Six speakers addressed the Commission via interactive teleconferencing from NAU at Paradise Valley, Tucson, Coolidge, Kingman, Page, Payson, Aravaipa, and San Luis; four spoke from Payson, one from Kingman, and one from Aravaipa.

The speaker from Kingman spoke positively of the legislative grid for north-western Arizona, describing the “north-south alignment” of the legislative grid “as much better than what we have had” and complaining about the current “east-west alignment which really fragmented Mohave County.” “We’ve been chopped up into three, four legislative districts in the past, even at the present time.” The speaker saw a community of interest involving Mohave, La Paz, and Yuma Counties; in addition to transportation issues, “the river communities have water, sewer, and growth problems which put them in a similar position with respect to needs and desires at the state level, federal level.”

One speaker from Payson endorsed the grids: “What I’ve seen here today looks very, very promising.” Another asked the Commission’s “cut-off date” for receiving input from the citizenry. Still another asked if statistical information for Gila County gathered by the Commission could be made available to the county as it undertakes to redistrict at the county level, and also volunteered that the bridge at Roosevelt Lake is the dividing line between the different types of employment and activities that exist in the northern and southern parts of the County. A fourth speaker, wanting to know what other speakers were referencing when they spoke of the grid, was given copies of the congressional and legislative grids by the Commission staff.

The speaker from Aravaipa indicated satisfaction “with the way Pinal County has been treated” and, suggesting a community of interest based on the copper industry in eastern Pinal County, proposed that Hayden and Winkelman “should be included with the San
Manuel, Oracle tri community, Dudleyville, and Kearny” in the same legislative district. The speaker also questioned whether Saddlebrooke should be included in that same district, as it is “a more up-scale, higher-income area.”

NOTE: These summaries and excerpts were developed for the Independent Redistricting Commission by its consultant, National Demographics Corporation, and have not been reviewed by the Commission prior to posting. They are not official statements of the Commission and represent only the consultant’s best effort to identify major themes and highlights of each public hearing. The excerpts were chosen by the consultant in an effort to identify common themes and especially noteworthy statements.

These materials are placed here for citizen review and with the hope that they will encourage comments. Comments can be made on the form provided.