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

For the record, four of the five Commissioners are present. Mr. Hall is in transit and will be here. He's in transit, coming in from California. He'll be here as soon as he can.

We have both legal counsel represented.

Let me start at my extreme right, make introductions, if I can do this without messing it up.

At the end of the table is Dr. Alan Heslop representing our primary consultant, National Demographics Corporation.

Next to Dr. Heslop, Jose Rivera.

Next to Jose, the other part of our legal duo, Lisa Hauser.

To my immediate right is Jim Huntwork, Commissioner.

To my left, Dan Elder, Commissioner.
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At the table in front of the dias this evening is Andi Minkoff, Vice Chairman of the Commission. She will be making a Power Point presentation momentarily.

Back to the table, our stenographer is Lisa Nance.

(Chairman Lynn introduces the interpreter, Alica Nieto Jacobs, in Spanish, and asks the audience if anyone desires the services of a Spanish interpreter. No one requests the services of an interpreter.)

COMMISSIONER ELDER: You have to do nothing.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We do that at every session in case there are those more comfortable in Spanish. We do have interpretation services available.

Let me also introduce Adolfo Echeveste, Executive Director for the Commission.

There are also other Commission staff present. If we have time this evening, we'll introduce them.

The schedule this evening is as follows:

There will be a brief Power Point presentation, as is custom, showing where we are, where we expect to go. Then the bulk of the evening is for you to talk to us.

If you've not already done so and wish to
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speak this evening, we'd ask you to fill out one of the yellow slips. They are available from staff members or at the back desk, the desk near the door where you came in. We'd appreciate it if you have one and wish to speak, fill one out. Staff will collect it. Once you fill it out, we'll take them in the order you fill out the slips.

I will ask when you make the presentation, we'll have the podium moved more centered to the table so we may talk to you a little more freely. We ask when you come make your presentation, state your name. If you have an unusual name, spell your name so the stenographer can enter it appropriately in the record.

After you've made your comments, remain at the podium to see if there are any comments directed your way by the Commissioners or anyone on the panel. We appreciate that very much.

With that, let me turn it over to Vice Commissioner Minkoff for the Power Point presentation.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Is this mike live?

First of all, excuse my back. I'm about to turn around so I can see the screen, know what I'm talking about. After I finish, I'll go back up there so
we can be face to face. For now, please excuse my back.

As the screen states, this is one in the second round of public hearings the Commission is holding in many parts of the state to solicit public input from the people on what they think of the draft maps so far, what they think about any changes, if any, they'd like to see us make.

The purpose of the plans is showing examples of the districts we drew, explaining why they're drawn the way they're drawn, how they got that way. Also we have wall maps in the back of the room you can look at, enlarged maps of the draft maps with the details of the specific areas of the state.

We have an additional handout of materials, the citizen kits. They are the large manila envelope you should have received when you came in. If anyone did not receive a manila envelope, one will be brought to you.

At the end of the meeting, if you have the energy, we're happy to stay to talk to you as individual Commissioners.

Please remember one thing. The maps we're showing you are drafts. We know they can be improved. Many people have told us we should improve them. We intend to improve them. We believe you can help us
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improve them with the comments you'll have tonight.

Last year the people of Arizona voted in the November election by a rather substantial majority to establish the Independent Redistricting Commission. Citizen redistricting follows explicit criteria for drawing new districts. These are the rules.

The first two rules relate to federal requirements, the equal protection clause of the United States Constitution and the United States Voting Rights Act. And the provisions of those two documents require us, first of all, to have districts that are substantially equal in population, one person, one vote, and, as a matter of fact, especially with Congressional Districts, federal government has held a pretty strict standard as to the terms. With the six current Congressional Districts we had, they differed as of 1990 the Census by only one person. Our goal as a Commission is to get those districts as equally populated as we possibly can and also to create state Legislative Districts of relatively equal population. Although the courts until now had a little more flexible standard for state legislative districts, that's one of the requirements of the federal government.

The other, the United States Voting Rights Act, requires we not diminish the rights of any
minorities to elect candidates of their choosing. So we must also take that into consideration in drawing districts.

The other four characteristics are criteria contained within Proposition 106. Criterion C says districts be geographically compact to the extent practicable.

Notice the phrase "to the extent practicable" occurs frequently in Prop 106. That's because on occasion guidelines conflict with one another. If you make a district compact, contiguous might run afoul. We have a balancing act to do. We have to do so to the extent practicable.

District boundaries must respect communities of interest. We heard a lot about that in the first round of hearings. There will be a lot said on that.

To the extent practicable, once again, we must use visible geographic features, respect local city, county, and town boundaries, and undivided Census tracts.

Finally, to the extent practicable, competitive districts should be favored where to do so would create no significant detriment to the other goals.
I'll talk about competitive districts in a little while.

Proposition 106 had a requirement we think is unique to Arizona. It required us to start with a grid.

A grid, according to the dictionary, is a rather rectangular straight-lined kind of map, or draft. We decided to use townships as the building blocks for this grid. Townships are six miles square, regular boundaries, straight lines. We felt that was a good building block. It is geometric in shape. That would allow us to create a grid. However, we then superimposed Census tracts on top of the grid because they had the population figures we needed. That led to some modification of the lines. Census tracts usually follow county boundaries and other natural boundaries and were not as straight as townships.

This grid took into account only population. None of the other criteria of Prop 106 were to be utilized in drawing the grid.

Once the grid was developed, it had to be adjusted pursuant to the other mandates.

Here are the Congressional and Legislative maps we drew. As you can see, there are a lot of
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nonstraight lines in these maps, and it's because of the Census tracts that we used.

The grids did not take any communities of interest into consideration, cut across many county boundaries, city boundaries, all kinds of things. We knew we'd have to adjust them, and we have.

To help us adjust the grid, we held 24 public hearings in our first series of public hearings in many parts of the state. We invited citizens to complete citizen forms. Many did. You could complete them at the public hearings, do them on website, write letters to us, and many of you did. And we had an incredible amount of public input that made it clear Arizona had a very firm belief in respecting communities of interest and respecting boundaries of cities, towns, boundaries of other local governments, and that became the basic principles and guiding approach as we moved further and people also developed information for us about their communities of interest which we have called Arizona Units of Representation, or AURs.

We learned from the hearings that there were three major AURs, three major communities of interest we should begin recognizing: Tribal representations, not only Native Americans and people living on reservations, people around the state felt
these people represented communities of interest. These
people should be kept together when drawing districts.

The Hispanic community was another one
pointed out and emphasized by large numbers of people.
The other thing we heard as we went around the state,
rural and urban interests were very different both in
rural and urban areas.

There was a lot of sentiment we should, to
the extent possible, create separate rural and urban
districts. Because the Commission followed these
mandates and citizen input, first of all, we have many
fewer city and town splits.

The existing Congressional Districts split
16 cities and towns. Remember, there were only six
existing Congressional Districts. We created eight
draft Congressional Districts and split only six cities
and towns. One, Phoenix, is too large for one
Congressional District and would be split under any
plan.

Existing Legislative Districts split 39
cities and towns. Our draft maps split only a third as
many cities and towns; once again, many larger than the
171,000 target population would be split under any plan.

We really tried to keep cities towns
together. The same thing with counties. It's not
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always possible. Some cities cross county boundaries. Many tribes cross county boundaries. Elsewhere, effort was really made to unite county boundaries. We've added two additional Congressional Districts. Elsewhere, we only split six counties in the draft plan. The Legislative draft districts split 15 draft districts. Our plan splits nine of the counties, kept many, many more of them united. And the state's major communities of interest, those three AURs that were identified, are respected in the draft plans.

No tribal reservations are divided and in many cases we tried to combine two, three, four or more tribal reservations in the districts to create a Native American community of interest.

The Hispanic community of interest, when located in the same geographic area, we tried to respect.

Rural and urban areas are distinguished. Most rural communities of interest are respected. You have to keep in mind, many AURs are in conflict. We couldn't satisfy all of them. There is built-in inconsistency in some of them.

We'll now deal with the competitiveness of those districts.
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Proposition 106 stated the Commission could not consider competitiveness early in the process. Under Prop 106, competitiveness should be considered only after the initial mapping process, only after the drawing of map process should it be considered and then only when there is no substantial detriment to any of the other goals.

We're anxious to elicit testimony from you regarding competitiveness of the draft districts. We encourage you to tell us whether or not we should be more competitive, if you think they should be. If you have suggestions how we might do that, we'd appreciate that as well.

We're about to look at the draft map of the Arizona eight Congressional Districts. This is the map. Quite honestly, the contrast doesn't show up very well on this screen. However, you do have this map in the manila envelope and can see it much, much more clearly. Plus, also, there are area maps of both the Phoenix and Tucson area to let you see a lot more detail of the districts which are quite small.

These are draft maps we want you to comment on tonight. These are the draft maps of the Phoenix Metropolitan area, and here is the Tucson area.

We also completed a plan for the Arizona
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30 districts. It's hard to see, certainly hard to see
detail on this map. There is one in the citizen kit.

These are the Legislative Districts in the
Phoenix Metropolitan area. These are the Legislative
Districts in the Tucson area. In these districts, you
see they are much smaller, only 171,000 people.

If you want to know a little more about
the exact boundary lines, especially within the
metropolitan areas, the individual maps of each one of
these districts will allow you to see a little more
detail about the area they cover.

We're now asking for your input, whether
favorable or negative. If you like the way they are,
tell us; tell us you don't want us to us change them.
If you want changes, tell us what they are. Tell us the
general ways, if you prefer. However, as much detail as
you can give us, we'd prefer. Detail is helpful where
you'd like us to meet the line.

If you want to testify and have not yet
turned in a yellow speaker slip, fill it out and staff
will give us the speaker request form.

As the evening goes on, if you decide gee,
I can do that, or I'd like to react to what that person
said, raise your hand and we'll get a speaker slip to
you and add your name to the list.
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There's also a form in the citizen kit. It's a short, easy-to-fill-out form you can use to indicate your opinion about the districts. You can complete it and hand it in tonight to staff, mail it back later. I believe there's an envelope for the citizen kit already addressed to the Commission, or go on the website. The form is there and fill it out.

The website is up on the screen, www.azredistricting.org. I'd encourage you to fill that out even if you've given us input before.

There's a lot of good information on the website. It's updated regularly. There are summaries of the hearings had up until now on there. As soon as the consultants prepare them for us, the draft maps are there. Zoom in, get a lot of detail. Any press releases we put them on there. Frequently asked questions, and many other useful things. I'd encourage you to visit it often. It's updated regularly.

We are pleased to hear from you any time during the process, by regular mail or by e-mail. Redistricting will determine the kind representation we'll have in the state for the rest of the decade. It's worthy of the effort, energy, and goodwill all of us can gave it.

I appreciate your interest, information,
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in Arizona's first citizen-conducted redistricting.

That's our presentation. And now it's time to hear from you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Minkoff.

What we are going to do is reposition the podium so we can have better contact with the speaker. We'd ask as your name is called and you come to the podium, again spell any unusual name, or spell your name for the stenographer, that would be helpful.

In order to accommodate all that wish to speak, I ask speakers limit their comments to, let's say, no more than five minutes. If there are more lengthy comments you wish to make, at the end of the first round of speakers, we'd be more than happy to invite you back to the podium to continue your remarks.

To the extent you have written comments and wish to submit them, we're always happy to take those and make them part of the record. We're pleased to do that as well.

Again to remind you, if wish an opportunity to speak tonight, fill out a yellow speaker slip. They are available from any of the staff tonight.

I'd like the record to reflect Mr. Hall has joined us and we have a full complement of the Commission this evening.
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The first speaker this evening is Debora Norris, first Vice Chair of Arizona Democratic Party and member of the Legislature party.

MS. NORRIS:  Good evening.  It's good to see you all again.

I'd like to comment on the idea of competition.  The Arizona Democratic Party has looked at the current maps and have come up with five competitive districts in the state.  And that's a concern to us, because we believe that one of the primary reasons for having Proposition 106 is so there would be a more competitive nature and be the possibility of either party having a majority in the Legislature.

This is a concern to us. During this last session, we had a rather balanced Legislature. We can see our priorities in the Legislature have changed for the benefit of most Arizona. Our focus has been moderated. In that way, we believe we have come to serve Arizona better. We really don't want to see the State of Arizona less competitive. We think that would be counterproductive.

Originally 106 was for the purpose of getting rid of gerrymandering. I believe the Commission has done that. The grid has taken care of that problem. The primary purpose of getting rid of gerrymandering was
to get rid of lopsided powers of the Legislature, having
either party run the Legislature. That's what we would
like to see.

As for specifics, I think some of the
districts look really good. I have to compliment this
Commission with staying true to the Commission in
getting minority-majority districts. I think that's
been a really wonderful thing you've done. The thing I
have a concern with, though, is there is a difference
between minority-majority districts and super
minority-majority districts. That's where we may cross
the line between maximizing the vote. In calculus, the
curve, and the speed limit of 55, the maximum
effectiveness of fuel, what is the maximum effectiveness
of the minority vote? In that way they may not only be
influential in perhaps two or three. That way they can
have more of a presence in the Legislative process via
the election process.

I don't have a specific number for you. I
can tell you I looked at some of the districts. And
where 80 percent of a certain district may be a minority
population, I know Tucson in the southern region,
minority-majority districts, about 50 percent, maybe 60,
they have a very successful record in electing minority
representation; also, people are able to represent
nonminority districts. Maybe that's just Tucson.

We don't have a specific number to give to you, but we do know the number is very close to 80 percent minority districts. It may be very close to packing minority communities. We want to make sure they are maximized, minority voices are heard. That's the whole reason the Department of Justice said we need majority-minority districts, so minority voices can be heard. The concern is that we have minority competitive districts and the Legislature best serve all communities. When the Legislature is lopsided, communities are hurt worse. Environmental, education issues are better off when minorities are served in the long run. We want to make sure there are minority-majority districts.

Of course, we're supportive the party has most or all minority representatives in the Legislature, at this point. We're not trying to say we don't want any. We need to make sure when we get minority people elected, we will have a system they can work with, actually pass bills for the community that elected them, and we can only do that through competitive districts, more competitive than the draft maps are currently.

I urge the Commission to look past that idea of competitiveness and look for a number that
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maximizes the minority vote in Arizona without packing them.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Norris, if you stand for questions.

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you for your input. As you indicated in comments --

MS. NORRIS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HALL: -- sometimes we're shooting for a target and we don't know exactly where that is. My question to you is: In your opinion, if we're going to push the envelope on reducing open minority-majority districts, you are in favor of reducing majority-minority districts in an effort to make other districts more competitive? Did I understand what you are were saying?

MS. NORRIS: We all agree we don't want to reduce the number of minority-majority districts. There is no way to reduce that number. That's not what we're talking about. We don't want to reduce that number at all. In fact, I think we should increase that number. But we have to look at where are we maximizing? I can't tell you 50 percent minority population. If we get into detail, look at some things we're not allowed to to look
at, voter performance, registration, for sure 80 percent
is nearing overkill. Have 50, 60 percent, and then if
we -- I hesitate to use the word packing, but all
minorities in one district reduces their voice in other
districts and may reduce their overall voice in the
Legislative process.

COMMISSIONER HALL: To clarify, I did
indicate, I didn't indicate the number of districts.
Our draft plan increases them. I'm focusing
specifically on a percentage. Utilizing that scenario,
you are saying is 50 to 60, you are comfortable that
would be the case throughout all districts, and then try
and utilize whatever additional population, that more
than likely you'd favor that for one party to increase
the competitiveness in neighboring districts?

MS. NORRIS: The focus is how to get the
voice of the minority voice most heard, how to get it
loudest. You are not going to do that if you stick them
all in one district.

I don't think I can stand and say limit it
at 55 percent, 60 percent. There might be regional
differences. The Tucson standard for minority-majority
might be different from the Phoenix standard.

I urge you to look at it. I don't have a
lot of information the Commission here has access to. I
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do know you shouldn't have one size fits all. Maybe
that's what the result is here. I don't know exactly
what you based your numbers on.

Again, the information is maximizing the
voice of communities.

I think if we can -- I don't think you can
say that if you take a particular community, that they
have to be in this one square, that's where they live.
We interact a lot. That's the school of thought.
Tucson is a lot like that. They shop, eat. I don't
feel like we're confined to one five square miles.

I do think that we may not be maximizing
the political voice with this map in some cases where
we're nearing 80 percent, a super majority, which I
think is great, maybe in the sense they are all together
with the idea of community of interest. I don't think
it furthers the political voice. That's one of the
things the Commission here needs to be aware of.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Let me give a bit of

a hypothetical, put you in the position of a
Commissioner, consider the Voting Rights Act, Section
Two, all of that. Let me give you an example.
Currently it's a 65 percent majority. By hearings,
meetings, input, we've been asked to increase that so
they have a better opportunity to elect their
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representative of choice say to 70. If we go down to
60, or 55, then we're threatened with a challenge based
on retrogression. Would you encourage the Commission to
vote and face a challenge on retrogression?

MS. NORRIS: There's a lot of difference
between 55 and 70. To be frank, probably 55.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: We're threatened if
we go below the numbers right now.

MS. NORRIS: If you go below --
While it may fit the legal language, it's
not to the true spirit of elevating the voice.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I agree.

MS. NORRIS: I'm glad I'm not a
Commissioner. It's a tough job to do.

I applaud your work.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I would like to add a
word. Ms. Hauser has one word. Mine is not on the
concept of super majority but the concept of
competitiveness.

You indicated your analysis or party
analysis indicated a certain number on competitiveness.
What would you define as the conclusion of
competitiveness?

MS. NORRIS: I'm not an expert. Our
criteria is do we have a candidate that has a chance of
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winning? That's our idea of competitiveness. Voter performance and perhaps how a certain -- how the voter body voted for a certain body in the past, follow how people voted in the past. A lot has to do not even with party affiliation. A lot of times it's on issues, you know that. Look at registration. That's not always the same, yet a person can be a good candidate, win as a Democratic. I wasn't in the room when crunching numbers, but I do know if you do get into the area where there's an extreme advantage to one party or another, it's no longer competitive. We're looking at lowering those numbers so we can have a more competitive district, focusing more on the candidate more than the parties, which I think probably is more favorable and more of Arizona would agree that's the way it's supposed to be.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Just to follow up, again, I understand you weren't a part of the process in terms of the analysis.

If a district has a reasonably high and disparate registration, more than 10 percent, less than 20, just for the sake of argument, and voting history data for that district showed periodically that district was able to elect representatives from either party over a period of time, would you then call that district
competitive despite its registration?

MS. NORRIS: I think on the criteria I've seen there is a window -- I can't answer that. If I don't have to answer it, it's better to say I can't.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser.

MS. HAUSER: Representative Norris, a follow-up on what Commissioner Lynn answered. Again, appreciating the fact you did not construct the most recent competitiveness data the party performed. Mr. Eckstein testified before us twice using a couple different models. Number five sounds again different to me, so I'd ask, if you could go back and see if you could get additional information for us on exactly what methodology was used to come up with those five districts, it would be very helpful to us.

MS. NORRIS: I apologize. To be helpful, voter registration, I was thinking minority population, different graphs, between 10, 20 percent advantage populationwise. I was still thinking maps. You saw, you have areas to play with those numbers without overly compromising your criteria of communities of interest. Perhaps that's what our idea of competitiveness is. You could tweak it a little bit, and that, we'd move, our two conversations wouldn't be polarized.

MS. HAUSER: The other question I have,
going back to the issue of majority-minority districts,
to make you aware, we've had testimony in particular
from the Navajo Nation concerning the level of minority
concentrations. They'd like to have influence, given
the low voting age population in relation to overall
voting age population and low turnout, and other factors
like that, that they in fact believe they need numbers
somewhere in the 70 percent range. Your previous
comments, given the percentages, you think it might be
able to stand some lowering. Would you think it
relevant for us to take into account the same factors?
The Navajo Nation mentioned voting age population,
turnout, those kind of things in determining minority
percentage to be necessary to have influence.

MS. NORRIS: You do, to a certain extent,
for reasons you can't ignore. I don't know a lot of
cases on voting age. On turnout, a lot of times it's
geographical barriers, distance. Sometimes you don't
know how many citizens -- how many are undocumented.
Numbers, working on strictly population, the job is
difficult. You have more access than I do to some
numbers. However, I still think it's close to 80
percent which is probably over the area we want to
maximize. I would look carefully at those issues.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.
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COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Thank you.

Ms. Norris, I very much appreciate your comments. They are very well thought out and very intelligently delivered. I have another question for you. One of the points made in the Power Point presentation is we've been very, very careful to extent possible to keep cities and towns within the same Legislative District. I'm asking you now how you would view competing criteria. If, in order to keep districts more competitive, it became necessary to change boundary lines so cities that were now united in one district are split into two, or some of the larger cities three or four districts, would you favor doing that if it meant more competitive districts or would you favor keeping cities and towns together?

MS. NORRIS: I think, from testimony I heard, some cities wouldn't mind that. Nogales said they wanted to be in different districts to have more political clout. I don't think it's necessarily a detrimental thing for certain cities and towns to be split up, if that means more political voice.

So I think in not all cases, but I think some cases, I think you could get a city or town to agree it wouldn't be a horrible thing to be in two districts. A lot are split right now and probably are
not dissatisfied with their level of representation, at least numbers wise.

I think as a Commissioner, I'd ask again, are you sure one representative, two representatives, have the opportunity of two representatives, four senators, that may give more leeway. You strive hard to keep all senators, again, maybe you don't feel you belong to one five square mile. People are transient, live their lives in larger areas than that.

MR. RIVERA: You stated, two questions, areas of minority-majority districts be lower based on voting patterns.

MS. NORRIS: Might be lowered.

MR. RIVERA: Might be lowered.

Any idea how you would advise the Commission how to define those areas, find where those areas are? Do you have an opinion how to identify those areas?

MS. NORRIS: I didn't -- 30 Legislative Districts, nearing 80 percentile minority districts, I'm sure you know which ones those are. And there weren't a lot of them, but I recall two or three of them.

MR. RIVERA: I guess more to the fact you said areas might be able to -- minorities or somebody to elect their choice, 50 or 60 percent. Any idea how the
Commission can make the determination, any idea to
idify to the Commission? It would be helpful to give
information today or give the information to the
Commission. That would be helpful.

MS. NORRIS: Can you give me an idea of
when to submit that?

MR. RIVERA: Yesterday.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: By the 15th of the month.

MS. NORRIS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If you could accommodate
that.

MR. RIVERA: Coming back to the testimony,
you stated in your view of the maps, you found areas
where the maps were tweaked to make areas more
competitive, that would be more helpful.

MS. NORRIS: I'll do that.

MR. RIVERA: That's all.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you very much.

Thank you for being here.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Lest anyone be thinking
we'll ask 45 minutes of questions of anyone that gives
testimony, be clear on a couple things. Ms. Norris is
representing the Democratic Party, and in that context
we needed to elicit some responses. We do wish to
engage the public in dialogue on issues we're talking
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about because the maps are still fluid, still in flux.
There are problems involved in these interchanges in
getting to those decisions.

   Mel Hannah representing the Greater
Phoenix Urban League.

   Mr. Hannah.

   MR. HANNAH:  As announced, I'm Mel Hannah
representing the Greater Phoenix Urban League,
H A N N A H, Hannah.

   Basically, the League supports a plan, if
you will, submitted earlier hearing at the hearing at
the Pointe South Hilton the 8th, 9th, 10th, the
Legislative Districts, in particular ones we have
observations on.

   Basically, our recommendation is this plan
will allow you to be in compliance, if you will, with
all the processes of the Constitution and the Voter
Rights Act, propositions of 106.

   I want to back up a bit and comment, you
and staff and consultants are doing an excellent job.

   By no means is your job easy. I read somewhere the
gauge of that will be how many people are upset at you
when this is all over. I won't be an easy job. I
suppose a lot this room and other rooms will feel this
way when it's all over. I commend you on the
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enlightening and encouraging process. The Urban League feels certain elements in 106 really are kind of what we focus on, the reason to support the South Mountain Central Phoenix Plan, one to suggest and allow you to abide by boundary man-made natural boundaries, particularly the western portion of what is now District P to allow you in our view of I-10 as it flows north and extends westward. We feel, utilizing that as if a man-made mountain boundary, if you will, it does allow communities of interest and creates an element of competitiveness consistent with what some guidelines ask you to do.

The second thing important is the ability to be competitive, competitive in terms of traditional political sense has meant the ability have to major parties equally or to some degree of equality compete for district seats. I'd submit some districts make sure there may be competitiveness between the majority and minority groups in those districts.

Certainly, in our opinion, some man-made boundaries, some communities of district, there are other elements we feel can accommodate and are done so. In fact, you'll be in a position to take into account those particular sets of regulation. Those comments are based on Legislative seats. We don't have any major
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concerns relative to the Congressional Districts.

Again, we want to commend you for our outstanding work
in a difficult setting.

Any questions, and I'd be happy to try to
answer them.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I have one. There was a
suggestion to use I-10 as a man-made boundary for
District P. As I understand it, to extend District P
slightly to the east past roughly one freeway alignment,
take some population from District Q, also raise the top
portion of District P from the current along I-17 to the
I-10 portion of the freeway through Phoenix. I know you
don't have a map in front of you. Let me call your
attention to this one, if I may.

If you take a look at the map, make sure
the way I thought I heard you say it is what you meant,
if you notice P, the eastern color of P goes slightly to
the east to pick up I-10.

MR. HANNAH: Correct. Suggestion is use
10 on the eastern portion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The top portion rather
than using I-17, the suggestion is use I-10 on the
northern boundary. That would add population to P.

Where, then, would you cut P to cut
population to get back to ideal population?
MR. HANNAH: I'm not sure if that process would not fit within the window anyway. Precisely where that, a little further, without giving the exact location, I could provide later.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'd be pleased if you give that to us later.

Other questions for Mr. Hannah?

Thank you very much.

Next speaker, Leah Landrum Taylor.

MS. LANDRUM TAYLOR: Hello.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Taylor, very nice to see you.

MS. LANDRUM TAYLOR: I'm hanging in there, walking slower.

Thank you, Commissioners, for letting us speak and returning back to South Mountain College.

I'd Echo what Mel Hannah spoke about earlier, the South Mountain plan presented on the 9th of August at the South Mountain resort, a plan we very much support. That plan, here currently in the P section, is something that, it's definitely a good start in the right direction. Our concern is it's still in the northern portion of the district. It did go between the 10 and 17 freeway. We'd not necessarily veer off into the area at the very far east, almost hitting into the
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Scottsdale, Tempe area, making sure the cities are staying together. That's one of the big concerns we had about the current district, the head of the little terrier dog there. Take a look at the terrier dog.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I call it the Scottie.

MS. LANDRUM TAYLOR: Look at it, that the populations be able to match and jibe, the map we in turn in support, South Mountain Central Phoenix community. The one we wanted to touch on, the one mentioned earlier, we'd like to make sure the Commission adheres to it. You guys are moving in that direction. We'd like to make sure we do have competitive districts. That's something really important, what the Commission, as far as I'm concerned, one of the original goals establishing the original goals to make sure there was a sense of competitiveness. And something we can't emphasize enough, we've already gone over earlier this evening, and I have to ditto those comments made.

That's it. I'd emphasize the northern portion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Landrum Taylor, the same question I posed, if I understand, the exchange of population you are talking about adding to District P, that portion of population between I-17 and I-10,
exchange you think we should take a look at is what we
call Oak, we you called the head of Scottie dog,
inclusion in the Northern District O?

MS. LANDRUM TAYLOR: Yes.

One of the things I've been reading about,
the goals of the Commission, is be sure you do follow
natural as well as man-made boundaries as much as
possible, and that could be done as much as possible.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: For your edification, we
spent this afternoon hearing I-10 is no sort of boundary
at all.

MS. LANDRUM TAYLOR: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: You want us to ignore
that.

MS. LANDRUM TAYLOR: We see it as a
boundary. And to make sure there are the necessary
resources in the downtown area, we'd want to continue to
have those.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: What I thought I heard
Mr. Hannah say, and what I thought I heard you allude
to, is these adjustments create a greater opportunity
for competition among major minority groups. Is that
correct?

MS. LANDRUM TAYLOR: It would consistently
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go along with diversity in the district and make sure
something is adhered to and create good competition, as
well, and something necessary.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Thank you,

Ms. Landrum Taylor. I wanted to relate Ms. Taylor's
comments to Representative Norris, what she saw as
ecessarily high representation in some districts,
District P is drawn as total minority, 76 percent,
voting population is 70 percent minority. My guess is
that the changes you are proposing would probably
increase that percentage, in other words, we'd have a
higher minority District P. The areas you are proposing
adding into it have higher minority percentages than
areas you're asking we remove from it. My question
relates to comments by Representative Norris, voiced by
Representative Norris, the minority voice would be
diminished by moving out of the districts as drafted,
they'd be diminished. That should we leave P the way it
is or make changes suggested, it's a very strong
minority-majority district. I wonder whether if we make
that change, created a homogenous district, it
essentially may dilute voices in other districts. I'd
ask you to react to that.

MS. LANDRUM TAYLOR: I thank you for that
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question.

In this instance, as far as the way it's laid out, it's very difficult to really have a less than majority-minority district. I see what you are talking about in that instance. One concerns are focusing on still looking at the community of interest, it still has more of a community of interest than getting toward the Tempe area. That's one concern we had as a major concern, make sure it is shared with that.

Now, as far as maybe a couple other districts, we want to make sure it's not a situation of having packing taking place. We want to be sure everybody has an opportunity to be represented. In some instances, we don't want to have potential disenfranchisement of a particular group. In this instance, there is more of a community of interest. I'm not necessarily focusing on what your point was.

I do appreciate the question.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Landrum Taylor, thank you very much. It's nice to see you.

Next speaker, Jacquelyn Butler.

A VOICE: Ms. Butler had to leave unexpectedly.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If she returns, we'll accommodate her appearance.
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Ms. Riann Balch, Executive Director,

Arizona Coalition to End Homelessness,

MS. BALCH: Mr. Speaker, Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm Riann Balch, Executive Director of the Coalition to End Homelessness. I represent 200 homeless service providers, services providers statewide for 2,000 people sleeping on the streets in Arizona any given night.

As a citizen here in Congressional District One, as a citizen concerned about families and individuals living in poverty in our community and in the state, I'm here to ask you to recognize and address the communities of interest of the homeless by placing a larger emphasis on competitive districts than is apparent in the current redistricting plans.

From our membership, I believe it's of paramount importance all candidates for public office being elected are accountable for all their constituents.

Thank you for the opportunity to express my opinion on behalf of the membership and myself and in taking on this task.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Balch, you mention in the same sentence, or same thought, one community of interest and competitiveness of districts. In your
opinion, do you favor one or the other, assuming you had
to make the choice?

MS. BALCH: I commend you for recognizing
and accommodating the minority populations, I think as
somebody that represents people living on low incomes,
we'd favor making competitive districts above anything
else. It is so important that elected officials be
responsive to constituents in whatever district they're
in.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

MS. BALCH: You are welcome.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I have one more speaker

If there are those of you that wish to be
heard this evening, please turn in your speaker slip as
quick as you can, at this point. There may be a couple
more coming down. Legal counsel likes keeping them,

Surprise, surprise. Don't worry we won't get to hear
from you.

The next speaker in the cue is Mark
Fleisher who was here and is down the hall.

MR. FLEISHER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Fleisher, will you
join us at the podium?

MR. FLEISHER: I will.
I will. I was having a conversation in the back.

I heard a lot of people say how hard you worked, how much they appreciated it, much bigger the task was than any anticipated, including yourselves. I appreciate you are dealing with a problem to which there are no easy answers, an equation, no one will be happy with what you come up with, no matter what you try to come up with. What you are trying to come up with, and now, at this is time, you are looking at competitiveness.

I think it's important to remember the reason Prop 106 passed, the reason you are here, you've been told it is to make districts competitive. In making them competitive, taking away gerrymandering, that's the reason it passed. That's the reason we're all here talking about talking about competitiveness is to assure true Congressional races and Legislative races. I know Congressional District 29 is one that does now.

The difference in having competitiveness,

I'm not sure how the term five percent came about, if it's a term someone in the newspaper came up with or someone using five percent voter difference, five percent, I'm not sure where that came from. Maybe it
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didn't have anything to do with the Commission. They still should not be bulletproof, so one-sided Democrat or Republican no one has a way of winning. There are times one side should be able to win, not be able to have five percent in every district. 10 percent, nice, go either way, or less. If 12, 15 percent in one of the districts, we know any district with 29 or 27 percent has a distinct advantage.

Look exactly at how you make changes. I understand changes are difficult.

On the Congressional map, there are eight to deal with rather than 30. Congressional map, A, more competitive, taking in part of district, let me look, part of District D. F part, take in part of G, make it more competitive. East Valley is very solidly Republican. That doesn't make it fair in saying the other hundred thousand or 80,000 voters never voted when you create a district like District F.

I hope you look at these adjustments when adjustments are made. If not competitive, bring down the number so you don't have districts with 29 percent, or 20 percent, or 18 percent. Get to the seven, eight, nine, 10 percent range.

I think it's very easy to make -- right now the only competitive districts are C and H. An easy
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competitive -- it's difficult for B, E or F to be competitive. Make them less bulletproof.

Those are my comments.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Comments or questions for Mr. Fleisher?

MR. FLEISHER?

MR. ELDER.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'd like to have you give advice on the choices.

MR. FLEISHER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Would you rather see 10 or 12 percent, 77 eight in one or --

MR. FLEISHER: I'm not sure I understand.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: What? F is very predominantly Republican. If you take and distribute the density of Republicans.

MR. FLEISHER: F I'm looking at, 91,000 to 156,000.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: What I'm asking, irrespective of what district, rather than see one or two districts that have 20 or 30 percent deviation and the rest of them could be in the five, seven percent range, or rather have them all 12 or 15 percent?

MR. FLEISHER: I'd rather make them all as competitive as you can.

When someone has a bulletproof district,
they govern for that district and are not as responsive. When competitive, they work harder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Competitive is 10, 12, 30 percent?

MR. FLEISHER: I'd say competitive, eight, nine, where someone can win. 12, 13, something like Grosscoff, something could happen out of control. Seven, eight is within reach with a good candidate running. An incumbent like J.D. Hayworth, what makes that competitive, you can't look at an individual candidate. If J.D. Hayworth were not there, what would happen? Seven, eight, nine points, that at least allows a person that does win to be responsive to citizens so they have to worry about getting elected without a 30 point advantage where they don't have to worry about constituents at all.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Fleisher, I think I agree with your concept in theory.

MR. FLEISHER: I agree.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: How do you implement it implicitly in Proposition 106? We're required districts be compact and contiguous. We're required to respect communities of interest.

MR. FLEISHER: Hang on.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: How do you mix the
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Republican population with, say, the West Valley without violating those principles?

MR. FLEISHER: Look at this dragon or puppy dog.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Let me answer that. We did not do that for the sake of competitiveness.

MR. FLEISHER: Let me --

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: It was for the sake of protecting a community of interest, another one of the criteria. Compact, contiguous, community of interest.

MR. FLEISHER: Only 15 people.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Community of interest, and contiguous.

Let me ask you again. There's an issue, again, we hopefully can make contact on. The proposition says districts shall be compact and contiguous, we shall respect communities of interest, we should make districts competitive. When we created the long neck it was in a balancing of two criteria against each other. What you are asking us to balance is criteria we don't have to balance against.

How do we balance the Republicans in the East Valley without doing violence to other mandatory

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
MR. FLEISHER: We won't get better, probably double digits. You certainly can come down into part of G, which would be, come down and get Democrats. G is heavily Democrats, get some votes to get down to a 10, 12 percent number. If you leave it at 29 percent, the people there that are Democrat, they have no voice at all. The district becomes bulletproof. I understand what you are saying. If you can make this adjustment, the community of interest adjustment for Hopi, which the Commission deemed necessary, which violated the idea of compactness, then the old District 20, Surprise, go up to Surprise, this is almost the same thing.

There are only 15 people living in that neck. You say contiguous, not contiguous, it matches other requirements you thought important. I won't get more in line percentagewise.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: When you suggest down south out of the East Valley, I know you are addressing contiguity. Would you focus on communities of interest for me?

Are you suggesting the East Valleys have a community of interest with Pinal County and the minority populations in the southern district?
MR. FLEISHER: When you list things from Prop 106, I was in the discussions when it was put together, competitiveness was equal or higher, was listed last, but it's the most important thing. I hear from you competitiveness is the last item, it may not be done --

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: That's not me you are quoting but Proposition 106.

MR. FLEISHER: I understand. It was clearly passed. Because it was supposed to be, 106, to keep from violating 106, maybe north, go into the blue area C, get numbers. Take one district, help create a way. I'll be glad to see any one of them not violate the goals, keep tribes, have counties and towns not split, certain things. You can't keep every community of interest happy. That may be true. I think you've achieved that answer on your own without me having to state that.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We're looking for one.

Mr. Fleisher, I have a question. Of three concepts, another way of asking the same question, an important way of asking the same question, of three concepts, rank order them in terms of importance: One, community of interest; two, Voting Rights Act violation; three, is competitiveness of districts.
MR. FLEISHER: If I was to rank them in interest?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Importance.

MR. FLEISHER: Competitiveness so it does not violate the Voting Rights Act, communities of interest, and the Voting Rights Act. Do it in that order.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other questions?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I did have a question. I'm using the wrong mike again.

What I'm doing, I'm looking at statistics on districts, trying figure out what you are asking, and looking at it it looks like it's impossible to make F other than bulletproof because of the concentration of people that live there. It just looks like a pretty difficult thing to do, the same with D. Once again, because of the concentration, one heavily Republican, one heavily Democratic, would you see a problem understanding the way people are concentrated, the way people live, where concentrated patterns are chosen, if we even out some others, we'd still have a couple districts, as you say, bulletproof?

MR. FLEISHER: I see, I live at Tatum and Thunderbird. There are many Democrats in that area. I'm sure there are some areas, using H, some may have to
be bulletproof. It's unfortunate, but there may not be
any choice. F, D, it may be, too, you can't get down
into the competitive range. I understand. B and E, it
will be difficult to get to 10 or less. Dropping 17 or
18 to 10 or 12 allows the other party there to get
responsiveness from a concerned office.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Fleisher, I think
I speak safely on behalf of each of my fellow
Commissioners, we dang near sleep together, it seems
like. I have a good vision of where we all are on this
subject. I think every one of us would like to see more
competitive races. Now, maybe my fellow Commissioners
are welcome to disagree with me. That's what our intent
is. So as we wrestle with this, coming back to what
Mr. Huntwork was saying, in F, in some maps, if a
Democrat, they help you sell your home. I know. I have
relatives there and I'm a Democrat.

MR. FLEISHER: Are they a Democrat?

COMMISSIONER HALL: No. They still live
there.

You can see we're wrestling with the whole
concept. What we're wrestling with, what I heard, take
some of D and put in B.

MR. FLEISHER: Or A.
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COMMISSIONER HALL: Take some of F and put in A. I guess what my question is, pursuant to what Mr. Rivera asked of the previous speaker, is give specific suggestions wherein we're able to make them more competitive and still comply fully with the Voting Rights Act and respect appropriately communities of interest.

MR. FLEISHER: The easiest one is A to make competitive. Take D, keep D strong as a minority-majority district. Make A competitive, or much more competitive.

I want to make it clear, everyone talks about being competitive. I understand I may be wrong, there, maybe it's not five percent as being a competitive range. There's also the argument of not being competitive, that bulletproof is important. No one commented much on B. I can tell you if a Democrat calls John Shaddag, he's not very responsive. In a closer election, even with an eight, nine percent advantage, he'd be more responsive. That's part of what, again, not being bulletproof is about. If not being bulletproof, if not competitive, make them not bulletproof.

COMMISSIONER HALL: We'd welcome alternative solutions. We get several unsolicited. I'm
requesting some ideas on what you are suggesting to make all the goals work.

MR. FLEISHER: We have a suggested map to adjust all eight districts.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Unless a straight trade of population which achieves that.

MR. FLEISHER: 50,000, 50,000.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Keep population roughly the same.

Mr. Hall's suggestion, take up to the 15th of the month and perhaps a little beyond that, any specific suggestions you have that would aid us in achieving that goal, we'd all like to see competitive districts.

MR. FLEISHER: Let me take a stab at it and submit that to you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next speaker is Cody Williams, a member of the Phoenix City Council.

Mr. Williams.

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: Thank you, members of the Committee, and those of you patient enough to hang out.

I could not help but be engaged in the discussion that proceeded me. And I would like to offer a concept that is key. While we were very familiar with
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the desire to be competitive, the one thing I never see distinguished, particularly when we talk about majority-minority districts, is ethnicity does not translate into efficacy.

In order for you to have competitiveness, you must have efficacy. One of the reasons why a strong Republican dominated community may be a more difficult challenge for competitiveness is because not necessarily does all of the counter-balancing result in efficacy. And so having, you know, said that, you have certainly a greater opportunity when you deal with 30 districts in a Legislative effort than you may have when you are dealing with eight individual rulings of communities. But I will challenge you to appreciate the fact that the strong Democratic -- the strong Republican voting population is a different kind of voting population than you find in the southern part of E. And I'm suggesting that the population that makes up Ahwatukee and Tempe has shown a dramatic voting difference, a different kind of individualism. You saw that proposition 302, the football stadium, we have strong support from those individuals south of South Mountain. Simply active, simply strong voting bodies in F may see divergent differences. What I'm asking you to consider
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specifically, hopefully in Glendale next week, I believe that's your next meeting, grab your mind around, for instance, what South Scottsdale, from its downtown to the Tempe border, and Tempe's downtown area, that they are more similar than South Scottsdale is with North Scottsdale. And I think if you looked at the percentages of individuals there, if you looked at the issues that they are facing, and they then become more like the City of Phoenix's downtown urban efforts with the historic property related efforts, redevelopment, also similar to the area in Glendale.

So if there was a district where B, for instance incorporated, took into consideration those areas of B, D, and F that made up a body of voting opportunities, you would be very close to that 50, 50 competitive opportunity. You would also be taking some of the numbers in a packed D and spreading them around. You would be taking some of the numbers in a packed E and spreading them around and creating also what could be a packed B and spreading them around and creating within a urban metropolitan area an of opportunity to have the very competitive districts with that original question you asked of Mr. Fleisher, which I happen to disagree on that point with him because I think there are some things you have to concede in order to achieve.
If we have to achieve, there are some slam
dunks, I don't agree with the conversation of
bulletproof, he considered Mr. Scott, I believe he would
have been considered bulletproof. One individual
changed that. One individual can change the position of
bulletproof. If we're in a position to change the
balance of communities, of interchanges of politics, the
ethnicities, or F being something nice and neat, E
looking something like District Counsel Six the way it's
broken up, we used to call that the barbell district, or
dumbbell, depending on who you referred to it to, and
appreciating the fact good candidates will certainly
race and rise to the top, I assure you I'd much prefer
to have an opportunity as an individual to run in a
district that included Republicans in Ahwatukee than I
would trying to run with the Republicans in Mesa. This
is not to say they aren't both wonderful individuals
that pay their taxes and love their children. I know
how long these individuals have lived in this area, and
I know the regions of world they've come from. And it's
the United States, and there is the opportunity for us
to have an opportunity. Even if that 10 percent or 15
percent is closer, then we have, we as individuals have
an opportunity to feel there's a chance.

I had to dive into that discussion only to
suggest to you I think personally, and others think
along with me, that there are ways to create three
competitive urban districts. As you know, when I stood
before you in the past I was certainly concentrating on
the majority population that is in Maricopa County
should concentrate on competitiveness. You may not
create it simply by the number of Democrats, or
competition, the distribution of African minority, or
Hispanics, but please consider the fact.

If you looks, Leah Landrum mentioned the
terrier here, these areas sort of outlined in yellow
represent mainly farm land. But by the time we go
through this process again, the projection is there will
be over 30,000 new homes. If you need that information,
the City information can provide it to you. The
Estrella Plan, Laveen Plan, South Mountain Baseline
Master Plan. Those plans have already established a
precedent for the number of homes. They also have the
ability to just share with you where growth is being
directed in this area. By the time an election or two
has taken place, the community of interest argument will
no longer exist if this community continues to be there,
because they will not have the same density of commerce
that you see along the corridor of I-10 as it moves
along. It will not even be included. It can only be
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moved to households. Households will not share the same concerns. Households sentiment that communities, households that existed for over 60 years.

I ask you to consider creating something that allows a community to exist and develop as M is going to exist and develop over time.

There is something very common to the way those communities will evolve. Certainly as you look at what is north and east in that district, what would be the dog's head --

When I say the dog, I'm talking about that little puppy right here. The ear right there. It has his teeth showing. I know that's not fair. If I ask you to go look at clouds, you might not think that cloud --

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Guadalupe is the paws.

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: But it's not from a competitive perspective. We're dealing with individuals, not going to have to shift 10,000 Dems or 10,000 Republicans, shift Democrats to Democrats, dealing with communities of interest as they exist today and highly likely exist, these are areas as they mature, as they grow, if they do grow, will not be in a position to shift positions as they exist today versus what we
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see to the far west. They'll certainly change, certainly be different, and tend to develop more like M in other western cities as they go from this point forward.

The final thing I'll say is to express my appreciation for the amount of work you've put in. One thing is we'll look at these things and make changes. You've heard us make recommendations. When we see the next wave of maps, and they don't look like anything you thought they would look like, I thought they would like, like I saw it, I don't know, perhaps I wasn't hearing you, me as an individual, individuals anticipating different, or people you are giving direction to to make the changes, but I certainly appreciate that, too, is being discussed as we get together. Are we actually being heard and are these changes actually being incorporated? And are the possible outlines like you asked us to provide, Mr. Hall is seeing it two, three, four, five different ways, are you getting a chance to see it two, three, four, five ways, or are they putting it in one map and for the next two weeks rolling with that? It's something I hope is not the case. I hope the people you have working for you are like the ones we have working for us. We pay them they do the things. They are working for us instead of creating policy their
own way.

I appreciate the time, you, the interested parties put into this and look forward to seeing you in the near future.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Don't go away.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Very interested in going away.

Next Mike.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have a couple of questions that relate competing criteria we have to consider. I'd like to ask your opinion based on remarks just given, the same one I asked Representative Norris. One of the criteria of Prop 106 is respecting integrity of cities, town boundaries, subdivisions; another is communities of interest; and third is competitive districts. And the change in Congressional Districts you were talking about would divide political subdivisions not currently divided. What I'm asking you is rank these priorities: Competitiveness, communities of interest, political subdivisions, and tell me if you believe one is more important than another.

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: I would certainly say, having served local government boundaries, in most cases they are generic to those that live there. If you
are in Ahwatukee, you eat at Red Lobster in Chandler.
You don't think: Hey, if I buy that food, it goes to
their tax base; the money goes to supporting Tempe or
Chandler's tax base. I do that. I totally avoid eating
across local lines.

As we look at how far we're willing to go
to spend, enjoy, participate, we often don't consider
those boundaries unless we are reminded of them.

What I suggest certainly is, first,
competitiveness, and then, two, communities of interest,
and then, three, the geographic realities you might try
to figure out from one line to another.

I would say that also to suggest that as
we look at our city concentric circles as we've moved
away from the circle, Phoenix, north of a certain line
demarcation, is more like the north whole parallel than
it is like what it is downtown.

I know individuals remind me on a constant
basis there is no real interest in what is happening in
downtown Phoenix because they can get that right down
the street from them in Scottsdale. This is not saying
they want to be Scottsdale residents. It is suggesting
their community of residence, in that instance, is one
more related to that area and where they live. Same
thing, I-17 corridor. Same thing, deal with the south,
southeast in Maricopa County.

That's probably a more convoluted answer than you wanted.

That's a way to break things down. That's what I believe. It's a way to serve our state better by having the opportunity to look at those individuals whose representative would certainly be in a position to help direct change across the board, taking one idea, say, in redevelopment of Tempe, extrapolating it into the same technique, ideas, of Southern Scottsdale, looking at Glendale, Southern Phoenix as a suggestion.

I also believe you could create a district which incorporated, as I said before, the southern half of E, south of the city, incorporated into D, have D move into B, B move over into E, and accomplish those same things.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Let me ask, one of the second things relates into different competing interests. I'd like your opinion. When we looked at the existing six Congressional Districts we found out while they started out with equal population, they certainly are not now because certain areas experienced tremendous growth, some not so much. District Six, three million people, six, 300,000, a third more people in District Five.

In drawing some districts early on, in
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developing the draft, we tried to look at that and we
drew districts maybe vertically instead of horizontally
or horizontally instead of vertically. Both took on
growth areas. In doing that, we may have taken in less
competitive districts.

You referred to the areas in the west or
southwest part of the valley. They can anticipate
tremendous growth. City of Tempe probably has no way to
go.

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: What I'd ask, to
what extent do you believe we should consider growth
patterns in drawing districts? What priority would they
have vis-a-vis other things we talked about?

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: 10 years ago, 20
years ago, I know we're growing smarter in the effort,
we've now required cities and jurisdictions to have
established a general plan which clearly establishes
those things and then requires certain triggering
mechanisms before those things can be changed.
Therefore, it's not as easy to go in on individual
projects and change what may be the scheme of the growth
patterns in a particular area. So we, at the City of
Phoenix, because we've been engaged in that, have a head
start over some of the smaller sister cities around us.

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
However, they are required to use similar technology to establish their general plans.

For instance, Tolleson has made it very clear theirs is not an effort to grow by numbers of individuals, but those zoning decisions have been more toward industrial and commercial because that's the base they seek.

Avondale and Goodyear are seeking to create different structures for their areas.

These things exist today, and I know we're in the final throws of something already complicated enough.

I do believe that's information which general phone calls could determine as to where you believe it's going. We already have the five areas we'll be focusing on for our economic development and regional development corridor, the central city today. 20,000 new people have the ability to be on 640 acres of state land in Ahwatukee. We can tell you almost to a human being how many people we expect to be there over the next 10 years. Other cities will be moving in the same directions. Whether they can do that or not, when you look at existing zoning, developers go to where it's easier to get to than where it's not. It may not be something plausible. I apologize if I tried to throw
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out something more involved than that I probably can
expect to really have happen. I believe it's a piece of
information, had it been a part of the discussions over
the last two, three months, it would have been something
easy to digest and easy to appreciate from the '70s.

There are only 87 cities in the State of
Arizona and only 15 counties. This is not 88 counties,
88 cities per county. 87 cities with 87 boundaries to
have a way to check information. That's why I raise it.
It's information relevant to the efforts and obtainable
to create something easier to digest than something
overly complicated.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I don't know if it's
a question in here or comment, but we've heard through a
series of hearings in the second round situations where,
as one example, an area of the state, we think this plan
would really work well, take in the reservation and
lands. Two meetings later, three meetings, go listen to
the reservation people, gosh, we wish somebody had asked
us. We don't want to be part of that.

We heard fairly strong testimony from the
City of Tempe saying if you do have to divide us, 60 is
it. That's where we want to be divided. We'd rather
stay whole. And heard it from Chandler, and that. You
made a comment you were watching to see if what you say
is what you do. Understand my point is I'd like to
listen to people in the areas, not have somebody else
speaking for them. I like to ask is this a good idea?
I like the ideas, try to see how the glue fits, and then
see if there might be something in other areas of
testimony that preclude, like you said, competing
testimony, and how do we resolve this.

You've had experience in the valley. Have
there been ways of doing resolution in areas such as
this?

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: Any of the things
I've suggested to you, with the exception of what might
be the B format, would not necessarily lead you to
divide Tempe in half, for instance.

The point I make about that commonality is
that I see a greater relationship with the southern half
of E and it's the rest of the bottom half of E by itself
that can be fit to B, D, F, any other place you place
it.

When I look to the relationship to the
northern half of B, I see it less than I do partners,
neighbors to the west or east of it.

I'm not suggesting take Tempe and start
dicing it into four quarters. I'm suggesting that that
cohesive body represents a finite, literally, as
Ms. Minkoff indicated, a finite number. We don't have
to worry about, start worrying about growth with some
numbers.

If we're able to capture Tempe, Ahwatukee,
and part of Chandler, whatever, and find a way to look
at those areas, that might not be as complicated as to
divest North Phoenix. That's a suggestion.

As I said before, by the time you get to
Glendale, we'll have plans. I might not be there to
present them. You don't want to keep hearing me.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: You are always
invited.

COUNCILMEMBER WILLIAMS: Yeah, yeah.
I certainly appreciate the relationship of
what Tempe is here. I appreciate how important Curry in
Tempe is, like East McDowell is, as it separates the
bottom half of Scottsdale. Once you start moving that
body up, very little is similar. The golf course has
changed, development of the golf course has changed,
complexion of the community has changed, certainly the
relationship and balance between Democrats.

I hope you appreciate that for what it's
worth. I hope one is of a mind necessary to be willing
to vote for the best candidate as opposed to I'm only
going to vote for this individual because he or she is of one party over another.

If I could prioritize anything, it would be to create anything, that is truly the case. That's the best of all words as far as I see it.

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

The next speaker is Levi Pace.

Mr. Pace.

MR. PACE: Good evening. I'm Levi Pace from District 20. I'm a representative committeeman from up in that area.

I'm looking at your map, and I guess District 20 has been pushed around and gerrymandered as much in the '95, we went throughout Surprise and El Mirage, and now we're chopped off here into a little square. We have the east side of 17 that we had before the '95 deal, and now you've moved us south, and so -- and you have the Northern Glendale corridor you chopped off from us.

Don't know where those people would be for years and years, don't know why those people would be for you and yours. There's five miles in there, a mile wide. I think that before they finalize this, this, I think District 20 is the most Democratic district in the
state. We're the only ones that elect three Democrats in the Republican Legislature time after time. This looks like you are just trying to chop us down and add us onto the south end of our -- the south end of our district and chop off the north end that they chop off, or they gave to us in '95. And so it looks like a gerry -- it's nice to get gerrymandered away from El Mirage and Surprise, because they haven't had representation in the last three elections because it was 15 miles to get from Glendale or Phoenix out to El Mirage. You had no corresponding action between the two of us since that happened. I'm glad to see that happen. I hate to see that happen from 43rd and 83rd Avenue.

And I think that your map has shown a great deal of ingenuity for taking out the gerrymandering with the exception, I guess, of the Sun City area and Youngtown, a little sacred enclave nobody wants to touch. I think it's a little nice to get some of us older people out of those towns and get the older people of Arizona out, instead of Sun City, Youngtown, and Sun City West. But it disturbs me, we got all our officers pushed out of I-17, and all our officers pushed on the other side of the I-17 freeway, but all the officers moved. Just a matter -- I just wanted to bring that up.
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Really, this competitiveness, I don't think very many people want to realize to get politics back to where it's fun, to where you feel like running out and being active and being active, you have to have competitiveness. And other thing is have younger people in this in the mix.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Pace.

Next speaker Jeannette Fish representing the Maricopa Farm Bureau.

MS. FISH: Jeannette Fish, J E A N N E T T E. It means you put in everything you can possibly put in there and still have it say Jeannette.

Let me turn your attention to a different community of interest, if I could. Different. I don't have a clue if Republicans or Democrats.

Look a minute at the farmers across the nation. Fewer than 20 percent of the population are still producing food, fibers, plants for yards and food. It's hard for us. A lot are not aware of the agricultural land and what it means to each of us individually.

With that preaching over with, the far reaches of the county, Maricopa County, if I could, looking first at the Buckeye area, that would be draft
Legislative Districts L and D. And the area there, it looks as if L and D splits right about through the middle of Buckeye. Buckeye, the few remaining areas, there's a lot of agriculture.

I'd like to suggest the line on the western end, Legislative L, move up to I-10. The agricultural land there on the south side of the freeway, Goodyear, Avondale, I don't think the freeway line makes much difference once past Cotton Lane, Jack Rabbit Trail. The major difference is farming land and the area north of the freeway. In fact, the area in Buckeye is annexed, a very large area north of the freeway.

I understand the cut for the future community, but they have kind of indicated there's a new area to be developed more like Scottsdale. Perhaps the community of interest is split along that line.

If I had my druthers, the other end of the county, the east end, district U, would extend to the east side and still have farming rather than on the west side. As I see that farming land disappearing under rooftops all across the area. I'm not sure it can make a big difference if you made a change.

The last point I'd make, I haven't heard anyone say tonight the Commission will work hard against
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gerrymandering as being high on the list of priorities.

Each map, Congressional District map, Legislative District map, each has one has a really odd-looking district, and I don't understand why. And if there's anyone that later can explain to that how came to be, perhaps we'd avoid that.

Thank you.

Any questions?

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

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm curious, do you have an opinion relative to Congressional District C?

MS. FISH: No.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Fish.

One slip left.

Other slips? If not -- don't sit down,

Mr. Fleisher. One point real fast.

MR. FLEISHER: That's what I said.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: That's your writing.

MR. FLEISHER: I was asked that question earlier, and I didn't answer very well. I got a copy of Prop 106. It reads, "Districts shall comply with the United States Constitution and United States Voting
Rights Act." Those clearly have to be number one and
two.

What we're doing, all others says to the
extent possible, they're subject to geographic and
compact. To the extent practicable. It justifies the
Hopi. It explains the last one, competitiveness. It
says, "To the extent practicable, competitive districts
should be favored where to do so it's to no significant
detriment to other goals." Not "no detriment."

Number one, Constitution; Voting Rights
Act, number two; competitiveness, number three.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: More succinct.

Other members of the public wishing to be
heard?

Anything from counsel?

From the consultants?

Any further instructions the Commission
wishes to make to the consultants?

If not, the Commission will adjourn until
next the meeting tomorrow evening in Prescott.

Thank you all very much for coming.

(Whereupon, the hearing concluded.)

* * * *
STATE OF ARIZONA          )  ss.
       ) COUNT OF MARICOPA      )

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
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typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing 71
pages constitute a true and accurate transcript of all
proceedings had upon the taking of said hearing, all
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way interested in the outcome hereof.

DATED at Phoenix, Arizona, this 17th day
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