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MR. ELDER: My name is Dan Elder. I'm one of the Commissioners on the state Independent Redistricting Commission, and I wanted to introduce myself first. Some of you may have met me or seen me at one of your redistricting committee.

I would like to introduce Steve Lynn who is the Chairman of our Redistricting Commission. And he will make the presentation, and then if any of you want to speak or give us your ideas, you know, go ahead and fill out one of these. If you don't have one, don't hesitate to come up here. We do have a court reporter here. Just give your name so that he can get to you or we can get to you and say, yes, we listened. Here's what we thought. We will respond as best we can.

So with this, I will give you over to Steve Lynn, and we will go from there.

MR. LYNN: Thanks, Dan. Good evening, and thank you very much for coming this evening. I know we had some conflicts in terms of other meetings that may be going on in this and other southern Arizona communities this evening. But for those of you who are here, as we go around the state, we are making a formal presentation at the start of each of the meetings and then open it up for public comment.
So we would like to present to those of you who are here that presentation, and I guess I can first ask (speaking in Spanish).

Okay. The subject tonight is redistricting, and that is in fact the drawing of lines for both the state legislative and the congressional districts, and for the time it's under the provisions of Proposition 106.

Now, there's a very important difference between Arizona's current redistricting process and those of the past. And that difference is that the citizens play a very different and crucial role in the process.

Since Arizona became a state, redistricting was the purview of the state legislature until the passing of 106. And while states in effect puts five citizens in the place of the legislature to actually prepare the district maps for review by the public and ultimately for submission to the Department of Justice and certification.

These public hearings are part of that process and they designed to educate you about the process. But more importantly, they are designed to have you educate us, the members of the Commission as
We are going to be using these hearings to bring the redistricting process to every corner of the state. This is the end of the second week of public hearings. We will go into a third week next week, and in all, we will have had 23 meetings across the state.

We went to involve as many people as we possibly can. We've told this story before. When Maricopa County last did its redistricting, they held 11 meetings around Maricopa County, and those 11 meetings produced a total of 11 people combined.

So we are far ahead of the game, even through the turnout in this part of the state was not as we would have liked it to be and hopefully it will be more the second time around. We will be back.

We need to share with you our plans and we need to hear from you your reactions to those plans. We are determined as the Commission to make this the most fair and honest redistricting, representing the needs of the people of Arizona, all 5.13 million people in Arizona.

In the past redistricting has been a deeply divisive process. It has raised charges of dirty politics, partisan power play, incumbent
for most of those kinds of abuses is commonly pronounced Gerrymandering but correctly pronounced Gerrymandering.

The reason it should be pronounced Gerrymandering is for a Governor in the State of Massachusetts, Eldridge Gerry, who was notorious for drawing some fairly interesting-looking districts to help himself and his political cronies in Massachusetts at that time. And in 1811 the Boston Globe cartoonist depicted his districts in the following fashion. This is the characterization of a salamander, therefore, Gerrymander being the term in drawing very interesting-looking districts for political purpose. Well, to perform a Gerrymander or Gerrymander, you can actually achieve several things, and here are some examples of things that Gerrymandering will or could do. In this example on the left, this is the dispersal of a group of minority party voters, whichever party happens to be in the minority, a dispersal of those voters by dilution. That is you draw the districts lines so that each of
those groups is bisected or trisected. Small groups of
those minority voters are found in the districts, and
they have no power.

The other thing that you can do with a


minority party group to dilute their power is instead
of drawing lines through them you can actually pack
them into a single district. Note in this
representation of the four districts that are there,
only one would have any of the minority party voters by
any volume.

The same kind of thing can be done in
terms of racial Gerrymandering to achieve a political
purpose. Because certain groups tend to vote in
certain ways, you can in one instance create an ethnic
district that would be helpful to Republicans by
drawing lines a very particular way with respect to the
group of ethnic voters. Or you could in another
instance, that being on the right, the example on the
right, preserve a white Democratic incumbent by drawing
the lines differently through that group of ethnic
voters with a particular voting history.

The voters in Arizona wanted none of these
to be the case. That's why 106 was both put on the
ballot and passed. They wanted to change the process.
And when they created this process by voting for 106, they created the Independent Redistricting Commission. This Commission is now responsible for this new method of redistricting.

Let me talk a little bit about who the members of the Commission are and also talk a little bit about the method of their selection. Under Proposition 106, there is an affirmative application process. That means that each of the people who are on the Commission along with over 300 other Arizonans submitted an application to be on the Commission.

That application was sent to the Commission on Appellate Court Appointments. That commission is chaired by the Chief Justice of the Arizona Supreme Court, Justice Zlaket of Tucson. The Commission took the 311 applications and after a couple of days of deliberation produced a list of 10 Republicans, 10 Democrats, and 5 Independents.

That list of 25 was then circulated to the leadership in the Arizona House and the Senate. And in turn each of the leaders selected a representative to the Commission from that list. There was no mandate that Republicans should choose Republicans, Democrats
should chose Democrats. It happened to work out that way, but there, again, the only thing that was certain was that an Independent was going to be chosen to chair the Commission.

The first selection was made by Speaker of the House, Jim Wires. And Jim Wires chose James R. Huntwork. Now, that's the last name on the list in front of you but he was the first one chosen. He is an attorney from Phoenix. He happens to be a Republican.

The second choice was that of the minority leader in the House, Ken Chevron. Ken Chevron selected Andrea Minkoff. Sometimes Andrea goes by Andy and thereby people think that we have five men on the Commission. It is certainly not the case. Andrea, who serves of Vice Chairman of the Commission is from Phoenix. She is very active in her community in Phoenix. Very active as a volunteer, and she happens to be a Democrat.

So with the first two selections, Maricopa County had two representatives on the Commission. Maricopa County was therefore precluded from having any further representatives of the first four. Proposition 106 clearly says that no more than two representatives from any one county can serve in the first four
However, the fifth selection, the Independent, can be from any county. So there was still a possibility that three from Maricopa could serve.

The third selection was that of made by Senate President Randall Gnatt. He's a Republican from Scottsdale, and President Gnatt chose Dan Elder, who is a landscape architect and consultant from Pima County, from Tucson. So we now have the first representative on the Commission from other than Maricopa County and the third chose.

The fourth selection was Jack Brown's selection. Jack is the Democratic leader in the Senate. Now, notice I didn't say minority leader because the Senate is 15-15. So there really is no majority/minority this time around, but he's the Democratic leader in the Senate, and he selected Joshua Hall who is in the land title business in northeastern Arizona. He's from St. John's and his business is in Show Low.

Again, the first four selections, two Republicans, two Democrats, two from Maricopa County, one from Pima, and one from Apache County. Those four
individuals were sworn in, and their first responsibility was to interview the Independents who were vying for the Commission Chairmanship.

At the time the list was circulate, there were five Independents on that list. One person withdrew his name from the competition before the interviews could take place. Apparently somebody had told him how much time it was going to take and that the pay was zero. And so being a smarter fellow than the other four of us decided not to continue to have his name in the competition.

The four remaining Independents were interviewed by the Commission, and on the first ballot there was a unanimous selection. I was chosen to chair the Commission. I am from Tucson, another Pima County representative. So we have two Maricopa, two Pima, and one from Apache County. And I work for Tucson Electric Power and Hughes Source Energy Corporation as their manager of corporate communications and corporate relations.

So the Commission was selected through that process, and one of the early criticisms of the Commission was that it was not as diverse as the State of Arizona is diverse. Certainly one would have hoped,
I would have hoped, that there would have been more diversity on the Commission. That didn't turn out to be the case, but as you can see from the selection process, we the Commissioners had very little to do with that selection process. We were simply the result of that process.

And so we have tried very hard through staffing and other means to become more reflective of the state, and I think as we introduce people, you will understand that we've tried very hard to do that.

Well, Proposition 106 dictates that the first thing the Commission needed to do was to establish congressional and legislative districts through a process that would create the districts of equal population in a grid-like pattern across the state. And a couple of weeks ago we released this grid.

Now, there are several other goals that the Commission has to achieve if it is to be successful. All these are listed in the proposition. Let's go over them very briefly.

The first and foremost is that we have to comply with the Constitution, particularly one
person/one vote, which means that the equal population requirement is particularly important, and the tolerances are very small.

What it means also is that we need to comply with the Voting Rights Act and all the case law that has been made since that time. Congressional districts need to have equal population to the extent practicable. You will notice that the official census number of the State of Arizona is divisible by 8, and therefore, it is at least possible to have exactly the same number in each of the congressional districts.

The legislative districts also shall have equal population to the extent practicable. And even though there is perhaps a little more latitude in the population variance on legislative districts, we are certainly going to attempt to make them as even as possible and expect to do so.

Next, the district shall be geographically compact and contiguous, again, to the extent practicable. That means that we shouldn’t have districts that look like Governor Gerry’s salamander but rather have districts that have definable boundaries that everyone can understand and hopefully they can understand how those boundaries were selected.
District boundaries shall respect communities of interest to the extent practicable. That concept of communities of interest is a term coined by Justice Sandra Day O'Connor of the U.S. Supreme Court in a decision on a Voting Rights Act case some years ago. And although Justice O'Connor mentioned communities of interest, she declined to define communities of interest.

So we had a couple of choices. We could either assume that we knew what communities of interest were and act accordingly or we could have this kind of series of meetings asking communities to define that themselves. We have been asking the communities through the State of Arizona to tell us what they believe communities of interest are comprised of. And we will talk a little bit more about that in a minute.

Again, to the extent practicable, district lines shall use visible geographic features, mountain ranges, rivers, those kinds of things where it's appropriate, use city, town, and county boundaries, and undivided census tracts. And the reason we do that is because the census tract is the unit where we have most information about the census data and are able to make
determinations about moving trends in and out of
districts by virtue of their effect on that district.

And finally that to the extent practicable
competitive districts should be favored where to do so
would create no significant detriment to the other
goals. Meaning that when possible, if you're not
affecting one of the other goals that have already been
listed that you would create districts where no one
party is dominant, that you would have the opportunity
to have very competitive elections.

But here's where Proposition 106 differs
from previous redistricting and also from other states
where redistricting is now handed over to an
independent commission. Party registration and voting
history data shall be excluded from the initial phase
of the mapping process but may be used to test the maps

for compliance with the goals that we just talked
about. But notice this prohibition. Places of
residence of incumbents and candidates shall not be
identified or considered ever in this process.

What that means is that when we are
finished drawing 8 congressional and 30 legislative
districts, it is not only conceivable, it is quite
possible that current incumbents from two or more
districts may find themselves residents of a single district having to compete against one another. That is because this prohibition does not allow us to take that into account.

In April of 2001 we received the facts on Arizona's changing population as recorded by the census. And I would like to point out here that several communities have challenged the census data figures for their community because they feel that there was a significant under count in the census.

While we sympathize with that point of view, we are bound by the law to use only approved census information and figures. And therefore, unless or until it comes from the census bureau, we cannot take that figure into account. So we will be using official census data to do our redistricting.

Here are some numbers that I think tells

the story of how the state has changed. Over the last 10 years the state grew more than 40 percent and from about 3.6 million to 5.13 million in Arizona. I want you to pay special attention to the 1990 population figure because when I show you a subsequent figure, this will be very important.
Take a look at how certain counties grew over that period of time. If the state grew 40 percent, these counties all grew at a rate greater than the state rate. But look at the 2000 population for Maricopa County, 3.072 million, almost the same number of people as were in the entire State of Arizona in the year 1990. It means that Maricopa County continues to be not only the center of population but the center of influence with respect to both congressional and legislative districts because of the one person/one vote prohibition. Understand that these other counties did very well in terms of their growth, but the numbers, the actual numbers aren't going to be as significant as they are for Maricopa County.

Well, what are the tasks of the Commission, what do we have to do. First, we have the responsibility of developing districts in a grid-like pattern, and in order to fulfill that, we need to take a look at what a grid needs.

No matter which dictionary we use to define grid, it all seems to be a network of lines that are regularly spaced that have right angles or angles that are nearly right angles and again be used to fill out a plane, plane being the map of Arizona.
There are several examples out there of grids that can be used. I'm not going to spend a lot of times on these. These all were published by the Arizona Republic before we had an opportunity to do any work. And their grids were all thawed. They had major problems in terms of ever being accepted as ultimate maps, as does our grid that was prepared 2 weeks ago. But we were responsible for preparing the grid. We prepared a grid. I will tell you a little later exactly how that grid came to be.

The next task of the Commission is public hearings. The first round of those we are in the middle of tonight. And at the conclusion of our 23 hearings of this round, we would be hopeful that you will have told us what your communities of interest look like.

We then will go back and actually draw maps. Different from a grid, the maps will be representations of the 30 legislative and the 8 congressional districts which would like the public then to comment on.

The Commission is going to advertise the draft maps of the congressional districts and the maps...
of the legislative districts for public comment. Now, that public comment will be at least a 30-day period. During the period of time, the legislative, both bodies of the legislature, may within that period make recommendations to the Commission as to how they see the redistricting and what they would like to see that might be different from what we have drawn as maps. We will take that information, just as we will take information from any citizen of the state and we will consider it during that 30-day period.

Understand that the Independent Redistricting Commission shall then establish final district boundaries without the consent of the legislature. The legislature is in an advisory capacity in this process.

To get your input on what constitutes communities of interest we're using the citizen input form. This form is available this evening. It was available on the table outside. Hopefully many of you have one in your hands.

What we're asking for are a series of questions to be answered. And the first deals with who you are and where were contacted. The reason we ask this question is that we are very concerned that when
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somebody gives us input that they get feedback. And so when you provide us input, we want to be able to get back in touch with you to let you know how your input is being treated and what our reaction to that input is.

In your own words, we would like you to tell us what you think are the most important aspects of redistricting as you the individual citizen or representing a group see it.

Third, we ask you to tell us what boundary lines you would like to see used in your area and briefly explain why. And the why becomes very important. We have to justify the lines that we draw to the Department of Justice and to others. And the fact of the matter is, the more we know about why we move a line, why we draw it a certain way, why we actually don't separate this community or do separate the community in a certain way, that helps us to justify the lines the way we submit it.

Fourth, we would like to know from you what areas, groups, or neighborhoods you do not think should be divided by new district boundaries. There are several communities in the state, Nogales among
them which are divided among legislative districts. Some communities feel that that's additional representation and feel comfortable with that division. Other communities felt that it's a dilution of their influence and would like to see a reconstitution of the community in a single legislative district. We hope to hear from you tonight which of those your prefer and why.

And finally, we would like to know what information you would like us to take into account in drawing lines in your area including things, such as, if there isn't enough population in this area to make a legislative district, where do you see yourselves with respect to other communities in this area. Do you feel more akin to Tucson and Green Valley. Do you feel more akin to Patagonia and Sierra Vista and other parts of the state so that we can get an idea from you as to where you think Nogales belongs.

Using those citizen forms, you can give them to us tonight. We will take them. You can take them home and mail them to us. You can fax them. You can go to our website and download the same form electronically at www.azredistricting.org. Fill it out on line and submit it right there. We will take any and all of those.
If you would like to go into a little more detail in terms of your input, if you would like to actually take the district map of this part of the state and the draw the lines yourselves as you think they ought to be drawn, tonight you can request a citizens kit from any of the staff people here. We will make sure you get one. You can, again, fill it out in terms of the lines that you wish to see drawn, submit those. Those will be taken into consideration just as the lines from the legislature and other people who will be submitting maps that we'll be taking into consideration.

The criteria for judging all the plans are these. The federal mandates that we talked about earlier, the Constitution and the Voting Rights Act, the population equality being paramount. The Voting Rights Act's provisions also being very important. And finally, the Proposition 106 requirements as we enumerated them earlier. All of those things have to be taken into account.

On May 18th we began the process by developing the grid. We tried to make the grid as objective as it could be, as random as it could be. And understand that the grid is nothing more than a starting point from which adjustments will be made to
the lines that ultimately will comprise our maps.

The reason we did not start with the current legislative and congressional districts is that those were created by political gerrymandering. And therefore, they're to a good place to start.

Under Proposition 106 we needed a grid-like or neutral place to begin, and so we selected first a point on the map from which to start the process. That point is the place where all legal descriptions for property in the State of Arizona begin. It's called the Gila Salt River Baseline & Meridian. It actually exists at about 107th Avenue and Baseline in Phoenix, southwest Phoenix. And that point is the point on the map where if you draw a perpendicular/horizontal axis, you get four quadrants of the state.

So having done that, we then had to figure out which quadrant would be our starting point. And we actually put those four quadrants in a hat and drew lots. Northwest was drawn. So we began in the northwest quadrant.

And what we said to the consultant was: we will give you the set of rules. And those rules are very firm. Follow the rules, and whatever the grid looks like when you're finished is what the grid looks
like. So we tried very hard not to get any bias into the development of the grid.

Once the consultant started accumulating area, they accumulated in regular building blocks, and we decided to use the township as our building block. Townships are 6-mile squares. They are regularly shaped. They exist in almost every part of the state. There are some parts of the American Indian reservations, Native-American reservations that do not have platted townships, but there are very few people in those areas, and so those people can be aggregated easily by taking large portions of that very thinly populated area into account.

In order to make this work, you can imagine the township in the middle of Phoenix is very densely populated, massive number of people in it. As you move out to the suburb and then rural areas, it takes more and more townships to accumulate people. So we needed to figure out a methodology to accumulate townships in regular forms so that we can add more and more to get the number of people we needed for legislative or congressional districts. This is the methodology that we used.

We started in the northwest. We started aggregating townships and using the census population
talking about how many people live in each of those
township areas to come up with the first threshold
under the legislative or congressional distracting.

Once we achieved that number, population
only, no other consideration, the consultants then went
on and started the second legislative or congressional
district and so on until the entire quadrant was
completed.

Next we have to figure out whether we move
clockwise or counterclockwise to complete the entire
State of Arizona process. Again, randomly we flipped a
coin. Counterclockwise won. And so we started
northwest, went southwest, came southeast, and then
finally finished in the northwest quadrant. Northeast
quadrant. Pardon me.

So the townships provided a grid-like
pattern. The census data, census geography provided
the population that was assigned to each one of those
townships.

Well, the grid has been out for 2 weeks,
and people have made quite a havoc of talking about the
grid. And we've held a number of public hearings since
that time, and people have always come to us and told
us what they liked or didn't like about the grid. Some
people in the state think the grid is beautiful. Some
people think it's the ugliest thing they've ever seen.

Given those two choices, we have a feeling that the grid is probably what it should be, totally random, pleasing some, not pleasing others. And that's precisely why it's our starting point, not our ending point.

Our public hearings tonight are to determine what you think communities of interest look like. We then will go back as a Commission with our consultant and develop maps, plans, congressional and legislative maps.

We will then hold another round of public hearings across the state at which time those maps will be made public. You will be able to comment on them for at a 30-day period. We will then draw final maps based on the input received in the second round of public hearings.

At the end of that process, the maps will again be made public for a comment period, and then they will be submitted to the Department of Justice for preclearance. Arizona is a state that requires preclearance because of its circumstances with respect to Voting Rights Act, legislative and law in the past. And so we are required to achieve preclearance from the
Once the Department of Justice has completed its review and assuming it grants preclearance, then the Commission is finished with its work for this round in terms of map drawing. It would submit those maps to the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State would certify them and they would become the political districts for the next 10 years.

Let me give you a little idea about the time frame. We are in the middle of the hearing process. We expect to have maps for review some time in July. We expect to have the comment period completed some time in August. We expect to have the submission to the Department of Justice in early September. And those are rough time frames, but that's the time frame we're working on.

Assuming the Department of Justice, which has 60 days to review, is finished in a timely fashion, we might very well have those maps certified through the Secretary of State by the end of this calendar year which would give candidates for the 2002 election almost a 12-month period in which to begin raising money, circulate petitions, and doing what they need to do.
Now, our job tonight is to listen, and we are going to do that as long as you want to stay here.

Let me make some brief introductions, and then I will ask Dan Elder, who is going to conduct the public portion of the meeting, I know he always makes a plea at the end of his presentation. I know he will want to do that, and then we will get to your comments.

Let me introduce the folks on stage and then in the audience. To my right is Lisa Hauser. Lisa is one of the two legal counsel employed by the Commission. We have two, not because we really felt that we needed a lot of legal help so much as the people who are experts in election law and redistricting tend to have been associated with one political party or another. And so we felt it prudent to have one Democratic expert and one Republican expert. Lisa and our Democratic expert, Jose Rivera, are splitting these meetings. So tonight Jose is in Hon Dah. That's where the other one is.

SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Flagstaff.

MR. LYNN: Oh, Flagstaff. I'm sorry. Flagstaff. So it's Nogales and Flagstaff this evening.
Jose is in Flagstaff and Lisa is here with us tonight. To her right is Dr. Ralph Rawson. He is representing our consultants, National Demographics Corporation. And Ralph is from California. Don't hold that against him. He's really a nice guy. And he is currently the director of the Rose Institute of Public Policy in the Claremont Colleges over in California.

And that group, NDC, National Demographics, has a long history of doing redistricting and uses a wonderful process of community input, and that is why we are engaging them in our services and they are helping us in this process.

Let me also introduce Enrique Medina Ochoa, who is our Executive Director. And Enrique comes to us most recently or very recently from the Census Bureau where he was involved in collecting much of the data that we are using to do the redistricting.

And Theresa left. Theresa Pulido, who was there to greet you when you came in, works with our Outreach staff. She has been traveling the state sort of in front of the beret, which if you think of the choices it's better than behind the beret. And she's been setting up the meetings as we've been coming to various communities.
Let me also introduce Rudy Cervaro, who is the master administrator in our office, and he is the one who's responsible for keeping all the bills in order and getting them paid and doing the things that we need to do administratively as we go through this process.

So with that, Dan, let me get back to your favorite page and turn it back over to you.

MR. ELDER: He's got my favorite page.

One of the things that we need to be able to demonstrate, to justify to the Department of Justice is reasons why we made modifications to the line. And the things that they respond to is similar to you go protest your taxes to the county assessor, say they're too high. He's going to say so. If you go in there and say my taxes are too high, here's comparable sales in the neighborhood. They'll justify there's been an error. I don't have 2000 feet. I've got 200 feet. There's error in calculation. If you phrase your protest or your comments in the terms that they could address and use, then your protest happens. It works.

And we're talking about the same way. The Department of Justice will review what we do and say,
well, why did you modify that line. And if we can say
well, the public gave us some comments there is a
community of interest we want to keep whole. Or there
was an edge. They said there's no roads that go over
the mountain. Don't put us with that other group.
There's 15 people over there. They're not going to get
good representation.

So anytime when you start thinking about
why you want a certain alignment of the edge of the
districts, if you can give us information that's using
these five or six sort of phrases or terms or concepts
that the Department of Justice will look at, it will
help us in our documentation say we moved this because.
It helps our certainly our submittal to DOJ but it also
helps us making sure we knew what your communities
would like.

So with that, we will go down the list.
Hopefully I still have them in the order it was given.
And if you come on up and use the microphone so
everybody can hear and it gives the court reporter a
chance to get it documented. And make your comments
and if there's more comments after we get done with
these, then we will stay and do what have -- we will
stay here until it's done.
So Cloie Meyers. Cloie, would you like to give us your comments?

MR. MEYERS: Mr. Chairman, Dan. Your Chairman has some background on my reapportionment involvement for the past 54 years. So I won't bore the audience with those activities other than having been at age 24 the primary author of the constitutional amendment that required the same type of impartial

reapportionment by population that Arizona did with 106. That was once supported by the young Republicans, the young Democrats, women voters, junior chamber of commerce.

Since then I've assisted in reapportioning in '61. I was chairman of the house committee. Outside not a member of the legislature. In '71 a rather unique provision that the legislature fails to do it, the Secretary of State shall do it. Little did I know that 20 years after I wrote the constitutional amendment I would be Secretary of State and a one-man legislature. Then I assisted the Republican Secretary of State in '81, the Democratic Secretary of State in '91.

The interesting thing is when you put
these together there are compactly, contiguously following the six points that were on the chart, when the Republican Secretary of State did it, the Democrats captured the legislature, and one time when the Democratic Secretary of State did it, the Republicans captured. And I think that's the way it ought to be. Going to specifics and doing it more generically because I think as a property owner here in Santa Cruz County for only a little over 4 years, I don't have the background as some of you from the audience have.

I would like to make a few comments. Statewide congressional as well as this county without having any firm opinion as to how Santa Cruz County should be linked to all of its neighbors because I am sure there are better experts in this audience. But it seems to me that most importantly, even more important than your grid, which was a good way to start, are the points of rivers, roads, mountains, access. I don't know what you can do about the area in northwestern Arizona that's above the Grand Canyon. There's no way to really bring them in the east district.

I do know we have good communication from
here to the east to Cochise and going up to Tucson to the west with Highway 8 down to Yuma. And as I look at your charts, it would seem to me that it makes a great deal of sense to emphasize increased Hispanic representation by doing as much as you can, and I sometimes refer to it as Olino, so I don't know who prefers what.

But obviously you've got some great areas here that run Greenlee, Graham, Cochise. We are the smallest county I think geographically in the state. Santa Cruz, the rural areas of Pima. And then either
go up into Pinal County or go to Yuma. I'm not proposing any specific ones, but if you follow roads in those other areas, that makes a great deal of sense.

Congressionally I spent most of 9 years in Scottsdale. And Scottsdale I find is much less related to Phoenix and west or south than it is to Fountain Hills and some other areas. So if I were under a commission, I would be taking the county maps and probably take the Indian communities, the Navajos, the Apaches, Coconino, and come down with my grid and pick up as much as I could of Gila and maybe even the northern part of Graham so that you could have a nice
compact northeastern district.

And then do as much as you can in the Hispanic districts in the south. The only change I would have made instead of using the zone would be to take a sheet like this starting four corners and come into the center, Phoenix, because there's no way you can put logically Yuma with parts of the Navajo or put Mohave with Cochise. So if you start in the four corners and work in, particularly on your legislative districts, you can divide up Phoenix, Scottsdale area like mad. They've got the population and they're growing.

The other comment I would make would be to try to take fast-growing areas and put them with slower-growing areas so that you don't increase the population discrepancies in the next 10 years. In other words, central Phoenix, central Scottsdale is not growing. So if you can throw some of them out with new development areas.

Here in this particular county I think my only observation would be -- it was ungodly things. What I'd see, six house districts and three senate districts when you don't even have half the population for one house district.
On the other hand if you go from three districts with six house members, three senators down to one and we don't have a majority even for that, would Santa Cruz possibly not be better off if you took those of us, and I forget to say that I live in Tubac, Tumacacori address, and take those of us possibly to the west of the Gromary Hills and go up to Green Valley and take Nogales and then take the other portion of the county, Patagonia and Sonoita and go over to Cochise County, and then run both to the suburbs of Tucson as well as out to the west.

I would be happy to respond to any questions either two of you have on the committee. But I do think that you have done a beautiful job in starting, more than starting. Very fair job in the preparation, and it should be possible to only cut half as many county lines as were done in '91. Do it without any of the Gerrymandering. And I say that because when I lived in New York, even though a fifth generation Erigonian, and Eldridge Gerry was one of my co-parts, one of my fellow estriman** so I've always called him Gerry rather than Gerry.

MR. ELDER: Okay. Thank you very much.
Jim -- well, yes, I think he was next. Jim Maynard.

SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Yes, Jim is not here tonight but I will speak on his behalf.

MR. ELDER: Wow.

SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: I don't think I need a microphone. I think -- can you all hear me? Great.

MR. LYNN: Actually it's better if you do.

SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: okay.

MR. LYNN: People are recording.

SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: I would be glad to either way. Can you hear me okay? Thanks.

My comments are rather brief. I think that the Santa Cruz County area would be best served if communities of like thought and lifestyles were represented. Obviously we don't have the population to be our district, but I have lived here for 15 years now, and it seems to me that there is more thought and we would be better served if Nogales, Rio Rico, and Tubac were aligned north with Pima county and if we were to set aside Patagonia and the Sonoita area with the Sierra Vista or Cochise County district.

The reason I say that is the simple thought of people, they say they're going to go to
town, and that may include buying groceries, a set of
tires, and maybe doing something else. The people in
the Patagonia and Sonoita area will generally go to
Sierra Vista, sometimes to Tucson, but the folks in the
Rio Rico and Tubac area as well as Nogales won’t go to
Sierra Vista. They will go to Tucson.

And so there seems to be more of a
connectivity, if there’s such a word that I can use,
between those communities. And I agree that we were
probably better served with two districts rather than
one.

So those are really my thoughts and hopes.

MR. ELDER: Let me ask a question in
relation to that. We met in Cochise County last week,
and there were two trains of thought there. One that
there were border communities, they had relationships,
same issues, same problems. And then there was

another, you know, person that said, well, really the
Cammex, you know, the freeway and the economics of that
up in Santa Cruz is totally different from what we have
in Cochise County. So you can divide in effect
vertically or you can divide horizontally.

Is there any thoughts or preferences in,
you know, is it a border issue item that it would take precedence if we were to combine, you know, some areas are more socioeconomic, you know, as you refer to there. I just want to get a sense of what criteria you use with that kind of a comment.

SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Yes. I-19 really connects us with Tucson and obviously the port of entry and the growth that's going to take place in Tucson. The port of entry is here in Nogales, and the growth that will correspond to that take place in Tucson. There's the Cammex corridor might separate us from Sierra Vista and Douglas.

But I do think that Patagonia and Sonoita connect more with that part of the state than they do with the Tucson area.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. Dennis Miller.

MR. MILLER: Well, Santa Cruz County may well be the example of Gerrymandering because we're the smallest geographic county in the state, and we're represented, as the gentleman said earlier, by three legislative districts. And at first there was some complaining about that. Now, I suppose either 10 years ago we were represented by two legislative, 7 and 9 now are 8, 9, and 11.
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I personally like it that way. I've spoken with most of all of the board members, and they haven't taken an official position on that from Santa Cruz County, but I think that we're pretty much in agreement that we're better off with more than one district.

We have been forced because we're small, because of our problems, and because of the district to have a pretty intense legislative lobby at both the steps, federal and state levels, particularly at the state level.

Because we, as was mentioned before, we cannot make -- we won't be one district to where we would be the deciding factor in an election. We will be part of somebody else's district. I believe we're better off in multiple districts. I think it's probably remote that we will wind up in three. I would like it that way. I think we're more effective that way. There is a natural division between the west side of the county and the east side of the county as what

Mr. Maynard said. So I think that should be a deterrent if it turns out to be that way. I think some people disagree with that, but I personally think, you
know, we're better off on that.

The one example that was asked when this came up, my board members asked -- I've been lobbying the state legislative on behalf of the Santa Cruz County for the last 17 sessions, and they asked me what, you know, when have our legislators voted against us. Well, it's rare, but there was an opposition, and that was during this last session, session four, with one of our legislators in Cochise County over some conflict on a particular issue.

So we're always going to be smaller. So I think we're better off to have 9 people that we can go to and lobby and get their interests. Thank you.

MR. ELDER: I'm looking at some communities of interest things, and I was trying to consider what was happening in the Santa Cruz Valley. Do you see an agriculture where there's a lot of produce and produce-related activity that happens with that border and port of entry and some of that? Other types of communities of interest. Any thoughts there? I mean is Rio Rico, is it predominantly retirement and fits well with the Tubac/Green Valley or are there other factors in the valley or community that bring you together or separate you? Anybody want to comment on
that?

SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Rio Rico is very much an Indian transition. The reason I know that is [not speaking in microphone--inaudible] is dealing with mortgages. And when you look at sales of homes and I financed some homes for retired folks and younger families. Right now I would say it's pretty split. There's a number of retired folks there, but there's a growing, increasing pollution of young families in Rio Rico.

Tubac I would say is still predominantly retired folks, although there are some more younger families there. So in a sense, I think there's a stronger connection between Green Valley and Tubac in age groups than there would be with Rio Rico and Green Valley.

So 5 to 10 years ago I would have said both Rio Rico and Tubac and Green Valley have been predominantly retired communities. I think there's a growing retirement community in Sierra Vista, and I believe that that's also in Sonoita as well. So again, there's a mention there.
But the point that Mr. Miller brought out is physically the mountains really separate the two halves of the county, and that's pretty important, I think natural boundaries is.

MR. ELDER: So you have people representing, you know, other like Patagonia, Sonoita, or Arivaca. Arivaca would fit better with the community and the relationship with Santa Cruz and that or they fit more with the Green Valley or Pima County or where do you think the western people, you know, in the county really fit in and then who do they, you know, bond with, if that's the correct term?

Any other comments or questions or wishes that you would like the Commission to consider as we get on with the next task that we've got?

Okay. Well, we've got some maps. Oh, yes, sir?

MR. SALTA: My name is Jim Salta. I just had a question with regards to the congressional grid map. What was the thinking or what was the community of interest that was considered in having the district run all the way up to -- it looks like two-thirds the way up Apache County, if I could ask that. Because it seems to me that the community of interest in Santa Cruz County, at least at the congressional level, would
be further south and further west. If you move it, you will have much more of a community of interest.

MR. ELDER: Okay. I will weigh in on that one real short and brief. There's absolutely no community of interest represented in that map. As Steve did and he's presented his presentation, it was literally a pure mathematical. Started in the northwest and calculating the number of people in the precinct. When that got filled up, went to the southwest, and then it went across. And the way the precincts -- excuse me. Precincts is not the correct term. Census tracts. As they put census tract after census tract, it was pure numbers. 345 people in that census tract. Let's add it to this group. As it kept going counterclockwise and aggregating the groups until they got 171,000 plus, 600 and what is it 41 or and change.

When we got to that, that's where the line was. So we know and right up front, our grid probably isn't any better than the grids that were in the newspaper. It was a starting point. People have asked us, why don't we don't we come up with multiple grids. Well, we didn't like this one, why didn't you give us another one. My opinion is -- it's my opinion is that we had come up with another grid, they would have said,
oh, there's something politically going on here. You
know, somebody didn't like it. So they chose another
grid. And we want to just take it for as a pure every
time a decision was made was made on one of the five
rules the Commission gave NDC, and they were generic.
You'll go counterclockwise. You'll go in this order.
You'll aggregate by census tract. If there's more
people in a township in the census tract on this side
of the tract than there are on the township line, it
gets included here. If there's more people there, it
gets excluded. And keep going. So literally there's
nothing in there other than numbers to get a sense of
how big the rural areas are, the legislative and
congressional districts, how concentrated are they so
that both we and the public start to get an idea of,
you know, how the matrix of the state may go.

Now, those can get shifted around in any
direction to take in communities of interest, to take
in socioeconomic if that's what ties the community
together. So that's what we're wanting to hear from
you folks is what ties your community, what values,
what fits, you know, so that you would have a district
you can be represented effectively by whoever you
select.

MR. LYNN: Thank you, Dan. I think it's
also reasonable to point out that when those grids were
released, they were shown for the first time in a
public meeting, we saw them for the first time as the
public saw them. They were the result of a set of
rules that were random in character and consistent in
application that were given to the consultants. There
were no political decisions whatsoever that went into
them and that's why we accepted them however they were
when they were presented because none of those issues,
community of interest of anything else other than
population, was given to the consultant as a criteria
for developing the grid. It's population only, it's
random and it's a starting point.

MR. ELDER: Anything else? Well, here's
where Steve said we get to my begging. We really do
need your help. We need your help in finding the wall,
but we need your help in getting your neighbors,
getting anybody else that would be willing to
participate.

The next time through we're going to have
some maps. We will want you to take a pen or pencil,
and you're more than welcome here this evening to say,
hey, here's where I think our community is, and we will
take that and use that in the development of the next
round of maps.
But please, you know, try and get as many people and citizens of the area that will participate here for the next meetings. We will try to get them out to the newspapers, facts, anybody and everybody in the world, you know, so that there’s no -- hopefully we’ll get out the dates out early enough that if some body in the community says, oh, wait, you know, we’ve got nine other community meetings that night. We will try and flip-flop the times during that 2, 2-1/2 week period to make sure that we can get participation that doesn’t conflict with any other or as many of the others as you possibly have this evening.

The other thing is access. I believe your library has the computer. If, you know, you know people that don’t have a computer, the librarians are willing to say here’s how to log onto that azredistricting.com You can fill out the citizen form right there and press send. You can ask, as I said, for a, you know, a packet tonight. You can e-mail us. You can fax us. You can call us with a request, and we will send them out to you.

So any way that you want to participate, we would appreciate it. They all come equal. You know, you mail them, send them in on the computer, fill them out, hand them to one of the Commissioners or
staff, they're treated the same. So if you're not at
the meeting, you can't participate, send it to us. If
you come up 2 weeks from now and say, oh, I forgot,
send us another one. I don't care whether I get four
from one person. You know, it helps us any time
there's an idea.

So thank you. We appreciate your
attendance -- one question or are you getting tired?

MR. GIBSON: I thought I would ask the
question first. Harold Gibson. You said call us and
we can send in the citizens kit. What's the number?

MR. ELDER: I will have to get out my
business card. We have an 800 number.

MR. LYNN: We do have a toll free number
as well. Enrique, do you have that?

MR. OCHOA: Yes, I do. It is 1-866-864-
7569.

MR. GIBSON: 866-864-7569.

MR. OCHOA: You got it.

MR. GIBSON: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ELDER: And if you would be willing to
publish that in your next paper, you know, the headline
banner, underline, we would appreciate any help we get
from the local media and news. So we appreciate that.
We're going to have sex scandal uncovered.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. All right. As I said, we're more than willing to stand around and discuss maps or discuss anything else this evening, and then we will see you here in about a month. Thank you again.

Oh, one other thing before we head out. There was comment says we may not be able to meet at Nogales this next time at this location. Is there another site that is easier for people to get to or somebody mentioned, you know, downtown there's either the Catholic church or there's I think up on the hill there's, you know, the Baptist church.