MR. LYNN: Welcome all of you to the first in a series of public hearings on the draft maps for congress and the legislature in the first governing independent redistricting in the State of Arizona.

My name is Steve Lynn. I chair the Commission. To my right is Dan Elder. He is a Commissioner and from Tucson as well. We appreciate your being here.

As is our custom with our public meetings, there will be a brief power point presentation just for orientation purposes, but the real purpose of the meeting today is to hear from the public. We would like to hear from as many of you as wish to address us, and if you would, please, if you wish to speak, fill out a yellow speaker form and hand it into one of the staff people present so that we may get to as many of you as we can.

We want to be very respectful of people's time today, since it is a weekend, but we will stay here as long as you would like to talk to us. We would, however, ask that during the public comment period if you could limit your remarks to approximately 3 minutes, we would appreciate it. If then when everyone has had an opportunity to speak, if you would like additional time at the microphone, we would be
happy to afford you that time.

So, without further ado, let's go through the power point presentation and begin the public hearing.

This is one of the second round of public hearings, and the purpose of this public hearing is to receive comment on the draft congressional and legislative plans. We welcome you and we are talking about the requirements of Proposition 106. Last year the people of Arizona established the Independent Redistricting Commission to provide a new kind of citizen conducted redistricting that would follow very specific criteria. Let's take a look at some of those.

Here are the new rules for redistricting, and as you may know, rules A and B are both federal requirements. It's important to note that Arizona does come under the terms of the Voting Rights Act which requires fair representation for minorities. Before final districts can go into effect, the Department of Justice must preclear them.

Another crucial important federal requirement now written into the law by Proposition 106 is that districts must be as equal in population as practicable. Now, rules C, D, and E establish other criteria which we have to follow. Compactness,
contiguity, respect for communities of interest,
visible geographic features, city, town, and county
boundaries, and undivided census tracts. Those are all
part of the rules.

The last of these rules, rule F, is also a
new rule which requires us to make competitive
districts. That is to say, once we've addressed the
other criteria, we need to adjust the districts to be
more competitive so long as those adjustments do not do
harm to any of the above criteria that are listed, and
if you read Proposition 106 very carefully, that is
precisely the way that proposition is worded.

Proposition 106 requires the Commission to
begin by designed a grid for use of geometric lines
with population equality as the only consideration. We
decided that we would use townships, which are 6 miles
square, as our building blocks, but we combined those
townships with whole census tracts to provide for equal
population.

Here are the equal population grids for
both congressional and legislative districts, which
were developed some months ago. Of course, we knew
these grids would have to be adjusted because they
really only have equal population, and even that is not
exactly as it should be. They are compact, they use
undivided census tract, but they fail to achieve many
of the other goals which Proposition 106 speaks to.

So after the task of designing those
grids, we then needed to adjust them in order to
address the other requirements. To help us adjust the
grid, we held 24 public meetings around the state. We
invited citizens to come to write their comments in
public input forms, to write us at our website, to send
us snail mail and e-mail, and summaries of this vast
amount of citizen input made it clear that Arizonans
have a firm belief in respecting communities of
interest and respecting boundaries of cities, towns,
counties, local governments. It was clear that these
should be basic principles in our guiding approach.

We also learned from the hearings that
other citizen and other citizen input that there were
three major communities of interest, and we should
being by recognizing Native-Americans, the Hispanic
communities of interest, and the state rural and urban

Citizen input helped us also identify what
we call Arizona Units of Representation or AURs. These
are the communities that citizens identified as
especially important to their own part of the state or
to the state as a whole.
Now, we created new districts and dealt with the issue of cities and towns in the following way. We will be showing maps of the adjusted districts in just a moment, but it's worthwhile to emphasize the differences between the drafts and the existing legislative and congressional districts.

Our draft congressional districts split less than a half the number of cities and towns split by the existing legislative, pardon me, congressional districts. Our legislative draft map splits no more than a third of the cities and towns split by existing districts.

Much of the same is also true of counties, and even though the draft plan has to draw lines for 8 congressional districts as opposed to 6, we split only one more county than the existing 6 congressional districts. The draft legislative districts split four fewer counties than the old ones.

Now, how about communities of interest. Perhaps most important, the draft plans respect communities of interest. Major communities that we mentioned earlier are well-respected in both the congressional and legislative drafts. And the drafts also pay attention to the communities of interest identified through the citizen process and the
identification of the Arizona Units of Representation.

Now, let’s talk about competitiveness.

Proposition 106 did not allow the Commission to consider competitiveness earlier in the process. During the grid process, there was no reason to consider competitiveness because the grids were efficient in a variety of aspects.

Under Proposition 106 competitive districts should be favored where there’s no substantial detriment to the other goals. The work on analyzing competitiveness is in its early stages and will be considered more carefully during the final phases of redistricting.

Now, let’s take a look at the draft plans, and let’s begin with the congressional map.

There are 8 congressional districts. Here you see them and for the purposes of discussion, and I apologize if there’s any confusion because as we go through these mapping processes, we are using letters as opposed to numbers. Ultimately, these districts will be numbered but only after we have completed our work and we submit them to the Department of Justice will they actually receive a number. For the purposes of our discussion today, they are lettered, and they
are lettered A through H.

Now, let's take a closer look at the congressional map in the Phoenix area, and you can see how the districts come into the Phoenix area or are contained wholly within the Phoenix area as the map is shown in detail.

Let's now take a look at the Tucson area map, and you will note that there are basically two districts in southern Arizona, both of which make use of Tucson's extensive population.

Now, let's turn to the legislative map. We have designed 30 brand new legislative districts for the state, and here you can see that map. And again, these are lettered rather than numbered, and they are lettered through -- A through I believe DD.

And let's take a look at some detail. In the Phoenix area you can see the legislative districts as they are currently proposed and then in the Tucson area.

Now, we want further citizen input. This has been an open process. It will continue to be one. Our hope is that you will take the opportunity today to let us know your opinion, whether favorable or negative, whether in terms of general comments or detailed. However, we really are looking for detail.
The importance of your comments this time around is not, "Gee, I like it" or "Gee, I don't like it." The importance of the comments this time around are really: tell me what you think should be changed, tell me why, tell us why it should be changed and tell us whether or not those changes have any other adverse impact on districts around the one that you're discussing at the current time. We need that information so that we and the consultant can analyze the efficacy of those changes and decide whether or not those are things that we can accommodate as we move forward.

We would ask you to keep your remarks relatively brief. I had mentioned before that we would like to at least shoot for a 3-minute time limit. Again, we won't have a stop watch on you, but if you could keep your comments relatively brief, and if you do have written comments that you would like to submit, we would be more than happy to take them and make them a part of the record.

We're also circulating to the audience a form which you may wish to fill out. You can complete it here, hand it into staff, or you can mail it back to us. You can also get this form on our website, www.azredistrictingj.org and can submit it through that
We also have some citizen kits which have more detailed information if you still would like to show us how the congressional or legislative lines should specifically be drawn. Those, too, can be submitted tonight or they can be mailed to us or delivered to us at a later date.

Redistricting will determine the kind of representation that we will have in the state for the rest of this decade. It is worthy of all the effort, energy, and goodwill that we can give it. We appreciate your interest, and we certainly are prepared to stay here as long as it takes to hear that input this afternoon.

Let me again ask you to fill out a yellow speaker form if you have not already done so so that we may get to everyone in an orderly fashion. And again, if you would limit your comments first pass and still wish to speak it when everyone has been heard, we will be more than happy to give you additional time.

At this time I would like to turn the hearing portion of the meeting over to Commissioner Dan Elder.

MR. ELDER: Thank you, Steve. The first speaker is Validy Lundin.
MR. LUNDIN: Good afternoon. I'm here to speak today because when I saw in the newspaper the lines that are drawn up there I was real upset. I live in legislative District Number 10. I reside at 21st Street and Tucson Boulevard, and we've lived there for over 40 years. The Lundin family has lived there and has resided in that area for over 40 years. We receive excellent representation. We associate with the southwest side, and so we are really, really interested in staying in legislative District 10 and kind of keeping the lines the way they are already, like the way they were before instead of the way they're being proposed.

And I looked around and really the way the old boundaries are, we're like in a community of interest like the City of South Tucson. And some of the neighborhoods there are south and east of the -- the City of South are a community of interest. Also, the neighborhoods north of the City of South Tucson to Congress, neighborhood south of Broadway to Tucson Boulevard, neighborhood between Tucson Boulevard and Country Club, south of Arroyo Chico, and the neighborhood south of 22nd Street and east of Country Club. These are all communities of interest. We all share the same cultural and traditional ties and we're
demographically and socioeconomically similar and we're connected through a major thoroughfare.

And when I looked at these maps, one of the things that kind of stuck out was Rita Ranch. Rita Ranch the way it's drawn up really has no community of interest with the rest of the district. It has no cultural or traditional ties. It's a brand new development. They haven't been there that long, and what you're really looking at out there in the proposal is you're kind of tearing into the central part of the city.

And as I stated earlier, we're real happy with the representation we receive out there. We've been residents of that district for 40 years, and I would like you really to reconsider that when you draw up your final version to try and keep us in legislative District 10. We're very happy with the service we receive from our legislators, and we've been there for a long time. And we really associate a lot more with the southwest part of town, not only because of our background, but everything. All of our ties are associated with the southwest side of town, and we would like to kind of keep it that way.

Thank you very much.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. The next speaker
is Alice Roe.

MS. ROE: My name is Alice Roe, R-0-E, and I live at 2318 East Elm Street. That is in this legislative District BB. I'm looking at this map, and I had to go to the website and look very carefully to find out I was off about 6 blocks or 8 blocks out of my neighborhood to put us with legislative District AA. I think this makes no sense.

Campbell Avenue is a real barrier on the west side of our neighborhood. My neighborhood is three-quarters of a square mile. The area between Elm and Speedway does not belong, when you have 2 blocks on the west side there, does not belong in AA where there is no residences other than student housing directly across Campbell.

So I would request that you put the line back to Campbell because there isn't a whole lot of population there. We really like to have them with us in this central 25 District BB.

Thanks very much.

MR. ELDER: Walker Smith.

MR. SMITH: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

I'm here today to read a letter on behalf of Shirley Gallegos and Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission. Dear commissioners, I regret that I'm
unable to be with you in person for this important
general hearing. I submit this letter to the Arizona
Independent Redistricting Commission as my comment for
this hearing.

My thanks to the Commission for your hard
work on behalf of the citizens of Arizona. In
particular, I appreciate your accommodation of our
request that South Tucson be included in a district
with communities of interest to our south and east.
This is accomplished in District CC on the graph map
under review today.

You have stated, and I realize that the
current draft must undergo further changes. It is my
hope that the Commission will be able to keep South
Tucson together with those communities who are south
and east in the final map.

Thanks again for undertaking this
important challenging task, and thank you all for your
continuing consideration of South Tucson residents, my
staff, and myself. Shirley Gallegos.

MR. ELDER: Thank you, David Ramirez.

MR. RAMIREZ: My name is David Ramirez
from the Pasqua Yaqui Tribe.

The chairman is out of town today. We
intend to present oral and written testimony because we
have some concerns with the boundaries that are being established. We will present this on August the 29th. Thank you, sir.

MR. LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Ramirez.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. Tom Ryan.

MR. RYAN: I'm going to give my 3 minutes or whatever time you have to Mary Judge Ryan.


MS. RYAN: Thank you. I also have one power point slide if I can slip that disk in your machine.

MR. ELDER: If you know how to make it work.

MS. RYAN: And while he readies that, I can go ahead and start with my comment.

I am Mary Judge Ryan. I have lived in southern Arizona for 32 years, and I live here because I love this place.

I am currently the Chief Deputy in the Pima County Attorney's Office, and I also am a candidate for congress in what is now CD5.

After review of the Commission process and proposals, I am saddened, I am angry, and yet I am more determined than ever. I am saddened by this report.
The people of Arizona voted overwhelmingly to improve to this system, to build a better mass tract, if you will. They voted to take the self-interest of politicians out of the process in the hope that fairness would be achieved, in the hope that the dream of democracy, government by the people would be achieved.

We in Arizona on are the cutting edge. We have public financing of our elections. We have term limits, and we have an Independent Redistricting Commission.

We the people of Arizona are trying desperately to have real representation, real government of the people, by the people, and for the people. We are a hopeful people. We believe that if the system is set up to make it happen that we can have real elections where people are encouraged to run. They are encouraged to vote, and they are encouraged to serve.

Instead, you have reneged on that promise. You have maintained the status quo and you have thwarted the will of the people. Let me be specific, and I will focus on the congressional districts.

Maybe we are having technical problems.

You got it?
As you know, 8 congressional districts have been created. It is not a coincidence that each congressional district that you have created in essence has only one incumbent in it and has a registration edge that favors that incumbent. And you can see as B, which is currently Shattock's district, has a registration edge of 50 percent Republicans to 32 percent Democrats.

E, which is currently where Hayward lives and would be Hayward's district, 49 percent Republicans and 30 percent Democrats.

F, Flake's district currently, 52 percent Republicans and 28 percent Democrats.

Kolby, 43 percent Republicans and 38 percent Democrats.

Stump does not live in his district. He runs in District A, but he has never lived in his district. Under federal law, you do not have to live in your district. 49 percent Republicans, 38 Democrats.

Pastore, who lives in District D, 52 percent Democrat, 28 percent Republican.

The two new districts are C, which has a 41 percent Democratic edge and has 38 percent Republican.
G, 56 percent Democrat and 26 percent Republicans.

It takes a stretch of the imagination to determine how these districts were created so that each individual incumbent is in a different district. The language of the statute states that you cannot consider the residence of the incumbent or the candidate when drawing the districts.

It also states that the districts are to be competitive as much as is practicable. You must show us how creating competitive districts creates a significant detriment to the other goals. That's what the language of the statute requires. These are not competitive districts, and so we need that information.

You must also show us how you created safe districts for these incumbents while following the law that prohibits you from considering the places of residence or the registration of the incumbent.

The proposals of this Commission are not for the people. They seem to be in the best interest of the parties and of the incumbent. I am saddened but I am undaunted because I believe despite this, the people will prevail. But we have taken another step back with these proposals.

I am a candidate in CD5. My competitive
position went from a 1 percent differential in 2000 to a 5 percent differential in favor of the Republican candidate under these proposals. I will run and I will win despite that inherent disadvantage you have created for me, but this is not what this process was about. It is about real political debate, real political dialogue, and you have once again silenced that. The people deserve better.

Thank you.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. Is it possible we can have a copy of your power point presentation?

Thank you.

Tom Ryan, did you wish to speak now?

MR. RYAN: No.

MR. ELDER: Okay. Daniel Benaditez.

MR. BENADIDEZ: I just want to take a moment to echo Mary Ryan's comment in hope that you can respond to those things because I voted for this, I voted for competitive districts so that people could participate in the process.

I don't think you've done that, and so I hope that you can change that and go back, look at what you've done and revisit it and make these districts what people had voted for, which is in fact competitive districts so people can participate and feel like their
vote actually matters.

Thank you.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. Luis Gonzales.

MR. GONZALES: Thank you, Chairman Lynn, Mr. Elder.

My name is Luis Gonzales. I'm a former state senator of the legislative District Number 10. I'm also a member of the Pascua Yaqui Indian Nation. And I'm here today representing myself, of course. We heard from Vice Chairman Ramirez earlier today and we will give additional testimony at a later date.

But my focus today is on your legislative districts. As we know, one of your mandates here is to take care and consideration in regards to the districts which are communities of interest. In this case with Tucson, you have completely ignored the Pascua Yaqui Indian Tribe and its people. What you've actually done with the current map that you have recently revealed or unveiled is that you have placed Pascua Yaqui people into four separate legislative districts.

By way of a little bit of history here, you have a Pascua Yaqui Indian Nation reservation, which is off of West Valencia Road. That is, in fact, land is in trust acts. You have coupled that with the Tohono O'Odham Nation in District Y.
The old Pascua Yaqui Indian Village, which is Grant Road and 15th Avenue, is in District AA, which is the old District 11. There are approximately 500 Yaqui people who live there. You have another community in the City of South Tucson, which is also a Yaqui community on 39th Street. You split that one over to the district across which currently District 10. You also have Pueblo, which is a community of about 100 Yaqui people who live in Marana right off of Moore Road.

As I look at your map, there is a gross disenfranchisement of the Yaqui Indian people. It makes practical sense to take the Pascua Yaqui Indian reservation and move it north into the new district that you have created, which is currently District 11. It also makes sense to move further up north and bring in Pueblo into that district. And it makes even more sense to take the entire O'Odham Indian Nation with the Pasqua Yaqui Tribe and put that in the same district.

What you will be doing there is you will then truly be looking at the need to keep those communities of interest together.

So I'm sure that the Pasqua Yaqui Indian Tribe will be presenting some written testimony as they have testified here earlier regarding those items.
I would also like to echo Mr. Lundin's testimony in regard to the issue of putting the boundary straight east on 22nd Street. What that basically does is removes communities of interest north of 22nd Street, which for decades have been together all the way up to Broadway area in the Randolph Park area. It doesn't make any bit of sense. I don't see any commonality between Rita Ranch and the City of South Tucson at all.

So think that you really need to pay some attention to that issue and particularly the Native-American community here in Tucson as there are only two tribes here in southern Arizona, as you well know.

Finally, I would just simply like to make a note on the district that doesn't include Tucson, but it goes all the way up from Cochise County to parts of Maricopa County up to the north. I think that's one of the most horrendous things I've ever seen, and believe me, I know that your job is difficult. I know you've labored hard and long trying to come up with something that makes sense, but that particular one looks like it might have been what was leftover and you took a vacuum cleaner and sucked it all in somehow. I'm not sure, but at any rate, that completes my testimony, and I appreciate your --
MR. LYNN: Mr. Gonzales, one question, if you would. In identifying the Pasqua Yaqui residents in the northern portion in Marana, the northern portion of AA, can you be as specific as you can about cross streets for us?

MR. GONZALES: I believe they're Moore Road and -- it's right off of Moore Road. That's the main road that goes across. And then Avra Valley I believe goes right through the front. Avra Valley Road, I believe.

MR. LYNN: Thank you.

MR. GONZALES: I'm not exactly sure. But it's in that specific area. Thank you.

MR. ELDER: George Miller.

MR. MILLER: My name is George Miller. And I just had to come down here this afternoon because I actually believe that the Redistricting Commission can dramatically change Arizona's ranking in several critical issues.

It seems to me that no matter what your political bias may be, it must be embarrassing and disgraceful, to say the least, to know that Arizona ranks in the lowest 10 percent of the nation in funding of mental health, education, health benefits, the working poor, and so on. And we rank high in the human
This is not any kind of accident. The 25 to 28 legislative districts as presently constituted have made it possible, I should say, no, probable, that the political rank will control primary elections. They will elect people who support their regressive use to cease in the state legislature. We will continue to see the same ugly record, a record of denial of social service necessities and an unfair taxation system.

The initiative proposed that has set up this Commission was based upon growing up legislative boundaries for present and future congressional districts, as well as boundaries for the 30 state legislative districts. And these 30 state legislative districts are at this point my greatest concern. The way things stand today in these 30 districts, only 3 to 5 in the districts will be engaged in genuine political contests following the primary elections.

This situation is particularly true in both Maricopa County and Pima. This situation was created by the state legislature and practice has meant that the party controlling the legislature also controlled redistricting to their own political advantage in each 10-year period.

The initiative that brought us this
Commission was meant to change this one-sided redistricting, whether pro Republican or pro Democrat so that the voters could participate in bonafide, competitive general elections in all 30 districts.

I believe that the Commission has the responsibility to replace the undemocratic and unfair method of redistricting with a rational, national and democratic, that's with a small "d," democratic formula that will change the current approach to the social and economic problems that we encounter every day.

Anything less than a designation of 30 districts is just plain political duplicity and gives cynics one more reason to point on how the electric and vote for A and get B.

I'm aware of the fact that major and mitigating conditions, such as Federal Voting Act, Voting Rights Act, geographic compactness, respect for natural boundaries, and the preservation of communities of interest makes your mission very difficult, but it should not deter the Commission from achieving with the voters require of you in the passage of Proposition 106.

No one on this Commission was elected in the usual sense for this office, nor will any of you be appointed again. Therefore, you have the unique luxury
of doing only what is the right thing for our state now
and for the future. In your special capacity, you will
not be subject to the political consequences.

And you, Mr. Lynn, as the sole Independent
on the Commission, are in the unique position to help
produce the result that coincides with the desire of
the voters to implement the law passed as Proposition
106 and to resist impression that would corrupt it.
The Commission has the power to make a better Arizona.
So please don't fail the people of Arizona.

In looking at this map that was in the
paper yesterday on the redistricting, it's obvious that
there is some areas that some people, whether they're
elected to office today or would like to be elected to
office today, are not too happy. And I think that's
part of your job.

And so I just urge you that this is a
chance to change the ability of the people of this
state to get the type of legislation that they're been
asking for and have been forced to in many cases go to
the ballot in order to get what they wanted. And if we
can have 30 competitive elections in the state for the
state legislature for what I speak about, this would be
what we talked about. That's the only reason for 106.
If you say to us that after redrawing the lines you've
ended up with instead of 3 to 5, we've got now 8 to 10,
that's a long ways from 30, and that's not going to do
the thing.

Thank you very much for hearing me out.

MR. ELDER: Next person requesting to
speak is Solomon Bald Ingram.

MR. INGRAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr.
Elder.

I do want to argue the case that I argued
before, but as I told you if mass anatomy sells
products by repeating things over and over again, maybe
I could sell you my idea by repeating it over and over
to you.

I want to argue again the case for the
voter district that we proposed. We submitted to you
an e-map as well as a detailed commentary arguing the
community of interest that the border constitutes. And
District G that you have configured takes in many of
the elements that we argued in our position paper.
However, it does not include the Cochise County area
which truncates the border and we argue the case that
the border does constitute a single unified and viable
and logical community of interest.

The issues that I mentioned in my
commentary to you are extensive. There's immigration
there that has to be dealt with. There are environmental issues on many levels, including enforcement of people and immigrants going through desert areas. All these scenarios I believe some issues, we have vantage and culture issues, we have history, economic activity, there are neighbor reckon issues, as you know are one of our issues right now that is dynamic at this moment is that the Tohono O'Odham Tribe trying to get citizenship for its people. And so on and so on. There are many, many, many, many issues that ties this border together.

And we argue very strongly that there is a need for a unified voice to represent the border. And also having a single border district I think will get more clout, more prestige to the people in this area. And given the many issues that are driving policy right now around the border, that clout and that prestige is needed and necessary.

Also, on this notion of competitive districts and the Voting Rights Act, I mentioned to you last time when I spoke that when you juxtapose the notion of competitive districts with the Voting Rights requirements that you're bound to follow, sometimes those two are in conflict with each other. And as I mentioned last time, in those districts where the
Voting Rights Act is relevant and important, then the competitive argument should play second seat to the notion of having minority representation.

So I want to make sure that I put myself on record as saying that we should not sacrifice the Voting Rights requirements to be bound to this notion of competitiveness except those areas where the Voting Rights Act is not necessary. The Voting Rights conditions that we're under are constitutionally good because they speak to mistakes that our country and our nation and our state have made and they speak to addressing those mistakes. So I hope that you not mess with those too much.

District G, going back to District G, adding to the Cochise County area to the border would also enhance the Hispanic representation in that area. As you know, it's 44 percent Hispanic but that's a high figure because that includes, total population figures include the many undocumented workers who are here and their families. It also includes people who are housed in the INS holding facilities. And those people are counted for total population, but obviously they are not viable political populations.

So that 44 percent I think is artificially inflated, and to give a better cushion and to be more
compatible with Voting Right requirements, I think
including Cochise County would serve that purpose.

Finally, I want to associate myself with

the comments of Mr. Lundin and Mr. Walker with respect
to South Tucson. I think that South Tucson -- I talked
to you about South Tucson last time, and I thank you
for having responded to the comments that I and others
made about South Tucson.

However, in correcting the wrong or the
issue that we were responding to last time, in your
good-faith attempt to do that, you may have created
another monster by putting South Tucson with Rita
Ranch, and those two are just two different worlds. I
don't know if there's any -- there's no community of
interest there, and the comments made by Mr. Lundin and
Mr. Walker I think are the ones that I think you should
consider when you redraw that district, which I think
is CC. I think you call it CC. But you know what it
is. You know what it is.

But anyway, I think you should reconsider
that and South Tucson is a viable, continues to be a
very viable part of our community, and I believe very
firmly that keeping it in an area that is so, so
disparage in demographics, political affiliation, the
physical aspect of it, South Tucson is very much of an
urban area. Rita Ranch is way out in the boons.

There's just so many differences that I think that
those two are incompatible on many, many differences,
many, many levels.

And I would urge you to take the comments
of Mr. Lundin, Mr. Walker, and others who will speak
later on South Tucson. And we compare that district to
make South Tucson -- not associate South Tucson with
such a district as Rita Ranch.

Thank you very much.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. Even with my
glasses on, I'm having a hard time reading it. I
believe it's Anne Murray.

MS. MURRAY: Yes, good afternoon. Thanks
for the opportunity to speak, Mr. Chairman and
Commissioner Elder.

First of all, I would like to say that I
spent a good deal of last Thursday and Friday in the
meeting that we had here, and I left that with the
feeling of real appreciation and an admiration for the
kind of job that you're doing and the fact that you
have been -- my whole experience in working with this
Commission has been that you've been very open to
hearing people's comments, and you've heard a lot of
conflicting requests, and my observation personally is
that you have done a tremendous job in trying to
accommodate a lot of competing kinds of interests.

And I want to speak again to the issue
that I spoke to last Thursday evening. And I think
you've become aware that there is some disagreement
with -- it is a very micro kind of issue involving
specific streets within the neighborhood. But I want
to ask you to look again at the neighborhood on the
north side and the south side of Broadway as being a
community of interest. The comments that several of us
made last week we still feel very committed to those
concerns and that we were correct in identifying those
concerns.

Broadway corridor represents a very
dominant feature in the City of Tucson. And on the
north side and the south side there are some very
important commercial interests, neighborhood interests,
historic district interests, and as I said last week,
those of us who are in neighborhoods on the north side
and the south side of Broadway do have a long history
of working together.

There are about 28 of us of neighborhoods
in what is called the Central City Leadership Network.
We are all organized around the Broadway corridor
issues and we work together on those issues. So you
have heard some testimony, and I believe you'll hear
more that the CC District should have its northern
boundary at Broadway. Right now you have the northern
boundary of CC at 22nd Street.

And BB, which is the central city
district, has the southern boundary at 22nd Street. We
feel that that's appropriate. That the neighborhoods
on the south side of Broadway but north of 22nd Street
are part of the central city and we function together
as Central City Leadership Network. We have a long
history of doing so and to make any other kind of a
division would be very disruptive and divide this
cohesiveness that we have.

So thank you very much again for letting
me present these observations.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. Dave Erchull.

MR. ERCHULL: Good afternoon, Mr. Lynn.

First of all, I would like to thank you and your fellow
commissioners for what I think is probably one of the
most thankless jobs in the state. I've watched and
admired the way you've gone about it knowing full well
you're not going to make everybody happy, but I do
appreciate your efforts.

Specifically I would like to address
direct legislative District AA. There is a strip of
homes in the northeast corner of that draft district between Camino Del Sero and Ina Road. It's a group that has more in common with Oro Valley, Casas Adobes, and Marana than with the rest of the draft district. Indeed in the congressional draft districts, we are lumped with those other groups in draft congressional District H.

While draft legislative District AA is geographically contiguous, it is not demographically contiguous in that to the southwest of that strip between Camino Del Sero and Ina. There is nothing there but park. And then you get to a population, as I say, we have more in common with the population to the northwest of us than to the south or to the -- than the population to the southwest of us, more in common with the population to the northeast.

My specific recommendation would be to move the boundary along Camino Del Sero west to the national park boundary. From there follow the trace of the national park boundary to the northwest until you've reached the northernmost point of the draft district. That would put that strip of residences in draft District Z, again, a population with which we have much more in common.

Thank you very much.
MR. ELDER: Thank you. Pete Davis.

MR. DAVIS: Good afternoon, gentlemen. I did see a lady here, but I guess she snuck off out of here.

My name is Pete Davis, D-A-V-I-S. And I live in the lovely area of Green Valley, and quite frankly, after listening here, I came to sing praise to you, not to bury you. I want to thank the Committee and the staff for doing a difficult and tedious job and doing it quite well.

I've been reading the newspaper that we're the opponents or unworthy opponents, depending upon your political persuasions, at trying to put the Committee in unneeded pressure to consider its main focus competitiveness.

I would like to state for the record that Proposition 106 was very clear that competitive districts should only be considered if they are not detrimental to other criteria. I am more concerned with being represented by a legislator or a congressman who shares my values than having a manufactured competitive race that impacts local communities and compact boundaries.

Talking about all the communities with compact boundaries, I was shocked and surprised that
the Committee had separated Green Valley and the City of Sahuarita. Actually those two communities have a tremendous amount in common, and I strongly urge the Committee to put the City of Sahuarita into the congressional and legislative districts along with Green Valley.

Green Valley and Sahuarita are really sister communities with many common interests, such as schools, chamber of commerce, churches, and I could go on and on, but I employ the Committee to grant this request, and I will send a letter to save time for the boundaries, and I will send it to you and hope you will honor it.

Again, I want to state that I am concerned that fabricating competitive districts where they don't naturally exist will violate the Voting Right Act and may lead to lengthy litigation. This will only cause confusion and chaos going into the next election.

I would also like to point out to Mayor George and Mrs. Ryan that part of a competitive district is also the Independent voters. We seem to have completely forgot about them, but almost every district, if you look at, they're bringing Independents into play. They will decide who is going to be represented, the Republican or the Democrat.
And I want to thank you for granting me the time to express my views, and may God continue to bless you in your difficult task. Thank you.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. So that everybody knows, we're going to take a break at about 4:30 to give our court reporter a 15-minute break to ease up his fingers. Until that time, Mr. Paul Newman.

MR. NEWMAN: I imagine when you announce Paul Newman, people are expecting Paul Newman to come up to give a dance. But it's not. It's the other Paul Newman.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Elder, if I may address the floor.

I wanted to come forward today to present an idea, really a conceptual idea that comes from Cochise County, and I heard another speaker today bring it up. I'm proposing an alliance, a border district alliance between Cochise County, a good part of Santa Cruz County, including all the population of the Nogales, and it encompasses the O'Odham Nation all the way over to the Pima County line, and I believe that such a district, and I don't have a calculator, I'm sorry, but I can show it to you right now and I'm going to present it to you and I will show it to the audience, but the black area, that opaque black area is
what I'm proposing.

It's a borderlands district. It includes an alliance between Cochise, Santa Cruz, and Pima County, and the O'Odham Tribe and the Yaqui Nation. I believe it's a beautiful district. It would be a minority -- majority/minority district of 53 percent minority that's 10 percent Native-American and 43 percent Hispanic. It would be not an overabundant of Democratic votes there but it would be a swing district.

I think it's the confluence of community of interest between the border communities of Douglas and Bisbee, which I represent as Cochise County Supervisor from District 2, and Nogales, which I represented as the state legislator for 6 years in the state legislature, and the respect for the O'Odham Tribe and the Yaqui Nation. I believe that it will create a beautiful district for the Choculas to Bobikebri.

And I think it's a proposal that will also include Pima County interest because I know from experience in the legislature we work in unison with Pima County delegation. This would create another Pima County district. It would give force and strength to the border communities of Nogales and Bisbee and Naco.
and Douglas, the mayors -- Willcox. Many of the mayors in Cochise County support this plan. I cannot speak on behalf of the entire board or supervisors. There are still some probably about this, but it will also allow a portion of Cochise County, a small portion of Sierra Vista to be in with the Green Valley area of Pima County, to go up into eastern Tucson.

Mr. Chairman, I bring this to you just as a concept. It will have a lot of support on Monday night in Sierra Vista. I wanted to give the community of Pima County and you a preview of this because this is going to be the border plan.

I've personally spoken to the Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors, and I believe that they will approve this plan. The Border Alliance Group of Tucson with Mr. Keene will support this plan. And I think it is a true solution to the quandary that the Commission is in now that it threw that very, very strange district that goes from Douglas all the way to Fountain Hills.

The Cochise County Board of Supervisors had a very strong resolution that was passed last week at our meeting urging the Commission to reconsider what it's done to Cochise County, and I believe that you will get a similar resolution from the Santa Cruz
County Board of Supervisors when you appear in front of them in Nogales on Tuesday.

So I believe that there is an alliance here. I've heard really promising words from people in the Pima County community that have come suggesting a solution. I can guarantee you that wasn't a coordinated. That was just I think good people looking at a solution that I think will do well for the people of the bordering area for the next 10 years.

Thank you very much.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. Bill Dupont.

MR. DUPONT: My name is Bill Dupont.

Thank you for this time.

I just want to reiterate that I would like to see the south end boundary of District BB to stay up 22nd Street. As I did a presentation earlier last week, I have told you that as a organizer of the Central City Leadership Network that I have worked with all these neighborhoods that are on the south side of Broadway as well as the north side of Broadway. We discuss such issues as the Broadway corridor, the Tip funding, the Rio Jueva corridor.

Rio Jueva corridor incorporates both sides of Broadway. It incorporates district as far as businesses and unfortunately in my neighborhood it took
up residential areas. Now you're going to try to split those into two different area.

As far as Reed Park in my neighborhood, we are a historic area and have been since 1928. We follow under the neighborhood plan with our council which is two again to the north of us. We're also with the Alvernon plan which incorporates areas from 20 -- I'm sorry, 22nd, Country Club, 5th, all the way over to Columbus and Swan area.

So these are areas that work as one unit. And that's why I requested you keep the boundary at 22nd, not over to Broadway. Again, we are looking at historic reference. You would be splitting a historic neighborhood if you started to divide that.

The water tower that exist on Randolph Way and Broadway was built for the El Conquistador Hotel. So as you can see the short reference there is that there is one unit. Reed Park is actually Randolph Park which currently Randolph donated to the city and has a historic reference.

As the neighborhood president, I worked with the Broadway Neighborhood Association, El Conte Neighborhood Association, Nearmonte and Sacramente for funds and grants to improve Randolph Park. So those are neighborhoods, as I said, we've always worked
together on both sides of Broadway. So therefore, I am
requesting that that boundary be kept at 22nd.

Thank you for your time.

MR. ELDER: One quick question from the
Commissioners. What is the northern boundary of this
Silver Central Collaborative Group?

MR. DUPONT: Northern boundary?

MR. ELDER: Right.

MR. DUPONT: Probably we go up to Grant in
that area but that's basically kind of a ward district.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. The next speaker

is Pedro Gonzales.

MR. GONZALES: Gonzales, my name is Pedro
Gonzales. I'm president -- or chair, not president. I
don't like that name. Chair of Barrio Juevo
Association, and this is my first time actually really
looking at this, but I really have a concern.

I would like to say to the audience that
for a long time there's been other people, other
interests that have spoke for us. But now Barrio Juevo
people, the people from the Barrios are here to speak,
and, you know, you're actually sitting where a lot of
our families used to live, and, you know, there's still
that anger because of that, and looking at this
proposal, I don't know how many of you are on this
Commission, but what I see is nobody representing me, Latino.

But one of the things that I'm concerned is that the old district, the legislative District 10, the old one, that's the one that benefits us. That's the reason why, you know, Mr. Valadez and Mr. Sotero were elected because we have something in common, our tradition, our culture traditions.

I'm not sure about east, but it has to go to Broadway for us. Right now you have it cut off at 22nd, and I guess we are under AA, but, you know, Barrio Juevo is just, I mean, just one block from here, and the old district is the one we want to stay in because that represents us. That represents -- that's why they're elected because they represent us. They have something in common with us, and I'm concerned about diluting the Latino vote.

Thank you.

MR. ELDER: Mr. Gonzales, one question. How far to east if it came up to Broadway, how far to keep that community intact would you want to go?

MR. GONZALES: Well, it seems like here you have it up to Campbell. I would have to discuss that with, you know, the people that I -- because I just would be able to talk about, you know, he wants it
all the way to Broadway, but that's up to Campbell. So I want to discuss this with some of them, but we want to stay in District 10, and for the same reason also, we're also -- the concern that they brought up earlier was the Rita Ranch neighborhood. I mean, there's nothing in common there. I mean, not to say anything bad about them, but, I mean, let's be realistic about this.

MR. ELDER: Thank you.
MR. GONZALES: Thank you.
MR. ELDER: Angie Queros.
MS. QUEROS: Good afternoon, I'm Angie Queros, and I'm here to speak to the proposed District CC.

Earlier it was mentioned that the need for fair representation, the minority vote, and taking into account the Hispanic community of interest. The proposed District CC is anything but. I live and I am publicly active in our District 10. That includes several inner city neighborhoods.

I lived for about 2 years in the east side of the proposed District CC, and I will tell you that the cultural and socioeconomic issues are different. They're quite different. I was not living my culture. We have traditionally and historically
tied together through our deep rooted families, our
institutions, my church, our schools in our current
District 10 and have absolutely nothing in common with
the far east of the proposed district.

It will most definitely dilute the
Hispanic vote, and I am proposing instead that the
boundary be moved to Congress/Broadway on the north all
the way east and cut off at Tucson Boulevard, I-10 to
the west.

And I know Mr. Dupont had mentioned
earlier about the Tip Financing off Broadway, but to me
Tip Financing is about financing. It's about money in
support of Barrio Juevo. Barrio Juego is also our
neighborhoods, and this district, current District 10
is very much about families, not financing.

Thank you.

MR. ELDER: Let me ask you one question.
In the boundary descriptions you gave, it looks like
you were splitting CC diagonally along I-10; is that
correct?

MS. QUEROS: I-10. Currently I believe
it's I-10.

MR. ELDER: Would you include CC with one
of the other districts like the AA or something around
it? In other words, where would you pick up the
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additional population that would be compatible with
this community of interest?

MS. QUEROS: That's on the west. That's
our barrios that are currently there. Well, the
barrios immediately west of I-10.

MR. ELDER: Oh, so it would be -- I
thought you said the --

MS. QUEROS: I'm sorry. Immediately east
of I-10.

MR. ELDER: Okay. Thank you.

MS. QUEROS: Excuse me. Thank you.

MR. ELDER: Belinda Gillion.

MS. GILLION: My name is Belinda Gillion.

I live at 1344 Calle Del Ciedor in the town of
Sahuarita, Arizona.

After the 1990 election -- excuse me, the
census, it was necessary to have the congressional and
legislative districts redrawn here in southern Arizona.
In 1990, Sahuarita was a small, quiet, unincorporated
town. Our area concerns were addressed by a group of
elected citizens known as the Sahuarita Arizona
Council.

I was elected to and and served on that
council. During the state's last redistricting, I was
upon it and served as chairman of the redistricting
committee for the area council. Ten years ago I argued against Green Valley and Sahuarita being split into two separate congressional and legislative districts.

The proposed redistricting was like a tight pair of shoes, it just didn't fit. As I stated before, I argued at that time against Sahuarita and Green Valley being split. The time was not right for Sahuarita and redistricting for our area was not beneficial to Sahuarita.

Today I speak as a citizen of Sahuarita. The 2000 census is complete and redistricting is upon us again. Sahuarita is no longer that quiet little town. In 1994, Sahuarita was incorporated by a narrow margin, but nevertheless did incorporate.

We are now self-governing. Since Sahuarita has incorporated, the town has grown at what I believe is a rapid rate. Sahuarita continues to grow with housing developments always seeming to be in a planning and/or building stage. Residences then soon follow. I believe additional businesses are expected in the near future. We will soon be holding our own with Nogales and the southern part of Tucson.

Nogales, the south part of Tucson, and Sahuarita are communities of common interests and should be included in the same districts. I support
the proposed congressional District G and I support the
proposed legislative District Y.

Thank you.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. Ted Prezylski.

MR. PREZYLSKI: My name is Ted Prezylski.

I live at 6965 East Brewlake Drive, and just to note in
the previous when I checked the website for comments, I
was listed as Jed, and I'm not a cast member from the
Beverly Hillbillies.

So, anyway, a couple of things. One thing
is on competitiveness. There was a comment earlier
that competitiveness was not a -- shouldn't be a major
factor in this. My understanding of why the people
voted for this and why it was presented to us in the
first place was exactly for competitiveness. And in
the last -- in the current districts, we have somewhere
between two and five competitive districts depending on
how you rate them. And I think in the current scheme,
we have probably between two and five competitive
districts. So I'm not sure if competitiveness was
achieved or why it wasn't fully considered.

Now, I understand that in certain areas we
have, you know, voting rights, concerns, particularly
with the tribes and with the Hispanic community and
there are geographic realities that you're dealing
with, but I'm not sure why we couldn't find more competitive districts, and I'm wondering if in this next phase if we can make more of an effort to look for that.

The other thing that concerns me on the map isn't so much where populations are now but where population projections are going. I'm not sure if you're able legally to consider that or what, but particularly with the, you know, there were two cases that I'm looking at with the district that includes Cochise County, which is a, you know, we're looking at how we can get rural communities represented, and then also the district that's the south side of Tucson. I know a lot of people have addressed we're trying to see if we can make sure that Hispanic communities are represented.

In both of those districts, you have very high growth areas. In that Cochise County district with the funny R line, you have Apache Junction, which is projected to grow a lot. That's going to really affect the way that those communities of Bisbee and Mammoth and those places, they're going to be represented by someone basically out in Phoenix if those growth projections happen.

The other in the south side district, Rita
Ranch, I'm concerned not so much for the community of interest problem but the problem is that that area around Rita Ranch is projected to have somewhere between 75,000 and 80,000 people over the next decade. Now, that includes areas that your didn't draw into that district, but still, you can understand where the growth is. And that will severely dilute the Hispanic representation in that district. So that's something that I think maybe should be looked at, so. That's it.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. Evan Elstein.

This will be the last one before we take a 15-minute break, and then we will go on for another hour, hour and a half.

MR. ELSTEIN: Thank you for this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, and in respect for those people that haven't had a chance to speak yet, I will try to adhere to the 3-minute limit here.

I want to echo Mayor Miller's comments in regards to education being underfunded in the State of Arizona. I live on the far northwest side of town. I'm here as a parent of three kids in the Marana School District. I've noticed that the congressional maps that the Marana School District is geographically divided right in half. And I guess when I looked at the map further a couple days ago in the paper, it was
alarming because it seems like with all the other small
districts, all the other small school districts in Pima
County, most of them are located within the same
congressional district. The Ajo School District,
Tanque Verde, Foothills, Vail, Sahuarita, Amphi,
Flowing Wells.

So it seems like proportionately, you
know, most of these school districts were located in
the same congressional district, except for the Marana
School District in District 1. You know, District 1
I'm not overly concerned with. The teachers and the
parents in that school district, when they get their
congressman's attention, he will return their phone
calls.

The Marana School District is not that
large, and so to dilute our political base by
geographically dividing the school district in half
between two congressional districts very severely
dilutes our political power.

You know, again, this is a brand new
process. I'm not here to scold anyone or to bawl
anyone out or to get into an argument with anyone, and
I'm sure that this was an oversight. I know that
there's not a conspiracy or anything involved here, and
I'm sure no one on the Committee has any kids in the
Marana School District, so I don't think this was anyone's -- intentional for this to work out this way, but that's the way it's worked out.

The southern boundary of the Marana School District would be Ina Road. The northern boundary is pretty much Pinal County. The eastern boundary of the school district is around Shannon Road, and the way you have congressional District G, the eastern boundary is right around Silverbell Road, which again technically it geographically divides the Marana School District right in half.

And the concern that I have as a Marana School District parent is the northwest side of Tucson is pretty much the fastest growing part of town. The way things stand right now, our schools are grossly underfunded. And as far as population growth goes into Tucson, there's not going to be that much as far as the school districts located within the Tucson city limits go. You know, there's not that much open space to build more homes. On the far northwest side, there's a ton of space being utilized right now, and we're going to see a ton of population growth over the next 10 years as we have the last 10 years.

So as severe as our educational spending is right now as far as, you know, not spending enough
to take care of our kids in that part of town as it
goes, it's going to get even worse over the next 10
years. And for the Marana School District to be the
only small school district because it gets
geographically divided in half between two
congressional districts I think is unfair.

Again, I want to acknowledge on your part
this is not a conspiracy. I'm sure it was an
oversight, but I hope this will be an oversight that
will be corrected.

I thank you for your attention this
afternoon.

MR. LYNN: Mr. Elstein, a question. And
I take your point about the congressional map dividing
the district. Have you had an opportunity to look at
the legislative map, legislative District 2?

MR. ELSTEIN: No, I have not looked at it
yet.

MR. LYNN: I wonder if during the break
you take a look at that.

MR. ELSTEIN: Sure.

MR. LYNN: At least on an informal basis,
if not formal. It seems that a quick look that Marana
is included within one -- or most of the Marana School
District is included within that legislative District
Z. I would like you to take a look at that, and I would appreciate your comments on that as well.

MR. ELSTEIN: Okay. Yes, I briefly did take a look at that. As far as the state legislature goes, it appears as though most of the Marana School District was located within one legislative district. So I didn't have any major complaints there, but as far as the congressional district was concerned, there was a major discrepancy. It just seemed like the district was like almost geographically divided right in half and that was not true with the other smaller districts in Pima County.

MR. LYNN: Thank you.

MR. ELSTEIN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. ELDER: And with that, we will take the about a 15-minute break. If you would all be back by that time, we will get started. Thank you.

(Recess taken.)

MR. ELDER: Thank you. Our next speaker is Octavio Barcelo.

MR. BARCELO: I live at 2702 East Melbourne Street, which currently is in the proposed BB district.

As far as I can recall growing up in this city having lived all my life in Tucson, my area had
always been part of District 10, traditionally and with
the same common and community interests to the area of
the south and to the west.

I think it's only a right idea that the
boundaries be moved back to the original place of being
Broadway. I think that the areas that we mentioned
have more congruency with the areas to our south and to
our west. I heard one of the speakers mention
churches, community schools, and parks, and I would
echo that sentiment.

As somewhat of a compromise perhaps, I
also made a map to the Commissioners, I would like the
Commissioners to consider moving the north boundary
perhaps in my area on Melbourne Street to Arroyo Chico,
which right now is a natural boundary in my
neighborhood, the Broadmoor/Broadway Village
neighborhood, which I'll say that I served as president
for two terms of that association and for the last 7
years served on its executive board.

The areas that I speak, as I said, there
is community interests. Traditionally with our elected
officials and even with the proposed congressional
District G, that area would remain intact. With the
proposition, with the proposal now, area BE is almost
excluded from congressional area G, and because of the
cooperation of our elected officials, I would like to say at least that remain the same.

I don't see a difference with the city officials that have worked so well with our neighborhood that addressed some of the issues I had when my neighborhood elected me as its president, and I would just like to reiterate some of the comments that were said with respect to the communities of interest.

With the area south of where I live on Melbourne Street and then to the west, and what I would like to do is submit this to the Commissioners.

Thank you.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. It looks like Charlyse Salaz Carlos. It's Carlos Salaz.

MR. SALAZ: Good afternoon. My name is Carlos Charni Salaz. I represent SWOTR, stands for Skill Workers Organization of Traffic Retirees.

I met you guys last week at the Doubletree Inn. I had no information, no mapping. I appreciate for the presentation today and the mapping. I will study it. I will get back to you on the 29th, have more to say about what you're doing. I've been hearing a lot of pros and cons, more cons than pros on this redistricting, but I will have more comments on the 29th. But I appreciate for the information and the
presentation.

Thank you very much.

MR. ELDER: Sally Ann Gonzales.

MS. GONZALES: Good afternoon, members of the Commission. My name is Sally Gonzales, and I'm a member of the Pasqua Yaqui Tribe.

I'm here not only representing myself as an individual, but my husband who sits on the Tribe Council. He had to leave prior to your 15-minute break for another commitment. I usually don't speak for him, but he asked me to speak for him as well.

I know you've heard testimony today already on how the Yaqui community is being split into three districts, AA and what is it? I didn't bring my maps up here, but --

MR. ELDER: CC and Y, I think.

MS. GONZALES: Yes, CC and Y. As you probably have heard and I might repeat some of the things that have already been said, but I think because I wasn't here earlier, I'm not sure, so I will just say it anyway.

I would agree with Mr. Pedro Gonzales who spoke before that sometimes people tend to speak for us without asking what we would like or what is in the best benefit to the Tribe. I think those attempts have
been made. I was happy to hear that Vice Chairman
David Ramirez was here today, that they will respond to
what is happening with the Yaqui Nation, with the
current draft maps. And so I would like to repeat some
of those issues that we had.

As you may or may not know, the Yaquis
have a very different culture, language, and history
from the Tohono O'Odham Nation as well as the Hispanic
community. While we have a lot of things in common, we
are very -- we're a different tribe. We're a different
people. And so we deserve to be together to have a
chance to have representation at least in the state
government. I'm only speaking to the legislative map
right now. I'm not sure, I haven't had the opportunity
to study the congressional map, so I'm not commenting
on that one right now.

And so I look forward to working, you
know, as far as what the maps propose, draft maps are
right now, I will probably can guarantee you that they
go against the Voting Act law. And so I would be
lobbying, the tribe, myself, personally, to -- if this
would not change, if you do not keep us together that
they sue because we need to be intact in order to be
able to have representation in the state government, in
the state legislature.
And so I will -- that's all the comments
that I have, and you will probably see me again on the
29th.

Thank you.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. Richard Fimbres.

Okay. Thank you. Robin Soltero. Or Roman, excuse me.

MR. SOLTERO: Honorable Committee Members
of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission,
my name is Roman, Roman Soltero. That's R-O-M-A-N.
My last name is S-O-L-T-E-R-O.

And I come before you today in two
different capacities, one as a teacher at Carrillo
Intermediate Magnet School, which has always been, at
least to my knowledge, in District 10. And under the
proposed change, it's a historic site in a historic
part of town, and I believe Mr. Gonzales already made
mention about the cultural ties it has with District
10, and if these plans come to fruition, that school
will no longer be in District 10, which has always been
a district with a strong culture, a strong tradition
with the Hispanic community.

I also come before you today as a
councilman representing the City of South Tucson, and I
would like to just touch for a minute on the
communities of interest with the City of South Tucson,
neighborhoods south and east of the City of South Tucson, neighborhoods to the north of the City of South Tucson to Congress, neighborhoods south of Broadway to Tucson Boulevard, neighborhoods between Tucson Boulevard and Country Club, south of Arroyo Chico, neighborhoods to the south of 22nd Street and east of the Country Club. They have cultural and traditional ties. They are demographically and socioeconomically similar. They also have similar social services needs and historically, I stress that that word "historically" has been tied together as Tucson has developed.

Now, under the proposed new redistricting, Rita Ranch has no community of interest with the rest of the district. There is no cultural or traditional ties with the rest of the district. There never has been. There probably never will be. Demographically and socioeconomically, it is totally dissimilar with the rest of the district, the current District 10. Historically, there is no connection whatsoever to the rest of this district. And also it has little or nothing in common with the rest of the district.

And I just present these concerns to you and I ask you to take them under advisement and just remember that I think it's very important to keep that
strong connection that the areas that under the new proposal would not be in District 10 no more. They really need to stay with District 10 because they have those ties. They have something that you just cannot measure in terms of the culture and the tradition and the history.

And that is all. Thank you for your time.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. D'Paco.

MR. D'PACO: My name is Jerry D'Paco. D'P-A-C-O. I reside at 3922 North Stone Avenue. And I editorialize and I present comments through access channel, the public access station in the bilingual manner to educate and empower our Hispanic community, and I'm actually addressing the process. There's not a lot I would like to speak about the boundaries.

But at one time or another my understanding when I first -- I would like to mention that we still have an objection to the lack of commissioners and representatives from the Latino Mexican or Hispanic community, whichever you might want to call your commissioners, and I believe your one Hispanic is a Republican. So there's a concern of mine that there's a bias that should have been addressed.

The bilingual community is a community that needs to be informed and needs to be empowered. So this is one of
the issues that I have with the process itself.

And then when we get to another phase of what has happened with the redistricting is that the word Gerrymandering was something that has not been used and has not been necessarily applied to this process, but in fact there are certain circumstance that actually make it seem apparent that there has been some Gerrymandering. When we look at the Kolby and Pastore via the associated press speaking and in agreement that they were in agreement with the districts that they were going to be representing 3 weeks ago as reported in the Star, which gives us very little information, but at any rate, 2 or 3 weeks ago when this was still not even concluded or in process, Kolby and Pastore are already making comments to Associated Press that they are in agreement with their districts. This seems like maybe they were consulted, and that seems like that is a form of Gerrymandering.

When we look at Green Valley having three attempts at being moved from Sahuarita and then being accommodated in another area and then being accommodated on the east side, then you might look at legislators and again bring up the word Gerrymandering because I know that you're supposed to move these areas of concern, but it seemed like Green Valley was not
satisfied indeed where they were until they were on the east side.

So outside of that, Mr. Lynn, the last time I was at Amphi, it was very difficult to find the location of Panther Auditorium. It's hard to find. There was no indication of where this was located. And this has happened before with the Civil Rights Commission before, and it just makes it a very low-attended type of a meeting. So there should be a way to at least let us know where this is. Fortunately, I live there and I know how to get there.

But also when I overheard or I thought I overheard how the process, how these consultants were picked, I thought I heard that you asked around the capitol who the consultants were, and I guess -- I know you must have investigated and found out who you might want as consultant, but it seemed like the consultants were picked from who was available and who do we want. I don't know if that was intentional or if they were the only ones available, but this just sets not very well with me. I don't know how you picked your consultants.

The other that I address is that I've seen every time there is a move of numbers, that you refer this to the consultants and the consultants come back
with their information for you to either digest or look at, but it seems like the consultants are really much more in control of the way the numbers are moved around because you instruct the consultants to look at and come back after a month with new numbers and then you go to your consensus.

So I don't know that I am talking only to the process. This is the only thing I can't address, the boundaries, the lines, I'm not that well acquainted with it, but I'm just not really satisfied with the process.

This is about all I really do have to say. I didn't come with notes. I didn't come prepared. But what I am speaking is what I do editorialize with the public access television at the bilingual level, and it is concerned that we do not have the right representation or Hispanic/Mexican representation that we have, and the one Hispanic or Mexican, it happens to be a Republican. I don't know that that is very fair.

So that concludes what I have to say, but it's just a comment on the process. Gerrymandering seems to be something that came into this process, although it might be not intentional, but it seems that there was some type of Gerrymandering involved in this process.
MR. ELDER: Thank you. We had a speaker request from Mr. Keith Bangor, and he had to leave, and he left notes, and it will be entered into the record.

The next speaker is Rita Toland.

MS. TOLAND: Good afternoon. I'm Rita Toland. I'm representing Broadmoor/Broadway Village Neighborhood.

And I wasn't going to speak. I'm here today mostly as an observer. I'm here with a friend of mine who is at the opposite end of the political spectrum than I am, but we agree on one thing, that redistricting transcends political interests and it's a community interest, at least it should be.

There are some in our neighborhood who identified with the proposed District CC. But it means that they have to split our neighborhood. Our neighborhood would be split to accommodate these few people, and I don't believe that splitting a neighborhood is the right thing to do.

It was mentioned that Arroyo Chico is a natural boundary and should be a dividing line. Arroyo Chico is a natural boundary but it's the central gathering point for our neighborhood. We have our neighborhood cleanup at Arroyo Chico where people on
both sides of Arroyo Chico gather at the Arroyo to
cleanup the neighborhood, to cleanup the Arroyo. It's
just a beautiful part of our neighborhood that we
preserve, and the whole neighborhood has an interest in
it.

We also start our 4th of July parade at
Arroyo Chico and Melbourne. So the argument that
Arroyo Chico should be a dividing line I don't think is
a good argument.

Until 1990 our neighborhood was in
District 13, and after the 1990 census, that's when our
neighborhood became split. Our neighborhood currently
is split between districts, and it's caused a lot of
problems, and it causes a lot of confusion in that --
it's a funny story, but I offered to take a neighbor to
voting to vote. An elderly neighbor could not get to
the voting place. I offered to take them to vote. And
I took them to my polling place, which was not their
polling place. That's how divided our neighborhood is
currently, and we would like to remedy that.

We believe that we have a lot in common
with our neighbors north of Broadway, even some south
of Broadway. Now, maybe 22nd is not the ideal dividing
line, but certainly we're here to ask you not to split
our neighborhood, Broadmoor/Broadway Village
neighborhood. It identifies closely with other
neighborhoods that are similar that are on the north
side of Broadway.

And as an aside, I'm not really familiar
with Rita Ranch, but it sounds like CC doesn't want
Rita Ranch in their district. But my question is then
why is they want Broadway and Columbus and Swan in
their district.

So the argument that Broadmoor needs to be
in the proposed District CC isn't consistent. If they
don't want Rita Ranch there, why is they want Broadmoor
and Columbus and Swan in that district.

Again, thank you for your time. I think
you guys are doing a great job. I'm certainly glad I'm
not sitting in your chair.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. This is the last
speaker slip I have. As we started off with the
meeting, if there's anybody else that would like to
speak, there are yellow slips for your access at the
table as you entered, and if you don't want to take the
time to do that and still want to speak, we will take
further speakers after this.

The last speaker that I have slip for is
Walker Smith.

MR. SMITH: I'm back, gentlemen, with a
little bit different hat. You said at the very outset, you asked if we had some detail to show you how a change might be made and related to the districts that would be affected by it. It kind of seems to me it's kind of a circular going from here to here to here.

I mean, let me make a -- it's not necessarily perfect, but you're heard a number of people talk about the area from 22nd to Broadway, east of the freeway. Mr. Elder, you asked what would be an east boundary. We have a suggestion. Obviously, each of the details, there can be endless variations, but the portion that we're suggesting with Broadway as a northbound, the freeway east. You heard Mr. Gonzales, Ms. Queros and others talk about that area eastbound Broadway to Tucson Boulevard, south to Arroyo Chico, and east to Country Club, and back down to 22nd Street.

You heard conflicting testimony just before, but this is a suggestion. We believe it has some balance and give you a good starting point at least to look at this.

We would then suggest that a portion of -- let's see. We've just taken from AA. So there's a piece of Flowing Wells, and I'm going to hand these maps to you. It's an area that runs between the freeway and La Cholla and roughly Sunset and Gardner,
and it's an area that we believe demographically would have some balance it be moved into AA. Okay.

Then we would have taken out of BB by that action. And so we would suggest that you might change the boundaries there where BB and CC and DD meet, and extend BB a little kind of north of east boundary, east go up Broadway to Camino Seco, and then south on Camino Seco to Spanish Trail and then east along Spanish Trail. Then the piece of Pantano Wash would be a western boundary, Golf Links a southern boundary. There would be a little piece between Golf Links and Escalante and just east of Harrison that then would go from DD to CC.

And then, of course, Rita Ranch and there's many people who have said we don't have anything against Rita Ranch, but we've heard people from Rita Ranch that were interested in being in DD, and that from Valencia, Old Vail Road forms the south and west and Houghton forms the east boundary, and that portion would be moved into DD.

I will submit these maps for you. I hope they're helpful and show you at least one way that this might be addressed.

Thank you.

MR. ELDER: Thank you. We appreciate
that. Is there anybody else at this time that would
like to speak? You're closest. Why don't we start
here, and then you come on up and be ready and we will
go from there.

MR. LYNN: If you would, Mr. Davis, state
your name again for the record.

MR. DAVIS: My name is Steve Davis, and I
live in Green Valley, Arizona. I'm legislative chair
of District 9. And I am so happy that Rita Ranch has
turned into offer. We will be happy to accept Rita
Ranch in DD, believe me. We were very disturbed that
it had been cut out. We thought there wasn't a chance
that so many people were upset. That would be a line
from Houghton Road north to Old Vail, Old Vail west of
Valencia, then back east to Houghton Road again, and I
will put a letter form to you, but we would be happy to
accept them back in DD and legislative District 9,
which will be whatever number they name it later. And
also, again, Sahuarita.

Thank you.

MS. MURRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
Commissioners. I know I've already spoken.

MR. LYNN: Your name again for the record.

MS. MURRAY: I'm Anne, A-N-N-E, Murray, M-
U-R-R-A-Y. And my residence is in the
Broadmoor/Broadway Village Neighborhood. And I asked to speak again because I do have with me a map which illustrates the issue that we've been discussing about boundaries being at Broadway or boundaries being at 22nd Street, and I would like the opportunity to submit this map to accompany the testimony that I've given because the map clearly shows that Broadmoor/Broadway Village is a small neighborhood, not more than 400 homes, something less than 400 homes. It lies between Tucson Boulevard and Country Club, and on the southern boundary is north of the Citation Wash. The streets like between like a horseshoe shape. And none of the streets exit to Country Club or Tucson Boulevard. At the southern end, Stratford goes down into another neighborhood. At the northern boundary, you can go out to Broadway, and on Arroyo Chico, you can go out to Tucson Boulevard or Country Club.

Otherwise, all of these streets, including my street that's two streets south of Arroyo Chico, and all the streets north of Arroyo Chico going up to Broadway, this compromises one neighborhood.

Making Arroyo Chico a boundary in this tiny self-enclosed neighborhood just doesn't -- it doesn't make any geographic sense. It doesn't make any demographic sense. And when I realized a few years ago
that for some reason this neighborhood had been divided between District 13 and District 10, the old districts. I've lived in this neighborhood for more than 30 years. It's going on 31 years. We were all based in the old District 13 until 10 years ago when some of the streets, which have been referred to by a group of people here today, moved these certain streets into District 10 and the rest of the neighborhood is in District 13. It doesn't make any sense.

So if I may submit this map also to clarify my statements.

MR. LYNN: Ms. Murray, before you -- we would be happy to take the map. I want to ask you a question, and this is question in the nature of the questions that we're dealing with.

Given the choice, do you feel from your perspective, not necessarily speaking for the entire neighborhood, but your point of view, is it more important to keep the neighborhood that you spoke of intact or is it more important to connect it to the neighborhoods north of Broadway? Which is more important?

   MS. MURRAY: Boy, that's a tough one.

   MR. LYNN: No kidding.

   MS. MURRAY: Because -- well, certainly
keeping the neighborhood intact but that divides us
from our natural -- I mean, if all our neighborhood was
kept intact and put in a legislative district different
than our neighbors to the east and our neighbors to the
north of Broadway, we would still be experiencing an
artificial division. I know you've heard testimony on
both sides, but --

MR. LYNN: That's why I asked the
question.

MS. MURRAY: Yes. Yes, it's a tough one.

My personal feeling is that they are of equal
importance.

MR. LYNN: Thank you.

MR. ELDER: Is there anybody else that
would like to speak this afternoon?

All right. With that, I will close the
formal hearing, and we will stay around and do some
informal talking or sketching on the maps, whatever you
would like to do. Thank you.