Speakers from both Yuma County and La Paz County addressed the Commission. Most of those from Yuma County expressed gratification that the draft legislative plan had kept the County together. Several also spoke of the advantage of uniting Yuma County and La Paz County; one of these speakers noted that in a recent flood, numbers of Yuma County residents had volunteered time and resources to help their neighbors across the County line and, citing the fact that 4,000 persons are split from La Paz County in the legislative draft, he urged that in order to unite La Paz 4,000 persons be split from southern Yuma County into a border legislative district. Most speakers, however, gave priority to keeping Yuma County undivided.

There were complaints of improper division of communities and inappropriate linkages among communities in the legislative draft plan. The Mayor and two residents of Quartzite, noting the rapid growth of their city, urged that it not be divided. A resident of Parker commented that his city had been divided from Mouser in the legislative draft; characterizing Mouser as a relatively poor agricultural community, he questioned its linkage to more affluent areas in Mohave County; and he pointed out that traveling from Mouser to Bullhead requires driving through Parker, which is in a different legislative district.

A La Paz County supervisor, although favoring the connection of his County and Yuma County in the Congressional draft map, said that in the legislative draft map it is probably the "lesser of two evils" to avoid splitting Yuma and to link an undivided La Paz County with Mojave County. Other speakers, however, questioning the need to create exactly equipopulous districts, urged that a five percent deviation be tolerated in order to keep Yuma and La Paz Counties together and suggested that population equality should be treated as only one factor to be balanced against others. In light of this discussion,
another La Paz County supervisor argued that it might be worth "giving it a good fight" over the use of deviations to link Yuma and La Paz Counties.

When the issue of representing River versus Border interests was raised, the discussion tended to favor the latter. One speaker, however, favored a Border congressional district including La Paz, dropping Pinal County from draft district G, and using both the River and the Border as unifying features. From a different perspective, another speaker commented that a River-based congressional district would require so much population from Maricopa that it would be dominated by that County; and he urged bringing Yuma County into a Border district, since Border issues are so pressing.

Although one speaker claimed that effective representation of interest is the best incentive to political participation, others insisted on the importance of creating more competitive districts in order to stimulate registration and turnout. One speaker said that "packing" Hispanics in two congressional districts had the unfair effect of making the other districts non-competitive.

Several speakers commented negatively about the Hopi separation and its effect on the Congressional map.
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