MR. LYNN: This is the meeting of the
Independent Redistricting Commission. Let the record
reflect that all five members of the Commission are
present along with both legal counsel and the NDC
representative from National Demographics Corporation,
Mr. Heslop and the Commission staff.

The first order of business this evening
is to introduce the people, and let me introduce some
of the staff that we have with us this evening. Let's
start over here to my right and introduce Jose Rivera,
one of the two legal counsel, and next to him -- next
to Jose is Lisa Hauser, the other member of our legal
counsel team.

The Commissioners I think you know by now
because most of you tend to be at the meetings or
certainly can read their names.

To the left of my table again is Alan
Heslop from NDC and his staff, Mr. Johnson there from
NDC, and the consultants, and IRC, and the staff who
are here this evening. Paul Collar is right over here
in the corner, and will be working our PowerPoint this
evening. We have our public information person with
the audience here who is in the back, and thank you
very much.

Now, just a point of information, if you
want to use the restrooms, you need to go out of this
door here to my right and then down the hall and to the
left.

Now, let me provide this one comment here
in Spanish.

(Information given in Spanish regarding
interpretation of the proceedings.)

MR. LYNN: Ms. Minkoff, our Vice Chairman,
is going to present the PowerPoint presentation this
evening.

I might mention that those of you that are
sitting to the far side of the room that you might have
a better angle as far as the slide presentation to move
over to the seats over here just to make it easier for
you, and that will give you a good line of vision
because there are many things that are displayed. All
right. Go ahead.

MS. MINKHOFF: Thank you. This is 1 in
approximately 15 of the Commission's second round
public hearings which we are holding all over the
state, and you will recall that over a month ago we did
the first round of public hearings.

We are going to begin by showing this
brief PowerPoint presentation which will provide some
background about what we were are doing.
The purpose of this hearing is to obtain your opinions on the draft plans we have developed. We will be showing, for example, a district that we have drawn and also be explaining why they are drawn the way they are drawn and there are also wall maps in the back that you can examine during or after the hearing is complete if you want to and get a close up of exactly where the lines are drawn. You can identify, for instance, certain areas in Phoenix and in Tucson.

We also have additional handout materials and the citizens kit, and if you would like to get one of those which are in the manila folder -- they should have been in the front when you came in, and if you don't have one, you can raise your hand and we will attempt to get the staff to bring them to you because there is a lot of information in there that would help you understand where we are to this point.

Also, those of us on the Commission will be happy to stay a little bit after the meeting if you have any questions that you want to ask us personally.

Please remember the maps that we are dealing with tonight are drafts. We know that there can be improvements and we intend to improve them, so you can help us by telling us your thoughts and opinions tonight.
The Independent Redistricting Commission was established to provide a new kind of citizen-conducted redistricting that would follow very explicit criteria for drawing new districts.

Here are the rules. The first two rules A and B are federal requirements involving the United States Constitution of the United States Voting Rights Act. It's important for you to note that Arizona comes under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act which requires fair representation for minorities and also requires approval, preclearance by the Justice Department of any plans that are developed by the state.

Another very important federal requirement now written into law by Proposition 106 is that districts be as equal in population as is practicable, and this is something that is held to pretty strictly in terms of federal scrutiny.

If you look at the districts that were established in 1990, they different by one person, and that's because the population of the state didn't divide evenly by six. There were three extra people, and so three of the districts got one extra person. So we really have to hit it as close as we possibly can.

Rule C, D, and E establish other criteria that we have to follow, compactness, contiguity,
respect for communities of interest, visible geographic features, city, town, county boundary, and undivided census tract.

The last of the rules, rule F requires us to try to make competitive districts, but if you read the language of Proposition 106, it says that once we have addressed the other criteria, we should then adjust the districts to be more competitive so long as it does not involve any detriment to the other criteria of Proposition 106.

Proposition 106 required us to start by designing a grid using geometric lines at the beginning point with population equality as the only consideration. The other criteria in Proposition 106, compactness, contiguity, respect for communities of interest, concern for political boundaries, etcetera, were not to be considered in the drawing of the grid, and they weren't.

We decided that we would use townships, which are 6 miles square, as our building blocks, but we combined these with whole census tracts and created 18 congressional districts -- or 18 congressional including legislative grids only considering equal population.

Here are the congressional and the
legislative grids that were developed using those rules. Each is based on townships. Each provides for equal population. As you can see, many of them follow county boundary lines. That's because census tracts do not cross county boundary lines.

We knew that these grids would have to be adjusted for the grids don't satisfy a lot of the other rules of Proposition 106. They're compact. They're in undivided census tracts. But they don't achieve a lot of the other goals. They split cities. They split Indian reservations. They don't consider communities of interest. So the task after designing these grids was to adjust them in order to address the other requirements of Proposition 106.

To help us adjust the grid, we held a first round of 24 public hearings all around the state, and one of them as I recall was right here at Amphi. We invited citizens to complete input forms. We invited them to write to us and to use our website to send us e-mail messages. We got incredible response, a vast amount of citizen input, and it made clear to us that Arizonans have a firm belief in respecting communities of interest and respecting political boundaries.

We got all kinds of things saying don't
divide my city. Keep my town with the neighboring
town. Don't split up counties. Look at school
district boundaries, that kind of thing. It was clear
to us that those should be the basic principles guiding
our approach.

We also learned from the hearings and
other citizen input that there were a number of
communities of interest in the state. We identified
three major communities of interest and felt that we
should begin by recognizing those three. Native-
Americans, tribal reservations, Hispanic communities of
interest, and the difference between rural and urban
communities. Got a lot of comments about that both
from rural and from urban areas saying it's not a good
mix, please try to separate us.

The citizen input also helped us to
identify what we have called Arizona Units of
Representation, AURs, and these are a wide variety of
communities of citizens identified as important to them
in their own regions or their own areas of the state.

We're going to be showing you maps of the
adjusted districts in a minute, but here it's
worthwhile to emphasize the difference between these
drafts and the existing districts under which we have
been electing congressional and legislative
officeholders for the last 10 years.

Our draft congressional districts split less than half of the number of cities and towns that are split by the existing districts. Our draft legislative districts split no more than a third of the cities and towns split by the existing legislative and congressional district -- or legislative district.

Much the same is true of counties. Even though our draft plan has to draw lines for eight congressional districts instead of six, we split only one more county than the existing six districts. The draft legislative districts, which are the same in number, split four fewer counties.

Perhaps most important, the draft plans respect communities of interest, those AURs I talked about a few minutes ago that you and people like you throughout the state helped us to identify. The major communities we mentioned early were respected in both the congressional and the legislative drafts. And the drafts also pay close attention to the communities of interest identified by citizens.

Proposition 106 did not allow the Commission to consider competitive districts earlier in the process. Under Prop 106, competitive districts should be favored when there is no substantial
detriment to the other goals. The work on analyzing
competitiveness is in its early stages. We do have
party registration. We have some very, very simple
input on the competitiveness of these districts but we
are in the process of gathering more data and data on
the competitiveness of the districts will be considered
more fully during this phase of the redistricting
process.

And this is an area quite honestly where
you can help us as well in telling us some adjustments
that you think might make districts more competitive
without sacrificing the other criteria in Prop 106.

Now, it's time to show some of the maps of
these draft plans beginning with Arizona's eight
congressional districts. I imagine you've seen this
before. This is the outline map of all of the
districts.

This is the draft congressional map. If
you have a citizen kit, there is a copy of it in your
citizen kit and you're probably going to have an easier
time distinguishing the districts because the color
contrast does not show up as well on the PowerPoint as
it does on the printed map in your district. The only
one that really stands out is the bright green one. So
I would urge you to look in those citizen kits and
follow along with us.

This is the design of the congressional districts for the Maricopa County area. And this is the map for the Tucson area. And once again, there's not a lot of contrast among those districts, so I would encourage you to look at the maps that are in your kit, which are probably a lot easier to follow.

Now let's turn to the 30 legislative districts that we've drafted. Here's an outline map of all of the districts, again, lettered from north through south. And once again, I think that you will see these better if you look at the map in your citizen kit because you will be able to get much closer and see the lines.

These are the draft districts in the metropolitan Phoenix area, and these are the draft districts in the Tucson area.

Now, since the alphabet doesn't stretch to 30 letters, we had to double up on some of the letters, and so some of the districts in the Tucson area are double A, double B, double C, and double D. Don't take it personally. There was nothing meant by that.

Our hope is that tonight you will take this opportunity to show us -- to tell us your opinion, whether it's favorable or whether it's negative,
whether in general terms or in detail. If you like the
districts as they are, tell us that you do because I
guarantee you that the people who don't like the
districts will tell us that they don't, and if you
don't want them to change, you need to tell us that.
If you do want them to change, we want to hear that too
and we want your suggestions as specific as you want to
get.

If you want to testify as Chairman Lynn
has said, please raise your hand and one of the staff
will give you a speaker request card. And to insure
that everybody has a chance, please try to keep your
remarks as short as possible. Say what you need to
say, but be respectful of other people who also want to
speak.

We're circulating to the audience you may
wish to use to indicate your opinion in writing. You
can complete it here. You can hand it into staff. Or
you can mail it back later using one of the prepaid
envelopes that the staff have available.

If you have specific suggestions for
district design or adjustment, we have a full packet of
citizen materials you can get from staff at the close
of the hearings.

And we are also pleased to hear from you
by regular mail or by e-mail. Please use our website. The address is up there. If you can't see it, it is www.azredistricting.org, and even if you don't choose to go there to e-mail us, just go there to take a look at it. It's really an incredibly complete website, and it will give you a lot of information about the redistricting process.

Redistricting will determine the kind of representation we'll have in the state for the rest of the decade. It's worth all of the effort, the energy, and the goodwill we can give to it. We appreciate your interest. We appreciate your participation in Arizona's first citizen-conducted redistricting.

That's our presentation, and now it's your turn to talk.

MR. LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Minkoff, we appreciate that presentation. The form of the evening will be to call on speakers who have filled out speaker slips, and I urge you again to fill out one if you have not done so if you wish to be heard this evening.

What we would like to do in the interest of fairness to everyone is we would ask that as much as possible if you could keep your comments to around 3 minutes for the first round. If we then go through all of the speaker slips and there are either more people
who wish to be heard or those of you wish to add
comments, we would be more than happy to hear you at
that time. But we will stay as long as you have
information that you want to share with us.

Without further ado, we will move to
public comment. When you come to the podium, if you
would please say and spell your name for the public
stenographer who is taking down the verbatim notes for
the meeting. We will appreciate it. And I'll
apologize in advance for any mispronunciation that I
may make of your name either based on my inability to
read or penmanship that may not have been the palmer
method, for those who are old enough to remember the
palmer method.

The first speaker this evening is Luis
Gonzales, Council Member of the Pasqua Yaqui Tribe.
Mr. Gonzales?

MS. GONZALES: Unfortunately he had to
leave to pick up children.

MR. LYNN: Oh.

MS. GONZALES: But I have the statement
that I'd like to read for him.

MR. LYNN: If you would, please, and would
you state your name for the record, please?

MS. GONZALES: Good evening, Mr. Chairman,
Commissioners. My name is Sally Ann Gonzales, and I
live at 7444 South Camino Demin.

MR. LYNN: One second, Ms. Gonzales, let's
make sure that mic is on.

MS. GONZALES: Okay.

MR. LYNN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. GONZALES: Again, my name is Sally Ann
Gonzales, and Mr. Gonzales has a letter here from the
chairman that he was going to address the Commission
on, but I'll read it to you.

The Pasqua Yaqui Tribe welcomes this
opportunity to present to the Arizona Independent
Redistricting Commission its comments regarding the
proposed alignments of district lines. These comments
are presently limited to the proposed map on the
legislative district draft maps for the metropolitan
Tucson area as provided on the website -- web page of
the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission.

The Tribe objects to district maps, draft
maps. The proposed alignments violates the spirit if
not the word of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.
Specifically, the proposed maps divides the community
of the tribe into four different districts, thus,
leaving the members of the Tribe with less opportunity
than other members of the electorate to participate in
the political process and to elect a representative of
their own choice.

Members of the Tribe live in four areas of
the metropolitan Tucson area: in Pasqua Pueblo, in
south Tucson, in Marana, and in the area which now has
become known as Old Pasqua. The proposed map placed
each of these communities in distinct districts. Those
placements only serve to leave the members of the Tribe
with a diminished ability to participate in the
political process and to elect a representative of
their choice.

As such, the Tribe objects to the district
maps and instead requests the Arizona Independent
Redistricting Committee to align their proposed
districts so as not to diminish the voting strength of
the members of the Pasqua Tribe.

Sincerely, Robert Valencia, Chairman of
the Pasqua Yaqui Tribe.

MR. LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Gonzales. We
may, as we move through the evening have questions
either from the Commission or from staff for
clarification purposes, and I wondered if as you speak,
if you would remain at the microphone so that we may do
that.

Also, I notice that you have a separate
slip in to speak.

MS. GONZALES: As an individual.

MR. LYNN: And we will be happy to hear you later on that score. Ms. Leon?

MS. LEON: Yes. We do have questions on that because we -- this was brought up the last meeting. We have taken a look at this meeting in depth. Could you address the Pasqua Yaqui so we can get some clarification of what the decision is here because we would like some clarification on this issue?

MALE SPEAKER: Just the main question, if I may, is we have a map showing where the reservation is adjacent to the Tohono O'Odham Reservation but we don't have a map of where the concentrations are in the three areas you listed. If you have a map, it would give us a chance to sit down and give a little more detail to us so we can be sure we understand exactly where these other three areas are.

MS. GONZALES: I personally, when I speak individually, will be speaking more specifically to those areas, but I would be happy to sit down and it's my understanding that the Commission is meeting with the Indian communities tomorrow, and there will be representatives there from the Tribe tomorrow to also probably have maps to share that with the Commission as
well.

MR. LYNN: Other comments or questions for Ms. Gonzales? Ms. Gonzales, thank you very much. We will take the letter from the Chairman.

MS. GONZALES: Thank you.

MR. LYNN: And put that into the record, and we will hear from you in order as we get to your slip.

MS. GONZALES: Thank you.

MR. LYNN: Thank you very much.

The next speaker is Jim McNulty, former member of Congress. Distinguished, former distinguished member of Congress. Always a distinguished citizen of southeastern Arizona. Mr. McNulty.

MR. McNULTY: Go right ahead.

MR. LYNN: I'm finished, sir.

MR. McNULTY: I am Jim McNulty. I came to Tucson, Arizona in January of 1946, and I have been engaged in civic affairs ever since.

I hold with the theory that everything fits into one of three categories. They're called lies, damn lies, and statistics. I'm going to deal with statistics.

For the last 10 years, Arizona has been
entitled to six congressional seats. Five of the
people who occupy those seats go to sleep every night
in Maricopa County. That means five out of six are
importantly influenced by Maricopa County. Or if you
want it in percentages it means 83 percent of the
deligation is affected by Maricopa.

Those numbers are not fair. I know
they're in the past, but it's the fact that the future
doesn't seem to be much brighter that we protest.
Arizona will have eight seats for the next 10 years.
What percentage of that new congressional will be
dominated by Maricopa? News articles suggest the
possibility of having Maricopa County dominating six of
the eight seats, which is just almost as bad as the
current situation. Which would you rather have, face
it by a 75 percent figure or an 83 percent figure.
They're both unacceptable.

All those here tonight are governed by the
current law on the subject of competitive districts,
and the new law says to the extent practicable,
competitive districts should be favored whereas to do
so would create no significant detriment to the other
goals.

I sense here tonight a little bit too much
satisfaction with that phrase about the causing no
significant detriment to the other goals. That appears at five places in the law, that particular phrase. There's no special language laid out here for the new districts, and that suggests to me that enough competitive districts should be created so as to strike out a continuation of the current ill-adjusted numbers.

Incumbents are entitled to consideration. I have enough knowledge of that to testify to that on my own. But the continuation of the system dominated by Maricopa County is wrong, and this committee should not approve it. Justice, the spirit and letter of the law, the current statute calls on our community-wide sense of decency that there be created competitive districts to terminate the current unjustly defined districts.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. LYNN: Are there questions or comments for Mr. McNulty? Thank you, Mr. McNulty, very much.

The next speaker is John Stair representing himself. Mr. Stair.

MR. STAIR: My name is John Stair, S-T-A-I-R, and I've been a resident of Arizona since Thursday, August 11th, 1945. I arrived at 10:30 in the morning.

I want to thank the Commission for all the
effort. I understand your pay is about the same as mine for being a precinct committeeman, but I hope maybe we can double your salary next year if you're still here. I appreciate, I do appreciate your effort and your trouble. I think your responsibility is tremendous. It's equivalent to trying to grow apples, oranges, and bananas on the same tree. I don't envy you your job. I don't know how you're going to accomplish it.

But the one point I would like to make is that it should be competitive. Every district should be competitive so that parties have almost equal opportunity to elect a candidate from their party and to make the elections worthwhile.

As we can see in the past 10 years, I have an article from the Arizona Republic that quoted "the decline in voter participation and the increased apathy." As I walked my district, or my precinct and try to get voters interested, the apathy that I encountered is tremendous. And I think the reason for this apathy is the fact that people are not being fairly represented at this time. We need fair representation and competitive elections in the future.

Thank you very much.

MR. LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Stair. Comments
The next speaker is Roger Voelker. Mr. Voelker?

MR. VOELKER: Thank you. My name is spelled V-O-E-L-K-E-R. I apologize for any mispronunciations. I just had a tooth extracted today.

I also have some statistics, so I won't try to bore you. I will try to get to them as quickly as possible.

District A -- well, first of all, I did some quick averages on average minority statewide, average Democrat registration, and average Republican registration statewide. Average minority is 36.2 percent. Average Democratic registration 38.8 percent. Average Republican registration 41.9 percent. About a 3 percent difference in Republican and Democratic registrations. Not overwhelmingly Republican, although obviously the state has a Republican flavor.

When I compare district by district with the state averages, we get quite different figures, quite strong discrepancies.

District A, 9.6 percent less than state average minority, 6.1 percent less than the average Democratic registration, 7.3 percent more than the average Republican. A safe Republican district.
District B, 14.4 percent less than the average state minority, 7.05 percent less than the average Democratic registration, 7.2 percent higher than the average Republican registration. A safe Republican district.

District C, 1.3 percent above the average minority, 2.2 percent above the average Democratic registration, and 3.6 percent below the average Republican registration. The most balanced of the districts and pretty much a toss up between the two parties. Very competitive.

District D, 34.1 percent over the average minorities, about double the state average, 13.2 percent over the average Democratic registration, and 13.8 percent under the average Republican registration. A very safe district for Democrats.

District E, 13.5 percent less than the average minority, 8.4 percent less than the average Democratic registration, and 10.5 percent over the average Republican registration. A safe Republican district.

Bear with me. There's only three to go.

District F.

MR. LYNN: I was hoping you weren't doing legislative.
MR. VOELKER: No.

District F, 12.8 percent less than the average minority, 10 percent less than the average Democratic registration, 10.5 percent over the average Republican registration. A safe Republican district.

And finally -- oh, two more. District G, 25.2 percent over the average minority, 16.8 percent over the average Democratic registration, 15.5 percent under the average Republican registration. A safe Democratic district.

And finally, you can cheer if you like, District H, 10.4 percent less than the average minority population, about 8 percent under the average Democratic registration, excuse me, that's .8 percent, .8 percent under the average Democratic registration, and .85 percent over the average Republican registration. That is the district I was in and the one that's actually closest to the state averages, although, still probably a safe Republican district.

Now, what do we conclude from these. First of all, we can see that most of the minorities and the Democrats are crammed into just two districts. That reduces the number of minorities and Democrats in most of the remaining districts, and that's a classic Gerrymandering technique as we know.
What's wrong with creating all these safe districts? Well, it obviously disenfranchises members of the other quote/unquote party. And really, since the outcome is ordained from the moment that the district lines are drawn, it really has the effect of disenfranchising all of the voters, even the ones who are with the majority parties of those districts because their votes are not going to make a large difference in the outcome. That doesn't give people a lot of incentive to vote.

The second problem is that safe districts allow politicians to become unaccountable to their constituents. Why should my representative listen to me when he has an absolutely safe district. He's going to do what he does and his seat is still guaranteed.

And finally, I'm new to the state, so I'm familiar with the clean elections of the public funding here. I don't know if that applies to congressional candidates or not. Somebody can inform me on that, but obviously we know that when you tend to have safe districts, the overwhelming majority of campaign contributions go to those candidates and it increases the imbalance even more.

So for all these reasons, I think the Commission needs to take a second look. I think
competitiveness has to be not the last consideration at 
least equal to the other considerations.

Thank you.

MR. LYNN: Mr. Voelker, before you go.

MR. VOELKER: Yes.

MR. LYNN: Two things. There may be 
comments or questions from the panel.

MR. VOELKER: Certainly.

MR. LYNN: I wondered if you could make 
your list of statistics, your analysis available to us, 
even in written form.

MR. VOELKER: I would be very happy to do 
that.

MR. LYNN: But we need that to be a part 
of the record, and quite honestly, we couldn't all take 
notes fast enough to get --

MR. VOELKER: Right. And I jotted this 
down in pen just before I came over here with a 
calculator. But I would be glad to print this out and 
send it to you or e-mail it to you.

MR. LYNN: E-mail would be fine.

MR. VOELKER: Whatever is most convenient.

MR. LYNN: E-mail would be fine. Are 
there comments or questions for Mr. Voelker. Thank 
you, sir, very much.
MR. VOELKER: Thank you.

MR. LYNN: The next speaker is Maribelle McCorkle representing the governing board of Tucson Unified School District. Dr. McCorkle.

MS. MCCORKLE: Hi, my name is Maribelle McCorkle, M-C-C-0-R-K-L-E. And I'm a native Tucsonan, and I would like it for the record that I'm not representing the governing board but I am a member of the governing board.

As many of you know, public education has been a priority and a passion in both my public life and my professional life, and I believe that in Pima County we have had good legislators representing public education. For the most part, they've been elected on the issues and not along party lines.

And so my concern tonight is to keep it that way. And I would like you to take special note of these districts and perhaps look at the reconfiguration of double B, DD, and Z. I've been looking at this area, and I truly believe that these districts are not competitive, and that you have BB and Z could be redrawn taking a little bit of DD and that would do the trick.

There will be some maps coming your way that show how this can be done, and so what I'm asking
tonight is that you help support public education by
allowing our votes to count in one competitive
district, and I thank you for all the work you're doing
in this situation. It's much appreciated.

MR. LYNN: Thank you, Dr. McCorkle. Next
-- are there comments or questions from the panel?
Next -- Ms.?

SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Are those maps
available tonight or are they going to be coming?

MS. MCCORKLE: I believe they will be
coming. They will probably be e-mailed to you.

SPEAKER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Fine.

MR. LYNN: Thank you.

The next speaker is Ann Murray, Vice
President of the Broadmoor/Broadway Village

MS. MURRAY: My name is Ann Murray, M-U-R-
R-A-Y. And I live in the Broadmoor/Broadway Village
Neighborhood. I am not representing the neighborhood,
but I am speaking for the interest of the neighborhood.

And tonight I would like to submit a
statement, and I have some supporting documents for
you, but here I would just like to make some comments,
and first of all, let me say that I am very pleased to
see that the southern boundary of BB is 22nd Street,
which is one of our major concerns.

Last Saturday, Commissioner Lynn asked me a question and I realized it was worthy of solving. In this case the baby is my neighborhood, Broadmoor/Broadway Village, and equally the neighborhood's position as a long-time participant in the Broadway corridor in the Central City Leadership Network.

I continue to state that chopping off any part of this community of interest would be very wrong. People who say otherwise are not speaking for the best interest of the neighborhood or the community.

Any division of the neighborhood itself would be a continuation of the convoluted districting which was done with no admitted knowledge and appeared after the 1990 census. It divided this small neighborhood between LD14 and 10. It made the neighborhood look like a jigsaw puzzle. Whose interest was served by putting three of our streets into LD10.

Since this obviously does not serve the neighborhood, people who defend it must have another personal motive. It sure looks like and sounds like a blatant example of the backroom Gerrymandering which this Commission is intended to correct.

I really don't want to think that this
Independent Commission would condone the political
power play that was at work, and you heard it on
Saturday. I expect you will preserve this community of
interest as you are charged to do. And tonight I have
some documents to help you.

First of all, I would like to show you,
and I have a copy of this for you. It's our
neighborhood charter, and it states our boundaries,
Broadway Boulevard, Country Club, Tucson Boulevard, and
on the south, Winsett, which dead ends halfway across
the Citation Wash and then the rest of the neighborhood
follows the outlined Citation Wash.

Some of us have ascribed to you that --
well, some people were heard to say that Arroyo Chico
would be a good dividing line. Others have described
to you that Arroyo Chico is the heart of the
neighborhood, is the focus of many neighborhood
activities. For example, our July 4th Parade.

And for further evidence of that, I have
for you selected pages from this wonderful document.
We don't have anymore copies, but they probably could
be printed. It's the Broadmoor/Broadway Village Urban
Forestry Manual, and it details indigenous native low-
water use vegetation particularly appropriate for the
central city.
And I want to direct your attention in that to this depiction of the Arroyo, it presents the Arroyo as we consider it a neighborhood entryway, not a neighborhood. It's the neighborhood entryway. The neighborhood is -- the landscaping you see here was planned and the plants were purchased and the neighborhood maintains all this vegetation. We're very proud of the way we cooperatively take care of the Arroyo.

Those who ask you to use the Arroyo as a dividing line are proposing something that would be really divisive. Further, we're in the process of seeking historic status. The Broadway Village is already a prominent historic landmark and it's not labeled to divide an area with historic designation.

Okay. We're a small, self-enclosed neighborhood with a unique identity. We're a strong community of interest. We're equally a part of the cohesive group of midtown neighborhood which have central city concerns and have been very active working together over a long period of time.

Our charter also contains as a purpose to maintain the commuter arterial designation of Broadway Boulevard. And it goes on to state concerns that we have about maintaining Broadway and the integrity of
Broadway.

I also have for you some selective pages from the City of Tucson Broadway Corridor Study Final Report, and on page 6 here, meetings and dates with participating neighborhoods are listed. My neighborhood is here along with other Broadway corridor midtown neighborhoods. This is 1986. This clearly demonstrates our historic position among midtown, Broadway corridor neighborhoods on both north and south sides of Broadway. Clearly for us Broadway is not a divider.

And incidently, at this time we're all meeting about current transportation needs and options along Broadway. This history and documentation clearly shows that we have never been in quotes "south side neighborhood." There is a residential area to our south and north of 22nd Street which I believe is not in an organized neighborhood association.

I've lived in my home for more than 30 years, and that area south of Citation Wash has never in my memory participated with us. But I was thinking after Saturday's testimony, if there are compelling reasons to believe that the south side does cross 22nd Street between Tucson Boulevard and Country Club, I prepared a suggested map for you which could put that
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area into proposed CC, and I will give you a copy of
this, but the northern boundary would follow along the
Citation Wash, being this northern boundary.

This is only submitted as a geographic
suggestion. It's not for me to know the demographic
constraints that you're working with.

Okay. Finally, I just wanted to say that
proposals to slice up my community look to me like a
transparent effort to fly under the radar and slip a
political power play into independent redistricting. I
wish for all of you the wisdom of Solomon.

Thank you.

MR. LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Murray.

Comments or questions for Ms. Murray. Thank you.

MS. MURRAY: Where should I submit my --

MR. LYNN: You would give them to Mr. --

do you want for us to take them?

MALE SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. LYNN: All right. If you would give
them to Ms. Knight. Thank you.

Next speaker is Jerry DePaco. Mr. DePaco.

MR. DEPACO: My name is Jerry DePaco. I
editorialize news review and political views on Access
Cox Channel 73, and I come here to speak to you of the
process again as I did Saturday.
I don't have prepared notes, but I'm going by what you have outlined here in your own material, and one of these things addresses the -- if I can read from this, it says, "Proposition 106 does not allow the Commission to consideration competitive districts earlier in the process. Under Proposition 106 competitive districts should be favored where there is no substantial detriment to other goals."

The competitiveness in a lot of these districts is not apparent. They're safe districts and proportionate to a lot of Republican districts. It seems like there's some very safe districts for a lot of politicians and it almost seems to be what has been called Gerrymandering. Or what is another word? The backroom politics.

There's some other small things that you included in here that said citizen input. Major communities of interest were identified. Native-Americans. You have the Yaquis coming to you right now explaining to you that there are three areas of Yaqui districts that are separated in the reservation and the urban Yaquis that are distinct but they are related. They're related by tradition.

And it does say Hispanic communities of interest. The Hispanic communities of interest
obviously I think there's one or two or a few Hispanics
here, but I'm only one Hispanic voicing an opinion, but
there is -- there seems to be what is classically
called Gerrymandering in the process, and I would like
to see some fairness and maybe the process look more
transparent.

As it seems now, it seems that there are
some safe districts, some districts where there are
overwhelming Republican representation, and the
communities of interest seem to be somewhat overlooked.

I didn't prepare any notes. I just came
to attend again to just mention that I do believe the
word Gerrymandering is still applicable to this
process.

MR. LYNN: Thank you, Mr. DePaco.
Comments or questions? Thank you, sir.
The next speaker is Mark Osterlo. Mr.
Osterlo.

MR. OSTERLO: My name is Mark Osterlo. I
was one of the co-authors of the redistricting
initiative, and I was at all of the meetings. So I
know the process and the reason you went into the
proposals that we have in there.

The main thing I want to address is what I
think is a serious misunderstanding by the Commission
of the importance of competitiveness in the list of
criteria. I've heard it stated in the press that it
was said that competitiveness was one of the last
issues and the least important issue.

Competitiveness was not put at the front
of the list of criteria but it was put at the end of
the criteria because it is the most important criteria.
What the drafters wanted to do was make sure that the
last thing that the Commission considered was
competitiveness. The very last changes you make in the
drawing of the lines are what are going to determine
the final outcome of the lines.

As you've struggled with all the different
criteria, like geographic borders, cities, and
communities of interest, you know how they all tug at
each other, and it's a matter of hunt and peck as to
which you usually have picked ultimately.

We left competitiveness at the very last
because that's going to be the last change. That's
going to ultimately determine what the districts are
going to be. If we had done it before, you know what
would have happened. There would be competitive
districts, but we would change them for a community of
interest or a geographic boundary.

And it's an important thing that the
Commission realizes it's last because it's the most important and it says in there they don't want any substantial detriment to the prior criteria so that you don't draw districts that go from the northeast to the southwest in a broad line or get something like district A in congressional which looks like a Gerry Dragon.

What we wanted to do was make sure that you understood. That was the last one, and it was the last one because it was the most important one. And the Commission has an opportunity at this point to either stand as a model for the rest of the country in saying that there is one criteria that is preeminent and you will get a lot of accolades both from the press and across the country if you can maximize competitive districts. If you have single-party districts, as you heard many comments here, there's going to be saying: Well, what do we get that's better from the Commission than what we had from legislators that cut up districts for the advantages of particular parties or particular individuals.

Competitiveness is the most important and was placed last before of that.

Thank you very much.

MR. LYNN: Comments or questions for Mr.
Osterlo? Ms. Hauser?

MS. HAUSER: No, I think Mr. Hall had the question.

MR. LYNN: Mr. Hall?

MR. HALL: Mr. Osterlo, I appreciate your input. Can you, for example, just using the practical scenario explain then how the Commission could create a competitive legislative district in Scottsdale without providing a substantial detriment to the other goals?

MR. OSTERLO: There you may have to take Scottsdale and go more to the west and do that. There are going to be limits to that, and obviously you have all of the other criteria. But by and large, you know, you will have to cut districts and you will have to cut cross boundary lines and stuff, but there are many competing criteria.

So you may not be able to keep Scottsdale intact in doing this, but the idea should be to get as many as competitive districts as close as possible within, what is it, approximately 5 percent differential between Republicans and Democrats? If you can get most of those districts within that range, any one of those districts can be competitive.

You cannot have perfectly square districts. You all know that I was for randomness, and
since you decided to not go with that, then you have to appear here. You will have to do some stretching, but you don't have to stretch from the northeast to the southwest part of the state to do it. You may not get it in every case, but if you can get them under 10 percent, closer to 5 percent, they're much more likely to be competitive.

MR. HALL: But wouldn't you agree that by doing what you just proposed there would be a substantial detriment to the community of interest to the City of Scottsdale which has defined itself —

MR. OSTERLO: Well, substantial, it depends what are your most important criteria. You have to take and say: what is the most important criteria, and the other ones are going to be below it. When it was set up, that's the most important criteria. Other criteria are then considered thereafter. That's why it was last because that's the last one you consider and that's what's going to determine the final maps.

And you will have to give and take on political boundaries. You'll have to give and take on compactness. You'll have to give and take on competitiveness. As you all know, they all compete with each other and they're mutually exclusive. So you
have to pick.

But if you have one leading criteria that ranks number one, the other ones, the detriment to the others should be minimized, but you have to decide which is the most important, and competitiveness is the most important. Yes.

MR. LYNN: Ms. Hauser?

MR. HAUSER: Mr. Osterlo, as one of the co-authors, you certainly are familiar with the language with respect to many of the criteria that says insofar as practicable. There is one paragraph that does not include that language, and that is the paragraph that deals with compliance with the U.S. Constitution and the Voting Rights Act.

My question to you is: In creating districts that comply with the Voting Rights Act, typically those districts have fairly large minority concentrations, and those minority concentrations tend to be overwhelmingly Democratic.

MR. OSTERLO: That is correct.

MS. HAUSER: In registration. My question to you is how do we then follow the suggestion that you just made without violating that criteria?

MR. OSTERLO: You have to make sure that
you have districts that make sure that the Hispanic
community, for example, or the Native-American
community has representation. Get those -- that's one
of the criteria that has to be considered in there in
the Voting Rights Act and ultimately the ultimate one.

Take and get those to a closer parity with
Democrat and Republican. I think one of the Hispanic
districts in Phoenix was, what, 56 percent Hispanic,
and I don't remember what the voter registrations are.
But they're so overwhelmingly Republican, no Republican
need apply for the job in that situation.

You can cut back on those districts with
the ultimate idea that if you have competitiveness
across the entire state, the interest of that community
will be protected when you consider the whole state.
If the Hispanic community is predominately Democratic,
if Democrats have a chance of winning across the entire
state and have an opportunity to actually be a majority
party, then the interest of those Hispanics will be
guaranteed or more likely be represented in that
particular situation. Whereas being a few guaranteed
Hispanic legislators in a minority will not necessarily
give them as much political clout ultimately.

So in the bigger picture making that a
little less overwhelmingly Hispanic may still benefit
them when you consider the whole state in the drafting
of all of the districts.

MS. HAUSER: Do you, Mr. Osterlo, have any
specific suggestions with respect to the minority
percentages that you believe would qualify under
section five with respect to preventing retrogression
or under section two with respect to vote dilution
under the Voting Rights Act?

MR. OSTERLO: I wouldn't hazard a number
on that one. That's one of the things that Mr. Heslop
and NDC I'm sure will give you information on.

Obviously the Hispanic community is known for not
having as high a voter participation. But in more
competitive districts and the chance across the state
for their particular party of preference to be elected
would give them stronger incentive to get more of their
members to vote in the elections, and that way
retrogression would be less likely.

MS. HAUSER: Okay. And finally, I know
you've given this entire process a lot of thought and
you've made a lot of suggestions to us before.

Do you have some specific suggestions with
respect to how the various boundary lines can be moved
in your opinion without substantial detriment to the
other goals in both the draft legislative and
congressional maps? Because I know we would be happy
to receive that.

MR. OSTERLO: I don't want to get into the
specifics, because as you know, you move one line and
the entire rest of the state does it.

MS. HAUSER: True.

MR. OSTERLO: If they go from the point of
view we will get every district as close to the parity
of the Democrats and the Republicans be at a 5 percent
difference and then see what those maps are and then
make minimum changes to make sure you don't get
entirely bizarre-shaped districts, we can have
competitive races in every one of those districts, that
minority groups will be protected because they are more
likely to have representation of their interests if
they have a legislature that may have an opportunity to
becoming a majority party.

MS. HAUSER: I would still encourage you
if you have any specific suggestions --

MR. OSTERLO: I'm not going to -- yes, I'm
not going to try and get onto the specifics there
because that's the kind of thing that we have some
high-quality experts that are paid better than you guys
to do that.

MR. LYNN: Ms. Leoni has a question.
MS. LEONI: Thank you much, thank you very much, Chairman Lynn.

Mr. Osterlo, as you know we're in public hearing, so we get a lot of points of views on various issues, and we have had communications from other persons involved with the drafting qualification and eventual success of Proposition 106 whose views tend to disagree with yours.

Can you explain, and I will cite specifically a communication we have received from Ann Essinger. Have you had an opportunity to discuss with her or how do you --

MR. OSTERLO: When she was President of the League of Women Voters, we discussed it at meetings and stuff, but what in particular did you have in mind?

MS. LEONI: Well, we have a communication in which she represents herself as one of the co-chairs of Proposition 106 organizing and drafting committee.

MR. OSTERLO: Correct.

MS. LEONI: And her communication to us stated that the drafters of Proposition 106 thought long and hard about the issue of competitive districts. We did not want the Commission's map makers to add arms and legs to areas where one party has a clear and natural advantage in an attempt to artificially create
competitiveness. And I'm just trying to reconcile that point of view which would seem to address a Scottsdale situation with the point of view that you're bringing up right now.

MR. OSTERLO: That's why we clearly put in there without significant detriment to. We think you can -- we aren't going to get the perfectly square districts or minimum size. That's a given in the situation.

What you try to do is you may ultimately have to have some districts that are one party. The idea is to minimize that where at all possible, and exactly what she says is totally consistent with how the law was written, without significant detriment, because we get, you know, Gerry Dragon districts all over the place to do that, but people are going to look at that and not even have to do much at all and think something is wrong with this one.

MS. LEONI: Okay. Then you are in agreement with this naturally occurring areas?

MR. OSTERLO: There are situations like that but you can minimize it and the idea of getting the computer which you can do modifications very rapidly is to try and get as many competitive districts as absolutely possible without getting incredibly --
and there may be some cases where you have to, you
know, take and draw way to another area to bring in the
population to make it competitive, and that would not
be an option that should be tried to incorporate in the
final plan.

MS. LEONI: Thank you.

MR. LYNN: Mr. Hall?

MR. HALL: Mr. Osterlo, nobody I think --
no question every member up here would like to have the
districts as competitive as possible, and certainly
that's the way I feel.

But based on what you said I'm confused a
little bit because you said that it was placed last
because it was the most important, yet the language in
the proposition concluded as to making that
consideration in the initial mapping phase.

So from a practical standpoint, in other
words, we laid a foundation and had built the house
halfway up, if you will, and then you're saying that
now that we're putting the final touches on the roof,
redo the foundation or?

MR. OSTERLO: No. You get the foundation
areas. You've got your communities of interest.
You've identified all of those, okay, to start with.
But before that car goes out, you put the finishing
touches on. You either vinyl seats or leather seats.
It's either a blue car or a yellow car and those are
the kind of things that make the final plans on that.

When you put the competitiveness in the
front, it's going to be one of the other criteria, just
like all the others being considered, when you set it
aside as the last one to be concentrated on, it's given
its importance proportional to what it needs. It is
the preeminent criteria. It is the one that you have
to consider last, and that's the last criteria is going
to determine the final lines, and that's why it was put
in that situation.

MR. LYNN: Thank you very much, Mr.
Osterlo.

MR. OSTERLO: Thank you very much.

MR. LYNN: The next speaker is Ann
Pattison, President of Broadmoor/Broadway Village

MS. PATTISON: Hi, my name is Ann
Pattison, P-A-T-T-I-S-O-N, and I've come here because I
was informed that there was a possibility of our
neighborhood being split up by the redistricting
commission among the ideas of using Arroyo Chico as a
boundary.

I would like to point out that Arroyo
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Chico is a natural feature around which our neighborhood was built. It's a post-war neighborhood. All the streets are named after small British towns, and they stand south of Arroyo Chico.

The neighborhood actually has limited entry. Arroyo Chico is one of the entry roads and also on the northeast and northwest corners, you can enter on either Stratford, Manchester, or Eastbourne Avenue.

Secondly, I would like to point out that Broadway Village, which was designed by Jostler is the cornerstone of our neighborhood. There are also a few Jostler houses running down Country Club, and I think architecturally, that puts our neighborhood within the central city where most of the Jostler houses and buildings lie.

Thirdly, historically and architecturally we belong with central city. Also, occupationally. Many of the residents work in or near the University, and I think that puts us occupationally within the central city.

I'm very pleased to see that the boundary as it is not splitting our neighborhood, and I did not discuss something. You have the University, the line goes very close to the east of the University, and I don't know how the people in those neighborhoods would
feel, but there's a lot of noise and traffic associated with University sports. And so one thing you might want to consider is bumping that western line there just a little bit west of the University because I think those neighborhoods work very closely with the University to try to keep noise and traffic and other problems associated with the sporting events at the University down.

Thank you.

MR. LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Pattison. Any comments or questions?

MS. PATTISON: And I do have a map of the neighborhood.

MR. LYNN: We will be happy to take it. If you would just hand it to Mr. Johnson there.

Ms. Pattison, one question.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes. I just wanted to make sure that I understood your last comment. Are you suggesting that the area surrounding the University be included with the Broadway/Broadmoor area of that it be separated from it?

MS. PATTISON: Oh, no, no, no. I was just noticing your line there, that it actually separates the University from the neighborhoods directly east of
the University. And I don't want to speak for those
neighborhoods, but because our neighborhood is -- or
the central city associations work fairly closely
together. I do know that those neighborhoods directly
east of the University by necessity work very closely
with the University, and this district line splits them
apart from the University.

FEMALE SPEAKER: But those neighborhoods
are not part of Broadway/Broadway?

MS. PATTISON: No, no, not at all.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you.

MS. PATTISON: Okay.

MR. LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Pattison.

Next speaker speaking for herself at this
time is Sally Gonzales. Ms. Gonzales.

MS. GONZALES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and
Commissioners. My name is S-A-L-L-Y, N-A-N, G-O-N-Z-
A-L-E-S.

I'm here to speak as an individual. I am
a member of the Pasqua Yaqui Tribe currently living on
the reservation, and I want to talk precisely to what
the Tribe already talked about about the Commission or
the current draft maps splitting the Yaqui community
into four districts.

Currently, in the legislature there are 4
Native-Americans. All of them -- out of the 4 of the 90 of Native-Americans, all of them Navajo. One has been elected from southern Arizona, but the three are from northern Arizona. Basically because of the district, I believe District 3, which encompasses most of the Navajo Nation in its boundaries. And so they are able to elect representation from their community to the state legislature.

But currently as it is now, there is very little chance of anybody electing, any other Indian community electing any representatives from their community into the state legislature.

And as far as the Yaqui Nation is concerned, that is what's happening with the current draft maps. Currently -- I've got a map. The reservation is called Pasqua Pueblo. So the reservation is Pasqua Pueblo. We also have a traditional community in the City of South Tucson, which if you -- it is right directly south of the intersection between I-19 and I-10. So that area just south of that, and it's called 39th as well. 39th, the community of 39th. So it's interchangeable.

Another traditional Yaqui community is on Grant just east of I-10, and that one is Old Pasqua. The fourth community is in Marana in
district, currently district Z, and that Yaqui
community is just south of I-10 where the old Marana
community is, where the Circle K and that, you know,
that little -- where the cleaning is. Where the old
Marana area is is just south of there.

And so currently Pueblo is in Z. Old
Pasqua is in AA. 39th community is in CC, and the
reservation is in Y. And really we would like -- I'm
asking here as an individual that we keep the community
or the Commission keep the Yaqui community intact. And
it would be very easy.

Probably the best solution would be to
keep it in AA and just move the boundaries to the north
and include -- it's right on the border. 39th
community is right on the border between AA and CC and
as well as the reservation is right on the border of AA
and Y. So it very, very easy to do that.

And that's not to say that that's what the
Tribe would like because you will probably hear from
the Tribe, and I'm not speaking for the Tribe. I'm
speaking as an individual. And that would probably be
the easiest way to keep us intact as a community.

As you probably know, the Yaquis have a
very different language, culture, history, completely
different from the Tohono O'Odham in the Hispanic
community, although, we share similarities, like in language, and in some instances, a little bit of culture. But we are a very distinct community, and I personally would like to be able to vote and elect somebody from the Yaqui Nation at one time to go to the state legislature.

I want to address, I'm very happy to hear that the Commission is meeting the Indian community, and that has happened in the past. And of course one of the reasons I supported this 306 was because -- I'm sorry. I said the wrong one, but 106. Was because we need to have fair districts and we need to be able to elect our own representatives into the state legislature.

But one of the things that I would like to also let the Commission know is that in the past different groups have come before you probably representing or talking about the Indian communities and the Yaquis, and you need to be very careful as to who are they representing and whose interest are they representing. I mean, it seems to me that some groups are trying to represent the interests of the Yaquis or the Indian community that have not been before the communities to discuss what they're representing.

And so I would like to just let the
Commission be aware of who is representing who and take
it and really listen to the Indian community when you
meet with them tomorrow and I'm sure there will be
follow-up meetings to answer questions, but I think
that's all I have.

Thank you very much.

MR. LYNN: Ms. Gonzales, a question. And
I don't want to put you on the spot. If it's an unfair
question, just if you could either pass it along to the
tribal leadership for someone else for an answer if
you're not comfortable.

I know we have statistical information
about the possible numbers. I know we have good census
data about the reservation land per se. What we don't
have good numbers on are the concentrations of Yaqui
people in south Tucson, in Old Pasqua and in Marana.
Could you either get or approximate for us how many
individuals we're talking about in each of those
sections?

MS. GONZALES: I don't have that
information. I will pass that onto the Tribe and have
them address that to you.

MR. LYNN: That would be most useful if
you could. Other questions or comments for Ms.
Gonzales?
If not, we have, as is our tradition, about every hour, 15 hour, 30, we take a break so that our public stenographer can get the feeling back in his fingers. And if we could please take about a 10- to 15-minute break, we will reconvene in about 10 to 15 minutes. Thank you.

(Recess taken.)

MR. LYNN: The next speaker is Ted Poelstra representing himself. Mr. Poelstra.

MR. POELSTRA: Good evening. I'm Ted Poelstra, P-O-E-L-S-T-R-A. And I do thank you very sincerely for your efforts in this endeavor. I know it's not an easy one.

I have just a few points. I know that the justice department in other states in the past has permitted legislative districts to have a variance much wider than what you're trying to project. You cannot get communities of interest down in such a fine number.

My belief is that communities of interest should be the number one factor in drawing lines. There will always be safe districts if you have any major portions of communities of interest in each of the 30 legislative districts statewide, and I am acquainted with all 30 legislative districts in the state. I have been in all of the 30 districts.
The use of city boundary lines in Pima County is very misleading when you compare it to other counties. And it's because only 61 percent of Pima County is incorporated. Ninety-three percent plus is incorporated in Maricopa County. So when you use a city boundary line in Pima County, you are breaking up communities of interest.

I think this is of primary importance here. It's a whole different factor when you leave the Maricopa, you are in southern Arizona. South of the Gila, the water is different, and I think that should be kept in mind.

In closing, I would ask you to review the map in this extent. Let me give you an example. DM Air Base you have in CC, but most of the residents that are on that property reside in either DD or in BB. Very few will reside in CC. To put this into that particular area is not a community of interest issue. CC interest will be, and it will always be, I think in my lifetime anyway, the issue of a district that will always have representation with a Hispanic influence. You aren't going to change that. It will be a safe district, and it should be. But that district should extend much further to the west to have that community of interest.
I would hope that you could keep this in mind that Tucson area, Pima County and southern Arizona is completely different than other portions of the state, and I think you have to almost change your criteria when you look at this area. And I am intrigued with the map that has come up for the border district. I think that has a lot of merit, and I think it should be given consideration because that is a community of interest.

Thank you.

MR. LYNN: Mr. Poelstra, I know Mr. Elder has question as well. I want clarifications on two things.

MR. POELSTRA: Yes.

MR. LYNN: Number one, the map on the border district, we had actually two of those presented or one could say that there are two presented. One was presented by Mr. Baldenegro who's going to speak later this evening, I have his card, and another border district has been presented out of Cochise County as well as Santa Cruz County. They're up on the board in back.

Would you tell us which one you're referring to so that we're clear on which one you're supporting?
MR. POELSTRA: I think the Sierra Vista
being in with DD is a much more practical district. I
think it's DD. And this would be more of a -- it
probably will be more competitive in some ways than
what it could be otherwise. But what I think the real
result is is that you go back to the area of
development, the area of the community, and I just
think that's key for this.

MR. LYNN: Then the second clarification
is you indicated that District CC should move west.
Can you be specific about how far west and
to what line of demarcation you would suggest?

MR. POELSTRA: I would start with the east
boundary would be Alvernon. And then it would go west
and possibly south into the Drexel Heights area.

MR. LYNN: Mr. Elder.

MR. ELDER: I suppose that's part of what
my question was because we heard testimony at the
previous Tucson meeting that we wanted to try and
include some of the barrios. There's some barrios to
the west of I-10. We kind of dropped off right at I-
10, I think D, is that western boundary at Drexel
Heights area, take in the barrio.

MR. POELSTRA: Yes.

MR. ELDER: And areas that we're looking
as we come down the west side of the Santa Cruz.

MR. POELSTRA: Yes, it would.

MR. ELDER: Thank you.

MR. POELSTRA: And I think probably one of the lines could very well be Ajo to the north and running in that direction.

The thing I also want to emphasize, the numbers. I can recall that the justice department has approved, I think it was 20 years ago, a variance of up to 5 percent. And maybe this has changed within the justice department, but I think trying to hold such a fine line down to this issue is not in the best interest of the communities involved.

MR. LYNN: Other questions or comments for Mr. Poelstra. Ms. Hauser.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Poelstra, one question with respect to Sierra Vista and your comment about Sierra Vista and DD.

We were just at a hearing in Sierra Vista a couple of nights ago. It was very well-attended. It was standing room only and then some. And the overwhelming sentiment at that meeting was for Sierra Vista to be united with the rest of Cochise County instead of with any part of Tucson. And maybe that is their community of interest.
And I wondered if knowing that, do you feel that -- does that change your opinion one way or the other about Sierra Vista and DD?

MR. POELSTRA: No, it does not. I know the area. I know a number of people there. I think that ideally that's probably true. But this cannot be an ideal situation. Somewhere we have to have some variances with the ideal situation.

I see that there are just as many common interests using the border issue and using the border because of the population numbers as trying to have Cochise County and Sierra Vista in line.

I have to go back upon my background, which is as a lobbyist and also as a sponsor of annexation and incorporation statutes in the state. And so I have a background I think that draws upon all areas of the state, and I just see somewhere you're going to have to give with this, and this is probably a better giving point than splitting up communities of interest within the large cities.

MS. HAUSER: Thank you.

MR. POELSTRA: Thank you.

MR. LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Poelstra.

MR. POELSTRA: Thank you.

MR. LYNN: The next speaker is Paul
Mackey. Mr. Mackey.

MR. MACKEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission.

I requested to see whether or not we could bring up legislative district BB for the purposes of what I want to say. With fairness to the audience, I want to make some specific references. So that way they will be able to follow, and yes, I will use the pointer.

Let me do this. Before I begin talking, I want to pass out a map to the Commission. I'm sorry I don't have more than one copy. It's the old district H crossed out and labeled BB. Let me also pass out a couple of copies of an area around the University that I specifically want to address that.

But even before I begin to talk about district BB, I want to simply support the comments made earlier about people talking about competitive districts and particularly in the central city itself, the comments by Ann Murray and Ann Pattison of the Broadway/Broadmoor neighborhood. I totally support those. I belong to a number of different groups, Central City Group, Central City Leadership member, an organization with 36 neighborhood associations in the central part of the city that feels it has a great deal
What I want to talk about is here. On the map that's before you and specifically one that's referred to as University area neighborhoods, I want to make some specific recommendations about that. And that is Savvy's meeting, Alice Rowe from a neighborhood association spoke to you. This little sliver here that runs roughly from Broadway and I'm not sure what street that is, possibly Lester there, that is Grant right there, but that particular sliver on the east side of Campbell Avenue makes absolutely no sense to us.

This whole area here between Speedway and Broadway, east of Campbell is the Sam Hughes Neighborhood Association, it's between Campbell and Country Club. It's a square mile, one of the oldest neighborhood associations in the city. Very cohesive group. To split that and sliver them makes absolutely no sense to us whatever. I realize there's a couple of precinct lines in there, but even at that, it still doesn't make any sense to split it up.

The handout I gave you for the University area neighborhoods, I chair a group called the Campus Community Relations Committee. It's ten neighborhood associations around the University of Arizona. Commissioner Minkoff had a question about that earlier.
We work closely with the University. In fact, we're involved with a joint planning effort right now for the area around it.

And if you look at the map that I handed out there, the University area proper probably extends from Campbell over to, I won't say Euclid because of some of the areas that are there. So it's area in here. Then you have this whole series of neighborhoods roughly from Grant to Stone down to Broadway and there, and all of the focus on the University area.

Some of this area historically has been included in a supervisors district on the west side. But historically, functionally, socially, demographically, every other criteria you want to use, it is an integrated area that works together there.

So what I'm suggesting is that that area that the line here for BB, extend it westward. I have a series of recommendations on the map I made there almost from the minimal to the ideal that I would like to make. One is a absolutely minimum, that line there to the east of Campbell has to be moved over to Campbell. If you do nothing else, do that because that makes absolutely no sense.

Secondly, I suggest that the next area that you include, you go east of that, include the area
here over to roughly Oracle, Oracle/Stone in this area here.

MR. LYNN: Mr. Mackey, to be clear, west of that?

MR. MACKEY: Did I say east?

MR. LYNN: West.

MR. MACKEY: Thank you.

MR. LYNN: Because the consultants are going to look at this very carefully.

MR. MACKEY: Okay. But they will have the map. This area will show that. Sorry that I said east. Definitely to the west there.

This is again, as I mentioned, this is a really cohesive area here and it makes no sense to break that up and not treat it as part of the larger area in here.

Then ideally, as my third recommendation, ideally, if we were really going to create the appropriate district here, I would include this area as well here as going to the northwest. There's a lot of similarities, commonalities in this area as well. It's interesting that you have this finger that goes up to the northwest here and this ties into a lot of the areas.

There are a lot of the areas here that
relate to each somehow were separated. You know, one
can argue perhaps you can use I-10 if you wanted to,
but I would say that if you didn't want to go that far,
at least use the Oracle/Stone because many of the areas
relate from that area there to the east in that sense.

If you then had to trade off some areas in
order to accomplish that, what I would suggest is on
the far east side of that area there that possibly you
use either Kolb or Pantano as the separation there. I
don't know if the numbers would exactly work out, but,
you know, it's roughly the same geographic size or
something like that.

So if you have to give some to tie this
into BB, I would suggest that you possibly at Pantano
or Kolb area leave that from it. And so that's roughly
--- that would be roughly an equal trade off because the
farther east you go in this area, the less commonality
there is with this central part of the city.

So we think it makes a lot more sense to
include this area here just west an area here as part
of it and perhaps the eastern area because that begins
to fall into other communities of interest. So I would
recommend that you make those changes with the specific
street names that I gave you.

This area here, I know there's been
discussion about this. We have the boundary here
should be on that street, I think it's Plumer there.
That seems to be still a workable dividing line there
as the people from the neighborhoods in here have
spoken about it. I would support that as well.

As far as where you would have like a
southern boundary if you moved it a little to the west
there, historically Tucson's development for this area
here has taken place north of the railroad as it runs
through there. So if you had to find a common or find
a boundary there, it would be roughly 6th Street as it
runs towards the west there, but 6th Street until it
hits the railroad tracks and then north of that.

So that area or maybe a portion of that
could be included. I think it would do a great deal in
developing what is a particularly strong community of
interest in this area, particularly to the areas around
the University. I don't think they should be broken up
and split.

Thank you.

MR. LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Mackey.

Questions? Mr. Johnson.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Mackey, just one
question, and I thank you for your testimony.

Should we be able to unify this district
or this area, but doing so means we unify it in AA
rather than BB. Is that a top priority for you or is
your --

MR. MACKEY: I'm not sure I know what you
mean.

MR. JOHNSON: Instead of moving BB to the
west, if we were able to unify this area by moving AA
to the east.

MR. MACKEY: No. That would make
absolutely no sense. Because if you consider the way
the communities you've oriented in the -- if you
consider all the factors, socioeconomic, any
demographic factors you want, orientation around the
University and things like that, to move that, to shift
that AA, say, farther east or something like that would
be going in absolutely the wrong direction.

MR. LYNN: Thank you. Mr. Elder.

MR. ELDER: Let me pose a hypothetical to
you to see if you can give me some idea at how to make
the choices.

Let's assume that that area that you've
identified on your map has 40,000 people in it. Let's
also assume that the area to the east of the river has
about 15,000 in it.

MR. MACKEY: East of Pantano?
MR. ELDER: East of the Pantano, yes.

Where would you propose a similar demographic or a similar community of interest to pick up the necessary 20,000 to 25,000?

MR. MACKEY: What I suggested was, okay, that BB be shifted to the west here. And whatever is added here, a commensurate amount on the eastern portion here would then be joined with some other area.

MR. ELDER: So you would not mind then going over to Craycroft or to --

MR. MACKEY: Right. If it moved -- if this was pulled in farther to the west there, and if I had that choice to pick up here, that's what I would recommend. There are some, you know, Pantano is a division of sorts. Kolb Road is also a major area as well, and as I said, as you go farther east the demographics and the community of interest aspects begin to change. So this portion here, this eastern has more in common with this general area here than it would have to the central portion of the city.

MR. LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

MS. MINKOFF: We're really talking about a ripple effect here.

MR. MACKEY: Absolutely.

MS. MINKOFF: As somebody said earlier,
when you change one district, you change them all.

MR. MACKEY: Right.

MS. MINKOFF: In order to add that area to BB, you would take it from AA, which means that AA is now underpopulated. And when you pull the eastern part of BB away, it's not connected to AA. So you can't put it there. So you have to put it in DD or CC and then possibly move some of those districts into A.

Do you have any suggestions as to how to do that?

MR. MACKEY: Without, you know, without like manipulating some of the numbers like, you know, say specifically, yes, I understand that, and that's why, you know, I said at one end you could possibly work AA, you know, there might be some additional changes there. For example, there is the possibility that AA, if the northeastern area of AA, that section between the boundary of AA and the interstate there, you know, we're talking about small areas here, but, you know, if some things like that happened, you know, possibly it could work.

MS. MINKOFF: But then you're under populating Z.

MR. MACKEY: Right, but they're growing. Right. No, I mean, and that's another aspect. I mean,
those are the fast-growing areas as well, and, you
know, I think that's a factor. Even though you're
using actual numbers now, we also have to look at
what's happening in the near future. Five years from
now if you were doing this, area Z would have a much
increased population on that.

But, you know, a couple of the slivers
there, like in Z, that run west of the Interstate or
something like that, I don't know what the actual
numbers are, but there is room there I think to move
some things.

But like I said, if I had to make a
choice, it's almost a free stage thing. I would take
that first thing as a minimum, and I think regardless
of anything else, that sliver east of Campbell needs to
be part of BB.

Secondly, the immediate area around the
University that I described, and then ideally that
portion, northwest portion of AA that's east of the
freeway there, that would make sense to tie that with
that portion of BB that extends up there to the
northwest. That would be ideal.

Whether or not the numbers would allow,
you know, those three steps, I don't know. But the
first two I would regard as the most important, and the
first one is absolutely minimal, just commonsensical.

MR. LYNN: Other questions for Mr. Mackey?

Thank you, Mr. Mackey, very much.

MR. MACKEY: All right. Thank you.

MR. LYNN: You're appreciated. Yes, thank you. The next speaker is Billy Yarnell. Mr. Yarnell.

MR. YARNELL: Hi, I'm Bill Yarnell. The last name is spelled Y-a-R-N-E-L-L. My address is 9880 East Paseo San Rosendo in Tucson.

Tonight I come to echo a lot of people's sentiments about competitiveness. When the Proposition 106 went on the ballot last year, everyone said: Oh, that's a good thing because in the past, all the districts were Gerrymandered by the political party in power, and they threw a bone to the party that wasn't in power. So some of their leaders said, okay, we'll give them, you know, this district's safe for them and these districts will be safe for us. And the result was Arizona has anywhere from 2 to 4 competitive districts out of 30 on the state level.

Now, people voted for this because they wanted things done differently. The way I look at this now is you're doing the same thing. There's about 2 to 4 competitive districts.

Now, people are saying that: Oh, there's
not minority interests or different interests. If
you're in a district that's 50-50, both parties will
listen to you because they need your vote. If you're
in a district that's 70-30, it doesn't matter if you're
the majority or the minority. The people are just
going to do what they want to do because they know they
will get reelected forever.

Now, I think you need to look at
competitiveness as an important issue. Right now I
live in Rita Ranch area which is part of District 9.
District 9 incorporates Green Valley and some other
rural areas that have basically nothing in common with
Rita Ranch.

Now, you're talking about putting it into
CC which will make it part of south Tucson, which we
probably don't have anything in common with south
Tucson. We went from being a strong Republican
district where I guess I can say because nobody from my
legislative district is here, but where they really
didn't have to listen to you because they knew they
were getting reelected. So now we're going to a strong
Democratic district where they're really not going to
have to listen to us because they know they're going to
get reelected.

And, you know, we've gone through this
whole process. It's time and money and effort to do this thing, and nobody -- I don't see a change from what the old system was, and the purpose of this whole proposition on the ballot was to make a change.

And one of the enlightening things I thought last year on the campaign for this was to look at who was opposed to this. The people that came out opposed to this were the elected officials, the incumbent elected officials were the ones that were opposed to this. The people were in favor of 106. The elected incumbent officials were opposed to it. And the people wanted it because they wanted to see a change. And right now, I'm not seeing much of a change.

You're moving a little bit here, little bit there, little bit this and that. There's not as many communities split in half and all that, but you're basically coming up with districts that are not competitive, and I think to serve the people of Arizona the best, you should have as many competitive districts as possible.

I realize there's going to be areas like Scottsdale and south Tucson and, you know, places that are going to be all favoring one party or another. But, you know, to go from two or three competitive
districts now to maybe three or four, you know, on the new map, that really doesn't accomplish anything I don't think.

MR. LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Yarnell.

Comments or questions?

The next speaker is Tomas Martinez. Is Mr. Martinez here?

MR. MARTINEZ: My name is Tomas Martinez, and it's spelled T-O-M-A-S. Last name M-A-R-T-I-N-E-Z. I was born and raised in Old Pasqua, which was talked about earlier. This is unrelated. It's sort of related but unrelated.

I want to speak to the issue of competitiveness. While I agree that congressional districts and legislative districts should be competitive, this competitiveness should not be at the expense of minority voters. The Voting Rights Act guards against the dilution of the minority vote.

Proposition 106 speaks to this in goals and A and F. I take offense to some suggestions that it is okay to dilute the minority or Hispanic vote because the Democratic is as good enough a representative for us being a minority or Hispanic regardless of race.

I believe this -- the intentions of the
Voting Rights Act were to help elect representatives that reflect the communities they serve, and this reflection includes race. I hope the Commission keeps us in mind in drawing the districts.

I would also like to add that the community of interest aspect be respected in congressional district G by including the entire border region in district G as detailed in the maps admitted by the Chicano Consortium.

And I was listening to some comments regarding district AA, legislative districts AA and BB which I find kind of disturbing. I live in district AA, which is Old -- well, depending on where the lines get drawn could have an effect on me. Just -- I live just west of Oracle, Oracle and Grant area.

Essentially I think that moving, let's say district BB west into AA east of the interstate affects us in that there's a large Hispanic and minority population in AA. That particular area, which includes Mansfield Park, Old Pasqua, and some areas, it's a high minority population, and I think the proposal to move AA into BB would result in diluting the minority vote and would break up community interest. At least it would break up my interest.

I mean, I really have no reason voting for
somebody in BB because they don't -- I'm assuming that University area, Sam Hughes and east, you know, can't represent me. I live in Old Pasqua, and we have a totally different dynamic than those in, say, Sam Hughes or east in BB. I basically believe that it would hinder my ability to vote effectively for somebody who would represent me.

So those are my comments. Thank you.

MR. LYNN: Comments or questions for Mr. Martinez?

Mr. Martinez, would you confirm something for me. My understanding of Old Pasqua, and again, I know that the neighborhood over time, there was some redevelopment and other changes, has changed, but roughly for the purposes of the consultant, south of Grant Road, west of Oracle, to the freeway, to just maybe two or three blocks of Speedway.

MR. MARTINEZ: Correct.

MR. LYNN: Would that pretty much --

MR. MARTINEZ: Yes. It includes Old Pasqua, Via Pasqua, OP. It includes -- let's see. Via Blue Moon, which is just north of Speedway. And Alliento, which is in between Blue Moon and Old Pasqua. A large community there. It's Hispanic and Yaqui. Actually I wouldn't say Hispanic. I would say Chicano
for the most part. And, yes, I mean, that's where it
is.

MR. LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Martinez.
MR. MARTINEZ: You're welcome.
MR. LYNN: Other comments or questions.

Thank you.

The next speaker is Tom Bowen. Mr. Bowen.

MR. BOWEN: Mr. Chairman, members of the
Commission. I'm Tom Bowen. Several of you are
probably aware that I'm also the chairman of the county
redistricting committee, and as such, I have great
empathy for the magnitude and difficulty of your task.
But that's not why I'm speaking tonight.

I also would like to address
competitiveness. All your statistics that you present
and most of what has been discussed is on the basis of
Republican versus Democratic. Well, as being active in
partisan politics, I of course would like to have safe
districts in all the districts for my party, but that's
not reflecting the realities of life.

One of those realities today is there is a
significant and growing number of voters who register
other than in those parties. Your statistics don't
reflect it. And a true evaluation of competitiveness
where the difference between the two major party
registrations is exceeded or closely to those people registered other than the two major parties. It truly is a competitive district, even though one party may have the advantage over the one just looking over the two parties, because in such a case the candidates have to go out and compete for those votes of the people registered other than in the two major parties, and those are real votes and those are real people and deserve real consideration.

And I strongly recommend that that be considered as a major factor in looking at competitiveness.

Thank you.

MR. LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Bowen. Comments or questions?

I did want to make a point, Mr. Bowen, that with respect to the districts that were shown in the newspaper, and there were pullouts of those districts that showed party registration, that those statistics did not reflect Independent and minority party voters. Our statistics do and we do take those into account as a part of our overall analysis of voting strength within the district. We're also looking at historical data as well.

MR. BOWEN: I'm please to hear that and
gratified.

MR. LYNN: Thank you.

Next speaker is Wayne Anderson also with the Broadway Village, Broadmoor/Broadway Village Association. Mr. Anderson.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Wayne Anderson, and that's spelled W-A-Y-N-E, A-N-D-E-R-S-O-N. I would like to thank the members of the Commission for all their hard work. I don't think I would ever want to be on a Commission like this. And one bit of good news, I am not asking for any changes on this map.

I am a real estate broker and past officer in the Broadway/Broadmoor -- Broadmoor/Broadway Village Neighborhood Association, and I was pleased to see that the south district, or the south boundary of legislative district BB was unchanged and reflected 22nd Street, which in my opinion better reflects or best reflects the cohesiveness of the neighborhood straddling the Broadway corridor.

These neighborhoods have expressed themselves as a community in many projects involving central Tucson, and the neighborhood leaders meet often to discuss these issues. And having 22nd Street as the south boundary best reflects these neighborhoods'
membership in a central community.

Last Saturday there were some discussions proposing that the Broadway, Broadmoor/Broadway Village neighborhood be split in half at Arroyo Chico. That's the neighborhood I live in, and that would be a disastrous move. Like Broadway being a focal point for the central corridor, the Arroyo Chico is also a focal point for neighborhoods that straddle the Arroyo.

There have been common projects with the Arroyo and maintenance and upkeep. The project of flood control in the Reed Park area and all the way downstream Arroyo Chico. And the houses on both sides of the Arroyo Chico have a common interest in the Arroyo Chico and a common political and community interest.

So I would stress to the Commission not to make any changes in the south boundary of BB and if any changes are considered, a change by dividing these neighborhoods at Arroyo Chico would be ill-advised.

So in summary, I would like you to continue to recognize Broadway, the Broadway corridor as a cohesive, joining aspect of this district and not a dividing line and that the Arroyo Chico in itself is also a cohesive element in the neighbors that staddle the Arroyo.
Thank you.

MR. LYNN: Comments or questions for Mr. Anderson? Mr. Elder.

MR. ELDER: Yes, Mr. Anderson. We've been given a considerable amount of testimony about the north-south edges of this area. How far to the east do you see this cohesiveness going, and how far to the west of Broadway/Broadmoor Village?

MR. ANDERSON: I'm happy with the boundaries as they stand. I would not suggest any changes in the boundaries as they are currently outlined.

MR. ELDER: Okay. Thank you.

MR. LYNN: Other comments or questions? The next speaker is Stuart Grabel, Ombudsman for the Elderly Pima Council on Aging. Mr. Grabel.

MR. GRABEL: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to come here today. It's always a pleasure to see democracy and to stay up late and listen to people talking about what their beliefs are, and I don't think I've seen you since our daughters were in a play together at University Rincon High, long time ago.

The point that I would like to make is

-------------
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again in favor of competitive districts. The elderly
are composed of all different parties, all different
races, nationalities, groups, and the one thing that
will get the issues that they see in front of our
legislatures is competitiveness where the
representatives have to go back to their districts and
ask what's going on and what those issues are.
And that's really about all that I have to
say.

MR. LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Grabel.

Comments or questions. Thank you. Give my best to
Jenny.

MR. GRABEL: Okay.

MR. LYNN: The next speaker -- no, it's a
big town but it's a very friendly town.
The next speaker is Solomon Baldenegro
representing the Chicano Consortium of Public Issues.
Mr. Baldenegro.

MR. BALDENEGRO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
members of the Commission. I thank you for your
indulgence. I know that anybody who has to listen to
me repeatedly as you have is serving some kind of
punishment, and the fact that you can still call us sir
and ma'am and be so polite after all these months
speaks to your patience and your good upbringing.
I want to speak to this issue of -- well, first off, before I say that, I would like to incorporate by reference my previous comments so I don't have to repeat them about the border district and about the south Tucson comments that I've made. And I would also like to associate myself with the comments made by Mr. Martinez earlier about the village and that area. There's just no community of interest.

But whatever you want to talk about has to do with this notion that's been bantered about tonight about competitiveness. I saw a memo today that was issued as a talking points memo, and in that memo asserted that the Voting Rights Act should not be used as a cover to make the maps that you draw less competitive.

Well, I would argue the adverse of that, and that is that the competitiveness should not be used as a cover to impact pejoratively the Voting Rights Acts on the interest of redistricting areas that are impacted by the Voting Rights Act.

As was mentioned earlier, there are certain areas like Scottsdale, Green Valley, south Tucson, no matter what you do with them, no matter -- unless you split them extremely bizarrely, there's no way that you're going to make certain areas
Now, it was asserted earlier that if we elect people from a certain party that are people of color that our interests would be protected per se. Well, the reason we're under section 5 jurisdiction is precisely because that hasn't happened because you have the rights of our communities have been violated in the past and section 5 and DOJ and all those folks are not trying to rectify that. The Voting Rights Act interest here are trying to rectify those things.

Those of you from Tucson know that Ed Moore was a Democrat, and Ed Moore was sure as hell not our advocate and not -- did nothing in our interest. Now, the only good thing about Ed Moore is that he was equal opportunity because he also, he misrepresented us as a Republican.

MR. LYNN: And an Independent.

MR. BALDENEGRO: Yes, that's right. So that was probably the only virtue that I could think of to say about Mr. Moore except that I'm sure he loves his family and his parents.

But I think that's one thing you have to keep in mind is that section 5, the reason we're under -- we're even talking about the Voting Rights Acts is because we're trying to rectify wrongs that were made
maybe in good faith, maybe not, but that's irrelevant.
The fact is that we're trying to correct those.
And I think that that should be what
drives our decisions in these forums because that is
correcting a historical wrong that has been going on.
We finally got a grasp on it. We're starting to become
viable politically. By "we" I mean the people of
color, and I think to truncate that, to stop that, to
do things that would stop that momentum would be wrong
politically, societally, and historically, and
constitutionally would be wrong. And I think that goes
off of a framework is what you drive us here.
Also, when we talk about the so-called
Hispanic population, I mentioned this before, most
populations are for the most part in many areas
artificially inflated. They're artificially inflated.
For example, people talk about district G, and I think
that if I remember it's something like 54 percent
Hispanic or something like that. I can't remember
exactly, but it's in that area.
Now, that's a artificially high number
because as you know, in that area district G are two
populations that are not politically viable. One is
the undocumented population and their families, which
are pretty substantial. Now, that's a totally
nonviable political population. And also we have some INS holding facilities in district G that has a lot of folks. And for census purposes, those people count towards the total population. So if you make the adjustments and take those variables into account, those districts that appear to be high Hispanic are really not when you look at the politically viable population.

Also, we are a very young population as you know. So the 18 plus politically viable population is also smaller than what the raw numbers would suggest.

So the point I'm making is that when we draw these maps, I don't think that the Voting Rights Act -- I don't think anybody believes that we should draw maps that would guarantee a Hispanic or any other minority an election to a seat. What it does I think guarantee or tries to guarantee is that those folks have an opportunity to have people elected to office and/or to impact the politics and the dynamics of their area.

And I think that in those areas where the Voting Rights act interests would not be impacted pejoratively, I think competitiveness is fine. I'm a Democrat with a small "D" and I think that
accomplishment is good.

But historically, historically having areas that don't protect our interests have not been good to us historically, and I think we have to do that in that light.

And I thank you again for your indulgence, and I wish you luck, and I thank you again for the tremendous time and effort you put into this. It's a thankless job, and you've done a good job of it.

Thanks.

MR. LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Baldenegro. A question, if you would, please.

I know that your presentation on the border district is a congressional presentation.

MR. BALDENEGRO: Right.

MR. LYNN: As opposed to legislative.

MR. BALDENEGRO: Right.

MR. LYNN: But I wonder if you've had an opportunity to look at the maps at the rear of the hall this evening that represent a legislative border approach to southeastern Arizona. Have you had an opportunity to look at those maps?

MR. BALDENEGRO: No, I haven't. I've heard people speak of it, but.

MR. LYNN: I wonder if you would be so
kind as before you leave this evening to take a look at those maps and either communicate in e-mail or other ways with your reaction to those maps legislatively. You're on record in terms of the congressional. But I value your opinion on those as well.

MR. BALDENEGRO: Okay. I will do that.

MR. LYNN: Other comments or questions for Mr. Baldenegro? Thank you very much.

MR. BALDENEGRO: Thank you.

MR. LYNN: The next speaker is State Senator Toni Hellon. Senator Hellon.

MR. HELLON: Mr. Chairman, Commission members, my name is Toni Hellon. That's spelled H-E-L-L-O-N.

I haven't heard other incumbents speak, and I've heard a lot of people talk about what's gone into this process and behind closed doors and the influence of current office holders, that sort of things, and of course I can't speak to that in general. I can certainly speak to it from my perspective.

I have intentionally -- this week is the first time I've attended any of these meetings intentionally because I thought that anything I might say or any incumbent might say would only look like it was self-serving and you have your job to do. I've not
sent a single e-mail, not submitted a single map, none of that, to purposely stay out of it. And from what I know, many of the incumbents have done the same thing. And you've drawn a few scenarios of my district. I now represent District 12, which on the newly drawn map is pretty similar to Z. It's changed a little bit, and you've made some changes that I think make a lot of sense. Communities of interest changes including Saddlebrook in with the same district Sun City Vistosa is in. That certainly makes a lot of sense for those people in those areas, including Marana all in one district. I think that makes a great deal of sense. And a dividing line at this point, and I know it may change, of the river. And that, too, if you talk to anyone who's lived here a long time, they will tell you that that's sort of a natural boundary of communities of interest, the river itself.

So I think what you've done is a good thing. But I have to tell you this. I like the map you've drawn for me this time. It shows me with no other incumbents, and that's great. But the map just before this I was in with another incumbent, and that's okay, too. I would think that you're not getting a lot of negative I guess from the incumbents. And I hope that that's case. This is your job.
However, you have to probably now empathize with the legislators who've done this year after year because it doesn't matter what you do or how you do it, there's no perfect. And people are going to be unhappy one way or another, and some of us are going to be happy. Some of us are going to be unhappy. That's part of your job. We have to see all through that.

I just want to tell you now we've seen it done by the legislators and we've seen it done by non-legislators and you run into the same problem because those are problems just borne by the kind of state we have and the kind of communities of interest that we have.

So I want to congratulate you for the job you've done. However it ends up, we will live with it. We will be fine. And you're putting a lot of hard work into it, and we appreciate it that very much, and we will live with what you do.

Thank you.

MR. LYNN: Thank you, Senator Hellon. Are there questions or comments for the Senator? Thank you very much.

MR. HELLON: Could I say one other thing. Someone else, I think Tom Bowen mentioned the
registration of those who are nonparty affiliated.

Now, you would say that my district is more Republican, but there are 20 percent unaffiliated registered voters. That's a huge block. And it's in the map you've drawn here. It was in the map you drew a couple weeks ago. It's in my district as it is now. So I agree with Mr. Bowen, that that makes a lot of difference in the outcome of election.

Thank you.

MR. LYNN: Thank you. Again, if there's anyone who has not filled out a speaker card and wishes to speak, I have two remaining speaker cards. I have two remaining, and anyone else who needs to bring one forward, if they would do so at this time.

The next speaker is H.R. Clark. Mr. Clark.

MR. CLARK: Thank you very much, and my name is Harry R. Clark. I live in Mammoth.

And I feel kind of out of place here because everybody's talking about boundaries right in city. But living in the rural area that I live in, and I represented District 7 for 8 years, and now it's district W I guess is what I can make out on this now. And it's not the way I would like to see it.

You know, somebody said we will live with
what you do, and I'm sure we will. And I don't mean to
be disrespectful and I hope I don't come across that
way.

But the way these lines are drawn, you
could have left the district the way it is today and it
wouldn't have made a lot of difference. But to draw a
line with E, and with the state boundary lines, you
have no leeway. So with the districts W, E, and A, I
mean, you could change districts around, those interior
lines pretty easily if the population will allow it,
and it doesn't affect any of the other districts
because the outside are state lines.

What I would suggest is going north and
south with the Cochise County line going up and putting
part of the mining industry that is in E back in W and
take the bottom part of Cochise County and put it in E.

Draw a line straight from the bottom of the Cochise
County line straight north and take in rural Miami and
come across there to whatever the population would need
to give you Gila County there to make that a more
rectangular area.

To me it seems like you're going to do
away two representatives and one senator out of two
districts that are intact today and replace it with
just people with two representatives and one senator
for all the people that are involved in it.

And I don't know where Sierra Vista is going to end up now, but that area there is represented by some folks, and this other area is represented by other people, too, so when you combine it, you're going to get the four representatives against each other and the two senators. And no matter who wins or who loses, you lose representation.

That's about all I have to say.

MR. LYNN: Mr. Clark, if I can ask a question.

MR. CLARK: Sure.

MR. LYNN: And first of all, I'm delighted that you're here because the eastern part of Pinal County has been the subject of much discussion as we have gone through this process. We've had much testimony about trying to keep Pinal County whole. We've had much discussion about if you're going to split Pinal County, the western part of the county and Graham is different from the eastern part of the county and the mining communities and other communities that run up along the eastern boundary.

Could you help us understand from your perspective how you perceive Mammoth's communities of interest. That is to say as a resident of that part of
eastern Pinal County, what other communities or what other areas do you feel an affinity to most especially?

MR. CLARK: Well, naturally it would be the mining industry areas, places like Miami, Globe, Superior, Hayden, Winkelman, and that whole copper valley.

MR. LYNN: Right up the highway there?

MR. CLARK: Yes, right up -- yes. Go right up 77. Sure. And to the south, when you talk about the mining industry, there's a mining industry that has historically been unionized and the other mining industry that has not been. In particular P.D., in other words. Clifton, Morenci, Douglas, and we just don't get along with each other. You know, and so that creates problems, too.

So leaving Morenci in the other areas would be better than putting all the mining industry in one district.

MR. LYNN: Other comments or questions for Mr. Clark? Mr. Clark, thank you very much for coming.

MR. CLARK: Thank you for allowing me.

MR. LYNN: Appreciate it.

The next speaker is Lela Aldrich.

MS. HAUSER: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman?

MR. LYNN: Ms. Hauser.
MS. HAUSER: One question for Mr. Clark.

MR. LYNN: Mr. Clark?

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir. Yes, sir.

MS. HAUSER: Sorry. I just have one question.

MR. CLARK: You bet.

MS. HAUSER: Did you have an opportunity to look at the maps on the back wall that were presented to Morenci and Sierra Vista?

MR. CLARK: I've looked at all of them. I'm not sure that I know exactly what I'm looking at. They seem to be different than what I'm holding in my hand. When I was talking, the way I was speaking, I was speaking from this map.

MS. HAUSER: Right.

MR. CLARK: Yes.

MS. HAUSER: They are different, in fact.

MR. CLARK: So.

MS. HAUSER: Those are proposals that came out of the Cochise County Board of Supervisors, and some of your comments about, you were talking about W essentially filling up. I wondered if scenario two back there was similar to what you were talking about.

MR. CLARK: Well, I'm not sure because I'm not sure I understand -- I'm not really not literate at
map reading as I should be. But I'm not sure.

MS. HAUSER: Okay.

MR. CLARK: I would like to study it some more.

MS. HAUSER: Okay. If you do and you have any comments, we'd be interested in them.

MR. LYNN: We appreciate your comments.

MR. CLARK: Okay.

MS. HAUSER: Thank you.

MR. CLARK: Thank you.


MS. ALDRICH: My name is Lela, L-E-L-A, Aldrich, A-L-D-R-I-C-H, and I have lived in Tucson since 1968 and all that time in the same neighborhood.

And there was some comment made earlier about the Independent vote and how that had not been taken into account when you were talking about some of these divisions.

I would point out that until recently, those of us who are Independent waited until we knew who was going to run and then ran down to the county and changed our registration so that we could vote for the person that we felt best represented our interests.

I would reiterate what people have said
about competitiveness. The reason I voted for 106 and
dparenthetically how I finally convinced my husband to
vote for 106 was the fact that it would be more
competitive, and therefore fairer.

And in all due respect to Toni Hellon, and
right now I'm in her district, she has no reason to
have -- to court me as an old Independent because her
district is safe. So I would like to see someone
running or the districts set up in such a way that,
yes, the people running have to come out and court old
Independents.

And that's all I have to say.

MR. LYNN: Ms. Aldrich, as another old
Independent, I have a question.

MS. ALDRICH: Yes.

MR. LYNN: The issue of competitiveness
has come up several times this evening.

MS. ALDRICH: Yes.

MR. LYNN: In a variety of contexts.

MS. ALDRICH: Yes.

MR. LYNN: And yet we really don't have
anyone's definition of competitiveness. Could you
offer us one?

MS. ALDRICH: Well, I would like to -- and
by competitiveness I mean some reasonable division of
registration, much as Dr. Osterlo talked about, and because I think if you got that reasonableness in registrations amongst Democrats, Republicans that the people running don't feel safe so that they have to come out to communities and talk about your interests and how they relate to your interests and community interests, and I'm not talking about my interests personally.

You know, I think that you have to talk to groups of people, to the elderly, to the retirees, to people of color, to, you know, to God forbid real estate developers, as well as, you know, small historic communities that don't want high-rise apartments built next door to -- a Jostler, for example.

So I think when I talk about competitiveness, that's what I'm talking about.

MR. LYNN: Thank you. The next speaker is -- well, let me ask our public recorder. Are you doing okay?

THE COURT REPORTER: If you give me one minute, I want to change some tape.

MR. LYNN: Why don't we do that now.

(RECESS TAKEN.)