A total of 29 speakers addressed the Commission. Various themes were affirmed and reaffirmed by the speakers. At the most basic level, most speakers agreed that Mesa and Tempe were separate communities of interest and should be kept in separate legislative districts.

Nine speakers argued in various ways that Tempe was a distinct community of interest based on the presence of Arizona State University. They urged that Tempe be kept whole and not be divided into separate legislative districts. Two speakers saw a community of interest involving Guadalupe, while one speaker argued that Tempe shared a community of interest with Ahwatukee, not with Guadalupe.

Three speakers argued that Chandler was a community of interest and should not be divided. Three said that the Indian reservations were separate communities of interest and should not be included in the same legislative districts with Mesa or Tempe. Three argued that Scottsdale and Fountain Hills were separate communities of interest and should not be included in the same legislative districts with Mesa or Tempe; they all noted that “you can’t get there from here.”

Several speakers described Mesa as constituting a community of interest; one thought that Mesa should be divided in such a way that it would control three legislative districts, another argued for two. One thought Mesa should be a dominant presence in two congressional districts. One urged the Commission to join Mesa with Gila or Navajo Counties rather than with Maricopa County.

Three speakers urged the Commission to protect rural interests from being dominated by urban interests, and two urged the Commission to protect the interests of the Hopi
Indians. Three speakers thought it would be useful for the Commission to draw lines that followed school districts (especially the Tempe Elementary School District), one thought it would not; two thought it would be useful to draw lines that followed freeways, one thought it would not.

AURs: Undivided Tempe
Scottsdale united with Fountain Hills
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