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COMMISSIONER HALL: Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Joshua Hall, and I'm one of the Commission members of the Independent Redistricting Commission. And as you can see by all this surrounding me, this is a public meeting, and I'd like to call that meeting to order. All of your input will be recorded, and that's why we're here is to receive your input.

I'm grateful to be here amongst you. Nothing more pleasant than for me, as a fellow who lives in Apache County, to see freshly irrigated fields and the beautiful green farm ground that I just witnessed as I drove in just this evening. I -- I appreciate that. Saturday I was branding calves, and I still have battle scars from that project. So I have some empathy with some of you that also be involved in that.

We're grateful for the opportunity to be with you and we appreciate to be here and we welcome your input. I'll kind of give you an overview of how this meeting will proceed, and then I'll do some introductions of those that are here with us, and then we will go ahead and proceed as rapidly as possible.

We want to give you a little bit of information and Mr. Elder, one of my fellow commissioners, Dan Elder, will make that presentation. Following that presentation we then will allow for public comment. For those of you that had not had an opportunity to fill out a
little yellow speaker slip, we would invite you to do so, if you so choose to public -- to provide public comment. You can come here to this microphone and do that. And in the event, if you feel so inspired, in the course of the meeting and want a speaker slip, just raise your hand and a member of our staff Theresa will provide that to you. Following the public comment then, we will allow for any additional questions that are relevant to what we're talking about today and then this meeting will be adjourned.

With your permission, sometimes throughout your public comment, if we need clarification, I hope it would be appropriate we may want to ask you some questions in order that we completely understand what you're trying to convey to us.

With that, Manuel and Theresa, do you mind coming up so we can introduce you. We have two members of our staff back here, Theresa and Manuel. And, Manuel, I need you definitely to come forward so you can make a statement here in a minute. And then we also have our court reporter. And we have our attorney, Jose Rivera, one of the members -- one of our two members of legal counsel. We have Ralph Rassum who is a member of our consultant, National Demographics Corporation. Again, I'm Joshua Hall.

And my fellow commissioner, Daniel Elder, who resides in Tucson.

Are there any questions before we proceed
with this meeting with respect to what you need to do? You have --

Manuel, you mind coming forward and insuring that there's no one here that requires an interpretation?

MR. GUTIERREZ: My name is Manuel Gutierrez, and I'm here to translate from English to Spanish. So if anybody needs Spanish translation, please raise your hand.

MR. RIVERA: Manuel.

(Mr. Gutierrez speaking in Spanish.)

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Manuel, you got the easiest job on this deal.

You know, it's kind of a -- you know, is there any -- here's the irony, are there any other language -- people that may need translation in another language? Of course, they wouldn't understand what I'm saying, so how would they know? But without any further ado, we'll go ahead and proceed with the meeting.

You can tell from my dress that I'm a little bit less formal than Joshua is, but I had an excuse. I just flew in from Vancouver and got into Tucson and I was behind about 45 minutes. I said, Well, I'd rather be here than go by and get my sportscoat and tie and all the other

things that Joshua brought along with him from the high country.

This will be a presentation of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission. The subject of tonight's presentation is the redistricting or the drawing
of new districts for both congressional --

Yes, sir.

MALE VOICE: Could you raise it up a little bit?

It's kind of behind the podium there. Any way to raise it?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Yes, sir. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: That or maybe we can pull the table back some and get and get a bigger handout. Would that help?

All right. We'll try that for a while.

To redraw the redistricts -- or the districts for both congressional and legislative districts per the provisions of Proposition 106.

It's very important to note the difference between previous redistricting efforts and redistricting that we are going through in 1999 through 2001. Anyway, the 2000 census.

The citizens play a crucial role in this. In the past legislators -- legislators have gone into caucus. They've drawn the lines. They've gone through a whole series of exercises to try and redistrict the state, and in the past I think historically we've never had a redistricting fly with the judicial system, and the courts have redrawn our district lines for us.

So this is an attempt for the citizens to play the process as opposed to the legislators. And we're here really to have you tell us. We're in the fact-finding. We want the information from you so that we
will know when we adjust the line why we're adjusting the line. It's also helpful for our standpoint that when we do submit the final plan to the Department of Justice, that they see that this is what the public wanted, this is why they wanted it and we've got a defensible position. We moved it and here's the documentation as to why.

The subject -- went the wrong direction.

We'll be using these hearings to bring the redistricting process to the state. We're holding approximately 23 meetings across the state. There's usually two meetings going on at any one time, so it's not that Josh and I were the only two that were willing to come to Safford. It's that there's another meeting going on at the same time in another part of the state. So the balance of the Commission is at their location.

We need to share our plans with you, and we need to hear from you the reaction. And that's the second phase. So once we get the information from you, we will go back and prepare plans and then we're going to have another second round of public meetings so that you can respond to those plans and let us know what you liked about them, what you didn't like about them, and then we will go back and take another shot at the plan and then submit that for review. And there's a 30-day comment period in there for your input as well as I'm sure we'll get the legislature, we'll get other interested parties wanting to submit a plan for review.
We're determined to make this a fair process. We want to derive and generate districts that are balanced enough that the people of Arizona will think that in effect we did a good job.

I'll diverge a little bit. In one of the -- I want to say -- meetings when I was going through the selection process, they asked the question if you had a choice between two districts that were one strongly democrat, one strongly republican, would you do that and leave it as such or would you try and make it a balanced district -- two balanced districts? And I made the comment, at that time I said, Here all the commissioners were selected not being politicians. As a matter of fact, we can't run, we could not have run for public office, both in the past or in the foreseeable future. But I gave a political answer. You can have it two ways. The one way would be that you leave it as a very strong republican and strong democratic district because it might be that they were getting excellent representation from those people.

The other side of it is is that if we have a very unbalanced district, if the opposition or the minority party in that district doesn't run credible candidates, it's over in the primaries. Then we don't have the discourse, we don't have the discussion of issues in our communities between the primary and the general elections.

So I said, you know, if I had -- had to do
it, I would go for the fair districts so that we generate that education, we generate the discourse, the discussion among the public so that the issues in our communities come to the top and we can start to -- to try and solve them. So I think that the balanced aspects of the Commission and the people that are on it, so far we have gone through this thing and I have to believe we're going to come up with a very balanced, very fair. It has not been partisan politics raised its heads yet, and I don't anticipate that it will.

Often in the past and in states all around the country redistricting has been very divisive. We've had incumbents wanting to protect their territory, and they've used processes that have been abusive and it's called gerrymandering. That's my terminology.

Back in -- in, I don't know, the 1800s a Governor Aldridge, I believe it was, in Massachusetts came up and he developed a -- a set of districts that I believe it was the Boston Harold, Boston Post, whatever the newspaper --

COMMmissioner Hall: Boston Globe.

COMMmissioner Elder: Boston Globe.

Thank you, Joshua.

-- had caricature and it looked like a salamander. So they put it together and it was Governor Gary and mander for salamander. So it's garymandering as opposed to gerrymandering, but call it what you will, it
was still divisive among the communities.

Here's how gerrymandering works. On the left we can dilute a majority area or a minority area by dispersing. We can take this and by splitting it down the middle and down the other side here, we can dilute the strength that that specific group, whether it be agricultural, whether it be Hispanic, whether it be Native American, whatever the issue may be, you could draw lines to separate them enough that they would have no power with any one of the four districts.

On the right-hand side, the other way of doing it is to draw the lines to where you put --

I told you I wandered.

-- where you put all of the group in one area and you leave the other three areas untouched, so that they have the power in one district, but the other three districts could go on this as before.

Here we have a example of racial gerrymandering. We have an area where there was a large group of Hispanics, and they were put all in one district, leaving the republican districts to -- to be free in this instance.

On the right-hand side you were using the dilution where we had a democratic, say a white incumbent, and by dividing this out they didn't have enough power at that point to be able to control what their representation was. So that's the two methods that come about in racial
The voters of Arizona wanted this process cleaned up. That's why they voted for and passed a state constitutional proposition. And they voted in -- in the Proposition 106 to create a new entity. That entity is the Independent Redistricting Commission. It's responsible for the process that we're in right now.

Let me give you a little bit of history about the Independent Redistricting Commission. The way the process was set up is that the House majority leader in effect got the first choice. He chose James Huntwork from Phoenix, a republican. Then it went to the other side. And the democrat chose Andrea Minkoff.

Let me give you, I suppose, a little bit of background. James Huntwork is an attorney in Phoenix. Andrea Minkoff, one person calls her a community activist. Others say she's extremely organized and involved in the community.

Then the Senate president had the third choice, and he chose myself. And I'm from Pima County. And the reason he went to the Pima County was is that the proposition said that out of the first four people chosen, you could have no more than two people from one county or two people from the same party. So there's two from Maricopa County, a republican and a democrat. I was then the third person chosen. I'm a republican from Pima County.
The fourth person chosen was Joshua Hall. He's from St. Johns and has businesses, I think, all over the White Mountains, if he let it be known, but, no, he runs a title company out of Pinetop. There we go.

The four of us got together after we were sworn in by the state -- what is it? It wasn't the supreme court -- Betsey Bayless.

MR. RIVERA: Secretary of state.

COMMIS SIONER ELDER: Secretary of state.

We got sworn in. And at that open meeting we then interviewed for the chairman. The chairman was an independent. The process of the numbers game was that there was 300 and I believe it was 31 people that filed an application with the appellate courts for doing this -- this job. We get paid exactly zero for. Steve Lynn, our chairman that we chose, likes to tell the story that he said by the time it got down to it, the state supreme court had chosen eight or ten republicans, ten democrats and five independents. By the time we were chosen, it was down to only four independents because the fifth one understood how much time it was going to take and how we were going to get paid.

So we went through an open process that we interviewed all four of the candidates in an open meeting. We then selected and it was a unanimous vote for Steve Lynn. And the independent was then appointed as the chairman. And he's with Unisource Corporation. It's with

So the way it comes down is we have two from Maricopa County, two from Pima County, and one from Apache County.

Proposition 106 states that the Commission shall establish legislative and congressional districts.

The commencement of the process -- for the process for both of these types of districts is the creation of an equal population grid.

Now, we started this gathering of information about two weeks ago. And I said right at the beginning I said, boy, I think we messed up in reverse here because the first four meetings we went to, they said, We love the grid. All of the river communities are together. You know, just went on and on. Wait a minute. Time out. This grid that we have done is only based on population alone. It takes into no account communities, school districts, ethnic-racial backgrounds and voting history. It has none of the things of the community's interest that we would like to find out about tonight from the standpoint of what is the glue in your community that holds you together? Where do you shop? Where do you work? What is the economic basis for -- for the area that we're in now? So we have a better understanding of if we move a line, if so, why so.

So we put this together. And the other part of the Proposition 106 relates to the Voting Rights Act.
So we started off with the districts shall comply with the United States Constitution and the Voting Rights Act. That was the first thing in 106.

The second was we start with a grid I just discussed.

And then we go into districts are geographically compact and contiguous. You know, meaning that you -- I think in the Pima County we've got areas that look like mooses or meese or whatever you want to call. We have the Star Trek, you know, district. There's all kinds of weird shaped districts. That the only reason they could possibly be there is maybe for some political reason. There just doesn't make sense. You can't get there from here type of vote issues.

The district boundaries shall respect communities of interest. Back in the -- I guess it was, what, ten years ago, Jose, twelve years ago, Sandra Day O'Connor, in -- in a decision on the supreme court, wrote the and used the term "communities of interest." That was all well and good, but she failed or did not continue on and define communities of interest. So rather than the Commission getting together and saying, Well, these are the communities of interest we're going to use to define districts, we wanted to come back and find out what those communities of interests are from you.

And you'll notice that the ends of the first four or five it says to the extent practicable. We know
we're not going to be able to not draw a line that's not going to split somebody off from somebody that they've traditionally been with. We know that we're not going to be able to, you know, change from six congressional districts to eight congressional districts and potentially not have two incumbents in the same district. We're not allowed to know where the incumbents live. We --

You know, that's one of the things Jose was going, nah, nah, nah, nah, nah, at a meeting because somebody wanted to give us an address of where their representative lived. We don't want to know that because we want to try to make this as fair as possible.

Then to the extent practicable, the district lines shall follow geographic features, city, town boundaries, undivided census tracts.

We're using the 2000 census as our database and that's all we're allowed to use. There are some communities that have filed protests because there has been undercounts. Well, appellate courts go through all of this. The only thing we are allowed to use is the 2000 census.

To the extent practicable, competitive districts shall be favored where they do not create any significant detriment to the other goals preceding this.

So these are the things that we use. And when you make your comments this evening, if you could tie it into some of these aspects and say, Well, the community
of interest is agriculture. Community of interest is mining. Community of interest is, you know, the school district.

You know, do we have anybody here from Willcox? I officiated football. It seemed like there was a pretty good rally between Safford and Thatcher and Willcox. So there's some things that tie you together as a community.

Partisanship and incumbency. The party registration and voting history is excluded in the first or the initial phase. We know not where the republicans are. We know not where the democrats are. We know the counts. We know the racial backgrounds, but we don't have anything with the party affiliation.

In the second round, after we've drawn these lines, then we'll be able to consider or identify those factors.

In April of 2001 the Commission received the 2000 census. So that was when we first got data that we could work with.

Take a look at these numbers here. We've got a state population of approximately 3.6 million in 1990. Remember this one because now we have 5.1 million in the state.

But when we take a look at this, we take a
look at the fastest-growing counties. And we look at Maricopa County and that number there is almost or it's approaching what the entire state was in 1990. So that growth there ends up making it very difficult to say, oh, yeah, we'll just spread all the congressional districts around the state and leave Maricopa County where it is. Not going to happen on the one man/one vote, so we've got some issues there that Maricopa County grew phenomenally in relation to the rest of the state.

Percentages though, look at Mohave. There's some amazing growth in those. You know, so you take a look at these and that's where the state's grown. Pima County, on the other hand, I think we're at 26 and some change. Inevitably they're going to lose legislative district. There just isn't any way around it.

COMMISIONER HALL: Graham County too.

COMMISIONER ELDER: Yeah, Graham County was approximately 25 percent. So we all grew, but we didn't grow as fast as the other parts of the state.

So the task of the Redistricting Commission was to develop the districts in a grid-like pattern. "Grid" -- you know, one of our commissioners, as a matter of fact I think it was Mr. Huntwork, went to the web site, said, Yeah, I found 17 different ways you can grid a plain. Oh, my goodness, Jim, you know. So we went
to the dictionary and we took a look. And it's really any
system that is somewhat rectilinear. And, you know, the
grid is a plain, and that's -- that's what we're looking at
here. And you can take your choice of which definition you
really like.

Steps toward equal population grid. On the
28th of May, which is approximately a month ago, we voted
to begin to develop the grid based on Arizona's townships.
May 25th the Commission received the progress -- progress
report from the consultant.

We chose the townships and range because of
one of -- really three or four different reasons. One, it
was nonpolitical. There wasn't a republican or a democrat
or a wig or anybody else that said this is where we're
going to start because it divided the state for an
advantage.

The other thing is most of the maps that you
get you have one page for a township. Township being six
miles wide, six miles high. So it was already somewhat of
a grid to begin with.

To assure complete neutrality in the gridding
process, the starting point we chose by lottery at the Salt
River Gila Base Meridian. We threw out the quarters:
Northwest, southwest, northeast, southeast. And we had one
of the members pull out and it turned out to be the

northwest. So we started in the northwest portion of the
state.
We then were asked by the consultant, he said, well, after we amalgamate or -- or aggregate enough population for the various census tracts, you know, accumulations into legislative districts and congressional districts, which way do we go from there? So we flipped a coin. Heads was counter -- was clockwise. Tails was counterclockwise. Came up counterclockwise. So we went from the northwest to the southwest to the southeast to the northeast. And we took -- each time we went to the township. And then just think about your area and think about Phoenix. In a 36 square miles you darn near have enough for one legislative district in a township. And you take a township out here and you may need to take eight, ten, twelve townships together to get enough people for a congressional district or a legislative district.

So this is what we ended up doing. We ended up taking a township and then we made it into four townships. So we have four square miles. And each time we went counterclockwise within the -- the grid. And then we made the super townships. We still didn't have enough population. And we continued counterclockwise in that. So it was mathematically pure I guess from the standpoint that any time the consultant came up and says, I don't quite have enough, where do I go next, there was a rule in place that said this is the way you go, not looking for a precinct that was -- or not a precinct -- a census tract that was the right size that might have biased the way we
Townships provide a grid -- yeah, okay, townships do provide a grid-like pattern.

We're now down to the public hearings. We're coming back at this stage to try and define what communities of interest are. We're trying to find out from the grid what things about the grid, you know, might appeal to you as -- as a way of starting to generate a dialog, knowing that the grid was only one factor out of six that we've got to consider. But it will give us a position to at least be able to start getting some answers and some questions out on the table.

Public review process. You know, after we develop these plans, after we get this information, we will develop a set of plans. There's a 30-day review process, which you can come back and you can fill out a Citizen Input Form and say, I was looking at the plan and I don't like the line such and such. Or I would like to see these two communities held together. We don't want to be divided. No, we want to be together. Whatever the issues and comments are, we have 30 days or more to -- to go in and -- and do the review process.

Then we come together and we make a revision to that plan. And we're going to have, I think, about two weeks, maybe more, to have further comment and modify that second set of plans.

Citizen Input Form In your package that you
picked up there should be a Citizen Input Form. You can fill it out tonight. Theresa or Theresa is holding up a package back there, but you can fill it out tonight. You can mail it to us. Address is on there. Our web site is www--whatever the little sign in slash azredistricting.org. And I found out a couple of weeks ago that if you say dot com it will come through also. We've got it linked together. But azredistricting.com

Your library. They said that they would make sure that their librarians were trained to where they could bring it up, you could fill out the form and have it fly just fine from the library. So you can do that. You can ask for a copy of this to be mailed to you, so that you can fill it in and send it back.

But the best way of getting to us is--is talking with us. And don't hesitate to give us a call if there is other information that you want to get in even after tonight. If you fill out a form oh, I forgot, this is a pretty important. You know, fill out another one.

You know, just give us as much information as we possibly can get.

First thing we want is we'd like to have your questions giving us your name and address so we can get back to you. We can tell you that we received your comments. The National Demographics Corporation said that if we have a plan drawn, they will review it, look at it to see how it conforms to the--to the law, how it conforms.
to the one man/one vote, how it affected the community and say, thank you, here's what we found, here's what we can do, and hopefully we'll be able to integrate those comments into our planning process.

But if -- and as I said, I'm a little bit less formal than Josh. If you'd like to speak or make a comment and don't want to give us your name, that's fine too. You know, at the end of these things, you know, say, I'd like to -- to add this to -- to the mix and we'll sit here and listen to you as long as we can.

Your major concern. The second part -- the number two is let us know what, in as few words as possible, what the most important aspect of the redistricting process is to you. What boundary lines would you like to see used in your area? Is it the river up here? Oh, we want the north part of the river separated from the south part of the river. The Graham Mountains, you know, that's a barrier. People on the other side, we don't relate to. It's hard to represent if you're a representative. It's hard to go canvass if you're trying to become elected. And it's harder to get roads over there if you're coming over here and saying, Hey, we need some roads or whatever the issue might be. If you can't get there, it's hard to be a part of the community.

Also what areas, groups, neighborhood do you want divided out? Say, they don't relate to us at all. Let us know what those are too.
Questions on Citizen Input Form

What information would you like to see taken into account in drawing the boundary lines? Please rank them in order.

There's about six or eight. There's some other things at the bottom as far as just some blank lines. If we haven't hit the six or eight best areas, go ahead and write in a couple. Say this is my number one priority. This is number two. We want to get some value. You know, what's the most valuable to us? What's the least value. So we start getting some relationships.

Keep the community intact. Bring it together. Such groups together: Neighborhood associations, minority group concerns, school districts. How did we vote in the last prop -- set of propositions? Was there one area that said, Oh, we voted very strongly for this proposition, but another area of the community didn't. You know, we like -- we think we're more alike because of these factors or concerns.

Using manmade or natural bounds. We talked about the river, the mountains.

Drawing congressional legislative district lines include whole cities as much as possible in the equal population.

We had a comment from Chandler that the last time that they were in the redistricting process about 95 percent of their community was in one district and here this one piece of 5 percent inside the city limits was...
outside the district and they said that they really never
got really good representation from the people probably out
of Globe, for all I know, but they said, you know, if you
can include whole communities.

Other areas, like when I went to Nogales,
they said, we like having nine representatives. You know,
we like being divided because then we got three senators
and six legislators we can go to and lobby and say, We
really need help up here in -- in Phoenix. Others said,
no, we want three strong ones that are only ours. So
that's the kind of thing we need here from you folks. You
want to be together or you want to be tied to other
communities?

Using local government boundaries when
drawing congressional and legislative districts. Local
governmental boundaries like the county, school district
lines, things along those lines.

Keeping census tracts from being split. If
we can, we want to keep the census tracts together because
we've got data that works well for us from that respect.
But if there's some reason why you say, Oh, no, this one
census tract is giant, divide this thing because we don't
get representation because of the mountain, we don't get
whatever, you know, that we want out of it. So it would be
helpful if we know when we've got a problem. Let us know
what that might be.

And then here it doesn't affect you as much
using freeways and major transportation routes. But you do have the State Highway and Federal, what is it, 40 through here?

FEMALE VOICE: 70.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: 70 through here. 40 down -- all right. We have 10 down through Tucson.


Complete it, mail it. Here we've got azredistricting.org. And, as I said, Tim Johnson, at our office, does have it to where dot com will work. The dot org is the one that will get you in, get you the fastest access.

Citizen kits -- kits. If you wish to provide geographic information, these kits will be available, are available on the web site. You can download them, draw a line on it, send it back to us and that's as good as if you handed it to us this evening.

Federal mandates: Equal population, voting rights, Proposition 106. We have to send this back in to the Department of Justice, Washington, DC. They're going to look at it from these factors.

I sense, when I first started this, that 106 they didn't care how we approached it as long as the Federal Voting Rights Act were followed. So the grid didn't affect them at all. They said, If that's how you
guys want to start in Arizona, that's fine with us, as long as you make sure that it's fair and make sure that it's not biased.

Public meetings. That's what we're doing now. We're going to develop the plans. This is coming in late July. We should be back to you for the second round with plans. We then will be having those public hearings. We will then spend two to three weeks developing final plans after we've received comments and then we have the submission to the U.S. Department of Justice.

And Steve left in his applause. So with that, I'd like to turn it over to Joshua. As a matter of fact, we'll probably put this microphone here so that as you speak it will be recorded. And if any of you that did not fill out any of the yellow forms, if you want to speak, come up and either spell your name or pronounce it clearly so that the court reporter will get that and it will become part of the record also. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Mr. Elder.

Appreciate that.

As a reminder, for those of you that may have folks that were unable to make --

Can you hold this far? Close?

-- were unable to make this meeting, we will also be in Globe tomorrow evening. Commissioner Elder will be at that meeting. I will be unable to attend the meeting in Globe because I will be in Holbrook, but for those of
you who had folks that were unable to come here, it's not too far a drive to Globe. I just made it. And that meeting will be at 6:00 p.m. at 150 North Pine Street. Wherever that is, I have no idea. But you're more than welcome to go, if you didn't -- if you failed this evening.

What we'd like to do now is turn the time over for public comment.

THERESA: I was trying to reduce the feedback. I think that's just it.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Again, for those of you who may have come late and did not have an opportunity to fill out a yellow speaker slip, you're more than welcome to do so if you'd like to make public comment to this Commission. You can ask Theresa. She will provide you with one of these and deliver it up front. And so I have a stack of these. I'm going to call these, just go down the list of them, and we appreciate the opportunity to hear from you.

The first one I have is Mr. Jim Palmer.

MR. PALMER: Thank you. Appreciate the opportunity to address you here this evening. Appreciate the efforts that this Commission has made and your staff to be here and to -- to hear from all of us.

I represent the Graham County Board of Supervisors. I am a member of the board of supervisors, and we have several concerns that we hope would be addressed as you consider this process.

One of the things that we are deeply
concerned about is the fact that for many years now Graham County has been divided into two legislative districts, and we feel like it has to a great extent neutralized our ability to influence the outcome of elections.

We're a very small county, something just over 30,000 people. And when you divide that between legislative districts it makes it very difficult for us to have very much influence. So we very much like to see the county united into one -- one district.

We believe very strongly in the concept of communities of interest. We think it's very, very important to our county, to our surrounding areas. We have many rural areas around us that we feel like share those communities of interest, be they mining, agriculture, forest issues, endangered species issues, many things that combine us as a community of interest with some of our rural neighbors. And we feel very strongly that we need rural -- rural representation that will represent that community of interest in state government for us.

Graham County belongs to an organization known as the Eastern Arizona Counties Organization. It's comprised of Graham, Greenlee, Gila, Navajo and Apache Counties. And we would very much support a move that would make those eastern counties -- that Eastern Counties Organization one legislative district. We think we would be very well served by that. We feel like we have very strong ties with those counties. We meet regularly with
them and -- and have a lot in common with many of the
issues and concerns that we share.

And while I know that there is some sentiment

in Graham County to align us with the southern part of the
state, in Cochise County, and certainly we do share some --
some interest with those areas, a concern that we have I
think is that perhaps some large population centers in --
in Cochise County, such as Sierra Vista, would -- would
dominate us. And we would have a very difficult time being
heard.

And in the eastern counties that I mentioned
earlier their -- we are comprised of counties that have all
communities of about the same size. Where I think we all
have a equal chance to be heard and -- and would be equally
represented in state government.

Both Graham County and the Eastern Counties
Organization have passed resolutions. The Graham County
Board of Supervisors and the Eastern Arizona Counties
Organization have passed resolutions that I would like to
submit into the record. If you'd like me to read those, I
would, or one of them or would you rather I just submit the
written?

COMMISSIONER HALL:  How long are they?

MR. PALMER:  Very short.

COMMISSIONER HALL:  Read one.

MR. PALMER:  I'll read one.

"Whereas, Graham County is a member
Organization, which is comprised of Apache, Gila, Graham, Greenlee, and Navajo Counties, and has been in existence for many years; and

Whereas, Graham County has economic, geographic, cultural and legislative interests in common with the other ECO counties; which form the basis of a strong and unique community of interests; and

Whereas, similar issues within ECO counties include mining, agriculture, forest health, endangered species, open spaces, ranching, recreation, transportation, water and healthcare, which are all unique in some way to the ECO counties; and

Whereas, representation of rural Arizona is in the best interest of Graham County, as well as the other ECO counties, and the state of Arizona.

Be it therefore resolved, that the Graham County Board of Supervisors recommends that a rural legislative district include southern Apache and Navajo Counties and Greenlee, Graham and
Gila Counties.

Be it further resolved, that the Graham County Board of Supervisors recommends that the new congressional districts be formed in a manner that optimizes rural Arizona representation and includes the entire ECO area in one district."

And -- and the ECO resolution is very similar to that, and it was passed last Thursday at an ECO board meeting.

And I'll submit those to you.

We feel like this -- this very well serves our community of interest. A group of small communities, all about the same size, all geographically -- geographically continuous, very good little block there. I think they could be well represented and well served.

Also would like to speak just very briefly on the need to have a rural congressional district. We feel like this would be very important and -- and would hope that there would be some way to find enough folks in rural Arizona that we could have at least one rural congressman from Arizona who would -- who would represent us, who would understand our needs and our concerns. We have been well represented by Congressman Kolbe back in Washington, but I
also --

MR. RIVERA: You cannot mention -- excuse me. You cannot mention who you're being represented by. Sorry.

MR. PALMER: Okay. I'm sorry.

We have been well represented in Washington, but I have also -- I have also been there at times when -- when I have been told quite frankly that when it comes -- push comes to shove that person was elected in Tucson and not in Graham County. And -- and we feel like rural Arizona would be well served by having a rural congressman. If we -- if that could be worked out.

I thank you for your time this evening and appreciate the opportunity to be heard.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Mr. Palmer.

Appreciate that.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Palmer, would you --

MR. PALMER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Our next speaker is Don Stacey.

MR. STACEY: Thank you very much, and we deeply appreciate you coming out to rural areas to receive our input.

My name is Don Stacey. I'm Chairman of the Board of Supervisors for Greenlee County. And Jim here, he kind of paved the way for me because we're very much in
The intent of this testimony is to convey Greenlee County's wishes to remain in a totally rural district to the extent possible given the population changes in the state. We believe that the voice of rural Arizona will not be heard if broken up and attached in large metropolitan areas.

Furthermore, because of issues such as mining, large tracts of public lands, ranching, farming, recreation, transportation, water and healthcare, it is our recommendation that Greenlee County be included in a rural legislative district that includes Apache, Navajo, Graham and Gila Counties.

It's not that we don't have a lot in common with our neighbors to the south, but I think the big issue with us is the use of public lands, and -- and the large amounts of forest in all of our counties. And this I think ties us because we have such a small amount of private land in each of these counties.

We feel that both state and congressional districts formed, which include the above-mentioned counties, would best serve the interest of the region.

And you'll -- of course, I'm not speaking for the other board members, but you may receive a similar resolution from Greenlee County's supporting such a combination.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you.
MR. STACEY: Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Mr. Stacey.

Our next speaker is Terry Cooper.

MR. COOPER: Members of the Commission, for the record, my name is Terry Cooper, and I too wish to welcome you to Graham County. I'm here as Graham County manager tonight. And quite frankly only a fool would go against what his boss just said a few minutes ago, but I would like to say that I too support a community of like interest with our neighbors to the north. We've worked very effectively as an ECO county organization and would continue to do so, representing and request that we be represented in rural Arizona.

I did want to make one other comment, however, and that is that today I had an opportunity to review the submittal from the Navajo Nation, which was submitted to you folks just the other day. Quite frankly, I think if you wish to change your slide for gerrymandering, that does it very nicely as it includes the entire reservation, comes down through Apache and then takes the White Mountains, San Carlos Reservations as well. So I'd certainly urge you to look more at community -- communities of interest as opposed to recommendation such as that. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Mr. Cooper.

The next speaker is Ed Sawyer.

MR. SAwer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
My name is Ed Sawyer, and I want to say that I am -- spent three different times going through this gerrymandering and I guess I'm part of it, so that picture up there might have looked like me as a matter of fact.

I wanted to take this opportunity though to compliment you on taking this job. It's a challenging job. It's a good step -- first step, but I'm not so sure when you get through you're going to wish you had done it or not, because I'm not sure how many friends you're going to have and how many enemies you're going to have when it's over, but I want to assure you that -- that when it's over with, no matter what you do, I'm going to appreciate it because this has been coming for a long time. It should have been -- happened.

The only thing I'd like to say in this is that I know how difficult it is when you get numbers and federal government telling you how you have to do it, but I would hope that you would consider in this -- in your deliberation that you keep at least the Gila Valley together. Now, there's a point here where they want to go up into the north. That's fine. Go to the south. That doesn't make any difference. But at the present time, as you probably know, we split the Gila -- Gila Valley, which I think is ridiculous.

I didn't do it in my time. When I got out they did it. But anyhow, it split. What they did is they took Safford and put it in one district, took half of
Thatcher and put it in the other district along with Pima and Fort Thomas. This is all an agricultural community. These people all are together here. They do all their shopping in Thatcher and Safford. Ninety-nine percent of it. So it's sort of funny to have them split it in this instant. And also this -- and I would hope that you would remember that, the Graham County needs to be back together the way it should be.

I know it's very difficult. And this doesn't have anything to do with the way you -- you can do this, but if you just think back and the people should think here that in the state when it gets through with redistricting, no matter how it goes, about 10 percent of the vote in the legislature is going to control about 85 percent of the land in the state of Arizona. In other words, the majority of the people are in Phoenix. Let's face it. The others in Tucson. Very small areas land wise. Which doesn't make any difference in your figuring, but just consider that.

And -- and I would have hope that in the redistricting of the congressional districts, if you could possibly, some way, I don't know how you're going to do it, get -- go a horseshoe and go around Maricopa and, I'm sorry, Tucson, and give us a district -- congressional district outside of those two areas.

And I do -- and I do want to thank you so much for your taking this opportunity, and I hope that when you're through that you don't get mad at Arizona and leave
the state of Arizona. Thank you so much.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Thank you.

I will say that we feel it's a them against us many times also. That Maricopa controls Pima, controls the rest of the state. We also have a little saying that says: If we offend everybody just a little bit, we probably did our job, or if we pleased everybody just a little bit, we did our job. But there is no way we please everybody all the time so.

We have Mark Tregaskes.

MR. TREGASKES: You say it almost as well as I do.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Oh, boy, I got close. I should have left this to Joshua so he'd have the privilege of mispronouncing and butchering your name. I apologize.

Thank you.

MR. TREGASKES: Thank you for being with us tonight. My name is Mark Tregaskes.

MR. RIVERA: Excuse me. Could you spell it for the court reporter and for me?


Thank you again for being with us tonight. Rather than repeat everything that's been said, I would just add that I concur with all that has been presented already tonight.

I'm also superintendent of Safford Schools, which is located here in Graham County. A big concern that we have certainly is not being split up as a district or as
a community or as a county. We feel very strongly that in order to really meet the needs of our students and our community it takes all of us working together, and that includes having people work for us at the legislature. We heartily endorse being all one piece as far as the redistricting continues.

Something else for your interest. Even though it wasn't by design, some of the comments that has been made in order to join us with the northern counties. In our district we have more common interests with the districts that are to the north of us than we do to those that are from the south. And, again, it wasn't by design. It is just something that has happened over the years and we see that continuing.

Now I notice that you say now your questions.

So some questions that I have, if we -- if you want to go back to the six goals that have been established, I have some questions regarding those.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Please.

MR. TREGASKES: The testimony that you've heard tonight I think is covered by all of the goals that you've mentioned. I think the question that really comes into -- into play is what priority do those goals have? If the goals cannot all be met, is there one or two goals that have greater priority over others at this time? And if they don't at this time, my guess is that some time they will, and I want to know what process would be used in
order to determine what priorities those goals would have in making the redistricting.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, I'm going to give you a general answer to that question and then if you want something more technical, I'll pass the microphone to legal counsel. How's that?

MR. TREGASKES: That would be great.

COMMISSIONER HALL: But generally there is some prepotency -- that's my word -- with respect to the order of these. Obviously, the United States Voting Rights Act and the United States Constitution in complying with the State Constitution, Proposition 106, are predominant. And there -- if you can see with respect to, for example,
MR. TREGASKES: What I understood is that certainly by the law and regulations that are there, those are going to take priority. Those that do not fit the law and regulations are going to take lesser priority. Of those, which are the most important at this time?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, I think there's another factor also. Realize that Arizona is subject to what's called Section 5. We're under the provisions of Section 5. Meaning that we have an obligation to insure by law that we do not minimize in any degree and that we properly preserve the voting capability of minorities in the state of Arizona, and specifically Hispanics and Native Americans. That issue there, in light of the fact that we're under Section 5, our plan must be precleared by the Department of Justice. And unless they stamp -- give us their stamp of approval as to what we do, then this plan cannot become efficacious. That is one of the issues that is very, very important, not only because it's required by law, because it's the right thing to do.

So it wouldn't matter if a district was contiguous, compact and identified community of interest. If it violates Section 5 requirements with respect to minorities, that particular issue would take precedence over a lot of those other issues.

MR. TREGASKES: That taken into account, as we take a look at the six goals that you have there, would you
say that that's a fairly good representation of the
priority ranking that you're going to be working with? The
order in which they're presented.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Rivera, did you have
anything you want to add to that or --

MR. RIVERA: No. I think that aside from A and B,
it's the individual Commissioners in terms of their thought
pattern and what they see and the way that the evidence is
presented and it's really more the public in terms of
what -- what they think is more important now the C, D and
F and testimony.

MR. TREGASKES: Which -- which was my final
question. Then some of the public input that you're
receiving, for those that their -- the ranking can't
change, that's going to be based on public input you
receive?

MR. RIVERA: Right. You know, but supreme court
decisions and the testimony, community interest is a big,
big, big factor.

MR. TREGASKES: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: That's what I was going to
make mention. That the C, D could easily be flipped. You
know, where communities of interest would take priority
over geographical boundaries and that. And that's really
one of the questions I've had is to -- we've got an area
in -- I hate to keep saying this -- in Pima County, where
Sabino High School is attached to Pinal. And I think when
I was a little bit under the weather in college I might have been able to make it down the road on the backside of the Catalina Mountains, but there is no way that that one little area gets fair representation if we left it as the grid shows now. So geography, access, compactness, compactness that, yes, I can get there. It might on a map look it's only two miles away, but if you have to go around Navajo Bridge to the other side of the Grand Canyon it doesn't make a whole lot of sense.

So there are areas where I can see that geography and the geographic, the land form the rivers, the edges that we have in our state might take priority over communities of interest, but not very often. Community interest, at least through one commissioner's position is, is that community interest is probably the thing we want to find out the most about. What is the glue that holds you together? How do you live? How do you socialize? How do you vote? How do you have a dialog among each other to -- to make the republic or the democratic process work?

MR. TREGASKES: Thank you for your clarification.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Mr. Mark.

I appreciate the prelude because I have no -- I'm having a hard time here. And I'm sure it's not this handwriting. It has to be my eyes. George.

MR. LEMEN: Lemen.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Lemen. I apologize, George.

Thank you.
MR. LEMEN: Gentlemen, thank you very much for coming here tonight.

Mr. Hall, you've got to be in trouble here because you're with two guys from -- from Maricopa -- the state of Maricopa, two guys from Pima. I live in Pima, which my state representative didn't know where Pima was for the first couple of years he was -- after the last gerrymandering thing, and you got two lawyers to work with. You're in deep, deep trouble. You're the only guy that's -- that's --

COMMISSIONER HALL: You want to repeat that for the record one more time?

Did you get that? Okay.

MR. LEMEN: You're in deep, deep trouble.

MR. RIVERA: He wants a copy of that.

MR. LEMEN: We sure appreciate you being here.

When we see a commission like yours, as all commissions like yours are made primarily out of the state of Maricopa and Pima County, we all say, Well, we're done. But maybe we're not.

You mentioned three or four times tonight the community of interest. In the congressional district that
we now have, our congressional -- our congressperson comes
out here like once a quarter and he sits down and he talks
to us and he listens to us and he nods his head, but he

really doesn't hear what's being said. Or he hears what's
being said, but when he goes back to where he lives and
gets on that airplane and he looks down on the ground and
sees how many of those people there are versus how many of
us there are, guess what he does. He does exactly what
they want him to do.

This idea of a rural district is wonderful.
If we could get that -- every district that you have on
your legislative map touches or takes a part of one of the
major metropolitan areas. Those major metropolitan areas
get everything they want, and we get what's left. That's
not right. It's just not right. But it is right because
after all the most people are -- have the most say. But
it's time for the rural Arizona, especially rural Arizona
to have some say in how we're governed. And not just give
it up and give it to the other guys. And that's what we
essentially have to do today. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Lemen, thank you for your
comments.

Let me just say a little bit in defense of my
fellow commissioners however.

When I first was appointed to this
commission, I had some of the similar concerns. And I can
assure you folks that my four fellow commissioners are four
of the five -- four of the fair-mindedness folks I ever
met. And I -- I can assure you that -- for example,
yesterday evening the chairman of our commission and I flew
to Window Rock. And I think he was kind of impressed with
our culture and was presented with a bola tie -- a
turquoise bola tie as a gift and -- and along with myself,
yeah, see.

MR. SAWYER: We missed out.

COMMISSIONER HALL: And I think that he really
began to appreciate the Native American culture, for
example, in northeastern Arizona.

And I can assure you that Mr. Huntwork and I
were in Flagstaff together wherein we listened to the Hopi
tribe, for example. And where we received a cob of corn
for a gift and -- one of those dry cobs of corn. And --
and my fellow commissioners, I can assure you, have a
vested interest also in -- in rural Arizona too.

Our next speaker is Walter Mayors.

MR. MARES: Walt -- excuse me. It's Walter Mares.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Sorry.

MR. MARES: It's all right. No problem

M-A-R-E-S.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm a bona fide gringo. I
apologize.

MR. MARES: No problem.

As I've written on my sheet there, I'm
chairman of the Greenlee County Democratic Party. I'm not here on any political agenda. The only ugly head that will be raised will be this one.

I have a very good rapport with -- with the chairman of the other party in Greenlee County. We keep in touch. We feel that we may have some differences, but basically we're in the same boat. I've spoken at length with many from both parties, major parties and a few who don't belong to either party, and the view I've seen so far is people would like to stay -- people I have spoken with, a cross-section, would like to stay -- Greenlee County to stay in District 8. I know it's contrary to what -- what the board of supervisors is -- is -- is wishing to, and I'm not here to say whether they're right or wrong.

But the bottom line is this, we feel we have a great more common ground with Graham, Cochise and Santa Cruz County. We have an organization -- governor's organization or SEAGO, called Southeastern Arizona Governor's Organization, that includes the counties currently in District 8. We have very strong historical ties certainly with Graham County. While we do share ties of interest, some environmental issues, whether it's spotted owl, coyotes, agriculture with Navajo and Apache Counties, we also share some of those with Cochise and Graham Counties and certainly issues in Santa Cruz.
Another strong tie -- District 8 strong tie is something known as SEABHS, Southeastern Arizona Behavioral Health Services, whose board I happen to sit. It covers the same areas as SEAGO. There has been a great deal of investment and hard work that has gone into providing behavioral health in rural Arizona, which is -- sometimes seems next to impossible. We built, own and operate a nonprofit psychiatric hospital in Benson to serve the region. Used to be that Greenlee County law enforcement officers had to drive all the way up to Pinetop in the middle of the winter, no fun, if not impossible, to acquire services.

We also have strong ties, again besides behavioral health, medical services with Graham County, on down through Cochise County and, of course, ultimately Tucson. But there -- there are far more issues. We strongly support stand on having to deal with environmental issues that affect the livelihood of so many. There are other issues I believe that also need to be addressed besides the environmental issues.

Clifton and Duncan. Clifton is the county seat of Greenlee County, and Duncan is the only other incorporated town. Both are designated colonias by U.S. Department of Agriculture and Department of Commerce. Duncan's may -- Duncan may only have one of the two

designations, but meaning that we're close enough to the
border to qualify for certain grants and other activities and programs and so forth. Certainly that's something we don't have in common with Apache, Navajo County. Try getting to Apache and Navajo County in the winter. It's not that easy. It's not that accessible for the common person.

Certainly another tie that we have with Graham County that filters on down south is we had a devastating flood in 1983. A great many people relocated in Graham County, and also many retirees have located here because there is far more extensive medical facility here than elsewhere.

When -- when District 8 was created, yes, part of that was gerrymandering and -- or garymandering. And I remember resenting that very strongly why it was done. It might have been by mistake, but I feel that it has worked out. Again, it -- it also includes the SEAGO region. And every county, every town, in those four counties Graham, Greenlee, Santa Cruz and Cochise, belongs to SEAGO.

Certainly one factor is representation of the Hispanic population. I don't see how going with Navajo and Apache Counties can in any way be beneficial. I am not talking about favoritism for any particular minority group whatever. I'm talking about fair and equitable representation. The chances of electing a Hispanic representative from Apache and Navajo about nil.
Anyway, in conclusion, I certainly have to agree with -- with what has been said here. Hopefully we'll see Graham County brought together. That's certainly was unfair to the folks here. And as far as keeping it rural, please, there -- there are two -- two rurals -- two definitions of rural I believe in Arizona. One is the Flagstaffs, the Casa Grandes, and to a point Sierra Vista, but it is not anywhere near the -- the animal that either Casa Grande or Flagstaff and some of the larger cities are in. And, yes, they can be dealt with politically. They don't have that kind of power yet or that kind of population that they can be dealt with.

And certainly thank you for -- for being here. It's nice to have some input, as compared to the partisan situation that occurred before when the redistricting was done somewhat ten years ago and so forth, but thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Mr. Mares. How did I do?

MR. MARES: Muy bien. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Our next speaker is Gale Barney.


MR. MARES: You too.

MRS. BARNEY: We talk on the telephone.
The plan that I have in my hand was given to me by Marsha Arzberger as a Cochise County plan. I believe you may have already been introduced to this plan; is that correct? Okay. Do you want me to list it or just discuss it?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Whatever your preference is.

MS. BARNEY: Okay. Under this particular plan would include Cochise County, only part of Graham County, keeping the present boundary that goes between Thatcher and Safford along 20th Avenue, as I understood from her description. The maps are not very clear. Greenlee County, and again looking at the map, I had hoped that Clifton and Morenci were in this plan, but I look at it, I can't tell if that little square puts it in or out. But it should have been in, according to her description on the phone. I'm only looking at a electronically transmitted thing. Would also include Cochise County, a little piece of Santa Cruz that would go over to Nogales. As much as I can tell, Patagonia is not in it or is in it. It's just very, very hard to read the map and see what it is.

There's some good things and some -- some strengths and weaknesses here. For Graham County we had hoped, you know, in considering as has been stated that it would be nice to have all of Graham County put into one district. That the county was a complete county. Advantages, as you have pointed out here before, would be splitting -- we would have representation for -- from two
different representatives if the split stays, and there
are -- there's some merit to that, as you stated. So I
won't negate it by stating it.

In addition to this, I'd understood that
there was also a plan of some kind that the Commission had
tentatively or someone has discussed last evening at the
Safford City Council. I was not there and no one has
addressed that. I had hoped that somebody would present
these various plans before we started discussing on them
so we could hear more completely what the options were
before we had an opinion on something we didn't know. I
find myself very illy and very lately informed, although I
have had my ear to the State democrats for, you know, quite
sometime. And nothing -- why was nothing given to us?
That's all. Just, you know, not that we're trying to go
out and do your job for us. It's just that if you think
ahead -- things ahead of time and really knew if -- like
you said, we can come back and present in July, but I still
do not have a clear idea of what the options are and
certainly would like to have them

COMMISSIONER HALL: Neither do we.

MS. BARNEY: Okay. Okay.

COMMISSIONER HALL: You can rest assured that when
we come back we will have draft plans.

MS. BARNEY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER HALL: And we'll post maps and we'll
have them on our Power Point presentation.
I think that you were alluding to our grid which has already been produced.

MS. BARNEY: And that is only the grid?

COMMISSIONER HALL: That's correct. That is a grid. And you're more than welcome to provide input relative to it. But my suggestion is that what we're looking for are the suggestions we've been receiving this evening in an effort to identify communities of interest to help us adjust the grid to accommodate communities of interest and then come back with draft maps and then allow us -- allow you folks to more accurately place us in your gun sights so that we can then respond again.

MS. BARNEY: And has been stated, I don't envy your position at all. And I can see you're working very hard at it.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Let me add to that that as soon as we get, even if it's a preliminary plan we're still working on, we plan on posting that on our web site so we start receiving comments on that as we're going through the sort of evolutionary process. So give us about three, maybe four weeks. Because we'll finish up here this week, and then it's going to take two to three weeks for just the statisticians to -- to give us the sort of next step and to evaluate what's been recorded, read it, categorize it, do all the -- the ranking that they will do for us to where we then will start preparing plans, but the first shot most likely will be on the web site before they're actually
brought to meetings.

MS. BARNEY: Okay. Thank you.

I would also like to comment I recognize with the supervisors that we do have interest of commonality concerning the watershed particularly. And as they've said the rural communities, as has been stated by Mr. Mares here so well. We also do have commonalities with our border towns and people because of our Hispanic population. And as Mrs. Arzberger pointed out, there is some problem with concerns that justice might come and mess everything up.

And just to illustrate what happens when justice messes things up, I brought the map of our county after they got through with it. So that's just to refresh your memory. That's what justice did. And the unfortunate thing is is they were doing it trying to create a strong Hispanic vote -- voting district and in essence what they did was disenfranchise them. And I'd like that to go on the record because campaigning, even the county manager when he retired could not find the constituents because the -- the -- the lines were so fuzzy. So I really hope that you keep as a priority this geographically compact contiguous highways straight lines.

We even found the -- the local school was gerrymandered out because there were no Hispanic names on that block here. You know, that was the kind of thing that justice did with the computer, and it's really unfortunate that they did not allow the input that had been so
I'd like to state this comment, that I would hope that in considering if it went to considering trying to make an area of interest based on say Hispanic or what, that we consider that a fine candidate is always electable by a majority of people, not just a particular race. And I would like to speak that in our own situation my husband was well supported greatly by the Hispanic community, which we much appreciated. And that if we had a Hispanic resident -- we worked ourselves trying to get a Hispanic person to run and they were a little reluctant to, but I'm sure that if we came with someone who's qualified and the people would have confidence you would find that -- that racism and things like that really wouldn't matter. It's -- it's qualifications in what you're able to do.

The border concerns are a real concern. And also with the Arzberger plan has been mentioned, we do have some concerns that Sierra Vista and the population there do overpower our vote sometimes. And that's a consideration. Another consideration was that if we were put into part of Pima -- I had heard that if it went into Pima it would go into the Vail area, which would really be rural people, moving towards Benson eastward there. But if it went on in say to the center of Tucson, into the city, we would have great concerns with losing rural representation. Keeping the communities of interest as the rural communities of interest.
So have I covered everything I hope. Anyway, really appreciate you. And we hope that in the final outcome that the very best is done. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Ms. Barney.

Appreciate that. You certainly heard more -- about more plans than I have so.

Our next speaker is Curtis Ward.

MR. WARD: Hello. I'm chairman of the Graham County Republican Party, and if I haven't ruined my credibility already I'll try a little harder. I voted against Proposition 106. I didn't think that the -- I thought the legislature could -- could do a better job than a commission could do, but so far I am impressed with the job that has been done.

I like your grid. It was just -- sounded like it was completely rural -- I mean -- arbitrary and happenstance how you did it, but I like it.

Gale Barney showed up -- held up the last one of the state -- I mean, of the -- of Safford area. This is of the state. You see it's been -- it is worked around quite a bit.

I want to second some of the things that have been said tonight. I really like the idea of a rural congressional district. I think that would do our state well.

I also like the idea of Graham County being left as a whole and also joining with Greenlee County.
We're sister counties. I think Greenlee County was carved off of Graham County.

If we need to divide, I -- my vote is to go with a southern area. To go with legislative District 8.

I just want to say I love everybody here, and we're -- we're not fighting each other. What we're doing is fighting ignorance. And what happens is when those lines are drawn, cutting up our community in a really odd form it's very difficult to reach people. And that was mentioned by some of the people here from the political parties. It's very difficult to get people interested in the political system because no one knows where they -- what precinct they're in, what legislative district they're in, and so forth. So if you can keep us together, we really appreciate that.

And that's all I have to say. Thank you.

Appreciate the job you're doing.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Mr. Ward.

Our next speaker is John Rhoads.

MR. RHOADS: My name is John Rhodes. It's R-H-O-A-D-S. And in response to the obvious question is this black eye of mine was not the result of a barroom brawl. It was the result of the dumb accident.

So anyway, a few months ago -- firstly, welcome to Safford. A few months ago I sat in a meeting and listened to the governor of Arizona address a fairly large group of political people. And in -- in that
presentation she made a comment that I was given great hope through. She said that the State of Arizona was acquiring a computer program that would help in an equitable solution to redistricting problem. And the reason I felt such great hope was because I had become a precinct committeeman some couple years before that, and

the first thing I recognized was the fact that there were three different sets of maps and they were all extremely confusing.

For example, my own precinct there's three separate areas in that precinct. Now, I didn't -- I was too naïve to think that that was the result of political prowess on the part of somebody sometime for somebody else's ends. But today I realize that gerrymandering is a real fact of life.

When I first saw the grid map that came out from -- from this Commission, which I -- I believe the grid as such is good, I really do, but I had hopes of seeing something a little bit different. And -- and before I tell you exactly what I was thinking, I'd like to ask you a question. Your -- your -- you asked your questions.

When the Proposition 106 was -- was passed, was there a mandate to this Commission to start at the legislative district level as compared to a congressional district level? Because I -- I -- I think we've got things exactly backwards. If we started with congressional district and we drew some equitable maps in the state of
Arizona, and then within those districts -- those congressional districts we drew some legislative districts, I think we could find a degree of equity for rural Arizona. That's my concern.

And -- and I'm -- I -- when I heard Governor Hull mention this computer program I envisioned something that would be along the lines of drawing a line from the exact population center in the state of Arizona, somewhere across to the border and then taking equal increments of a pie and -- and dividing it into legislative districts. Now that's the kind of thinking I think most computers operate on. All right. That's the simplicity of a computer.

And -- and I admire your -- your grid system because I do recognize the fact that the effort was made to -- to -- to address communities of interest, which a computer, without direction, cannot do.

But I believe in this case we need to address not just communities of interest, but communities of disinterest. What is it that separates a cowboy from his horse? There's a burr under the saddle. And it -- quite often a burr can be in the form of -- of animosity from one group to another or from litigation or whatever it is. I believe there is a burr under the saddle in this area that needs to be addressed when it comes to redistricting. And I would simply ask that that burr be considered. It's a very real situation at this point involving money in my humble opinion. And not mining, not agriculture, not
anything but money. And we all have interest in money.

But I haven't heard that said yet, and I just felt that it

really needed to be addressed.

I would like to see an answer to the question

though or hear one if you have one regarding the sequence

of redistricting.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you for the question.

It's an excellent question. Let me -- you -- you really

asked three or four. I'll try and hit all of those, and if

I don't do so, please -- please correct me.

Your question was do we start with

legislative first and then go to congressional? And, no,

we didn't start with either one because really those are

two parallel processes. Realize that an ideal -- pursuant

to the new population figures of 5.1 approximately, the new

legislative district is about a hundred and seventy-one

thousand and twenty-one people. The law requires that

every district is equal population. With that same figure,

the equal population figure, that 5.1 divisible by eight,

is five point -- I'm sorry -- 641,329 people.

So basically in the aggregation process, as

Commissioner Elder explained, we started in the northwest

corner and aggregate townships which are square. You

alluded to why don't we just draw a square lines? Well,

that was my understanding as -- until I began to understand

really the process. You need to understand that the

fundamental population basis of the census is a census
tract or block. And that's why when you aggregate townships you -- you have to overlay the census tracts or blocks. Because it's very difficult to divide those -- in fact, it's somewhat of an act of Congress to divide those -- and we have to utilize those basic population building blocks in an effort to aggregate only considering population.

Let me correct. In one of your statements you said, I don't think the grid should have considered communities of interest. It did not consider community of interest. The only consideration for the grid was arbitrary rules that were established by the Commission. And, in fact, by reason of adoption of those rules, the map was an automatic by-product of the adoption of the rules. And all the rules said was, we need to aggregate townships with the overlay of census tracts and we accommodate -- other accommodating rules as problems occurred as we tried to do this arbitrary process.

Therefore, if you look at the map and analyze it in that respect, and given a copy of our rules, anyone with the same software could reproduce this grid like that. It aggregates and then you could see there's overflow. But there had to be some rules with relation to overflow or undercount of certain issues as they aggregated. And that's really what the rules do.
Consequently, for example, one of the congressional districts in the grid is aggregating to Tucson, after it picks up the rest of Tucson, and then goes clear up and takes in Window Rock before it runs out of population 621,329 and then starts aggregating the rest of the northeast quadrant.

Did that sufficiently answer your question or did I --

MR. RHOADS: Obviously.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Perfect.

MR. RHOADS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you.

Our next presenter is Mr. Phil Martin.

MR. MARTIN: I'd also like to thank you gentlemen for being here with us tonight, giving us your time and talents and abilities.

District number 4 right now is kind of a nightmare. You've got a strip in Greenlee County called York Valley that's part of District 4 and then the rest of the county is District 8. Across the highway here -- here in Thatcher is District 4, and on the south side of the highway is District 8. All of Safford is District 8. So our community is split here in Graham County.

You go on over to the west, goes clear into Apache Junction, Pinal County. Then it jumps -- District 4
jumps Coolidge -- not Coolidge, excuse me -- Florence and takes in a northeast corner of Casa Grande. You go into Hayden. On the north side of the highway in Hayden you're in District 4 and on the south side of the highway you're in District 7. So it's -- it's a nightmare trying to keep up with where -- where do you jump the road and where you're not -- who you skip over and -- in District 4.

So my main interest would be to follow this proposal that Mr. Palmer made with the Graham County Supervisors. Pull us all together with the ECO group so that it would be a lot easier or a lot -- a lot more workable solution rather than wondering which road do you turn on to be in a district and which one you don't turn on to be in a district.

For example, some -- some of the politicians in Phoenix, they can go up 20-block area and they've got a district, but out here we've got to travel many, many miles to cover one district. And then when you cover that district, you wonder whether you're in the right one or the wrong one.

Pinal County really is a nightmare for any politician to try and figure out because you go into Apache Junction. If you get to the Old Grand Hotel there in Apache Junction, then you go north to the county line and all of Gold Canyon is in District 4. Now if those people

wake up and find out how many people there are out there in
Gold Canyon, how are we going to get representation over on this side of the state to support us?

So I'd like to go on record as saying that I support the issue that was brought up by Mr. Palmer.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Mr. Martin.

Our next speaker is Joe Chapin. Is that C-H-A-P-I-N?

MR. CHAPIN: Close. It's Chapin.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. I apologize.

MR. CHAPIN: My name is Joe Chapin, C-H-A-P-I-N.

And I'm from the other side of the mountain. Whether or not it's a barrier, we're still part of Graham County and we'll still claim Safford.

We have raised many of the same issues that you did when you were standing up here talking, but they're still not resolved.

A couple of questions. Do you have a pretty good handle -- or does the Commission have a pretty good handle on the court requirements and criteria for redistricting?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Do we have a very good handle on it?

MR. CHAPIN: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER HALL: We have a perfect handle on it because we hired two attorneys that have been through this process several times.

MR. CHAPIN: The second part of that question is,
if you can do it in less than a year, why can't the legislature do it?

COMMISISONER HALL: Well, I can't speak on their behalf.

MR. CHAPIN: I didn't think so.

Also, we've heard some some rumors and some discussion about a request or proposal from the Indians -- now I don't know exactly what that means -- but for their own legislative district. Is that accurate?

COMMISISONER HALL: That's correct. And that is public record I might add. Last evening at Window Rock the Navajo Nation made a presentation of two proposals, a congressional map and a legislative map, which would be their preference.

And I assume, Jose, that if anyone wants a copy of that they can have a copy of that, correct?

MR. RIVERA: Right. It's public record.

COMMISISONER HALL: In fact, I think some of your representatives already have received copies of that via their -- their own network.

COMMISISONER ELDER: I might add also that that map, although I have not seen it yet either, carries no more weight than a map that you folks here would produce and say we would like to see our district be this a way and here's why. The Navajo and Hopi and the Tohono O'odham they've all come out and -- and described their areas of concern, their areas of interest, communities of interest,
and given us a basis for why they want their tribal grounds or lands to be managed in one direction or another. But that's not to say, you know, that that's going to be the end all. It's not. We have to take all citizens of the state into account. So we'll draw more maps.

MR. CHAPIN: Also it's my understanding -- and again I'm not absolutely sure -- it's my understanding that a single race may not be the basis of a legislative district. Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, if I understand your question correctly, and help me, are you saying that could one legislative district constitute one single race?

MR. CHAPIN: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, I assume that that could potentially be the case, depending on the demographics of a certain area. I mean, that's really a hard question to answer.

Jose, did you have anything you want to add?

MR. RIVERA: It's difficult. If you go back to the presentation that they originally made about packing and dilution of -- of voting districts. If you create a district that was just a single race, it would be difficult to get around the packing constitutional prohibition against that.

The case you're talking about is a case called Reno vs. Shaw, where the supreme court said that race cannot be used solely as a criteria for drawing a
MR. CHAPIN: So it's a little bit the other way around? A single race could be a legislative district, but race alone cannot be the basis for the district.

MR. RIVERA: Theoretically that probably could be right, but it would be very difficult to meet constitutional mustard because, one, it would be difficult to demonstrate that race was not the sole criteria to create that one district; and, two, it would be difficult to meet Section 5 criteria where you're packing minorities in one district to dilute their vote elsewhere.

MR. CHAPIN: Sure. Thank you.

Also my main concern is that the redistricting does not create a state of Phoenix or Maricopa County. Now, I realize that the greater population is in Phoenix and Maricopa County, and there are -- are naturally less votes in rural Arizona. If you want to make me happy, pretty simple: That you don't create a state of Phoenix or Maricopa County; that you create the districts that are fair to all the people of the state, all of the people of the state; and that you give a fair voice to rural Arizona. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Mr. Chapin.

Mr. Van Talley.

MR. TALLEY: Thank you very much. My name is Van Talley.

While I believe it's probably all been said,
we haven't all said it yet, so. You know, as I listened to
some of the proposals that have been kicked around a little
bit this evening, and especially with a lot of interest to
the proposal that Graham County has -- has proposed, I want
to emphasize one thing, it's somebody else's turn to be
split up, not ours. We've been split up way too long.
It's very divisive in the area. It's very hard to get fair
representation. Graham County, and especially the Gila
Valley, needs to be one district. And I think that if you
going across this valley that's one message you're going to
find very strongly.

As far as whether or not to create a district
that moves further north or a district that goes down into
Cochise County, as I think about that, I wonder what are
the factors there? And one of the things that keeps coming
up are communities of interest. And I look down at Sierra

Vista and I wonder what are the communities of interest
that we have with Sierra Vista. And one thing sticks out
pretty strongly with me and that's a military base down
there. And I have to believe that their community of
interest to a large degree is different than our community
of interest which is basically an agricultural-based
economy, as well as mining. And so as you take a look at
that, I think those are the communities of interest that --
that need to be emphasized. But more importantly and most
importantly is don't split us up. We need to remain one
voice so that we will have a voice. Thank you.
COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you.

Ms. Lois Claridge.

MS. CLARIDGE: My last name is spelled C-L-A-R-I-D-G-E. My first name is Lois.

Leave it to a woman to have the last word maybe, but --

COMMISSIONER ELDER: No chance.

MS. CLARIDGE: Anyway, I just wanted to put my thoughts into this.

I've lived here for 55 years. I came here from Illinois as a registered nurse. There was hardly a hospital here. It was not very much. But, at any rate, I -- I have practiced nursing for 25 years. I had been teaching medical and surgical nursing at Northwestern University when I came here, so you can imagine that it was a bit of a shock, although I had been raised in a rural community in Illinois.

I met and married my husband, who's family came here in 1883. And he was a cattle rancher. And so my concern basically is, although I worked this entire community later, 18 and a half years of social work, and I had part of the reservations, all of Graham County, and all of northern Cochise, and so I have a little concern about the area over between Bowie or around eastern -- the northern part of Cochise County because it is industrial -- it is rural and many of the ranches are actually half in one county -- in Graham County and some then extend over
into Cochise. And I do know that they -- they come here to shop. They come here for their medical center that we now have, which is really the finest that one could expect and very new and still improving. Whereas, before we had very little and they didn't either, but -- so they come over here to shop and that. And in my worry about that I do not object to being included in the district that has been mentioned, but I think some thought should be given to that little section of the -- of Cochise County.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Bowie you mentioned, and what else?

MS. CLARIDGE: Well, Willcox. Actually District 6 for the Department of Economic Security includes Benson as well. We're -- that's one of the things that -- where I worked that whole area because of that. And I don't know if anyone had thought about that or not.

And really I think that many of those folk come over here to shop because it's the closest largest city. So those are a little thought for you. Just thoughts.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you for that input.

MS. CLARIDGE: I wanted to say that I also have branded calves, Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, where were you Saturday?

MS. CLARIDGE: I was on the State Community College Board and I was in Phoenix.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you.
We needed lunch bad.

Our next speaker is Paul Brierley.

You'll definitely need to spell that.

MR. BRIERLEY: You pronounced it perfectly. I appreciate that. It's B-R-I-E-R-L-E-Y.

I just want to make a couple of quick points.

When I first heard about your commission was in an editorial in the paper when it was being formed or the proposition was being formed. And I got very excited about it. Mainly because I think here in Graham County,

especially in what we call the Gila Valley, we had the exact prototypical case of what your commission was designed to correct. We're split down the middle.

And besides representation problems, the other problem I see is -- is we wanted an informed electorate, but we -- being sort of an isolated single community here, we have two sets of candidates coming into campaign. And people get excited about a particular candidate, and then they go to the polls, they're not -- they're not on their ballot. Nobody knows what district they're in. So I would just like to add to everybody else's voice that I think that should be your strongest -- I think you will have failed as a commission if that split remains intact.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: The line has been drawn in the sand.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Now we know.
MR. BRIERLEY: And the other issue I don't really have a solution for, but at least to make you aware. It's been brought up maybe in a little gentler terms, but regarding the Native Americans, in particular the San Carlos Reservation, a part of it -- I think a small part, but anyways a part of it is in Graham County. And when I look at your concerns about communities of interest, it seems to me that an Indian reservation is certainly a community of interest that you'd want to keep together.

And the other concern that comes with that is many of us as individual citizens in different organizations here are being sued by the San Carlos Indians for our water rights. And I look at how a representative could represent both them and us with this kind of thing going on. That would be very difficult. So, like I say, I don't have a solution, but I want to bring that to your attention. Thank you for taking our input.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you.

Next speaker is Bill.

MR. KONOPNICKI: Konopnicki.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thanks, Bill.

MR. KONOPNICKI: I'm sure you want me to spell it, right?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Yes, sir.

MR. KONOPNICKI: I'm Bill Konopnicki, K-O-N-O-P-N-I-C-K-I. I think I got it right. Let me check.
Thank you for coming along with everyone else who said that tonight. As I sit here and watched you, I keep thinking you're going to do this a number of times and then you're going to come back and do it again. I really admire you. It's hard to sit through one let alone how many you're going to be sitting through.

I do business in both of the northern counties. I do business in Gila County, as well as Graham County and in Cochise County. It kind of gives me a little different perspective. And I want to talk about that for just one minute. I have lived here 30 years. And being married with Cochise County has not been a good thing for us in Graham County. It's a very, very difficult working situation. If you take the land mass of Cochise County, and particularly as mentioned by Mr. Talley Sierra Vista, it puts us in a tremendous disadvantage.

Somebody talked about driving north, but if you try to get to here -- from here to Sierra Vista is not exactly an easy drive or Bisbee or Nogales, which are all part of that legislative district, makes it a -- a literal impossibility. So I would very much endorse the plan that's been proposed by the board of supervisors and again for the reason that they stated it, it puts communities of relative -- relatively the same size and interest together, and I think it would be a big asset to us.

Also I'd like to support the idea of a rural legislative -- federal legislative district. I think that
would be an important thing if we could do that.
I also am the president of the hospital operating board. And I can tell you that in terms of where we are and what we would like to do, our -- our -- we

basically serve Graham and Greenlee County. We get very little from Cochise County. It's almost as easy for them -- in fact, it's easier for them to go either to Sierra Vista or go to Tucson. But in terms of a hospital board, it would be a huge advantage for us if we could be associated with the northern group of folks.

And, again, thank you for coming. We appreciate all your help.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Bill.
I have mercifully run out of yellow sheets.
Are there -- is there anyone else who wishes to speak to this Commission that has not had an opportunity to fill out a sheet?
With that is there anyone else that would like to -- would have any additional questions that may have come to mind while some of the speakers made comments?
Please.

MR. WARD: Can you go over the time frame again?
I sort of forgot that already.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Appreciate that.
And I may say that our time frame is ever evolving. I was on the phone this morning with our chair, with one of our attorneys, just trying to coordinate five
schedules plus our staff, plus our attorneys, and our consultant trying to assimilate all the information we've had. As Mr. Elder indicated, we have folks that are in Phoenix the same evening gathering information, but in general our goal is to somehow meet several times over the next few weeks and hopefully by let's say the third week of July have draft maps and then with those draft maps and maybe even simultaneously go back out for a second round of hearings and, as indicated in the presentation, allow for the 30-day review also by the legislature and anyone else who would like to provide input relative to our first draft map.

Subsequent to that then, our desire is then to garner all of that information, come back and develop final maps. And hopefully sometime in September hand that to our -- first part of September, late August, hand that to our counsel -- legal counsel who then will prepare the -- all of the documentation to go with those maps and submit that to Department of Justice for clearance.

Realize that Department of Justice has 60 days to review our proposal. And in the event that we're missing a paper clip or something and they determine that they need more information or have a question, they can send that back. And when they do, the clock stops. And until we respond to any questions or concerns they have, the clock doesn't start again. And so realizing that 60-day period, we're wanting to get in there early, if you
will, assuming, of course, there are no lawsuits. And then hopefully by the end of the year we have a precleared plan wherein candidates under the Clean Elections Act at the first of the year could go ahead and, one, know who their constituents were that they need to collect money from and, two, where they were going to run. So that's kind of our general goal, and hopefully we can achieve that.

MR. RIVERA: You know --

COMMISSIONER HALL: Please.

MR. RIVERA: Keeping in mind that when you go for preclearance with Justice, all they preclear is for Section 5. They don't preclear for Section 2, and they don't preclear for constitutional one man/one vote issues.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you.

Please.

MR. BRIERLEY: What if you're not done, if it's delayed by lawsuits or whatever, just for the next election stay with the existing district?

COMMISSIONER HALL: If we're pushed that far down the line, I believe that's correct, is it not?

MR. RIVERA: You can do that -- it depends on the judge. And there's an Arizona law that says basically you do that for state legislators. The problem is you have two additional congressional seats. So you can't go back and only elect six people. You have to elect eight. And there
has been a variety of innovative ways that courts have done it in the past, including like if you can't do it in a congressional, electing two at large until -- until the plan gets approved. But it's -- it's a good guess what happens when you can't do the congressional.

But the good thing is that I went through this litigation in 1990 on the congressional district side of it. The courts will put this on a fast track. The -- there's a three-judge panel that goes through it. That's chosen by the Ninth Circuit. The three-judge panel last time made us try the case in one week. And we started really early in the morning and we went until almost midnight and included Saturdays and Sundays. And then from that there's a direct appeal to the Supreme Court. You don't go through the Ninth Circuit. And Supreme Court acts fairly quickly. Last time the litigation started in March or April. We were done by May.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you.

Any other questions?

Please.

MR. BRYCE: What I was wondering, on your input where you've got the citizens' input and then people who have input of a voice here, as far as the Commission how -- I mean, how are you able to assimilate all of that information? I mean --
COMMISSIONER HALL: I won't even -- I won't even tell you how much money we've spent on consultants because you'll be depressed, but we -- we have -- we have hired some high-dollar consultants who will take this information with their extensive staff and they're going to develop what is called Arizona units of representation.

For example, we've heard some very significant comment this evening with respect to what can be considered in your area a unit of representation. Then the Commission will analyze that input relative to it as they try and determine -- as we analyze what they've said, this is a unit of representation, is that's their terminology, and then develop some rules with respect to how to handle those rules of -- units of representation for the actual drafting of the maps.

Did that answer your question?

Anything else?

Folks, it's a pleasure to be with you this evening. We appreciate the opportunity to be with you again. And we're grateful to have the opportunity to hear your input. And I think Dan needs to talk one more time.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'm the beggar of the group. Really, without your participation, as was stated by one gentleman up here, we'll fail. This next time through we're going to have maps. And if you can bring your neighbors, you know, attend again because you heard the first part, we really would appreciate it. We'll be
getting the information out as to when and the where. I assume it will probably be in the same location, but we really would like to have you out. And also visit our web site. Pick up the slips in the back. Mail them in. Any way you can get us information will be very helpful. Again, thank you for coming this evening, and we appreciate it.

(Adjourned: 9:00 p.m.)
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