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COMMISSIONER HALL: With your permission, I would like to call this meeting to order.

My name is Joshua Hall, and I am one of the five members of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission, and it's a pleasure to be with you here this evening. We are grateful for your hospitality and the opportunity to be with you. We are here, in short, to hear from you. And with your permission, I'd like to go ahead and will introduce a few members of our staff that are here with us.

What we will do then is make a short presentation to kind of give you an overview of what we are about and kind of where we are headed, and following that, then we would like to welcome your input, wherein you can come to this pulpit. We would ask you to speak in the microphone for recording purposes.

Subsequent to that, then we would be more than happy to answer any burning questions that you may have. If you have not had an opportunity to, if you'd like to speak, we have these yellow sheets that were provided at the front table and we have staff -- who is Myra here at the back. And Myra will be the first I introduce. Myra Parker. If you will raise your hand, she would be more than happy to provide you with one of these sheets wherein you can fill it out. We will place it into our stack and then you can have an opportunity to provide us whatever information you deem to be appropriate.

While we are in the phrase of introductions, I would like to introduce our attorney, who is Jose Rivera, one of the two members of our legal counsel. We are grateful to have him here with us. Mr. Rivera is a former U.S. attorney, has had extensive experience in voting rights law, in addition to other law, and we are grateful to have him as a member of our team.

And on my right is Miss Marguerite Leoni, who is a member of National Demographics, who is our consultant. And they have been involved in redistricting at a variety of levels for a number of years, and she's also an attorney and has extensive
experience and expertise with voting rights law and
other areas relative to what we are trying to
accomplish. As you can see, to my left is a court
reporter who will record all aspects of this
proceeding. If I can ask Mica, would you mind coming
forward. Dijoli, is that right?

MS. DIJOLI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HALL: And if you don't mind
coming forward and making a statement.

MS. DIJOLI: My name is Mica Dijoli, and I
work with Navajo County.

COMMISSIONER HALL: It's not amplified.

Just go ahead.

MS. DIJOLI: (Speaking in Navajo.)

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you.

MR. RIVERA: Repeat it in English so we can
have a record.

MS. DIJOLI: My name is Mica Dijoli, and I
represent Navajo County. And I'm an outreach worker
for Navajo County here in Holbrook. And I asked how
many people were present were Navajo, and only two of
them raised their hands. And I asked them if they
need assistance in translating what was being said
today and they said they didn't need it because they
understand English.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Rivera, for the
record, do you mind making the same statement?

MR. RIVERA: (Speaking in Spanish.)

And, again, if there is anybody here that
only speaks Spanish and needs help in translation or
translating any of the proceedings here, please let me
know.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you. I'm going
to go ahead and represent the English version. We
want to insure that we accommodate all cultures and
languages and, therefore, we want to make an effort to
do so.

Without further ado, are there any other
items of business that I have failed to touch on?

We are, as I have indicated, here as part of
the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission. Our
purpose of this commission is to draw new state
legislative and congressional district lines. And we
are excited about that process.

There is a very important difference between
the process now and the process in the past, because
citizens play an important and crucial role in this
process. And these public hearings are partly to
educate you, but mostly we are here so that you can
educate us and help us to understand what is most
important to you.

We are holding these hearings throughout the
state of Arizona. And I have fellow commissioners who
are in Globe this evening; I was in Thatcher last
evening; and we have been throughout the whole state
in an effort to try and receive input and information
from the citizens. Our desire is to make this process
as impartial and fair as possible because not only is
that part of our appointment, but that is the right
thing to do. In the past, redistricting has been a rather
divisive process. Some have been accused of doing
partisan politics and partisan power plays and
incumbent protection and racial discrimination. And,
typically, in an effort to draw lines that would
accomplish these goals, that term has been referred to
as gerrymandering. In 1811, there was a federalist
governor by the name of Elbridge Gerry, and he drew a
district line similar to this design in an effort to
protect his own interests. The Boston Globe drew a
comic then in their newspaper, and they made it into a
salamander, thus the term Gerrymander -- named after
Elbridge Gerry and a salamander -- was born. And
consequently and subsequently, we have Americanized
that term in most cases to gerrymander.
Here is a couple of examples how abusive
political redistrictings can occur in the process of
utilizing gerrymandering. You will notice the example
on the left, there is a dispersal of the minority
table population. This term is typically referred to
as dilution. And you can see they have diluted the
minority voters as indicated in the pink boxes in an
effort to achieve their own political purposes.
On the right-hand example, there is a
concentration of minority party voters, which is
called packing. I might add that both of these are
examples of the process that are not only
inappropriate but illegal.
Here is some examples of racial
gerrymandering. On the left is an example to create
an ethnic district to help the Republicans in this
hypothetical example. And you can see that they have
done that with their lines so that they are able to
protect their own personal interests.
On the right, the desire is to preserve a
white democratic incumbent, therefore they diluted the
vote of the Hispanics as represented in the orange box
so that they could minimize their influence and power
in an effort to go ahead and achieve their own
personal goals.
The voters of Arizona wanted to clean up
this state's redistricting process, and, therefore, in
November of 2000 they passed Proposition 106. And
many of you may remember seeing that on the ballot.
Some of you may have voted for it; some of you may
have not. We won't ask for a raise of hands.
And it created, by reason of that
proposition, the Independent Redistricting Commission,
who is responsible, for this term period and in the
future, to create and draw the new legislative and
congressional district lines.
There are five members of that commission.
As I have indicated, my name is Joshua Hall. I am a
registered Democrat. I reside in St. Johns, and I'm a
business owner who owns a title company that does work
in Navajo County, primarily.
The chair of our commission is Steven W
Lynn, and he is the only independent member of our
commission, registered Independent. And he resides in
Tucson. He works for UniSource Power Corporation.
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which is the parent corp of Tucson Electric Power.
The vice chair is Andrea Mnkoff, who is a
former businesswoman who resides in Phoenix and
Maricopa County. And she's a registered Democrat.
Daniel R. Elder is a registered Republican.
He resides in Pima County. He does architectural
design work.
And the other member of our commission is
James R. Huntwork, who is an attorney who resides in
Maricopa County. And he is a registered Republican.

Just to give you an idea how these five
members were chosen, Mr. Huntwork was appointed by the
speaker of the house, Mr. Weiers. Subsequent to his
appointment, then, Andrea Mnkoff was represented by
Representative Cheuvront, who is the minority leader
of the house. Next was Mr. Elder, who was appointed
by the president of the senate, Randall Gnait. And
following him the floor leader of the senate is
representative Jack Brown, who appointed myself. The
four members were commissioned then, pursuant to the
conditions of Proposition 106, met, and they
interviewed four candidates who were there. The fifth
one dropped out, probably because he was smarter than
the rest of us. And we interviewed four, and of those
four, in a public meeting we chose Mr. Lynn, who is a
registered Independent, as indicated and provided for
in the proposition, to be the chairman of this
commission.

Each of these members, I might add,
regardless of residency or regardless of party
registration, are dedicated and committed to impartial
and fair redistricting that complies with the laws of
the state and of the federal government.
The proposition itself states that the
Independent Redistricting Commission shall establish
congressional and legislative districts. The
commencement of this process was to occur by the
establishment of an equal population grid. Many of
you, I notice, have a copy of that equal population
grid. Subsequent to that commencement grid, then, we
then are required to consider the following goals;
namely, that our districts shall comply with the United
States Constitution and the Voting Rights Act; that
they shall have equal population, both legislatively
and congressionally, to the extent possible; that they
shall be geographically compact and contiguous; that
they shall respect communities of interest; that they
shall respect -- district lines shall respect visible
geographic features, such as city, town, county
boundaries and undivided census tracts; and to the
extent practical, that competitive districts should be
favored where to do so would create no significant
detriment to the other goals provided above.

It also --
MR. BOLES: Excuse me. Would you go back
to that last one again?
COMMISSIONER HALL: Yes, sir.
MR. BOLES: I'm not sure I -- competitive
districts should be -- would you explain that?
party registration with respect to Democrat versus
Republican, or whatever. That there is the
opportunity for each district to be competitive to the
extent that it would not create a significant
detriment to the above goals. In other words, that
the above goals take precedence over the issue of
competitiveness. Thank you for the question.

It also states that in the initial process,
voting history data and party registration shall be
excluded from consideration. And, furthermore, it
states that the places of residence of incumbents and
candidates shall not be identified or considered.
Therefore, we would ask as you provide
public comment to this commission this evening, that
you would not reference the address or who is the
incumbent that represents you, or any potential
candidates that you may be aware of, because that is
not something that this commission is allowed to
consider.

In April of 2001, we received facts on
Arizona's changing population as reported by the
census. I think it's important to note that we must
rely upon the census figures, and those are the only
figures that we can utilize in consideration of
accomplishing the equal population requirement. There
are those that are of the opinion that the census does
not properly or adequately represent their particular
communities. While that may well be the case, that is
not something that we can consider. We can only rely
upon the figures that are provided to us.

As we are all aware, Arizona has grown. And
it's amazing. It's grown over 40 percent. Notice
that it was only 3.6 million and change in 1990, and
now, in 2000, it is over 5.1 million people.
Where do you think most of that growth
occurred? Well, if Arizona was only 3.6, notice
Maricopa County itself is now over three million
alone. Significant growth to the extent of
44.8 percent in Maricopa County. And these are some
samples of counties with some of the highest growth
counties throughout the state. Look at Mohave, at
nearly 66 percent growth in a period of ten years.
Our task, therefore, as we have indicated,
is to develop districts into a grid-like pattern,
which we have done. Here are a couple of examples in
the dictionary of what a grid is. You are welcome to
choose whatever definition meets your needs, but I
think we all know that a grid is essentially something
that is linear, if you will, across the plain.

On May 18th, we, as a commission, voted to
begin development of the grid based on Arizona's
townships. And on May 25th, we received a progress
report from our consultant regarding how that was
going to occur. And to insure complete neutrality in
this process, we made a determination to start this
grid-like process at the Gila Salt River Basin
Meridian.

Being one who utilizes legal descriptions
rather frequently, you will notice that in a metes and
bounds legal description, that is the point at which
the geographical survey of the state of Arizona starts. So our determination was to use the grid-like building block of a township, starting at this neutral point, in an effort to try and create a grid based solely on the consideration of equal population.

And on June 7th, the rules of the grid, both state and congressional and legislative districts were approved, and the grid was created, which many of you have, which is the starting point for that process.

Most of Arizona is already divided into grid-like patterns as I have indicated. Please.

Questions?

The aggregation of the grids then occurred.

One township basically constitutes a square of six miles square, then one township grid is four grid townships. An intermediate township grid would constitute 16 townships, and a super township grid would, in essence, be four intermediate township grids.

The commission said if we start at the point of the Gila Salt River Basin Meridian and drew a vertical and horizontal line through that point, we would be able to determine which quadrant we would start this aggregation process of townships. We drew out of a hat one of the four quadrants, and it was determined by a luck of the draw, if you will, that the northwest quadrant would be the place that we would start. Then it needed to be determined would we aggregate in a clockwise or counterclockwise fashion. By the flip of a coin, we determined it would be counterclockwise. Therefore, the aggregation occurred in the northwest quadrant, aggregated to the southwest quadrant, to the southeast quadrant, and to the northeast quadrant of the state where you folks reside.

In addition to the consideration of townships, we needed to overlay census geography because that is the basic building block of population. Therefore, you would ask why, then, is the map before me basically not square, because, as you know, census tracts and blocks are basically not square and rather odd in shape. So utilizing the township grid as an aggregation point and overlaying census geography, we then developed rules to accommodate challenges as they occurred and aggregated and developed the equal population grid as many of you have seen. Again, that is only the starting point and only considers population.

Subsequent to the grid, then, we now are here in a public hearing to hear input from you folks because it's our desire for you to assist us in adjusting this grid to accommodate the other goals as previously stated in Proposition 106. It says we then will develop a draft map. And after the development of the draft map, we then will allow for comment for at least 30 days.

The legislature might also provide comment for that time frame, and it's important to realize that this commission will consider that comment after the draft maps and then incorporate that into our
final maps that we will send to Justice for pre-clearance. Before I move on, let me just talk about that process of sending this to Justice to pre-clearance.

So, in essence, in review, we have created a grid. We want your public input via these public hearings. We then will create draft maps and, after the draft maps, we will allow for additional input from all parties and we will do another round of public hearings. And, then, after the other round of public hearings, our legal counsel then will prepare the final map -- will prepare the final maps and our legal counsel will prepare the appropriate documentation to submit this to the Department of Justice.

You may ask why do we need to submit our plan to the Department of Justice? I knew you were going to ask that. The reason being is because we are under what's called Section 5, and that means that we have an obligation -- one of the few, what, 11 states, 11 states throughout the nation who is subject to provisions of Section 5, meaning that we have an obligation to insure that minority representation is properly protected and represented. And, therefore, Justice must pre-clear our plan in an effort to insure that we have complied with Section 5 requirements.

In your packet, you have a citizen input form and we would welcome that you provide input to this commission via that form. That form essentially asks for pertinent information about you. In addition, it may ask what are some of your major concerns, what do you think is most important relative to this process? Further, it would say what boundary lines would you like to see used in your areas? What area, groups or neighbors do you think should absolutely not be divided by district boundaries? I was in Thatcher last evening, as I indicated. And presently, the legislative district lines divide Thatcher and Safford in a rather interesting manner. It was very clear from their public input that they -- their desire was that their community not be divided.

Questions on the input form. It asks that you take some of the following considerations and rank them in order of importance. Which do you feel is most important to you? Keeping a community intact or bringing particular groups together, such as neighborhood associations or minority group concentrations; using a man-made or natural boundary; drawing congressional and legislative districts that include whole cities or as much of a city as equal population permits; using local government boundaries when drawing congressional and legislative district lines; keeping census tracts from being split; using freeways and major transportation routes; drawing compact and contiguous shapes.

And, basically, that form you can utilize as a tool to help us understand what is most important, for example, to the Holbrook area. You can complete it and hand it in tonight; you can mail it in; you can
have your granddaughter hand-deliver it, whatever is most appropriate to you. In addition, we have a
website where you can do that via the Web. Our address as indicated is www.Azredistricting.org.
Also on that website you will find some maps, some answers to frequently asked questions, and anything else that you may find interesting. If you don't have a citizens kit, you can request one. If you lose your citizens kit, you can get another one. We are more than happy and we welcome any and all input.

In review, we must follow the federal mandates, equal population, the Voting Rights Act, and make sure we comply with Section 5 pursuant to the Department of Justice's recommendations, and, in addition, Proposition 106 requirements which is now state law. In review, we will also provide public hearings as we are doing now. We will develop draft plans. We will have more public hearings. We then will do a final plan, and then we will submit our plan to the Department of Justice.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: First of all, you will be, I'm assuming, creating seven congressional districts?
COMMISSIONER HALL: We are going to create eight congressional districts; 5.1 million people is equally divisible by eight, which constitute eight congressional districts comprising of an equal population number of 641,329 people. The legislative districts will be 30, which comprises an ideal number of 171,021 people.

MR. RIVERA: Excuse me.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: A question --
MR. RIVERA: Josh, before --
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You don't have a choice --
MR. RIVERA: Before you ask the question, could you identify yourselves when you are asking questions for the court reporter.
MR. BOLES: My name is Jim Boles. I'm the mayor of Winslow. B-O-L-E-S.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you.
MR. BOLES: You don't have a choice on the congressional districts. Do you have a choice on the number of legislative districts?
COMMISSIONER HALL: No, sir. It's 30.
MR. BOLES: So you are mandated to maintain --
COMMISSIONER HALL: Thirty districts.
MR. BOLES: -- 30 districts.
COMMISSIONER HALL: That's correct. Eight congressional, 30 legislative. There is slight wiggle room with respect to population deviation on legislative districts. With respect to the population on congressional districts, there is almost no wiggle room. Please.
MR. BOLES: Do you go any further than that? As an example, counties will be concerned with things like supervisor districts and so forth.
MR. BOLES: Are you involved in that or is that separate?

COMMISSIONER HALL: That's the responsibility of the board of supervisors of each individual county. Same as with respect to precinct boundaries. We simply do eight congressional and 30 legislative.

MR. BOLES: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Any other pertinent and burning questions before we move to the next segment of our meeting, wherein we would welcome your public input? Wonderful.

MS. RHODEN: Actually, I have one question.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Your name, please.

MS. RHODEN: My name is Paula Rhoden, R-H-O-D-E-N. And, I'm sorry, I didn't fill out your yellow thing.

COMMISSIONER HALL: That's okay.

MS. RHODEN: But when you talked about the review process, the public input, you take their input, then you do it again, then you take it back to the legislature to get their input. How vital is their input going to be? Or are you guys just doing their work and then they are going to say, yes, we like it or, no, we don't?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Good question. The input of all citizens is equally important. Your input is just as important as senator X or representative Y. The proposition provides for them to provide input and it provides for you to provide input, and we take into consideration all input because we are here to represent over 5.1 million citizens of the state.

MS. RHODEN: But they are providing their input as a legislature and not as individual members of the community.

COMMISSIONER HALL: It says either a minority or majority report, that's correct.

MS. RHODEN: But what I'm saying is that if they are giving their input, is it -- is the appearance going to be that you guys have done all the footwork and then you are going to just --

MR. RIVERA: Excuse me, ma'am Commissioner Hall. There is no veto power of the legislature. The commission makes the ultimate decision in terms of what happens.

COMMISSIONER HALL: The five members make the final decision.

MS. RHODEN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Please.

MR. SHELLY: Going back to the grid --

COMMISSIONER HALL: Yes, sir.

MR. SHELLY: -- you were saying, well, what I have here, it says five-two-one on your minority and all that stuff. Are you going to address that, or are you going to try to make it so -- you were saying something about the way it was drawn out was the Democratic party had more, all the majority on their block, and that's what you were telling us. Now, what
is the different with the five, two and one when you have, in Arizona, you have more whites and Hispanics and Native American are minority? And what are the difference? You are trying to change that and redistrict. What is the difference between the two?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, let me see if I understand your question correctly.

MR. RIVERA: Identify yourself, first.

COMMISSIONER HALL: What was your name?

MR. SHELLY: Ben Shelly.

COMMISSIONER HALL: S-H-E-L-L-Y?

MR. SHELLY: Yes. No EY. Just Y.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Pretty good.

MR. SHELLY: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Let me see if I understand your question correctly.

Are you saying -- when you say five, two, one, what do you mean?

MR. SHELLY: It's in the booklet here. The problem that --

COMMISSIONER HALL: You are looking at a copy of our old presentation.

MR. SHELLY: Somebody should tell us it's an old one. Okay?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Fine. Let me then comment on what you're referencing. I apologize. On our previous versions of the redistricting process, we referenced examples that were provided in the Arizona Republic simply as other examples that they gave for congressional grids. That five-two-one, the three examples that you're referencing, were simply cited by the Arizona Republic. We simply referenced those. Those are not a product of this commission. We are simply saying here is some examples of grids that have already been placed of record or placed out into the public.

MR. SHELLY: But is this commission going to be looking at those problem that exists?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Oh, absolutely. And our consultants and our counsel, we all agreed with a lot of the problems that the Republic cited, because that's a direct quote from the Republic. But realize, in the grid, we created it in a completely arbitrary fashion and that grid is simply the starting point. So we can adjust it based upon the input we receive from you.

Now with respect to your question about minorities or whatever, absolutely. As I have indicated, pursuant to Section 5, under the provisions of the Constitution, we will insure that minorities have proper representation throughout the state.

MR. SHELLY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Any other questions?

Thank you.

With your permission, then, and without objection, I'd like to go ahead and invite those who have requested to make comment to this commission to come to this microphone. Again, that does not amplify; therefore, you will need to speak loudly so everyone in the audience can hear. And, in addition, we would ask that you would state your name and spell your name correctly, first. I'll try to do my best to see if I can make out what you're saying.
it for the court reporter.
I will simply call these names as I have
received them via the yellow sheet. And, again, if
you desire to speak and felt inspired during my
presentation to speak and have not had an opportunity
to do so, please request one of these slips from Myra
and she will be happy to do that and provide that to
this commission.
The first speaker I have is Freddie Howard.
MR. SHELLY: They will put me in jail if I
call myself Freddie Howard. My name is Ben Shelly. I
just mentioned that a while ago. I guess -- I just
came here to listen to see how this thing was going on, what was going on with the redistricting and all
that. So -- and Freddie Howard said he had an
emergency so he gave me his note, his statement, that
he wants me to make to the commissioner. I would like
to go ahead and read that to you for the record.
This is the way it goes, so here we go. My
name is Freddie Howard -- which I'm not. I'm Ben Shelly. I am a Navajo Nation tribal council -- which
I am a Navajo Nation Tribal council, too.
Representing Tonalea Lake, Bird Springs Chapter and
Coconino and Navajo County in Arizona.
I am the current chairman of the Public
Safety Committee, and I'm also a member of the,
Navajo-Hopi Land Commission, both of the Navajo Nation
council. I would like to extend my welcome to you for
coming to northern Arizona, the Redistricting
Commission, to the committee and the commissioner, and
the chairpersons, Steve Lynn, Andrea Minkoff -- if I'm
mispronouncing your name, you can call me a name any
time you want -- Daniel Elder and Joshua Hall, James
Huntwork. I appreciate your holding your
redistricting hearing here in Holbrook, Arizona. This
shows the genuine efforts of the commissioner
extending your interest in northern Arizona
representation and the state of Arizona legislature
and the congressional representation in Washington,
D.C.
As we know, the 2000 Arizona population
increased to 5,130,632, and allows us an increase in
the apportionment of the congressional representation,
the 2000 U.S. census allowing the Navajo Nation to
maintain a better count and decrease a tremendous
under count we experienced in 1990. The 1990 under
count resulted in damage to the Navajo Nation and
decreased federal funding we would have otherwise been
eligible for.
On Monday evening, June 25th, 2001, the
Navajo Nation submitted a proposed congressional and
legislative redistricting map. I am here for the
record in support of the map submitted to this Arizona
Redistricting Commission. The proposed congressional
redistricting map allows the Navajo Nation and the
neighboring tribe to be contained on one congressional
district. We have similar background and share common
community bonds. The proposed legislative
redistricting map serves the same purpose in keeping
the Navajo Nation in one legislative district to work
with the state of Arizona as one Navajo Nation.
Any other proposed redistricting recommendation submitted to the commissioner will only split the Navajo people's votes or will dilute their voting power. Do -- in future discussion, the redistricting commission may conclude that if Navajo Nation is split into two congressional districts in Arizona, that the decision may not be -- it may be harmful. But, as such, a decision will be harmful to the Navajo Nation.

Currently, the Navajo Nation is split by state line, Arizona/New Mexico and Arizona and Utah. By this virtue, we have to communicate and to work aggressively with two congressional representatives from New Mexico, district two, Mr. Skeet, and district three, Udall, and one congressional representative from Utah and our two congressional representatives from Arizona. This is a total of five different congressional representatives the Navajo Nation that has to work with. One might argue that this is more representation, but one deciding factor is we need our vote to be in one district to carry more weight for our voice to be heard. Therefore, I ask you as commissioner to support the Navajo Nation to be contained in one congressional district.

Therefore -- for most, the Navajo Nation face more diverse challenge than the general urban and typical rural areas of Arizona. Our outlying areas are not developed. And while they have lovely scenery and landscape, they are barren to radio transmission, communication lines, utilities and roads and construction and maintenance, to name very few examples.

We have had qualified Navajo candidates who ran in the congressional race but were unsuccessful. This has diminished our enthusiasm for entering into congressional politics because the votes were not there to begin with for, for a candidate who understood the needs of the Navajo people. Our Navajo people become more involved in issue if they know they are voting as a whole Navajo Nation, not on two halves of Navajo Nation, voting for different candidates. The Navajos are a political group, and not necessarily should be viewed as a racial minority group because of our Navajo Nation 1868 treaty with the United States government that creates our sovereign status. The Navajo Nation has developed a functioning tribal government and we had to travel to Washington, D.C. to lobby on our own without help from the counties or the state of Arizona.

As chair of the Public Safety Committee of the Navajo Nation council, I have faced continue up battle in meeting the needs of our law enforcement officers, department judicial issues, taxation issue and state tribal relation and representation. I also serve on the Navajo-Hopi Land Commission. Hopi land area needs to be in the same congressional district since we have many common interests. The same congressional representative will understand our difference and needs rather than have two different congressional representatives who may end up working.
on opposite side and risk miscommunication. Situation
like this often creates worse. With two new congressional districts to add
to Arizona representation, I ask that this Arizona
Redistricting Commission not to follow the old pattern
of drawing districts. Allow the Navajo Nation and the
nearby tribal reservation to become the truly first
Native American congressional district in the United
States. These tribes are connected by similar needs,
geographical location and voting pattern. These
tribes, along with surrounding voting towns with
similar voting pattern to the Navajo Nation, will be a
true representation to the northern Arizona. We can
then reach the goal of the purpose of the
redistricting, to select a candidate of our choice.

Again, thank you for your efforts in
redistricting, and I ask you to give favorable
consideration to the Navajo Nation congressional and
legislative district proposal. Thank you.
Do I need to provide this copy?

MS. PARKER: I have one right here.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Mr. Shelly.
I appreciate your comments.

Next speaker is Frank Seanez.

MR. SEANEZ: Commissioner Hall, members of
the commission staff, it's good to see you again this
evening. You're looking -- you're still looking like
you're going strong even though I know that that's one
tough tour that you're undertaking.

The Navajo Nation has sent me down here to
provide some additional input to the commission as
well as to provide the opportunity for members of the
audience to be able to access the Navajo Nation
proposals on the congressional and legislative
boundaries as well. And the Navajo Nation staff,
myself and Ms. Carolyn Calvin, the legislative branch
press officer, do have copies available for members of
the audience who would like to access them. Since I
know that the -- every stop on the road show the
commission picks up more paper, unless the
commission or staff really needs any, I will refrain
from adding to your burden.

My name is Frank Seanez, S-E-A-N-E-Z. I'm
an attorney with the Office of Legislative Council for
the Navajo Nation. And I would like to provide input
relative to the Navajo Nation's proposals for
congressional and legislative district.

The Navajo Nation has taken great, great
effort to try to address the criteria for the
redistricting set forth in Proposition 106 in a manner
which is going to meet all of those criteria, which is
going to be strongly supportable by members of the
community, and also not to be vulnerable to attack
either under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act or
Section 5 in the pre-clearance submission of the
redistricting plan to the U.S. Department of Justice
sometime in September.

The Navajo Nation is aware that equal
population under the U.S. Constitution, Article 1,
Section 2, 14th and 15th Amendment, and other criteria
must be adhered to in the redistricting, as well as
the Voting Rights Act, because of those potential difficulties under both Section 2 and Section 5 of the Act.

There are just a few items I'd like to point out with regards to the Navajo Nation's proposed congressional and legislative districts.

The criterion two, for equal population, the Navajo Nation's congressional and legislative district proposals both meet the standards established under federal law for equal population. The ideal population as calculated is 641,329 individuals. The Navajo Nation proposal would contain 641,045 individuals. That's a deviation of only 0.4 percent. And although there is a very stringent adherence to equal population criterion in the federal case law, that deviation of 0.4 percent is well within the deviation as accepted by United States Supreme Court and the U.S. district courts.

The legislative district proposal, the ideal number is 171,021 persons. The Navajo Nation proposal is 172,852 persons. That's a deviation of 1.1 percent. Again, as previously noted by Commissioner Hall, there is a greater degree of deviation which is considered acceptable by both the United States Supreme Court and the U.S. district courts. The deviation of 1.1 percent is still quite small and would meet the requirements for equal population.

Relative to the criterion number three, there is a requirement which arises under the Voting Rights Act and the neutral criteria stated by the courts that the districts shall be geographically compact and contiguous to the extent possible.

The Navajo Nation's congressional and legislative district proposals both meet the requirements of contiguity and compactness. Relative to contiguity, the courts have stated that no part of one district may be completely separated from any other part. And a glance at the Navajo Nation congressional district proposal shows that it meets the contiguity criterion. In fact, the congressional proposal is as block-like as you can -- pretty much as you can get within the state, taking in a little over half of the state, the northern portion.

The legislative district proposal as well meets the contiguity requirement. While it is not perfectly, regularly shaped, it is certainly every bit as regularly shaped as any of the legislative districts contained within the current districting proposal.

The compactness criterion is difficult to meet where there are large land areas which contain relatively few people, and that's what we have in northern Arizona, northern and eastern Arizona. So while the, while the land areas are quite large as compared to the southern portion of the state, Maricopa County, Pima County, they're really as compact as they can get given the distribution of the population throughout the area.

One of the strongest portions of the Navajo Nation proposal, both on the congressional district
and the legislative district, is in the area of communities of interest. The conditions which affect the Navajo Nation in Apache, Navajo and Coconino counties also affect the remainder of those counties, as well as Mohave and Yavapai counties. The Navajo Nation congressional district proposal speaks to the need of a northern congressional district to serve the interests of these largely rural communities of interest.

The Navajo Nation has been present at the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission’s public hearings on the Fort Apache Indian reservation, in Flagstaff and in Window Rock, and heard calls repeatedly for the establishment of a northern congressional district to serve those interests. The Navajo Nation’s congressional district proposal addresses the concerns put forth at these commission public hearings, including the inclusion of portions of Gila, Graham and Pinal counties where necessary to retain the boundaries of the San Carlos Apache reservation and the Fort Apache Indian reservation intact.

The Navajo Nation has sought to -- has sought consensus with its neighbors relative to its proposals and will continue to do so. Thus far, the Navajo Nation has received letters of support from the Yavapai Apache tribe, San Carlos Apache, Walpai and White Mountain Apache tribe. As well, the Navajo Nation is seeking support and seeking consensus with the counties and with the municipalities contained both within the congressional district and within the proposed legislative district. The office of -- the speaker of the Navajo Nation Council, also the chair of the Intergovernmental Relations Committee, redistricting subcommittee, has sent letters to the boards of supervisors for Apache, Navajo and Coconino counties for meetings relative to the Navajo Nation’s proposals and to explain those proposals and to obtain input from those bodies. As well, the Navajo Nation is seeking, is seeking to meet through, through meetings established by contact with the speaker of the Navajo Nation Council with the municipalities. As late as this afternoon, Speaker Begay sent a letter to the Honorable Brian Smithson, the mayor of this great city of Holbrook, seeking a meeting of that nature.

As well, it is good to see Cary Ballard, the mayor of Snowflake; Jeff Font, vice mayor of Holbrook; Spike Simmons from Holbrook city council; Fern Larson, the city manager of Holbrook; Steve Anderson, city manager of St. Johns; and the Honorable Jim Boles, the mayor of Winslow. And those of you who have not received contacts yet from Speaker Begay can expect to receive them in the near future.

The legislative district -- and that’s both for the congressional district and the legislative district proposal -- in criterion number five, visible geographic features, political boundaries and undivided census tracts, the congressional district proposal factors which I’d like to highlight are that the political boundaries observed in the Navajo Nation proposed congressional district would include the
entirety of Mohave, Yavapai, Coconino, Navajo and Apache counties. As well, it would include the Payson reservation and Tonto census division, the CCD's within Gila County and CCD's within Graham County.

One of the things that's noticeable as well is the Navajo Nation's congressional district proposal does not divide any municipalities. It would not divide Sedona, it would not divide some of the other municipalities which are currently divided under the districting plan which is now in place.

Relative to the legislative district proposal, the Navajo Nation's proposal respects political boundaries wherever those are practicable. It would include all of Apache County, the portions of Graham, Gila and Pinal counties within the San Carlos reservation, the portion of Navajo County within the Navajo Nation reservation, the Hopi reservation, and the Fort Apache Indian reservation, and portions of Coconino County which include portions of the Navajo Nation as well as the Havasupai reservation. The Kaibab and Walpi county census divisions, the CCD's within Coconino County and the Payson CCD's within Gila County and San Carlos CCD of Graham County would be included as well.

The legislative district proposal of the Navajo Nation as well does not divide any municipalities. That's the conclusion of the statement which I'd like to make at this point. Again, Commissioner Hall, the Navajo Nation would be happy to stand for further questions. The Navajo Nation wishes to remain engaged with the commission as well as the Indian tribes, the non-Indian communities, the counties, the municipalities, chambers of commerce, school boards, and anyone else who we can get to talk to us relative to the Navajo Nation proposals. And, again, we do have further information available for anyone who might want that, Commissioner Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm assuming that what we have received here is identical to what we received Monday evening. Is that correct?

MR. SEANEZ: That is correct, Commissioner Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: And at that meeting, we asked several questions relative to demographics, and I understand you are working on those. Those are still forthcoming, I presume.

MR. SEANEZ: That is correct, Commissioner Hall. And if there are any other inquiries which, which either you don't believe have been addressed by the Navajo Nation in its supplemental, in its supplemental submission, or if other questions arise, please feel free to have your staff contact us and we will respond with as much alacrity as possible.

COMMISSIONER HALL: So if Ms. Leoni wanted to get additional clarification with respect to demographics, who would she contact? Would it be you or your demographer?

MR. SEANEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Hall.

We are asking that the requests come through Edward T.
Begay, the speaker of the Navajo Nation Council. And that's simply so there is a single point of entry so that we can all -- so that we can all be aware of what is being requested and we don't step on each other's toes.

MS. LEONI: Mr. Seanez? Excuse me. Is it your plan to present in the supplemental submission the demographics, or should we request them specifically?

MR. SEANEZ: Commissioner Hall, Ms. Leoni, the Navajo Nation understands that there are certain demographic statistical information which has been requested, such as the complete breakout of the minority and majority populations within the proposed, within the proposed district. And we are, we are getting that information. If there is further information, it would certainly help the Navajo Nation to receive those requests in writing. That way, we can be clear and don't have to pass off -- pass it off as hearsay to our various consultants.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Mr. Seanez.

MS. FURRH: That's right. My last name is spelled F-U-R-R-H. I'm director of the Concho Community Assistance Center in Apache County. I also have contracts with 14 other community service agencies through Navajo and Apache County. I am on the advisory board for the CDBG funding source for Apache County. I'm a member of the town hall. I'm also on the board for the Arizona Homeless Coalition.

Basically, what I wanted to address tonight, or I want you really to keep in mind when you are doing your redistricting has to do with like needs in communities. In the four years that I have been doing community service and community action, consistently in the rural communities, we are overshadowed or outvoted or just nullified due to the simple fact that although a city like Flagstaff will use our numbers of poverty, of low income, of homelessness, we do not benefit from any of the programs that they receive from Phoenix. It doesn't make it to the rural communities.

When people are talking about new technology -- and I know that there is a proposal now down in the state to put in high technology throughout rural Arizona. That's, that would not be possible in areas of Apache and Navajo County along with Greenlee and Graham due to the simple fact we don't have the infrastructure to get that in. So we would not benefit from something like that.

I believe what I'm trying to tell you is that you need to put like communities together with like interests. We cannot keep standing second to cities like Flagstaff and Sedona and Phoenix and Tucson. It's just not working. We -- our people are starving and we can't even get a decent food bank in our own district.

So when you do do this redistricting, like interests makes sense. Rural development in our...
areas -- our counties are able to work together to
come up with rural development plans. We share and
collaborate with each other, and to see that to see
that relationship that we have just been developing
severed would probably set back a lot of agencies and
people for a great deal of time.

The last thing I want to point out to you,
the way district goes right now in district three,
recently for legislation, a survey was done for our
Home Start and Head Start to let the legislators know
what the needs were of our children in district three.
The district supervisors, who are in Flagstaff, did a
survey and said this represents district three. They
called 20 people in Apache County. They called 30
people in Navajo County. They interviewed over 480.
That's, that's what our voice is like.

So when you are thinking of redistricting,
please keep like communities together, like the
gentleman said. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Ms. Furrh.
Our next speaker is Donald Hancock.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you. My name is Donald
Hancock. I will speak loud enough so everyone can
hear me.

I'm representing two particular groups this
evening. One, I'm on the board of directors of the
Navapache Regional Medical Center located in the Show
Low area, and I'm also the superintendent of schools
of the Sanders school district.

I have a couple comments I want to make.
You have indicated already that the precincts, et

cetera, will not be affected; strictly, the
congressional districts are being formed. Legislative
districts. You need to make sure that that includes
those districts that have been formed, particularly
the NAVI, Northern Arizona Vocational Institute, which
I was directly involved in the formation. They

received a direct waiver from the U.S. Department of
Justice in the formation of that district. The
creation of these other districts will not set aside
the waivers because of population and voting or ethnic
background, for example. We need to make sure that
that occurs. These are districts that are currently
formed that need to continue as they were formed with
the waivers.

The other question I have is as we complete
this public hearing session, will the new districts be
formed in time for the next election? Or is it going
to be four years down the road or six years, or when
will that occur?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, our goal is to
have these completed by the end of the year. And
short of any litigation, we feel like we can
accomplish that goal. But given the numerous
variables with respect to the Department of Justice
and the potential for folks to challenge whatever the
commission may decide via the courts, that's obviously
a difficult question to answer, but that's what our
goal is.

MR. HANCOCK: I do have one concern here.
In this map, there is an indication here that -- I'm
Sanders has been withdrawn from the Native American population. We have a little white area, and it seems to follow the boundaries of the Navajo-Hopi Indian relocation program.

MS. LEONI: Could you explain that a little more clearly?
MR. HANCOCK: Right here, there is a red area that goes from Chambers north to Ganado. The area around that appears to be white. And according to the legend, it says that's a township where it might be that there is not enough population there to identify it, even though 98 percent of our student population in the school is Native American.
COMMISSIONER HALL: But Sanders itself is not on the reservation. Is that correct?
MR. HANCOCK: It depends on which side of the highway you are on.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I understand. I think the portion that's indicated white, that's specifically referencing what is reservation land. Trust land I'm not mistaken. I'm not the cartographer, mind you, but --
MR. HANCOCK: Well, the whole population for the community is Native American.
COMMISSIONER HALL: I understand. It's not referencing -- a lot of Holbrook is Native American, but, nevertheless, it is not reservation trust land.

MS. LEONI: That is the difference, Mr. Hancock. This represents boundaries of the reservations. And if you look at this map, which is a shaded map demonstrating population densities by particular racial groups, you will see that that area does reflect the Native American population.
MR. HANCOCK: Okay.

The other thing I would like to point out is that we do, in various districts, school districts in particular, we have a number of programs we want to continue. We want to make sure that whoever is elected continues those programs. In our particular school district budget, over 55 percent is federally impacted monies and federal programs, and we don't want to see those cut in any way, shape or form. We want to see a continuation of our programs.

Thank you.
COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Mr. Hancock.
I appreciate your input.
Our next speaker is J.R. Despain.
MR. DESPAIN: Hello, I am J.R. Despain. I represent the I-40 corridor of Winslow, Holbrook, Joseph City, Woodruff, and that particular area.
The supervisors throughout Navajo County and also throughout the eastern counties have met and have sent the board members a resolution of the five counties supporting that the redistricting remain with these five small counties. Just as you folks were attentive to make sure that the languages were covered tonight in your meeting, these five counties have, over the years, been attentive to the needs of their...
citizens through their similar problems, not only
similar topography, but similar community problems,
similar legislative and congressional problems as far
as transportation, as far as air, as far as
infrastructure, as far as health care, any of those
items that the county provides service.
So I'm here representing Navajo County
supervisor, district three, to go on record in support
of the five-county proposal for the redistricting that
Navajo -- or that Arizona is presently going through.
We feel, with these similar problems that we've
organized and addressed over the years, we will be
able to provide our citizens, whether they're yellow,
black, green, blue, orange or whatever, with the
services that the counties and the legislative laws
passed down to us. We feel that it's important that
through these organizations, that we remain a voice
for these communities and for these districts, and we
encourage this districting board to consider the five
county -- small counties when they do their
redistricting. Thank you very much.

Mr. Despain, I believe last night we received a copy
of that resolution from -- Mr. Despain?
MR. DESPAIN: I'm sorry, Mr. Hall.
COMM SSIONER HALL: That's all right. I believe last night we received a copy of the
resolution of EACO from Supervisor Jim Palmer. Is that correct?
MR. DESPAIN: Yes, there is. And you will
be provided with it.
COMM SSIONER HALL: Great. Just as long as
that gets to our staff so we can appropriately have
that on record. Thank you.
Our next speaker is Spike Simmons.
MR. SIMMONS: Spike Simmons, member of the
Holbrook city council. I filled out your yellow slip
mainly in case there were questions that I wanted to
address as the program goes along and did not prepare
a detailed speech to give at this time. However, I do
have one brief comment. I think it's in line with
some of what you've already heard that I feel is very,
very important, and that is that I do not feel that
our rural areas in northern Arizona ought to be put in
the same district, either in the state legislature or
in the congressional district, with the metropolitan
populations of the Phoenix metropolitan area. We do
not have enough common interests to be able to feel
that the same representative could represent both us
and them equally. There's bound to be on one side or
another, and I feel that we should be separate from
any major metropolitan districts. Thank you.
COMM SSIONER HALL: Thank you, Mr. Simmons.
Our next speaker is Eddie Koury. Koury.
MR. KOURY: No problem. I'm Eddie Koury.
I'm Navajo County manager. And I would like to, I guess, talk about the grid map for the legislative district first.

Couple of things I'd like to point out is, one, splitting, I guess, our ethnic populations. I recognize this was just a starting point, but we recognize in Navajo County redistricting that we have had to do over the years that you don't split the Navajo Nation. We also have in our county the Hopi Nation, which this map also splits. And we also have the White Mountain Apaches, which this map also splits. Certainly, some concerns for you to address. I wouldn't want to be in your shoes. I don't know how you are going to balance all the concerns you're hearing around the state and all of the desires that we all have. All of us in this room are kind of friends, we kind of know each other, but we have different views on how we would like to see these maps drawn.

Another community of interest I'd like to point out would be the Holbrook-Winslow area, the I-40 corridor. It's been an important part of Navajo County redistricting to keep that corridor together. Common communities made up of common people, common ethnic mixes. I'd also like to point out that Holbrook and Winslow are the two communities in Navajo County where our largest portion of Hispanic residents reside, and I think it would probably be appropriate to keep those two communities together.

On the Eastern Arizona Counties Organization, I would like to talk about that. You heard it before. You're going to be hearing more because I know that we have our executive director here. We actually have a formal organization of eastern Arizona counties. The counties are made up of Navajo, Apache, Gila, Graham and Greenlee. We have been working together for a number of years. We have a lot of common issues. We have had a lot of success. We actually have received funding the last two years and will the next two years from the Arizona state legislature for the common goals that we do have. We would like to see the non-reservation, non-Navajo reservation portion of Navajo and Apache County and the counties of Gila, Greenlee and Graham kept together if at all possible. We work together, we have a lot of common interests as I said, and we have a good organization. And I think we have been very successful helping the individuals of all five counties.

Again, that's about all I really have to say. We recognize you have a tough job. Good luck with it. We hope that the comments that you are hearing around the state will allow you to draw district boundaries that can be fair to all the citizens of Navajo County and all the citizens of Arizona. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Koury. I appreciate that.

Next speaker is Nick Patterson.

MR. PATTERSON: I'm here to address
Commissioner Hall and the rest of you people who have come and giving us this opportunity to speak and voice our concerns.

As I have been listening here tonight, my concerns are -- I have seen the proposal, I have just seen it tonight, the proposal of the Navajo Nation. I concur with Mr. Koury that just spoke before me that we need to keep southern Apache and Navajo counties with Greenlee and Graham because we have worked together in the past. I would propose that because of the Navajo Nation wanting to have one voice, that they could very easily take in the new lands just north of, north of St. Johns in Apache County, come across through Navajo County, come on and take on the whole reservation there and bring over and catch Flagstaff and Page. And that, if you will look at the numbers from the census, that would make a legislative body there. And I -- that's one I would propose.

Another one of my concerns is on a congressional level. You know, in Arizona, we're very different in our metropolitan areas. There, the people are trying to control growth. They are trying to, you know, where we see some of the legislative proposals that, you know, they want to restrict growth, development. And in rural Arizona, it's just the opposite. We are here trying to make it grow. We want the growth. We want the population. We want the tax base.

And I think as you go through this, this redistricting, I think the congressional -- we have eight seats. I have worked it out. I don't have a plan that I can present you, or a map, I'd like to, that would show that there are the possibility to have two congressional seats that represent rural Arizona. And they would represent our needs of growth.

One of the issues that, that we don't meet eye-to-eye on is -- with the metropolitan areas, like I said earlier, one is growth and one is habitat. We have endangered species. Well, in metropolitan Phoenix, they don't worry about the spotted owl. They don't worry about lumbering, timber, cattle. I mean, their ideas and concerns are a lot different than rural Arizona.

So I would hope that as you go through this, that you would look at it and consider the interests of rural Arizona, especially on a congressional basis. And on a legislative basis, I think it would be, as brother -- I can't remember. His name is Bob -- Koury. As Mr. Koury said, I think it would be smart to keep us with Graham or Gila and Navajo and southern Apache County because we have worked together in the past. And that's all I have to say. Thank you for letting us come.

COMMISIIONER HALL: Thank you, Mr. Patterson.

Next speaker is Mr. Jim Boles.

MR. BOLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the staff. My name is Jim Boles. I'm mayor of the City of Winslow, also chairman of the Apache and Navajo County Mayor and Council Members Association.
I would just like to echo, basically, what has been said here by the last -- previous speakers. You have indicated that you have a desire to accommodate as much as possible commonalities, commonality in languages, commonality in cultures, commonality in other kinds of things that people work together.

One of the things that I have stressed as mayor in working with other communities is that we gain so much more through cooperation rather than competition. And we have been working with the cities in our current legislative district and we have been able to have some, I believe some effective impact on the legislators in our district. Even though we are spread out, we have some common problems.

The gentleman just mentioned that in the metropolitan areas, they want to curb growth. They don't deal with things like the endangered species. We have to deal with those, and we have suffered from closing down of many of the businesses that have been a mainstay for many, many years because of the influence of some of the metropolitan -- tree huggers, I guess is a good name for them.

But we just, we would encourage you to do everything you can to accommodate the like interests, the languages and the cultures, and those communities that have traditionally been working together. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Mr. Boles. Our next presenter is Mr. Steve Anderson.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: While we are waiting, what is Mr. Anderson's title?

MR. ANDERSON: I am the city manager of the City of St. John in southern Apache County.

Mr. Hall, staff members of the Redistricting Commission, thank you very much for taking the time and agreeing to work on this worthwhile project that will shape the future of Arizona for the next ten years. I applaud you and respect you for that undertaking.

I want to reiterate what Mayor Boles has previously said, Supervisor Despain, Manager Koury, and Councilman Patterson in their comments. In talking about growth management in Maricopa County, they impose impact fees. In Apache County, we will pass out impact fees, or probably should, if people will move to our region. That's how diverse our identities are, and I think that that should be recognized by this commission.

It is not only important, but imperative, to establish legislative and congressional boundaries that recognize the voice of rural Arizonans on a state and federal basis. The proposed boundaries as outlined -- that I will outline -- will meet all of the goals and objectives of Proposition 106.

And I should just mention that I would strongly support the statements made by these prior gentlemen that would establish the five county boundaries as that legislative district. Since -- I don't want to go into any more duplication of what
they have said, other than the fact that the
commonalities are an important issue as I see it, but
identifying specifically that we have issues that are
very common in health care.
In the rural areas, we have a hard time
establishing reliable health care through insurance
carriers. Some of the ones that have been established
have been bankrupt and now we are in dire straits. We
only have a few insurance companies that have the
financial reserves capable of meeting the state
mandates to serve rural Arizona. Our watershed is
unique. Our economy is a very unique economy. The
lifestyle is unique. The political diversity, the
forestry. NAVI is the Northern Arizona Vocational
Institute, which is a collaboration of the school
districts in the region to meet our technology needs.
We have established alliances and relationships based
upon commonality that are natural and free-flowing.
That's why we have the five-county district as
outlined previously.
Also, the Little Colorado River Resource
Conservation and Development District is established
along those boundaries. All in all, I would like to
reiterate how strongly I feel about this issue and
would encourage you to support these gentlemen and
myself and their statements and actions. Thank you.
COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you,
Mr. Anderson.

Our next presenter is Martin Moore.
MR. MOORE: For the record, I'm Martin
Moore, executive director of Eastern Arizona Counties
Organization.
As has been previously stated, a copy of a
resolution was provided to you in Graham County
yesterday. If you need other copies, I have at least
three or four copies here with me.
COMMISSIONER HALL: Do you mind providing
one to Ms. Leoni? Thank you.
MR. MOORE: Absolutely.
I'm here on behalf -- I'm here speaking
formally on behalf of Apache, Gila, Graham Greenlee
and Navajo counties that comprise the Eastern Arizona
Counties Organization. As has been stated, we have
submitted through this resolution a recommendation to
the commission in relationship to both the legislative
district and congressional district.
On the legislative district, we are
recommending that the rural legislative district
includes southern Apache, Navajo County and Greenlee
and Graham and Gila counties and, again, the
congressional district formed over in this part of
rural Arizona be formed in a manner optimizing rural
Arizona representation, including this entire area
just described. Also, in one congressional district,
includes as part of one congressional district,
recognizing that there is a greater population
threshold for that district.
I'd also like to speak a little bit more
specifically in relationship to interests in common.
Back in approximately 1993, the counties formally came
together, recognizing that they had a number of
interests in common, and formed the Eastern Arizona Counties Organization. That organization charter was filed with the Secretary of State's office. Also, our organization worked, because of the common interests, with the state offices and state agencies to become county official reviewers of types of federal programs and potential federal programs that would impact this area. We also have had a number of initiatives that have been started in the relationship to interests in common.

Recently, at the beginning of this year, we had what was called the Arizona/New Mexico Co-forest Summit, in which our counties worked very diligently and hard together on -- recognizing the need, especially for western New Mexico, our sister counties on the other side of the line, and some other counties in New Mexico that also had common interests with us here in eastern Arizona, and are moving forward very effectively through the legislative and the congressional districts that we have now to address these common interests in relationship to forest restoration and revitalizing our forest-based and range land-based and other types of economies in relationship to that.

I'd also like to point out, as we pointed out in the resolution, that we have mining, endangered species, open space, ranching, farming, recreation, transportation, water and health care issues that are all in some way unique to these counties. They share interests in common. Through previous arrangements, for example, in the water arenas and in the basin transfers from, for example, the Little Colorado to the Gila River Basin, we recognize a tie there, at least a type of legal tie there in relationship to those issues. We recognize cultural issues. And anyone who has traced, historically, the settlement patterns and migration patterns through the state of Arizona would recognize a clear tie-in from the counties that we are discussing and talking about here as far as having interests in common. It's obvious here that interests in common is a very important concern for us because of the fact that utilizing the interests in common and working together, we have been able to effect positive change on behalf of the citizens of this part of the state of Arizona. And we feel that it is extremely important that representation in -- as you deal with the adjustments to the grid that you have established, recognize that and maintain the cohesiveness that we have, that we have been able to work with here, with the legislature and with the congress on making these issues move forward in a positive way.

We appreciate the difficulty of the work that you have as well. We hope that you'll give our recommendations serious consideration.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Mr. Moore.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mr. Moore, your title and where you're from?
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COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you. Next presenter is Cary Ballard.

MR. BALLARD: I won't take up too much time, but I -- my name is Cary Ballard. I'm the mayor of Snowflake.

And I would like to let the committee know that I agree with what's been said. I agree with the Navajo Nation, what they want to do, and I agree with Mayor Boles and others who have talked about how they want to redistrict the area around here. I feel like we work close together as communities and we have the mayors association with Apache and Navajo County in which we are able to work really close together with common problems and common goals.

We also work close with the, real close with the communities of Show Low and Pinetop-Lakeside. We have a group called the WMRDC, which means White Mountain Regional Development, and we work close with them. And a lot of the things that we work on are legislative issues, and we'd just like to see it continue. So we'd like you to give consideration to that. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Mr. Ballard. Next presenter is Richard Begay, Jr. Did I get that right?

MR. BEGAY: Yes. That's right.

COMMISSIONER HALL: B-E-G-A-Y.

MR. BEGAY: My name is Richard Begay, Jr. from Indian Wells. I'm just a private person. I have some concerns that have been mentioned and I'd like to reiterate that, and that is that we have a representative in Congress presently from -- I guess the Mesa area. And a lot of times, we have something to say to him it's like during parades or some picnic or barbeque, you try to get hold of him at his office, his office in Flagstaff, never get a call back from him. And then you go and try to contact his Mesa office, the staff there don't know where you're from or where that community is. We've had a lot of problems that we have turned to the state for.

I guess I should say that I have served as a representative on the Navajo Nation and also work with the tribe somewhat and find that they are beginning to act like what Phoenix treats Holbrook like. We go to Window Rock for something, nothing happens. Just like, the 19th of this month, we had a referendum. The Navajo people said no, but they want to keep going with something that the people don't want.

We'd like, you know, our little communities up here, like all the people have said, you know, to stay together, hold hands, and, you know, work for one cause. Where we try to bring people in the state -- or, rather, the city of Phoenix, those big areas, we like to limit things. And we have seen a lot of things go by the wayside simply because the ideas of Phoenix is very predominant in Washington. A lot of the things that need to happen here are left by the wayside by our representatives.

Another thing that I have a problem with is that on the state legislative districts, our Navajo
people, our Hopi people, all Indian tribes, we give a
lot of money into the cities of Holbrook and to
Winslow and Flagstaff, yet they are in a separate
district. So what our monies go to support are their
plans, yet we are totally on the other side of the
fence looking in. And I’d like to see maybe some,
something addressed like that.

How do I know this? I work at Cake
Chevrolet in Winslow. And Mayor Boles is here. And I
see a lot of things like that going on. You see
people coming in in an empty truck and totally loaded
going out back to the reservation, and there is no --
they all pay taxes on what is there, even though that
becomes an issue a lot of times. A lot of people
don’t really understand that. But when I go to
Wal-Mart, Safeway, wherever, I pay taxes. No one says
anything about that. The only time that I can do a
sale at Cake Chevrolet is you don’t have to pay tax on
a vehicle, which is good, because we pay a lot.

And, then, another thing that has been said
before is that Indian tribes have problems with one
another. I don’t see that. I have a lot of customers
of different Indian races, and we talk, we sit
together. And sometimes we believe — and maybe our
leaders, you know — a lot of things that happen in
the tribal councils, or whatever they are called,
elsewhere, you know, they have their own issues. But
when — it’s like the mayors are saying, you know. I
went to school in Holbrook — I mean, in Snowflake,
and we used to pick on Holbrook. But so what, you
know. It was just us high school kids. Other than
that, they work together.

And I like those little communities and I
think Indian tribes are like that. They can work
together. And some of the leaders have been in there
too long, so I guess it’s time for them to move on.
But I’d like to see a design where the districts are
drawn to where it includes everybody. I know the
Navajo Nation has a plan that looks real good, and
also the opinions that are put forth here, where we
all have a common interest, and that is to keep the
rural people together and keep Phoenix and Tucson,
those big metropolitan areas, out of, out of our
little plans that we have for our people here. I’d
like to see something good work for all of us. I know
it can work. I have seen it and I think it can be
done again. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you.
Mr. Foster.
MR. FOSTER: Good evening.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Hello, again.
MR. FOSTER: Hello, again. Tried to get to
Globe, but my chopper wouldn’t go. Good evening.

Let me just introduce myself, first of all.
My name is Larry Foster, and I’m a private business
person. I have an office in Window Rock and also in
Phoenix. And I’m en route to Phoenix, and I wanted to
stop by here and voice my opinions.

And I, as a Navajo, I see some relatives in
the audience, so I will introduce myself properly.

(Speaking in Navajo.)
Those of you that don't speak Navajo, I am of the Red Water clan. That's my mother's clan. My father's clan is the One Who Walks Around clan. My grandparents is Irish and Sioux, so if there is any Irish in the house, you are my grandfather and grandmother clan. And my paternal grandfather is Red House clan. My children and spouse are my Red Water clan. So that's who I am as a human being.

I just want to say greetings to the commissioners, Commissioner Hall, for taking time out of your busy schedule to hold a hearing here tonight, your staff, your advisers. Before I get into my presentation, I'd like to share with you just a short story of what my grandfather told me when I was a young boy, about nine or ten. My grandfathers, as I said earlier, were Irish and Sioux, and I guess they were telling me their stories of their grandfathers from way back. This happened probably around 1909 or 1910 before Arizona became a territory. I mean, a state. It was a territory then.

There were three Anglo boys that came onto the reservation, American missionaries from St. Michaels. They were William Day, Charles Day and Samuel Day. Those are my grandparents. And I remember my grandparents telling me that while they were Anglo, they lived in Navajo society. And at that point, they were vastly outnumbered. However, you know, they were told back in 1909, 1910, that while they were vastly outnumbered, that they still had a voice in the community because of their knowledge and their expertise. And I think that that's something important here.

One of the things I remember my grandfather telling me was that while he was a minority here now you as Navajos are the majority, but sooner or later, you guys will become a minority because they will keep coming west. Sooner or later, the Anglos will become a majority. And that has occurred.

But I guess the bottom line I'm saying is that what my people had told my grandparents were that -- and his brothers, were that you still will have a voice. You will have a say-so in what we do. And I respect that. And I guess that's all we are asking here, is that while, right now if you look at the state of Arizona from 1990 to, to this last census count, we have grown, the state of Arizona, by 40 percent. From 3.6 million to over 5.1 million right now. That's a big jump. However, the major population shift has occurred down south in the metropolitan areas. And I guess that's where the concern we have, is that there is an imbalance.

And I share the comments made by previous speakers that there has to be balance. There has to be some representation exclusively for -- to the northern part of the state. So in doing so, I just want to thank my Navajo Nation leaders, officials and those in attendance that are here, and especially my Navajo Nation leaders, for taking the initiative to
look at the issue itself on the redistricting and
looking at northern Arizona, whether we are Navajo,
Hopi, Apache, Walpi, Havasupai, whatever, Anglo,
Hispanic, Asian.
You know, the Nation in this case took the
initiative to look at the redistricting from a
different perspective. And I think there is an echo
here, is it's the rural versus the metropolitan areas.
And I think, in a sense, at least with the Nation,
with the proposal they presented on Monday night, I
wholeheartedly support that. I think that is a very
viable plan and should be taken seriously into
consideration.
Now, if you look at Proposition 106, the
goals that have been established, your six areas, six
areas that the commission has established, looking at
the way the proposition has come to be, I applaud the
commission for coming forth with those goals, and I
think that the way -- and I also supported Proposition
106 when the referendum took place, and I think it's
about time that we as citizens take control of serious
political matters such as political redistricting,
whether it be at the congressional level or at local
or state levels. I think that you as commissioners
have a very key, very important responsibility. And I
would not want to be in your shoes, but I can offer
you my prayers and just good thoughts.
A couple things that are in goals. One is
to insure the geographical compactness and
contiguosity of the development, which is in your
blue packet under item C. "D" says it shall respect
communities of interest. And I think that those are
two very key areas that I want to talk about. I echo
the comments made previously by our previous speakers,
the rural versus the urban development, metropolitan
development.
We, up in the northern part, we have a lot
in common. I have a lot of friends here in the city
of Holbrook and Winslow, St. Johns, Flagstaff. I have
many friends on the Hopi reservation, all the other
Indian tribes. We work very close together. Common
is very important here in our own way of development.
I think earlier there was mention of how the
metropolitan areas are curbing new growth. Up here,
it's the reverse. And I guess the key is they take
our water down south and they build upon that. We are
not as fortunate up here to have pools in all our back
yards, swimming pools, but they have that luxury of
doing it down south.
You take our coal and ship it down. We
generate electricity and ship the power down south.
We ship a lot of our moneys down south. And one of my
brothers, Richard Begay, said we do a lot of commerce
with the border towns, and it's true. One example, I
think just last year alone, just on the Arizona side,
over half a billion dollars just from the Navajo
Nation, just the Navajo Nation alone, over half a
billion dollars in commerce, in payroll and goods and
services were -- account for the reservation.
However, 76 percent of that went to the border towns
and to the metropolitan Phoenix area. So I think
that's something very crucial there. We would, we're not saying we want all that back, but we want some good justification. And I think what we need now is looking at developing a good relationship, long-standing. And we have had that amongst ourselves. We have had this relationship for years. I remember my grandparents coming to Holbrook, Flagstaff, to do commerce. And we still, to this day, the grandchildren carry that tradition. My grandkids will do the same. My children will do the same.

The tribes are also working very closely. You've heard testimony. And I think that, as I mentioned previously, that while maybe the Hopi Nation supposedly has a problem with being a part of the Navajo Nation in the redistricting process, I think it's time to get beyond those issues and it's time for us to move on to better and bigger things.

So in that sense, you are seeing a lot of support from among all the people in the northern area. The northern area is a rural area. Maybe the commissioners need to take a good look at an explicit northern Arizona area for a congressional district and take a good look at the what's mentioned in the five county areas and the five-county organization. Historically, as I mentioned previously, we have intellectual properties that are spiritual in nature for us. Some of us Native Americans, we probably would be on the endangered species list in another ten years, but I think what we need to do is when we look at everything we have in common, we have the lands we hold in common, the mountains, the waters, our livestock, our commerce, the way we do business in the rural areas is a lot different than the way we do things in the metropolitan areas. There, it's a material thing. Here, it's a spiritual. It's something that's of common interest.

So I think with the six goals the redistricting commission has put in place, what has been recommended by the Navajo Nation I believe meets each of the six areas, the goals you laid out for yourself. And with testimony, I'm very pleased that we are hearing positive comments from all my brothers and sisters here, whether we are red, black, yellow or white. I think we are all here singing the same song.

So, again, I just want to express my appreciation for allowing you to listen to me and I hope you will do the best you can do for the state of Arizona. It's a beautiful state and I think that we also need to have representation explicitly for northern Navajo and northern Arizona. Thank you again.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Mr. Foster. Appreciate it. Sylvia -- I apologize for my inability to read your last name.

MS. ALLEN: Allen.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Sorry. That's what I thought, but I wasn't sure.

MS. ALLEN: I thought the meeting was tomorrow night and I came over in a dither. But I
appreciate this opportunity to address the commission.

For the last eight years, I have been very much involved in rural issues. I was the former field director for People for U.S.A., and I have three western states to cover and I have 24 different chapters in Arizona. All but three of them were rural chapters. So I really worked a lot with rural communities, understanding their issues, their problems.

And I'm here also to support that, if at all possible, we could have a rural congressional district. And when you go through this horrendous chore and challenge that you have, and I realize you are not going to be able to please everyone, but we have to trust, through this process, that we can make things better.

I'm currently the president of the Freedom for America League, and I'm I do support the proposal of EACO, the eastern Arizona counties. I had many chapters in those five counties. They do have similar problems and situations that they work with.

If I had my wish list, I would like to see Navajo and Apache County down the eastern -- from the northern part of the state down the eastern side of the state in a district for itself. I think that they have a lot in common. All the way across the northern part of the state there are different issues, and things not so much in common in those areas.

So I don't really have any more to say other than to say that I do support, if at all possible, that we could have a rural congressional district and support the things said by the Eastern Arizona County Association. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Grace Pooley.

MS. POOLEY: Correct. Good evening. I don't wish to be in your spot, but somebody's got to do the dirty work, don't we? I want to introduce myself to those who don't know me. I'm going to introduce myself first to my Navajo brothers and sisters.

(Speaking in Navajo)

What I explained to them is I'm half Hopi. My mother is Navajo, so I'm Navajo. My mother has just given me her home. And my father is Hopi. And I own a home here in Holbrook. My job is I direct the Navajo -- I mean the Northland Pioneer College Native American program services. And my area extends from Shonto clear down to Cibecue, Hotevilla, clear over to Sanders. One person in my office: Me. So you talk about rural, I know it. I know what's not out there. I'm not going to say what's out there because there is more not out there.

And this is one thing I want the commissioners to understand: Rural Arizona, northeastern Arizona, is hurting. And if we are going to upgrade our lifestyle, that's, we -- be it Native American or non-Native American, we are going to have to get some representation. We are going to have to be treated like children of Arizona and not
stepchildren.
the one I gripe about most. I can talk all night if I
had to, but I'm not going to. The other issue I want
to bring up is my brother, Richard, made a comment
that was -- it wasn't Richard. Somebody said -- where
is it. Oh. Time to move on with the Navajo-Hopi land
dispute. Being a half Hopi and half Navajo, I've been
in this all of my life. I just came, I just went to a
Hopi Kachina dance in Hotevilla where my father is
from I still go out in -- I still mingle with all my
relatives. I still do the same thing with Greasewood.
I have been joint use kid ever since I was a little
girl. That's what they called me. That's what they
nicknamed me, "joint use kid". And I have seen the
fighting going on. I have seen families from both
sides going on. Yeah, it's got to stop. But us, we
have got to be more giving. I know us Navajo people
(speaking Navajo) we can't be that way.
So if we want the Hopi people in our
district, we are going to have to work with them.
Yeah, there are a lot who are willing to work with
Navajos. My village is Hotevilla. But there is a lot
against. So we can't make a comment saying they will
work with us, they will have to, it's time to move on.
These are our brothers and sisters. We have to work
with them. And if this is going to work -- I support
the Navajo proposal. If the Hopis, if the Hopis
decide they don't want to, let's give them that option
of going someplace else. Because they have been dealt
with unfairly at certain times in this whole --

COMMISSIONER HALL: Do you mind if I ask
you a question?
MS. POOLEY: Sure.
COMMISSIONER HALL: We heard very clearly
from the Hopi chairman and various representatives at
Flagstaff that it was their desire to remain separate,
both legislatively and congressionally, from the
Navajo Nation. Therefore -- and we have heard this
evening and previously that it's the desire to be all
one. So with no -- with limited understanding of this
issue, and given your perspective, which is rather
unique, would you mind commenting, give us a little
more insight on that rather sensitive issue?
MS. POOLEY: You know, I like the idea of
these Indian tribes all coming together. I like the
idea. But if we are going to force the Hopi in, we
are going to have to have another battle. So I don't
think we need to force them in unless you are going to
get some good public relations in there and working
with them. I don't know whether that's going to even
work or not. But, like I said, they have had a lot of
burned fingers, and I just don't agree that we need to
force them into this. If they do not want to be a
part of this coalition, then I think they ought to be
given that right.
That's my opinion, being with both tribes,
having been raised with both tribes all of my life and
still very much associated with the Hopis and Navajos
and the Apaches. I'm very much involved with the
Apaches. So I go all over the northeastern part of
Arizona, but I like the coalition between the groups coming together, the tribes coming together and working. And, again, what we have to do is, as tribes, we cannot be (speaking in Navajo). We have to work together. All of us, all of our people are hurting. They are hurting.

And we have to be fair to everyone if we are going to make this work. Otherwise, we will be in the headlines like Dilkon school. It's true. And we need to understand that. If we want this, then we've got to make it work. We've got to work twice as hard as we ever had before because we have other tribes who want to follow behind the Navajo Nation. And the Navajo Nation is the big giant and we have to understand we are the older brother. I will use that concept. Maybe the bigger brother. I have a son that's seven -- six-five, and you better believe it, when he says stop, everybody stops. And it's kind of like the Navajo. We have to be very kind, we have to be very congenial to our other Indian brothers and sisters.

But that -- on behalf of the Hopi, that's what I'm saying. Don't force them into it. Sure, the Hotevilla bunch, oh, we have no problem. But they have their own problems. And I'm Hopi, too. I know. I go from mesa to mesa to mesa. Okay? I don't want to take any more time. Thank you for hearing me.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Miss Pooley.

I appreciate your comments.

There is no question that that particular issue is one of our more challenging concerns. Shall we hire her as a consultant? I'm joking. I appreciate your input.

MS. LEONI: Need someone on both sides.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Our next speaker is Steven Kee, K-E-E.

MR. KEE: Thank you, and good evening. And thank you for the honorable mayors of Holbrook, Winslow and other surrounding areas.

My name is Steven Kee. I'm the substance abuse counselor down in Dilkon, which is in Navajo County. I'm sorry the way I'm dressed. I have been here all day. I have class here and we were doing our homework with all those ladies out there so I haven't gone back to my motel here at Days Inn.

And talking about Days Inn, the city of Holbrook, when I first registered here three weeks ago, I was called an outsider, that I had to pay out-of-state tuition because the Navajo -- Northland Pioneer College does not recognize Apache County. And I make a big stink out of it. I won't sign any documentations until I talk to the commissioners of the school here. Eventually, it got resolved. That's working together and standing your ground.

I'm also Ganado sub, Apache County, precinct of many men. I'm the only one within the reservation, the Navajo reservation, that is, that's elected council, plus two from St. John area, Concho, and the rest of them are appointed. Then, here, we are talking about representation, so who's all going to
run? Who's going to represent us? We are talking
about all these different areas, how we work together
as brothers and sisters.
I'm surprised. Since this whole thing
started coming up, I understand there's one individual
from Flagstaff that wants to run and he's already
campaigning out there. So is that equal
representation? I don't think so. The only thing I
learn out of this whole thing is listening to
everybody's comment. That way, when I decide to run,
I said, oh, yeah, I heard somebody say this in
Holbrook area, Winslow they represent all these
different areas, Dilkon agency, the Navajo reservation
and Mr. Nez here says he represents the Navajo Nation.
I wasn't even informed. He is not representing the
Navajo Nation. And if somebody is going to speak for
me, I like to be informed, too.

But I haven't seen the whole pamphlet or
anything like that. All I see is, when I first got
here, it says Coconino County up there. Out there,
flyers were Coconino County. Finally, they put Apache
County out there, but there is only two documentations
out there. The rest of them they don't even have
anything. So I can't even look at my pamphlets or
anything else. I say I wonder what they are talking
about. So I'm sitting there thinking what are they
talking about.

So by the time I leave, one of those
commissioners, I'm taking one of those Navajo County
maps down so I can study it.
COMMISSIONER HALL: We will give you your
very own copy. We have them reduced for your handy
briefcase.
MR. KEE: I like a bigger one so I can take
it back to my counties, my people. When I'm saying my
people, I'm saying Navajo Nation, like what I'm saying
to Mr. Nez.
COMMISSIONER HALL: You know what? You can
have it.
MR. KEE: Thank you very much.
MS. POOLEY: I'd like to correct you. All
this was on KTNN, Navajo Times. Read, listen.
Navajo. All of this was on there.
MR. KEE: Ma'am I have the floor. Thank
you.
Let me translate that. Everything is
written, over the radio, everything has been written
down black and white in the newspaper. That was as
she indicated. Everything else, I understand. And
it's hard to explain. Since I read about it, yes, I
heard it over the air. Otherwise, I would have been
in Navajo Nation at Window Rock Monday, but I had
class here all this week so the only time I have is
here. So that's why I'm here, to "recorrect" that.
And everybody else wants to work together,
and I think our students are doing that for us when it
comes down to football season, basketball season,
volleyball season, I think they all do a tremendous
job. They do good. They are all good sportsmanship.
They practice that.

So us, as adults, we need to do that, also.
And we need to go out there, and I think we need to have more public meetings like this. So far, one was in Window Rock, which was Monday. Tonight here in Holbrook, I'd like to see some same thing done in maybe Kayenta area, Page area, because those are rural areas. Maybe down in Chinle, maybe back in Tuba City. Instead of saying let's get this thing done by this coming election, November, following year. So I would say let's kind of prolong this for maybe a year and a half. That's all I have to say. Thank you for my understanding.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Mr. Kee, for your input.

Mr. Shelly, did you feel inspired to speak again?

MR. SHELLY: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER HALL: All right.

MR. SHELLY: It's me this time, okay?

COMMISSIONER HALL: All right. I might add that you are certainly a vision of your former self.

MR. SHELLY: This is me now.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Ben Shelly.

MR. SHELLY: Thank you, Commissioner Hall, for allowing me again to talk to you. It is kind of hard for me to read a statement. I normally don't do that. It was kind of long. Could have made it short and simple. But it was his statement that he wanted to express to you. So I done that.

So me, myself, I'm Ben Shelly. I'm a council delegate for the Navajo Nation and I'm also a county commissioner for McKinley County, New Mexico. So I wear two hats and I do see both world, and this is where I would like to express my concern for the people that I do represent within the New Mexico, McKinley County. Ninety percent is all within Navajo reservation, so most of the people that I will be talking for will be those people in the rural area.

One other thing I wanted to bring out to the commissioner is this: I think this would be one of your guiding thing and what the people out there in grass root people, the rural area people, low income people that doesn't have no job, no income at all, this is the one, I want to express this to you. This might be one of your guiding tools when you are redistricting the area of representation: As you know in the 1900's, the early start of the 1900's, the government, they call it government versus marketplace. A lot of government have implement a policy and regulatory system within government which are used to control market. And some of the areas have been overlooked, basically, normally because of politics. And people being at that time, they wanted to benefit from that. And one was the utility area and the other one coming up is the insurance area. The insurance we are talking about, what we fear from the grass root people is that monopolizing the whole economy is one of the thing that they fear the most, and they watch that every day. When the gas price goes up, then they can't afford to pay travel on those -- transportation area. They can't afford to
pay for those gas. And then the next day you'll see
them the fluctuation of prices. I'm talking about
price gouging. The way the utility have done what
they did to California. And they are thinking that
they start monopolizing the system, the economy,
control the rates, the prices is going to go sky high.
Because what they are doing now, what I hear
now in the insurance business right now is they are
getting rid of the small competition and they are
making four or five giant insurance companies and they
are going to regulate and control prices. And there
is no regulation for those, those in the gray areas.
And these are some of the fear that they have that
this is going -- it's going in that direction. And I
think a good representation in the redistricting area
where people voice are heard and the representative
will, whoever that is, will be from that area, he
knows what the situation is and how the economy and
how the people, what the people are concerned about,
is what we want. So this is why I believe the Navajo
Nation is trying to strive for a good representation
where he is from that area; he knows.

And as I know for sure from the county,
state -- or state side, or county, Arizona has never
really supported energy policy of the Navajo Nation.
We are trying to implement a transmission line, we are
trying to implement a generating to help out in the
world, lack of shortage of energy, and somehow we're
not getting support. I don't know why it's happening.
We are doing everything we can to get support from the
all the states, but it's not happening. This is one
of my biggest concerns. This is why I wanted to come
here and listen to your commission, the commissioners
meeting here and see what are being said. My turn
will come in New Mexico, but I will probably say the
same thing what I'm saying here.

So one of the -- going back to what I
alluded to in the monopolizing of the business, I
think this is where it's heading. We fear that.
Somehow or another, we have good representation that
represent the voice of the people out there in the
rural area, low income people. I think this is going
to be great. I'm hoping this will be one of your
guiding tools when you go on through reviewing all the
comments that are made by the public, and I'd just
like to add that this, going to this particular
meeting here, I do, again, like to say thank you to
the commissioner for allowing me to talk twice. And
this is me. I'm talking. Then, again, let me
properly introduce myself. Clan system since you
have mentioned from the start of the meeting, whoever
is Navajo here, Hispanic that are here, I'd just like
to tell my Navajo people, I am the water herb Navajo
and Sage Brush is my father's, and Navajo Navajo. So
those are just who I am and I'm glad to be here
attending your meeting. Thanks again.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you, Mr. Shelly.
That is the merciful end of our -- of my stack of
yellow slips. I say that facetiously, of course. We
really do genuinely appreciate your input.
And are there any burning questions that
anyone feels like -- please. The lady.

MS. POOLEY: The other tribes, we know how the Hopis feel, how have they commented on this redistricting and the Navajo plan?

COMMISSIONER HALL: You know, I have spent a lot of time throughout rural Arizona. I have had an opportunity to meet with Chairman Stanley and Chairman Taylor and Chairman Massey and President Begay and Speaker Begay and Vice Chair Snezie and the Intertribal Council in Phoenix, and there's certainly a steady theme of we desire for rural representation for those tribes that are rural.

And with the exception of the noted, you know, issue that we mentioned with respect to the Hopis and Navajos, there didn’t seem to be any particular other issue other than we would like rural representation and we would like to have the maximum amount of Native American representation as possible. Any other questions? Please.

MR. BOLES: This will probably be an opinion on your part, but we -- according to the proposition that brought about your commission, partisanship is not to be considered. Opinion: Will it play a part?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, the last condition of the goals of Proposition 106 states that party registration, voting history data, may not be considered in the initial phase. But in the latter phase, I think that there will be consideration with respect to that. If I'm speaking to what I understand the intent of your question to be, is there partisanship on this commission? I have yet to see that at this point.

MR. BOLES: I didn't mean to imply that.

COMMISSIONER HALL: But, certainly, at the latter phase --

MR. BOLES: You put things in the computer early on --

COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

MR. BOLES: -- but then it only takes a push of a button to change the perimeters.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

MR. BOLES: And how many revisions do you anticipate in the kinds of material that we have in our hands today?

COMMISSIONER HALL: If I could predict that, I would certainly be not here. But I --

MR. RIVERA: I would be driving to Vegas right now with him.

COMMISSIONER HALL: That's almost impossible. You can rest assured that -- just generally, a little more detail for you. Tomorrow -- well, today -- tomorrow is our last -- well, actually, we have one more Saturday. But this week is our last week of public hearings in the first hearing. Our consultants then have an incredible job, as you can imagine. You can multiply this hearing by -- how many do we have, total?

MS. LEONI: It will be 24 in total by the time we are done.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Twenty-four hearings,
MS. LEONI: All of them similar.

COMMISSIONER HALL: They will assimilate that information and try and digest it, and then they are going to develop what they are calling Arizona units of representation to try and say what are units of representation. Then we, as a commission, will meet with our consultants. We will hash through that, for lack of a better word, in an effort to say what are some procedures and policies and rules we are going to develop in trying to address these various units and then come up with some draft maps with input from each of the commissioners.

And I'm speaking solely for myself at this point, but I would assume that there would be a few draft maps and then try and do something to hone it down and then go back out and allow for additional input. We've received -- we've received several maps, and you can rest assured that the floodgates have yet to be opened. And it's going to be a challenge to try and address all of those, but -- and then, subsequent to that, of course, after the input, we will come up with some final maps.

MS. LEONI: May I continue just on that?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Please.

MS. LEONI: I do want to point out to you that the units, the pictures, the map pictures we develop from input we get from you will be available for you to see. You will be able to look at whether we understood what your concerns were and how you identify yourselves in terms of community and tell us whether we are right or wrong.

They are going to be posted on the website, these units, when we get them done, as well as a summary of all of the comments that we heard. So none of this will be secret and your input will be welcome as it is currently on the website. So as soon as we finish these public hearings, as the commissioner said, we have a tremendous task to amalgamate this information. But we are not only going to do it in writing, we are also going to do it in pictures. And those pictures will be on a map, individual and on a map, and you will be able to see how communities view themselves and where those views overlap, where they diverge. And you will be able to see better some of the problems that we will be facing. And that will lead them to map development.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you. And please --

MS. ALLEN: I was just wondering, doesn't the law require that this process is through in time for the 2002 election? Or does it not?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Obviously, we are here to redraw districts so people can run for office and represent the people. And under the Clean Elections Act, which is a whole other situation, they can really, at the first of the year, begin collecting donations in an effort to run for office. It's handy to know from whom to collect those donations and where
you're running for office. So that's our goal. And with your support, and discouraging any and all litigation, that certainly can -- my counsel to my left, he is shaking his head. He gets paid for the cases --

MR. RIVERA: Ten years ago, what happened is there was litigation as a result of this and they were able to get the congressional elections done in time to everybody else, but the legislature, they were not able to get it done. So they went back on the original legislative, legislate -- legislative districts before they were able to resolve it and they came back and the court resolved it after that. The problem this year is if we don't get it done in time, what do you do with the two extra congressmen?

MS. ALLEN: That was my question. Are they, like, at large?

MR. RIVERA: Different states approach it different ways, and that's a different approach. And the other approach is I have suggested we nominate Joshua Hall, and there is your rural congressman.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, on that note, let me just say -- and I failed to --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can we see your first draft of that map?

COMMISSIONER HALL: On that note, I failed to mention this when I discussed the five commissioners. By reason of our appointment, one of the qualifications for us to be appointed is we could not have held public office or be a big lobbyist. And one of the things we covenanted not to do is that we are unable to run for public office at least three years subsequent to the resigning of our commission. And so you can rest assured we are not here to carve our own little political turf.

Are there any other burning -- please.

MR. DESPAIN: Commissioner Hall, did you -- and if you did say it prior to, I missed that. Did you say you would be back again in September with public input as to --

COMMISSIONER HALL: Prior to September. Probably in late July, early August. And where we are going to come -- or mid, late August. Where we are going to come, I'm not exactly sure. We may have to scale down, quite frankly, some of our locations for the second round just in light of the time. But we definitely are coming back somewhere in rural Arizona for additional public hearing. That's correct.

MR. DESPAIN: But at that particular time, you will provide us with --

COMMISSIONER HALL: There will be draft maps, absolutely, and they will be posted on the wall. And we will have an extra large one for Mr. Kee.

MR. RIVERA: And they will also be on the website.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Of course, they will be on website.

Any other questions? Please, Mr. Seanez.

MR. SEANEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Hall.

The only thing is that if -- a suggestion.
The maps, if there would be some possibility to have them on the website in some sort of way that they could be zoomed in as the -- that would be helpful.

MR. RIVERA: That's going to happen.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And they also don't convert if you download them. We tried three different conversions and couldn't get them to convert.

COMMISSIONER HALL: We are working -- realize, we are -- I will talk to our technical guy there, our technical consultant. He just sent me something, though, and I'm not any computer genius. So I will check with him. And I appreciate that input.

Is there anything else that anyone feels -- my legal counsel to my left has circled "chicken", says he's buying. So with that --

MR. RIVERA: Wait a minute. I have one more thing. Happy birthday, Commissioner Hall. Today is Commissioner Hall's birthday.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I can't think of a better way to spend it. With that, folks, this meeting will stand adjourned.

(The proceedings concluded at 9:20 p.m., June 27, 2001.)
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