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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. If I may have your attention.

Good evening.

Thank you. I don't know whether you hear this. Maybe you'll hear if it's quiet, then you can hear it.

I'd like to call the meeting of the Independent Redistricting Commission to order.

I'd like everyone to stand for a moment of silence for those who this are not at this meeting and met with a tragic and untimely death at the hands of people that don't understand who we are in this process, don't understand what we are all here to do as Americans and as citizens of this country.

(A moment of silence is observed.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

I'd like to welcome you this evening to the latest in a series of meetings held around the State of Arizona for the purpose hearing from the public on
the Draft Legislative and Congressional maps the Commission has put forth to date.

I'm delighted with the turnout.

I want to assure all of you, we'll be here as long as it takes to hear from all of you, all of you who wish to speak.

I would ask anyone who is interested in speaking if they'd fill out a yellow speaker slip.

We have several who have already done so.

If you have one, if you'd just make it known to staff, they'll pick it up, and we'll get you in order to speak this evening.

Let me make some introductions and then we'll begin with a brief Power Point presentation and get to the more important part of the evening which is your comments.

First, I'll introduce the Commissioners present.

To my right, the Vice Chairman of the Commission, Andrea Minkoff. To my left is a member of the Commission, Joshua Hall. We may also be joined this evening by one other member of the Commission, Jim Huntwork. He was not sure whether or not he could be here. You do have a majority of the Commission present.

To the far left on the dias is our legal
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counsel: Lisa Hauser, Jose Rivera.

Our consultants, National Demographics Corporation, they are represented this evening by Dr. Florence Adams and Douglas Johnson. Lisa Nance, our public stenographer.

I'll ask later on when you come speak at the podium that you state your name and spell it for the record so Lisa can get that precisely as part of the record this evening.

Let me also, we do have Commission staff around several places.

Let me at least acknowledge Augusta Knight on the dias. There are other members of the Commission around the building as well.

(Chairman Lynn addresses the audience in Spanish asking if anyone requires the services of a Spanish interpreter. No one indicates the desire for the services of an interpreter.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Gracias.

We do have a translator available. Since no one requested her services, we'll release the translator this evening.

Thank you very much.

We'll begin with a brief Power Point presentation.
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For the presentation, we'd like Vice Chairman Minkoff to make the presentation.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Can you all hear me?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Marion, can you get the volume up?

MS. PORCH: I'm going to have them come in, turn the volume up. I'll find the lights.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It's a technical glitch. Write a note, tell my husband how soft spoken I am.

I want to echo Chairman Lynn's welcome.

Thank you all for being here during one of our second round of public hearings. We're holding hearings throughout the state, as we did during the first round, to elicit your comments as to what you like and do not like in the Legislative and Congressional Districts.

One of our staff people, Paul Cullor in back, he'll be changing the slides. If you see me waving, it's just to ask Paul to go on to the next slide.

The purpose of the hearings, as I mentioned, is to obtain your opinions on the draft plans we developed. We're going to show you examples of the
districts we've drawn and we're going to explain a
little bit about why we drew them the way that we did.
There are also wall maps which you may have seen as you
came into the room. And you are certainly free to go
and look at them afterwards. They show you, in detail,
the maps of the Congressional and Legislative District,
as well as maps of the Phoenix Metropolitan area.

Please remember that these maps are
drafts. They are subject to change. They can be
improved. They will be improved. And one of the ways
we're going to improve them is listening to what you are
going to say and eliciting your help in reviewing the
maps.

When you came in, you should have been
given a citizen kit in a large manila envelope. If you
did not get one, raise your hand. We'll have staff give
one to you. We'll get citizen kits to you.

Citizen kits are valuable tools in
understanding the process. There are smaller versions
of the draft maps you may find more helpful than what
are up here so you may be able to distinguish the
districts better.

Also, there are individual maps of the
eight Congressional Districts and 30 Legislative
Districts along with descriptions of what the districts
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include. There is a lot of other useful information we'll get to later on.

A VOICE: Can't hear you.

A VOICE: They're working on getting the sound up.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I can't move the microphone any closer. It's fixed in position. I'll do the best I can.

Last year, November, the people in Arizona voted by a very substantial majority to establish the Independent Redistricting Commission.

Proposition 106 became part of the Constitution of the State of Arizona, and it provides for a citizen-conducted redistricting process, follows very explicit criteria for drawing districts.

These criteria are contained in Proposition 106.

The first two are required by federal statute and the Constitution.

First of all, the districts must be substantially equal in size. There must be equal protection by the Constitution to say one person's vote counts the same as any other person's vote; therefore, Congressional Districts, especially, also the Legislative Districts, must substantially of equal size.
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Secondly, the Voting Rights Act has provisions that require the ability of minorities to elect candidates of their choice not be diminished any by the redistricting process. Arizona, in particular, is one of a number of states subject to preclearance of any law regarding elections, any of that, the Voting Rights Act, the federal requirements.

In addition to federal requirements, Proposition 106 has state requirements:

Districts must be geographically compact and contiguous and follow geographic boundaries. You'll the notice phrases in C, D, and E, the phrase "to the extent practicable" appears in each one of them. That's very important. We'll talk about that a little later.

Very often these criteria are in conflict with one another. We on the Commission have to do a balancing act, make judgment calls, when weighing these criteria which are in conflict.

The final one says, "To the extent practicable, competitive districts shall be favored when to do so creates no significant detriment to the other goals."

We'll talk about that also a little later.

All right. Proposition 106 required
something, to our knowledge, unique to the State of Arizona. We had to begin the process by developing a grid. A grid is something rather regular in shape, straight lines, even spaces, that kind of thing. And we were to do grid for the entire State of Arizona, Legislative and Congressional Districts. It took nothing into consideration other than population. None of the other criteria of 106 was to be considered.

In doing the grid, we decided to use townships as the building blocks. Townships are very regular in shape, six miles square on top. Townships were superimposed with Census tracts to give us population numbers. And then once developed, the grid had to be adjusted to comply with the other criteria of Proposition 106.

These are grids. And they don't look very rectangular, do they? They don't look very evenly spaced. That's because of the Census tracts I mentioned. Census tracts are not evenly spaced, don't have straight lines, and in no case do they cross county lines.

You see a lot boundaries of the grid follow the boundaries of counties. This is the starting point from which we began to develop the draft maps.

The next thing we did, once we had the
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grid, was we went out into the State of Arizona for 24 hearings in round one of the process, and we asked people to tell us what they would like to see in their districts, not react to any maps or lines, because the grid wasn't a map, just a grid, but to tell us what their concerns were, what types of districts they would like to see.

They made it very, very clear there were certain things we should consider.

First of all, we should respect communities of interest.

The "term communities of interest" appears in Prop 106. It was a phrase developed by Sandra Day O'Connor in a Supreme Court opinion. The only problem was she didn't define it. So rather than defining it ourselves, we decided to go to you and ask you to define it. You did. You told us what was important to you, told us what your commonalities were with other people and what you would like to see in your districts.

People also told us they wanted to respect the integrity of cities, towns, counties, local governments. And we tried to do this as well.

The people who talked to us during the first round of public hearings identified their own communities of interest, communities they wished to
preserve as areas they lived.

We used the term "Arizona units of representation," or AURs, to refer to those communities of interest. When you here us talk about communities of interest, or AURs, we're really talking about sort of the same thing.

There were three major communities of interest in the first round of public hearings. First, respect Native Americans and Tribal Reservations. That came to us from members of those tribes and also came to us from non-Native Americans. They all identified the importance of respecting that community of interest. Also, there was a great deal of testimony relating to recognizing Hispanic communities of interest wherever they may be around the state. And finally, it was very clear, the representation between rural and urban interests.

And people told us in rural areas that they wanted rural districts so their representatives would be sensitive to the needs of their communities and not dominated by urban issues. And urban communities said the same thing about the issues they had.

Because we listened to people and AURs, they helped us create districts in draft plans very different than the first hearings. We started with the
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grid. It required us to essentially start over.

Secondly, we really used the communities of interest as building blocks for the draft maps.

The draft maps have many split cities and towns, fewer splits towns than the current districts.

In the existing Congressional Districts, there are 16 split cities and towns. In the Draft Congressional Districts, there are six split cities and towns. I might mention, of the existing Congressional districts, there are only six of them. We added two more districts, only split six cities or towns. One of them, Phoenix, would have to be split in any case as it's too large for a Congressional District.

Outside Phoenix, we only split five.

Legislative Districts, we split 39 cities and towns. Draft Legislative Districts, we split a third of that amount. Only 13 cities and towns were split.

Some cities do cross county boundaries.

So do a lot of Native American Reservations. Therefore, in certain areas counties definitely are split.

Elsewhere, we made effort to unite counties wherever possible.

In the existing six Congressional Districts, they split five counties. In the Draft
Congressional Districts, remember we added two Congressional Districts, we only split six. Existing Legislative Districts split 15 counties in Arizona. The draft splits only nine counties.

And we respected three major AURs mentioned earlier. Tribal reservations were undivided and in many cases unified with other reservations within the same district.

Hispanic communities of interest were kept together in a number of districts with concentrations of the Hispanic community.

Rural and urban communities, to the extent possible, are separated.

Most other AURs are also respected in the draft plans. However, once again, there were conflicts. Sometimes people come to us at a public hearing and say this is a community of interest. These are what comments are. These are borders for a community of interest. Another group will say this is the community of interest, the issues that concern us. These are the borders, boundaries, we'd like to see this Legislative District. We'd look at them and they'd overlap.

Obviously that was in conflict with some AURs. Where possible, we try to respect as many as possible.

Proposition 106 refers to competitiveness.
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It does not allow us to consider it at the initial stage. We're required to do draft maps first and other considerations of 106 should be favored unless there is no substantial detriment to other requirements.

Competitiveness is one of the things we're anxious to hear about at this stage of the process now as we begin to consider competitiveness and adjust lines to create competitive districts. If you have specific suggestions on how to do that, we'd love to hear from you.

The Commission designed the following draft plans for the eight Congressional Districts. This is the map, and once again, you may have seen the draft. It's a bit difficult seeing the contrast between districts on the screen. I refer to you to the citizen kit. There is the same map in there and you will be able to follow it much more carefully.

That's a map of the whole state.

This is a map of the Congressional Districts in the greater Phoenix area.

And this is a map in the Tucson area.

Now let's go to the Legislative grid. This is a map of the 30 Legislative Districts. Once again, you can probably see it better in the map in your citizen kit.
These Draft Legislative Districts are of the Greater Phoenix area.

These are Draft Legislative Districts in the Tucson area.

Now are what we call round tow public hearings, and there are a number of different ways we solicit your input to help us in the next stage of the process.

First of all, of course, your testimony tonight. Let us know your opinion. Let us know what you like as well as what you don't like. There will be people that will want changes, that will stand up and say I don't like the district. The line shouldn't be there. This is the way it should be changed.

If you like it the way it is, you better say so. We're certainly going to hear from people who want changes. Tell us either way, whether like it or don't like it.

You can speak in general terms, if you like, or with as much detail. If you give us specific lines, that's really the best, if you can tell us the kind of districts you like to see.

If you want to testify, once again, let me echo Chairman Lynn's comments. You need to fill out the yellow speaker slip. If you have not yet done so, and
you want to speak, raise your hand and staff will bring
one to you.

Also, as the evening goes on, you may
think now you don't want to speak to the Commission. As
the evening goes on, something may come to you you want
to say or want to speak in opposition to something
somebody else said. If at any time during the evening,
if you want to speak, raise your hand. We'll get a
speaker slip to you and we'll love to hear what you have
to say.

There's also a form inside the citizen
kit. It's a very short form, doesn't take long to fill
out. There's an envelope with the form. If you'd like
to fill it out, hand it in tonight, take it home, fill
it out, mail it into the Commission in the envelope
provided, please do so. You can also go to the website
shown on the screen, www.azredistricting.org. There is
a form there you can fill out and send out
electronically.

I'll tell you that every bit of citizen
input comes to the Commission is shared with all the
Commissioners. I just downloaded about 30 citizen input
forms last night and read every single one of them.

Our Webmaster sends them all to us and
we're also copied with any mailed to us. We get them,
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read them. We're really interested in what you have to say.

Also, write us a letter, or go to website. There is e-mail narrative rather than just filling out form. I encourage you to visit the website even if you are not going to send us e-mail for the form.

It's really very well-organized, user friendly. There is a lot of information, maps there, statistics about districts. You can zoom in on the maps. There are answers frequently asked questions. If you want to know what people in other public hearings are saying, there are summaries of public hearings posted on the website. I suggest you visit it and visit it often, if interested in the redistricting process.

There is a lot of good information.

Redistricting is going to determine the kind of representation we all have for the next 10 years, and it's worthy of all of our efforts and all of our interests.

We thank you for coming here tonight and we look forward to hearing what you have to say.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Minkoff.

I don't know whether all the mikes are turned up or just Ms. Minkoff's.

I don't know whether you can still hear me
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reasonably well.

I have a pair, a set of keys someone --

MS. REZZONICO: Oh.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Never mind.

The purpose of this meeting this evening is to hear from you. That's what we'll do the balance of evening.

What I'll do, as is the custom in our hearings, is call to names, the name of the immediate speaker and the person who is, so to speak, on deck, so you know once that person is finished to move to the podium for the next speaking slot.

I would ask, because we have a great number of people that wish to address us this evening, that you do two things. Number one, be very respectful to people who are speaking so we hear them and they can get their points across as quickly as possible. The second thing I ask is each speaker try to limit their remarks. I don't have a time clock. I'm not going to keep a watch on you, but to the extent you can, if you limit your remarks to three minutes, we'd appreciate that.

If, if you wish then to get back in the cue and speak later in the evening once we've heard from everyone one time, we'll be happy to hear from you in
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Again, we'd hope you would be respectful of everyone else's time and try to keep your remarks to three minutes.

With that, let's begin the public hearing.

The first speaker slip I have is from Jay Howe, Supervisor, La Paz County. And Mr. Howe will be followed by George Davis.

Mr. Howe.

MR. HOWE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good evening.

My name is Jay Howe. J A Y, H O W E. I'm a District Three Supervisor, La Paz County.

It's a pleasure to address the Honorable Commission tonight.

I do have the greatest respect for the task you are charged with, the concerns, the input I would like you to consider, in part, in the redistricting proposal would be in keeping the spirit of the record in establishing new Legislative District boundaries.

My understanding is the US Attorney General Department of Justice Guidelines have a five percent flexibility factor built into this to protect like interests, keep bordering communities with common
shared interests together when possible. I believe this is possible in the case of La Paz and Yuma Counties. I believe communities of interest become a weighted factor. In our case, there are many common interests that La Paz shares with you, more so than the pure number idea for the same each district, as much as possible. That's definitely an element. I respect that.

The draft proposal for counties, the same number of Legislative Districts as we had last redistricting, has been able to reduce the number of Legislative Districts in nine counties. Two the remaining counties, Pima is the second largest in the state. La Paz is the second smallest. Of the Legislative Districts increased, Pima County experienced a percentage growth of unwarranted growth. La Paz County was an oversight to be corrected, and you can use flexibilities built into the directives. Only with the belief in splitting Quartzsite, La Paz was -- it was unintended in trying to meet a stated goal of an equal district.

What I'm proposing tonight, deviate from the originally stated goal. Use five percent and place more weight on keeping communities of interest together.

If you were to keep my proposal, Yuma La Paz together in
the same Legislative District 28, the districts would be virtually identical, two districts with plus or minus five percent.

The justification for doing this: Easily identified communities interest. The following reasons:

Three reservations in the counties share many common interests; share agricultural interests, farming, it's an agricultural community; many, certainly, rural issues tie La Paz and Yuma County; share common concerns regarding health care system; we have Arizona Western College in both counties; support both counties through the general fund; and Arizona Western College is active part of both families; we contract with Yuma County Juvenile Detention; utilize Yuma County's mental health facility; we have ongoing common law issues and have always supported Yuma County; we have a protected partnership, are close with law enforcement; up until a few months ago we shared a portion of our emergency services communication with Yuma County.

This current proposal disenfranchises Quartzsite, Wenden, and Salome. These communities make up the majority of the my community, the most rural portion of the La Paz community, and they have shared interests, similar interests and problems with Yuma County.
You need to recognize the need to keep like interests together because of the greater good. The greater good is at least as important as the need for exact numbers.

I respectfully request as you do this redistricting directive La Paz and Yuma County be together in one Legislative District.

I understand Proposition 106 is the document that outlines the goals and directives, and the language contained within Prop 106 allows a degree of flexibility. I encourage you to use that to the degree which you feel you are able to.

I would like to close with a small reiteration of the fact there is no harm in using the full flexibility of the five percent margin. In fact, it would be a very sensible justification of great benefit to both La Paz and Yuma County in regards to the Legislative representation. Many of our concerns are common. We have shared issues, shared services.

I thank you very much for the opportunity to address you this evening and look forward to working through the process with all of you to the benefit of the Great State of Arizona.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Howe, let me make one comment to correct the record on one point. The

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
Department of Justice is not the arbiter on the number
of people in a district. What you may have seen is a
review of case law.

MR. HOWE: Right.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Cases brought for
clearance from the one-person-one-vote standard. Some
cases have been decided by as much as a five percent
window.

MR. HOWE: Right.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Department of Justice
makes no claim one way or other about that. However,
Proposition 106 sets a standard for Legislative
Districts in particular that elevates it to the standard
for Congressional redistricting. Congressional
redistricting is quite exact. In fact, to the extent
population is divisible by number of districts you have,
you need to have almost identically the same number of
people in each district unless you can make a superior
argument for any deviation whatsoever.

So we take your point and we understand
that La Paz County wishes to be with Yuma County. The
variation, however, may, I stress "may," we'll look at
it, be more than we are able to defend.

MR. HOWE: I understand, respect that.

I guess the biggest point would be La Paz
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County definitely wishes to remain whole. Certainly the Town of Quartzsite would. And secondly, the next priority is we would like to be attached to Yuma County, if at all possible.

And thank you for your time and effort.

We certainly respect the job you have.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Howe.

Mrs. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have a question, Mr. Howe, relating to the last comment. I just want to know if I understand you correctly.

There's been a lot of testimony from Mohave County saying they would really like to have La Paz County with them. La Paz County we know wants to be with Yuma County. If the numbers do not allow us put you with Yuma County, is Mohave County a fit? Because it's possible those numbers may work. I don't know, don't have them in front with me.

MR. HOWE: To answer the question the best way I can, we'll be happy, accept and work with wherever we are placed, first and foremost, no question about it. We do share similar river issues along the river with Mohave County, one of the smaller-sized districts, District Two. And we really don't have a problem with Mohave County. We have a great relationship with their
board and can work well with them. We just feel as a whole La Paz County has more common interests, the rural, agricultural, Hispanic issues that tie us a little closer Yuma County, in our opinion. We're not adverse to it, though.

CHAIRMAN LYN: Thank you, Mr. Howe.

George Davis. Following him, Tom Vorus.

MR. DAVIS: George Davis, D A V I S.

Redistricting Commission, friends and concerned citizens of redistricting. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Ten years ago, at several redistricting meetings, I said that the various communities of our west side had the seniors of Arizona, were glad to have seniors as part of their community for the experience, the volunteering that seniors give to the community, the levity seniors give to any area. Ten years later, you can look back and have said yes, that's among many things seniors bring to community.

Just this week a paper on the west side highlighted a senior citizen among hundreds that had done things for the community.

I would offer a challenge to all the community to embrace the experience and dedication of its seniors. I like to think that seniors of the
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community are apples of gold in settings of silver.

Thank you for allowing me to speak and may the efforts of the committee be crowned with success.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Davis.

Next is Tom Voros then Ms. Karen Osborne.

MR. VOROS: Tom, V O R O S.

I come as an independent voter. I just want to remind the Commission I stood here at the hearing on the 28th of June as an opening representative that spoke for keeping Sun Cities separate and that subsequently to that I did file a letter on June 30th which was accomplished by the revered consultant outlining commonalty.

In the way you come out in your draft, I'm very, very disappointed, because Sun City itself has very little in common. You did ignore the natural boundaries that exist on the rivers, separate the communities. But I do understand the research issues you people are under.

I did want you to know that I am still personally opposed to having the Sun Cities merged into the same district. We do not have the same common interests.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Voros.

A question. Mr. Voros.
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COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Voros.

Could you explain to me the differences, briefly, among the three Sun City communities so we understand why you feel that way?

MR. VOROS: There are only two. Sun City Grand is a subdivision of Surprise. There's Sun City, Sun City West. Sun City Grand is an unincorporated subdivision in Maricopa County. There's a great difference in that.

Are you -- I'd like to point out we are separated from Sun City West by a -- approximately four, five miles. A river gives us a natural boundary between the two communities. We are surrounded on three sides by the City of Peoria, on the fourth side by the City of Youngtown, all of which are unincorporated communities. Just a wee little bit is a piece of Surprise, the next slice of that is Surprise.

We are two completely different developments, although both share similar names. And I would like to point out that at the original hearing that there was a gentleman who spoke and said he represented the boards, but we do not have boards represent the voters. They are not elected by the people, a park board, appointed or something, not governing bodies.
Our governing body is the county supervisors. Also, Sun City is oriented economically more toward Peoria than they are toward western, over to Sun City West. We shop in Peoria. Peoria, Peorians shop in Sun City, share churches in -- in Sun City, go to Peoria schools, Sun City West to Dysart. Our children are in both communities.

I think my point is that we are an open community. Sun City West is a closed community. What I mean by that is the result is traffic through Sun City West, it's opened -- anybody going through the west must go through Sun City. I always like to look at Sun City West as being able to become a gated community if they like because there are such few entrances to the community. They really don't like to have any additional entrances to their community.

Those are some of my reasons for asking for us to be separate.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Thank you.

MR. VOROS: Thank you for the opportunity to address you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Karen Osborne followed by Phil Garner.

MS. OSBORNE: Karen Osborne,

OSBORNE.
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Good evening. Nice to see you all again.

It's kind of at the end of deliberations. When it started out, one of the things I promised you, technical issues we had I'd bring to you toward the end deliberations.

We provided to the staff tonight technical issues, 27 what we call traps that have a Congressional line on one side and Legislative line on the other. State law requires I not mix those two, so we believe in these 27, there are 20 that have no population at all, which if you wanted to move a Congressional line or Legislative line, fine with us, provide us with the ability to not have to create ballots or precincts that have no people and be able to do our accountability in a better fashion. There are a few, I believe four or five that have two, three, four, five people. Two have 100, a little, a little over 100 each. In the rest of your deliberations, as you change lines, I hope you take those into consideration.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Osborne.

Thank you for the detail in the maps. I also, I think, need to publicly acknowledge the assistance your office has given us through not only allowing us to use Tim Johnson for the period of the redistricting but also the support that

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
your office has given us throughout the process. We really appreciate it.

MS. OSBORNE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Phil Garner, Ms. Wilcox.

Mr. Garner.

MR. GARNER: Thank you for allowing me to speak to you.

I believe there's significant interest and concern to residents in the northwest, a retirement interest.

Phil Garner, P H I L, G A R N E R.

As currently proposed, the Sun Cities, Sun City, Sun City West, Sun City Grand, which is a portion of Surprise, along the towns of Youngtown, have been included in one Legislative District. As such, these communities will only have one State Senator, two Representatives, instead of the three Senators, six Representatives, we now enjoy in Districts 15, 17, and 19. The point of this is our representation in the State Legislature would be reduced from 10 percent to three percent. This becomes very significant when it comes to approval or defeat of Legislative matters.

I strongly believe the residents in the retirement communities do not want to be isolated and contained in one district and reduces in State
We're not a walled-in community that isolates itself in. We're involved in West Valley issues, the west part, West Maricopa Coalitions, West Loop Council, MAG Loop, Maricopa Association of Governments. A large number of residents volunteer time in neighboring communities' governments. What you are proposing is a compromised plan shift of 28,000 people in the Southern Section of Sun City south of Bell Road into the District Two, the East of Sun City, which is now, as I understand it, District H. In order to satisfy the required population count, or approximately 171,000 in this case, you have to shift some of the people from the area northeast of Sun City into District D.

Again, as pointed out earlier, in the southern portion of Sun City, more there are more common community interests in District H, the northern section of Sun City.

In the recommended compromise plan, there will be two State Senators and Four Representatives along with two silver-haired Legislators representing the retirement communities, and as such, they would provide more voice on Legislative matters.

We'd also recognize it's not feasible to

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
retain three Senators, six Legislators we now have in
the redistricting effort.

Some seniors have come to me and said
we'll take 28,000 people out of Sun City, our voice will
be diminished, but the numbers do not reveal that.

Look at how many people are eligible to
vote in the Sun Cities, how many go out and vote. You
are looking at about a two-one ratio favoring the senior
vote over those to the east of us, which only about 20
percent are eligible to vote and 20 percent do vote.

We see no significant overall voter
dilution.

We also believe we'd be much better off
with a stronger collective voice in Legislative matters
in retirement communities having two districts, having
more legislators, which also results in being
represented on more Legislative committees.

I'd like point out PORO, Property Owner
Resident Owners of Sun City West, which I was president
of for two years, the Sun City Homeowner Association,
Sun City Grand Association, have gone on record to the
Redistricting Commission in July of this year to support
one common district for Sun City, Sun City West, Sun
City Grand. This decision apparently raised single
consideration, namely common interests of the Sun
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Cities. On the surface this can be viewed somewhat understandable; however, the impact was a reduced number of Senators and Representatives resulting in the fact of reduced representation in the Legislature which apparently was not addressed. Natures way to reduce. Two districts, a compromised plan to be presented at the formal board meeting to be held tomorrow, will address that issue.

We urge you as a Commission to carefully consider the two district committee compromised plan.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Garner.

Appreciate it.

To extent you can provide us any more detail on the 28,000 shift you are talking about with boundary lines, or anything of that nature, it would be helpful.

MR. GARNER: It's pretty clear. Bell Road south, the southern portion of Sun City, that's the portion that drops down in that district. I can provide that for you later.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: You are saying then, the portion, current District H, above Bell Road, shift that into D to replace what is taken out?

MR. GARNER: Above Bell Road, stay in the district with Sun City West. What we're talking about
is shifting south of Bell Road into the east district.
You have to compensate the shift with some people
northeast of that area back into the Sun City West
district.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Right.

MR. GARNER: To balance the district.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Those shifted back Sun
City West district, District B, you suggest the northern
District, District H?

MR. GARNER: Correct.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

We fixed the sound system. Hopefully they
are working on fixing the temperature in the room. I
note it's gotten quite warm. To the extent they can get
the temperature to come down a little bit, we'd
appreciate it they would try to do that.

For the record, Mr. Huntwork joined us.

Welcome.

Next, Mary Rose Wilcox and Aaron Kizer
representing the Minority Coalition for Fair
Redistricting followed by Dan Ortega.

SUPERVISOR WILCOX: Thank you for hosting
the final hearing here in Maricopa County.

I'm Mary Rose Wilcox, as you introduced
me. We, our coalition, are coming out to protect the
minority voting rights in Arizona. We have been very much involved in the process of redistricting and have learned quite a bit as we've moved along with the Commission.

We first presented our common interests to you, and presented our map from the Minority Coalition establishing 10 minority-majority districts. Now we come before you presenting a new map. And the Coalition recognizes the Arizona State Constitution calls for the Commission to provide for competitive districts where possible. Our utmost goal is to present, is to protect voting rights, minority voting rights in Arizona. We realize if we can do the to together, they are not mutually exclusive.

The Coalition does not believe they are mutually exclusive. The Legislative goal maximizes the minority strength present in the Legislative districts. We've presented to you quite a number of times and had several members of the Coalition speak last Saturday. We'll also have several members stand, before Aaron comes up to explain the competitive districts and protection of minority districts. With your permission, I'd like them to at least wave their hand, do that with the minority coalition.

Several are scattered throughout the room
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and there are also several members in Florence.

Once again, before he comes up, we realize that you are going to take all our analysis. We feel the map presented to you is a very good one, protects all rights for all people.

Aaron.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Kizer, I expect you'll do this anyway. If your remarks regard competitiveness, if you'll do your best to define for us as you've defined the definition.

MR. KIZER: I'm Aaron Kizer, K I Z E R.

The highlights of the maps are presented to you in print and also on disk as they include the nine majority-minority districts, includes also eight competitive districts, four with more Republican registration, three more Democratic registration, one that is an split even.

As to competitiveness, in addition to looking at this registration, we also looked at how Democratic candidates, how Republican candidates perform, that's included in the last stack, F.

What we considered competitive is about a difference of less than eight percentage points between the two parties. In one district, wit may have a Republican that has run very well. Another one,
Democrats. If you get within eight points, candidates, we considered that to be competitive. See the table there under F.

The test, Lisa Hauser asked us to define the races we considered in developing the competitive index. That's also in your book right before tab G.

We looked at the United States President's race in '96 and 2000, the Governor's race in '98, the Attorney General Arizona race in '98, the Secretary of State in '98, and the Corporation Commission in '98 and 2000.

So in a nutshell, that is the map we presented to you tonight. And we really appreciate your time and consideration.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Kizer.

Questions or comments for either Supervisor Wilcox or Kizer?

Ms. Wilcox.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Comment, really, couple comments.

First of all, I want to thank you for the time and effort you put into this.

Obviously we're seeing this --

I can't seem to get along with it (referring to the mike).
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-- we're seeing this for the first time.

So what I want to know is I don't have any questions about it now. I haven't looked at it. If we do have questions, how should we go about presenting them?

SUPERVISOR WILCOX: Contact myself or Mr. Kizer, the Coalition, if need be. We'll answer any questions or answer them individually.

We feel very strongly we tried to meet the competitive needs of the Commission and also tried to fill some of the needs that arise in Pinal County as a whole. Instead of life, tried to change W, the Legislative District you all had trouble with, too.

We tried. Call Aaron or myself, if need be, or we'll call Coalition members.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork had a question so did Ms. Hauser.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I wonder, if possible, if you can briefly compare your majority minority districts with ours to the west, answer that question in a few words.

MR. KIZER: If you look in the book, there's a tab that does that. I point out, and I know you are not familiar with our product yet, if you look under tab A, three pages in, you'll see the table says, at the very top, minority keeper plus percent. If you
find that page, if you looked at the IRC proposal to our proposal, the proposed race majority minority districts, M and L, let me explain to you, your draft M majority minority, our draft map M majority, same with Y, W, you can see the percentages for minority over 18, Hispanic over 18, Hispanic Native American, Native American over 18.

There are nine majority-minority districts.

As to other districts, we do have Democratic registration, all other registration, and then minority populations, the Hispanic, total, and voting age, African American, total minority population. That's the page that precedes it.

We did try to compare to yours to a certain extent.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser.

MS. HAUSER: I wonder if you could, I looked at the competitive index at the back of the proposal. I wondered if you could characterize which districts were the -- you mentioned five leaned one direction, three leaned another direction. I'm not sure which ones those are.

MR. KIZER: I'm sorry, which are competitiveness? Which are ones that lean?
MR. RIVERA: Both.

MS. HAUSER: Both.

MR. KIZER: Competitive, if you look at the introduction page on the overview, you'll see competitiveness are E, B, C, D, I, M, Q, X, and Z. We do define what we are considering competitiveness in proposal page. As to how they lean, I would have -- we purposely did not come in and say this district leans Republican, this district leans Democratic, because we're very touchy about partisanship, whether we're coming here as Democrats, Republicans. We didn't want to be painted into that box. We wanted to be districted on minority voting rights. We could produce those numbers for you. I think with the Maptitude software, you can produce it for yourself as well. Some are pretty obvious, if you look which way they lean. W will lean Democratic.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Kizer, let me follow up. We can ask better questions if we studied it first. Not having had the opportunity to do that, I'll apologize for asking the previous question since you did lay it out here in the intro.

Now that I've looked at this introduction, you have done a competitiveness analysis based on election returns.
When you characterize districts as leaning one direction or another it appears you did so based on registration rather than election results. Am I right on that?

MR. KIZER: When I did for Republican, three Democrat, one split, that's registration.

Competitiveness, that's when we went into the percentages on the competitive index table.

SUPERVISOR WILCOX: Voting.

MS. HAUSER: If a district leans one way, that's registration.

MR. KIZER: Eight percent for competitiveness. In our opinion, a good Democrat could win or good Republican, a tossup, we don't feel it leans either way.

MS. HAUSER: Okay.

MR. KIZER: Either party could win a district.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: You characterize either party by registration.

MR. KIZER: If you look at the competitive index, look at competitive BB, competitive index, if you go and back analyze the race it's talking about, that number tell us that district either went five percent more Republican or more Democrat in the elections. You
can tell which way ultimately that district went. But
the reason we didn't say five percent Democrat or
Republican, I'm not sure which way BB leans, it didn't
matter, with that narrow a range, five percent, either
party could win.

SUPERVISOR WILCOX: We can supply that
analysis. We'll do it, give it to you tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's difficult, having
just gotten the material. We'll look at it, give fair
review, look at it, the districts as well.

MR. RIVERA: Mr. Chairman, they gave a
disk. I tried to open it up, am trying to open it up on
Maptitude, and can't.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's not do that at the
moment.

MR. RIVERA: I'm trying --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If we could ask a
representative of the Coalition to stay with us a while,
see if can --

MR. KIZER: If you can't open it and your
technical people can't, we'll reopen it.

SUPERVISOR WILCOX: We have copies of the
map, large sizes.

One other point, we spoke of Legislative
maps, have spoken to you several times and testified the

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
Congressional maps we do support.

Congressman Ed Pastor tonight is standing in strong support for that map. We realize Danny Ortega is right after us.

Ed's map, we'd oppose the Central Phoenix District. That community disenfranchises many, many communities, should the Central Phoenix district split communities.

With that, like we say, we'd stay consistent, have stayed consistent, as much as we can.

We're bringing in competitiveness, thought that very, very necessary.

We hope any questions you have would be asked. We'll stay. We wanted to speak early. That's why we came early, to sign up.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I appreciate that.

I want to make sure we have an opportunity to ask technical questions on using the materials when we do have an opportunity look at it, have questions in mind, answers in mind.

Mr. Hall.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you for your input.

I have a couple questions. Generally glancing at the map, it's hard for me to tell. I'm assuming on the District W that you pulled Sierra Vista
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out. Is that correct? What was the rationale there.

SUPERVISOR WILCOX: Common interests are retirement and common communities. We felt they fit in with the eastern edge of the Pima retirement communities.

MR. KIZER: The northern edge, the Saddlebrooke and other retirement communities. We thought the retirement factors were important, the Republican factor, and also that Sierra Vista wanted to stay united. That's the way we were doing it, allowing the minority-majority district in W.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Am I correct Flagstaff is in District C?

MR. KIZER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Tri-Cities?

MR. KIZER: Tri-Cities being --

COMMISSIONER HALL: Prescott communities.

MR. KIZER: They are split. We should give you a blowup. Prescott in B and Prescott Valley in C.

SUPERVISOR WILCOX: We believe that follows your draft.

COMMISSIONER HALL: We're willing to correct that.

SUPERVISOR WILCOX: We didn't know
COMMISSIONER HALL:  Help me understand the rationale in District Y.

SUPERVISOR WILCOX:  We felt the interests of the Pinal community has been the community in the past, the Legislative District listened very hard to make the coalition from Eloy, Casa Grande, Florence, the mining communities, and we felt that their community of interest, even the very diverse population, is along county lines.  We honored that.

I believe you'll hear testimony tonight that either Casa Grande now believes the way District Y is on a map now is very unacceptable.

COMMISSIONER HALL:  Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN:  Dr. Adams.

DR. ADAMS:  Yes, Members of the Commission.  I just wanted to say, we were able indeed, able to open their disk.  I know Doug will help the Commissioners.  It's a two-step process to open it.  We'll assist everyone to open that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN:  During --

SUPERVISOR WILCOX:  Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN:  Perhaps if counsel has further questions, unless there are further questions on the record, we can get together on the break, ask
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We appreciate the work you've done.

SUPERVISOR WILCOX: We appreciate all the work.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you very much.

Next speaker, Daniel Ortega, then followed by Steve Gallardo.

MR. ORTEGA: Thank you very much.

I'm Danny Ortega. I'm here representing Congressman Ed Pastor.

Congressman Ed Pastor submitted maps directly to the Commission by the deadline in July. The Congressman took several considerations, wanted to create three Democratic districts, one competitive district, to create two minority districts, three Democratic districts.

The guidelines, number one, equal population, constitutional provisions, deviation of less than one percent, and of course tried stay within -- as close as possible to the original lines drawn, the grid maps. Of course, the maps took into account compactness, contiguity. With some exceptions they were small.

I think the biggest part of our work is many maps of the Commission came up with dealing with
communities of interest.

We want you to know we did not take one factor alone, indeed, but many, many factors.

I think the lead to presenting those factors was presented by the Coalition back in its first meeting at South Mountain Community College. The Congressman saw the Coalition and thought he'd do the same, not only for the county, on a county basis, with several maps that show you the extensive work the Congressman has undertaken, but trying to draw districts for the state.

Just briefly, I'd like to leaf through them for you. You'll get them electronically, all these electronically tomorrow. They show the different factors used in drawing the maps.

If I may, quickly.

The first map here, this map deals with the percentage of minorities in the Census tract. You'll see where it's red, 70 percent of the minority is outlined throughout the state, drawing particularly rural districts, talking here, minority districts right here, shows by color where all minority groups are.

That's number one.

Number two, you will see, we broke some minority groups down. Took the black African American
community as a whole state, put where the concentration
is, where 47 percent greater or less. That's highest.
Of course, note this particular area here has a great
concentration of African American.

We also took the Native American community
and also tracked them throughout the state and also went
70 percent or greater. The real dark areas, see where
all Native American communities are throughout the
state.

We also took a voter support for
Proposition 203, which you know was very important
regarding language for minorities, very important to
minority communities. Note in blue areas is where --
blue areas is where the state opposed Proposition 203,
not English immersion. Native American communities,
greater color blue, green, light green, light green
being 55 percent or more. Notice when you begin to
look, look at almost color lines there, the very first
map you drew after the grids was very consistent with a
lot of what is in these maps. Okay?

Next here, student bilingual participation
in school districts. Once again, there are groups of
community interest grouping up where there are
bilingual, different parts of the state, central
Maricopa County and western part of Pinal County, and of
course you see down here in Yuma area, the Yuma area as
well as Indian Reservations. Okay?

We also took food stamp recipients by zip
code, the darkest, where the greatest number of zip
codes. Density has something to do with that.

We began to group communities of interest,
almost the same, the northeast area, Central Maricopa
County, the western part of Pinal County, up here to
Mohave.

If you notice, as some Commissioners were
noticing, the rural district, group, is fairly
consistent in terms of cash assistance. We also took
cash assistance by zip code. If you notice, in terms of
minority communities, as income is not available from
the Census until next year, we tried to deal with
income. Dark pinks are more cash assistance.

Ultimately, the last thing, only one small
factor is the issue of dominant party registration for
active voters in the state. And note that the blue is
Democrat and red is Republican, and it will show you
where the different party registrations are.

Ladies and gentlemen, Members of the
Commission, in drawing maps we did not take the simple
approach of trying to make districts one party or one or
another, which is convenient. One party, another. We
grouped communities from the standpoint of interest,
then drew maps. I'll tell you, after we submit the
maps, all of you saw what we first came out with. We
believe you must have been using the same information we
did. They weren't exactly the same, but they were very
similar. And we're happy with it.

I want you to keep in mind that the maps
the Congressmen submitted had the support, particularly
of the Coalition. We did not do that alone, but we
worked a lot within the Coalition. We took maps from
Tucson, a fairly large group of voting people with
different backgrounds interests, that were happy with
maps, maps to the Inter Tribal Council. The Inter
Tribal Council gave input. They did not endorse the
maps, didn't say that.

We didn't take to them -- we took them
labor. We didn't get them endorsed by all groups.
We're putting them out with the ultimate maps you got.
The real question is where you stand with
the present maps, what you most recently drew. It
relates to what Congressman Ed Pastor believes.

District D, as drawn, very satisfactory
really takes into account all the different factors
outlined for you. We believe it needs a little
tweaking, once again, on the basis of communities of

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
interest.

Voting Rights Act is paramount, paramount to preparation of maps. It takes precedence over anything else.

If you simply looked at the Biltmore Estates, we do not believe the Biltmore Estates has any commonality with south and southwest Phoenix, and we ask that you consider taking that out of District D.

We propose to you that you consider the area north on Bethany, east on -- west on Seventh Street, and east on 32nd Street and Indian School to the south as an area that you could put somewhere else; and to make up for that to include, because of more commonalities, based upon our research, the area of Glendale north, Camelback south, 59th Avenue west, 43rd Avenue east; Glendale north, Camelback to the south, 59th avenue to west, and 43rd Avenue to the east.

Now, on another point I wanted to make, very important to the Congressman, the Congressman has looked at the Central Phoenix proposal that has been made, and he absolutely unequivocally opposes it. That map specifically does what we have been trying to avoid, that does to split, divide communities of interest. You know, the voting rights on Section Two requires this Commission create districts minorities equal candidates
of choice. If we argue that the map you drew is
contrary to the concept of communities of interest
because you included Biltmore Estate, we must also be
consistent and say if you include large a Hispanic
community with Biltmore Estate, with parts of
Scottsdale, the north part of Phoenix, that's totally
inconsistent and would disenfranchise nother mostly
large segment of the Hispanic community. Let me tell
you what that segment is.

If you take Camelback on the north, I-17
north and south, I-17 east and west, and 48th Street to
the east, you are talking about a tremendous, a great
number of minorities, particularly Hispanics in that
area, who we believe have no commonalities with the
other areas that have been proposed in the Central City
of Phoenix District.

Protecting communities of interest
pursuant to the Voting Rights Act takes precedence over
creating federal districts. Federal law preempts state
law. Any division only create a legal challenge.

The Congressman is prepared to take on
that challenge, if necessary.

The maps are on the right track. They
need some tweaking in District D. Straightening of
District C relates more to competitiveness.
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We believe you are on the right track, and we thank you very much for your attention.

Any questions? I'll be glad to answer them.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser has questions for you.

MS. HAUSER: Hi, Mr. Ortega.

You mentioned you had or Congressman Pastor met extensively with various communities of interest. You -- you've been defining those communities. I wondered if you could make available to the Commission summaries of those meetings that developed your communities of interest similar to sort of the summaries we've done as we've met with hearings and interest groups around the state.

MR. ORTEGA: Let me clarify. The extensive research communities of interest are what I showed today. We met with different groups, including different groups within the Coalition, labor, Native Americans, a fairly sizable group in Tucson, to share our maps, to get input from them. And overall, their was no objection. But we were only the voice of the Coalition, a pretty large group, formal group, other groups were there for input, and to present our maps. For the most part people agreed.
If you look at your own maps, first maps, we all agree.

MS. HAUSER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you for coming.

It's interesting, in light of Congressman Pastor's presently drafted District G, the comment --

MR. ORTEGA: D or G?

COMMISSIONER HALL: G.

MR. RIVERA: G is Yuma.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yuma, western Yuma County.

MR. ORTEGA: Ask me again. I got confused.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Comments are loaded relative to District D?

MR. ORTEGA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HALL: In light of the fact it presently represents G, the southwestern portion of the state, if you could comment relative to that district's configurations, if you had input relative to that, the boundaries of that district.

MR. ORTEGA: That district, Gila Bend, I believe.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No. Explaining.
MR. ORTEGA: District G.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If you understand that question, we, our maps drew that District G almost the same way you drew District G, fairly similar. Only the lower portion of Maricopa County is down here. The only difference we had is your map and ours is very similar.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Included in the district you drew.

MR. ORTEGA: We included E, our D your G. The only difference, very minor difference, your G is similar to what we drew, also.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I just -- I need another microphone.

I want to make sure essentially what we're endorsing is the Commission's draft plan with the small change mentioned.

MR. ORTEGA: We're endorsing D with the Commission changes for South Glendale and the Biltmore Estate.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Let me ask a question. It looks like South Glendale is currently in District A and the area we want to take out is contiguous to District A, would go over to B, which is
what it's next to, so we now have D balanced in population.

MR. ORTEGA: I have it all done for these districts, also. What it is, if you take this portion here, take it out of District D, include South Glendale, you have to go up here in B. Take some of B out and give it to A.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay.

MR. ORTEGA: If you like, I'll be glad to give to you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other questions for Mr. Ortega?

Mr. Ortega, thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Will you leave the maps with us?

MR. ORTEGA: We'll get them to you tomorrow through the consultants.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The next speaker is Steve Gallardo followed by -- last name is Shaw. I apologize, can't read the first name.

MS. HAUSER: John?

A VOICE: Well, I believe that is.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Gallardo.

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
MR. GALLARDO: Chairman, Members of the Commission, I represent the Latino Coalition for Political Action. Our coalition is involved with the larger coalition, the Coalition for Fair Redistricting.

The Latino Coalition for Political Action does not take a stand on the issue of competitiveness adjusting boundaries to achieve competitiveness. We're opposed to the issue of competitiveness only if it violates any issue of the Voting Rights Act or disturbs communities of interest. Our Coalition has never taken competitiveness into consideration at any time during this redistricting process. Since the Commission has decided to look at competitiveness, we have decided to also look at competitiveness as well.

We support Supervisor Wilcox and Aaron Kizer's proposal on the map dealing with competitiveness. We know this map accomplishes several things: keeps communities together, achieves competitiveness, allows minorities maximize voting strength, allows them to elect candidates, to have a voice, take the map into consideration, and maximizes the legislative line.

With respect to Congressional District boundaries, the coalition would support IZ Draft map Congressional lines also with some provisions.
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Mr. Ortega has reiterated, mentions these provisions. They strongly support the divisions of 32nd Street, 16th Street, Camelback, and Indian School, a non-Hispanic AUR, pretty much moving out of the Hispanic AUR into North Phoenix, so they have more in common, more likely, also bring in southern Glendale, a 24,000 people switch, even swap, make the Congressional District more intact as far as communities of interest.

If I'm correct District B, as was brought to Andi's attention, District B to 19th Avenue, make up the population, if you approve the selection, only not disrupt a school district going up on the northern part. Take those comments into consideration.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Gallardo.

Next speaker, John Shaw, followed by Bob Rosenberg.

MR. SHAW: Thank you. I was supposed to press something that starts the Power Point.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Either that or we'll start it from the back.

MR. SHAW: Okay. I'm actually here as a stand-in.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Hang on and let's see if we can get power to the projector.

They are doing something from the back.
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Be patient.

MS. PORCH: Don't touch it. It's being done back here.

MR. SHAW: I have a few comments. Should I proceed with those?

I'm John Shaw, precinct committee person, really here on behalf of two neighbors, one, Westwood Neighborhood, which you heard about during a presentation on Central Avenue across from Central High School.

To reinforce that, I have a map to present with a petition.

The Committee heard great deal about how they want to be included in the historic neighborhood district. I'll not go into that. I'd further ask you to please accept the petition and map.

Shall I hand this to you?

The other neighborhood is our neighbor to the south. That's known as the Greenway Terrace and the Estates Neighborhood. They have a slightly different interest. Debbie McCune Davis prepared the presentation, was going to be here to present it, unfortunately was not able to get back from out of town for well-known reasons. So I was asked to come and do this. What I have is the presentation on Power Point.
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I understand there's a video portion.

There's no audio.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It won't play?

MR. SHAW: Again, I have for each individual member, a copy.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay.

MR. SHAW: The other thing I have is a petition and a map submitted on behalf of Greenway Terrace and the Estates Neighborhoods who, not like their neighbors, the Westwood neighborhood, Greenway Terrace and Estates want to be part of what I believe would be your District O. The reason for that, and as should be clear from the Power Point, is they feel a strong affiliation with the West Valley. And also I would point out the minority coalition maps you have received, I believe, support what Greenway Terrace and Estates would like to do which would continue to be identified as they have in the past with the West Valley. I'll hand that Pete and copies to the appropriate person.

I'm not sure what is supposed to be happening with the Power Point.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If you'd like to go through, you have to direct the operator to change slides when you wish them changed.
MR. SHAW: I hoped someone they'd know
that as I'm a stand in and have not gone through the
presentation but was asked to present it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If you don't mind,
Mr. Shaw, we could view it individually.

MR. SHAW: In fact, it looks like it just
started.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I don't think it will
continue unless you direct it to continue.

MR. SHAW: You have the information.


COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Can you tell us the
boundaries.

MR. SHAW: I can. What I'd rather do, if
I could, I'd simply ask you, if I distributed, there's a
map that shows that information. Can I approach and
give this to you?

Okay.

I can tell you the area in question is
part of District 20 and has been. It's always been
part, tied to the West Valley. And the people from
Greenway Terrace Estates valley feel that relationship
continues.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Shaw, I'm
confused. It looks from this map that Greenway Terrace
runs west of 19th Avenue to Black Canyon freeway.

MR. SHAW: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Which is the east end of the district already.

MR. SHAW: I think your proposal would divide at the Black Canyon Highway, wouldn't it, and move them out of the West Valley.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The draft map does not. Westwood Village asked for a larger neighborhood to be pulled into O. I'm trying to figure it out. Could it be Greenway Village doesn't want to be --

MR. SHAW: Greenway -- Terrace Estates wants to remain in N. Where I live wanted to join the historic neighborhoods. They are not currently in with the people south of us. People south of us, in the south valley -- I'm the precinct person of both neighborhoods at present. I wish they would have told this in detail.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If we pull Westwood Village out of N into O, don't do it to Greenway Terrace.

MR. SHAW: Yes.
MR. SLAGHT: N.C. Slaght, President of Westwood.

Absolutely correct. We're wanting to move from N into O because of the significance of our historic area and the amount of work we've accomplished already with ASU, the graduate students, now undergraduate students in the process of becoming the First Post World War 1950s historic region in the country.

Again, you heard it from many of my residents at Phoenix Union as to the important of us wanting to be in part of O. Unlike the area Mr. Shaw talking about, they choose to remain part of the West Valley. They do not have interest at this current time that establishes them with the historic entity where we do. That's where the differences are.

F. C. Slaght, SLAGHT, III.

Questions?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Comments or questions?

Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Just to be sure we're doing something, helping people find out what they want to us do, would someone send the Commission the exact boundaries of Greenway Terrace and boundaries of Westwood? That would be helpful.
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MR. SHAW: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The streets are not labeled. If it follows Greenway Terrace, I don't want to be confused.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you very much.

Next speaker, Bob Rosenberg.

It's our custom to allow the public stenographer to stretch and get feeling back into her fingers. We tend to take a break at the one and a half mark, which would bring us up to the point after Mr. Rosenberg speaks. We'll try our best to keep breaks to 10 minutes, because we do have more than 40 people yet to speak that have given us speaker slips this evening.

MR. ROSENBERG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: May we have your attention, please.

MR. ROSENBERG: I appreciate the opportunity to speak this evening. I wish you my condolences for the assignment you've taken upon yourselves.

This is a political process, redistricting. And whether you would like it, better or not, it's the ultimate political process. I believe it
is very important that the final outcome of the process contain competitive districts.

The district with five percent Republican, another five percent Democrat, exactly the same total population in those two districts, I look at a district that is skewed in favor of one party, and I think a candidate in that party, in that district, has a very nice time. And that's good, perhaps, for that one candidate. That is bad for the State of Arizona.

Where there is competitiveness in the districts, then it makes the candidates work harder to present their case to the voters, but it is much better for the State of Arizona. It forces the candidates to compete where the majority of the people are on the site. Draw a bell curve on some of that, I think it's instructive for us to look at the acrimonious activity that took place in the Arizona State Senate as recently as a couple years ago and compare that, the very civil and constructive way the Senate has operated this year when it's a 15-15 split. It is a significant improvement, in my estimation.

I suggest to you you give serious consideration for improvement for the Coalition for Fair Redistricting and do everything possible for you to do given all the constraints you have to the process to end
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up with districts across the state that are competitive.

Thank you very much. I'd be happy to

answer any questions.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you very much.

Appreciate your comments very much.

We will at this point take a 10-minute

break. We'll meet at 20 minutes after the hour.

(Recess taken at 8:11 p.m. until

approximately 8:29.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The next speaker is

Councilman David Ortega.

COUNCILMAN ORTEGA: Good evening,

Chairman, Vice Chair, and Commissioners. I'm David

Ortega, serve for the City Council for Scottsdale, which

has no districts. As a Councilman, I run at large from

cost to coast so to speak. I emphasize tonight my

comments are as a citizen, not the official position of

the City of Scottsdale.

Scottsdale is somewhat demographically

challenged, in some ways, two miles wide, 32 long.

There is, I would way, an under current discussion for

districting for councilships. Again, councilships are

at large.

What I've seen tonight and certainly
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our -- are a couple plans that have been proposed or are
on the table. I would like to respond to the
Commission's work for a Congressional situation and
Legislative situation. We're very interested in the
Coalition's proposed map. And once you have received
them, hopefully some form can be transmitted more
widely.

First of all, the Congressional districts,
the comments concerning D and E, E comes to Scottsdale
again, North-South 32 miles, and appears to go through
Tempe and pinwheels through Ahwatukee. This looks like
a spiral galaxy in comparison to the other district
configurations.

As I see, this is the Congressional one.
In D, which is an area abutting E, there are comments
about the Hispanic portion, that is the south -- excuse
me, the southeast section of D and trying to keep D
intact for the Hispanic interest. I'm not a member of
the coalition, so to speak. I again would like a
briefing on that to understand. But philosophically I
believe that the area G, Congressional G, which
essentially protects the Pastor District, is essential.
I think diminishing area G would not be wise. At the
same time, as we look at area D, again, it appears as
though the Hispanic component at the southeast.
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The other comment, because I was made aware and have been referenced tonight about a downtown district, and so I was briefed on that. And that is an interesting proposal. I do see that. And I do have a few comments on what is known as the Downtown Proposition. It appears, if I look at the downtown, so-called downtown district, it looks like a tree ring. If you have one growth, you'd been able to identify a core area. In terms of age, it would be pre-1970, and it is somewhat interesting because it seems to show a competitive balance. And I use that, heard that word "competitive nature" as to different groups. However, also, I heard, as far as whether or not downtown plan would damage Hispanic community damaging southeast corner of area D.

In terms of looking at that specifically because there are so many proposals on the table, I find it interesting you could perhaps contrast what I refer to in your current Legislative, excuse me, Congressional plan, showing a spiral district, which I alluded to as E, including Scottsdale, Ahwatukee, going through the central area, going through a core design, downtown, with other elements coming off of that. So that's essentially an interesting contrast. However, again, I would be a little concerned with breaking off the
Hispanic element which the downtown corridor, or whatever it is called, appears to do. And I think that we should not diminish that aspect, not only for, you know -- well, for community of interest reasons.

Therefore, just in listening and looking at other maps as they comfort, I understand you just received one as well tonight, I think that there may be a middle ground. And there may be a middle ground with the downtown core excluding, again, the -- a good portion of the Hispanic corner, so to speak. I'd encourage you, and obviously there are state Legislative Districts which encompass Scottsdale, and whether there's three, whether there's four, that Scottsdale may have a split already because of the need on the Legislative level. And we sometimes encounter, with that kind of geographic obstacle, that is perhaps going 50 miles across in a metropolitan area, that's a bigger challenge, I think, for representation at a Congressional level.

I think I was clear in that last comment, you might be able to solve some compaction with a downtown core and still be able to have other spiral elements. That might mean Scottsdale might, possibly, be split in Congressional. I say that because it already is, of course, in the Legislature. These,
again, are just comments. And I greatly appreciate your
time this evening and best wishes to you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Ortega.
Questions?
I appreciate it.
We'll return to our custom of having a
batter one on deck.
Next speaker, Town Manager of the Town of
Sahuarita, Tom Stahle, followed by Fred Berkenkamp.

MR. STAHLE: Thank you. I appreciate it.
Your committee's proposed Congressional
Redistrict Map indicates that you are putting the
majority of the Town of Sahuarita in a separate
Congressional District from that of Green Valley. The
Town Council of the Town of Sahuarita voted to oppose
this from occurring. The Town of Sahuarita belongs in
the same Congressional District as Green Valley. We are
communities of similar interest and because we are
immediately beside each other the Town Council feels
that it is in our mutual interest to remain in the same
Congressional District.

The Town Council of the Town of Sahuarita
respectfully requests that your Redistricting Committee
keep the Town of Sahuarita together with Green Valley in
the same Congressional District. We look forward to
COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: How many people are in Sahuarita?

MR. STAHEL: 3,500.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: What about Green Valley?

MR. STAHEL: Residents, 1,500, as far as I'm aware.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Of the two districts you are currently in, would you suggest moving Green Valley into yours or theirs into ours?

MR. STAHEL: I think it's easier moving the smaller population. G and H are the issues.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Stahle, very much.

Next those still here, 50 plus speaker slips, don't want take away anyone's comments. To the extent you are echoing comments made earlier, I certainly just want to say that. We've been listening intently to everyone. Rather than restate the entire case, if you have something you wish to support that's been stated previously, we're happy to note that and take it as a separate comment.

Fred Berkenkamp followed by Mark Fooks.
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MR. BERKENKAMP: Chairman Lynn and fellow Commissioners, I appreciate the opportunity to address you very briefly as suggested. I wish to support the concept of two districts representing the senior communities all across them and the argument, I could make lots of arguments, very simply, we have had, really, three percent representation. We know that that can't continue. We don't think one can represent -- one percent representation is out and out discrimination against seniors. I don't think that is right. We are 80 percent of the vote as compared to 25, 30 percent.

I think it's much fairer if that portion of Sun City below Bell Road would be added to Peoria as there's great commonalty of interest, and, in turn, Arrowhead Ranch, or a chunk of that, added into District E.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Berkenkamp, exactly as proposed is how I understand you supportive of it. In other words, you are not -- it was earlier proposed we take that portion below Bell Road and move it, and take the top part of the next district and make the switch.

MR. BERKENKAMP: Precisely.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: You support that.

Mark Fooks. Mr. Fooks followed by -- well, hang on just a second.
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I'm missing a slip.

My understanding is Mr. Fooks and Mr. Williams are speaking together.

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: Correct.

MR. FOOKS: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of other members here tonight. I'm not speaking on my own. I'm generally speaking about the generalities of the proposing for the redrawing of District B.

My name is Mark Fooks, M A R K, F O O K S.

And I live at 4704 West Evans Drive, Glendale, Arizona, and have lived in Arizona for the past 40 years. And at this time, Mr. Chairman, I'll cut out the jokes, so you'll not be privy to that.

I'm here tonight for the citizens group Coalition for Downtown Competitive Districts. We have a website, www.GDOCITIDS.com/azcdcd, and, Mr. Chairman, we're preparing a petition currently of individuals who think like we do. And we'll be presenting that to you at a later date.

We are citizens who believe that competitive districts should have equal footing with the other five districts.

When I voted yes for proposition 106, I thought it had --
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We have a number of coalition supporters here audience in the tonight, Mr. Chairman, and would with your approval, to note those that left, we'd like to ask the last few due to time here, wonder if they'd just raise their hand.

(Hands are raised.)

MR. FOOKS: People that support the downtown district. They are rapidly growing numbers. Word gets out, not one in five of the proposed districts in Maricopa County is competitive.

We do understand the Commission is now attempting to input competitiveness into the process. And I've heard several of you ask participants to please show specific examples of how competitiveness might occur.

Our recommendation includes redrawing Congressional District B. I've given you a rough map there, Mr. Chairman, Commission members. The more detailed map is coming with statistics, and there is an individual here tonight if you wanted to get into statistics that could discuss population and all the details. The detailed statistics, for your information, is that essentially the new District B encompass all Tempe, downtown, south Scottsdale, east Phoenix, Sky Harbor Airport, downtown Phoenix, east of Third Avenue
and north of I-10, the Sunnyslope area, and over to the
City of Glendale's eastern border. That's the map you
have before you there.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the population of
this area is equal to the others in population, and, if
adopted, would present a competitive Congressional
District within a five percent difference of the
parties.

I sat down and tried to figure out how
best to explain to you why. I come up with the top 10
reasons to redraw District B for you.

Number 10, it would put together urban
areas that need and want redevelopment and infill;
Number nine, it would put ASU and ASU West
in the same Congressional District;
Number eight, it would encompass the area
currently approved for mass transit proposals by Phoenix
and Tempe;
Number seven, it would encompass urban
areas that are affected by similar types of crime;
Number six, it would utilize visible
geographic features;
Number 5, it would respect communities of
interest;
Number four, it would be geographically
compact and contiguous;

Number 3, it would comply with the Constitution of the United States and US Voting Rights Act;

Number two, it would have equal population, as I said earlier;

And the number one, most important reason to redraw District B, Mr. Chairman, and Commissioners, is it would provide a competitive district.

I recommend to you as a citizen living in the northern portion of this newly proposed district you take a serious look at this opportunity to provide at least one competitive Congressional District in Maricopa County.

(Appause.)

MR. FOOKS: Thank you.

The newly drawn Congressional District B, major urban district, becomes one of the most competitive districts, Mr. Chairman, in the nation. I am hopeful the final product will be the best we all can do to assure when Arizona citizens go to vote they will do so believing their candidate has a competitive chance to win the election.

A VOICE: Yeah.

MR. FOOKS: And that their vote counts.
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Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, that can only happen if competitiveness is injected into the process. Finally, the Coalition for a Downtown Competitive District is requesting that the Commission seriously consider changing Congressional District B to make a competitive district that would create a district political party registration virtually tied so that any candidate, that's any candidate, even of a partiless political party, could have a chance to win.

I would like to thank all of you for the giant task you've chosen to take on and let you know that we all know you are doing the best job that you can, and we wish you well.

(Appause.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff has a question I do to. She may ask mine, so I'll let her go first.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: A lot of pressure.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Then I'll ask it.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It's a question about the configuration of the district. Phoenix, Scottsdale, and Tempe, are they only cities in this district? Do you go into Glendale?

MR. FOOKS: Tempe, Scottsdale, Phoenix.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is all Tempe in the district?
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MR. FOOKS: All Tempe district.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Only split Phoenix, which in any plan is too big, and Scottsdale?

MR. FOOKS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: My question is similarly related. I'm wondering if the Coalition had any communication with the other jurisdictions with respect to their reaction to this district? Tempe, Scottsdale in particular?

MR. FOOKS: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Matter of fact, there is a letter here I could read from Tempe.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Just submit it.

Summarize.

MR. FOOKS: Basically Representatives Meg Burton Cahill, Councilmen Mark Mitchell, and Dennis Mitchell. And it's from Senator Harry Mitchell. He endorses the proposal today by the Coalition for a Downtown Competitive District and goes on to explain commonalities and things they have a problem with that district as drawn. They express apologies for not being here, other things they'll submit at their first opportunity.

Second, here, Councilmember Cody Williams is here to speak on his behalf in regards to this district.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand the Phoenix portion. I'm more interested in the Tempe, Scottsdale portions. Are the people you cited in the letter State Representatives --

MR. FOOKS: Representative Meg Burton Cahill, Councilman Mark Mitchell, and Dennis Cahill, signed by Harry Mitchell.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay.

MR. FOOKS: Who's a Senator. Four political leaders in the City of Tempe. We could have brought some more powerful people here, Mr. Chairman, but the recall election was going on, and just -- we didn't want to mix issues. That was the problem in Tempe.

Scottsdale was just here. We believe that -- we call South Scottsdale, Camelback, downtown Tempe, we have much more commonalty than from Camelback Road north than Scottsdale in issues and transportation and economic development. All cities, small, large, are always competing for the monies. Big federal dollars is what we're talking about here. If this district doesn't get a Congressional Representative that represents what the district needs instead of politics of the district, they're going to be suffering more than if you did draw that.

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

Leave that with the stenographer.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall had question and --

MR. FUKES: A few others may speak on the issue. I don't know if there's an order?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Williams is following you and --

COMMISSIONER HALL: You referenced to competitiveness, curious. Can you tell us what did you utilize, simply a party registration talking about districts, competitive, or utilizing other variables other than party registration.

MR. FUKES: As I understand, 4.87 something between parties difference, in population in that district. But there is an individual here that could get into, you know, details like you are asking here, if you care to and have the time. We'd love to take your time. If you want statistical, exact numbers, we have them, are working on them to present to you. As you know, this always kind of comes on us quickly. We've been working hard to give you information we think you need.

COMMISSIONER HALL: We'd be more than happy to receive whatever supplemental information you
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have.

MR. FOOKS: We'll provide that for you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork then Ms. Hauser.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Fooks, a question which affects other districts.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Question.

MR. FOOKS: Bonus one, competitive district, with small merges out of the other. If you are going to take, to make this, again --

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: When you say it doesn't affect, go down each one of the lines, and we do have numbers and information.

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: I'll address that with a lot more detail than what may be available at this moment.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser.

MS. HAUSER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You, in going through your top 10 list, being as some includes restatements about the urgings of proposed District B, I'm wondering if you could supplement your testimony with some additional explanation --

MR. FOOKS: You bet.
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MS. HAUSER: -- of each of the 10 factors
you mentioned. That would be terrific. Send it to the
Commission.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: E-mail it.

MR. FOOKS: I just tried to keep it to 10.

MS. HAUSER: More the merrier.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The top 10 list. Kept it
to 10.

Thank you, Mr. Fooks.

(Appause.)

MR. FOOKS: Thank you.

(The following is the letter submitted by
Mr. Fooks with the typed signature line for Senator
Harry Mitchell, which reads as follows:


"Arizona Independent Redistricting
Commission, 1400 West Washington Street, Suite B-10,
Phoenix, Arizona 85007.

"Dear Members of the Commission:

"Representative Meg Burton Cahill,
Councilmen Mark Mitchell and Dennis Cahill, and I would
like to endorse the map being proposed today by the
Coalition for the Downtown Competitive District.

"Tempe has long desired to maintain its
boundaries in one Congressional District. The proposal
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by the Downtown Competitive District accomplishes this
goal and keeps Tempe in a very cohesive community of
interest. Communities of interest extend beyond just
city limits and include areas and issues that unite
people together. Inclusion of portions of Scottsdale
and Phoenix with Tempe accomplishes this goal because
the areas share similar issues and concerns. 00
transportation, urban redevelopment and crime. These
are topics of concern to all those areas, and our common
issues would give us the opportunity to leverage more
federal funding to address our similar needs.

"In addition, we all believe that
competition is important in elections. Tempe is a very
diverse city and proud that despite the differences in
party registration, elections are able to field
candidates from both parties. Our elected officials
move beyond their political party to represent the
entire city. It would be refreshing to see this at the
Congressional level as well.

"We urge you to look closely at this
proposal. After doing so, I believe that you, too, will
support it as much as we do. Thank you, and good luck
in addressing the challenges before you.

"Sincerely, Senator Harry Mitchell.")

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next speaker, Cody
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Williams, then Mr. Williams Hegarty.

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: I promise not to reiterate a word he said.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Go for it.

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: In essence, the map that you have before you is what I introduced to you at South Mountain Community College, a way to create an environment that gives you the opportunity to do something that otherwise her has sounded as though it was mutually exclusive to do.

What I'm referring to, we talk about communities of interest as being a very critical factor, talk about natural boundaries being a critical factor, talk about minority representation, and the Voting Rights Act almost as one, and making sure that those things are not violated. But we also have introduced and have discussed on many occasions competitiveness. The thing that this particular district does without exposing the other districts boundaries does this: For instance, we've heard there's a real desire to protect the status quo of the D boundaries. D currently has 70 percent minority population within its boundaries. The configuration of D reduces it from 70 percent to 65 while at the same time increasing the minority population of B from 22 percent to 40 percent. That
then says that 62 percent in G and 37 percent in C, not
only do we have the ability to say there are two
majority-minority districts but we also have districts
where minority populations can make a difference and/or
influence the outcome of elections.

This, too, protects the fact, I think we discussed it last time we were together, that there
would still be three districts that would predominantly be Republican, or have a strong Republican majority, or
strong majority, to have a stronger Democratic majority, and three that would then, 15 to 10 percent, 12 percent,
three of them, which would be competitive. And so that gives us the ability to say, as the previous speaker
said, we now have three competitive districts with a very, very good balance of all three of these
categories. Created communities of interest, because you can clearly establish the issues facing the central
city and urban communities, talk about minority involvement and minority inclusion in the same number of
districts as we have in the past, but certainly in a way that allows the balance to contribute to more of the
districts in the State of Arizona instead of just two, but you've also protected the fact that there will be those districts as we kind of alluded to the last time that don't necessarily agree with the term bulletproof,
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but certainly you have those districts that will create
the strong representation that they have enjoyed in the
past while at the same time opening the competitive
ranks to those who will be able to be judged based on
their overall skills, not solely by the party that they
are represented by. We see this as both an opportunity
to add to the many headaches of decisions that you make,
but we also wanted to establish, as I said before, that
you do not have to mutually exclude one of those
categories to achieve the results desired in the others.

We have communities of interest, and we
have not violated that by changing this around in any of
the other districts.

We still have natural boundaries. As can
you see, the freeways, and the city boundaries continue
to be the predominant reasons for these changes. We've
created strong, competitive minority involved districts
throughout the State of Arizona. And I think when you
look at the ratio throughout the course of, the other
thing that has gone unnoticed, with this configuration,
all eight districts will have somewhere between 14 and
19 percent non-Republican or Democratic registration, so
you will also create the greatest balance of influence
from non-Democratic and Democratic Party registration,
which certainly says, if thinking balance and
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competition, it can't all be about Rs and Ds forever, but certainly there is a chance for the outcome to be changed or influenced because of this distribution of voters that you will see in this forwarded documentation. With that, I will say only one thing about the Legislative Districts. And we've mentioned this before. Draft Legislative District P continues to only need to be rounded out by the fact that 51st Avenue on the western edge of it will one day be a freeway, part of a freeway that connects the southern half of the Ahwatukee area to the 10 freeway. And the land bodies, human beings that live in the area west of 51st Avenue, based on our calculations, would not increase the number of individuals in what you have in the Legislative District M, if they were included, and would not create the kind of -- a kind of imbalance that would prevent that kind of relationship from being successfully achieved. That is all. I hope I did not -- I tore up my top 10 list. I agreed to leave it as such.

Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: One quick question about 51st Avenue. It looks like 51st Avenue is the boundary of M. Are you talking about the little area in O?

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: Let me just say
this is the -- what I have as this -- in this one.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Oh. Okay.

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: 51st Avenue runs from there to there. This will come around this way.

Everything west of that is rural and very sparsely populated as relates to what is happening today in today's Census numbers.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser.

MS. HAUSER: Thank you, Councilman Williams.

The question I have for you, I think I heard you say this proposal increases the minority concentration in B from 22 to 40 percent. Is that right?

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: Roughly 40, 44 percent.

MS. HAUSER: The question is roughly as far as I can tell that's going to be made up of members of various minority groups.

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: Absolutely.

MS. HAUSER: Have you done any analysis of cohesiveness of voting patterns among minority group members?

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: As I've said last time, I cannot talk about minority groups without
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talking voting efficacy. It's one thing, to have taken
in sheer numbers without productivity being attached to
it, is a minority of percentage. What we've done, as
you move through the areas, there is a higher degree of
efficacy today with voting minority population of B than
there would been with solely the 22 percent efficacy
that was in the earlier B. By taking in the minority
populations in the Tempe area, taking in minority
populations in the north, excuse me, the Central Phoenix
north areas, you do have higher efficacy. There are
African Americans in Coronado, African Americans and
Hispanics in Willow, other neighborhoods as well. You
also see them compacted in the Van Buren corridor, at
least in Phoenix. You see them compacted as you move
south along the Tempe area. And certainly there is
minority population now included that would be otherwise
not included in the South Scottsdale area.

MS. HAUSER: My question, more
specifically, though, is does the increase, in your
opinion, from the 22 percent to the roughly 40 percent
figure translate into an increase in influence? In
other words, do the various minority groups that would
comprise this new District B tend to vote in the same
way, for the same kinds of candidates, or would that
vote essentially be split?
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COUCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: Very good question. I can't answer that one technically. Maybe someone else might. I certainly can say to you that the issues that are most common in local government, for instance housing, affordable housing, urban renewal, in-fill housing, all affect the community of interest here, would affect minority voters or support from voters that have a tendency to vote the same way. How do I know that? We work very closely with a number of agencies doing affordable housing in all areas, and in some cases extend into Glendale and east into Mesa.

But the reality of what we think we have achieved in this central core community is that we now have the ability to have a Rio Salado, the airport, other things supported by more than one candidate. In doing so, whether that individual is voting for someone that supports the Rio Salado development D, Rio Salado development D, it is the same level of commonalty. The level of disenfranchisement is minimal if you really do get further than what you see on the surface.

MS. HAUSER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Williams, I was asking how it affects the adjoining districts. You really focused primarily on District D.
COUNCILLMEMBER WILLIAMS: D, G, and E for a moment.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Hold on a moment.

What you've done is cut-off Ahwatukee and cut-off a significant amount of western Mesa and it looks like parts of Chandler, perhaps, even from the bottom part of that district. My guess, just looking at it, is it's somewhere in the area of 100,000 plus people that have been separated from --

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: Let me see if Representative Coleman -- we have a color map, see if F still includes those communities.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is it a map of the entire state including this district?

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: Yes, both of those.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Let me say again, F currently does not include the areas just described. They have to come from the west in order to pick it up. F, to pick up 100,000 people on the west, means you have to give up 100,000 people on the east.

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: What east of F, District C is a rural district that currently is evenly balanced and competitive.

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Obviously I don't think your intent, or the intent of this group, is to simply switch one competitive district for another district. The only other safety valve, only other safety valve is G, a majority-minority district, where 100,000 voters from the East Valley also, I think, would not fit very comfortably.

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: I understand.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Do you have specific information?

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: I was raised to prefer Bs over Fs, to avoid them with all due diligence. So it is probably the natural time for me to turn this over to the person who probably has the most technical information, the guru we have to assist us who can give you exactly the impression of what F, A, some of the other districts look like. We have a disk that can be placed into the computer, as some of the others have, and --

Paul, do you have a --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I don't know whether the gentleman filled out speaker slip.

MR. HEGARTY: I'm up next.

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: He's the man.
He's the man.

MR. HEGARTY: I came out. You invited me to come out.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I have one more question before we turn it over to Mr. Hegarty.

One more question. In talking competitive districts, to paraphrase, if I paraphrased incorrectly, correct me. One of the attributes of the districts drawn, in addition to those previously stated, was that the number of non-Republican and non-Democratic voters, Independents, third-party voters, is sufficiently large to cover the spread between the two parties and would, therefore, enhance the competitiveness of the district?

That is to say there is significant influence in an election, even if they didn't have a candidate, their numbers in a district influence the outcome of the vote?

COUNCILMAN WILLIAMS: Correct.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Did I paraphrase correctly?

May I then take it as part of your definition of competitiveness, in any case, where other than a majority of party voters exist in numbers greater than the spread between the two parties, by definition we'd have a more competitive district?

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: I certainly
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believe that that is one of the defining attributes of a competitive district. For instance, I believe that District A may have the largest percentage of non-Republicans and Democrats, I think 19 percent, based on what we've done. Not sure which one has 14 percent. Just as B now, B, we've shown you, there is an increase of minority participation by 22 percent Friday. Having a balance along the lines of all eight districts, saying less than five percent difference from districts at the low end of non-Republicans and Democrats is too high, even Republicans and Democrats say there is the opportunity for otherwise noninfluential registered voters to truly have an opportunity to influence positively does not allow a candidate to disregard the non-Republican or Democratic voters in those districts. And I think that that is something that has not been raised as far as information I'm familiar with, the number of meetings I've attended.

We think just as we want to balance minority population in more than just two districts, what we have here today is something I think very, very worthwhile to continue to pursue, having a balance of non-Republicans and Democrats which also creates the same kind of fairness which comes down to voting one day to get the best candidates elected.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thanks, Mr. Williams.

Mr. Hegarty followed by John Keck.

Paul Hegarty.

MR. HEGARTY: If you all can see that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Stand up.

MR. HEGARTY: Paul Hegarty,

HEGARTY.

I'm here on behalf of the Arizona Democratic party. I'm here today from a downtown demographic district, have been very involved since the meetings have just began. I'm trying to provide you the public input you've been seeking.

As you know, the Democratic Party is a diverse party that truly represents the new maps that come out here. On that note, it's pretty simple that one of the goals we're trying to follow, obviously, in light of Proposition 106 is the current law. We want to make sure there is an increase in the number of majority-minority districts. That's a way to distribute the influx in population Arizona.

Communities of interest, city outreach is possible. The best example is on the Native American Reservations. Most importantly, we provide, do provide a statewide map.

We understand there is much discussion by
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the Commission and others on competition as the last
criteria that cannot be considered until all other
factors are taken care of first. I have to disagree
with that. As law states, it says the competition issue
should be considered if there is no significant
detriment to the other factors.

As you know, we did submit both maps,
Congressionally and Legislatively, during the first
stage of the public hearing process that demonstrated
you can abide by all other factors of 106 and still
provide the competition issue, factor, that is used on
the maps. One chart shows the competition issue,
compared '92 maps, the recent proposal, and then to
ours. It demonstrated we're actually able to increase
the number of competitive districts in both maps and
still abide by other factors.

On that note, we're happy to see this
composition. You did come up, provide a map, and it was
in line with what we've been talking about for a while.

We're pretty disgusted with the largest
district, the largest county in Arizona, five districts
in it, and there are no competitive districts
whatever. All five districts are pretty much
bulletproof.

We felt another way for actually people in
Maricopa to have a decision and actually be representative which would lead to so much better elections, to better representation, sometimes an incumbent is very safe, they stay to themselves and ignore issues of other constituents.

We did meet earlier this week. As you know, you do have some computers that allow better data information to look into these maps.

Mark talked to us about what he wanted on the Downtown B District, to incorporate it, show what the effect of B was on the rest of the state. There is very minimal effect. I'll try put on here.

It's not too bright, I guess.

A VOICE: Need to focus it.

SPEAKER: There you go.

MR. HEGARTY: This gives an idea. The biggest effect of this district, District D, even that is somewhat minimal.

Notice current D does take away part of that, that downtown area, which is roughly up to Camelback Road down to I-17, or actually I-10, in order to make up that, and moved D a little northwest to include the cities of El Mirage and Surprise, as well as just further into the northern area there.

We kept within just to 300 people as far
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deviation. I realize that's a little over. It gives an
idea what to look for.

One of the things very good about the map
is it keeps all of Tempe together, includes that with
what, pretty much the old downtown Scottsdale.

I believe the maps used the Loop and
Camelback Road, the initial lines of 1992 to, I believe,
the current lines in Scottsdale.

I grew up in North Scottsdale. I
definitely know everything above that is much different.
Especially with the amazing growth that happened in both
areas, parts of north Scottsdale are growing more and
more, larger houses.

The southern part, there is more
redevelopment, either shops or condos, much more city
style living as opposed to suburbs. If you plug in the
dimension of registration performance numbers,
registration of District B, 36 percent Democrat, 41
percent Republican, it falls right within the five
percent registration difference.

If you also then go and use a performance
compilation of previous statewide elections, it actually
comes out to be around a four point difference,
Democrats and Republicans, 48 actual vote, depending on
who the candidate was, the true definition of
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competitive.

On a similar note, how it affects the other districts, D still maintains a majority minority status. It would decrease the 70 percent minority to 65 percent. We are still very well above what the Voting Rights Act requires, and we maintain most of the community together. It still keeps the current registration performance and D relatively safe.

In order to accommodate the rest of the map, there are not much facts. I'll show you a larger map here.

A VOICE: Too long.

MR. HEGARTY: What it does, it expands districts E, pick up the northern sections that were taken away from District B, brought down further south. It does expand to the east.

What that does, it does allow Fort McDowell, the Salt River Indian communities to be brought into District E, like they told us they'd like to have happen.

Also, the only effect on District C, it takes those communities out of District C but up in the Mohave region, it takes out Fort Mohave Indian Reservation, includes that part of District C in the current District A, helps balance it, roughly 7,300
people.

Once again, Fort Mohave Tribe requested District C. That's a large Native American community.

The effects on District F, it includes all of Ahwatukee as well as Chandler, keeps it with Mesa, keeps all the cities together, and represents a good community of interest there.

Inclusion, like you say, this map is something we feel really does provide for the competition the state is looking for, provides for a statewide map with three competitive districts, two Democratic Districts, three Republican Districts. We feel that's what a lot of people are supportive of, are supportive of Proposition 106, a fair indicator for the state for next 10 years.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Hegarty, does this plan differ from the other earlier proposal?

MR. HEGARTY: Our proposal, we went ahead with the current map submitted out there.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Right.

MR. HEGARTY: One area, C and D, the minimal stuff is C.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Do you have extra copies for us?
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MR. HEGARTY: I'll get paper copies. We have it on computer in a Maptitude file.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Commissioner Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Hegarty, as you've been tagged with statistics, your label, you will be the man I'll have to zero in on here.

What happened to the 100,000 people? Did they not go with District C?

MR. HEGARTY: Part of the people, a little, went to A. Some of A were taken out and shifted to D.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Added to F. People in the bottom, the part of the proposal to D, were added to F.

MR. HEGARTY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The district ran into F.

MR. HEGARTY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The same people, A, A had nothing to do with F. What happened to the 100,000 in F?

MR. HEGARTY: Yes. Same to C.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: C was crafted as a rural district. Now it comes to the East Valley.

MR. HEGARTY: Part of the northern part of
that does go -- there is minimal effect.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Can you share the effectiveness of C?

MR. HEGARTY: C stands for the same numbers. Currently it's this, 50.4.

It's a, under the new map, it would go to --

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: 50.48 of what?

MR. HEGARTY: 50.49, the performance number, what we expect a Democrat to receive based on statewide races in the last three terms. It shows minimal effects.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: It doesn't seem, on the face of it, that doesn't seem right. We all know most voters in the East Valley are Republican. 100,000 Republican voters in the East Valley should have a bigger effect.

The map, outside boundaries of F, haven't changed the northern boundary of C, eastern boundary of C. Southern boundaries of G look the same. Where do the 100,000 people go?

MR. HEGARTY: Part of that, it expanded to the west.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'm sorry C --

MR. HEGARTY: To go back, the effect on C
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District, I remember looking at it, and since the
numbers wouldn't change that much, which did surprise me
as well, but I'll get you a better answer on that. I
think bringing in both the Fort Mohave area of 10,000
people total --

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: 100,000 people are
a very large group very politically --

MR. HEGARTY: I'll get you more
information.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The other thing,
where did C lose 100,000 since they picked them up.

MR. HEGARTY: E is expanding to the east
from where it currently is. Your E didn't go as far as
ours would.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: E has to pick up
the northern part of B as well.

I'll wait, see the whole thing as well.

This changes every district except H.

MR. HEGARTY: It does not touch G or H.

We did do something, but we did not touch those
districts. Once you do that, it really becomes a mess.

I'll get back to you on this. I apologize
I don't have the answer.

It's actually better than it looks. We do
have the numbers. I'll get back to you with the
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changes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Do you have a copy of the disk for each of us?

MR. HEGARTY: I can get more for you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: They can make them for us.

Thank you, Mr. Hegarty, very much.

Next speaker, John Keck. I believe next after Mr. Keck, B. L. Donaldson.

A VOICE: I think Donaldson had to go.

Following Mr. Donaldson.

MR. KECK: John Check, K E C K.

I'm here to represent myself. If you, the Commissioners, dig out the map I provided for each of you, I'll refer to it shortly.

I'm sorry many that spoke earlier did not have an opportunity, were not in my public speaking class. My professor taught us to be seen, stand up, to be heard, speak up, most of all, to know when to shut up.

I'm a bit disappointed you did not create a district for citizens of German descent.

I hope you realize I'm being facetious in that joke. You've been barraged by all sorts of citizens and special groups. 10 percent of any of the groups members attend meetings. This means a spokesman
only speaks for that small percentage of the group.

Proposed District N has a minority population of 66 percent, and total minority voting population of 59 percent, this means what used to be a minority is now a majority, and the ethnic group to which I've been assigned is in the minority. Let me say I don't mind this. I've been in the minority before. I do have a couple of questions. Am I now eligible for affirmative action in my district? Can I now bring a class action suit if one of my three legislators is not of my ethnic group?

I guess that's enough of showing how absurd and ridiculous political correctness is.

If you look at the map I provided each of the Commissioners, I'd ask the general audience to bear with me. I live on a fixed income and couldn't afford a copy for each of you.

I wish to propose you exchange a small area between Legislative District I and Legislative District N which will place District N completely within Phoenix, not split across Glendale and Phoenix as it is with that. Also, Legislative District N will now be split across only two Congressional Districts, B and D, rather than three, as is now proposed. Legislative Districts A will still be split across Glendale and
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Phoenix. Also, it will still be split across two Congressional Districts as it is now.

I propose to exchange area Roman Numeral I bounded on the north with 47th Avenue and Orangewood, 45th Avenue and Palmaire, and 43rd Avenue, for area Roman Numeral II, bounded by 31st Avenue, Butler, I-17, and Northern. These two areas are similar in size, multiple dwelling units, single family dwelling units, and commercial area. They did not have single tract figures to be any more indepth.

By the way, does anyone have a logical explanation for why Legislative District W runs from Maricopa County, the Yavapai County line, down to the Cochise County and the Nation of Mexico line?

Thank you very much for the time you've given me.

Do you have any questions?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Keck. I think we can add the population numbers to your map.

(Written Statement of B. L. Donaldson:
"Chairman and Commission Member,
"Thank you very much for volunteering your services to the state of Arizona to serve on the Arizona Independent Redistrict Commission. You have undertaken a seemingly insurmountable task, one which will affect
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the citizens of this great state for the next 10 years. You are not going to be able to satisfy everyone, and looking at your preliminary proposals I am one of those persons.

"The present boundaries of District D remind me of the leper colonies described in the Bible, but rather than dealing with lepers you are dealing with retired people. It is apparent that the members of the Commission have not taken the time to understand the broad range of interest that manifest itself in the retirement communities.

"I will propose a change in the district area to address this flawed thinking, but first I would like to present some reasons why a change needs to be made.

"With one of the top 100 heart hospitals in the United States, serves primarily phase one, two, and four of Sun City and a major area of District H.

"Two, The medical clinics in the south part of Sun City also primarily serve Sun City phase one, two and four and the area described as District H.

"Three, the retail service area also serves the same general area.

"Four, Sun City, home of the volunteers also primarily serves the same area, volunteering in
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schools, churches, long-term care facilities and other
social services agencies.

"Five, many of the recent home sales in
Sun City, phase one, two and four, have been to
pre-retirement persons still employed in Phoenix, Peoria
and Glendale.

"To correct this misunderstanding would
not be difficult and I have already submitted a
compromise plan to accomplish this. To refresh your
memory we would transfer Sun City, south of Bell Road
and west to the alignment with 111th Avenue, then south
to Northern Avenue, leaving the balance of District H as
proposed with the exception of that the portion of
District H north of By-pass 101 would be transferred to
District D.

"If my figures are correct, this would
place 171,367 persons in District D and 170,719 in
District H. This would not appreciably change the party
affiliations, nor would it make a major change in the
ethnic representation.

"Thank you for the opportunity of speaking
to you and I respectfully request that you consider
making this change.

"B.L. Donaldson, 9813 West Casita Court,
Sun City, Arizona 85351.")
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Randall Blecha is the next speaker.

MR. BLECHA: Good evening.

Randy Blecha, Superintendent of the Fowler School District, and my partner.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Alex Hernandez, here in support of the comments.

MR. BLECHA: BLECHA.

I'm Superintendent of the Fowler Elementary School District in southwest Phoenix. I want to speak, take a moment to read a resolution.

I want to read to you on the following topics, reiterate the concept of community of interest, speak to a community of interest, the school district.

We believe the school districts are, in fact, and local governing bodies, should be respected for that purpose.

The second thing, I think, that perhaps makes my comments unique, if paying attention to the first group to ask, please hold onto your chairs, we would ask you to not make a change.

If I may, please, the resolution in support of the redistricting plan, specifically District M:

"Whereas, the Fowler Elementary School
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District Number 45 has been a part of the Tolleson Union High School District since the 1920s, and

"WHEREAS, we believe that the legislative districts should not cut across established school district boundaries thereby placing school districts in two or more Legislative Districts, and

"Whereas, the Fowler Elementary School District has long associated itself with the "west side" valley, and

"Whereas, the proposed redistricting plan, particularly District M, includes all of the Fowler Elementary School District with the Town of Tolleson and the majority of the Tolleson Union High School District,

and

"Whereas, the proposed redistricting plan, particularly District M, does not divide the Fowler School District into two separate school districts,

"NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the undersigned residents, parents, and employees of the Fowler Elementary School District No. 45 support and endorse the current proposed redistricting plan, including District M, as it is presented on the plan dated August 21st, 2001."

There are more than 50 signatures here.

And several folks came here this evening.
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Of course, as a school district, many parents went home to take care of their kids. I'd like to just acknowledge the couple that stayed. Anyone from Fowler that stayed this evening, a couple, I personally thank them for staying and appreciate their time.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next, Charles Ullman. Next -- Mr. Latham asked to withdraw. Malcolm Herbert. Mr. Ullman. MR. ULLMAN: Chairman Lynn, thank you for hearing me.

Chuck Ullman. I'm a senior citizen and resident of Sun City West. I encourage the Independent Redistricting Commission to retain the proposed Legislative District (D)(1) common interests, needs, and objectives that seniors need and have at the present time. Any division of this district reduces the voting power of seniors in each district and probably disenfranchises 28,000 seniors. Senior residents split off the district as proposed previously. We must live in this Legislative District for 10 years. And the growth of seniors in...
communities is static while the remaining area would
have an expected large growth.

Thank you for listening.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Ullman.

I want to make sure we're clear. The

previous speaker talked about a compromise of the

current three districts, Sun City, Sun City West, Sun
City Grand into two districts you are speaking against

that in favor of the current D as we proposed it?

MR. ULLMAN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hubert followed by.

MR. HUBERT: MALCOLM HUBERT.

I'm here as a clear leader for

competition. It's good for business. The proposition,
in my opinion, doesn't call -- competition is necessary
for effective democracy. 60 percent of the people vote,
in the general election, and about 13 percent vote in
the primary election. This 13 percent is largely made
up of the far right and far left. To win the election,
just for argument's sake, I want to say that half are

Republicans, half Democrats. Six-and-a-half percent in
the voting primary are Democrats. Six and a half are
Republicans, essentially. So if, to win an election,
all one has to do in most Arizona districts is win half
of their six and a half percent of registered voters.
It's goofy. We end up with -- if there's more than one candidate in the primary, say four candidates in a primary, you win an election with one or two percent of the registered voters. We end up with legislators with elected representatives who never have to pander to the 60 percent. So as a result, they -- this just allows idiot behavior with no consequences, Legislators calling for dissension from the Union, Legislators for calling for putting a bounty on wolves the federal government are attempting to reintroduce, just goofy; people attempting to pass a resolution for the sole purpose entirely of competition.

When you go into the booth and there is no one to vote for, that has a terrible psychological effect on the voting public. And so I'm just here as a clear leader for competition with no suggestions how we do that. I commend you for your civic task and hope you are able to do that. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Lawson, very much.

Next speaker, Helen Murphy, if Ms. Murphy is still here.

How about Margorie Mead?

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman.

(Discussion off the record.)
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Hang on, Ms. Mead.

Helen Madrid? Then also Ms. Murphy.

MS. HAUSER: In either case, I believe she's no longer present at the meeting.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Marjorie Mead then Councilwoman Greiss or Greiss from Youngtown.

MS. MEAD: Marjorie Mead.

Thank you for the opportunity to address the Commission, and I also want to thank the Commission for your time, effort, and the hard work that has gone into the maps. It's many hours of your time, and we all appreciate it.

I'm a member of the League of Women Voters, which is instrumental in the creation of the fair districts, the Fair Elections Initiative. And I met Mr. Lynn at our convention when you addressed us and I introduced myself to you at the time.

I served on the Committee for Fair Districts Elections Committee. I served as secretary. Most significant, I and most league members anticipated in the creation of the Fair Districts Elections Initiative. There was a greater number of competitive districts. This is because the central goal of the mission of the league has long been to encourage full citizen participation in the electoral process.
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Competitive districts are more apartment
to encourage candidates in representing more than one
electoral party to compete for candidates in those
districts thus allowing voters more choice at the polls.
The League members getting signatures for Pete were most
persuasive for establishment of an increased number of
competitive districts because people were more apt to
vote when they know their will be candidates
representing different political points of view and
different issues, positions on issues.
The League -- in helping to write the
initiative, we were insured one of the six goals of this
initiative was the favoring of competitive districts. I
ask you to please help the League with a hundred percent
competition by having eager, involved voters working
toward a greater number of truly competitive districts.
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Mead.
(Applause.)
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is Councilman Greiss or
Greiss still with us?
How about Verle Naber?
A VOICE: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Naber asked to
withdraw.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you very much.
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Todd Lawson?

Charles Hill?

I'm sorry, Mr. Lawson?

MR. LAWSON: Yes.

Thank you, Mr. Lynn, Chairman Lynn,

Members of the committee.

My name is Todd Lawson. I speak for the
Young Democrats for Maricopa County.

I'm speaking as somebody that circulated
petitions for this initiative that is charged with
protecting and putting this into practice, a very
difficult task. I appreciate the hard work, however, as
we've seen here tonight, we need look no further than
this room to realize the definition communities of
interest is a double edged sword. We've seen minority
groups, one group claiming it is meaning something else,
another group claiming something else. Minority groups
are asking something else.

Look at competitiveness.

You are charged by the Voting Rights Act
to look at communities of interest, racial divides,
things like that, so you do not violate the Voting
Rights Act. The intent of the act produced at this
Commission was to produce competitive districts.
However, districts as drawn create senseless divides.
In every Tucson Legislative District, there is more than a 13 percent advantage for one party, that's six districts. Congressional Districts created more than 16 percent registration between parties.

Central Phoenix is strangely divided creating what I prefer to call rather bulletproof district fortress districts that really protect no one in communities of interest.

People participate, turn out competitive elections and produce a responsive, better government for people.

To create a single concentrated district for a community of interest, I may ask with such community of interest, you've only ended up stifling another community of interest. It's not to disenfranchise the voters' aim to protect permitting communities of interest which will create more problems than we aim to solve by recognizing those interests here.

If you look more towards producing competitive interests, minorities have a shot to be swing districts or a percentage of. That is more than just a token, like the districts presented by the Arizona Democratic Party to serve the communities of interest and serve interests created by the district you
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Lawson.

Next is Elaine Scruggs, Mayor of the City of Glendale.

You are here representing the Mayor?

COUNCILPERSON RIVERA: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: You don't look like the Mayor.

COUNCILPERSON RIVERA: Just bad light.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's late, but --

COUNCILPERSON RIVERA: She's much better looking.

Mine was shorter.

I'll put mine aside. The Mayor had to leave, asked me to read her comments.

If I may, please.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If lengthy, we'd just as soon have them in the record. We get a verbatim statement from the reporter, read every statement.

COUNCILPERSON RIVERA: In deference to her --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: They can be made part of the record. You can read them or submit them, your choice.

COUNCILPERSON RIVERA: I think I'd read
CHAIRMAN LYNN: State your name.

COUNCILPERSON RIVERA: Manny Martinez, Councilmember, Cholla District, northern part of city.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I would like to thank you for returning to Glendale for a second Redistricting Commission meeting. On behalf of the Glendale Council, I would like to make a few comments regarding the latest Legislative maps released August 16th and 17th.

As was stated previously, we believe Glendale has three distinct separate communities of interest: Far West Glendale, which is more rural in nature; Old Town Glendale, with its strong ties to the Hispanic community; and the area near south of Glendale and central/north Glendale with its ties to the Metropolitan Phoenix area.

I would like to thank you for the fact that the proposed state Legislative District map better aligns Glendale's communities of interest than the current district structure, however, there are still a few concerns I'd like placed on the record. The current map does an excellent job of maintaining the central north Glendale community together in District H. And while we share this district with citizens of Peoria, we
believe this area encompasses like interests. We strongly respect the commission make no changes to District H. In regards to our other two communities of interest, the current map continues to divide these groups. Old Town Glendale continues to be represented by several districts, specifically N, M, and L. We believe additional efforts should be taken to better unify this community. Finally, our third community of interest, Far West Glendale, is represented by Districts L and M. Again, we would like to see the Commission make every effort to unify this community.

Regarding Congressional Districts, I would now like to share Glendale's concerns with the current Congressional district maps. After review of the latest maps, it is our strong preference that the earlier version dated August 8 by National Demographics be adopted. We believe that the new congressional district in which Glendale lies, Glendale District A, fails to meet the criteria or intent of the initiative approved by the voters. To quote the initiative directly, it states that "Districts shall be geographically compact and contiguous to the extent practicable; and districts shall respect communities of interest to the extent practicable."

The current district disenfranchises the
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Glendale community and its residents. District A, not only encompasses the entire Western Maricopa County, it stretches as far as Lake Havasu City and Parker. We believe this action inadequately responds to the diverse communities of interest not only within Glendale, but also within these other 19 plus communities. Therefore, we strongly urge you to adopt a congressional plan which respects these differing communities of interest and provides Glendale, and the West Valley, with adequate representation.

I understand that you will hear a lot of comments this evening. Therefore, I would like to reiterate that we strongly oppose dividing our communities of interest. It is my understanding that some changes to the current map will be necessary. I would again like to reiterate our desire that no additional changes be made to Legislative District H, and that representation for central and western Glendale, be revised to better maintain our communities of interest. However, if the Commission believes it is necessary to revise this district, we would again welcome the opportunity to provide our comments on those revisions.

Again, thank you for considering our input on this matter.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you Councilmember Martinez. Appreciate that. We will make that part of the record as well as your comments, if you would like us to incorporate those. We can take yours as well.

(Written submittal by Councilmember Manny Martinez:

"Chairman Lynn and Members of the Commission:

"For the record my name is Manny Martinez, and I am the Glendale Councilmember representing the Cholla District, the most northern area of Glendale.

"Before I begin my comments I would like to once again thank the Commission for all their efforts to establish Congressional and Legislative districts that best represent the needs of Arizona.

"I last presented to you at the June meeting in Glendale and I would like to share my comments base on the current drafts.

"We appreciate your efforts to try to unify the communities of interest in Glendale. Glendale does in fact have three distinct communities of interest: Far West Glendale, which is more rural in nature; Old Town Glendale, with its strong ties to the Hispanic community; and the area of South Glendale and Central/North Glendale with its ties to the metropolitan
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Phoenix area.

"I stated to you at the meeting in June that it was our request to reduce the number of legislative districts that divide our community. We support your efforts to try to identify a district to represent a majority of Glendale.

"We also appreciate the fact that you have better aligned us with communities with whom we have an alliance. It is our hope that the new districts would have the same legislative issues that we do. I realize that the maps are a work in progress. It is my hope that you not modify the current draft of legislative district H which represents my district.

"I would also like to repeat what I stated at the June meeting. It is my hope that you will, one, unify all communities of interest to include city boundaries, neighborhood associations, and minority demographics.

"I do not think the proposed Congressional District best represents the needs of Glendale citizens. The map has linked us with many communities throughout the state that have little in common with Glendale. I like Glendale's current Congressional district configuration much better than what your map proposes.

"Glendale has a community of interest with
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the area South of Glendale.

"Sections of District N, M, L could be zoned together as in the original map that the consultants did.

"Thank you."

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next one, Caleb Soptelean, followed by George Powers.

Is Mr. Powers still with us?

MR. SOPTELEAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

State Legislative candidate in District One, it currently consists of Yavapai County in the severe extreme, a nasty dog leg over in Havasu and Bullhead. I can say it makes no sense in the current scheme of things to have part of Yavapai County, Prescott, namely the sprawling leg that goes over Bullhead, Havasu, and Bullhead once again. In order to drive that, you have to leave your district. Trust me, I've done it.

My campaign is actively involved in fair districts, fair elections. We were out collecting signatures for this, strongly supported it. Initiatives made the ballot. This one, I was most strongly in favor of as a conservative Republican.

Item C on the goals, districts be geographically compact and contiguous to the extent
practicable. I know when you went up in Prescott, they were hard and heavy on the issue. And I live Black Canyon City. It wasn't easy to come to this meeting.

I'm here.

Correct me if I'm wrong. Yavapai County currently exists of 171,000 people, about what you're shooting for. Simple arithmetic, a geographic and contiguousness district, all Yavapai County should be one Legislative District. If you must rip off any portion, only a portion of Sedona, Sedona, split a portion of Yavapai County with a portion of Coconino. What I understand the people of Sedona said is they look more toward Flag anyway. Maybe that's something you might want to consider.

I previously lived in the Wickenburg area, Wickenburg and Yarnell for 40 years. There is a move afoot in Wickenburg of annexing with Yavapai. If you chop off Sedona, you might consider putting Wickenburg in with Yavapai County.

I'm echoing comments read for Mayor Scruggs on Congressional District A. Off the cuff, I'd say the way the dog leg goes up, pulls in the Hopis is grotesque, to put it mildly, and does not meet the geographical compactness tests. I don't know what somebody was smoking when they did that. Be that as it
Finally, I would say that probably if you put Kingman with Havasu and Bullhead City in the Legislative Districts, that's pretty much it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next slip, George Powers.

Is George Powers with us?

Liz Farley.

MS. FARLEY: Good evening or good morning. There are not very many people left. I'd like to speak on behalf myself as a resident of Glendale, also as a Congressional candidate speaking this time as a regular old resident that voted for this proposition.

I'm concerned that Congressional District A, as the districts we heard, I do not like the way it's split off. I understand you are having previous meetings and there is a need to include the Hopi in that area.

As the dog leg continues up through seven counties, it does not seem to be necessary.

I suggest at this time remove Coconino, Gila, and La Paz County from here and expand the area up into Yavapai. And that looks to be approximately the right amount of geographic area, approximately the correct population, without that data, additionally, help make the district more compact and more contiguous.
Help keep the communities of interest together and reduce the split.

At this time the current configuration splits across 11 Legislative Districts. It does not appear very compact at all.

On the topic of Legislative Districts, once again, as a resident of Glendale, you split Glendale into multiple pieces. I agree with portions of what Mayor Scruggs said. I do agree H does need to be modified, H needs to be modified to pick up the bottom piece of I, the lower piece Glendale. I further believe you need to work the piece below that, which I think was L, and pick up the entire lower piece of Glendale in order to accommodate restrictions on population.

My suggestion is to take the line above Union Hills, currently known as the Arrowhead Ranch area, move it over to I, approximately the same amount of population. I believe those areas, the Arrowhead area is more in line with the North Phoenix area, and then the bulk of Glendale's interests are together.

I had several other Glendale residents that agreed with this proposition. They had to go because of time.

Thank you for allowing me to address you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Farley.
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Let's take a five-minute break, resume at five after 10:00.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ladies and gentlemen, we have 10 more speakers based on the list I have. I'll go through the list at the very end.

Next speaker, Bill Feldmeier.

Mr. Feldmeier, who I thought said he was here.

MR. FELDMEIER: I'm here.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Feldmeier followed by Dr. Marsha Presley.

MR. FELDMEIER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate this opportunity.

I'm here to visit with you this evening about the current draft Congressional District A map. That was part of the packet this evening that I've seen in the newspaper most recently.

Before I begin to visit with you, share with you, I'm a contractor of Arizona, and landlord, and I was a Yavapai County Supervisor for almost 11 years and retired, resigned from that, if you will, almost two years ago and took a position in Governor Hall's office as her representative for Northern Arizona.

I want to make it clear that, for those of
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you here and the record, I'm not here in that capacity,
meaning for Governor Hall. I'm here to speak on some
observations I have and learned as a County Supervisor
and in the two years I've been her representative in
Northern Arizona.

I came here from Yavapai County this
evening and missed both of the last two meetings you had
in the Prescott area. I was out working in the field,
if you will, in my capacity with the Governor's Office.

I wanted to share with you some
observations I had, break it down into tow observations.
One, as a first-time county supervisor, more recently in
my time on Governor Hall's staff, as a Supervisor and
business person in Yavapai County I began to recognize
the unique opportunities our region had and how that
region was interconnected.

I worked very closely with my counterparts
in the counties of Yavapai, La Paz, Mohave, and
Northwestern Maricopa County on issues that were of
really great concern and common interest to us, and I
began to recognize in a short period of time issues in
the counties, particularly the northwestern part
Maricopa County, had very much in common.

Some issues I want to share with you
briefly, water, water quality, recreation, the CaniMex
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corridor, landfills, air quality, and, almost more importantly than all of them, a very high growth rate.

I also want to add to them, the territory is owned, if you will, or overseen by the federal government, more B.L.M. than there is a Forest Service. Realistically the issues are urbanalized issues rapidly growing area in all those I've described. The part two is my experience as the Governor's representative in the State of Arizona. I want you to know, too, when I took that position, I came to that responsibility with the preconceived notion I would understand what those issues in the north and northeastern Arizona were, meaning I thought they were very much the same as issues I just described. In fact, in some cases they are polls apart, 180 degrees.

Of the counties I represent, most are Coconino, Navajo, Apache, the upper portion of Coconino County, they were dealing with issues for the most part foreign to me I have come to learn well over the past few years. I want to share a couple of those several issues right now, timber cuts, grazing allotment cutbacks, increasing elk populations, the loss of jobs, and the need for growth, Indian nation issues from too large tribes, Navajos and White Mountain Apaches, declining populations in several communities impact
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revenue streams, more recently because of the Census, and in these areas, there is more Forest Service than there is B.L.M.

The issues were entirely different than what is occurring on the other side of -- western side of Arizona. And I began to realize these issues I've just described are more rural in nature, certainly different than other issues I just described have gone through, we're dealing with issues meaning rural, urban, as relates to this map.

This comes to a critical portion, what I would like to leave you with. We are in Yavapai County being put into an area where they have significantly rural issues which are entirely different than the urban issues we've been dealing with over the last 10 years. My suggestion to you is that you move us back to western Arizona and Northwestern Maricopa County, much like the consultants map originally recognized, and I suggest to you also that the consultant's map more accurately reflects the community of interest we have with western Arizona as opposed to those in northeastern Arizona.

I'd also suggest to you that, particularly hearing the comments delivered by the Councilman related to the Mayor of Glendale's remarks, they are not pleased with the way that line is drawn. And the instantaneous
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thought came to my mind that the shift easily take place moving Glendale into the arena they are interested in there by freeing up the population for Yavapai and the far western part of Coconino County, meaning the Williams area on up to Grand Canyon the parks area of the Grand Canyon shifting them over to the west as well. I would hope you certainly consider that, particularly recognizing Glendale is certainly offering up to move over to the other side.

I must also, in closing, mention to you while I was listening to the comments earlier, I got a page and went out and called, a friend of mine sits on Prescott Valley Town Council. There is no one here from those communities or the Tri-City community. You met with them the other night when I was on assignment in Southern Arizona, it was discussed quite vividly, their concerns about the Legislative District.

Mr. Flannery, Councilman Flannery mentioned to me this evening, asked me to relate to you Prescott, Prescott Valley, Chino Valley, Yavapai, a quarterly session of the Regional Association of Governments said they slipped by not conversing with you about the Congressional concerns. And Mike asked me to convey to you the concern I just now expressed on my own and said that he has asked me to be a point person on
your staff, he's the point person for the local
governments, and described to discuss with your staff
how maps might be adjusted to convey that portion of
Yavapai, if not all of it, back towards Northern
Arizona. With that, if you'd take any suggestion, I'd
offer my new line to your Congressional District A map.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Feldmeier.
As the point person, tell Mr. Flannery,
someone from Yavapai County, whatever comments they have
or whatever maps they'll be supplying, or if not maps, a
description of concerns on the Congressional District,
just get those to the Commission office, Redistricting
Office, make sure they get into the process.

MR. FELDMEIER: Okay. Would you also
suggest that they might work with the Mayor of Glendale
to discuss how that possibility work?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: That's up to them.

MR. FELDMEIER: Would that assist in
working through that issue with the Commission?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: You might certainly infer
from the Commission's comments, when somebody has
mentioned, somebody makes a proposal that is not
supposedly self-contained, asks to come to back other
communities, we've asked if there has been communication
with other communities, if changes in the community take
place.

MR. FELDMEIER: I'll convey that to Councilman Flannery and convey that they carry on.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you very much.

Dr. Marsha Presley and following

Dr. Presley, JoMarie McDonald.

DR. PRESLEY: Mr. Chairman and Commission,

I appreciate being allowed to speak here.

I'm not a member of any coalition or member of any major party.

Marsha, M A R S H A, Presley, just like Elvis, P R E S L E Y.

When I voted in Proposition 106, I understood voting in favor competitive districts. If you do not consider competition an issue, nobody wins. Without competitiveness, people get the message their vote doesn't count. People stop voting. When people stop voting, people stop running for office. You don't get candidates anymore. Without competition and with voter apathy, they don't have to start and they can do whatever they want.

So I urge you to consider competitiveness in the second phase.

Although not a member of any coalitions here, I support the Coalition for Fair Redistricting
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Legislative Districts. And as a citizen of Tempe, I'm in favor of being included in the Downtown Competitive District.

I am a citizen of Tempe but live south of Guadalupe and west of Kyrene. The current districts puts me in District T, removes me from the city, removes from the University. It's a noncompetitive district, has completely silenced my vote.

I urge you to also maintain the integrity Tempe in further deliberations.

I appreciate the hard work of the Commission and the imbalance you have. And thank you for the work.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

Next speaker, JoMarie McDonald.

Ms. McDonald followed by Kevin Clayborn.

MS. MCDONALD: JoMarie McDonald, and I'm here representing the Phoenix Community Alliance.

The Phoenix Community Alliance has been serving the Central Phoenix for over 16 years, and it represents members from the business community, arts, cultural, educational, a broad spectrum of Central Phoenix.

I'm here as an advocate on behalf of downtown.
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Two reasons, one, we feel the downtown district is competitive, and secondly, and very briefly, is serving a community of interest that is critical to the future of the entire community with the broad spectrum of urban transit, the complexities of brown fields and blight and crime, we need to have a voice in Washington. It is critical to our future. And over the years, it has been drastically underserved.

I'm here just to advocate on behalf of the future this part of our community.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

Kevin Clayborn, next speaker, followed by Dorothy Schultz.

MR. CLAYBORN: Good evening, Chairman Lynn, Members of the Commission.

District A as drawn includes the entire City of Glendale. And contrary to city leaders, I'm in favor of that, like the City of Glendale being in one Congressional District, not being divided into two. City Legislative Districts M and L currently have the City of Glendale in four districts.
We already have heard comments that other citizens would 
like to see that reduced. So would I.

The southern part of Glendale is divided, 
L and M. I would like to see you change the northern 
boundary of M to Camelback Road.

Citizens, people living north of Camelback 
Road are in one school district. People living south 
are in another school district. There are differences 
in services, so it would just make more logical sense if 
you keep the citizens in Glendale in as few districts as 
possible. If you give up, if you give up the northern 
portion of M, it's about -- L could give up the section 
south of Camelback and east of 99th Avenue, the far 
western edge of Maryvale, the edge of Phoenix, keep all 
the edge of Maryvale in one district, not divide them. 
Both areas are roughly six square miles of area. Both 
contain roughly the same population.

I do not know the statistics: Hispanics, 
Democrats, Republicans. We were always taught we were 
Americans and voters.

Thank you for hearing my comments.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Clayborn.

Next speaker, Dorothy Schultz, followed by 
Dave Braun.

MS. SCHULTZ: Hello.
Again, when I spoke to you at Phoenix Union, you had not a chance really to look at this in detail. And welcome to the political world. You can't please anyone, can you? And I need to say, I have a great deal of respect for anyone that steps forward and runs for office and serves in any capacity. You have a very difficult job.

You've heard from a lot of different community interest groups. But what we haven't really heard from very much, I haven't heard specifically defined, is our largest community interest group, and that's the voter.

We, as Americans, as a political scientist, from the sixties to now, I have seen the respect for our political institutions, the respect for those we elect, indeed respect for those that step forward to serve as you have diminished and been subjected to all sorts of accusations, usually unfounded. But, the bottom line is when people go to vote and don't have a choice, or are told the only choice they have is twiddley dee and twiddley dumm, that's totally not true, whole not true. Our country and system have served enough. This system served enough. Our country depends on you to get competitive districts.
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19 percent, I did some figuring, 19 percent, roughly, a little less, of the voters belong to no party, Democrat or Republican. I think it is disgraceful that some party, parties and candidates, want safe districts for themselves. It's undemocratic. I have criticized candidates of own party when they sue parties off the ballot to prevent having a competitive primary. Democracy, competitiveness, I respect government, respect elected officials and those that serve. It thrives only when you have competition. It is a tragedy when we get our Timothy McVeys and other people so disenfranchised, so alienated, they strike out as terrorists and we have shocking, another shock to shake us to the core today. So we need to start looking and retweaking this. You already listened tonight, you have a hopeless situation if you try to satisfy everybody. Let's aim at the biggest community of interest, and that's our voters.

Try, I looked at some districts, and they can be tweaked, and all, so you get anywhere from -- let me just give you percentages of Democrats and Republicans. My own figures, 19 percent, roughly, independents, 37 percent Democrats, and 43 percent
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Republicans. We shouldn't have any districts with 59 percent. Every Congressional District in this state should be competitive. We have gone 10 years with six districts that have not been competitive. And most of our Legislative Districts haven't even fielded candidates. And at that, I want to thank you again for your service. I know it's a job that nobody really will justly appreciate. I thank you for the service you are serving.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Schultz.

The next speaker is Dave Braun followed by Meg Burton Cahill.

MR. BRAUN: David Braun, B R A U N.

I'm speaking for myself. I've been a lawyer for 25 years, also served as a judge in the Maricopa Justice Courts for 12 years in the 1980s and 1990s.

First of all, let me thank the Members of the Commission for perhaps taking on an impossible task. I've been an active participant and observer of your work, complement you on the diligence, energy, patience, especially considering some of the verbal abuse you've suffered by the various speakers and information you have received.

Notwithstanding that, I am somewhat

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
disappointed with the First Draft Legislative Districts,
disappointed for two reasons, the totality of the
districts created, I do not believe that the Commission
results comply with the competitiveness requirement of
Proposition 106. Second, I do not believe that the
ethnic packing that was done by the Commission will ever
comply with the Voting Rights Act, United States
Constitution, or United States Supreme Court
Constitution. For these reasons, I believe the current
proposal is contrary to law and will not, should not
withstand Department of Justice review or both state and
federal challenges which are inevitable.

I reference competitiveness, heard
speakers discuss that, so I will summarize basically
what I'm about to say. I heard some Commissioners make
a public statement about minimizing competitiveness as a
requirement of Proposition 106.

I do not believe there is the slightest
evidence, however, to indicate that the six goals listed
in the amendment were to be weighted less or considered
in decreasing order of importance.

According to authors of the proposition,
the specific language, goal of F, you do not mean
competitive districts are not important, rather it's
meant simply that it's virtually impossible to create a
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competitive district without making growth an outrageous deviation from other goals than that district did not need to consider or be competitive.

Everyone involved in the political process, from the very beginning, new certain boundaries, city lines, would have to be cut in new lines. Not all eight Congressional Districts could be compact with Arizona disbursed throughout as large a geographical entity as our state. And the language of the amendment itself states the five, six goals limited only by the phrase "to the extent practicable," unquote. So you have been given some discretion on how to achieve the policy goals of Proposition 106.

Please review what the proposition action states, the official title placed at the very top of the proposition being circulated for voter signatures. The written election ballot states "The Amendment is creating an Independent Commission to oversee a mapping for Fair Independent Congressional Legislative Districts," unquote. That is the only substantive description given to the voters as to exactly what they were voting on. In fact, almost all authors presented four arguments in the November 2000 voters' pamphlets, pamphlet, argued for the proposition the electoral process would benefit genuine political competition.
For instance, just consider the arguments of the former Attorney General of the State, Grant Woods, certainly an able attorney, who wrote, in part, "For too long both parties created Legislative Congressional Districts to protect their incumbents. Such gerrymandering will not make real political competition and short-changes all of us." And he continues, "By transferring the redistricting responsibility from self-interests of politicians, to independent citizens, it will create balance, better districts, better elections, generate more competition, more accountability, and better government for all Arizonians."

While we all know you will not be able to create eight Congressional, 30 Legislative Districts that are competitive, you should create as many as possible.

For instance, I suggest you create four competitive Congressional Districts consciously moving dividable communities of interest that tend to be heavily Democratic or Republican in any way into the other Legislative or other Congressional Districts, if that makes those four Congressional Districts actually less competitive, those results are both appropriate and legal. It is better four out of eight districts be competitive rather than one or two out of eight. And
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similarly, at least 10 of 30 Legislative Districts could conform to this policy. Again, it's better 10 Legislative Districts remain competitive, even if the other 20 are not as theoretically competitive. Going from 15 percent one party 17, 18, 20 percent one party, really doesn't change reality. Rather, the current system, current map, creates three or four legitimately competitive districts.

Regarding the second issue, in reference to racial packing, that is a real disappointment. I believe that the Commission in its endeavors to satisfy the Voting Rights Act perhaps has gone overboard for and in fact in an effort to abide, or rather fell into the trap of racial profiles.

While the Supreme Court approved partisan gerrymandering as a practice, it does not allow you to violate the Constitution or the Voting Rights Act. Racial gerrymandering does. Racial packing, such as what was done in District D in South Phoenix with a 73.3 minority vote; District G, 61.4 percent minority vote, does pack so as to diminish the minority influence upon another Congressional District. And that, in and of itself, is a violation of the Voting Rights Act.

Packing obviously can be done by separating a minority among lots of districts so that
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the minority has no influence in an election. But packing can also be done by concentrating, packing, putting as many minorities into a Congressional District so as to diminish the influence may have, even if they don't have an overwhelming voting strength in that other Congressional District. And notwithstanding some of my friends in the Hispanic community, that is racial discrimination.

I suggest strongly that is unlikely to survive Department of Justice review or litigation I shall pursue.

By appropriate mapping, you could separate equal minority influence districts that are 51, 52, 53 percent minority yet conform with other requirements of Proposition 106, the Voting Rights Act, and the Supreme Court.

Vote so things could also allow you to make Congressional Districts genuinely competitive and yet not diminish the minority influence of other districts, not choose the district victor in an election.

In conclusion, there is time left to do the job under Proposition 106. It is your obligation to comply with the law. Turn your computers back on. Turn on your consultants again. And complete the hard task
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you were assigned to bring the partisan component to many political districts and races as possible.

I thank you for your attention.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Braun.

Meg Burton Cahill followed by Shirley McAllister.

REPRESENTATIVE CAHILL: Meg, M E G, Burton, B U R T O N, Cahill, C A H I L L.

I had originally not planned to speak this evening. I planned to be in San Francisco at a Transit Conference and Sustainable Development Conference. Seeing as we have no flights out, this was my second choice.

I really commend you for what you are doing and the time you've taken in allowing the number of people to speak that you have this evening. I know it's a very tiring evening. I think this is a very valuable process.

I just spoke at the meeting held at Mesa Community College very early in the summer. I hadn't intended to speak at that meeting, either. I was the very first speaker because my good friend put my name in on the slip and low and behold I was the first person called.

I want to talk about a few things very
briefly. One is the idea of a downtown competitive
district. I think that's very important for my part of
Maricopa County. My community of Tempe is in support of
this idea. I know there are a lot transit redevelopment
areas in Phoenix, Scottsdale, Tempe. I'll go ditto,
ditto, ditto with things said by Cody Williams, by
Mr. Ortega from Scottsdale, many other things spoken by
many people that have spoken this evening.

One other point, I got a call today from a
friend that said "I'd love to go to the meeting but I
can't go." She's very physically challenged, said it
would take no less than five hours to get from Tempe to
here. She said, "Since you've not leaving town, I'd
like you to go for me." She's going to send an e-mail,
Christine Coglin.

Speaking on behalf of myself and
Christine, I'd mention or bring up the fact that at the
last meeting at Mesa Community College there was a group
of citizens testifying and talking about how Tempe is
very diverse and there was another group of people who
talked about how North Tempe and South Tempe are two
totally different communities. What Christine wanted me
to relate to you was the effects of or outcome of the
Mayoral race held yesterday. And the Mayor won his
recall with 67.6 percent of the people.
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What is interesting is at the last meeting, at the Mesa Community College, a small fraction of people were saying something very different about North-South Tempe. As a Mayor race goes, he did win by 67.6 percent.

There are 19 municipal precincts in Tempe. Down in precinct 18 at the very near bottom of Tempe, the Mayor won by 67.21 percent. In one of the most northern precincts, 70.8 percent. It's a very small -- very small, random mixture of percentages only .2 in each precinct.

I think this shows that even though we don't always agree on things, there's a very strong community of interest in Tempe. And I believe what I've and heard over the years from Tempe, we'd like to be all unified.

It seems kind of ironic to me in the beginning there was a small section of North Tempe that wanted to be unified with the rest of Tempe. It looks like at best we're going to be able to get have -- lose a little of South Tempe. I think it's too bad. It's very unique to Tempe in the East Valley.

And I'm ready to answer any questions, if you have any.

I understand you have none.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Cahill.

REPRESENTATIVE CAHILL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Shirley McAllister,

S H I R L E Y, M C A L L I S T E R, former president of the Sun City Democrats and currently secretary of the Maricopa County Democrats.

I'm here tonight to speak myself. I'd prefer to have left an hour or two or earlier, but I couldn't leave without letting you know many of us in Sun City and Sun City West are opposed to the proposition presented at the beginning of the evening that parts of Sun City should be divided out from the proposal that you have presented for District D.

Mike Dubin was here from Sun City West and planned to speak. He left. He agrees. Jack Adler, also from Sun City West, I assume they agreed with Mike. At least Mike and I talked. I know Mike agrees with me on that point.

The Sun City -- I live in the area that they wanted to separate from the rest of Sun City.

Sun City has been part of three separate districts as long as I've lived there. And I don't like that arrangement. Sun City is not a large enough community to be divided into three districts or even two. It's 40,000 people. It's a stable community,
surrounded completely, is not going to be growing.

There is no reason all of Sun City should not be in one
district.

We have a lot of common interests with Sun
City West, Sun City Grand, Youngtown, and numerous
communities located in north Peoria all listed in
District D. And each of these communities have a unique
features, but we do have commonalty of interest. So I
request that you continue with that.

By joining these communities in one
district we may have better representation, even though
we have fewer people representing us, than we've had in
the past, because the representation we've had
previously has not been responsive to many in our
community.

We do not have public forums. People who
represent us do not make any effort to contact people
other than of their own party. I hope if we had one
representative or one district, then they would be more
responsive to us.

I have confidence seniors throughout the
rest of the state would be persuasive in generating good
legislation for seniors.

I appreciate the work you're doing for the
Commission and I'll end my remarks there.
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If there are any questions, I'm happy to respond.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. McAllister, very much.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you very much.

John Mills.

John Mills speaks.

MR. MILLS: John Mills, M I L L S.

I have lived in the Arcadia area and would like to rise in strong opposition to the plan presented by some people tonight regarding the new Congressional Districting plan. I believe the Democratic party presented this plan. This plan completely eviscerates the Arcadia area, cuts us into several different pieces. I think that is completely wrong.

From just looking at the map, at least my little portion of it, District C, it seems you sacrificed a community of interest on the alter of competitiveness. And this sacrifice is completely unwarranted given the wording of Proposition 106.

Any time that you are developing legislation and have multiple competing interests in different items in this legislation, the most important is listed first and least important is listed last. If
any other, unless there is some specific keynote which
denotes the priority of these things, you have to take
them in order of importance from first to last;
otherwise how could you possibly balance the different
communities of -- different competing interests.
So the reason that competitiveness was put
last was because you must fulfill the rights of the
minorities, the Voting Rights Act, and that is paramount
in legislation, because that is federal legislation.
Whatever we put in the State Constitution makes no
difference if it goes against federal law, so Voting
Rights Act and then communities of interest. That has
to be the most important.
Most people that spoke tonight have said
my community of interest is this, and my community of
interest is that. These communities of interest are the
ones most important. Competitiveness is such a small
portion of this.
Take the East Valley. Everything from
Country Club Road to the county line, there is five --
enough people put five Legislative Districts there. How
on earth do you make that competitive? There is no way
to make that competitive. It's enough for a full
Congressional District. Here again, how do you make
that competitive? It's impossible unless you try to do
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these unnatural arms and legs, pulling in different
communities.

North Scottsdale, how do you make that
competitive? It's next to impossible.

South Phoenix, how do you make it
competitive? That's impossible. I could go on for 20
minutes on that, but I promise I won't.

Suffice it to say competitiveness is being
put over above communities of interest and that is
something the Commission need not do and should not do.

I'll not threaten with lawsuits or
anything else like that, but that is how the law was
written, and please follow the law.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Mills.

Let me run through the names again of the
speakers for whom I have slips that may not be here:

Drew Hunsaker, Mike Dubin, Barry Goedfarb, C. J. Riggle,
Al Carroll, Jack Adler, Esther Duran Lumm, Cheryl
Hunter, Eduardo Delci, Steve Schallenberger, Tom
Eggleston, Ray Pendergast?

Any individuals still here this evening?

Any member of the public wishing to be
heard?

Come forward, state your name for the
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record, and spell it, please.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Chairman Lynn.

Bill Evans, E V A N S.

I want to just thank all of you for your performance in developing this. I do believe probably one of the primary needs of any electoral body is competition. I think one of the ways we get it is to use concise, compact geographical areas. I think you've done pretty much that, with maybe the -- to eliminate gerrymandering in the routine. I appreciate it. You must be doing a good job since getting a lot of complaints.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Evans.

Are there other members of the public wishing to be heard at time?

Comments or questions from the Commission?

Legal counsel?

Consultants?

I want to thank those of you able to stay with us until the end. It's not quite as late as Yavapai County, but it was an instructive evening nonetheless.

We appreciate everyone's comments and thank you very much.
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The Commission will be adjourned.

(Whereupon, the Commission adjourned at 10:50 p.m.)

* * * *
BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing hearing was taken before me, LISA A. NANCE, RPR, CCR, Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Arizona, Certificate Number 50349; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing 159 pages constitute a true and accurate transcript of all proceedings had upon the taking of said hearing, all done to the best of my ability.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto, nor am I in any way interested in the outcome hereof.

DATED at Phoenix, Arizona, this 21st day of September, 2001.

LISA A. NANCE, RPR, CCR
Certified Court Reporter
Certificate Number 50349
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