifically, the issues of community interests and so forth with the current redistricting maps.

I would like to just address very quickly some circumstance that has already been mentioned with the congressional map, just to include perhaps some things not thought of.

Looking at the map, if you were to include Mohave County, Yavapai County, Coconino County, Gila County, Navajo County and Apache Counties, and the south -- I'm sorry. And the eastern portion of Pinal County which pertains to the San Carlos Indian Reservation, Graham County and Greenlee Counties, that would comprise the population of around 699,000. Those counties all share similar communities of interest and economics as well as social issues.

If you were to include La Paz County, Yuma County, the western portions of Pinal County, Santa Cruz County and Cochise County as a second congressional district, you would also have close to 690,000 if you included some of the communities in...
western Phoenix, Avondale, Litchfield Park and so forth.

The reason for that is what has been stated is representation for rural Arizona, which comprises about 1.2 million. The current congressional redistricting map, including Tucson, into that, in essence would give that area a good congressional seat by themselves. It would disregard the community of interest for rural Arizona.

Again, I thank you for your time and for your efforts and appreciate the opportunity to express my views.

MR. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Platt. Mr. Mike Humphrey.

MR. HUMPHREY: My name is Mike Humphrey. I'm a resident of Apache County. I live in the little town of Vernon. I kind of have a foot in most camps here tonight.

I work for the White Mountain Apache Tribe. I'm a comptroller of the Fort Apache Timber Company, and up to this point coming tonight, I did not really know what the position of the tribe was. However, I have to agree with those comments made by David Osterfeld on behalf of the Chairman of the Tribe. It just does not make any sense to split up the tribe into these un-unified areas.
If there is anything, any entity that has more of a community of interest, it is the tribes and the reservations of our counties, and so I would fully support that.

And then on the other side, I completely support David Brown's comments and his suggestions about the make up of the districts to include the southern part of Navajo and Apache counties and the others that he mentioned.

We have in the rural part of Arizona, we have specific community interests also. And so I would you to take those interests in things into consideration. Thank you.

MR. HALL: Thank you. Mr. Jack Brown.

MR. BROWN: Jack Brown. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, people who are here with the commission. I think that you have a tough job, but I'm sure that you are off to a good start, working hard at it.

I am an incumbent senator. I'm not going to admit where I live. I just have been in legislature a long time. I've been through three of these redistrictings and they are all tough. We have had some real out wars and some real gerrymandering. I may have even participated in some of it.

Your job is a hard one, but I think that
the guidelines that the people gave us, we need to try to do the best we can.

I could serve two more years after my term ends this time, but I don't know if I'll serve or not. I'm not very concerned what district I fall into. I'm ready to quit and hang up the spurs and let somebody else do the job.

But I do think that we do need to be careful and try to keep the integrity of rural counties and rural areas of our state as strong as we can make them. I think most people in Maricopa County think that, too. They realize that they are growing faster than we are, and they need to bend over backwards to help us to keep the people that we have and the strengths that we have.

They have got to have some place to come in the summertime, you know. We have got to keep our highways and everything going good so they come. I think that the Maricopa County area is a strong example of what can happen when you work together, and I would hope that we would keep basically the same boundaries for districts for the state legislative districts to keep those boundaries intact if we possibly can.

I think we can make it so we keep the San Carlos and Apache Tribes together. I don't think there is any reason to divide those at all, and I
think on the congressional district, I think that we
need to make it so we put as many native Americans
into one big district as we can, and then we would
have to see where we have similar people to make

TAYLOR REPORTING (520) 367-5810
HONDAH PUBLIC HEARING 6-18-2001

that be a good, solid district, and I think that can
be done.

In closing, let me say, do all you can to
make it so that rural Arizona is well represented
and we don't get fractured so bad that our
representation is even weaker than it is now. Thank
you.

MR. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Brown. Mr.
Lewis Tenney.

MR. TENNEY: My name is Lewis Tenney,
T-e-n-n-e-y. I appreciate the opportunity to make a
few comments this evening.

I serve as a Supervisor here in Navajo
County, and this year I'm serving also as President
of the County Supervisor Association of Arizona
which represents all 15 counties in legislative
issues and matters. So I have had the privilege of
being involved over the last few years in
legislative circumstances. I have spent a lot of
time at the State Legislature, and I have dealt with
large counties and small counties and seen the
circumstances that they each have. I would
encourage you to look at county boundaries as much as possible.

I think your legislative ability and mandate from the public allows you to do some things that I would suggest you consider.

There are voices that this commission needs to listen to. I know they are out there, but I think, basically, they fall under rural counties, urban counties, and Native American Reservations.

I think you'll see under the present legislative issues that minorities, other minorities within this state have received a loud voice in congress as well as within the state, and my comments to protect rural Arizona would be the same as many of the suggestions that you have been given tonight, that our issues here in rural Arizona are different than the issues that are faced by Maricopa County and Pima County, the two largest counties within the state and other mid-sized counties.

For us to protect our way of life, the rural way of life, the customs and cultures that mean a lot to us and have meant a lot to those that have moved to our area. We need to have a voice and so some of the suggestions that have been presented today, I could buy off on several of them I think several of them that have been presented to you would allow you to keep rural counties together and
One of the things that I don't want to see is regression with the Native Americans. I think this allows you to put Native American tribes together in a district. They have specific issues as wards of the Federal Government, challenges, their culture that they are trying to maintain, their sovereignty that they are trying to maintain needs specific attention in congress. And so they need to have a voice there.

They need to get that voice from their own people, and I think that if you combine them together in a district, you have enabled that to happen.

I would plead with you not to tie rural Arizona to urban areas with larger votes that dilute us from rural Arizona any voice at all. Thank you very much.

MR. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Tenney.

B.C. Irwin.

MR. WATSON: I think that he left.

MR. HALL: William Furrow

MR. FURROW Pass. No comment.

MR. HALL: Gerry Whipple or is it Gary?

MR. WHIPPLE: Based on how you said my name, I was going to pass if you said it correctly.
Since you did not --

MR. HALL: I did that on purpose.

MR. WHIPPLE: My name is Gerry Whipple. G-e-r-r-y and I think that you can get Whipple okay. Which I found kind of interesting that governor Gerry who kind of began that term coined it and we have all changed it to gerrymandering, but I spelled it correctly and pronounced it correctly. I told Steve Lynn when we made this agreement, I appreciated him

Clarifying what my neighbors said, I think that the comments said here today I would just kind of echo those comments and some of those I would emphasize in particular representing towns and cities is that we give strong consideration in not splitting up any of our strong cities.

The Casa Grande area, I know Casa Grande is split up into two or three different districts. I know that the concern that some have in particular is this grid has been presented along county lines. We have a community of Sedona in Coconino County and Yavapai County, so if we follow that, it would be a concern.

I think what I would strongly emphasize is that they not look at dividing cities, towns in that
area and strongly keep the communities together.

I agree with comments that were said earlier concerning Native American Tribes, that there needs to be -- instead of splitting up, they need to be put together.

I think Mr. Dave Brown indicated the importance of our area as far as the many communities we have in northeastern Arizona. I think it is important that we be together and stay together because of those reasons so that we do have representation and I appreciate this opportunity.

Thank you.

MR. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Whipple.

MR. PALMER: Thank you very much for hearing me. My name is Richard J. Palmer, Sr., P-a-l-m-e-r. I'm a member of the White Mountain Apache Tribe. I'm a member of the White Mountain Apache Tribe. I concur with what our chairman has presented tonight through David Osterfeld, Tribal Attorney.

Listening to some of the speakers talk right now, several things have come up in front of me. "The best we can", that is something that
applies, but we have never been the beneficiary of “the best we can" by breaking the tribes up. It has always been a "best we can" type of approach to looking at some of the problems that we face on the reservation.

The White Mountain Apache Tribe and other tribes, we need to experience a time when we can look at tribal issues. We are not ignorant of the other issues that rural communities face. We shop in those rural areas. We travel to those rural areas. We understand what those rural people are looking at. We are neighbors with them and we have a lot of friends in those areas, too.

The funding sources that we receive in reservations, it always comes at the expenses of -- we are getting tailings from the larger communities and so what we have -- would like to do is we would like the commission to look at keeping those tribes and bringing them together so that we can look at and find the experience and time when we can maybe yield some. We don't want to yield it in a negative way, but looking at this tribe particularly, we have part of our tribe in Apache County, part of our tribe is in Navajo County, and then we also have part of our Tribe in Gila County.
When we go to -- when we deal with school
issues, we have to deal with school issues in that
manner and we have to look at the three areas for
schooling monies.

And so I strongly would like you guys,
this commission, these people on the commission to
look at the tribal issues and hear the tribal issues
and again, we are neighbors with those non-tribal
folks. Thank you very much.

MR. HALL: Thank you very much, Mr.
Palmer. Mr. Ben Nuvamsa. Is that the correct
pronunciation?

MR. NUVAMSA: You did quite well. My name
is Ben Nuvamsa. I am with the Bureau of Indian
Affairs. However, I'm only representing myself.
My last name is spelled N-u-v-a-m-s-a. I'm from the
Hopi Tribe. I have lived here in this area for
approximately 12 or 13 years. I currently live in
the Pinetop Lakes Country Club and I work down in
Whiteriver. I work closely with the White Mountain
Apache Tribe.

There are factors that you need to
consider and that is that tribes continue to depend
on the developing their local communities and are
major players in the area of economic development

through local communities, as some of you live in
this area are very familiar. The very facility that we are in tonight. However, they depend on State funding and federal, mostly federal funding, and I think it is important to keep them from being split up into -- well unify them into one district because they depend on their Arizona congressional delegation for support in securing federal funding.

While the tribes, some tribes are fortunate in having gaming or other enterprises, they still have responsibilities for other governmental obligations to their people, and for that they need to depend on their enterprises.

You have to consider also the increasing tribal population is about two percent annual increase in tribal populations, and because of that, there is going to be some continuing need for services.

You can see by the map that the Arizona tribes, the land base takes up sizable amounts of land in the state of Arizona. I'm not sure whether the proposal to put Indian tribes into one district is -- I guess it sounds good, but I'm not sure about the ramifications of that. But I do want to say that to not proceed with the splitting of the White Mountain Apache Tribe and San Carlos Apache Tribe into different districts.

The other thing that I want to say is
tribes can co-exist with rural communities and the metropolitan areas, as you can see with the Salt River Community. They have done very well with Scottsdale and the City of Phoenix and Fountain Hills. But there are some about 27,000 some tribes in the State of Arizona. To put them in one district, again, I'm not so sure that -- it does sound promising and we do need to have Indian tribes -- we do need to have a stronger voice in congress and legislature. Thank you for the opportunity. With that I say thank you for the opportunity.

MR. HALL: Thank you, Mr. Nuvmassa. Is there anyone else who wishes to be heard in the portion of our agenda, in the public comments?

At this time, we would entertain any questions that are relevant to the points of discussion that have occurred, and if anyone would have any questions, we would like to open it up for a little question and answer period, if anyone would have any desire, and if not, we'll adjourn.

Does anyone have any questions? Would you please identify yourself when you speak?

MR. REYNOLDS: Can I speak from here?

MR. HALL: That would be fine.

MR. REYNOLDS: I'm Lewis Reynolds from Show Low. I lived in Maricopa County for about 38
years and I have lived in Navajo County for 20 years, and we know that there is no comparison.
They can't relate to us, and we have difficulty relating to them.

But my question -- surely this will be a trial and error program. I don't think that the commission is going to be so blessed that they will come up with a solution for this the first time around.

And my question would be, is 106 unique to the whole Country? Are there other states that have propositions similar to this that we might get some input from?

MR. HALL: Excellent question. Can everyone hear me fine?

ADOLFO: You have to speak through that because of the tape.

MR. HALL: That is an excellent question. Are there other states that have an Independent Redistricting Commission? Dr. Heslop, do you know how many?

DR. HESLOP: Eleven states with commissions.

MR. HALL: Eleven states?

DR. HESLOP: With commissions that are similar to 106 are found in Montana and Iowa.

MR. HALL: Our consultant tells us those...
similar in other states are Montana and Iowa.

Let me just say specifically, and he can correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe that we are the only one that has language that initiates this process via the initial equal population grid.

This is a very unique and rather perplexing proposal that we have had to address starting with this grid that you folks have seen and then attempting to proceed from that fashion.

Thank you for the question.

MR. RIVERA: Also incumbency.

MR. HALL: The other issue is the issue of non-consideration of incumbency is also unique to proposition 106.

MR. PERU: I'm William Peru and I'll put my question in the form that it is. How in the world is the commission going to take an equal population and translate that into an equal voting population, i.e. those over 18?

MR. HALL: I love it when you ask questions I can ask my attorney.

MR. RIVERA: We look at God and if God shines down the light -- No. The only requirement is equal population under 106 and is the only thing that you look at. They are not required under 106 to look at equal voting population.
There are some adjustments that you might make under section five, the Voting Rights Act, which terms of retrogression may look in terms of who votes and who does not vote and the manner in which they vote to see whether or not there is retrogression toward minorities, Native American voters, but for all intense and purposes, you are looking at equal population.

MR. GREGG: My name is Walter Gregg. I live in Vernon. I'm retired. I'm a World War II Veteran, and I'm wondering why there was a translation of only Latino or Mexican or Spanish for the general information sheet? I don't think that they are any more important than any other minority group in our state here, and if they don't have translation for all of the other minorities, maybe they shouldn't have that for them either.

MR. HALL: Thank you for the question.
requires us to make sure that we look into that, and
I'm sorry if we gave the impression it was only for
Hispanics.

It is for any minority that has a second
language. There are arrangements for Native
Americans throughout the place, throughout all of
these hearings that we are going through, or anybody
that makes requests ahead of time.

Just like a disability, we can also make
arrangements for a disability. If we gave that
impression that we are speaking to Hispanics, we
apologize for that. It is not just Hispanics.

MR. HALL: Any other questions, please?

MS. DODD: Hi. My name is Dorothy Dodd.
I am an interested citizen with no axe to grind,
and my question is: Can you put all of the Indian
reservations in one district without packing?

MR. HALL: As you noted in the provisions
that were stated in the presentation that I made,
there are a couple requirements. One was
continuity. And just taking specifically that
particular requirement, I maybe able to show this up
on the screen. But if you look at it, we have
reservations that go clear over by -- there is a
reservation clear over by Yuma, the Colorado River
Reservation and the Navajos are kind of at opposite
ends of the state.

There are several reservations in the southern portion and some clear up in the northwest portion of the state.

With respect simply to that specific requirement, geographically, it is an extreme challenge it would be to draw corridors, if you will, to accommodate all 21 reservations that are located throughout the state of Arizona.

Did you have anything more to add to that?

MR. RIVERA: Yes. Yours is a really interesting question that could probably be asked in a lot of law schools. There is a fine line, if you notice and maybe Commissioner Hall, if you could, he could show you that one between packing and cracking at the very beginning of the power points. Let's don't do it.

Then Arizona is what is called a section five state, and what that means, it is a section two out of section five. Section two does not concern us at this point in time, but a section five state requires that before any plan gets approved by the commission here and before it goes into effect, it has to be what is called pre-cleared by the United States Department of Justice.

When it goes back, there is a hole bunch
of legal terms and I'm trying to -- they look back to see whether there is retrogression. Retrogression means that they look at Native Americans and Hispanics because those are the two that qualified a long time ago, and you look at those two sections and see whether the new plan that the commission will come out with this time has effected those two groups of people's ability to continue to have a choice in terms of who they are representing, not that they have to elect someone of their choice, but whether or not they are better off or worse off than in 1990.

If they are worse off than 1990, they look at it as an intent, in effect, and that is retrogression and they won't allow that to be passed.

On the other hand, the other aspects of it, it is not just in question. It is if you go too far the other way, and you put too many minorities in one district, and you have effectively dis-allowed them from-- like, take the Native Americans, the two congressional districts. If you put -- there is a fine line where you might have -- Native Americans might be able to effect the election of two legislative districts, but if you put too many of them in one legislative district
which looks like you are helping the minorities, you are probably diluting their vote because you are packing. You are putting too many and you are diluting their vote.

But if you separate them too much and they don't have an effect on either one of them then it is what Commissioner Hall says you are cracking and not allowing them to have the same voice they had the last time.

It is a real fine line and luckily all I have to do is give advice. They are the ones that have to make the decision. It is a fine line between those two concepts, but your question is really an excellent question.

I teach at the law school. I guarantee that is going to be one of the questions I'm going to ask of my law students next semester is how you can do that in terms of if you put all of them in one district, what is the percent that you can put in to be effective, and the gentleman talking earlier in terms of voting, that is one of the things that you look at, because when you look at them you look at minorities and Hispanics and Native Americans, how they voted in the past to see whether they are having an effect or not having an effect. That is when you can look at voting age population.
I'm sorry for such a long answer, but it is really an excellent question.

Mr. Hall: We don't know of any attorney that can be brief. I'm kidding.

Any other questions, please? Thank you.

Mr. Vaughn: Given the past history of Arizona here in the last 10 or 15 years, and the problems that we have had with the federal government, it is obviously very key that whatever plan you come up with is acceptable to them in the final draft.

What is your target date for when you expect to present a plan to them?

Mr. Hall: What is your name, sir?

Mr. Vaughn: George Vaughn.

Mr. Hall: Once we submit a plan -- Let's kind of start backwards. Clean election says what, January or December they start taking $5.00 donations?

Mr. Rivera: January.

Mr. Hall: So if you start with that date for candidates to know when they can start taking collections from whatever people in whatever district they want to run in, and you move backwards, then that is kind of our -- hopefully by
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the end of the year we are completed.

Once we submit a plan to the Department of Justice, they have 60 days to respond and provide pre-clearance for that.

If on any plan that we submit they say, you know, what? We don't like this particular page and they kick it back, the clock starts over again.

MR. RIVERA: No, it does not start over.

It stops for that period of time.

MR. HALL: It stops and then they say, "when you get back to us, we'll continue to make the clock continue."

So our goal is to have a final plan in to them sometime in September.

MR. VAUGHN: Of this year?

MR. HALL: Of this year. So October, November, 60 days and give us a little fudge room there and if I knock on a little wood and with minimal legal concerns, hopefully that can be the case. Hopefully that is why this schedule, of which we have been highly criticized, is aggressive, because we have gone as fast as we can through the first round of public hearings, trying to get the draft available, allow 30 days and then the second round of public hearings, and you folks who would like to have input and then have another try to get all of that done sometime in September.
Thank you for the question. Excellent question. Any other questions?

MR. GREGG: My name is Walter Gregg. It sounds to me like Arizona has no sovereignty left. The federal government tells us what to do, how to do it and when to do it. They make it their way or no way.

MR. HALL: Well, there is no question that they have tremendous authority over what is approved and it is what it is and that may be something that you want to address with your new congressman, wherever he is and whenever he runs or she runs.

MR. HUMPHREY: I'm sorry. You may have answered this before. Is there going to be a second round of public hearings that are going to be coming up in this? That is my --

MR. HALL: Yes.

MR. HUMPHREY: The second question would be, would it be maybe possible to have one of those hearings somewhere not on the reservation, in the rural community out here, like, over in Springerville or Snowflake?

MR. HALL: The specific location of the second round of hearings, the times and locations have not been identified yet. Those comments are noted by the folks sitting here. You are more than
welcome to make comments through the internet. If you have some suggestions or requests with respect to location of public hearings, realize folks, that all of these hearings statewide are an attempt to just try and accommodate the best we could. We held a hearing in Bullhead City and there were other folks in Kingman that felt like that was too far to drive. There was certainly no pre-set attempt to slight any other folks.

Our desire is to be essentially centrally located for a variety of reasons and to encourage people to get out and participate.

For our area, this is outstanding, much better than most in much higher populated areas.

Any other questions?

There is also a meeting on the 27th in Holbrook. On that subject, if I may, let me just address the forthcoming meetings for those of you that may have friends who were unable to attend, and you would like to repeat this process again. In fact, I think -- have those been passed out? These are in your citizen's kit.

ADOLFO: They are in your citizen's kit, for those of you who are picking up one.

MR. HALL: Today, as you know, is the 18th, Monday. Tomorrow, two meetings are going to be held in Flagstaff and in Nogales. I'll be in
Flagstaff on Tuesday, Wednesday in Apache Junction and Pima County. I'll be in Prescott on Thursday and in the Phoenix Community College and Prescott will be in Yavapai Community College.
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On Monday, at Mesa Community College and Window Rock. I'll be in Window Rock. On Tuesday Estrella Mountain Community College and Safford/Thatcher, Eastern Arizona College, and I'll be at Thatcher and Safford.

On Wednesday, Holbrook and Globe and I'll be in Holbrook and other members of the commission will be in Globe. And our final meeting of the first round will be at the Glendale Community College, and those are -- and we have additional copies of these kits.

You are more than welcome to additional attendance to any and all meetings for those who fail to have been able to voice any opinions.

Any other comments or questions?

A CITIZEN: Not a question, but is it possible there will be any kind of public -- some kind of public report based on the comments that you have heard here this evening? Is that your plan?

MR. HALL: If I understand the question correctly, will the comments of this meeting be published? Was that your question?
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A CITIZEN: Your interpretation of what has been said here, what if -- we have had several people that have made some very specific points.
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1 How do we know the commission has heard them exactly? Can they have a chance to proofread their report?

MR. HALL: This lady here, I think is pretty well going to ensure -- who is a court reporter -- what has been said and what I'm saying as we speak is being transcribed word for word. We receive transcripts of the proceedings in addition to supplemental notes by consultants and counsel.

If someone wants to review and receive a copy of the transcript, all of our meetings are public. We would be more than happy. You can contact our office. Adolfo is waiting at the copy machine in an effort to provide copies.

I will tell you, having read all of these various e-mails, they are rather cumbersome.

MR. PLATT: I'll yell. Mr. Hall, I think what his question was not so much is everything being reported, but your interpretation of what has been said. We would like some feedback that you understand what we have presented so we are all on the same wavelength here.

MR. RIVERA: Mr. Platt, let me kind of walk you through the process of why we ask for all
of this feedback. I think that Commissioner Hall

has the rural aspect. There is a message that came
that we want to get rural communities here, but here
is what happens. The reason they are having this
meeting, this gentleman right here works for
National Demographic Corporation. It is their
responsibility to come up and take all of these
comments and come up with a rough draft of a map,
so that will be presented for the second hearing,
and it is, you know, that is why we are asking that
you really don't pay too much attention to the grid
because the grid was required by 106.

The map is really what is going to
happen, and the map, he has been taking copious
notes that only he can read, but the court reporter
has been taking these notes and they are going to go
back after all of these hearings and they are going
to combine all of this and look at everything that
is being said and start making out areas of
representation, of common interests, and they will
start matching those up and start putting those
together, and essentially what they hope to do is
they will come up with a match.

We'll take around the second group, the
second series and they'll come up with a match and
they will explain in terms why they reached, in the
manner that they reached the draft maps and
hopefully have been approached by the commission at
that point.

That is when you come and say that is
not what we said the first time. What we really
meant -- you have to listen to us, this and this and
that, and hopefully they will go back and state that
is occurring, two other things are occurring.

All of these things are being taken down
by the court reporter. When this goes to the
Justice Department, the lawyers have to justify why
this map not only meets section five, but it is
constitutional under 106 and everything else.

We have to respond to all of the written
stuff the Justice Department will be looking at and
the court may be looking at and there will be
responses from all of the lawyers to the commission
saying, "Well, you did not look at this one," or
"you did not look at this. This consideration you
did not take," and then Justice will come back and
ask why.

Commissioner Hall was talking about --
well, Justice may come back and ask questions. They
may look at the questions you are asking today and
say, "you did not answer that man's question."
"How did you respond to that question?"
and then we have to go back and find your question,
go back into it.

It is all public record, and then at the
very end, hopefully the very end when all of this
gets included, since this is really historic what is
happening now. It is the very first time.

NDC is going to present an outline of what
was said, the procedure that was done, and do what
is called a final report so that it will be
presented to the citizens of the state of Arizona.
But, you know, it is all public record. You can ask
for a transcript from the court reporter. The maps
are going to be coming up. Why don't I let NDC tell
you what is going to happen.

MR. HESLOP: What he has said is correct,
except that one of the preliminary steps is to
summarize these hearings, and NDC will present these
summaries, and if they are approved by the I.R.C.,
they will go on the web site, and at the same time,
NDC will try to develop Arizona units of
representation that reflect all of these questions,
all of this input. So that is the next big test.

In a couple of weeks time, we are going to
be in the business of summarizing the hearings and
presenting what we refer to as Arizona Units of Representation, and the importance of those is that they allow us to amend the grid in a way that fits the public.

MR. HALL: Thank you very much. If it was me, and I had concerns, given all that you have heard that the interpretation of what has occurred here today would be misinterpreted or misrepresented, I would provide my own summary to the commission. You are more than welcome to do so, and certainly that is welcome.

I can tell you, having read summaries of meetings thus far, I have read several reportings of meetings already that I did not attend, it was pretty clear what the flavor was and I might add that there wasn't necessarily an overwhelming similarity, but there appears to be some very standard themes and not necessarily all of those have agreed, but there are standard things presented today and I have confidence that the representation will be accurate, and if you are concerned in that respect, you are more than welcome to provide us additional information in writing which is less likely to be misinterpreted.

Any other questions, please? Okay.
Thank you very much. We appreciate the opportunity to be with you.

(Whereupon the proceedings were adjourned at 8:05 p.m.)
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